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ABSTRACT

With the rise of the digital language archive and the plethora of referenceable content, a critical question arises: “How easy is it for authors to use existing tools to cite the content they are referencing?” This is especially important as people use archived materials as evidence within published language descriptions.

Archived resource metadata is well discussed in language documentation circles; however, bibliographic metadata and its accessibility are less discussed. Discoverability metadata, a subset of archived resource metadata, serves aggregators like OLAC by declaring a resource exists. In contrast, bibliographic metadata functions within documents by declaring where to find a resource that is known to exist.

In this thesis I look at the interaction between Zotero, an open source reference manager, five different archives (PARADISEC, Pangloss, SIL Language & Culture Archives, ELAR, and Kaipuleohone), and three methods of importing metadata from them into Zotero (DOI import, HTML embedded metadata, and file based import). I report on collection and audio artifact metadata provided by the archive to the author via Zotero’s interfaces: what’s included, what’s missing, and what’s misaligned.

Understanding the processes by which authors collect metadata for the purpose of citation and referencing, what metadata they need, and if it is being provided, facilitates the design of useful interfaces to archives which elevate the value of archives to all groups who interact with them. I propose that interaction design is an additional factor to those presented by Chang (2010) in her well received checklist for evaluating language archives. Interaction design, the technical field concerned with designing how people interact with objects and services, is the design process by which archives manage the interactions they have with those they serve. I specifically argue that interaction design adds value to an
archive’s brand, as perceived by the network of archive users, when it facilitates the interaction with bibliographic metadata about artifacts within holdings. This added value speaks to the sustainability of an archive within its sphere of influence. It is increasingly important in the career development of scholars to meet metric-based assessments of their influence in scholarly discussions. Reference counts, including those pointing to the evidentiary record housed in archives, play a significant role in establishing quantitative baseline metrics for scholars.
CHAPTER 1
Background

Within the fields of linguistics and language documentation there has been a favorable response to a larger movement across scholarly disciplines to “prevent the erosion of the base” (Altman 2013). That is, there is a need to secure the evidence on which the discipline depends. This commitment to accessible evidence has led to an embraced use of language archives to house the evidentiary record.\(^1\) However, making evidence accessible is only one part of the picture. It is equally important to link social (including scholarly) uses and observations about the evidence back to where that evidence is preserved—and accessible, that is, through proper referencing. An early discussion of the poor state of referencing can be found in Bird and Simons (2003a:§3.5) where they present the challenges that linguists in a digital world and language documentation practitioners should address with more specificity. The challenge that Bird and Simons laid out was in part answered via the work that went into creating both the *Austin Principles*\(^2\) and a position statement (Berez-Kroeker et al. 2018) which together lay out the imperatives for data referencing and citation.\(^3\)\(^4\)

\(^1\) The embraced use of language archives by language documentation practitioners has also been influenced by scholarly activism, in which scholars have generally broadened their understanding of how scholarly pursuits impact language communities.

\(^2\) https://site.uit.no/linguisticsdatacitation/austinprinciples

\(^3\) In my work, I follow the usage of *citation* and *references* as outlined in the *Chicago Manual of Style* (2017:898 §15.10) and the *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (2010:6). That is, I use the term *citation* to mean an in-line pointer to a specific item within a *references section* (a document-internal link). I use the term *references* to refer to the items in a references section which provide the bibliographic metadata necessary for someone to find the cited resource (a document-external link). A references section is also sometimes called a *bibliography section*, though other document sections, such as *works consulted* may also contain references. References may also appear throughout a work depending on the selected style sheet or the purpose of the document as is the case with annotated bibliographies.

\(^4\) I use the term *artifact* to mean any physical or digital object. In this sense, archives hold artifacts. In my work, I define *evidence* as those things used to support an argument. Evidence may be true or fabricated, but evidence speaks to the use of artifacts as logical propositions for belief. When I use the term *data*, I refer specifically to an artifact which can be described with the DCMIType element *dataset*, e.g., tabulated values which are often designed to be read by computer. In this way, it is not uncommon for scientists in the physical sciences to create a laboratory event (e.g., with an electron or proton) and observe that event with instruments that only produce datasets. Taking certain values from these datasets, then, and using them in an argument allows for the datasets (or some part of a dataset) to serve as evidence. In the activities of linguistics,
This was then followed up with work aimed at authors and publishers which offers a practical method to implement data citation, resulting in *The Tromsø Recommendations for Citation of Research Data in Linguistics* (Andreassen et al. 2019).

In order to promote a culture of informative and effective linking between evidence and its usage, still more work needs to be done. In this research I take a first look at how language archives—acting as evidence distributors—provide metadata to authors. I look at the interaction between authors and archives via an open source tool—*Zotero*—which is used to craft citations and references during the authorship process. *Zotero*\(^5\) was chosen for two reasons: first, a poll conducted in 2015 indicated that sixty percent of respondents use *Zotero*; and second, *Zotero* has more import options and a larger ecosystem of plugins and compatible authorship tools than other open source reference managers. That is, *Zotero* is only one example of technology which sits between artifacts and the creative outputs of scholarly discussion, but there is reason to believe that a larger number of authors use it. Reference managers like *Zotero* are used in various ways, but three benefits are:

1. the abstraction of bibliographic metadata from the formats required by different style sheets (allowing the reuse of the metadata in different authorship projects with different style sheets),
2. the storage of associated research notes with the bibliographic metadata, and
3. the storage and management of a representation of the referenced work (usually a PDF).

In April of 2015, I sent a poll to an SIL International mailing list to which 143 language researchers were subscribed. Approximately thirty percent of the list members responded

---

\(^5\) https://www.zotero.org

---

language documentation, and language archiving, linguists generally create primary artifacts of the following kinds: video, audio, and text. These artifacts may then be processed to create secondary artifacts and compiled into datasets, e.g., using tools like PRAAT to extract formant values. However, generally, the original artifact produced in a linguistic investigation is not a dataset nor data—it is the *artifact*. My perspective has certain similarities with Himmelmann’s (2012) analysis of linguistic data types. However, I do not use the term *data* with as broad a range as he does.
to the following question: *Do you use a citation manager and if so which one?* The results are tabulated in Table 1.

Table 1. Breakdown of reference manager poll responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation Manager</th>
<th>Users</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zotero</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endnote</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citavi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sente</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JabRef / Bibtex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioscape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XLingPaper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RefWorks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general there were two classes of reference manager software users who responded to the poll: those who use a reference manager currently in ongoing research, and those who have used a reference manager in the past but no-longer are conducting research. Both classes of users were treated as “users” and are presented in the same manner. Several people responded that they are not using any reference manager during their research process. I suspect that many more people who are actively involved in research but do not use a reference manager simply did not respond. I interpret these results to indicate that many people don’t use a reference manager at all, but of those who do, there is a significantly larger portion of researchers who use Zotero.⁶

There is a linking cycle between scholarly works, archival artifacts, and authors. The cycle is illustrated in Figure 1 presented in the order of evolutionary history. At point 🔄, Bird and Simons (2003a) urge the discipline to find descriptive and articulate reference formats for linking scholarly works to archival artifacts. More recently indicated by point 🆠, the authors of the *The Tromsø Recommendations for Citation of Research Data in Linguistics* (Andreassen et al. 2019) propose formatting guidelines for use within scholarly works.

---

⁶This kind of question should be investigated with a larger audience of language researchers. One possible bias might be generational. I have incidentally noticed that senior language researchers have a tendency to not use reference managers.
This thesis addresses the relationship between the archive and Zotero at point ☐ and seeks to give an account of the state of the field and which direction the discipline needs to move. Finally, point ☐ indicates that even after bibliographic metadata is in Zotero, Citation Style Language files for specific style sheets need to be updated to accommodate authors as they use tools like Zotero.

Figure 1. The linking cycle between scholarly works and archives

One could reasonably expect that the minimum bibliographic metadata required to be transferred to Zotero via these interactions would be the sum of metadata required to create references across important citation styles such as *Chicago 17th edition Author-date*, APA 6th, APA 7th, *Unified style sheet for linguistics*, etc.

---

7 The *Chicago Manual of Style* outlines two major ways of presenting citations and references, each with several sub-variations. The two major styles presented are often referred to as *Chicago 17th edition* and *Chicago 17th edition Author-date*. The “Author-date” part of the title refers to the presentation style’s format for references where the first element of the reference is the author’s name and the second element is the date. Throughout this thesis I refer to the Author-date style.
This thesis reviews collection records and audio artifacts contained within a collection\(^8\) as the point of analysis across the archives surveyed. As a point of reference and a baseline, the following examples are provided from *APA 6th edition*\(^9\) and *Chicago 17th edition Author-date*\(^10\) in order to demonstrate the kinds of references expected when using these well-respected and well-described style sheets.\(^11\) Particularly note how material types are indicated in the references, how contributors are treated, and how the location of the artifact is specified including the artifact’s location within a larger collection.

Below is the *APA 6th edition* collection reference template (VandenBos 2010:212):

---

\(^{8}\) There has been some discussion of what constitutes a *collection* among language documentation practitioners. Johnson (2004:142) equates a collection and a corpus saying: “A *collection*, or *corpus*, is the body of documentary materials created by linguists and native speakers in the course of their research.” Simons (2008) and Boerger (2011:Footnote 2) advance the idea that the materials generated as part of a language documentation effort are a corpus, not distinguishing between a corpus and a collection. Many other language documentation practitioners (Lübbe 2010, Good 2011, Austin 2013) extend or modify the meaning of “corpus” when referring to a collection; using a phrase like *language documentation corpus*. In contrast to the coalescence of corpus and collection, Thieberger (2018), in a blog post, credits Jane Simpson with proposing the following terms: *Assemblage* – all material collected, working files, early sources, multiple versions and drafts; *Collection* – the archived material, a subset of the above, but curated with sufficient metadata to allow the user to know what all items are; *Corpus* – a crafted set of texts in the language that can be used for further analysis. For a recent treatment of these ideas see Sullivant (2020) which expounds on Simpon’s ideas. I am not convinced that the distinction between assemblage and collection is relevant for a variety of reasons. Most relevant for this thesis is their bearing on the crafting of a bibliographic reference. I suggest that reference formulations do not need to be different between an assemblage and a collection. Lest I leave the definitions distinguishing a corpus and a collection undisputed, let me suggest some pragmatic distinctions. Biber (1993a; 1993b) set up diversity-based criteria for corpus design. One interpretation of Biber’s work is that if a body of evidence does not meet the diversity threshold then it does not qualify as a corpus. The diversity dynamic as a goal for a set of materials generated through language documentation efforts has been a long standing tenant of creating an evidence based documentary record for a language (Himmelmann 1998). Biber’s diversity arguments have even been suggested as guidelines for guiding elicitation in language documentation (Lübbe 2010). In this sense it is clear that selection is a process which impacts both corpus design and what is collected during fieldwork. However, a second useful criterion for defining a corpus (in contrast to a collection) might be that there is an existing tool set which can be used to exploit the collection of artifacts as a single work. This could lead to an interpretation that a corpus is more like a *dataset* in the Dublin Core sense, while a collection is more like a *collection* in the Dublin Core sense—and indeed we see that Xia et al. (2016) blur the line between database and corpus in their work. Both datasets (of which databases are a type) and collections can be considered examples of aggregate works. I realize that linguists and language materials archivists have applied these labels loosely but I side with Society of American Archivists (2013:rule 2.3.19) in its suggested distinguishing terms for the highest level of an archival unit of materials: “Archival materials are frequently described by devised aggregate terms such as *papers* (for personal materials), *records* (for organizational materials), or *collection* (for topical aggregations)” (see Wahbeh 2009 for an example of application). There are other terms which still need to be fleshed out among language archive practitioners such as: *archival deposit*, *accession*, and what one might call an *artifact and its associated metadata file*.

\(^{9}\) In this thesis APA formatted references are presented in *brown boxes*.

\(^{10}\) In this thesis Chicago formatted references are presented in *lavender boxes*.

\(^{11}\) It is not uncommon for websites to offer a “suggested citation” or “suggested reference”. Because the formats of these suggestions are generally not either Chicago or APA they are presented in *blue boxes*. In some cases, publishers do not provide a template or discussion for a reference pattern. They only provide exemplars. This is the case with Chicago 17, the journal *Language*, and the journal *Linguistic Inquiry*. Specifically in chapter 5, I provide an analysis of reference patterns provided by publishers. I place these analyses in *yellow boxes*. 

---
Below are examples of referenced collections components APA 6th edition (VandenBos 2010:213):


Writer, A. A. (copyright year). Title of song [Recorded by B. B. Artist if different from writer]. On Title of album [Medium of recording: CD, mp3, record, cassette, etc.]. Retrieved from http://xxxxx (Date of recording if different from song’s copyright date)

Below is the Chicago 17th edition collection reference for a whole collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.54):

---

¹² I lean on APA descriptions of published audio works for their object-in-a-container nature, e.g., track on an album. Skutley (2012:27 #53) does present an example of a speech, unfortunately, the location of where to access the content is ephemeral.


APA like Chicago (as mentioned in footnote 13) does not have a straightforward approach to signifying the difference between an object title and a container title for collections and artifacts. Speeches such as I have a dream, may have author assigned titles. Collections however seem more frequently to have titles assigned by the institutions which house them. It seems to be that it is in these cases which titles are not italicized, the distinguishing characteristic used in APA. None of the collection titles are italicized in any of the examples provided by VandenBos (2010:§7.08-7.10).
Below is the Chicago 17th edition collection reference for a single item in a collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.54):


Below are Chicago 17th edition audio recording references for a single item in a collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.57):


The remainder of this thesis is organized as follows. In chapter 2 I discuss how bibliographic metadata is imported to Zotero. In chapter 3 I discuss how authors make use

---
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of their Zotero database when composing documents. In chapter 4 I present a survey of interoperability of bibliographic metadata between five language archives and Zotero. In chapter 5 I offer some example references and include a brief discussion of archive resources in the journal style sheets for *Language* and *Linguistic Inquiry*. In chapter 6 I discuss the implications of the survey results and some of the underlying reasons why archives struggle to provide value to users via bibliographic metadata exchange. Finally, in chapter 7 I discuss some social approaches for addressing technical challenges.
CHAPTER 2
Importing bibliographic data

Given that Zotero is well reviewed in the academic literature (Trinoskey et al. 2009; Duong 2010; Mueen Ahmed & Al Dhubaib 2011; Idri 2015; Thomson 2016; Ray 2017; Brander et al. 2019), I discuss only those technical details of its use which are directly relevant to this discussion. Broadly, Zotero is a reference management database which allows users to track the artifacts they reference in scholarly works. It facilitates the easy crafting of formatted citations and references in an author’s document.

Zotero allows users to import metadata about items they encounter and wish to potentially cite and reference, in three different automated ways. The first is with a unique identifier such as a DOI (as shown at the number 1 in Figure 2) which Zotero uses to fetch data about an item from online databases. This method or tool is sometimes called the “magic wand tool” due to its icon.

---

14 Rueda (2016) is a DataCite blogpost presenting a DataCite webinar (Karcher 2016b, Karcher (2016a) in which a Zotero team presents methods for making Zotero CSL craft references for Datasets. Datasets and Collections are similar in how Zotero and CSL currently implement them. Watching the video (Karcher 2016b) will give my reader an introductory perspective on the technical issues I discuss.

15 Zotero detects other kinds of identifiers (ISBN, PMID, and arXiv IDs) as is shown in Figure 2. None of these apply to language archives and therefore are not discussed. There is also the manual input method, which is necessary to use when automated methods provide errant or missing information.
Second, Zotero allows users to add a browser plugin that can read embedded metadata in HTML pages upon which digital artifacts and records are viewed. Upon selection by the user, Zotero then creates an entry in its database for the desired items. If multiple input methods exist, the connector plugin allows users to select which input method they wish to use. This is illustrated in Figure 3.

Third, Zotero facilitates the import of metadata from several different file types which are used for bibliographic metadata exchange (BibTeX, RIS, Zotero RDF, etc.).
Zotero does not glean information from a web page the way a human would by reading the displayed text. Since Zotero does not have any natural language processing features to detect metadata, nothing is automatic. However, website developers and publishers can write translators, i.e., small JavaScript web page scrapers, which tell Zotero which HTML fields and which classed HTML elements contain compatible text.\footnote{https://www.zotero.org/support/translators}

### 2.1 DOI import

Digital object identifiers (DOI)\footnote{https://www.doi.org/factsheets.html} are frequently used by publishers to identify a specific publication. They are intended to be globally unique and usable in a URL to access either an item or information about an item. There are several companies, known as registration agencies, that issue DOIs to publishers. Crossref\footnote{https://www.crossref.org} and DataCite\footnote{https://datacite.org} are two such registration agencies. Crossref focuses on providing service to traditional format publishers (books and journals). In contrast, DataCite focuses on providing services to data repositories and non-traditional publishers, such as institutional repositories. Both registration agencies provide application programming interfaces (APIs) which enable software programs to look up information in their databases.\footnote{As an organization, Crossref focuses on the issuance of DOIs to publishers in the traditional sense, while DataCite focuses on the issuance of DOIs to archives and repertories which have “datasets”. In practice, I have seen archives such as SEALang (\url{http://sealang.net/library}) assign DOIs from DataCite to published articles (from serial publications). Doing this raises several questions regarding ideological definitions of “published”, and “dataset”. Does published mean public access or does it mean processed via a formal press and publication venue? Similarly, can one have a dataset composed of published works? From the archive’s perspective they are not the publisher of these objects, as that designation belongs to the originating press. What organizations must deal with when choosing appropriate DOIs for their content is the metadata schema available from the organization providing the DOI. DataCite’s schema is designed to be applied in contexts where non-traditional print artifacts or non-print artifacts are the objects being defined. Whereas Crossref’s metadata schema is oriented towards traditional academic print media.}

A Zotero user may use the DOI feature to query these APIs to import the metadata on record in the Crossref or DataCite database into Zotero. However, from personal experience I find it is the rare case that an API reply from Crossref or DataCite is without error for content published via linguistic publishers and language documentation data repositories. Tracking down the source of these errors is challenging. Possible sources include Zotero’s interpretation of the metadata provided to it, or that the publishers are providing errant metadata to the
DOI providers. Sometimes it is clearly the case that publishers and archives are providing errant or insufficient metadata to the DOI API service. In chapter 4, I present the results of attempts to import metadata from several artifacts in language archives which use DOIs.

### 2.2 Embedded metadata in HTML import

Zotero can, through a plugin, connect to a user’s web-browser and read metadata embedded in HTML pages.\(^{21}\) This can be very useful as users can then click a button in their browser to add an item they discover on the web to their Zotero database. Zotero attempts to read a variety of kinds of metadata embedded in a website to fill in a Zotero record via JavaScript translators. Zotero is responsive to several “dialects” of embedded metadata includ HTML meta tags such as Dublin Core tags,\(^{22}\) EPrints tags,\(^{23}\) or Highwire Press tags.\(^{24,25}\) It is also able to detect a type of semantic markup using HTML span elements called *ContextObjects in Spans* (COinS).\(^{26}\) Each set of tags has a different metadata schema associated with it. These schema were each designed to describe various kinds of materials and therefore have different scopes of coverage, resulting in different limitations when describing artifacts. For instance, COinS was designed specifically for books and journal articles to the exclusion of other kinds of materials, while Dublin Core does not overtly specify the difference between a masters thesis and a doctoral dissertation (see discussion in Allinson 2008). So, best practice recommendations for embedding metadata in HTML pages suggest using multiple strategies for full coverage. Bibliographic metadata

---

21 [https://www.zotero.org/support/dev/exposing_metadata](https://www.zotero.org/support/dev/exposing_metadata)

22 For Dublin Core elements, and Dublin Core terms HTML tags consult defined tags in the WHATWG Wiki with the namespaces dc. and dcterms. : [https://wiki.whatwg.org/wiki/MetaExtensions](https://wiki.whatwg.org/wiki/MetaExtensions). Google Scholar indexing also uses this same namespace for their tags, but has added some Google Scholar specific tags which are not true Dublin Core elements or terms. Consult: [https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/inclusion.html#indexing](https://scholar.google.com/intl/en/scholar/inclusion.html#indexing)

23 There are several vocabularies which make up the EPrints tag set. These can be found in the Scholarly Works Application Profile at: [http://purl.org/eprint/terms](http://purl.org/eprint/terms). There are four other EPrints vocabularies which are also used in addition to the terms. These are the Access Rights Vocabulary, the Entity Type Vocabulary, the Status Vocabulary, and the Type Vocabulary. These are accessible at the wiki for JISC Digital Repositories Programme’s Repositories Research Team: [http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/Category:ScholarlyWorksApplicationProfile](http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/Category:ScholarlyWorksApplicationProfile)

24 There is no Internet based publication of “The Highwire Press Tags”. However, some tags are mentioned in the citation namespace within the WHATWG Wiki. Other Highwire Press tags are mentioned in Google Scholar’s documentation for indexing. See footnote 22 for links. I have noticed that several publishers hijack the citation namespace and create custom tags. So, the exact set may be a bit amorphous.

25 The exact file Zotero uses to convert these tags can be read in the application’s Github repository: [https://github.com/zotero/translators/blob/master/Embedded%20Metadata.js](https://github.com/zotero/translators/blob/master/Embedded%20Metadata.js)

encoded thoroughly and presented well can save users many keystrokes. This makes the task of collecting bibliographic metadata and the resulting task of attribution in publications much easier. The embedding of metadata in HTML can also improve the visibility of content in search result rankings (Arlitsch & O’Brien 2012, 2013) for both general search and special search engines like Google Scholar. However, negotiating web standards, metadata standards, and how those standards impact tools like Zotero can be a specialist’s job. In this thesis I look at how HTML import works on webpages presenting archived artifacts.

Zotero also has the capability of detecting through the HTML metadata that an unAPI server is running (Chudnov et al. 2006; Chudnov & England 2008). The unAPI protocol is not well known outside of specialist circles but is implemented in a variety of open-source library catalog applications. In this context it allows software developers to identify a location where machines can read the metadata, while not directly embedding it in the HTML pages.

2.3 File based import

The final way to import metadata to Zotero is from a variety of metadata file types. This includes most of the popular types like EndNote XML, RIS, BibTeX, and MODS (Metadata Object Description Schema). A full list, along with a picture tutorial, is available in the Zotero documentation. It should also be noted that Zotero can be extended to import more file types in two ways: the first is via a plug-in framework, and the second is through a JavaScript file called a translator. Either of these methods could be used to increase the import options to Zotero, but I limit this discussion to capabilities that are already present in Zotero.

28 When crafting academic websites, my go-to resources have included: Verrelli (2018), Johnston (2010), and the HTML5 WHATWG Wiki (2020). The ongoing issue is that HTML5 and XHTML approach embedding differently from a standards point of view. Description via Schema.org JSON looks to be a promising replacement technology for embedded metadata challenges, and works for general search like Google, Bing, and Yandex, but is unproven in specialized search like Google Scholar, or for capture by Zotero. Fenner et al. (2019) presents some ideas on Schema.org implementation in scholarly contexts. Note, however, that Schema.org is a broad scoped metadata schema much like Dublin Core. There are contexts in which the schema does not align cleanly with academic and preservationist needs.
30 https://www.zotero.org/support/adding_items_to_zotero
CHAPTER 3

Using bibliographic data

In the context of the linking cycle described in chapter 1 and illustrated by Figure 1, this chapter is focused on getting data out of Zotero in useful ways. This is illustrated in Figure 1 by point (6). Zotero has two main export methods which are relevant to this part of the cycle. That is, there are two main ways to get bibliographic metadata out of Zotero. The first method uses a metadata file which can be read by other applications. The second method creates a reference or citation which is realized inside of an author’s document. To implement the second method, Zotero uses the Citation Style Language (CSL)\(^{31}\) to encapsulate a publisher’s style sheet requirements and make them operational in an author’s document.

3.1 Export files

Much like how Zotero imports a variety of metadata file types from other bibliographic software, it can natively export to a variety of metadata file types. The most complete (as in lossless data) is the Zotero RDF file which is in an XML format. Plug-ins can increase the export options.

3.2 Citation Style Language based export

When authors use a Zotero database to cite and reference the evidentiary record during their writing process, they depend on CSL descriptions as the primary means to properly format citations and references. Most authors do not think of Citation Style Language as a Zotero “export” because the data is inserted directly into their documents in the reference and citation formats they desire. However, of the ways to extract data from Zotero,

\(^{31}\) https://citationstyles.org
exporting references and citations in a desired CSL format directly into an authored document is likely the most important to an average user. Furthermore it is the export which completes the linking cycle illustrated in Figure 1.

Citation Style Language is a meta-language for encoding the series of typographical choices necessary for crafting citations and references, e.g., should page numbers include all digits or only different digits (102–105 vs. 102–5) or the sorting of references by title (some styles exclude articles while others include them). The specific details of the style sheet’s preferences are encoded in XML. The technical specification for the Citation Style Language is independent from Zotero, but many of the Zotero developers are also contributors to the CSL project.\footnote{CSL 1.0.1 is used in Zotero at the time of writing. In July 2020 the specification was advanced to 1.0.2. The version increment addressed many of the limitations encountered in 1.0.1. The 1.0.2 specification can be found at: https://github.com/citation-style-language/documentation/blob/master/specification.rst. An overview of changes made available by the CSL team is available as a GoogleDoc: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wY1c0OamDYYh8VNWW7huleqieBDGOaLYsRiVdQy1R/edit#} CSL is relevant because some of Zotero’s limitations are actually limitations in CSL. For example, the only contributor roles in Zotero are those which are specified in CSL.\footnote{This is important for those who advocate the use of the The Tromsø Recommendations for Citation of Research Data in Linguistics because it allows for all datacite roles, OLAC roles, and CRediT roles to be used in the contributor slot.} As a technology, it has wide support across several citation managers, and therefore also has significant leverage in a very niche market. Both BibTeX (Patashnik 1988, 1998, 2003) and BibLaTeX (Lehman, Kime & Wemheuer 2019) style files (.bst), which work within the context of the TeX typesetting system, are comparable to CSL in the sense that they encode ways of taking bibliographic data from a database and formatting it into a reference or citation. However, CSL styles have a much broader range of influence, interacting with authorship tools including: Microsoft Word, Apple Pages, LibreOffice, Open Office, TeX, Pandoc, R Markdown, GoogleDocs and a variety of web content management systems like Drupal and WordPress.

As of March 2021 there are more than 125 different style sheets in the CSL repository that are relevant to the field of linguistics and neighboring disciplines.\footnote{Including subjects such as: General Linguistics, Phonetics, Phonology, Syntax, Language Pedagogy, Language Policy, Writing Systems Researcher, Ethno-Studies such as Ethnomusicology, and Ethnic Studies.} Style sheets and journals are not in a one-to-one correspondence. For example, several journals may use the same style sheet, or a single style sheet may have several sub-varieties like the one
for the Modern Language Association. Within these 125 styles, some styles are used to support publishing in specific languages including: French, German, English, Spanish, Italian, and Polish. Some of the reference styles which are included in the CSL repository used by Zotero are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Sample of style sheets with a CSL file in the Citation Style Language Repository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style sheet</th>
<th>Publishing House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generic Style Rules for Linguistics</td>
<td>Language Science Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified style sheet for linguistics</td>
<td>LSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Stylesheet for Linguistics (de Gruyter Literature)</td>
<td>De Gruyter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>LSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Psychological Association (APA) 6th &amp; 7th editions</td>
<td>APA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 15th, 16th, 17th editions</td>
<td>Chicago University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions on Asian Language Information Processing</td>
<td>ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions on Speech and Language Processing</td>
<td>ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Computational Linguistics</td>
<td>ACM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conference Proceedings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicography</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossa: a journal of general linguistics</td>
<td>Ubiquity Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Lexicography</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingua</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingua Sinica</td>
<td>Sciendo (De Gruyter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics and Education</td>
<td>Elsevier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual Education</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Language &amp; Linguistic Theory</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Language Semantics</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Journal of Speech</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revista de Filología Española</td>
<td>Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Linguistics</td>
<td>Springer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Systems Research</td>
<td>Taylor &amp; Francis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie</td>
<td>Erich Schmidt Verlag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 Crafting references

Crafting a reference is a multifaceted act. References set the context for an argument and reflect the truth basis an author holds. References also define the social connections
authors consider important and the relationships authors wish to acknowledge. While social connection and epistemological connection serve as two distinct functions of a reference, the reference itself still needs to be clear and informative to readers, regardless of its function. The *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* says it this way:

As with any reference, the purpose is to direct the reader to the source, despite the fact that only a single copy of the document may be available and the reader may have some difficulty actually seeing a copy. (VandenBos 2010:212)

Therefore, references should be crafted first and foremost with the human reader in mind, describing not only the artifact being referenced, but also where to find it. Some redundancy may be required so that artifacts can be found both manually and digitally. In opposition to informative references, many publication’s style sheets opt for short references, valuing the economy of the page over clarity in communication. This perspective had merit in the pre-digital era and certainly still has merit when considering physical media. The social nature of a reference may also stand in contrast to the information nature of a reference, since it reflects the way the authors craft their social identity via their argumentation.

With the rise of bibliometrics, the study of how many authors reference another given work, the social networking of scholarly discourse is more visible. Bibliometrics can be used to assess the impact of a particular scholarly work by counting only authors who are in agreement with the thesis of that work. However, more often, bibliometrics are generalized to count total mentions from works supporting and countering the position. These broader impact statistics are then used in the career advancement of the scholar, e.g., tenure. This relevance is certainly felt in the academic linguistics community. Haspelmath (2014) and Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) both argue for changes in referencing practices in order to favorably impact (for scholars) the metrics by which scholars are evaluated. Haspelmath (2014) argues for a simplified presentation structure in the reference.

---

35 Both Peroni & Shotton (2012) and Hoffmann et al (2016) provide multiple technical and moral reasons authors choose to cite and reference literature.
The strongest justification for simple rules is that the references should be automatically parsable (e.g. by Google Scholar), and correct and complete author names should be extractable. In the modern age, this is crucial for scientometric and hence career-building purposes. (Haspelmath 2014:footnote 16)

Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) argues that authors should clearly and overtly cite and reference the data they use.

Unfortunately most linguists do not know how to go about advocating that “data work” be given the same kind of attribution as “analysis work” in hiring, tenure and promotion cases. (Berez-Kroeker et al. 2018:11)

More subtle is the issue of who should be privileged with “attributions” and which “works” a publisher should allow to appear in a references section. These more subtle differences are rarely articulated overtly in a publisher’s style sheet,36 rather they are manifested by the examples they do or do not provide for authors to consult. Those who craft CSL files rely on publisher-provided examples to create complete representations of what publishers will accept. One can not simply add a missing item type (such as an audio recording, or a video recording) to a publisher’s style sheet by adding these items to a CSL file.37 For example in the The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics, Haspelmath (2014:10) acknowledges six item types (journal article, book, article in edited book, thesis, published conference papers, unpublished materials) which could theoretically be used in a references section,38 but suggests that only four are dependable options to be included

36 In the course of reviewing over 40 journal style sheets, I only encountered one, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, which overtly stated that unpublished materials should only be mentioned in the text body, and not included in the references section.

37 This pressure has been felt broadly across the sciences with some communities rallying around a new type of article called the data paper—a paper dedicated to the description of a dataset and published in a journal series so that dataset users can reference the data paper when they encounter publishing constraints. Something similar is also found in some communities who create software. People often publish an introductory paper presenting software. The idea is that future academic users of these resource types would then reference the associated paper. This strategy has some inherent problems in that both software and data sets can have an evolutionary nature, whereas papers when published are generally static.

38 Haspelmath (2014:8) seems to assume that authored works should have two sections. A references section, and then a sources section, perhaps with extensive usage of footnotes. It states: “When the source is not a bibliographical reference, but is the name of a text or corpus (perhaps unpublished), as in (10), the source is given in square brackets and the article must contain a special section at the end where more information about the sources is given. (When the source indication is unique and quite long, it may of course alternatively be given in a footnote, e.g. when it is a long URL.)”
in the citation of academic works (specifically in the domain of linguistics). The two
dispreferred item types are published conference papers and unpublished materials:

Other kinds of publications should be treated like one of these to the extent that this
is possible. For example, published conference papers can be treated like articles
in edited volumes or like journal articles. Unpublished papers can be treated like
journal articles, with information about the location given as a nonstandard part.

In unpublished conference papers, the conference is treated as a nonstandard
part in parentheses (but such unpublished papers should only be cited from recent
conferences, if it can be expected that the material will eventually be published)... (Haspelmath 2014:11)

*The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics* with its four acknowledged item types is very
influential within linguistic publishing as evidenced by the list of publishers in Table 3
who incorporate it into their style sheet.39

---

39 There are nearly 1700 linguistic journals among the approximately 40,000 journals and serials tracked
by MIAR (Rodríguez-Gairín et al. 2011). http://miar.ub.edu/lista/CAMPO/-TEIIO8Ocw41TVEIDQQ = = .
Needless to say, neither the list in Table 3 or Table 4 is exhaustive.
Table 3. Publishing ventures using or incorporating *The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publishing Venture</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELPublishing</td>
<td>Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Science Press(^{40})</td>
<td>Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Journal of Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuadernos de Lingüística de El Colegio de México</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Welt der Slaven</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossa: a journal of general linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Documentation &amp; Conservation</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language in Africa</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistica Atlantica</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d’Onoma</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandenkan</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minpaku Sign Language Studies</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKY Journal of Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANIL Style Guide: A Guide for Formatting Term Papers to Be Submitted in Linguistic Courses Offered at the Canada Institute of Linguistics</td>
<td>Educational Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Linguistics at the University of Konstanz: Guidelines for writing an academic paper</td>
<td>Educational Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of General Linguistics University of Bamberg: Style Guide for term papers and final theses in linguistics (v1.4)</td>
<td>Educational Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics Program at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks</td>
<td>Educational Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second influential style sheet in linguistic publishing is the *Unified style sheet for linguistics* (Salmons 2007). A list of known users of this style sheet is listed in Table 4.

\(^{40}\) The Language Science Press guidelines for authors says that they follow *The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics* but their Microsoft Word Template file says to format references following the *Unified style sheet for linguistics.*
Table 4. Publishing ventures using the *Unified style sheet for linguistics*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publishing Venture</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De Gruyter Mouton</td>
<td>Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Journal of Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of African Languages and Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Linguistics in Melanesia</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistica Atlantica</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of English Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Linguistics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Linguistic Geography</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantics and Pragmatics</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studia Neophilologica</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Language</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics</td>
<td>Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt: English Linguistics</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *Unified style sheet for linguistics* also does not contain a formulation for an unpublished work in its examples. No guidance is provided for the referencing of audio materials, video materials, or archival materials which are part of a collection.

When publishing style sheets such as *Unified style sheet for linguistics* or *The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics* lack instructions for citing certain types of items in the evidentiary record, authors are less likely to cite and reference the evidentiary record. I interpret this as a contributing factor to the apparent absence of referencing of primary sources in linguistic works as discussed by Gawne et al. (2017), Gawne, Berez-Kroeker, Andreassen & Okura (2017), Berez-Kroeker et al. (2017), and Gawne & Berez-Kroeker (2018) where the authors show that grammar authors and journal article authors rarely reference the archival copies of the evidence they present.

In addition to the Zotero import challenges that are the focus of this thesis, the publishing requirements and the availability of CSL files for processing bibliographic metadata have an impact on the extent to which archived materials are referenced; and therefore,

---

41 *The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics* builds upon the *Unified style sheet for linguistics* and therefore is typographically similar in many respects. Due to their typographical differences I treat them as separate style sheets.
publishing requirements represent a separate challenge in the completion of the linking cycle between artifacts, authors, and publications. The availability of reference formats for collections, and components of collections could be added to CSL files, which implement the style guides for academic publishing venues, if publishers would put these types of references in their style guides. I acknowledge the capability of the CSL technology as an influential component in the relationship between authors and published literature. I have indicated this relationship with point (6) in Figure 1. However, the implementation of reference patterns remains a sociological and philosophical issue stemming from how editors wish to have authors articulate the evidentiary record.
CHAPTER 4
Archives

The following archives are included in the analysis presented in this chapter:

• The Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures (PARADISEC),
• The Pangloss Collection of the Collection de Corpus Oraux Numériques (Pangloss),
• SIL Language & Culture Archives (L&CA),
• Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR), and
• Kaipuleohone.

There was no specific reason to look at these archives to the exclusion of other archives and special collections, other than I am personally familiar with them in my linguistic research. Together they represent a variety of perspectives on the discipline of archiving. One presents work conducted within a national research lab; one is run by an international NGO and presents work by its staff; and the others are associated with universities presenting a variety of evidence collected or created by scholars and associates. One is centered in France, one in England, one in Australia, and two in the United States. Each has different primary sets of contributors, different hierarchical organization, and different aims or aspirations for user engagement with their holdings. Each of them also has chosen a different technology infrastructure to manage interactions with people interested in their holdings. So, in fact, they represent a fair sampling of the diversity which exists across the “industry” of language artifact archiving.

42 https://www.paradisec.org.au
43 https://pangloss.cnrs.fr
44 https://www.sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives
45 https://elar.soas.ac.uk
46 https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/4250
4.1 Archive organization & record management

While there is quite a bit of diversity with regards to the sample of language archives, discussed in this thesis there are also some commonalities across the five archives:

1. They all have strong institutional support (rather than being collections managed at a department or individual level).
2. They are all members of DELAMAN, an association of language archives.
3. They all, with the exception of some records in SIL’s Language & Culture Archives, have eschewed best practice for archival collection description (which includes preserving hierarchical structures in which artifact creators organized their creations) in favor of a flatter three tiered structure.
4. They also all participate in the Open Language Archive Community (OLAC) by using or reducing some of their collection holding records to Dublin Core plus OLAC extensions and sending metadata from their holdings to the OLAC catalogue aggregator via an OAI feed.

Commonalities (1) and (2) are fairly straightforward. However, as (3) and (4) deal with archival collection curation in general, I introduce these and related concepts in the rest of Section 4.1 and further explore the implications in Chapter 6.

4.1.1 Tiered structure of archives

I define archives as institutional organizations which facilitate the preservation and access to artifacts. Archives do this by organizing artifacts into collections. Libraries sometimes also steward or choose to manage sets of artifacts as “special collections” which is an analogous concept to an archives’ concept of collections. Collections are also organized internally by curators and catalogers working within an archive or library.

47 https://www.delaman.org
48 http://www.language-archives.org
The Society of American Archivists (2013) lays out their standard for the description of collections in *Describing archives: a content standard* (hereafter DACS). While every collection is unique, there are general guiding principles for organization and description of collections. Principle number two from DACS, *Respect des Fonds*, says that items should be kept “in their original order”. This is further explained as:

Inherent in the overarching principle of *respect des fonds* are two sub-principles—provenance and original order. The principle of provenance means that the records that were created, assembled, accumulated, and/or maintained by an organization or individual must be represented together, distinguishable from the records of any other organization or individual. The principle of original order means that the order of the records that was established by the creator should be maintained by physical and/or intellectual means whenever possible to preserve existing relationships between the documents and the evidential value inherent in their order. Together, these principles form the basis of archival arrangement and description. (Society of American Archivists 2013:xvi)

To conduct preservation activities and to facilitate access, archivists must negotiate and reconcile the concepts of collection *arrangement* and *description*.

*Arrangement* is the intellectual and/or physical processes of organizing documents in accordance with accepted archival principles, as well as the results of these processes. *Description* is the creation of an accurate representation of the archival material by the process of capturing, collating, analyzing, and organizing information that serves to identify archival material and to explain the context and records systems that produced it, as well as the results of these processes. (Society of American Archivists 2013:xvi)

Arrangement and description are built into the third and fourth DACS principles: *Arrangement involves the identification of groupings within the material* and *Description reflects arrangement*. These particular DACS principles are relevant when referencing archival material. If references are to be informative (to where one can access an artifact) and descriptive (to the nature of the artifact), then the reference needs to also contain context about the arrangement and the tiers of the archival collection. For example, a reference to an audio artifact is more informative if it contains the larger structure of which it is a part (e.g.,
group of recordings from the same session) as well as its collection (e.g., entire fieldwork trip).

![Diagram of archival structure]

**Figure 4. Hodges & McClurkin (2011:3)’s typical archival structures**

While the number of tiers a collection should contain is not prescribed by DACS, Hodges & McClurkin (2011), in the *Archives and Manuscripts Processing Manual* from the University of Texas at Arlington’s Special Collections Library, demonstrate a multi-tier structure which is a widely held norm across archives. This multi-tier structure, shown in Figure 4, is comprised of levels with the titles: **Collection level, Series level, Subseries level, File unit level, Item level**. Such a system allows for the arrangement and description of series of aggregate works and their components. Aggregate works are a type of collection, which by their provenance (i.e., created together or edited together) in some contexts should be viewed as a whole unit, but in other contexts may be viewed in its component parts. For example, one could reference a whole book using Chicago 17th edition:

Or one could reference only a section of that book:


In the same way a scholar may wish to reference an individual archived .wav file or the aggregate work that includes a particular .wav file along with its transcription or other related recordings.

Linguists frequently use, create, and reference aggregate works. A corpus is a type of aggregate work composed of a balance of materials. An edited volume is another type of aggregate work. Within audio publication, most playlists, CDs, and phonograph records (except the single), e.g., LP 33 ½, are all types of aggregate works. Linguistic fieldwork often creates aggregate works in audio, video, text, and mixed media. For instance, when a recording session runs long the tape may need to be flipped, or the digital audio recorder might need to have its card changed or might start saving the recording session to a second file due to technical limitations. Additionally, a linguist may be running a secondary recording activity such as video or may be taking handwritten notes in their notebook. The audio, video, and text in the notebook together could be considered an aggregate work.

In the context of field linguistics then it is rather easy to consider that a linguist may have a larger effort which correlates to the Collection level in an archive, e.g., the output of a grant sponsored field trip lasting several months. Continuing with the hypothetical field trip, many linguists will work on several sub-projects. Projects may center around speech variety (e.g., variation within a language), the speech of a specific place (e.g., multilingualism in a town), a specific speech genre (e.g., talk between parents and baby) or social activity (e.g., harvesting), discourse type such as dialogue, or generic syntax and vocabulary elicitation (e.g., using lists and elicitation tools). It is easy to see that some of these projects might be well-suited for Series level descriptions. Within any one of these series, several recording sessions might be undertaken and be aptly suited for description
at the **File unit level**. Every file in a **File unit** would be then considered an **Item**. In citation and referencing a scholar will want to be able to reference each node of the tree from a **collection** down to an **item**.

### 4.1.2 Bibliographic records and archives

If an archive is to keep track of the items in a collection, it will need to create a **bibliographic record**. This is different from a **bibliographic reference** which is used in the sense of citing and referencing within a document. There is content overlap between a bibliographic record and a bibliographic reference in that the bibliographic record should inform the bibliographic reference. However, a bibliographic record will be the authoritative resource for metadata and usually contain more information than what is needed to create a clear link from a document to an artifact.

Bibliographic records need to be consistent across an archive in order for archives to efficiently manage content and service to archive users. A conceptual model for bibliographic records supports archive management by articulating various management concerns such as rights management, user engagement requirements, and intra-artifact content relationships. *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR) (Byrum et al. 2009 [1998], see also Carlyle 2006)\(^49\) is one such widely embraced model in the library sciences. The basic FRBR model is shown in Figure 5. The distinctions in the model guide curators and catalogers in their description of an artifact/item. It informs the creation of various kinds of bibliographic records and the application of metadata to those various kinds of records.\(^50\) FRBR has five important entities: **Endeavour**, **Work**, **Expression**, **Manifestation**, and **Item**. The simple idea is that an Endeavour will produce a work which will have a distinct (but not necessarily unique) intellectual or artistic creation, which is

---

\(^{49}\) The FRBR has undergone extensive implementation review in the library sciences and is currently discussed in its evolved state as part of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions’ (IFLA) *Library Reference Model* (LRM) see Riva, Le Beuf & Žumer (2017). The LRM contains more associated library management models. In this thesis I limit my discussion to FRBR so I reference FRBR.

\(^{50}\) For example, copyright claims might be at the expression level or the manifestation level. Someone can take a book from the Public Domain and re-typeset the book creating a PDF for circulation or publication. That person would have copyright to the manifestation they created, but the content would still be in the Public Domain. FRBR allows the scope of the rights claims to be articulated in the metadata records by specifying if the claim is to the expression or to the manifestation.
realized through an expression. Expressions in turn are embodied by a manifestation, which in turn are exemplified by an item.

![Diagram of FRBR model]

**Figure 5. Basic FRBR model**

To make a practical application for linguists, an example of an item is a book on a library shelf. Several libraries might have this same book. Each bound book is a unique item. A book such as *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* (Shopen 2007) has multiple editions. Each edition is a different expression. An abridged or translated version of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* would also be a different expression. A book might have different publication formats such as a PDF version and a print version. These are different manifestations. For a more detailed analysis of how variations of works map to expression and manifestation, see Tillett (2001, 2004, 2009). To the best of my knowledge no attempt has been made to use FRBR with linguistic resources. However, several music catalogues have been recast in FRBR models (Le Boeuf 2005; Vellucci 2007; Riley 2008; Iglesias et al. 2009; Holden 2019). The similarity of this work to language documentation lies in the fact that language documentation materials often have aural and transcribed components, much like western music. Work by Yee (1993; 2007) has also looked at FRBR in the context of video materials, another media type commonly used by language documentation practitioners.
For an application of the FRBR model to audio artifacts, linguists could consider the workflow published in the BOLD method as presented in Reiman (2010). The first recording would be a .wav file which is its own work, expression, manifestation, and item. The second recording (i.e., the slow speech) would be a second expression of the same work, but the manifestation of the first recording is interlaced into the manifestation of the second recording. The third recording, which is a translation by another person, is also a new expression. The produced .wav file is interlaced into the aggregate of the first two recordings. So in the end one would have an audio recording which was an aggregate work of three different expressions of the same FRBR work, all within the same manifestation. This creates an interesting type of aggregate work, but it is certainly possible for the FRBR model to describe (Shadle 2006; O’Neill, Žumer & Mixter 2015; Coyle 2016:130–135; discuss the complexities of aggregate works).

4.1.3 Metadata standards and archives

Each archive discussed in this thesis participates in the Open Language Archive Community by sending metadata from their holdings to the OLAC aggregator. OLAC metadata is built on two technologies: Open Archive Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH),\(^1\) a transmission protocol, and Dublin Core,\(^2\) a meta-schema for metadata used to increase interoperability between information systems used by libraries and institutional repositories. As a meta-schema, Dublin Core creates general categories. In contrast other schema, such as MARC\(^3\) and institution specific schema, are used by catalogers and curators to provide specific metadata values from controlled sets of options. Dublin Core as a system of description consists of 15 properties known as elements and 55 properties known as terms. Elements and terms can take a variety of values. Sometimes the values are links or pointers to other records, sometimes the values are free-text, and sometimes values may be elements of a controlled vocabulary.

Dublin Core recognizes nine controlled vocabularies. Of those nine, the framers of Dublin Core include only the elements of one of them within the standard; the rest they

---

\(^{1}\) https://www.openarchives.org

\(^{2}\) https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core

\(^{3}\) https://www.loc.gov/marc
reference as composed by others apart from the standard itself. This speaks to its importance and weight in fully descriptive records. The vocabulary they included is the DCMIType vocabulary.\textsuperscript{54} It is used to declare a broad type (type-nature) for the resource and prescribes one of the following values: Collection, Dataset, Event, Image, InteractiveResource, MovingImage, PhysicalObject, Service, Software, Sound, StillImage, Text.

Dublin Core usage guidance suggests that an object should be described with the most appropriate value, e.g., if a record represents a collection of artifacts, then it should be described as a Collection rather than both Sound and Text. The guiding principles of Dublin Core also suggest a one-to-one correspondence for item description.\textsuperscript{55} This means among other things that three records would be produced, one for the collection, one for the sound artifact, and a third for the text artifact.

The engineering behind Dublin Core makes it favorable for broad search and discovery tasks. These standards were never intended to contain all the elements needed for complete description of language resources. The OLAC metadata standard inherits these biases.

4.1.4 Referencing archival materials

The OLAC metadata standard has been seen by many in the language documentation community as an essential metadata set for language-based resources (Bird and Simons 2001). Participating in the OLAC metadata exchange via the OLAC aggregator by publishing an OAI feed is seen as a best practice. However, if the OLAC metadata standard is viewed as a minimum set of descriptive elements for resources, the risk is that the describer of those resources (usually an institution) will not have enough metadata to do preservation tasks or to support artifact discovery within the archive’s user community. One activity of an archive’s user community is the referencing of artifacts contained in archives!

\textsuperscript{54} https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dcmi-terms/#section-7
\textsuperscript{55} The One-To-One principle is discussed in the Dublin Core guidelines in section 1.2. https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/usageguide/#whatis
In order to support these activities, archives need to consider the types of items that publishing style sheets acknowledge. These style sheets guide scholars when they reference artifacts and collections. Keeping track of these various item types on their own is a gargantuan task; however, much of the hard work to identify item types has already been done by the CSL development team and has been visually implemented in Zotero (see discussion in Section 3.2).

Table 5 presents the item types currently available via the Zotero user interface, along with the additional item types available via CSL. The additional CSL item types can currently be used in Zotero via the **Extra** field in the user interface.\(^{56}\) So, even when these values do not appear in Zotero drop down lists, CSL style sheets can use these additional CSL variables to craft a reference in a document.

Table 5. Zotero item types with additional types available via CSL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Zotero</strong></th>
<th><strong>CSL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artwork</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Magazine Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Post</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Paper</td>
<td>Podcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Entry</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Radio Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia Article</td>
<td>Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Post</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>TV Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Message</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to item types fields which do not appear in Zotero’s user interface other CSL variables can also be added to the Extra field (see Figure 14 for example).\(^{57}\) This is done with the pattern **CSL-variable: text value**. However, it is up to the CSL style sheet

---

56 See Zotero’s user documentation for item types: https://www.zotero.org/support/kb/item_types_and_fields

and the editors who commission them to implement these variables. The first four fields in Table 6 are necessary for archival items in general, while the last two items are necessary for aggregate works in archives. The necessity of using the Extra field is dependent on the kind of material being referenced in the archive; some of these fields may already be present in the Zotero user interface.

Table 6. CSL values useful in crafting archival references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>archive</td>
<td>archive storing the item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archive_location</td>
<td>storage location within an archive (e.g., a box and folder number)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>archive-place</td>
<td>geographic location of the archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection-title</td>
<td>title of the collection holding the item (e.g., the series title for a book)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>container-title</td>
<td>title of the container holding the item (e.g., the book title for a book chapter, the journal title for a journal article)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>container-author</td>
<td>author of the container holding the item (e.g., the book author for a book chapter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the remainder of this chapter, I look at how bibliographic metadata is transferred between institution and end-user during an import to Zotero. Table 7 presents an overview of the archive interfaces and their capabilities to transmit bibliographic metadata to Zotero as of January 2021.

Table 7. Summary of support for Zotero import methods across language archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISEC</td>
<td>Collection/Item</td>
<td>None / DOI detection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangloss (Cocoon)</td>
<td>Collection/Item</td>
<td>Some / DOI detection / unAPI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangloss (Villejuif)</td>
<td>Collection/Item</td>
<td>None / DOI detection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIL L&amp;CA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAR (VuFind)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Broken COinS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAR (WordPress)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipuleohone</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some DC tags</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58 I follow Paterson (2015a:50) in acknowledging “The global levelling of information access through the Internet also enables speakers of endangered languages and academics to engage more fully with each other – rather than, as before, operating in different social circles. Roles such as ‘linguist’, ‘language documenter’ or ‘endangered language speaker’, which might previously have been mutually exclusive, can therefore now be fulfilled by ‘academics’ and ‘native speakers’ alike.”
For each of the five archives I present a short introduction of the archive, list the technologies used when known, and the set of collections and their items I reviewed in my investigation. I then discuss the various levels of support for the transfer of bibliographic metadata. Discussed methods include import via DOI based APIs, import via embedded metadata in HTML pages, and any options for files which could be downloaded and imported into Zotero. I look at the content of the records imported into Zotero and discuss the totality of transferred metadata, I then look at the metadata captured by Zotero and discuss the record’s sufficiency in crafting informative references like those demonstrated in the APA 6th edition and Chicago 17th edition Author-date style sheets. Where an archive has provided a suggested reference, I contrast that with what can be crafted with Zotero imported information.59

4.2 PARADISEC

The Pacific and Regional Archive for Digital Sources in Endangered Cultures (PARADISEC)60 is an institutional archive which delivers services around the digitization of analog language artifacts and access to digital language artifacts. Established in 2003 under the leadership of Linda Barwick and Nick Thieberger, PARADISEC’s founding context and evolution is described in their works (Barwick 2003, 2004, 2005; Thieberger 2009; Thieberger & Jacobson 2010; Barwick & Thieberger 2012; Barwick & Harris 2013). Based in Australia, it has been a significant part of the infrastructure supporting language communities in Australia, Papua New Guinea, and the greater Pacific region. The visionary leadership at PARADISEC has been open to accessioning collections from all over the world. This has in part created an operation which is esteemed by many in the scholarly fields of anthropology, (ethno)musicology, linguistics, language documentation, language development, and language revitalization.

Table 8 provides a summary of the import technologies currently available to Zotero users via PARADISEC’s website.

59 It is not uncommon for digital repositories and various online resources to provide a “suggested citation”. For the sake of consistent terminology, I suggest that what they really provide is a “suggested reference”. The utility of these formatted references is questionable, as formatting decisions ultimately are determined by the publisher of the work containing the formatted reference, not the entity wishing to be referenced.
60 See footnote 42 in chapter 4.
Table 8. Summary of support for Zotero at PARADISEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None / DOI detection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None / DOI detection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essence File</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None - No unique webpage</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Technology infrastructure

For its digital collection management, PARADISEC uses Nabu\(^{61}\) a self-built media content management system (CMS) written in Ruby on Rails.\(^{62}\) Nabu is, as far as I know, unique among CMS platforms in that it is the only open source content management system that natively provides an OLAC feed.

4.2.2 Collections structure

PARADISEC has an advertised hierarchical arrangement system with the following nodes: PARADISEC > Collection > Item > Essence Files. Within a PARADISEC collection there may be many items, and then there may be many essence files per item. These files may include multiple manifestations, e.g., a .wav file and a .mp3 file of the same recording session, where one is a derivative from the other. PARADISEC further lumps multiple manifestations of a single artifact with other creative works under the same item in their structure, e.g., recordings made in different villages on different days.

4.2.3 Collections and artifacts reviewed

In reviewing PARADISEC I looked at three collections: Roger Blench Collection 5 (RB5),\(^{63}\) Zygmunt Frajzyngier Collection 1 (ZF1),\(^{64}\) and Greg Anderson Collection 1 (GA1).\(^{65}\) Although I mention elements from all three collections, for reasons of simplicity in presentation I include examples in this thesis from only RB5.

---

\(^{61}\) [https://github.com/nabu-catalog/nabu]
\(^{62}\) [https://rubyonrails.org]
\(^{63}\) [https://catalog.paradisec.org.au/collections/RB5]
\(^{64}\) [https://catalog.paradisec.org.au/collections/ZF1]
\(^{65}\) [https://catalog.paradisec.org.au/collections/GA1]
Each of these collections have different quantities of descriptive metadata. In particular, many of the metadata fields in the PARADISEC public web-view for RB5 and ZF1 are empty—suggesting that they may be under-described collections. The GA1 collection is much more thoroughly described with nearly every field containing some content. As Chapman et al. (2009) discuss, this is not entirely uncommon across archives or institutional repositories because archival content may be imported through various processes, or archives may have several different curation workflows set up where different aspects of the record are enhanced through independent workflows (preservationists, curators, re-users, depositors, producers, etc.). In this thesis I have chosen to review the under-described collection RB5 because it is more informative for our discussion when compared with the collection described in the section on the SIL Language & Culture Archives. In my import experiment, the additional rich metadata provided in GA1 did not affect and were not part of the metadata transferred to Zotero in any way. That is, from Zotero’s perspective both RB5 and GA1 collections were equally described related specifically to bibliographic metadata.

Figure 6 shows the top portion of the web-view of the RB5 collection with the list of 104 items in the collection. Some metadata for the collection level is presented on the left. Out of frame are the remaining languages in the collection metadata, an approximate geographical display of where those languages are spoken, the names of those with edit access to the collection, and the “cite as” box which is discussed in Section 4.2.7.
Figure 6. Top portion of the Roger Blench 5 collection display in PARADISEC

To review a single item node within a collection, I chose to look at the item titled Kamuku wordlists. It is an item in the RB5 collection and has its own DOI separate from the DOI for the RB5 collection. The item contains 406 different audio artifacts (essence files). Table 9 demonstrates what is possible with unlimited disk space and a constrained hierarchical structure.

Table 9. Component parts: Collection vs. Item

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier node</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RB5 Collection</td>
<td>104 Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamuku wordlists Item</td>
<td>406 Essence Files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7 shows the full page view for the item reviewed (ID: RB5-Kainji_Kamuku_wordlists) while Figure 8 shows the top portion in more detail.

Figure 7. Full view of the Kamuku wordlist an item in the RB5 collection at PARADISEC.
Barwick & Thieberger (2018:137) say “Since its establishment, PARADISEC has always used persistent identifiers for objects in our collections, down to the file-level. In 2016 we added digital object identifiers (DOI) to all collections, items and files.” However, essence files do not have their own web pages nor are their alleged DOIs visible via the Nabu web interface. Therefore, as far as end users are concerned, for the crafting of references they might as well not exist. In this section, I show the DOIs investigated (in Table 10), the metadata on file with DataCite, and what Zotero does with the data it receives.

Table 10. PARADISEC DOIs investigated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RB5 Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamuku wordlists Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essence Files</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4.1 DOI import from Collection

Recall that Figure 6 shows the RB5 collection metadata that Nabu presents to users. Figure 9 shows the data sent by the DataCite API service to Zotero while Figure 10 shows what Zotero users receive as input when they use the DOI to get metadata from the API service.\footnote{All JSON data in this thesis was acquired by using the DataCite API with the command line application CURL. A command similar to the following was used: \texttt{Terminal-user:}$\ curl https://api.datacite.org/works/10.4225/72/56E977B622032} The JSON formatting was converted to standard JSON formatting for editing using: https://jsonformatter.curiousconcept.com. Syntax highlighting and conversion to PDF for inclusion as a figure was done using: https://nsspot.herokuapp.com/code2pdf.}
Figure 9. DataCite API supplied JSON response for the RB5 Collection
Figure 10. Zotero’s interpretation of DataCite API supplied JSON for the RB5 collection

4.2.4.2 DOI import from Item

Recall that Figure 8 shows the item level metadata that Nabu presents to users. Figure 11 shows the data sent by the DataCite API service to Zotero while Figure 12 shows what the Zotero user sees as input when they use the DOI to receive metadata.
Figure 11. DataCite API supplied JSON response for the Kamuku Wordlist
4.2.4.3 DOI Discussion

There are several observations worth mentioning about the use of DOIs at PARADISEC and the data brought to Zotero through the DataCite API.

The first issue is one of user expectation. Most DOI-users have experienced them in the contexts of referencing an article or a chapter in an edited volume. However, in the PARADISEC context by pointing to collections and items (which are also collections because they are filled with various kinds of artifacts), this situates the DOIs in a context where they point to a portion of a hierarchical structure, which is analogous to the entirety of an edited volume or the series in which the edited volume is published rather than to a chapter within the edited volume.

Second is the particular version of the DataCite metadata schema used by PARADISEC. The JSON data (as presented in Figures 9 and 11) suggests that PARADISEC first sent data to the DataCite database for these records in 2016. At that time the DataCite metadata
The metadata schema has since evolved and is as of January 2021 at version 4.3 (DataCite 2019). Meanwhile the last time PARADISEC refreshed the data it sent to DataCite for these reviewed collections and artifacts was 2020. Even though it updated the metadata records recently, it still used schema version 3.1. So, something in the pipeline of data from PARADISEC to DataCite is not working in the best interest of DataCite API users. One important issue that is not addressed in PARADISEC’s 2020 update to DataCite is the crosswalking of metadata from PARADISEC’s application profile to DataCite’s metadata schema. That is, the DataCite metadata schema and all the services which come with it can not be useful to PARADISEC’s users until PARADISEC undertakes the effort to map DataCite’s schema to the existing metadata fields in PARADISEC’s metadata schema.

A third issue which directly impacts Zotero users is PARADISEC’s choice to not fill in any resource type as can be seen by the value “null” for line 66 of Figure 11. DataCite’s resource types are matched to Zotero’s item type vocabulary via a JavaScript translator. This means that each DataCite import which is not assigned a value will be imported as a basic document (defaulting to journal article). In the reviewed cases, each PARADISEC object with a DOI should be matched to the DataCite vocabulary resourceTypeGeneral with the term Collection (DataCite 2019:16). However, this was not the case.

Besides the issues of data interoperability mentioned above, there is a fourth issue of data continuity in the reviewed objects as listed in Table 11. The values of things like dates, titles (names of objects such as collections), and contributor roles are different between the data presented on Nabu and the data presented via DataCite. This can lead to mixed or errant references depending on how a user actually acquires the metadata. This is a less than ideal situation for measuring the impact and use of a collection.

---

68 An application profile is the schema that an organization chooses to use. It may contain schema elements from a variety of schema while not implementing any schema completely. For discussion see Heery and Patel (2000). Some have considered OLAC to be an application profile (Hillmann & Phipps 2007).

69 The exact Zotero translator which interprets the DataCite metadata and converts it to Zotero values can be read from the Zotero Github repository at: https://github.com/zotero/translators/blob/master/Datacite%20JSON.js.

70 Importing the bibliographic metadata and matching it to the right item type in Zotero impacts how it will appear via CSL in a reference.
Table 11. Data Continuity: Nabu vs. DataCite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nabu</th>
<th>DataCite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection name</td>
<td>Niger-Congo field materials</td>
<td>[Blench Niger-Congo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 11, at least three metadata fields are suspect for accuracy.\(^{71}\) Collection name, date, and role all have different values when one compares the DataCite record and the Nabu record.

In addition to the role variation between Nabu and DataCite,\(^{72}\) there exists a role variation between Nabu and OLAC. On OLAC\(^{73}\) Roger Blench is listed as Compiler.\(^{74}\) OLAC defines this term as “The participant is responsible for collecting the sub-parts of the resource together. This refers to someone who creates a single resource with multiple parts, such as a book of short stories, or a person who produces a corpus of resources, which may be archived separately.” However, on the basis of my personal communication with Roger Blench about this collection, he maintains that he acted more in-line with the OLAC role of depositor.\(^{75}\) Depositor is defined by OLAC as someone who “was responsible for depositing the resource in an archive.” Collector is a valid MARC relator role.\(^{76}\) It is defined as someone who “brings together items from various sources that are then arranged, described, and cataloged as a collection. A collector is neither the creator of the material nor a person to whom manuscripts in the collection may have been addressed”. OLAC documentation says that the OLAC standard accepts MARC relator roles.\(^{77}\) However, to the best of my knowledge, these roles have not been added to the OLAC validator.\(^{78}\) So, if one tries to use MARC roles in their OLAC feed, they are marked as errors. To complicate

---

\(^{71}\) Collection ZFI does not even have a collection title in DataCite.

\(^{72}\) Zotero categorizes the null it receives from DataCite as contributor. Any role for which Zotero does not have an internal match are imported as contributors. Zotero does not export contributors, so they become an application internal way of applying name oriented metadata to a Zotero record.

\(^{73}\) http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/olac/search.html?q=rb5&fq=country_facet%3A%22Nigeria%22

\(^{74}\) http://www.language-archives.org/REC/role.html#compiler

\(^{75}\) http://www.language-archives.org/REC/role.html#depositor

\(^{76}\) https://www.loc.gov/marc/relators/relaterm.html

\(^{77}\) http://www.language-archives.org/REC/role.html#Role

\(^{78}\) The validation code for OLAC roles can be found here: http://www.language-archives.org/OLAC/1.1/olac-role.xsd
matters further, DataCite has its own role vocabulary (DataCite 2019:32–35) which is not in alignment with MARC relator roles or OLAC roles.

### 4.2.5 Embedded metadata in HTML for collection and item levels

No HTML embedded metadata is discovered by Zotero because none is presented in the HTML code (as is shown in Figure 13). Because there is no HTML metadata, Zotero picks up that there is a DOI on the page, and then it fetches the metadata provided via the DataCite API.⁸⁰ This results in a Zotero import identical to the DOI import discussed in Section 4.2.4.1 and shown in Figure 10 for the collection and Section 4.2.4.2 and shown in Figure 12 for the item.

---

⁸⁰ In some cases Zotero will detect both DOIs and HTML metadata. Zotero presents the user a default option. A computer user can choose a non-default option by right clicking the Zotero connector icon in the browser.
4.2.6 File download

PARADISEC does not provide a downloadable metadata file in a common format such as BibTeX, RIS, or MODS at any level—collection, item or essence file.

4.2.7 Complete or sufficient

In this section I present a comparison of what was imported to Zotero with what is needed to craft a reference in both APA 6th edition and Chicago 17th edition Author-date as discussed in Chapter 1. I then present for comparison the suggested reference provided by PARADISEC. I do this for both the collection level and the artifact level. In this way we can see if the information transferred to Zotero is complete and if the provided suggested reference from the institution is sufficient for an informative reference.

4.2.7.1 Collection

If required to format a reference for the RB5 collection manually in APA 6th edition, I would craft it to look like the following:


If required to format a reference for the RB5 collection manually in Chicago 17th edition (author-date format), I would craft it to look like the following:

This *Chicago 17th edition* formatted reference is a bit contrived and is not as “clean” as the examples in the Chicago manual of style for two reasons. First, the style manual assumes paper or textual manuscripts are the components of a collection—at least all the examples in the Chicago manual of style indicate such.\(^81\) Second, it is not clear how PARADISEC has applied well-known archival collection management principles such as **Provenance**, **Original Order**,\(^82\) and **Respect des Fonds** as discussed in Hodges & McClurkin (2011:1–2) and DACS (Society of American Archivists 2013:xv–1). The Chicago manual of style’s recommendations for collections seem to be biased towards well-described collections within archival industry norms.

PARADISEC’s suggested reference for RB5 is given as:


There are three comments worth making here. First is about the suggested role in the citation. It’s not clear how this role is defined or to which list of roles it references. As a “non-standard” role in publisher style sheets, it is not supported by CSL and therefore also not supported by Zotero.\(^83\) The second thing to note is the presence of [Open Access] in the reference. Wikipedia references often include a green unlock icon in the citation indicating that the item linked is open access. However, the open access information is not part of any of the major publication style sheets I have seen, beyond the practice

---

\(^81\) Part of the rationale given for this is that many publisher style sheets, when citing audio or moving image resources require a separate section from the bibliography called a discography or filmography (Harper 2017:§14.221, §14.262, §15.57).

\(^82\) In my own interactions with PARADISEC as part of research done when looking at archived lexicons (Paterson 2015a), it became clear that the archive was not always preserving the original artifact as it was delivered to them. That is, they would sometimes destroy the integrity of an artifact and only preserve certain components of the artifact even though the entire artifact was necessary for functionality with the generating software. The artifact in question is mentioned in the record at: http://www.language-archives.org/item/oai:paradisec.org.au:DD1-028 . In some cases by viewing item notes via OLAC records, I have seen descriptions where original audio artifacts recorded in lossy formats were converted to lossless file formats. Nabu does not indicate to web-users which digital artifact is the original. Note that items within the RB5 collection may contain both .wav (lossless) and .mp3 (lossy) artifacts. From the Nabu interface it is impossible to tell which of the various file formats are the original recordings, or if they are all original recordings, but from different recording devices.

\(^83\) In Zotero there is a manual way via the Extra field to add custom roles on a per name and per reference basis.
at Wikipedia. However, the open access component is remarkable for a second reason: no item in PARADISEC is truly open access per the widely accepted definition of open access defined in the Budapest Open Access Initiative,\(^{84}\) which stipulates that open access items must not have any encumbrance to access other than access to the Internet itself. PARADISEC requires users to login and agree to their ethics statement in order to access files.

Finally, I generate references for the PARADISEC RB5 collection via Zotero’s DOI import. Zotero’s output for APA 6th edition is as follows:


\(^{84}\) [https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org](https://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org)
Zotero’s output for *Chicago 17th edition* is as follows:


I find that the information provided by the DOI about the collection makes it challenging to craft a well-formed reference in the style of those recommended by the *APA 6th edition* and the *Chicago 17th edition*. This leads me to believe that an application of Zipf’s **principle of least effort** (Zipf 1949)\(^85\) would tempt authors to create poor or non-style-sheet-compliant references for artifacts held at PARADISEC, under the guise that *something is better than nothing or nothing is better than something errant*. However, if one were to go full manual mode and create the Zotero record by hand from the Nabu interface using Zotero’s **Extra** field as shown in Figure 14,\(^86\) Zotero will export valid *Chicago 17th edition* collection formatted references as shown below.\(^87\)


\(^85\) As stated by Case (2002:140), Zipf’s principle of least effort is “each individual will adopt a course of action that will involve the expenditure of the probable least average of his work”.

\(^86\) In Figure 14 the Zotero item type screen for “Book Section” is shown. Any item type option could be used because the item type is from the screen will be overwritten by the one present in the Extra field. However, when choosing a screen, choosing one which has more of the type of fields one might need is advantageous as one needs to place fewer values in the Extra field.

\(^87\) Some terms such as RB5 are not super informative as titles. This should cause every linguist to strive to find informative titles for their works—including collections.
4.2.7.2 Item

In this section I look at the sufficiency of metadata for crafting a reference for a component of a collection. Because PARADISEC has chosen to curate the collection in such a manner that the individual essence files do not match with their item node, it is hard to craft an appropriate reference in either APA 6th edition or Chicago 17th edition Author-date. Many times PARADISEC’s item-level nodes are representative of aggregate works—or even more befuddling multiple aggregate works, as is the case with the Kamuku wordlists item. Aggregate works in fact are a type of collection. So, we have a case where PARADISEC’s structures are saying we should have a single item, but the archive is presenting multiple items each with multiple artifacts. At this point one could choose...
to reference the item as a collection and use strategies as presented in Section 4.2.7.1, or one could choose to focus the reference pattern around implied metadata contained in the names of essence files. However, if one chooses to focus on crafting a reference around the essence file name, then they must reinterpret the item level metadata as a collection and manually adjust any metadata received via the DataCite API—including the DOI. Using locations and events (timestamp ranges) can help archives create aggregate works from ambiguous deposits. The plethora of choices a scholar must make in order to craft a reasonable reference which is both informative and accurate to either APA 6th edition or Chicago 17th edition Author-date reduces automaticity. Under the principle of least effort we should expect this to break the referencing and citation cycle discussed in Chapter 1.

Scholars, when crafting a reference, should take an artifact view of a PARADISEC essence file. However, taking this view does not acknowledge the collection description which is yet to be done and on which the reference should be based.

The following reference is suggested by PARADISEC:


I find the suggested reference by PARADISEC interesting for several reasons. Like the APA style, it attempts to indicate which media type the artifact is. In general this is a good thing. The APA style has given guidance that the kind of information which should go in this slot for physical media is the carrier. These are indicated with expressions like “LP 33 1/2”, “reel: 7 1/2 ips”, or “CD”. For digital artifacts, the media carrier slot is used to indicate the technology needed to access the resource. Digital formats can use the

---

88 Recall that collection description and collection arrangement are interlinked. An archive that does not reflect the full range of embedded structure has re-interpreted the artifact, and misrepresents its original context to archive visitors.

89 Two additional thoughts on this issue deserve additional investigation, but I do not address them further. First, what should an archive’s suggested reference look like when an artifact is also located in another archive? Traditional manuscripts do not have this issue as there is only one copy. However, digital artifacts could be in two collections at two institutions at the same time or even in two different collections at the same institution at the same time. Second, archivists have long approached collection description as a progressive task. How should references evolve with progressive description practices surrounding language artifacts in language archives?
designator of the set of media types specified by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA). This is sometimes known as the MIME type. The MIME type is Dublin Core and OLAC compatible; therefore, they should be automatically available to any of the archives reviewed in this thesis. However, in the case of the Kamuku wordlists this is a collection not a single file. MIME types should only be included in the reference when it is a reference to an individual file. Furthermore, the recommended reference includes the MIME types of “X-WAV/MPEG”. This fallaciously indicates two distinct MIME types when only one should be indicated. Second, the reference does not acknowledge that it is part of the RB5 collection except in the construction of the item’s ID element. Third, the date is interesting in that the RB5 collection has an earlier date. It seems to me that a span of a few years might be reason to consider a new collection in an archive’s holdings, or the date of RB5 should be adjusted to a range style date. If Roger Blench is the Collector of the Collection, what roles are viable for elements of the collection such as this one where Zachariah Yoder is also considered a collector? The curation process should check for conflicts such as overlapping exclusive roles. This could be done programmatically or at least flagged programmatically for manual review and resolved with a curator’s clarifying note. I do not find the provided reference satisfying or helpful if I wanted to reference a particular audio file within this “item”. The inclusion of information relevant to what technology is required to hear the audio and the inclusion of information about the aggregate work is something that both APA and Chicago require.

4.3 Pangloss

The Pangloss Collection, established in 1994, is described in works such as Thieberger & Jacobson (2010), Michailovsky et al. (2011), Michailovsky et al. (2014), and Vasile

---

90 http://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types
91 In most cases using the IANA registered formats is sufficient. However, in one particularly relevant case a compromise needs to be made. RFC2046 specifies that IANA will host a list of registered Media Types (formerly known as MIME types). This list can be found here: https://www.iana.org/assignments/media-types/media-types.xhtml. It is the list that Dublin Core, and therefore OLAC, reference via the IMT vocabulary: http://purl.org/dc/terms/IMT. The difficulty comes around to this: .wav does not have a registered entry in the IANA registry. Even though Mozilla web documentation and browsers support the MIME type audio/wav this is not a valid IANA MIME type (see: https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/HTTP/Basics_of_HTTP/MIME_types/Common_types) Obviously, this could be a problem for language archives which have a tendency to have a significant quantity of .wav based audio.
The Pangloss Collection is a special collection (in the library collections management sense) housed “inside of” or on top of the infrastructure of Cocoon (*Collection de Corpus Oraux Numériques*), a national data infrastructure platform supporting open science in France. *The Pangloss Collection* is a presentation and interaction platform for language focused audio and audiovisual artifacts and their derivative or associated works. *The Pangloss Collection* is affiliated with at least a half dozen language labs in the CNRS (*Centre national de la recherche scientifique*) research lab system. Many of these labs also have partnerships with universities and their academic departments. Pangloss contains over 780 hours of recordings in more than 170 languages. Transcription coverage is about fifty percent for the contained audio artifacts.

Contributors to the Pangloss collection have mostly been scholarly researchers affiliated with CNRS-LACITO (*Langues et civilisations à tradition orale*). LACITO is located on the CNRS Villejuif campus at the outskirts of Paris, France. In addition to the interagency collaboration which undergirds Cocoon, the Villejuif campus also has their own campus-based staff supporting the various library and data science needs of the on-campus labs. The Villejuif staff have produced a second interface to Pangloss. The Villejuif display of the artifacts has two modes: a “pro mode” with details designed for a scientific audience and a “default mode” with some details removed in the hopes that a general audience would not be encumbered by details of interest to specialists. I review both the Cocoon interface and the “pro mode” of the Villejuif user interface. Table 12 provides a summary of the import technologies currently available for the two Pangloss interfaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cocoon Collection</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some / DOI detection / unAPI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cocoon Item</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Some / DOI detection / unAPI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villejuif Collection</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Villejuif Item</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

92 See footnote 43 in chapter 4.
93 https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo
94 https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/?lang=en&mode=pro
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4.3.1 Technology infrastructure

Each Pangloss interface is managed by different designers and IT teams.\footnote{In fact, a renewed Villejuif-based interface was released while this thesis was being written—and looks really nice.} A variety of technological and archiving agencies are contracted through the national infrastructure system to deliver the interactive experience. The actual software used to deliver the interactive experiences in both cases is not overtly stated. However, through a series of tests I was able to determine that Cocoon uses Jetty\footnote{http://www.eclipse.org/jetty} as part of the set of technologies used to deliver the service, while the Villejuif interface uses a PHP/MySQL based infrastructure.

4.3.2 Collections structure

The Pangloss holdings have one hierarchical arrangement in the Cocoon interface and another hierarchical arrangement in the Villejuif interface. Web-based user interfaces are the embodiment of philosophical approaches to artifacts. Both Pangloss interfaces embody and facilitate a particular materiality. That is, artifact engagement is suggested by the options of a user interface and at the same time limited by the user interface. User interfaces set the cadence for how members of society interact with artifacts, how they come to let these artifacts inform their activities, and ultimately their beliefs about the artifacts. Because there are two Pangloss user interfaces, there are two philosophical approaches presented.

Within the Cocoon interface, the collection is situated as a special collection. Inside of the special collection, there are individual collections called “Corpora”. Within a corpus, individual items exist. Items can have multiple files. However, unlike the large sets of files presented in a single PARADISEC item (discussed in Section 4.2), Pangloss items have a more limited scope. Items contain only artifacts which are closely related such as a source audio file (usually a .wav file), a low fidelity distribution manifestation (.mp3) of the source audio file, the source audio file’s transcription, and possibly any instrumental data which was co-produced with the audio recording. Files within items have multiple unique URIs.\footnote{https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo/identifiers.htm} Corpora are generally based on specific research endeavors and therefore
demonstrate cohesion from that perspective. For instance they might be the combined output of a single scholarly research endeavor, e.g., a single phonetic experiment.\textsuperscript{98} The hierarchical arrangement of nodes looks like: \textit{Cocoon} > \textit{Pangloss} > \textit{Collections (Corpora)} > \textit{Item} > \textit{Single File}. From the Cocoon item view, one can access the DOI (and other unique identifiers) of the artifact, a link to the record of the entire collection, and links to associated artifacts. Annotation files, when they exist, have their own DOIs separate from their associated audio files—and are linked to audio files via relational metadata. However, instrumental data files, such as electroglottography files, do not have their own identifiers.

The Villejuif interface presents a “collection of languages” or speech varieties; each body of files for a speech variety is labeled as a “corpus”. When a corpus is selected in the user interface one can navigate to a page and interact with the artifacts by listening to them and seeing the transcription when available. The hierarchical arrangement of nodes looks similar to the Cocoon arrangement in terms of nodes, but names are labeled differently: \textit{Pangloss} > \textit{Languages (Corpora)} > \textit{Item} > \textit{Single File}.

The variation in names between presentation interfaces is likely to cause confusion to scholars as they look to craft references, not just for the name variations but also because the collections are not equivalent.

\textbf{4.3.3 Collections and artifacts reviewed}

When evaluating Pangloss I looked at an artifact with the title \textit{SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /ɗa/}. Speaker \textit{M7} and the collections it is presented in. Within the Cocoon interface it is presented in the \textit{AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins} collection,\textsuperscript{99} and the \textit{Pangloss} collection. In the Villejuif interface it is presented in the \textit{Vietnamese (Hanoï dialect)} collection.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{98} While I use the term corpus and corpora here when describing Pangloss, I use this term because they use the term. I question the appropriateness of calling these nodes in the hierarchy \textit{corpora}. In addition to the discussion in footnote 8, one complicating factor may be the variation in lexically similar terminology across languages. That is, does \textit{corpus} in French come with the same contextual meaning as \textit{corpora} in English?

\textsuperscript{99} https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exists/crdo/meta/cocoon-e33c294f-50f7-3c38-b190-056e2585a31d

\textsuperscript{100} https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/corpus/Hanoi%20dialect?lang=en&mode=pro
Pangloss and AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins are both parallel structures in the Cocoon interface and the artifacts are cross-listed (see Figure 18). The Pangloss collection page within the Cocoon interface is shown in Figure 15. One thing to note is that from this page one can not see the fond/series which would house the collection. Presumably, this is a limitation of the user interface which only lists six series in the collection, not a logical limitation where some set of materials is not listed in the index of the collection.

Figure 16 shows the collection page of AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins in the Cocoon interface. While the Cocoon page does represent the collection record, from this page one can not see a list of files which are part of the collection. However, by clicking the dark blue button with the text “Accéder aux 393 enregistrements”, one can find the list of all files in the collection via filters in a faceted view. Otherwise there is no list of all the files within the AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins collection. Further breakdown of the collection into the contained aggregate works is not possible via the user interface, even though there is an inference in the title of some works that there might be other recordings which are related, e.g., the use of “Speaker M7” in the title implies that their might also be speakers M1 through M6 and artifacts organized around those speakers.101

101 Another example of an aggregate work in the AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins collection on Cocoon infrastructure includes:
Notice de collection

Collection Pangloss

I.D. ussone (N.N. Chercheur)

The Pangloss Collection
Laboratoire de langues et civilisations à tradition orale (pamplé)

(mise à disposition: 2010-06-26; archivage: 2010-06-26/07:11:04 10-02:00; dernière modification de la notice: 2020-11-20)

Plan de classement

Collection Pangloss

- Fonds Eleanor Ridge
- Fonds Jean Claude Rivière - langues de Nouvelle-Calédonie
- Fonds Chantal Corenti
- Ethn and Kurn: Comparative and Cross-Varietal Documentation of Highly Endangered Languages of South-West China
- Fonds Zénon Chirchiri:ONGO
- Fonds Chantal Corenti: BOUL
- Fonds Zénon Chirchiri: LUG
- Fonds Chantal Corenti: NUB
- Fonds Katala Chirchiri: Compléments
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie (CNR-LACTO): Linguistique africaine - Langue subsaharienne du Nord-Cameroun
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 2 - Tradition orale, contes, histoires et légendes 1982-1985
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 4 - Musique de fêtes, rituels, action traditionnelle
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 5 - Traditions orales, actions rituelles, traditions en ch ''hambuka''
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 6 - Notes de voyage et de chasse
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 7 - Traditions orales, actions rituelles, traditions en ch ''hambuka''
- Fonds Véronique de Colombie: Bole 8 - Notes de voyage et de chasse

Éditeur(s):
Laboratoire de langues et civilisations à tradition orale (pamplé)

Description(s):
1 (fr) 2 (en)

La Collection Pangloss offre, en libre accès, des documents linguistiques sonores, avec une spécialité de langues "rare" ou peu éditées. Son but est de contribuer à la documentation et à l'étude du patrimoine humain que représentent les langues du monde. Les documents présentés contiennent en majeure partie de la parole spontanée, enregistrée dans son contexte social et transcrit en consultation avec les locuteurs. On y trouvera aussi des éclats d'objets et des travaux de mots. Ces documents ont été enregistrés et annotés par des chercheurs d'horizon très variés, dont les chercheurs du laboratoire LACTO-CNR. La gestion de la collection est assurée par une équipe du LACTO.

Type(s):
Collection

Sujet(s):
Mots-clés: An open-access collection of recordings of "rare" languages / under-resourced languages; Fonds sonores, en libre accès, de langues « rares » / peu étudiées au plan informatique

Droits:
Librement accessible

Identifiant(s):
doi:10.6844/ta/taf3b9d-2b33-2b33-3b3d-a05f-49a7f651ebf1
doi:10.6844/ta/taf3b9d-2b33-2b33-3b3d-a05f-49a7f651ebf1

Pour citer la ressource:
https://doi.org/10.6844/ta/taf3b9d-2b33-2b33-3b3d-a05f-49a7f651ebf1

Figure 15. Pangloss Collection-level page in the Cocoon interface

https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/EXIST/CRDO/META/COCOON-AF3BD0FD-2B33-3B0B-A6F1-49A7FC551EBF1
Figure 16. Top of the AuCo Collection-level page in the Cocoon interface.

Figure 17 shows the collection *Vietnamese (Hanoï dialect)* in the Villejuif interface. In contrast to the Cocoon interface, the Villejuif interface makes no mention of the AuCo: *corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins* collection. The Villejuif interface does list all (presumably all) the contained files in a list containing 21 unique sub-records (some containing the text M1 through M6). That is, the collection description is not really a description of the aggregate of artifacts, but rather a description of the language variety that the files are reported to represent. The description is interesting from a social perspective, but it is not helpful for understanding the artifacts themselves or the context in which they were created. Based on the names of the files, it appears that together they

---

103 https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/
form the evidentiary record for an investigation of tone in the Hanoi dialect of Vietnamese. So, albeit in different ways, both interfaces do not acknowledge a crucial component of the aggregate work hierarchical arrangement. Cocoon leaves out the grouping: Vietnamese (Hanoi dialect), while the Villejuif interface leaves out the higher level grouping: AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins. The hierarchical arrangement in an aggregate work is a crucial contextual component not only for reference formation, but also to inform artifact users of the context of artifact creation and preservation.

Figure 17. Top of the Vietnamese (Hanoi dialect) Collection-level page in the Villejuif interface

When looking at the item view, I chose a component of the collection from speaker M7. Figure 18 shows this item in the Cocoon interface, and Figure 19 shows it in the Villejuif interface.

---

104 https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/corpus/Hanoi%20dialect?lang=en&mode=pro
Notice d’enregistrement

SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /iə/. Speaker M7

Michaud, Alexis (depositor, recorder, researcher); Nguyên, Thi Lan (interviewer, researcher); Trần, Đỗ Đạt (researcher); Ngô, Bình Khoa (researcher, speaker)

(position: 2013-02-24; mise à disposition: 2013-05-09; archivage: 2013-05-09T19:06:00+02:00; dernière modification de la notice: 2020-11-20)

Position dans le plan de classement

Collection Fangles:
- SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /iə/. Speaker M7
- Auco-corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins
- SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /iə/. Speaker M7

Éditeur(s):
- Laboratoire de langues et civilisations à tradition orale
- Multimedia, Informations, Communication et Applications

Description(s):
- SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /iə/. Speaker M7

Type(s):
- Types linguistiques: "primary, text"
- Enregistrement sonore

Sujet(s):
- Langues objet d'étude: "Vietnamese (code ISO-639: vie)"
- Mots-clés: "Hanoi dialect, Vietnamese"

Langue(s):
- Vietnamese (code ISO-639: vie)

Format(s):
- born digital

Droits:
- Livrement accessible
- Copyright (c) Michel, Alexis

Identifiants:
- doi:10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3
- hdl:10670/1.dcherv
- [fr] Ancienne cote: crdo-MT_SM OODTOTES_SOUND
- oai:crdo.vuf.fr:cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3
- ark:87985/r.17-346944
- doi:10.34847/PANSLO5S.00040690

Figure 18. Item-level page in the Cocoon interface.

https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo/meta/cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3
4.3.4 DOI import

The two Pangloss interfaces each assign distinct DOIs to the same artifacts. Additionally, the Cocoon interface assigns DOIs to the collections it recognizes. Villejuif does not assign DOIs to collections. Recall that the visual presentations of “collections” are not equivalent across the two user interfaces. Table 13 displays the DOIs reviewed.

---

106 https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/corpus/show?lang=en&mode=pro&oai_primary=cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3

107 As discussed in Vasile et al (2020), the DOIs that the Villejuif interface assigns to artifacts also use HTML anchor syntax at the end of the resolvable DOI to link directly to segments of the referenced artifact (phrases in a recording). This is not currently implemented in the Cocoon interface. While the direct linking to segments of the phrase with HTML anchors is both technologically interesting and creative, the HTML interface is likely ephemeral. I am not sure if it would have been better or not to add the links as a branch to the DOI directly, e.g., 10.24397/pangloss-0004690.001 and 10.24397/pangloss-0004690.002. This could have implications on the metadata which is importable via the DataCite API.
Table 13. Pangloss DOIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier node</th>
<th>DOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cocoon collection^{108}</td>
<td>10.34847/cocoon.e33c294f-50f7-3c38-b190-056e2585a31d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villejuif collection</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoon artifact</td>
<td>10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villejuif artifact</td>
<td>10.24397/pangloss-0004690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.4.1 DOI Collection import

Figure 20 contains the JSON data which the DataCite API sends to Zotero when the magic wand tool is used to import the Cocoon collection’s bibliographic metadata. The way that Zotero interprets these results is shown in Figure 21.

^{108} To be clear the DOI in the table is the DOI for the collection AuCo: corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins. The Pangloss collection DOI within the Cocoon interface is 10.34847/cocoon.af3bd0fd-2b33-3b0b-a6f1-49a7fc551eb1. The AuCo corpus is the one that was primarily tested and presented here. The differences between the two collections as far as reference generation is concerned pertain to the tokens passed between software, not the types of tokens passed between software, e.g., both have dates though AuCo is 2013 and Pangloss is 2010.
Figure 20. JSON response for the Cocoon collection AuCo from the DataCite API
There are three issues with the data imported via DataCite. First, recall from Table 5 that additional CSL variables can be added to Zotero’s Extra field. In this case type: collection is not invoked to tell Zotero and CSL to use collection templates in style sheets. It should be. Second, the name in the Author field is not recognized as an institutional name. It is an open question as to whether the institutional name is really the best choice here or if this collection should have a depositor’s name or some other role (filled by a person) instead of the institution. Third, the data should likely be the range of dates from the production of the artifacts in the collection rather than a single date. As indicated in the Extra field, DataCite provides a version number for the collection. Versioning a collection is a good idea, as versions are in general a great way to handle provenance issues (including notes which apply specifically to a given version). However, no version number is indicated in the user web-based interface and so was not expected upon import. A scholar building this reference manually would not know to include a version number.

\[109\text{ I specifically advocate for semantic versioning: https://semver.org}\]
4.3.4.2 DOI Artifact import

Figure 22 contains the JSON data which the DataCite API sends to Zotero when the magic wand tool is used to import the specified audio artifact’s bibliographic metadata. However, no record is produced.

```json
{
  "data":
    "id": "https://doi.org/10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-897-e29ba7678d3",
  "type": "works",
  "attributes":
    "doai": "https://doi.org/10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-897-e29ba7678d3",
    "identifier": "https://doi.org/10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-897-e29ba7678d3",
    "url": "https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/web/cro/meta/cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-897-e29ba7678d3",
    "author":
      { "literal": "Michaud, Alexis"
      },
      { "literal": "Nguyen, Thi Lan"
      },
      { "literal": "Tran, D.D. Quy"
      },
      { "literal": "Mac, Dang Khoa"
      },
      "title": "SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /ia/. Speaker M7",
      "description": "SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /ia/. Speaker M7",
      "data-center-id": "vrit.humanum",
      "member-id": "picu",
      "resource-type-id": "sound",
      "version": "1.0",
      "license": "http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/2.5/",
      "schema-version": "null",
      "results":
        { "related-identifiers":
          { "citations-count": 0,
            "citations-over-time": [0],
            "view-count": 0,
            "view-over-time": [0],
            "downloads-count": 0,
            "downloads-over-time": [0]
          }
        },
        "published": "2013",
        "registered": "2020-11-28T19:30:29.000Z",
        "checked": "null",
        "updated": "2020-11-28T19:30:29.000Z",
        "media": ["audio/mp3"],
        "xref": "https://doi.org/10.34847/cocoon.a966a1bc-6642-36a3-897-e29ba7678d3"
    },
    "relationships":
      { "data-center":
        { "id": "vrit.humanum",
          "type": "data-centers"
        }
      },
      { "member":
        { "id": "picu",
          "type": "members"
        }
      },
      { "resource-type":
        { "id": "sound",
          "type": "resource-types"
        }
      }
}
```

Figure 22. JSON response for the Cocoon artifact from the DataCite API
Zotero does not produce a record when the Cocoon artifact’s DOI is queried. The reason for this is that the DataCite JavaScript translator file depends on the JSON data containing a schema value (see line 32 in Figure 22 where the value is “null”). This is a known bug in some data associated with some DOIs in the DataCite data repository. Apparently, archives and Zotero teams are waiting on DataCite engineers to fix this problem.110

The Villejuif based interface uses a separate set of DOIs. Figure 23 contains the JSON data which the DataCite API sends to Zotero when the magic wand tool is used to import the Villejuif audio artifact’s bibliographic metadata. The way that Zotero interprets these results is shown in Figure 24.

110 https://github.com/zotero/translators/issues/2018
Figure 23. JSON response for the Villejuif artifact from the DataCite API
The interpretation of the JSON results as shown in Figure 24 highlights several issues in the DataCite JavaScript translator file. The first is the interpretation of the time value as *artwork size* and *pages* as can be seen in the Extra field within Figure 24. The issue is that the translator was not coded to handle this use case and needs to be extended to cover extent for audio artifacts. The second is the interpretation of the language value. The valid BCP47 code for Vietnamese is *vi* as is shown in Figure 24. The issue is that the value should be *en* for English to match the typographical style in which the reference will be published, i.e., a scholar would create a reference in English within

---

**Figure 24.** Zotero’s interpretation of DataCite API JSON for the Villejuif item


---
a paper written in English. Zotero’s language field (and its value) is only currently useful for turning Zotero’s capitalization on or off. Any value other than blank and en turn off capitalization. Ideally, this would be further developed to pass the language value to CSL so that one could have control over which language variant of a CSL file is used for a specific reference. It would impact typical locale variables such as capitalization patterns, date formats, ordinals indicator, and which style of quote marks are used. CSL locale identifiers follow BCP47, the IETF standard for indicating languages in computing contexts. However, CSL only supports a limited number of locales. These can be referenced in the CSL wiki documentation. The Zotero language field is not useful to linguists who are trying to track which language a resource is about. The language a resource is about belongs in the keywords area as a specialized subject term. Third, the collection value “Pangloss” is put in the Label field. The label for audio recordings is mapped to CSL field publisher. In this case Pangloss is not the publisher, rather it is the collection name. It is not clear that there is a publisher other than the research lab.

Still missing from the Zotero record are values for CSL variables used to indicate the aggregate work of which the audio is a part, the archive which houses the artifact, and the location of the archive. These can be placed in the Zotero Extra field using the appropriate CSL variables taken from the CSL specification and are indicated in Table 6 in Section 4.1.4.

4.3.5 Embedded metadata

There are two different methods for triggering Zotero to detect metadata in web pages. The first is via the use of HTML meta tags. The second is via the unAPI. The Cocoon interface has both some embedded HTML metadata and utilizes the unAPI. The Villejuif interface uses neither embedded HTML metadata nor the unAPI.

4.3.5.1 HTML

The Cocoon collection has some minimal embedded HTML metadata. This is presented across two formats. Figure 25 lines 14–17 show Dublin Core meta tags while lines

114 https://github.com/citation-style-language/locales/wiki
18–22 show HTML5 meta tags. Other Dublin Core metadata tags are possible but the archive has chosen not to use them. These same tags and distinctions can also be seen in the code from the Cocoon item page as shown in Figure 27 (same line numbers apply).

Figure 25. Cocoon collection HTML metadata

Zotero reads this metadata and imports it to create a Zotero record as shown in Figure 26.

---

Figure 26. Cocoon item metadata import via embedded HTML metadata
The same analysis was performed for the audio artifact. The embedded metadata is shown in Figure 27. Zotero read the metadata and created the Zotero record shown in Figure 28.

Figure 27. Cocoon item HTML metadata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Info</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Tags</th>
<th>Related</th>
<th>PubPeer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citation Key: Jacobson_crdococoon_node5e-2</td>
<td>Item Type: Web Page</td>
<td>Title: CRDO/COCOON: metadata: SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /eə/. Speaker MT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author: Jacobson, Michel</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Website Title</td>
<td>Website Type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Short Title: CRDO/COCOON</td>
<td>URL: <a href="https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo/meta/cocoon:966a1bc-6642-3603-8f">https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo/meta/cocoon:966a1bc-6642-3603-8f</a>...</td>
<td>Accessed: 3/9/2021, 9:31:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language: fr</td>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Extra Publisher: CNRS/COCOON</td>
<td>Date Added: 3/9/2021, 9:31:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified: 3/9/2021, 9:31:26 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 28. Cocoon item metadata import via embedded HTML metadata

There are several things to note about the bibliographic data imported by Zotero. The first is the perspective of the metadata. This can come into clearer perspective if we ask the question: *does the metadata apply to the web page or to the artifact that the page represents?* If the metadata applies to the web page itself, then it is mostly correct. However, the date and the website title are missing, and the title of the collection was not clearly presented. Using Dublin Core metadata, while not wrong, is unnecessary and not likely parsed by search engines looking at the web page as a web resource (as opposed to an archive or
scholarly resource). However, if the perspective is taken that this metadata is supposed to describe the resource the page is about, then much of the content is errant. Embedded metadata in HTML can be improved by making the page itself transparent to search engines and only presenting metadata on the artifacts and collections. Site based metadata can be presented to search engines on web page(s) at the root of the site.

The Villejuif interface does not have any scholarly embedded metadata as is shown in Figure 29 (collection) and Figure 31 (artifact). This means that Zotero recognizes both collection pages and artifact pages as only the web pages of the user interface. Zotero does pick up the DOIs on the artifact page and can then import the metadata from DataCite. Figure 30 shows the end result of the metadata processed from the collection page shown in Figure 29.

```html
<html>
<head>
  <link rel="icon" type="image/png" href="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/favicon.png">
  <meta charset="utf-8">
  <meta name="viewport" content="width=device-width, initial-scale=1.0, minimum-scale=1.0">
  <title>Pangloss Collection | Hanoi Dialect corpus</title>
  <link rel="stylesheet" type="text/css" href="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/dist/main-pro.css">
  <script src="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/dist/main.js"></script>
  <script>
    const CURRENTLANGUAGE = "en";
  </script>
</head>

// CONSTANTS
const HOMEOURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/';
const APIURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/api/';
const ASSETSURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/assets/';
const MODULESURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/modules/';
const URLPARAMETERS = {'corpus': 'Hanoi dialect', 'lang': 'en', 'mode': 'pro'};

</body>
</html>
```

Figure 29. Villejuif collection HTML metadata
Figure 30. Villejuif collection record in Zotero from HTML metadata

```html
<head>
  <link rel="icon" type="image/png" href="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/favicon.png">
  <meta charset="utf-8">
  <title>Pangloss Collection | Vietnamese (Hanoi Dialect) corpus - SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Han</title>
  <link rel="stylesheet" type="text/css" href="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/dist/main-pro.css">
  <script src="https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/dist/main.js"></script>
  <script const CURRENTLANGUAGE = "en"></script>
</head>
```

Figure 31. Villejuif artifact page HTML metadata

```html
<head>
  // CONSTANTS
  const HOMEURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr';
  const APIURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/api';
  const ASSETSURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/assets';
  const MODULESURL = 'https://pangloss.cnrs.fr/modules';
  const URLPARAMETERS = ["lang":"en", "mode":"pro", "oai_primary":"cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a7678d3", "oai_sea...
</head>
```

Figure 32. Villejuif artifact page record in Zotero from HTML metadata
In both the collection and the item level records created in Zotero, the HTML metadata is sparse. It does not matter if one is trying to craft a reference for the web pages themselves or for the artifact (or collection) which the pages represent. In both cases more metadata would be needed for Zotero to make a useful record. This is a case which certainly impacts relevance ranking in search engine results.

4.3.5.2 unAPI

Introduced at the end of Section 2.2, the unAPI is an HTML embedded link to a metadata description for the record described by a web page. Figures 25 and 27 show the head of each HTML document. Line 10, replicated in example (1), declares that there is an unAPI server at the location https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/crdo_servlet/un-api. Later on in the body section of the HTML code (not shown in this thesis) there is an abbreviation element with the ID of the artifact of which the associated record is to be queried. It appears as example (2).

(1)  

<link rel="unapi-server" type="application/xml" title="unAPI" href="/crdo_servlet/un-api" />

(2)  

<abbr class="unapi-id" title="cocoon-e33c294f-50f7-3c38-b190-056e2585a31d"> </abbr>

The unAPI crawler (built into Zotero) queries the root of the unAPI server at https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/crdo_servlet/un-api. It receives a response which tells the crawler which metadata formats the unAPI server can provide. The XML response from the unAPI server is shown in Figure 33, indicating that in the Cocoon case, MODS XML is the only bibliographic metadata format provided by the server. The unAPI crawler then crawls the location in example (3) reading the MODS XML file. The MODS file crawled is presented in Figure 34. The results of how Zotero interprets the MODS file are presented in Figure 35. Comparison with Figure 21 shows the different ways that Zotero is told to interpret the referenced object (collection). Zotero interprets the DOI metadata for the same collection as a Journal Article item type, whereas Zotero interprets the MODS import and creates a record with the Document item type.
Figure 33. Metadata types available via the unAPI server

```xml
<?xml version='1.0' encoding='UTF-8'?>
<formats>
  <format name='mods' type='application/xml' docs='http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/v3/mods-3-5.xsd'/>
</formats>
```

Figure 34. Cocoon collection unAPI response
Figure 35. Zotero’s interpretation of Cocoon collection unAPI metadata

In similar fashion example (4) shows the URL for the MODS record for the audio artifact queried in Section 4.3.4.2 and shown in Figure 24. The MODS XML is shown in Figure 36 and how Zotero interprets that response is shown in Figure 37.

(4) https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/crdo_servlet/un-api?id=cocoon-e33c294f-50f7-3c38-b190-056e2585a31d&format=mods
Figure 36. Cocon item unAPI response
This particular implementation of the unAPI import depends on Zotero’s MODS translator for the conversion of the archive presented data. Other implementations of the unAPI could use BibTeX, RIS, or any other file translator that Zotero has. It is possible that the MODS metadata import could be improved by improving the translator. In general the same issues apply as were previously described in Table 6, e.g., the language values are not relevant for this artifact, the place is not the place of the publisher, and the running time of the artifact is not transferred to the record. I did not try to validate the Cocoon MODS files or run tests on other MODS files to examine the robustness of the Zotero translator. Such a validation check should be conducted before assuming that the Zotero software is faulty.
4.3.6 File download

No “download method” for bibliographic file download exists in either the Cocoon interface or the Villejuif interface. However, two of the types of bibliographic files (RIS and BibTeX) which users who seek files would expect to be able to download are available in text boxes via the Cocoon interface. A user can copy these outputs to their computer clipboard and paste from clipboard into Zotero, bypassing the download step. So, in my evaluation, I assess the Cocoon interface as having download files. Figure 38 shows the interface for copying the BibTeX code for a collection. Zotero will import this as a journal article as shown in Figure 39 because journal articles are the default document type in Zotero. The default document type is invoked because the BibTeX code accurately uses the BibTeX item type \texttt{@misc} when referencing a collection. BibTeX does not recognize an independent item type for collections. It is a limitation of the BibTeX data format. BibTeX also does not have a unique item type for audio artifacts so these also use \texttt{@misc}. This can be seen in Figure 40. Therefore, Zotero reads the BibTeX code and assigns the generic Journal Article type to both types.

![Figure 38. Metadata download options via the Cocoon interface as presented on a collection](image_url)
Figure 39. BibTeX import from the Cocoon interface as presented on a collection
Figure 40. BibTeX import from the Cocoon interface as presented on an item

BibTeX and RIS are different data formats in the scope of their schema. RIS is generally considered to have a broader scope because it has more item types. This means that what is brought into Zotero from the archive is different than when importing a BibTeX file. The results of the RIS import can be seen in Figure 41 and Figure 42 where the Zotero record is shown for both collection and item levels. Note in Figure 41 the item type is again reduced to the default type of journal article but in Figure 42 the item type is recognized as an audio artifact.
Figure 41. RIS import from the Cocoon interface as presented on a collection
4.3.7 Complete or sufficient

In this section I present a comparison of what was imported to Zotero with what is needed to craft a reference in both *APA 6th edition* and *Chicago 17th edition Author-date* as discussed in Chapter 1. If there was a suggested reference for either the artifact or the collection I also discuss it. In this way we can see if the information transferred to Zotero is complete and if the provided suggested reference from the institution is sufficient for an informative reference. Of all five archives reviewed, Pangloss was the most prolific in its options to provide bibliographic metadata to archive users. For this reason, there are several subsections where each subsection addresses a single combination of style sheet (APA vs. Chicago), item type (collection vs. artifact), and interface (Cocoon vs. Villejuif). However, none of the methods included the total run time for the audio artifact transferred to Zotero—an important component when using *Chicago 17 Author-date* formatted references (Harper 2017:920 §15.57).
4.3.7.1 APA Collection—Cocoon

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Cocoon interface when trying to craft an *APA 6th edition* collection reference. For ease of reference the APA 6th edition collection reference template from VandenBos (2010:212) is provided again:

| Author, A. A. (Year, Month Day). Title of material. [Description of material]. Name of collection (Call number, Box number, File name or number, etc.). Name and location of repository. |

Given the information at hand about the collection via the web interface, I would follow the APA template and manually craft a reference something like the following:115

```
```

---

115 Two things to note. First, different data sources provided different dates for the collection. Second, the collection has two languages in its title. *APA 6th edition*, is a Roman-script-only reference style, and it says to put translations in square brackets. However, this case is not one where I have translated the title (or someone else has translated the referenced work), rather the collection is issued with a title in multiple languages. APA 6th edition is not clear on what to do in cases where an item is issued in multiple languages. Typographically, I could take various approaches: use an em-dash between the two titles or use something like double pipes or double forward slashes. I chose double forward slashes.
Note that none of the following exports based on the bibliographic metadata imported to Zotero produce anything like the above hand crafted reference. The following is the “suggested APA style reference” provided via the Cocoon interface:


In each of the following boxes the first reference is made exactly as the content was imported to Zotero. The second reference was created after type: collection was added to Zotero’s Extra field to make the CSL exports use the collection reference pattern. In some cases there was no difference.

The following is the APA formatted output from the DOI input:


The following is the APA formatted output from the HTML input. Note that it varies significantly from the others as it likely is a reference to the web page rather than the object the web page presents:


The following is the APA formatted output from the unAPI (MODS) input:


The following is the APA formatted output from the RIS input. Notice that the name was imported as a personal name rather a corporate name and is therefore shortened as such:


The following is the APA formatted output from the BibTeX input:


These automated references fail to provide information about three components of the collection reference: the archival institution, the multi-lingual title of the collection, and the description of the collection. Arguably a fourth dynamic is missing, any information about the fonds level and below and their identifiers. Fonds are called series in Figure 4.

4.3.7.2 APA Collection—Villejuif

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Villejuif interface when trying to craft an APA 6th edition collection reference. Recall that the two collections (*AuCo: Corpus audio de langues du Vietnam et des pays voisins* and Vietnamese (*Hanoi dialect*)) do not represent the same thing (they have different content) and that
the Villejuif based interface did not assign DOIs to its collections, nor did it provide a wide range of metadata download options. Given the information at hand about the collection Vietnamese (Hanoï dialect), I would follow the APA template and craft a reference something like the following:


The following references are crafted by using the metadata imported to Zotero by looking at the website metadata. The first reference is made exactly as the content was imported to Zotero (not changing the item type). The second reference was created after type: collection (changing the item type to collection) was added to Zotero’s Extra field to make the CSL exports use the collection reference pattern. The second reference does not output the date retrieved, even though the data is present. This is due to the patterns dictated by the style sheet as implemented via CSL.


Neither of the two automated APA outputs are anything like the information needed to make a well-formed reference. In this case it is not the fault of Zotero, but rather poverty of the information available to it.
4.3.7.3 Chicago Collection—Cocoon

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Cocoon interface when trying to craft a Chicago 17th edition collection reference. For ease of reference the Chicago 17th edition example reference from Harper (2017:§15.54) is provided again:


Given the information at hand about the collection via the web interface I would follow the Chicago template and craft a reference something like the following:

None of the following exports based on the bibliographic metadata imported to Zotero produce anything like the above handcrafted reference. The Cocoon interface does provide access to a Chicago style pre-formatted reference, but it is not in the author-date variety of Chicago and the specific edition of Chicago was not specified, so it is not listed here. In each of the following boxes the first reference is made exactly as the content was imported to Zotero. The second reference was created after type: collection was added to Zotero’s Extra field to make the CSL exports use the collection reference pattern. In some cases there was no difference. One difference to note is that those items which have been told to use the type: collection still use quotes whereas the handcrafted reference follows the patterns presented in the Chicago 17th edition and does not include quotes. This is likely a bug in the Chicago 17th edition CSL file. The following is the Chicago formatted output from the DOI input:


The following is the Chicago formatted output from the HTML input. Note that it varies significantly from the others as it likely is a reference to the web page rather than the object the web page presents:

|--------------------------------------------------|

The following is the Chicago formatted output from the unAPI (MODS) input:

| --- |

The following is the Chicago formatted output from the RIS input:

| --- |

| --- |
The following is the Chicago formatted output from the BibTeX input:

```
```


4.3.7.4 Chicago Collection—Villejuif

This section presents the output of the Villejuif interface when trying to craft a Chicago 17th edition collection reference. The Chicago 17th edition example reference is presented at the top of Section 4.3.7.3. Given the information at hand about the collection via the web interface I would follow the Chicago template and craft a reference something like the following:

```
```

Note that none of the following exports based on the bibliographic metadata imported to Zotero produce anything like the above handcrafted reference. In the following box the first reference is made exactly as the content was imported to Zotero. The second reference was created after **type: collection** was added to Zotero’s Extra field to make the CSL exports use the collection reference pattern. In this case there was no difference. The following is the Chicago formatted output from the HTML input (which is the only input for collections in the Villejuif interface):
4.3.7.5 APA artifact—Cocoon

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Cocoon interface when trying to craft an APA 6th edition audio artifact reference. Note that the audio artifact is found in an archival collection. There is not an example pattern for this in APA so we need to extract the pattern from the example for an item in a collection and an audio artifact. For ease of reference the APA 6th edition item in a collection and an audio artifact templates from VandenBos (2010:213, 209) and Skutley (2012:25) are provided again. The APA 6th edition examples of referenced collections components (VandenBos 2010:213):


The following is the APA 6th edition audio recording reference template (VandenBos 2010:209, Skutley 2012:25):

Writer, A. A. (copyright year). Title of song [Recorded by B. B. Artist if different from writer]. On Title of album [Medium of recording: CD, mp3, record, cassette, etc.]. Retrieved from http://xxxxx (Date of recording if different from song’s copyright date)
Given the information at hand about the audio artifact via the web interface I would follow the APA guidance and craft a reference something like the following:


My handcrafted reference shows the audio artifact, the aggregate work (collection), the archive, the location in the archive, and the archive’s location. The reference contains enough information to find the resource either by contacting the institution or through digital means. Note that this format is very similar to other aggregate work references like a chapter in an edited volume.

Recall that DOI import did not work for this item. So I skip it and move to present the output on the basis of the HTML input. Note that it varies significantly from the others as it likely is a reference to the web page rather than the object the web page presents:


I find that the location of the medium of recording can be confusing. It is often the case that one can only access a particular unit of audio by first accessing its aggregate work which will be in a specific medium. However, with digital aggregate works, it is possible that the medium should be an attribute of the title (the artifact/audio track) instead of the aggregate because aggregate works might have different mediums.
The following is the output on data from the unAPI input. Note that with the unAPI import that names were not brought into the Zotero record with their first-name/last-name distinctions, therefore they are treated as corporate names by Zotero:


The following is the output on data from the RIS input. Note how unlike the import via the unAPI the names are imported correctly, however there is a difference in how the URL is presented:


The following is the output on data from the BibTeX input. Note how the names are also not well imported to Zotero, but at least one does not have to manually type the freakishly long DOI:

4.3.7.6 APA artifact—Villejuif

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Villejuif interface when trying to craft an APA 6th edition audio artifact reference. Recall that the Villejuif interface does not have any embedded metadata, and it indicates to Zotero that it needs to get bibliographic metadata via the DOI and DataCite API. The Zotero crafted, APA formatted, bibliographic reference is presented below:


The APA formatted reference based on the HTML Zotero reads is presented below. Notice the impact of passing variables (content between ampersands) via the URL.


4.3.7.7 Chicago artifact—Cocoon

This section presents the variation created when using the various inputs from the Cocoon interface when trying to craft a Chicago 17th edition audio artifact reference.
Chicago 17th edition does not contain any unpublished research related audio artifacts, so I have replicated their examples here for archival audio artifacts:


Given the information at hand about the audio artifact via the web interface I would follow the Chicago 17th edition guidance and craft a reference something like the following:


My handcrafted reference shows the audio artifact, the aggregate work (collection), the archive, the location in the archive, and the archive’s location. The reference contains enough information to find the resource either by contacting the institution or through digital means. Note that this format is very similar to other aggregate work references.
like a chapter in an edited volume. I have not included the DOI because I have included
the ARK ID which is shorter, and I have included the archive’s URL.

Recall that DOI import did not work for this item. So I skip it and move to present the
output on the basis of the HTML input. Note that it varies significantly from the others as
it likely is a reference to the web page rather than the object the web page presents:

| of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and
| https://cocoon.huma-num.fr/exist/crdo/meta/cocoon-a966a1bc-6642-36a3-8f87-e298a78678d3. |

The following is the output on data from the unAPI input. Note that with the unAPI
import that names were not brought into the Zotero record with their first-name/last-
name distinctions, but because they have commas in their names and they are listed in
the Zotero record with the role performer they look like they fit with the desired style
output:

| SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /ɗa/.
The following is the output on data from the RIS input. The names are imported as composers on an audio recording item type. Chicago does not list those roles:


The following is the output on data from the BibTeX input. Note how the names are also not well imported to Zotero, but at least one does not have to manually type the freakishly long DOI:

Michaud, Alexis, Nguyễn, Thị Lan, Trần, Đỗ Đạt, and Mạc, Đăng Khoa. 2013. “SmoothTones: The six tones of sonorant-ending syllables of Hanoi Vietnamese, on the syllables /a/ and /*da*/. Speaker M7.”

4.3.7.8 Chicago artifact—Villejuif

This section presents the variation created when using the two inputs from the Villejuif interface when trying to craft a Chicago 17th edition audio artifact reference. Recall that the Villejuif interface does not have any embedded metadata and indicates to Zotero that it needs to get bibliographic metadata via the DOI and DataCite API. The Zotero crafted, Chicago 17th edition formatted, bibliographic reference using the DOI import method is presented below:


The Chicago 17th edition formatted reference based on the HTML Zotero reads is presented below. Notice the impact of passing variables (content between ampersands) via the URL.


4.3.7.9 Pangloss summary

Even though Pangloss offers more methods than any of the other five archives survived by which to transfer bibliographic metadata, each method fails in some respect.
Sometimes it is clearly the limitation of the transmission format (as in the BibTeX cases), but in other cases there is a general lack of clarity on the part of publishing style sheets on what data component must be included for success, e.g., neither Chicago nor APA provide examples for how to reference audio artifacts which are part of field recordings. Style sheet ambiguities make technical implementations difficult.
4.4 SIL Language & Culture Archives

The SIL Language & Culture Archives\footnote{See footnote 44 in chapter 4.} is SIL International’s corporate repository for language related artifacts. SIL International is an NGO with its head offices in Dallas, Texas. The SIL Language & Culture Archives also has a physical holdings location in Dallas, Texas. The hierarchical nature of holdings at the L&CA is highly influenced by SIL’s corporate architecture, which prior to the 2000’s primarily functioned under a “franchise” business model, e.g., SIL-PNG, SIL Sudan, SIL Peru, etc., with a common supporting organization known as SIL International. SIL was founded in 1934 and so has a long corporate history (Aldridge & Simons 2018), but the existence of national and regional level business units within the SIL family of organizations has varied over time. The practice for decades was for each business unit to be responsible for its own language artifacts, as deemed necessary—including artifact inventory, retention, deaccession, and preservation. Today, this has a significant impact on how collections are managed and how the hierarchical system as a whole is structured. Prior to 1999 the SIL collections were managed as a bibliography rather than an archive. The bibliography was chiefly concerned with the preservation of references rather than artifacts. When viewed as a whole, the organization’s historical practices and the natural development into an institutional repository have created a great deal of variation in the availability of items listed in the various collections. Nordmoe (2018)\footnote{Jeremy Nordmoe is the Director of the SIL Language & Culture Archives.} suggests that the collections contain a 3:2 ratio of public to private content and 20:80 ratio of unpublished to published materials across a scoping of 68,000+ items. This means many artifacts in the SIL Institutional Repository are formally published somewhere, and many others are not available at all via open access venues.

Table 14 provides a summary of the import technologies currently available at SIL’s Language & Culture Archives.
Table 14. Summary of support for Zotero at L&CA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None / DOI detection</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metadata for items in the L&CA are not queryable via DOI. The archive interface does not provide any HTML embedded bibliographic metadata (Dublin Core, EPrints, Highwire Press, or COinS), nor any downloadable files of bibliographic metadata. This makes the task for collecting bibliographic metadata completely manual.

4.4.1 Technology infrastructure

Since 2011 SIL has used DSpace\textsuperscript{119} for managing digital holdings. A data feed containing metadata approved for public view is provided to sil.org and other SIL websites which are served via Drupal\textsuperscript{120}. Some bitstreams\textsuperscript{121} from the holdings are also available at these sites. These Drupal based websites become the primary means of end-user engagement with the SIL Language & Culture Archives catalogue/content. Examples include:

- Mexico: https://mexico.sil.org/resources
- Cameroon: https://www.silcam.org/resources
- Peru: https://peru.sil.org/resources
- PNG: https://pnglanguages.sil.org/resources

In 2011–2012 designers on the sil.org project suggested the use of Drupal modules to make bibliographic metadata available via HTML embedding and downloadable files.\textsuperscript{122} However, this work was not carried out as no clear return on investment (to SIL as a whole or specifically the L&CA) for the funds required to implement or maintain features could be articulated. In that same project, designers following Bird and Simons (2003a)

\textsuperscript{119} Currently running version 6.3.
\textsuperscript{120} https://www.drupal.org
\textsuperscript{121} Bitstreams is a technical concept used in DSpace for the bits of a particular file. It is explained more in Section 4.6.2.
\textsuperscript{122} The biblio module was originally suggested, as that was the model of choice for delivering this kind of functionality via Drupal. Biblio has now been superseded by bibcite: https://www.drupal.org/project/biblio; https://www.drupal.org/project/bibcite
suggested implementing a stable URI system for artifact referencing (such as the Handle\(^{123}\) or DOI systems). However, counter use cases were provided in the design evaluation process. The biggest issue was *what should happen when an archive (or organization) wishes to repress, deaccession, or remove an artifact (inclusive of its associated records and relations)?* With an externally registered URL system, anonymity is relinquished. DOIs and Handles are resolvable identifiers. SIL does have an item ID system, where each item has a numeric ID, but it is not related to a stable URI structure.

### 4.4.2 Collections structure

Within the public-facing web presentations that SIL offers no collection information is shown to users. The L&CA uses DSpace as its back end (Nordmoe 2018), but since the DSpace structures are not visible, they are not discussed in this section.

### 4.4.3 Collections and artifacts reviewed

The L&CA does not display collection level data via sil.org, the public interface for the L&CA’s holdings. So in this case all a user has to go on is what is presented about the artifact. The archive does link between related works when they are related via the Dublin Core *hasPart/isPartOf* relationships.\(^{124}\)\(^{125}\) A good example of how the L&CA links resources in aggregate works can be seen in the listing for Hartell (1993a) which not only has its subsections listed but also has a link to the French translation (Hartell 1993b). So, while the L&CA does not list collections, it does list aggregate works in particular cases. The case of Hartell’s publications exhibits the fact that the L&CA does this both when aggregate works are in a part-whole relationship and when aggregate works are part of the same FRBR work, but are separate FRBR expressions.

I chose to review L&CA item 52216 (Figure 43). The artifact’s title is *Audio Wordlist: Kamuku Survey, Cinda dialect, Danasabe village.*\(^{126}\) It is not indicated to be part of any larger work or have any related entries. In fact, as discussed later in Section 6.3.2.2 this

---

\(^{123}\) https://www.handle.net  
\(^{124}\) http://purl.org/dc/terms/hasPart  
\(^{125}\) http://purl.org/dc/terms/isPartOf  
\(^{126}\) Titles for works in language research, especially field work elicited audio, are notoriously difficult to craft informatively.
item comprises part of the same work reviewed in Section 4.2.3 as part of PARADISEC’s Kamuku wordlists.

Audio Wordlist: Kamuku Survey, Cinda dialect, Danasabe village

Researchers: Hope, April  
Date Created: 2007 to 2011  
Sponsored By: Nigeria Group  
Extent: 00:26:56  
Description: This is a 100+ item wordlist that was taken at Danasabe village in the Cinda dialect of the Kamuku language group in Niger state, Nigeria.  
Publication Status: Draft (posted ‘as is’ without peer review)  
Country: Nigeria  
Subject Languages: Cinda-Regi-Tiyal [cdr]  
Content Language: Cinda-Regi-Tiyal [cdr]  
English [eng]  
Field: Language Assessment  
Work Type: Data set  
Subject: Wordlist  
Niger State  
Danasabe  
Cinda  
Nature of Work: Speech  
Entry Number: 52216

Figure 43. SIL L&CA item 52216 as seen on sil.org

4.4.4 DOI import

As a publisher SIL International does not subscribe to DOI services nor do any of its national level entities. However, many SIL staff publish in venues where DOIs are provided. These DOIs are listed in L&CA records when known. Zotero will use these DOIs if detected;\textsuperscript{127} however, the metadata from these DOIs are not sourced from the L&CA. The reviewed artifacts had no DOIs.

\textsuperscript{127} This can be tested with L&CA item 52727: https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/52727
4.4.5 Embedded metadata in HTML

As is seen in Figure 44 lines 8–12, SIL is meticulous about supplying HTML embedded metadata for Open Graph (a metadata schema created by Facebook and used by Twitter),\(^{128}\) on each page of sil.org.\(^{129}\) The Open Graph metadata can be identified with the \texttt{og:} prefix which starts the metadata property value. The L&CA provides no metadata for Google Scholar or other scholarly search indexers via embedded HTML metadata. Zotero detects the Open Graph metadata and categorizes the archive page as a web page on import. The imported record is displayed in Figure 45. If a DOI exists in the content of the web page, Zotero can see it and import the metadata from the DOI publisher. However, a user will need to right click the Zotero connector icon in the browser and choose the import via DOI option as is illustrated in Figure 3 in Chapter 2.

\begin{verbatim}
<head>
  <meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=utf-8" />
  <link rel="shortcut icon" href="https://www.sil.org/sites/default/files/sil-favicon.png?qpgghx" type="image/png" />
  <meta name="viewport" content="width=device-width, initial-scale=1, maximum-scale=1, minimum-scale=1, user-scalable=no" />
  <meta name="generator" content="Drupal 7 (https://www.drupal.org)" />
  <link rel="canonical" href="https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/52216" />
  <link rel="shortlink" href="https://www.sil.org/node/62887" />
  <meta property="og:site_name" content="SIL International" />
  <meta property="og:type" content="article" />
  <meta property="og:url" content="https://www.sil.org/resources/archives/52216" />
  <meta property="og:title" content="Audio Wordlist: Kamuku Survey, Cinda dialect, Danasabe village" />
  <meta property="og:updated_time" content="2020-12-02T05:44:01-06:00" />
  <meta property="article:published_time" content="2013-02-01T20:11:05-06:00" />
  <meta property="article:modified_time" content="2020-12-02T05:44:01-06:00" />
  <title>Audio Wordlist: Kamuku Survey, Cinda dialect, Danasabe village | SIL International</title>
</head>
\end{verbatim}

**Figure 44. HTML code from SIL L&CA item 52216**

\(^{128}\) https://ogp.me  
\(^{129}\) Some non-relevant JavaScript was removed to clarify the presentation.
4.4.6 File download

The Language and Culture Archive does not provide a downloadable metadata file in a common format such as BibTeX, RIS, or MODS at any level.

4.4.7 Complete or sufficient

In general crafting a reference to be style compliant for either APA 6th edition or Chicago 17th edition Author-date based on the information the L&CA made available is difficult for several reasons, including that the medium is unknown, the date is not precise, the collection is unstated, and the context within another aggregate work is unstated. Zotero only sees the web page and not the work it represents.

4.4.7.1 Collection

Since the L&CA does not make collection information available, it is impossible for the average person who engages with the archive to actually create a collection citation.

4.4.7.2 Item

The HTML embedded metadata pulled into Zotero as shown in Figure 45 is insufficient to craft an APA 6th edition or Chicago 17th edition Author-date style reference. To craft an APA or Chicago reference one would need to look at the web page and manually build the reference in Zotero. If one tries to use the data imported to Zotero the reference will

Figure 45. SIL L&CA item 52216 as imported from the publicly accessible sil.org
follow the **Web Page** item type formats for the chosen CSL style. The **APA 6th edition** is shown below.

```
```

In addition to manually building the reference in Zotero, one would also need to assume that the reviewed artifact is indeed a single artifact and not an aggregate work (in a **is-PartOf** relationship with another item). To do this one would just use the APA’s audio recording template and Chicago’s audio style template (both are shown in Chapter 1).

A handcrafted, APA 6th edition-ish style reference might look like the following. Note that there is no place in the APA template for an audio recording shown in chapter 1 to describe the archive, so I have diverged from the APA and added the archive’s name and location in between the medium and the URL.

```
```

A handcrafted Chicago 17th edition audio recording references for a single item Author-date format might look like the following:

```
```
4.5 Endangered Languages Archive

The Endangered Languages Archive\textsuperscript{130} is a digital archive embedded at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London. It was started in 2004 and launched in 2005. It has been described in works by Munro & Nathan (2005), Wittenburg (2007), and Nathan (2011, 2013b, 2013a). Major contributions to ELAR come from scholars who are funded via the Endangered Language Program (also at SOAS).

Table 15 provides a summary of the import technologies currently available at ELAR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VuFind Collection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>COinS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VuFind Item</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>COinS</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPress Collection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WordPress Item</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Technology infrastructure

During the initial stages of this study, the user interaction with the collections catalogue was managed via VuFind\textsuperscript{131} an open source library catalog management tool. However, a new user interface was put in place in February 2021 as ELAR moved its collection management infrastructure to Preservica\textsuperscript{132} with a WordPress\textsuperscript{133} front end.

4.5.2 Collections structure

A significant motivation for structural segmentation in the hierarchical organization system at ELAR is grant or funding allocation, e.g., see the metadata displayed in Figure 46. The artifacts collected under the auspices of a funded project are compiled into a collection. A collection then contains bundles which may contain one or more artifacts; these artifacts may in some cases have multiple manifestations. Commonly bundles, the

\textsuperscript{130}See footnote 45 in chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{131}https://vufind.org/vufind
\textsuperscript{132}https://preservica.com
\textsuperscript{133}https://wordpress.org
only sub-grouping concept in-between a file and a collection, are groupings of artifacts which were created together or are derivatives of some common artifact. Both collections and bundles can have names, but names are not unique, therefore the collection ID or record ID (for bundles) is important (collection IDs and record IDs are distinct from deposit IDs). The hierarchical system under VuFind looks like: **SOAS Library > ELAR > Collections > Bundles > Files.** However, with the move to Preservica, it is not clear how dependent ELAR is on SOAS or University London library services and long term affiliation.\(^\text{134}\)

### 4.5.3 Collections and artifacts reviewed

In reviewing ELAR I browsed a few collections but it was quicker and more convenient to just read the HTML code. Examples presented here show the same view in both the VuFind and the WordPress interfaces. They present the *Cicipu documentation*\(^\text{135}\) collection (shown in Figure 46) and the **228 word list**\(^\text{136}\) bundle (shown in Figure 47) which is part of the *Cicipu documentation* collection.

\(^{134}\) It is not outside of archival industry norms for archives (or special collections) to move between institutions or to rotate their position within management structures of the same organization. A good example of this can be found in the history of [arxiv.org](https://arxiv.org). The repository started at Los Alamos National Laboratory (Butler 2001), moved to Cornell’s Computer Science Department, moved again to be managed under Cornell’s University Library and then moved back to Cornell’s Computer Science Department (CornellCIS 2018).

\(^{135}\) [https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI97667](https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI97667)

\(^{136}\) [https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Record/MPI538104](https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Record/MPI538104)
Notice how in Figure 46 the metadata shown for a collection is not the kind of bibliographic metadata needed for crafting a reference, e.g., no dates are present, the title is not labeled as title, no identifier is provided for this node of the collection, and the name of the creator is not specified. It is, however, helpful for determining other kinds of contextual information about the formation of the collection.
Figure 47. ELAR bundle page in the VuFind interface
Figure 48. Metadata on ELAR bundle page in the WordPress interface
With the switch in platforms to WordPress, the visual presentation of metadata is much improved as shown in Figure 48. There is one small caveat: in the VuFind interface, collections and bundles had IDs. These IDs were nice and short. They were part of the URLs which were used in ELAR’s “suggested reference” pattern where they said: "To refer to any data from the corpus, please cite the corpus in this way:"


These URLs still resolve at the moment, but a new URL structure was revealed and each collection, bundle (sometimes called a session), and file now has a persistent URL via the handle system (the handles do not demonstrate the logical structure of the collections). However, because the previous ID which was part of the URL is no-longer visible anywhere on the site, it is hard for people who use references to know if the object they are seeing on their screen is in fact the one which a previous author is referring to in their publication. This underscores the need for references to not just be clear with their digital pointers, but also with their textual descriptions of the collections and artifacts to which they are pointing.

4.5.4 DOI import

ELAR does not use DOIs so there is no option for Zotero users to import metadata via this method.

4.5.5 Embedded metadata in HTML

VuFind’s software supports COinS. COinS code from ELAR is shown in Figure 49. This code triggers Zotero’s detection of multiple importable objects (referenceable objects) as shown in Figure 50. COinS is designed to describe item types like books, book sections (chapters in an edited volume), journal articles, and dissertations, rather than collections\footnote{https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dcmi-terms/dcmitype/Collection} and datasets\footnote{https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dcmi-terms/dcmitype/Dataset} (in the Dublin Core senses). Therefore, details needed for
crafting references for collections and datasets are not included in the COinS specification. This means that when Zotero reads the embedded metadata, reference details are not available to the Zotero user.

Figure 49. COinS code at ELAR (line breaks added).

When multiple items are detected on a page Zotero allows the user to choose which they want to import.

Figure 50. Import choice when multiple items are available

While the pre-2021 VuFind interface provided COinS integration, it was functionally useless as most objects in the archive were not within scope of the type that COinS supports. Therefore, for the types of items reviewed, there was no embedded metadata. The new WordPress interface did away with the COinS support. Currently with the WordPress
interface (shown in Figure 48), there is no embedded HTML metadata for Zotero to find. This means that Zotero will recognize these web pages as web pages, and not detect any artifact records (as shown in Figure 51).

![Figure 51. Zotero imports metadata from ELAR as Web Pages](image)

**4.5.6 File download**

ELAR does not provide a downloadable metadata file in a common format such as BibTeX, RIS, or MODS at any level—collection, bundle, or file.

**4.5.7 Complete or sufficient**

The following references are crafted from interactions with the WordPress interface. Because Zotero detects ELAR web pages as the Zotero item type web page, only minimal metadata is discovered—even for web page references. Insufficient metadata is made available to both scholarly indexing tools and to Zotero. Given the information at hand about the collection via the web interface, I would follow the APA template and craft a reference something like the following:

The following is the Zotero produced APA reference for the collection based on the embedded metadata (web page title and URL) in the HTML detected by Zotero. Note that absent are discrete identifiable names, roles, dates, location of archive, identifier, and permanent URL. Further, the title is of the web page and not that of the collection.


The following is the Zotero/CSL produced APA reference for the bundle based on the embedded metadata (web page title and URL) in the HTML detected by Zotero. Categorically Zotero detects the same information. Differences include the web page’s title is computed differently by WordPress and the URL is different.


In the Cicipu documentation collection, there are several bundles which have the same title. So, in this case citing a bundle without a handle does not make the reference very clear to a reader. The VuFind interface had bundle IDs but these are not visible in the new WordPress ELAR user interface.

Given the information at hand about the collection via the web interface I would follow the Chicago template and craft a reference something like the following:

In contrast, the Zotero/CSL output in Chicago 17th edition from the same embedded metadata (web page title and URL) detected through HTML looks like the following for each collection (recall bundles are collections or aggregate works as well):\textsuperscript{139}

|---------------------------------------------------------------|

The following is the Zotero/CSL produced Chicago 17th edition reference for the bundle based on the embedded metadata (web page title and URL) in the HTML detected by Zotero.

|-----------------------------------------------------------------|

In both cases (the collection and the bundle) what is being referenced is the web page not the collection. Zotero does not have any indication that a collection exists.

4.6 Kaipuleohone

Kaipuleohone\textsuperscript{140} was established in 2008 at the University of Hawai‘i. It is described by Albarillo and Thieberger (2009) and Berez (2013). It is a collection of ethnographic research materials at the University of Hawai‘i. Kaipuleohone hosts a wide variety of research materials collected during the course of scholarly projects based at the university or conducted by university affiliated staff.

Table 16 provides a summary of the import technologies currently available at Kaipuleohone.

\textsuperscript{139} In the new WordPress based interface, artifacts contained within bundles do have their own handles which can be used as IDs.

\textsuperscript{140} See footnote 46 in chapter 4.
Table 16. Summary of support for Zotero at Kaipuleohone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Embedded metadata</th>
<th>File import</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes - Dublin Core</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6.1 **Technology infrastructure**

The collection is managed by the linguistics department while the software and infrastructure support is provided via the university library. The digital collection is hosted along with other university special collections using DSpace\(^{141}\) (the same software that powers the SIL’s L&CA discussed in Section 4.4).

4.6.2 **Collections structure**

One challenge faced by both traditional archives and all digital repositories is the decision on how to arrange the hierarchical systems—including a model which determines which metadata elements should be applied to each node in the hierarchy. Relationships with organizations providing digital infrastructure to special collections may dictate some prerequisites with regards to hierarchical systems including node structures and the ability to apply metadata to nodes. Software choices may lend themselves to certain types of hierarchical structures. The general DSpace architecture applies in the case of Kaipuleohone as it is a sub-community within the set of communities managed by the UHM linguistics department. Their hierarchical structure therefore looks like: Communities/Sub-Communities > Collection > Item > bitstreams (see Smith 2002:546 for further details).

4.6.3 **Collections and artifacts reviewed**

For this project I looked at two collections: *Blust Field Notebooks*\(^{142}\) and *Marshallese Language from the 1950s*.\(^{143}\) Web pages representing a collection have a unique ID via the Handle system. The collection page for *Marshallese Language from the 1950s* (shown in

---

\(^{141}\) At the time of writing the university was using DSpace version 5.7.

\(^{142}\) https://hdl.handle.net/10125/33115

\(^{143}\) https://hdl.handle.net/10125/27416
Figure 52) includes a very helpful description introducing the major contributors to the collection.

**Marshallese Language from the 1950s**

During the years Byron W. Bender lived and worked at Majuro, he was able to record traditional legends as told by three esteemed raconteurs: Lommaan from Rongelap, Jauwej from Wetje, and Jbaaj from Ebon. He also recorded a session by Uijjellaai, paramount chief of the Râlik chain of atolls at the Marshall Islands Intermediate School on Majuro.

**Figure 52. Collection description at Kaipuleohone**

At the item level, I looked at item BB1-018\(^1\) within the *Marshallese Language from the 1950s* collection (as shown in Figure 53).

\(^1\)https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/30788
### Item Summary

- **dc.date.accessioned**: 2013-10-29T20:34:42Z
- **dc.date.available**: 2013-10-29T20:34:42Z
- **dc.date.issued**: [1954-01-01]
- **dc.identifier.uri**: http://hdl.handle.net/10125/30788
- **dc.description**: UQalin #1, #3
- **dc.format**: Maxwell UR 60 min cassette
- **dc.language.iso**: mah
- **dc.title**: BB1-018
- **dc.type=document**: Sound
- **dc.contributor.speaker**: UQalin
- **dc.contributor.recorder**: Bender, Byron
- **dc.subject.language**: Marshallese
- **dc.type.language**: primary_text
- **dc.date.begin**: [1954-01-01]
- **dc.date.finish**: [1954-01-01]
- **dc.content.language**: Marshallese
- **dc.content.languagecode**: mah
- **dc.contributor.depositor**: Bender, Byron
- **dc.coverage.spatial**: MH
- **local.coverage.country**: Marshall Islands

Appears in Collections: [Marshallese Language from the 1950s](#)

---

Figure 53. Item view at Kaipuleohone
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4.6.4 DOI import

Kaipuleohone does not use DOIs so there is no option for Zotero users to import metadata via this method.

4.6.5 Embedded metadata in HTML

Collection pages do not contain any HTML embedded metadata about a collection. Therefore, they import as simple web pages to Zotero requiring an author to collect their own metadata manually for crafting a reference for a collection.\(^{145}\)

Item level pages are different. In contrast to all the other archives discussed in this thesis, DSpace at Kaipuleohone provides rich embedded Dublin Core metadata at the item level (DSpace sense of item). This can be seen in Figure 54.

```html
1 <DOCTYPE html>
2 <html lang="en">
3 <head>
4   <title>ScholarSpace at University of Hawaii at Manoa: BB1-018</title>
5   <meta http-equiv="Content-Type" content="text/html; charset=UTF-8" />
6   <meta name="Generator" content="DSpace 5.7" />
7   ...
8   <link rel="schema.DCTERMS" href="http://purl.org/dc/terms/" />
9   <link rel="schema.DC" href="http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1/" />
10  <meta name="DCTERMS.dateAccepted" content="2013-10-29T20:34:42Z" scheme="DCTERMS.W3CDTF" />
11  <meta name="DCTERMS.available" content="2013-10-29T20:34:42Z" scheme="DCTERMS.W3CDTF" />
12  <meta name="DCTERMS.issued" content="[1954-01-01]" xml:lang="en_US" scheme="DCTERMS.W3CDTF" />
13  <meta name="DC.identifier" content="http://hdl.handle.net/10125/30788' scheme="DCTERMS.URI" />
14  <meta name="DC.description" content="Löjelañ #1, #3" xml:lang="en_US" />
15  <meta name="DC.format" content="Maxell UR 60 min cassette" xml:lang="en_US" />
16  <meta name="DC.language" content="mah" xml:lang="en_US" scheme="DCTERMS.RFC1766" />
17  <meta name="DC.title" content="BB1-018" xml:lang="en_US" />
18  <meta name="DC.contributor" content="Löjelañ" xml:lang="en_US" />
19  ...
20  <meta name="citation_date" content="[1954-01-01]" />
21  <meta name="citation_abstract_html_url" content="http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/30788" />
22  <meta name="citation_language" content="mah" />
24  <meta name="citation_title" content="BB1-018" />
```

Figure 54. Embedded metadata code from DSpace (non-relevant code removed).

\(^{145}\) This would be done by indicating the CSL variable in the Extra field as indicated in Figure 14. Any CSL style with a pattern defined for collection shows output results in authored documents. See discussion about the Extra field in Section 4.1.4.
However, even with this rich Dublin Core metadata, in the header of the web page, most of the metadata is not transferable to the Zotero user. There are likely several reasons for lack of successful transfer. The most likely reason is the presence of two DC.type elements (lines 18 and 23). With two DC.type elements, declared Zotero defaults to its default document type—journal article. Daniel Ishimitsu of UHM Hamilton Library suggested (p.c. 2019) that this is because the embedded metadata was chosen to increase the ScholarSpace profile in Google Scholar, and compatibility with Zotero was not a design requirement at the time of implementation. However, even with Google Scholar as the target, several metadata values are just poor form. Dates are not in their declared formats. For example, in Figure 54 lines 12, 24, and 25, dates should not have square 

\[146\] The presence of primary_text in line 23 is a value from OLAC metadata, and should not be included in the HTML header as there are not any other services that read OLAC metadata.
brackets around them per the W3CDTF standard for indicating dates.\textsuperscript{147} Square brackets around dates in some library cataloging traditions have been used to indicate that the date was hand-written on the material. However, even if these brackets appear in the source record, they should be removed before being put in the HTML header metadata, as they are not a valid format in W3CDTF, Google Scholar, or useful in bibliographic reference managers such as Zotero.\textsuperscript{148} The noise created by using various date formats and techniques like square brackets is a broadly encountered problem by metadata harvesters and is not unique to Kaipuleohone (Toves & Hickey 2014).\textsuperscript{149} However, conformity to modern cataloging standards like RDA and clean transformations of metadata from in-house storage practices to declared metadata standards improves interoperability.

Other data points to consider are language tags. There are three types of language tags in Figure 54. The first appears in line 2 `<html lang="en">` as part of the HTML tag.\textsuperscript{150} This declares that the foundational language of the document is English. This code is done correctly. However, each of the meta tags in lines 12, 14–26 contain `xml:lang="en_US"`. This is in most cases not needed because it is saying that the language of the metadata is English, which is the default language of the document. However, if the metadata was not in English, then presumably some other value would be able to be put in place of `en_US`. More egregious than being redundant is that the code value is wrong. When used, HTML5 calls for the use of BCP47 codes in this position; `en_US` is a locale code. BCP47 codes have a hyphen/minus sign instead of an underscore.\textsuperscript{151} The correct code would be `en-US`. Lines 14 and 19 are the only lines which might benefit from a code in this position, but it does not seem that the software has detected that the values of these fields are not in English. The third language code which appears on line 16 is declared to be in the controlled vocabulary of RFC1766.\textsuperscript{152} However, “mah” is not a valid language code

\textsuperscript{147} https://www.w3.org/TR/NOTE-datetime.
\textsuperscript{148} As is shown in Section 4.6.7.2 Zotero does strip out the square brackets when creating a reference.
\textsuperscript{149} Though often described as a point of variation, specific examples from institutional repositories on date variation are hard to pin down as research on metadata quality suffers from a clear definition of “quality”, and most metadata quality studies have a broad overview. However, Klinke (2018) found 4,320 date patterns across 472,669 objects in The Museum of Modern Art’s records (New York) and Kräutli (2016:76ff) discusses issues with variation and digital collection artifact presentation based on records in the Victoria and Albert Museum collections.
\textsuperscript{150} https://www.w3.org/International/tutorials/language-decl
\textsuperscript{151} https://unicode-org.github.io/cldr/ldml/tr35.html#Unicode_Locale_Identifier_CLDR_to_BCP_47
\textsuperscript{152} https://tools.ietf.org/html/rfc1766
under RFC1766. One possible explanation is that the option to embed metadata comes from the DSpace theme, rather than being specifically coded for this DSpace community and its metadata terms. Within the DSpace community (Kaipuleohone), it is likely that catalogers use ISO 639-3 instead while the DSpace theme (or possibly even the rest of the Hamilton Library) uses RFC1766.\footnote{Dublin Core allows for language codes from ISO 639-3, ISO 639-2, and RFC1766. RFC1766 is an earlier language code standard to which Dublin Core makes reference. Dublin Core would have ideally referenced BCP47 rather than a specific RFC document as RFC documents are obsoleted from time to time with more current documents, but this is not likely to happen for another 25 years, at which time ISO 639-3 may have run out of codes for new languages, and a new code standard will be implemented. When crafting technical standards, referencing BCP47 is often preferred to referencing ISO 639-3 or specific RFC documents as it provides a stable reference point and allows for evolution of the RFC documents to occur seamlessly.}

### 4.6.6 File download

Kaipuleohone does not provide a downloadable metadata file in a common format such as BibTeX, RIS, or MODS at any level—collection, item, or bitstream.

### 4.6.7 Complete or sufficient

In this section I present a comparison of what was imported to Zotero with what is needed to craft a reference in both \textit{APA 6th edition} and \textit{Chicago 17th edition Author-date} (as previously presented in Chapter 1). Kaipuleohone does not provide a suggested reference; so unlike ELAR and PARADISEC, there is no institutional reference to compare. The artifact reviewed is interesting and different from other audio artifacts discussed in this thesis. In contrast to the others and in line with the additional information given in the collection description (shown in Figure 52), I would consider classifying this audio artifact as an interview. Reference styles like \textit{APA 6th edition} and \textit{Chicago 17th edition Author-date} both have layouts with special considerations for interviews. These interview formats list the roles of those engaged in the recording, the medium of the recording, and the archive. The following references were both produced using the Zotero interview template. If I were to reference these materials, I would craft my reference to look like those presented below. The following is the \textit{APA 6th edition} interview reference (VandenBos 2010:213–214 #69):

\footnote{153}
The following is the Chicago 17th edition interview reference in the Author-date format (Harper 2017:§14.211):


In the following subsections, the collection and audio artifact references are presented based on the data that Zotero detected.

4.6.7.1 Collection

The following is the APA 6th edition collection reference output based on the data that Zotero detected:


The following is the Chicago 17th edition collection reference from Zotero in Author-date format:

Neither of these collection references conform to the style guides. What is shown is basic web page bibliographic metadata. The archive has aptly enabled the relevant pages, creating a fluke where the Zotero output is reasonably close to a reference for a collection. For example, the collection title, the institutional repository, and the university’s name all appear in the title of the web page.

4.6.7.2 Item

The following is the APA 6th edition reference output based on the data that Zotero detected:


The following is the Chicago 17th edition reference output from Zotero in Author-date format:


These item level references reflect the sparse nature of the metadata actually interpretable by Zotero.

4.7 Review summary

A review of these five archives indicates that the cycle described in Chapter 1 is not as easily completed with archival material as it is with formally published materials such as books and journal articles. The archives reviewed have either chosen to not support bibliographic metadata transfer, or they indirectly support it. To briefly recap, the communicability\(^{154}\) of metadata between institutions that hold language artifacts and authors that need to reference those artifacts is limited even though there are diverse methods for

\(^{154}\) Some have labeled this interoperability. Interoperability has been cast as the ability to move data out of one application and into another. Another way to look at the concept that term interoperability tries to capture is: How does some data increase in value to an end-user as it travels through a workflow?
importing bibliographic metadata to Zotero. We have seen that there are some technical issues with Zotero, primarily with data translation. We have also seen that there are data issues with metadata repositories such as DataCite. However, the largest portion of the technical obstacles actually lie with the language archives. The Pangloss collection is the most articulate in the sense that it had the most bibliographic transfer options, and the bibliographic metadata it transferred to Zotero was the most complete. However, even with great user interfaces making the transfer of bibliographic metadata easy, some critical data points are not transferred, e.g., audio duration, and some are transferred in unusable ways, e.g., language identifier.

This thesis has focused on a technical assessment of bibliographic metadata interoperability between authorship tools and archives. While resources could be expended on addressing this important issue, there are other issues which if unaddressed along with the technical issues would likely leave archive users unsatisfied and less likely to reference evidence from language archives. One such issue is arrangement and description. The significant degree of variation in curation practice specifically in regards to how items are classified (assigned an item type) has an impact on what metadata is perceived as necessary for transmission to reference managers such as Zotero. This ultimately impacts authors and the referencing cycle described in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER 5
Example references

In this thesis, I address two types of archive records—the collection record and the audio artifact record, specifically within the context of the archive collection. I would be remiss to mention the sparse nature of bibliographic data transferred between an archive and a reference manager, without also giving some examples of the types of data points that researchers should expect and in fact need to make informative references. I have already provided some of the same examples in chapter 1 and, as relevant, in chapter 4. In this chapter I bring together the templates from the *APA 6th edition* and the *Chicago 17th edition Author-date* styles and contrast them with the exemplars provided by the style sheets of *Language* and *Linguistic Inquiry*. I provide examples for referencing an archive collection, a component in a collection, and an audio artifact. I also juxtapose the style guides with guidance provided by the style sheets of *Language* and *Linguistic Inquiry* and “suggested citation” formats provided by ELAR and PARADISEC.

The following is the APA 6th edition collection reference template (VandenBos 2010:212):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, A. A. (Year, Month Day). Title of material. [Description of material]. Name of collection (Call number, Box number, File name or number, etc.). Name and location of repository.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

155 An author may be tempted to reference a digitally hosted collection as they would a web page. After all, when an archive does not provide collection level metadata on import, Zotero imports the web page’s metadata as a web page item. However, there is a conceptual difference between referencing a web page and referencing a collection. Collections may move from institution to institution, and may change Internet locations. A web page is a specific unit of content at a specific point in time.
The following is the APA 6th edition examples of referenced collections components (Van-denBos 2010:213):


The following is the APA 6th edition audio recording reference template (VandenBos 2010:209, Skutley 2012:25):

Writer, A. A. (copyright year). Title of song [Recorded by B. B. Artist if different from writer]. On Title of album [Medium of recording: CD, mp3, record, cassette, etc.]. Retrieved from http://xxxxx (Date of recording if different from song’s copyright date)

The APA style guide, as opposed to the Chicago Manual of Style, provides descriptive templates. Even with the wonderful examples of the Chicago Manual of Style one must still infer the categories of information they have deemed necessary.

The following is the Chicago 17th edition collection reference for a whole collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.54):


Unlike the APA provided template above, Chicago 17th edition only provides exemplars. I present my analysis of these exemplars within yellow boxes below each lavender box. The following is my analysis of the collection reference pattern based on the Egmont Manuscript exemplar.

Series or (Sub)series Name. Collection Name. Archive Name.
The following is the Chicago 17th edition collection reference for a single item in a collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.54):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name, Given Name, Date</th>
<th>Title or Description of the artifact</th>
<th>Collection Name</th>
<th>Archive Name, Archive Institution Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following is the Chicago 17th edition audio recording references for a single item in a collection in Author-date format (Harper 2017:§15.57):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker’s Family Name, Given Name, role</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>“Title” (Type of audio)</th>
<th>In “Title of Aggregate work.”</th>
<th>Archive</th>
<th>Copy of original carrier, current formats, time-based-length</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Both APA and Chicago treat archival material as part of an aggregate work. The basic problem solved by the reference is where can someone find the thing referenced? Crucial criteria for solving the search problem are identifying the archive and the location in the archive where the artifact is managed. Additionally, they both describe the artifact so that
someone following the reference would be able to identify if the artifact was truly the one referenced (the content at the other end of a URL can change from time to time, just as your friend or spouse may sometimes answer your phone when someone is calling you).

Archives as publishers and distributors of artifacts should be making the bibliographic data available in several ways. First, it should be visually available to human readers of web pages. Second, it should be available in machine readable formats. Additionally, navigation through the tiers of organization of collections to artifacts via web interfaces should help people understand the organization structure of collections. In this way there should be a distinct difference between an exhibit which presents artifacts from a collection for comparison with other artifacts, and a web page which presents artifacts for their publication state. For example, if one wanted to compare the contents of two articles, that comparison could be done in an online tool. Such a comparison should not be the use case which drives the publication of the two articles.

The search and finding component of reference formation has in recent years been undermined by the social forces which take a perspective that the primary role of references is for “attribution”—which has become a necessary building block for career development. The style sheets for Language (Dawson 2011) and Linguistic Inquiry (Witz 2009) are influential in the academic publishing industry (for linguistics) because they are replicated by other editorial teams (and style sheets). Together they represent an interesting editorial perspective on referencing the evidentiary record. In particular, they reject the philosophical approach to referencing presented by Haspelmath (2014) in The Generic Style Rules For Linguistics. When dealing with unpublished materials, it states:

... but such unpublished papers should only be cited from recent conferences, if it can be expected that the material will eventually be published.

The implication here is that unpublished works should not be referenced. While there is a philosophical question on what “published” means, I take it here to mean peer-reviewed publication, rather than public access. In 2014, many preprint servers and conferences hosted content in publicly accessible locations. In this context, Haspelmath and Michaelis’
(2014) blog post arguing for the peer review status of annotated corpora (an output of language documentation practice) becomes relevant to archived collections—the implication is that in order to reference archival content, it first needs to be peer-reviewed.¹⁵⁶

In contrast to my interpretation of Haspelmath and Michaelis (2014), the style sheets for both Language and Linguistic Inquiry each provide an example for referencing unpublished materials, meaning they find it acceptable to reference unpublished and non-peer-reviewed materials.¹⁵⁷,¹⁵⁸

The following is an example from Language’s style sheet for referencing a manuscript with an online component:


Surname, given name. Year. Title. City-of-author’s-institution: Institution-of-author, Manuscript indicator. Online: URL.

The style sheet for the journal Linguistic Inquiry¹⁵⁹ heavily relies on Chicago 15th edition (Mahan 2003) and provides an example of referenced material from an archive:


¹⁵⁶ Currently there is no standard method or accepted practice for peer-reviewing an archive collection of language materials. Within the tradition of archiving, collections would simply have their descriptions enhanced, but for linguists the question remains: How does one argue that enhancing the description of a collection has intellectual merit worthy of attribution sufficient enough to use as evidence in hiring and tenure processes?

¹⁵⁷ Note that neither example is of an audio artifact, nor of an archival collection.

¹⁵⁸ Neither of these examples provide enough for a third party to create a CSL style sheet (both reference objects which would have the DCMIType text) for that publication without additional consultation with the editors. Style sheets, which are freely accessible via Zotero, are often constrained by the lack of sufficient concrete examples provided by editors in their publishing style guides. CSL style sheets are further discussed in Section 3.2.

¹⁵⁹ Linguistic Inquiry is interesting in that many authors use Optimality Theory. Some of the founding documents presenting Optimality Theory were not formally published for many years but were referenced from the Rutgers Optimality Archive, a sort of early preprint server used by discussants of Optimality Theory. This firmly established the need to reference textual manuscripts within the formal publishing literature.
Some of the reviewed archives provide pre-formatted references for users to copy and incorporate into their works.\textsuperscript{160} The utility of these formatted references is questionable, as formatting decisions ultimately are determined by the publisher of the work containing the formatted reference, not the entity wishing to be referenced. The examples below are replicated from items or collections reviewed in chapter 4. The VuFind interface to ELAR provided the following statement and reference: “To refer to any data from the corpus, please cite the corpus in this way:"

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

ELAR’s suggestion creates an overgeneralization if one wants to reference a particular artifact within the collection. Citing and referencing strategies together need to be able to address issues of granularity. Pangloss takes an interesting approach by assigning HTML anchor tags at the phrasal level of oral texts. How well authors will notice these extensions to the URL structure remains to be seen. PARADISEC’s “suggested citation” consists of the following:

\begin{quote}
https://dx.doi.org/10.4225/72/56E977B622032
\end{quote}

It is interesting that the role is provided. However, it is not entirely clear that this is necessary if DACS practices are followed for naming collections. If collections are given appropriate item type status in reference strategies, then additional role information is

\textsuperscript{160} Tangentially, it is interesting that many of entities use "recommended citation" or "cite as" when they really provide a reference.
redundant. Generally, item type status is distinguished by position and content of elements in the reference.
CHAPTER 6

Theory and applications

In Chapter 4, we see that there are some technological barriers to the frictionless flow of bibliographic metadata from language archives to authors who would reference the materials. However, the lion’s share of barriers actually arise out of curation and archival practices. Changing these patterns of behavior in archives would take an immense amount of work. So, Is it a problem worth solving? Or in other words, Is distribution of bibliographic metadata from archives for archived content worth solving?

In order to address the question, I apply an economic model and cast archives and their clients within that model. The economic model builds upon a critical observation by Bourdieu (1977:645)—that language can be analyzed as both an object of understanding and an instrument of action. As objects of understanding, language and language artifacts are subject to commodification and influences of economic exchanges just like other goods. Commodification of language is well discussed in the literature (see among others: Ganahl 2001; Dobrin et al. 2009; Hemphill & Blakely 2015; Holborow 2018; Guo et al. 2020; Škevin Rajko & Šimičić 2020). Less discussed is the influence language archives have in the ecology of language as a commodity. An economic model applied to commodities traded by language archives must take into account that which language documentation practitioners have long been aware—language archives have multiple audiences (Holton 2012; Woodbury 2014). Generally these audiences are described in contrastive categories such as academics and language “community” members as illustrated in Figure 56.
When researchers and language “community” members are cast as the various sides to which a business or central platform must cater it appears as if there is a genuine two-sided market with two separate groups both of which may either be contributors of language artifacts or consumer/re-users of language artifacts. However, turning from how language archive audiences are described in the language documentation literature, it is also possible to categorize these same audiences as consumers and producers. This situates the audiences within the terms more commonly used for digital content delivery platforms, but also lends to an analysis of the transactions as a single-sided market due to the unidirectional transfer of language artifacts (from producer to consumer).\textsuperscript{161} I illustrate this in Figure 57.

\textsuperscript{161} Even if we were to take this unidirectional view of exchange, it we still need to acknowledge that consumers seek out and consumer language artifacts for different reasons. That is, as discussed more later, the jobs-to-be-done that they each seek to do are different. This minimally suggests that there are distinct audiences serviced by archives.
capture the complexity of the market activity. In this work, I follow Paterson and Nordmoe (2013) in situating archives as the platform in a two-sided market because it provides an economic model that helps us see the interactions of the multiple audiences.\textsuperscript{162} Some well-known two-sided markets include credit card companies (Evans 2011b) and Facebook (Evans 2011a:379).

Credit card companies attempt to reduce friction between businesses and their clients. To do this, they enlist two classes of customers: businesses and people. They tell businesses that their card is used by X number of people for the purpose of offering that market to businesses. Businesses value the reduction of friction during the financial transaction, so they sign up to accept the credit card as payment. Businesses in turn agree to give a portion of their transactions to the credit card company in exchange for less friction at the point of sale. Credit card companies then tell people that X number of businesses are accepting their card. The greater the quantity of cardholders, the more businesses are interested in accepting the card; the greater the quantity of businesses accepting the card, the more people are willing to use the card instead of alternatives. The more transactions occur using the card, then the more revenue the credit card company makes. In this way, the credit card company is the financial transaction platform.

Facebook has a similar model where the social networking site is the platform. Facebook offers a product to some people to use for free—a communication tool. It then charges other parties to use the platform in certain ways—to sell advertisements. Facebook acts as a matchmaker to connect businesses with people. It positions its platform so that it can offer two products: the eyeball-time of the categories of people in whom businesses are interested to those businesses and the advertisements that businesses create to the people.\textsuperscript{163} Just as a language community is made up of individuals, so is any business

\textsuperscript{162} This is asserted in section four of the poster (26178-1.pdf) and illustrated from an L&CA perspective on page 27 of the accompanying handout (26178-2.pdf).
https://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10125/26178/2/26178-2.pdf#page=27

The choice to situate language archives within the model of two-sided markets has some similarities with prior work situating journal publishers as two-sided markets (McCabe & Snyder 2007, Jeon & Rochet 2010). The primary similarity is that both language archives and journal publishers are platform owners acting as content receivers and distributors, often with different audiences. Situating language archives within the model of two-sided markets also has similarities with internet content delivery markets which are often two-sided markets (Zhang et al. 2014).

\textsuperscript{163} The second offer is possible because people are looking for person-to-person connections. Facebook offers the potential for these connections for free, but then uses the desire for these connections to place paid offerings from businesses.
that advertises on Facebook. Any individual may interact with the platform in either type of transaction on any given day. On Monday morning a business owner might submit an advertisement through Facebook’s marketing tools. And then on Tuesday, that same business owner, may be scrolling through her neighborhood Facebook group and come across an advertisement for the local bakery, click the link, get the coupon, and continue the series of exchanges available via the platform. It is the multiplicity of transaction types, their directions, and the roles which any particular individual may fill that makes the two-sided market analysis most helpful.

The two-sided market (Parker & Van Alstyne 2000; Rysman 2009) is an economic model with three classes of actors. First, there is the business which positions itself as a platform; the business then interacts with two different classes of customers (Class1 and Class2). The business sets up its transactions such that it is a “matchmaker” or “middle man” between the two classes of customers. As discussed by Rysman (2009:126–129), technical definitions of a two-sided market vary. Rysman (2009:127) states:

... the literature on two-sided markets could be seen as a subset of the literature on network effects. However, papers on two-sided markets tend to focus on the actions of the market intermediary, particularly pricing choices, whereas papers on network effects typically focus on adoption by users and optimal network size.

I take this to mean that one could also apply insights from literature on value networks to language archives. However, because I am specifically looking at a platform type business I have chosen the term two-sided market. Broadly cast, the business in a two-sided market will seek to charge a total amount for a service provided. Generally that service involves connecting two parties which would otherwise not normally be able to conduct a transaction on their own. The business will split the total sum of what they charge across the parties from the transaction—the charged split may be 0–100 where one class of customer is charged nothing while the other class of customer covers all the financial costs.

---

164 It is often the case in two-sided markets that actor class distinctions are made on the basis of role in a given transaction, e.g., consumers may also be producers therefore switching classes between transactions. YouTube is a great example of actor class crossing; content producers often also watch videos as well—the person is the same, but the transactions with the market vendor (YouTube) are different.
A two-sided market is also generally distinguished from a single-sided market because it both “buys” and “sells” the product—it has transactions going both ways between classes of actors. Language archives fit the two-sided market definition because they both “buy” and “sell” language artifacts. That is, the terms of acquisition are often different between the receiving/“buying” of language artifacts and the giving/“selling” of language artifacts. Additionally, those who deposit language artifacts are often not able to directly engage with consumers of language artifacts.

Within the two-sided market model, I adopt a view of the transaction as put forward by Clayton Christensen. Christensen presents the idea that people hire products to do a job (Christensen 2011; Christensen et al. 2016). That is people have a job-to-be-done, and need a way to solve that problem. The thing they buy is what they perceive is the solution; their true placement of value is in the solution—as manifested in the object(s) they acquire to solve the job-to-be-done task. By way of example, a homeowner with a clogged toilet does not buy a plunger for the aesthetic nature of the plunger. In fact the better analysis is that they are not even buying a plunger, rather they think they are buying the capability to create a working toilet. This is often evidenced by the frustration encountered when the plunger fails to fix the clogged toilet and the person makes a second trip to their local hardware store to purchase a plumber’s snake. The job-to-be-done has not changed; what the homeowner is still buying is the capability to unclog the pipe.

Academic linguists have a job-to-be-done. It is to create products that can and will be referenced. For language “community” language-artifact users, the most frequently perceived job-to-be-done is to transform commodified objects of language into a socially viable communication system which functions as an instrument of action between language users.

People who engage with a two-sided market do so because they believe that the business (running the platform) will provide them with a solution to their job-to-be-done. Osterwalder & Pigneur (2010) and Osterwalder et al. (2015) label the business’s proposed solution as the value proposition. Osterwalder et al. (2015) and Strategyzer (2017) map the value proposition to a customer’s jobs-to-be-done and motivations. The mapping between the value proposition and the jobs-to-be-done creates an identifiable link where a
class of actor finds value in the solution a business offers. The tools described in Osterwalder et al. (2015) and Strategyzer (2017) help businesses discover this link and the deep motivational reasons why people find value in an offering. When a potential customer starts to see the value in an offering, they develop a reason-to-believe. Maintaining that reason-to-believe is an important goal for a corporation if they are going to turn single transaction customers into multi-transaction customers. While Osterwalder and Christensen’s terminologies are designed to be widely applicable, the same general idea about value was previously articulated for the museum industry in Bitgood (2006:464) where he states the following about value.

The general value principle (Bitgood 2005; 2006) argues that the value of an experience is calculated (usually without awareness) as a ratio between the benefits and the costs. We attend to things that are perceived as beneficial (such as satisfying curiosity, enjoyment) only if the costs are perceived as low in relation to the benefits. This means the value of an experience may change even if the perceived benefits stay the same. That is, if the costs (time, effort, and so on) are perceived to be high, the value of the experience is lower than it would be if the costs were perceived to be low. You are likely to choose to earn $100 if it takes only one hour and involves an activity you enjoy doing; but you are less likely to engage in the same activity if it takes 30 hours. The value of $100 is discounted if it takes too much time to earn it. (Bitgood 2006:464)

I consider the user interaction with a website—the main interaction platform for many digital language archives—a designed experience. In this way, exchange via an archive either for depositing or receiving is crafting the perception of value by Class1 and Class2 actors. It is defining the value proposition.165

In Figure 58, I illustrate the contrast in the flow of revenue and value between a typical business (one sided market) and a two-sided market. The traditional business analysis approach is to conceptualize value and revenue in a single sequential stream. Each actor in the chain is alleged to increase the value in some way to the end customer, and in exchange each actor in the chain receives “value” packaged in their desired format. As described earlier, these assumptions are not present in a two-sided market. For the two-sided market, I maintain the label value following Osterwalder et al. (2015), and I apply

165 There may be non-website based interactions with digital archives, but these too are designed interactions.
it to what the platform returns to Class1 and Class2 actors. Osterwalder et al. (2015) further discusses the customer-perceived positive value in terms of gains while Bitgood’s (2006:464) costs are discussed in terms of pains.\(^ {166}\)

**One-Sided Market**
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**Two-Sided Market**
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Figure 58. Value vs. revenue flow in markets

Both Osterwalder et al. and Bitgood are careful to note that value may be a functional change in situation or an emotional and social change in the way that the job-to-be-done is accomplished. I intentionally use the label value in Figure 58 for what is returned to archive customers. This is not just to emphasize these social and emotional components of the customers motivations to engage in the transaction but also to provide a loosely articulated category for the kind of thing returned to archive customers.\(^ {167}\) In this sense, then, value is a crucial concept here; value is objectified; it is what we buy (acquire). We may “buy” (or acquire) it with our money, our time, or our work. The thing we are finding our value in may or may not be tangible, e.g., we might exchange something to get the value of language knowledge.

\(^ {166}\) I am unaware of any published studies about archives or repositories which have used the methodologies presented in Osterwalder et al. (2015) to evaluate customer interactions. Wilms et al. (2020) use Social Exchange Theory (Homans 1958), while Davis & Connolly (2007) do not present their results in the context of a theory.

\(^ {167}\) Some suggest that the thing returned to the customer is a commodity; however, as seen with the toilet example, the homeowner was really acquiring a capability.
While business and economic models generally look at financial transactions, I employ the insights of the two-sided market transactional model to describe the flow of information. That is, I let information and cultural heritage artifacts take the place of money (currency) as value is passed between the three classes of actors. Some value language artifacts for their innate properties—as collectors of fetish objects. However, the more frequent case is that people value them as part of their intangible cultural heritage. They are a medium of access to the capability of knowing about a heritage culture or a worldview through the language artifacts of a particular language. The object is a medium of exchange for a capability. As such, the medium can be traded for other mediums or capabilities—both tangible and intangible. In this way, I see language artifacts as a type of currency because they are exchanged among actors in the model, and they are traded for capabilities. I follow Paterson and Nordmoe (2013) in broadly casting language researchers as one class of customer, language users as the second, and the language archive as the business or platform owner. However, I extend their limited description of the rationale for the two-sided market by acknowledging that a non-exclusionary analysis indicates that the distinction between Class1 and Class2 actors is that Class1 are language-resource creators, while Class2 are language-resource consumers. That is, this additional perceptive lends strength to the use of the two-sided market model. Both researchers and language users are consumers and/or creators. Archives hold the platform for interactions across time between various interested stakeholders in language artifacts.

![Language Archive Market](image)

Figure 59. The language archive as a two-sided market
By situating the language archive in the context of a two-sided market, I position my analysis in terms of value generation and artifact acquisition (revenue).\footnote{I discuss value further in 6.2. From the economic models, value is what one obtains in exchange for what they give up.} This stands in contrast to more traditional models of content archives which focus on content stewardship under the Open Archival Information System (OAIS) model.\footnote{https://www.iso.org/standard/57284.html} Under OAIS, archives are responsible to deliver the content they received in the same condition they received it in. One of the business observations which comes with a two-sided market analysis is that when there is a decrease in the platform’s perceived value by customers in one type of exchange, it impacts the ability of the platform to provide value to customers in a different type of exchange. This can come in several ways such as brand value or number of users with which to make value exchanges. In the two-sided market model, language artifacts are like a currency in that they are attributed value and they can move fluidly around within the network of artifact and language users. However, language artifacts are unlike currency in the Keynesian sense because it is not necessarily true that the value of artifacts goes down when they are in greater circulation. In fact, the opposite is often assumed to be true: the more widely distributed a language artifact is circulated, the greater the general awareness is of the artifact and the greater its social impact! By situating archives as the platform owner, it challenges the perspective that archives are passive depositories in the data life cycle. Rather they are active agents with a responsibility to shape the marketplace to create value and ensure their own sustainability within the network of users.

By focusing on value generation, it allows one to ask questions of the archive like: \textit{In what ways does the platform need to evolve in order to continue generating ongoing value?} If we ask the original question about whether the problem is worth solving, the question can be re-framed in the context of this new question. That is, \textit{What value is lost when the free flow of bibliographic metadata is hindered by friction, or when the description and arrangement of materials in the archives do not support efficient and informative citation and reference generation?} Does the threat of lost value in turn threaten the very existence of language archives? If it does threaten the existence of language archives, then it might
be a concern worth addressing. I propose that it does threaten their existence. When references are hard to make, academics leave the network for other solutions as shown in Paterson (2015a) where academic linguists have opted to use backup and social sharing tools instead of archives. Using other kinds of tools instead of archives, lowers the value of the whole network.

In the remainder of this chapter I address the value exchange between archives and language users (Section 6.1), the value exchange between archives and linguists in academia (Section 6.2), and how archives can maintain the ability to deliver value (Section 6.3).

### 6.1 Value exchange between archives and language users

Language archives inherently have limited interactive value for language users, especially in the context of language revitalization work. The reason for this is that language archives inherently treat language artifacts as objects. Revitalized language is not a set of actions which can be done with objects but rather an instrument of action—more specifically the restoration of an instrument of action.

Much of the current discussion in language documentation venues about language-user access to archival content and language revitalization centers around the process of creating and using objects—language artifacts. To the extent that artifact stewardship is what is common practice in language revitalization, archives can and should have a role in the exchange of language artifacts between creators and consumers (generally Class1 and Class2 actors in the two-sided market model). However, there is strong evidence that consumers are mostly interested in interacting with content once it is outside of the archive. Therefore, in some workflows it does not make sense to ever put the content into an archive in the first place. For example, the *Mukurtu CMS* 170 (presented in Christen et al. 2017) is heralded by Kanahele and Holton (2021) as a great solution for communities of the Pacific as a way to facilitate user engagement with cultural heritage artifacts. Unfortunately, these artifacts from the online Mukurtu communities are not also stored

---

170 https://mukurtu.org
In Thailand, language documentation efforts are turning to commercial services like SoundCloud (Ferreira et al. 2021) not just to facilitate community access but in lieu of archiving. In these cases, secondary points of distribution become the referenceable location, often with contributor roles removed—instead of a language archive, where contributor roles can be found. It is not clear that much value is transferred from archive to language user at the current time—at least as language archives are currently set up with their current web interfaces. This does not mean that value is not transferred from archives to some class of consumer, only that there is a middle man between language archives and language users who must “enhance” or add value to an existing artifact to make it a consumable. For instance, a technologist may extract content from archives and recast it in something like a Mukurtu instance.

In contrast to the model where a technologist is situated between a general public-facing portal presenting artifacts and an archive’s user interface, The Digital Library Services team at the University of Cape Town chose to use Omeka-S to create a display of the artifacts in the #Khomani San | Hugh Brody Collection, one of the special collections at the library (Jones & Muftic 2020a, 2020b). This display has elements which were tailored for topics of interest to the language communities represented in the collection. By working from within the context of the archive rather than extracting the artifacts from the

---

171 Mukurtu or Omeka are both web-platform content management systems which enable the creation of online exhibits. Exhibits are an important public engagement tool in the repertoire of museums. Quigley (2019:§1.3) discusses both museum exhibits and catalogues as tools of public engagement and as scholarly works. Quigley notes that within the museum sector exhibitions are considered ephemeral, whereas catalogues are more enduring but both are crucial for carrying out the mission of the museum. The role of digital language exhibits and the digital language museum as a distinct entity from the digital language archive are not broadly discussed in language documentation circles. Historically, museums such as the Peabody Museum have had a significant impact on the production of language and culture descriptions. They still play a significant role as centers of research and in shaping the collective consciousness about specific languages and the people who speak those languages. Specific language museums are a more recent innovation, e.g., National Museum of Language (established 1997), Museu da Língua Portuguesa in São Paulo (established 2006), Canadian Language Museum (established 2011), Mundolíngua in Paris, Museum of Languages in Leiden (established 2015). Museums in the language preservation context are not undisputed, for example, Kuzmin (2013) lumps them together with archives and libraries under the broad title of “memory institutions”. However, Thieberger (2013) presents the museum function for exhibit creation as independent from digitization and archival functions. For additional discussion on language museums see Lehmann (1992, 2001), Crystal (2004), and Sönmez et al. (2020).

172 In the presentation there is a stated hope or plan that these materials will be archived at some institution. Unfortunately, the linking between secondary distribution channel and primary preservation channel does not currently exist.

173 Web interfaces at language archives are not designed to engage with audiences who are interested in using language as an instrument of action.

174 https://omeka.org/s
holding institution and recasting them in a self-hosted website, the archive also now has a much richer collection description and can continue to deliver the enriched contextualized content as part of its service to content consumers.

6.2 Value exchange between archives and linguists in academia

Value is transferred from archives to linguists in three primary ways. In what follows I list the three ways, with the remainder of this section focused on the third way value is transferred. First, archives provide a place to deposit media generated during research efforts. The act of depositing fulfills many modern grant requirements—that is, a researcher can continue to receive grants because they have deposited their artifacts in an archive, per the terms of the last received grant. Second, linguists can act in the role of content consumer and access content from other researchers and conduct further research with those artifacts. Third, the archive provides an end point or distribution point for other producers to reference existing language work.

The significance of this third aspect of realized value—reference counts—should not be overlooked. In 2020, I was indirectly involved with a group of linguists who were struggling with how to fit three names (Principal Investigator, Researcher/Recorder/Postdoc, and Speaker) into a referencing format for a set of annotated corpora they wished to release as interactive resources. The importance of the name accessibility and name prominence across publication styles was shaping the way that the scholars were approaching the organization of their collections and artifacts.

Both Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) and Haspelmath (2014) argue for changes in referencing practices in order to favorably impact (for scholars) the metrics by which scholars are evaluated.

Unfortunately most linguists do not know how to go about advocating that “data work” be given the same kind of attribution as “analysis work” in hiring, tenure and promotion cases. (Berez-Kroeker et al. 2018:11)
The strongest justification for simple rules is that the references should be automatically parsable (e.g. by Google Scholar), and correct and complete author names should be extractable. In the modern age, this is crucial for scientometric and hence career-building purposes. (Hasepmath 2014:footnote 16)

The perceived value transfer is one where mid-career scholars do not have frequently referenced works because they made early-career choices to engage in language documentation practices, and then the returned value (in terms of defensible indicators of scholarly influence) is not enough to sustain them while navigating career paths into their late-career stages. The effects of career academics’ desire to impact indicators demonstrating their scholarly influence should not be underappreciated. Let’s cut to the chase, “linguistic social work” (Newman 2003:11) is not without value transfer or expectations. After working with a linguist, a language “community” might have a few resources in their language, a new orthography, or recordings of their traditional stories in an archive, but now the piper needs to be paid. The economic currency of academia is reference counts.\footnote{In some ways, reference counts (also referred to in the literature as “citation counts”) are not like currency in that they are not directly exchangeable once awarded. However, Piwowar et al. (2007) refer to references as currency saying: “A currency of value to many investigators is the number of times their publications are cited. Although limited as a proxy for the scientific contribution of a paper, citation counts are often used in research funding and promotion decisions...” Reference counts are estimated by Diamond (1986) to have a United States Dollar (USD) value between $50–$1300 in 1984 dollars per reference depending on the organization of employment and academic discipline. Mueller-Langer & Watt (2018) evaluate the $3000 USD price for hybrid open access publication charged by some publishers and equate it with reference counts. Their results suggest that those who pay a $3000 open access fee value a single reference to their work at least $3,278 USD; a price point at which they suggest pre-print and post-print deposits in institutional repositories make a better investment without a statistically significant difference in reference counts generated per publication (though they estimate that there may be as much as an 8 percent increase in reference counts for open access publications).}

In this regard, well-crafted references are highly valued by academic authors, but they are only a token used towards career development. When archives strive to reduce transactional friction related to metadata interoperability, they increase the value of their platform to all parties in the system. If a researcher has a choice on which archive to deposit materials, it is going to be the one with the least amount of friction and the greatest return for their effort. The archive that can boast “more people reference our collections than any other archive” will have academics favor submitting to their holdings.

As references to artifacts and “data” are valuable to linguists in academia, questions are raised: what is an artifact, and what constitutes data? In the ongoing conversation...
around citing and referencing linguistic artifacts, Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) cast their position statement on reproducibility in linguistic science “with regard to facilitating a culture of proper long-term care and citation of linguistic data sets” (emphasis added). Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) and The Tromsø Recommendations for Citation of Research Data in Linguistics (2019) merge the concepts of “data” and evidence. By merging these concepts a new narrative is projected: if something is not an opinion published in a journal, then it must be “data”, or worse, anything at the other end of a reference is “data”. I would like to remind us that evidence comes in different types which are based on different contexts of production, modes, and variation in carrier types (paper, CD, DVD, reel-to-reel, etc.). It does not serve us well to think of everything in the archive as “data”—even if data is the term commonly used for digital information. The unitary view of data is countered by computer scientists, another class of scientists that Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018) point to as having ongoing discussion about practices of citation and referencing. They have struggled with the definition of data—specifically contrasting it with software. They state in Katz et al. (2016):

Software is data, but it is not just data. While “data” in computing and information science can refer to anything that can be processed by a computer, software is a special kind of data that can be a creative, executable tool that operates on data.

Just as the computer scientists had to tease apart the difference between data and software, our discipline of linguistics needs to tease apart the difference between data and evidence. Our discipline is in jeopardy of conflating the concepts of data and evidence. I propose sticking with a definition of data that is compatible with Dublin Core DCMI-Type term: Dataset.\(^{176}\) The DCMIType definition is Data encoded in a defined structure. This definition appears to be rather broad. In practice, though, it narrows based on other guidance provided. A dataset is perceived to not be classifiable as one of the other DCMI-Types (such as Sound, MovingImage, Text, and Collection, etc.) and is exemplified in the DCMIType description: lists, tables, and databases. A dataset may be useful for direct machine processing.

\(^{176}\) https://www.dublincore.org/specifications/dublin-core/dcmi-terms/dcmitype/Dataset
As a co-author of *The Tromsø Recommendations for Citation of Research Data in Linguistics*, I certainly agree with the tenet that the evidentiary record should be cited and referenced. However, I am concerned that conflating the concepts of data and evidence does not support the “scientific” goal of improving citation and referencing.\footnote{It is possible that the weighting of reference counts by type would cause linguists to desire more detailed description of the language artifacts they deposit. That is, if their deposits are all lumped together/typed alike they may loose credit in a weighted system, e.g., a low fidelity/accuracy but highly used dataset for historical comparative linguistics might garner more reference counts than a hand-annotated (e.g., for part of speech) and translated collection of audio and video recordings, yet both might appear to be referenced as “data” and therefore falsely evaluated as equivalent. If nothing else, linguists should be interested in the type description of their language-artifact deposits for the sake of how they might be referenced and thereby communicate the nature of their work. Dictionaries are clearly not journal articles, but is an elicited word list “data” or an “interview”?}

The role of evidence is acknowledged in Berez-Kroeker et al. (2018:7). While the main topic of their position paper is about the referencing of data, they make a heretofore under-explored connection between description and arrangement of the evidentiary record when they say:

This of course presumes that the data themselves are also properly preserved, discoverable, and accessible.

I find it necessary to restate this as follows, replacing “data” with “evidence”:

This of course presumes that the evidence is also properly preserved, discoverable, and accessible.

So what does properly preserved mean? If there can be properly preserved evidence, is there then such a thing as un-properly or improperly preserved evidence? And then what does this mean for citation and referencing? The state of archival records suggests that the notion of “properly preserved evidence” has no community consensus among linguists—perhaps there should be. One might assume that proper preservation also includes proper curation and artifact description, which in the case of references would include categorizing an artifact with an item type beyond the overused term data. Preferably, the used item type would also align with how the artifact would fit into various style sheets.
It is this idea of proper curation, or an idealized state of curation, which leads to the discussion of varied curation practices in Section 6.3.

6.3 Archives: maintaining the ability to deliver value

Many linguists and language documentation practitioners use the term “archive” to denote a place which collects or holds collections of language artifacts, in essence a depository. I propose that depositories come in two types: Archives and Repositories. Both offer value to people who seek to solve challenges related to the long term stewardship of artifacts they have amassed or created; however, the two come with important variations on the types of results they provide. Archives have ongoing curation, cataloging, preservation, and enrichment schemes or plans for their artifacts. In contrast, repositories ingest and outgest (distribute) with minimal ongoing changes to the artifacts with which they were entrusted (or for that matter the arrangement or description of those artifacts)—they faithfully persist\(^\text{178}\) (i.e. preserve) the artifacts.\(^\text{179}\) For the person committing an artifact to a depository one possible question to ask then is: By choosing this depository, do I archive the language artifacts or do I merely persist them? Both archives and repositories address the issue of artifact persistence, but the expected life of the artifact is different. Both have business plans, but they seek to provide value to different audience classes. The different classes of audiences hold different perspectives on what good stewardship means.

Broadly, archives take an active role in the evolution of their collections, while repositories seek to let others find and generate value from their collections. By casting archives as active agents in the marketplace for language commodities, we can see that archives derive their value not as a depository, but as the center of a knowledge economy and an artifact-centric economy. However, remaining in the center is difficult due to sociological evolution and cultural evolution within the groups of Class1 and Class2. An archive needs to adapt to remain relevant and sustainable. The question becomes how should

\(^{178}\) Persist is a transitive verb in computer science. The following example definition is taken from Wikipedia: Non-orthogonal persistence requires data to be written and read to and from storage using specific instructions in a program, resulting in the use of persist as a transitive verb: On completion, the program persists the data. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persistence_(computer_science)

\(^{179}\) Often repositories and their architecture assume system-to-system communication as the primary means of engaging with artifacts. System-to-system interaction often happens over an API, and is generally a business-to-business type of interaction rather than a person-to-business type of interaction.
the platform be managed to continuously provide value to customers in either Class1 or Class2. For this, a business model can help. A business model clearly articulates “the rationale of how an organisation creates, delivers and captures value” (Osterwalder & Pigneur 2010:14). Archives need to be more than collections of features around media on servers. For the organizations to generate value, their goods need to be in circulation. The arrangement of artifacts and the description of artifacts according to archival principles, such as those articulated in DACS, give archives the organizational capacity and operational capability to leverage their holdings to create value exchanges with new and existing audiences alike. This is an important concept for businesses who need to adjust to evolutionary market spaces. I return to points I first made in Section 4.1 by suggesting that arrangement and description according to DACS enable archives to generate enduring value, a key element of properly preserved. When we look at the issue of citation and referencing, good references are designed to give the reader context about the artifact being referenced. Guidance from the discipline of archiving about good arrangement and description is also designed to give users context about the artifact with which they are interacting.

6.3.1 Arrangement

Across the collections and artifacts reviewed, there was variation in arrangement. Pangloss appears to follow the recommendations of the French national organization for audio preservation for cultural heritage records (Marcadé et al. 2014) which align well with the tiered structure presented in DACS. All of the other archives reviewed followed a different pattern of arrangement. That is, arrangement of materials within language archives in many cases does not follow best practices or industry norms within the broader discipline of archival content management. For example, Table 17 is replicated from Kung et al. (2021:§'Step 7: Arrangement & Discoverability’). It appears in an online course presenting an introduction to language archiving. The table shows the two-tier hierarchy which is employed by many language archives and the various terms they use

---
180 They also list the archive. In many ways they are an advertisement for the archive. This should add to the reasons that an archive might want content it stewards to be cited and referenced.
to describe those tiers.\textsuperscript{181} Three of the archives in their list are also discussed in this thesis (PARADISEC, ELAR, and Kaipuleohone). The list shows that the issues are wider spread than just the archives that I have reviewed. Each of the listed archives has a two-tiered structure, even though the names of the structures vary from archive to archive.

Table 17. File arrangement at some language archives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Folder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARADISEC</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAR</td>
<td>Deposit</td>
<td>Bundle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AILIA</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLA</td>
<td>Corpus</td>
<td>Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaipuleohone</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dataverse Repositories</td>
<td>Dataverse</td>
<td>Dataset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final line in Table 17 gives us an indication as to why arrangement principles like those illustrated in Figure 4 (Section 4.1.1) and described in Hodges & McClurkin (2011:1–2) are eschewed. Digital artifact management tools like Dataverse\textsuperscript{182} and DSpace (used by Kaipuleohone and L&CA) do not easily facilitate the required hierarchical structures. DSpace has already been briefly mentioned in Section 4.6.1 in regard to Kaipuleohone; the L&CA also uses DSpace as a back-end storage and management solution. In the L&CA’s case, the SIL hierarchy system is essentially an historical organizational structure mapped to a current organizational structure via the DSpace notion of communities. This seems to be the typical application of communities in DSpace (Davis & Connolly 2007, Tramboo et al. 2012:§2.1). DSpace communities can be recursive, containing (sub)communities. Communities can contain multiple collections. Collections contain items. Items can have one or more bitstreams (files). Most metadata in DSpace is stored at the item level. Depending on the bibliographic model for record keeping, aggregate works may have a single DSpace item level record inclusive of all the parts as bitstreams, or it may contain no bitstreams and only contain non-literal pointers (links)\textsuperscript{183} with a has-Part relationship to another item level record which contains the artifact (bitstream). The

\textsuperscript{181} All abbreviations in Table 17 are listed in the abbreviations list in the front matter.

\textsuperscript{182} https://dataverse.org

\textsuperscript{183} For a discussion on literals and non-literals in bibliographic contexts see Coyle (2008).
The internal storage architecture of repository software is only one way that the depository’s holdings are impacted. A second way is through the ingest process. DSpace has a process-based role-aware ingest workflow. Sometimes metadata application profiles can be complex making metadata entry laborious. Ingest workflows for one type of content from a particular class of depositor doesn’t always make sense for another type of content from a different class of depositor. This can lead to the need for multiple workflows or for complex workflows. There have been numerous pieces of software written to facilitate the ingest of new content to DSpace (Nordmoe 2011, Weiland et al. 2019, Yumi & Kelly 2020). The constrained and laborious process of ingesting artifacts to repository
software has two impacts: first, the human psychological response is to lump artifacts together under the same record to avoid extra work; second, it means that the relational metadata between records is generally missing (left undone) or must be crafted by hand by platform administrators after both artifacts have been ingested to the repository. Linguists and language documenters don’t just make one or two artifacts, rather they create entire collections from fieldwork stints lasting weeks or months. The metadata relating artifacts to each other can be immense and provide deep descriptive insights to the collection. These descriptive insights comprise a key way that archive users derive value. Hsu et al. (2015) point out that rich metadata is one way that people evaluate satisfaction with archives and is foundational to perception of an archive’s value.

In the OAIS model, repositories are removed from requirements for interacting with people because they interact with systems (systems for ingest and distribution). Their customers are no longer the content users but rather the system administrators of the systems which interact with the OAIS compliant repository. Therefore, the class of users (systems) in a repository framework does not derive value in the same way as a class of users (people) would because they are looking at the content through different sets of requirements. One result is that inter-artifact relationships are not as valued in repository oriented systems. To illustrate the contrasting way that repositories approach artifact handling, consider the use of SayMore, SIL’s software for organizing fieldwork recordings and metadata about those recordings (Moeller 2014). As a language documentation practitioner and early tester of SayMore, I engaged in discussions with the corporate architect at the L&CA on how SayMore outputs (essentially zip files containing sets of artifacts) should be ingested to the depository for management by the archive. It was suggested by the architect that the entire package (containing all the artifacts and metadata) should be ingested as a single DSpace item; metadata then only needs to be managed for the collective of the .zip file and not the component parts. In a repository type model this makes a lot of sense. The principle is usually described in the following ways: “Garbage in garbage out”, “Faithfulness to the input”, and “seek to manage the fewest number of units while

\[185\] \url{https://software.sil.org/saymore}
delegating interaction and information management processes to other systems and architecture”. This is the OAIS model, and in a sense it is exactly and only what DSpace implements (OAIS is first discussed in the introduction of Chapter 6): ingest is done by one system, long term storage is done by another system (DSpace), and presentation and access is done by a third system as illustrated in Figure 60.

```
Figure 60. Simplified OAIS model
```

However, DSpace in its out-of-the-box configuration, only works smoothly for artifacts which are a single work, expression, manifestation, and item. If the item is a collection which will be displayed by another system, then there is no loss as long as the deposited package also contains metadata and instructions for the down-stream systems. However, if the storage system is also the browsing and managing system, then there are issues with communicating inter- and intra-resource relations. For example, DCMIType collection exploration is really difficult in the default DSpace interface.

To summarize, software concepts appear to be a driving force in determining the number of tiers within a collection, and subsequently how many artifacts are uniquely described within a collection at language archives. The workflows imposed by the software dictate how the institution arranges their collections impacting their ability to deliver and capture value. To support value generation via referencing and citation, institutions need to implement cataloging processes which allow for the description of unique artifacts, along with the description of each tier of the organizational structure of the collection.
We can see some of the impacts of arrangement practices within the artifacts and collections reviewed in this thesis. For example, Figure 53 is the Kaipuleohone record for an “item”. It presents two .wav files and two .mp3 files. These are presumably different manifestations of the same expression. Furthermore, the record reports in its metadata that the format of the artifact the record is about as “Maxell UR 60 min cassette”. We can also see this information about format replicated in Figure 54 on line 15. However, this record is not a record for the actual Maxwell cassette, rather it is a record for the digitized content. So, the record producer (Kaipuleohone in this case) has conflated a third manifestation (the one on the cassette tape) into the record. Additionally, we know that the record description contains “Lōjjeļañ #1, #3”. Presumably, #1 and #3 are separate works by virtue of being separate narrations. So we have a record which covers three manifestations and two different works. This becomes very confusing for citation and referencing.

Best practice (see Koelling 2006 and Wijesundara & Sugimoto 2018) calls for one record to be created for the physical object—the cassette—and another record for each work on the recording. In this way, a one-to-one principle applicable at the manifestation level (manifestation-to-record) is preserved. It may be that #1 and #3 are each a full side (as in Side A and Side B) of the cassette, but recordings could be carried out across sides of the cassette (i.e., #1 may have a duration of 38 minutes and #3 only 10 minutes), especially if the cassette was not the original carrier and the cassette was itself a transfer from a reel-to-reel recording. The digitization process and any post-editing process would determine exactly how many files make up a single work, and how many artifacts should be created from the digitization of this particular cassette. The digitization process is not described in the record, nor is a link to the description of the process provided. The conflation of works and manifestations into a single record makes it difficult for the institution to deliver value to its audiences. This directly impacts discovery and referencing, and ultimately the perception of the archive as a source of value by its audiences (for a more in depth discussion on archive value perception see Hsu et al. 2015).

\footnote{See footnote 55 in chapter 4.}
The conflation of manifestations into a single record at Kaipuleohone reveals a complex issue which still needs wider consensus and work among those participating in the language artifact archiving and publishing communities. That issue is, *what are the components of an archival collection?* As far as I can tell there is no discussion in the academic literature on how hierarchical systems used to organize materials in a collection, aggregate works, and bibliographic record models such as FRBR could or should interact when linguistic and language documentation artifacts are described. \(^{187}\) When we compare the organizational systems of several archives, we can see that each has its own practice with regard to the types of content included in hierarchical nodes smaller than the **archival collection**. Within the discipline of archiving, the term **collection** can be applied within different frameworks to mean different things. Variation in the use of the term collection is illustrated in Figure 61.

---

\(^{187}\) There has been discussion of FRBR application more broadly across cultural heritage collections (among others see Nicolas 2005, Daquino & Tomasi 2015, Decourselle et al. 2015, and Farrokhnia 2019). For an overview of various models, not just FRBR, see Farrokhnia (2019:§2.2.4). There are also ample discussions on how FRBR applied to time based media collections such as film and audio collections. FRBR has also been discussed in the context of music collections which have complex relations between annotations and performance. See Section 4.1.2 for specific citations.
The motivating factors in choosing these hierarchical structures are often tied to the financial notion of sustainability. That is, each archive is in an ongoing journey to demonstrate their social value in order to secure their operational funding. In many cases, funding is not provided by either Class1 or Class2 actors who are deriving value from an archive’s information content. For example, if we compare the larger public narratives of organizations like SIL (the parent organization that the L&CA serves) and ELAR we can quite easily see that the organizational structures that ELAR brings forward in its choice of hierarchical structures are the funded projects. That is, there is a high degree of institutional value in the creation of a quantifiable and identifiable “object” (the collection) which can be presented as a return-on-investment for the donated funds to the Endangered Languages Program. In contrast, the narrative SIL puts forward to its funders is not project based but rather draws on a framed narrative where artifacts are presented rela-
tive to their associated language. By presenting the artifact and hiding the organization structure (collections) which helped to breathe the artifact into existence, the language-community/artifact frame maintains a continuity with frames presented to SIL’s primary funders, while giving the organization the flexibility to manage projects through a variety of means.

Across archives, the shallow depth in hierarchical systems can create complications for easily transmitting bibliographic data consistently. However, the presentation is not atheoretical, rather language archives prioritize presentational views which communicate to their funders over other views which might impact organizational structures within collections.188

6.3.2 Description

Across the archives reviewed in Chapter 4, there is substantial variation in curation practice for describing language artifacts. As mentioned in Section 6.3.1 when the hierarchy is conflated, it impacts the ability to effectively describe artifacts so as to accurately communicate their context. There is a lot of discussion on the kinds of metadata that linguists should keep when creating collections of language artifacts (Nathan & Austin 2004, Himmelmann 2006, Bergqvist 2007, Lüpke 2010, Good 2011, Austin 2013). Linguistics is after all a metadata-hungry discipline.

Some metadata suggested for linguists to generate relates the language analysis nature of the content contained in artifacts. Some metadata is needed for artifact preservation and management, still other metadata elements are helpful in the understanding the type-nature of the artifact. The works of Nathan and Theiberger sometimes use the terms **thick** and **thin** to draw contrast between artifact description and linguistic content exposition. As they use the term, **thin** relates to metadata which describes the artifact. The term **thin** can be interpreted as drawing parallels with minimalism and in these contexts, under-description of the artifacts. So an outstanding question is how well described are the artifacts in collections at language archives? There are several ways that the quality of a

---

188 By views here, I mean web page presentations. That is, the web pages of the archive are influenced by the design need to craft the narrative for the funders rather than organization of content for artifact-reuse.
description can be measured, but quality metadata is notoriously hard to define.\textsuperscript{189} One could take the perspective that the quality of a collection description is the completeness of the record description, on the basis of the number of metadata elements provided to the curator at the time the collection was deposited for initial description. This would include any description for the tiers (series, sub-series, file unit), and any specific elements required or mandated by the institutionally adopted metadata application profile. OLAC provides a basic quality judgment on submissions of participating archives when it assigns a rating to the archive. It does this by ranking the average number of fields provided by the archive against the number of fields in the OLAC application profile (see Hughes \textit{2004} for further discussion).\textsuperscript{190} More recent work has been done to review the descriptive quality of language archive holdings, (Burke \& Zavalina 2019, 2020a, 2020b). This work looks at the textual content of descriptions. As far as I can tell no-one has reported on the accuracy of language archive metadata when compared with the semantic intent of metadata elements,\textsuperscript{191} e.g., are collection records described with the DCMIType collection, and do records with the DCMIType collection actually refer to collections?

Accuracy in metadata builds trust between artifact re-users and holding institutions. Depositories which function as archives are expected to be responsible for their metadata and curation practice, including more consistent application and adherence to semantics; depositories which function as repositories often require depositors to provide the metadata about a resource. This allows for more opportunities for variation with regard to semantics.

Open Language Archive Community vocabularies are built on top of Dublin Core (Bird and Simons 2003b). This means that the core vocabularies of Dublin Core apply to records, not just the OLAC vocabularies. All of the archives in this thesis are participating members of OLAC; however, OLAC does not prescribe any model for the application of Dublin Core metadata to institutional records. Dublin Core can be applied in a variety of ways including hierarchically (with cascading levels of description and association between elements) or flat (where all elements are applied to a single record).

\textsuperscript{189} For a more in-depth discussion on metadata quality assessment see discussion in Shreeves et al. (2005).
\textsuperscript{190} http://www.language-archives.org/metrics/compare
\textsuperscript{191} By semantics I mean the purpose for which the metadata schema element was designed.
Dublin Core approaches the type-nature of an object by suggesting the use of the DCMIType vocabulary. The suggestion to use the DCMIType vocabulary seems rather strong to me because the framers of Dublin Core saw fit to also provide this vocabulary. They did not provide any other vocabularies, but rather referenced each of the other vocabularies. This is not to say that DCMIType is the only way to describe the type-nature of an object but it is within the same set of metadata that many in linguistics and language documentation find foundational via the authority of the OLAC metadata standard which builds upon Dublin Core.

The DCMIType vocabulary only contains twelve terms (listed in section 4.1.3). Yet still language archives seem to use the terms in different ways. None of the archives reviewed have to-date submitted any of the reviewed collections to OLAC.

Across the spectrum of archival activities related to the preservation of cultural heritage materials, there are many metadata schema and application profiles with more specific relationships than what is provided for in Dublin Core. While these other schema can in some contexts provide added value to collections described with Dublin Core, none of them helps define the “it”. By “it” I primarily mean the type-nature of the thing being described as exemplified in the DCMIType vocabulary. To connect the “it” to both description and referencing practice (reference styles in publications generally form patterns based on the type-nature of items referenced), it is helpful to ask the following questions:

- What is the “it” that archives have? That is, what is the type-nature of items held at an archive?
- What is the “it” that archives don’t have? That is, what items held at an archive have the wrong DCMIType applied or no DCMIType applied?

192 Some of the more well-known metadata schemas used within the cultural heritage preservation community include: Conceptual Reference Model (CIDOC-CRM) used by museums; Europeana Data Model (EDM) for use by the data aggregator Europeana (7,000 institutions use this); Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA); Lightweight Information Describing Objects (LIDO); and PCore used by audio archives. Some of these focus on describing content, others on format/carrier.
• What is the “it” that people think they are getting? That is, what type-nature do consumers expect when they investigate a record with a specific DCMIType label? And what is the consumer hoping to get—e.g., a collection from Mali, a transcribed narrative viewable in ELAN,\footnote{https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan} or set of files arranged for use in big data phonetic analysis?

• What is the “it” that Zotero recognizes? That is, how does Zotero interpret an item based on the declared type-nature?

By asking these four questions, we can look at the value proposition that archives are making to Class1 and Class2 actors, the value that Class1 and Class2 actors are expecting to receive, and how the artifact's bibliographic metadata will translate to formatted references via Zotero.

These questions can guide archive administrators as they make decisions about how and why to apply DCMIType terms consistently. In the following sections I discuss DCMIType as a fundamental element of the description of records.

6.3.2.1 Where have all the collections gone?

In this thesis I have focused on collections and audio artifacts. In the DCMIType vocabulary both collection and sound are valid terms. We should be able to find the collections reviewed in this thesis within the OLAC set of records. Figure 62 indicates that there are 771 records in OLAC for collections. This is a vast under representation if we consider that aggregate works (including collections like RBS) should have a DCMIType of \textit{collection}.

\footnote{https://archive.mpi.nl/tla/elan}
As shown in Figure 63, the collection records which are listed in OLAC are provided by only seven of the participating archives. Of the archives reviewed in this thesis, Pangloss and PARADISEC were the only ones to provide collection records to OLAC. All of the PARADISEC-provided records were part of a single collection, and it seems to be an administrative error that the DCMIType collection was applied to each item within the collection. The Cocoon collection records do represent aggregate works as an archive would conceive of a collection—an administrative unit for managing artifacts. Figure 64 shows one such collection record. However, even though Cocoon does provide these collection records, no relationship data is provided to the records of the constituent parts. Further, the specific collections I review in Chapter 4 are for some reason not included in OLAC.

\[194\] http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/olac/browse.html?browse=dcmi_type_facet&OLAC does not persist its data, so updates by archives to the aggregator will alter the numbers presented. OLAC metadata showing these figures is persisted in Zenodo as Paterson (2021).

\[195\] The alternative view is that there is only one collection within PARADISEC which is correctly noted for DCMIType at their item level. It seems that many of the items in the concerned collection are aggregate works and therefore would accurately be described with the DCMIType term collection. The collection in question is: https://catalog.paradisec.org.au/collections/TNS1.
Figure 63. OLAC Collections by archive on 20 March 2021

This shows us that the “it” that archives have when measured as collections is not well shared with OLAC and may not be well described at all. The “it” that archives are saying they have is something other than aggregate works. In a similar vein then the “it” that archives do not have is the inverse.
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6.3.2.2 The item type identification crisis

Categorizing artifacts into identified item types seems to be rather difficult for not just linguists but publishers as well.\footnote{Linguists are often content providers and metadata generators for OAIS model repositories, meaning that these systems are susceptible to the item type identification crisis.} We have already seen in footnote 6 in Chapter 1 how linguists have had challenges distinguishing a corpus from a collection. We have also seen in Section 6.2 how data scientists have struggled with the distinction between data and software. A review of the item types registered with DataCite shows that a significant portion of the DOIs which point to “data” are actually pointing to textual objects like journal articles and conference proceedings (Robinson-Garcia et al. 2017).\footnote{It is also acknowledged that for some, like linguists who focus on text based corpora, e.g., the Brown Corpus of Standard American English (Francis & Kučera 1961), textual objects are the focal objects in their investigations.} In this way we can say there is sometimes a confusion between “data” and a conference paper or any other form of grey literature which might find itself in an institutional repository that assigns DataCite DOIs to content.

Reference works which are very often multi-part, multi-contributor aggregate works have suffered from terrible confusion as well. Zotero provides specific item types for articles or sections of reference works because some style sheets require specific information regarding these resources. Reference works are common in linguistics and include works like: The Blackwell Companion to Phonology, the International Encyclopedia of Linguistics, the World Atlas of Language Structures, the Ethnologue, Linguistic Minorities in Europe Online, and the Glottolog. Their creation and use has traditionally been understood to be in the domain of text and published as collections of articles which are a part of a whole. Recently when looking to reference Škevin Rajko & Šimičić (2020) a part of Linguistic Minorities in Europe Online, the publisher, De Gruyter, has told the CrossRef API that the work article is a dataset. This impacts referencing because Zotero gets its metadata for propagating the reference via the CrossRef API.

Lest we think this is some clerical error in the mis-categorization of reference works, let us consider some remarks from one of the editors of the Glottolog. These comments were provided in the context of a discussion across two threads on Github where referencing...
strategies and item types were being discussed.\footnote{https://github.com/glottolog/glottolog/issues/535}\footnote{https://github.com/glottolog/glottolog/issues/536} In the first quote we can see that the user *haspelmath*, an editor at the Glottolog, in the Glottolog issue tracker on Github, presents the understanding that the Glottolog is a published book and not a web page (Zotero detects all Glottolog pages except the base URL https://glottolog.org as a web page), while in the second quote we can see that the same user the next day has the understanding that the Glottolog is a dataset.

Glottolog is a published book, not a "webpage". You could order a physical copy through some print-on-demand service, but more to the point, Glottolog is of course a special kind of book: A highly structured database that does not make much sense on paper. Maybe such books should eventually get a special Bib category, but for the time being, "book" is the closest match. "Webpage" would send the wrong message. (*haspelmath* Glottolog Github issue 536)

Yes, the way I understand it, the Glottolog IS the dataset. The webpage is just a particular presentation of the data. Maybe we should somehow make this clearer. (*haspelmath* Glottolog Github issue 535)

An FRBR approach to describing the Glottolog via DCMIType would allow for the work to have multiple expressions to match its various versions, and for each expression to have three manifestations: a book with the DCMIType Text, a web page with the DCMIType InteractiveResource,\footnote{http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/InteractiveResource} and a dataset with the DCMIType Dataset. So in some cases we have publishers who have challenges distinguishing between parts and wholes, and in other cases we have publishers who have challenges distinguishing between manifestations, and yet other cases we have publishers who have troubles distinguishing an item type.

The item type identity crisis appears even in the artifacts reviewed for this thesis. For example, we have seen how in the Kaipuleohone artifact record (Figure 53) is listed as Sound, It is clear that there are at least two separate works #1 and #3, indicating
the record represents a collection type artifact. Minimally, the one-to-one principle for
Dublin Core is not followed. However, this is not the only record which suffers from
mis-alignment of DCMITypes.

Careful investigation of the artifacts reviewed under the L&CA (item ID: 52216) and
PARADISEC (Kamuku wordlist) show that they come from the same recording session. That
is, they are the same work, expression, and manifestation. Unlike PARADISEC, the L&CA
has broken up the artifacts which comprise the Kamuku wordlist into several unlinked
records. By breaking up the recordings into their aggregate works, the L&CA has pro-
vided access to more contributors and their roles than the PARADISEC record offers. This
can be viewed as an overall increase in description. Neither Nabu (PARADISEC) nor
the L&CA provide DCMIType information via their public interfaces. However, in their
OLAC feeds, they do provide DCMIType information. In both cases the OLAC records are
listed as Sound, not Collection which would be more appropriate given the Dublin Core
definition: A collection is described as a group; its parts may also be separately described. In
the L&CA case, they do not use the DCMIType vocabulary within their DSpace instance.
In lieu of the DCMIType vocabulary, the L&CA uses a custom vocabulary to modify the
Dublin Core type element. They call the vocabulary “the scholarly work vocabulary”. It
appears to be heavily influenced by or an extension of the EPrints Type Vocabulary Encoding
Scheme. Within this custom vocabulary, the L&CA record indicates that the set of
audio files is a “dataset”.

Specifically in regards to how items are classified (assigned an item type), the differ-
ence between dataset and collection can have an impact on what metadata is perceived
as necessary for transmission to reference managers such as Zotero.

201 Unlinked at least from the view of the artifact shown in the review. Other artifacts, such as L&CA
item:82881 which is a transcription of the elicited wordlist, link to the audio, but no reverse relationship is
shown in the audio record.
202 The Nabu interface does not show this metadata. One needs to visit the item record at the
OLAC website to see this metadata: http://www.language-archives.org/item/oai:paradisec.org.au:RB5-
Kainji_Kamuku_wordlists
203 http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/Eprints_Type_Vocabulary_Encoding_Scheme
204 It is possible that the DCMIType is derived in an XML transform from some combination of fields, as no
value of “sound” exists in the record (see Figure 66). Another explanation might be that the current item
type is not the same as what appears on OLAC as of January 2021, L&CA had not updated their OLAC feed
since 2013. Also note that the OLAC text types differ between the archives (PARADISEC: primary text; L&CA:
Figure 65. Kamuku wordlist at PARADISEC
6.3.2.3 Identifying the item for referencing

One final consideration in the structure of what is communicated between archive and reference manager is the **item type**. Getting people and systems to know “what” they have is an important part of generating value in communities of re-users. Understanding artifacts and generating community value are significantly enhanced by identifying item type. Zotero items types (as shown in Table 5) are displayed in the application’s user interface.
interface and pulled from the item types in CSL specification. The item types are only added to the CSL specification on the basis that some style sheet makes a significant distinction to warrant a new item type. In this way the categories match what reference style sheets (all 9,000+ that CSL supports) call for, not what Zotero users might consider as independent types of items. Items types are informed by reference patterns in style sheets, but also consider the impacts on how a user should reference the same content in another style sheet. Some well articulated style sheets like Chicago or APA specify citation and reference formats for each of the item types in Table 18.

It seems that there is a great deal of confusion, a total lack of awareness, or a total lack of empathy for existing item types as required by style sheets. Item types are those things which pattern together for a common reference. For instance many of us are familiar with a book or a journal as an item type and how they are referenced differently. Some of us may be familiar with a video as an item type, but are we careful to distinguish the difference between a film and a video as some style sheets call for? From time to time there are new item types which must be considered, such as the poster presentation which is not a panel presentation nor a conference paper. But within the disciplines of language documentation and linguistics do archives under-describe their holdings? For instance, some audio recordings may be better cited as an interview, a distinct item type acknowledged and prescribed associated roles by some style sheets, rather citing the artifact as a generic audio recording with OLAC specific roles such as speaker. If we treat the interview as "data" and merely reference it as data, we risk losing the opportunity to clearly tell the reader something important about the nature of the artifact we reference. OLAC even assents to the importance of describing text types with the Discourse Type Vocabulary. However, the relevant term dialogue is perhaps a bit broader than the CSL item type interview. Keep in mind, OLAC, built upon Dublin Core, was designed for artifact discovery, not considering the requirements of bibliographic metadata.
### Table 18. Zotero item types with additional types available via CSL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zotero</th>
<th>CSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artwork</td>
<td>Letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Recording</td>
<td>Magazine Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Post</td>
<td>Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Paper</td>
<td>Podcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Entry</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Radio Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia Article</td>
<td>Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Post</td>
<td>Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>TV Broadcast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instant Message</td>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Web Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of a collection’s description is important to most archivists because it is often representative of how helpful an archive can be to the archive’s clients. Common practice at many non-language-archives is to progressively increase the description details of a collection; this may take years or decades, as there are many collections and few archivists. Additionally, finding someone with the interest and the domain knowledge required to evaluate artifacts in ways which will enrich descriptions is often challenging. The discussion of the evolution in arrangement and description of a collection as “curation” stands in contrast to tasks I have previously discussed under the label of “curation”. The main difference being that my previous discussion has been focused on the establishment of new collections, whereas now I am discussing the revision of records or the enhancement of existing records. Broadly conceived, curation tasks are related to the activities of preservation, digitization, and format transformation which may be necessary for language artifact use (Weber 2021).  

Most visitors (or clients) to an archive must accept the metadata provided at its face value—having no other reference point

---

205 Activity done to an existing collection is distinct from assembling a collection. In both cases the format of artifact may need to undergo conservation activities to enable further use.
upon which to evaluate the accuracy (quality) of the metadata. With language archives, the situation is especially dire, because current social practice in documentary linguistics does not greatly reward curation activities—improving the metadata and records of collections. Peer-reviewed journal articles about collections are more easily translated into career building blocks, e.g., examples include Salffner (2015), Caballero (2017), Gawne (2018), Oez (2018), Franjieh (2019), Holley-Kline (2019). So rather than working with an archive to enrich the descriptions of the holdings, it is seen as more rewarding (career-wise) to publish an article about the holdings. The trend to move collection descriptions out of the archive’s purview and into the journal-sphere has led to meta-discussion on what should be included in these types of articles, e.g., Sullivant (2020), Fitzgerald (2021). However, the separation of archival content from description (via external publications) reinforces the OAIS or repository-type business model that many language archives seem to have adopted. A more integrated approach to collection description should be pursued; however this requires a different management approach by language archives. Such an integrated approach would need to recalibrate peer-review in such a way as to make sure the effort expended during peer-review was not spent on an article about the collection, but rather on the arrangement and description of the content of the collection. Such a recalibration would not only reward newly created collections, but could also serve to facilitate the description of older materials in “legacy” collections. Nordmoe (2013) discusses the losses encountered because the social reward system for career linguists values the acquisition of new artifacts over the reuse of already existing artifacts and the preservation of production contexts (of existing artifacts). Weber (2021) describes the lack of scholarly acknowledgment for work conducted with legacy materials; a sentiment articulated outside of the field of linguistics (Suarez & Tsutsui 2004; Thessen et al. 2019). A progressive and open peer-review model would acknowledge the contributions of curation. The much needed curation of linguistic collections impacts the ability to craft informative references. Among the collections consulted for this thesis, the ZF1 collection at PARADISEC is in need of curation. Among other things the DataCite API returns a notice “PLEASE PROVIDE TITLE” as its title. An academic system that acknowledges curation could encourage cross-generational collaborations with emeritus professors over
their fieldwork notes and recordings. The added attention to curation would also facilitate review and correction of bibliographic metadata errors such as those which occur in the ZF1 collection.
CHAPTER 7

Forward movement

We have seen that there are technical challenges inhibiting the easy reuse of bibliographic metadata between archives and authors who reference artifacts. There are two things our community of language artifact creators, stewards, and consumers can do to improve the transmission of bibliographic metadata between archives and tools such as reference managers. The first is to strengthen the relationship between archives and software tool developers. The second is to change the status quo of language archives in how they share bibliographic metadata about their holdings.

A contribution of developer time, such as sponsoring specific development goals to be conducted by the Zotero team, or developing code outside the core project (but licensed in a comparable way) and contributed to the Zotero project for distribution with Zotero would widely benefit language-artifact-using-communities. Additional engagement by Zotero end-users with the CSL and Zotero developers, describing interactive challenges in the citation of archival materials in language artifact situations, would help those developer teams understand the contexts in which their products are used. I have found these teams to be very responsive and knowledgeable of current issues in scholarly communication. They are priority driven, meaning that there are constraints on their activities. They evaluate the cost of work to be done (financial and man hours) and evaluate it in the context of the impact any change will have upon end-user expectations. When engaging with any open source project, important factors affecting successful implementation include:

---

206 Such development could be undertaken in several ways, and need not be solely conducted as part of linguistic research. Rather development could be part of library science, digital humanities, or computer science education or research activities. Generally the development is not arduous, and could be the collaboration of several people as part of a course level project. Currently recognition and reward are limited outside of personal satisfaction and motivation.

207 For example, adding use cases where using MARC relator roles in the citation can be added to the discussion here: https://discourse.citationstyles.org/t/feedback-csl-1-0-2-media-roles/1669.
clearly communicating the use case, the needed changes, and the breadth of the proposed impact among the product end-users, and possibly financing for developer time. Zotero is an open source project. It is also a modular project. Components such as translators (custom page scrapers written in JavaScript) and import plugins (for instance importing Lameta\textsuperscript{208} records or OLAC-OAI records\textsuperscript{209} to make bibliographic records) need not be written by the current Zotero developers. Contributions of code can come from a variety of global locations, individuals, teams, and sponsoring agencies.

The second way to contribute to better transmission of metadata between language artifact archives and the users of those artifacts is to take responsibility for the transmission process as a discipline, building into the repositories the technologies needed to communicate with tools like Zotero. In many cases the metadata is already part of the archive’s records. It is only a matter of making it available, not just to Zotero but also to search engines like Google Scholar. This is an important step in leading our communities into a publishing practice where the evidentiary record is cited and referenced. The exact technological approach each archive needs to take will be different, depending on their descriptive and arrangement practices and the current state of their web platform.

The front door (interface) of digital archives is constantly changing. For example, during the research phase of this thesis Pangloss and ELAR both launched new web interfaces. PARADISEC is looking forward to a new interface later in 2021 (Thieberger p.c., 2021). In that new interface they plan on making some Dublin Core Metadata available in the HTML code, some of which can be seen in Figure 67 lines 14–20.

\textsuperscript{208} \url{https://sites.google.com/site/metadatatooldiscussion/home}

\textsuperscript{209} \url{https://forums.zotero.org/discussion/52296/open-language-archives-community-olac-translator-needed}
Figure 67. Preliminary code for new HTML embedded metadata at PARADISEC

Catching the winds of change and navigating the archive towards the center of the value exchange remains the ongoing challenge of language archives.
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