

OUT OF THE HOLLINGER BOX AND INTO THE STREETS:
ACTIVISTS, ARCHIVES, AND UNDER-DOCUMENTED POPULATIONS

by
Amy S. McDonald

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Information and Library Science
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

December 2008

Approved by

Katherine M. Wisser

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	2
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
METHODOLOGY.....	24
FINDINGS.....	39
STUDY LIMITATIONS.....	65
SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	67
CONCLUSION.....	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	73
APPENDICES.....	78

INTRODUCTION

A common metaphor portrays archives as repositories of stories and memories, as “filled with voices”¹—those of the decedents whose lifetimes of work and leisure have been shuffled into folders and storage boxes and those of the archivists and researchers who daily exhume this documentation. It is fitting, then, to begin with three of those voices.

Heather Andrea Williams opens her study of newly freedpeople’s efforts to educate themselves with the observation that “relying on sources produced by white people to tell a story about black people can be frustrating.” She recounts how, after a day of fruitless research, she found herself wandering aimlessly through an archives, “muttering, ‘Where are the black people? I have to find the black people.’”²

Estelle Freedman writes of asking an archivist at the Schlesinger Library (perhaps the premier collection of women’s history materials in the United States) whether or not the woman whose papers she was studying was a lesbian. “[The] archivist responded . . . ‘We don’t say that about anyone without proof.’ The implication, in tone and words, was that I was making an unpleasant accusation.”³

Joel Wurl recalls hearing of an incident during the 1992 Los Angeles riots in which a group of rioters approached the Southern California Library for Social Studies and Research. The building manager dissuaded the rioters from burning the building by

¹ Carter, “Of Things Said and Unsaid,” 216.

² Williams, *Self-Taught*, 1.

³ Freedman, “The Burning of Letters Continues,” 52.

telling them of the repository's rich documentation of African-American, Latino/a, and working class people's history. He concludes, "many of the surrounding buildings were damaged or destroyed, but not the library."⁴

These three stories frame the professional imperative that guides this study. These stories speak of unlocatable, hidden, silenced, and marginalized populations within archival documentation; at the same time, they speak of the fervency of interest among members of both the scholarly community and the general public in establishing alternative historical narratives that countermand the one constructed by the dominant culture.

Archivists have only recently begun to acknowledge, let alone examine, the dynamics of power at work in the construction of history. Archivist Nancy Sahli commented that "dominant cultures have held the keys to power and to those institutions that both create and preserve the historical record."⁵ A short time afterward philosopher Jacques Derrida honed in more precisely on the dual functions of "creating" and "preserving":

Arkhe, we recall, names at once the *commencement* and the *commandment*. This name apparently coordinates two principles in one: the principle according to nature or history, *there* where things *commence*—physical, historical, or ontological principle—but also the principle according to the law, *there* where men and gods *command*, *there* where authority, social order are exercised, *in this place* from which *order* is given—nomological principle.⁶

In essence, preservation does not automatically follow creation; what is preserved—what will be available to later generations attempting to construct history—is what the will of the dominant culture chooses to preserve. Doubtless, archivists have, in the past, been

⁴ Wurl, "Ethnicity as Provenance," 66.

⁵ Sahli, "Commentary," 100.

⁶ Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 1.

complicit in collecting and maintaining a body of documentation that denies the history of some populations and overemphasizes the history of more powerful others. This study is predicated on the assumption that there is an ethical and professional imperative to turn from this course to actively seek out the documentation of those heretofore unlocatable, hidden, silenced, and marginalized populations.

Documenting any expanse of human activity is assuredly daunting for archivists; developing comprehensive—as opposed to piecemeal—strategies for the appraisal and acquisition of voluminous modern archival collections has been a challenge of archival practice since the professionalization of archival work. What Verne Harris refers to as the “sliver of a sliver of a sliver”⁷—that tiny percentage of documentation that is ultimately acquired by an archival repository—becomes an even narrower prospect when one is referring to the documentation of under-documented societal groups—documentation that members of such groups may have discarded out of a perceived lack of broader public interest, a fundamental distrust of archival or other heritage institutions, or a fear of reprisal by the dominant culture for failure to remain silent. Unfortunately, while this study has no solutions to offer archivists seeking ways to best document marginalized populations, it does present a modest sense of how one traditional source of such documentation—non-profit organizations that advocate for rights and opportunities for these marginalized populations—understand archives, archival research, and the process of maintaining their own organizational records.

Elsie Freeman Finch wrote in 1984 that archivists “must begin to learn systematically, not impressionistically as is our present tendency, who our users are.”⁸

⁷ Harris, “The Archival Sliver,” 65.

⁸ Finch, “In the Eye of the Beholder,” 417.

With this exhortation in mind, and recognizing that a systematic portrait of communities of potential archival *donors* is also warranted, this study explores two related questions. First, to what extent do non-profit organizations whose work centers on under-documented populations use archival materials in their activism and research? Second, to what extent do these non-profit organizations maintain documentation of their activities, and what intentions do they have for the future of this documentation?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In his inaugural speech as the ninth Archivist of the United States, Allen Weinstein remarked that, under his tenure, the National Archives and Records Administration would “remain absolutely nonpolitical and professional.” He continued with the promise to serve as the “custodian of America's essential ‘records that defy the tooth of time’”⁹ With this speech, he linked two concepts that have been central to definitions of archival professionalism since the profession first diverged from the historian’s path. Many archivists, like Weinstein, have long assumed that a good custodian of archival materials must remain apolitical.

Weinstein tapped a model of archival administration—what might be termed the “custodial model”—that harkens back to Sir Hilary Jenkinson’s 1922 definition of “archives”:

A document which may be said to belong to the class of Archives is one which was drawn up or used in the course of an administrative or executive transaction (whether public or private) of which itself formed a part; and subsequently preserved in their own custody for their own information by the person or persons responsible for that transaction and their legitimate successors.¹⁰

Under this model, the archivist serves as an impartial and disinterested custodian of records, with only a concern for the arrangement, description, and continued preservation of the collections in his or her care. Jenkinson declines to charge

⁹ “Remarks by Professor Allen Weinstein upon Being Sworn in as the Ninth Archivist of the United States,” <http://www.archives.gov/about/speeches/03-07-05.html>.

¹⁰ Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration*, 11.

archivists with evaluating the archival value of collections—in fact, he leaves the evaluation of a record’s worth with the creating agency.¹¹

Jenkinson, it should be noted, was Deputy Keeper of the British Public Records Office. Terry Cook, reflecting on the elder archivist’s work, writes that “such traditional approaches sanctioned archives’ and archivists’ already strong predilection, as state institutions and employees, to support mainstream culture and powerful records creators.”¹² Cook’s insinuation is that the supposed link between being apolitical and impartial and the custodial model of archival administration never existed.

Indeed, archivists have recently begun to challenge the notions of remaining apolitical, acknowledging, as Randall Jimerson does, that the “profession is inherently and unavoidably engaged in political power struggles to define the nature of our societies.”¹³ As it is often practiced today, archival administration is predicated on a series of value judgments that renders the archivist the arbiter of what is and is not worth remembering.

This ultimately subjective mode of practice becomes more apparent in the “appraisal model” of archival administration. This model is first raised in the work of T.R. Schellenberg, with whom Jenkinson is often compared. Schellenberg, almost 30 years later, defines archives as

¹¹ Jenkinson, 149-150.

¹² Cook, “Remembering the Past,” 173.

¹³ Jimerson, “Archives for All,” 262.

those records of any public or private institution which are adjudged worthy of permanent preservation for reference and research purposes and which have been deposited or have been selected for deposit in an archival institution.¹⁴

With that phrase—records that are “adjudged worthy”—Schellenberg admits the archival prerogative of appraisal which Jenkinson denies. Still, Schellenberg himself does not go so far as to suggest the possibility that, under his “appraisal model,” archivists might decide to destroy or keep a collection based on subjective judgment.

He writes that

an archivist admittedly must do a great deal of analytical work, but this relates mainly to finding out how records came into being. It is in the nature of historical work, but it is historical inquiry directed to finding out the source of documents, not their meaning.¹⁵

Instead, the dilemma of subjective appraisal was raised in 1973 by Gould Colman, who rails against the “politicization” of the archival profession in the absence of the development of appropriate acquisition policies, arguing that this absence allowed for the “skewing [of] the study of culture by the studied preservation of unrepresentative indicators of that culture”—particularly with regard to what he saw as the over-preservation of state documents.¹⁶

Two years later, the subjective nature of archival appraisal would be famously harpooned by F. Gerald Ham, who wonders, “why must we do it so badly?” Ham notes that the appraisal process was often “so random, so fragmented, so uncoordinated, and even so often accidental” as to challenge the creation of “a representative record of the human experience.”¹⁷

¹⁴ Schellenberg, *Modern Archives*, 16.

¹⁵ Schellenberg, *The Management of Archives*, 72.

¹⁶ Colman, “Letter in The Forum,” 484.

¹⁷ Ham, “The Archival Edge,” 5.

In short, while the appraisal model makes plain the motives at work in archival administration which the custodial model attempts to hide or deny, the appraisal model is still subject to the archivist's bias. Verne Harris presents a simple solution to Colman's politicization and Ham's unrepresentative record:

The structural pull in all recordmaking is towards the replication of existing relations of power. . . . [Archivists] cannot avoid complicity. But [they] can work against the pull; and for me it is a moral imperative to do so.¹⁸

Harris transforms the creation of a "representative record of human experience" into an ethical concern. He hints at a distinction even more profound than that of whether or not to invite politics into archival work: the distinction between the personal and the professional. In doing so, he revisits the subject of a speech given by historian Howard Zinn at the 1970 meeting of the Society of American Archivists. Zinn spoke of "the relation between professing one's craft and professing one's humanity,"¹⁹ arguing that being political in one context—one's personal life—could not, and should not, be separated from being political in other contexts—specifically, one's professional life. Zinn's elision of politics, professionalism, and personal belief stands in direct counterpoint to Weinstein's statements in favor of a neutral archival practice.

Zinn concluded his speech with two proposals for archivists, the second of which states that archivists should "take the trouble to compile a whole new world of documentary material, about the lives, desires, needs, of ordinary people."²⁰ Enacting this proposal requires what has been termed "archival activism,"²¹ a willingness to engage the current of politics that runs through the field of archivy and actively

¹⁸ Harris, "Archives, Politics, and Justice," 178.

¹⁹ Zinn, "Secrecy, Archives, and the Public Interest," 517.

²⁰ Zinn, 528.

²¹ Quinn, "The Archivist as Activist," 30.

collect documents outside the mainstream, a willingness to recognize archivists as the natural shapers of the documentary record.

Postmodernism and Social History

Zinn's statements were predicated upon several assumptions about the elitism of the archival record, one of which holds

that the collection of records, papers, and memoirs, as well as oral history . . . tend[s] to ignore the impotent and the obscure: we learn most about the rich, not the poor; the successful, not the failures; the old, not the young; the politically active, not the politically alienated; men, not women; white, not black; free people rather than prisoners; civilians rather than soldiers; officers rather than enlisted men.²²

Until recently, it has been near impossible to discover records by and about these under-documented populations. They may have been hidden, tucked into the papers of fathers, brothers, husbands, masters.²³ They may have been suppressed, destroyed by embarrassed family members—if not the creator him or herself—before donation²⁴ or restricted by discomfited archivists.²⁵ They may be the products of cultural outsiders.²⁶ They may simply have been judged worthless and discarded, by creators and their families, or by archivists themselves.

Whatever the reason for the obscurity of this documentation, the confluence, within the past few decades, of two schools of thought—postmodernism and social history—have given archivists new justification for collecting the documentation of under-documented cultures.

²² Zinn, 523.

²³ Ulrich, "Of Pens and Needles," 200.

²⁴ Freedman, 64.

²⁵ Duberman, "Historical Interpretation and the Politics of Evidence," 49.

²⁶ Hagan, "Archival Captive," 137.

The apex of postmodernism is often seen as the 1979 publication of Jean-François Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. In his examination of the potential impact of the philosophy upon archival thought, which borrows heavily from the work of Lyotard, Cook explains

postmodernism eschews metanarrative, those sweeping interpretations that totalize human experience in some monolithic way. . . . Postmodernism seeks to emphasize the diversity of human experience by recovering marginalized voices in the face of . . . hegemony.²⁷

A postmodern archivist assumes that records are no longer documents of absolute truth, but are rather products born out of the specific context—and out of the creator's subjectivity—in which they were made.²⁸ This paradigm shift from absolute truth to relative memory is a laden one: “we need to understand better our own politics of memory . . . if we want our ‘memory houses’ to reflect more accurately all components of the complex societies they allegedly serve.”²⁹ Charged with preserving a comprehensive documentation of society, archivists seem duty-bound to consider the tenets of a postmodernism, particularly as they relate to archival practice.

Born out of the 1960s, social history “deals with ordinary people, rather than the elite. . . . A second topical approach moves to greater prominence the history of ordinary activities, institutions, and modes of thought.”³⁰ Finding social history a “significant research trend worthy of response from the archival community,” Dale C. Meyer urged changes to all aspects of archival administration in order to keep pace with researchers in the new discipline.³¹ In terms of appraisal and acquisitions, he

²⁷ Cook, “Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth,” 17.

²⁸ Deodato, “Becoming Responsible Mediators,” 54.

²⁹ Cook, “What is Past is Prologue,” 19.

³⁰ Stearns, “The New Social History,” 4-5.

³¹ Mayer, “The New Social History,” 389.

wrote that, while many archives had likely collected the papers and records of elite members and noteworthy organizations, “special efforts must be made to obtain those less readily available records which document the lives of poor blacks, ordinary women, small farmers, poor immigrant families, and labor’s rank and file.”³²

The risk of not having material of scholarly interest to researchers drives the archival community’s growing sense of urgency in collecting this valuable documentation. Her frustration apparent, Elizabeth Lockwood asserts that the National Archives and Records Administration opens itself to criticism from researchers “by continuing to respond to new research trends in a piecemeal fashion” and “by not officially acknowledging that the definition of historical importance has changed over the past twenty years.”³³ Her criticisms of NARA can be effectively applied to archivists in general. Lockwood proposes that the systematic acquisition of new materials about under-documented populations will “allay fears of an elitist bias in the archival record and potentially improve [the archival community’s] relationship with the historical community.”³⁴ While the documentation of marginalized populations should be something of an end in itself, archivists’ need to better serve one of their primary constituencies cannot be discounted.

Activists and Archival Research

Little has been written on the research practices of activists and activist organizations, and the research that does exist does not mention archival repositories

³² Mayer, 393.

³³ Lockwood, “Imponderable Matters,” 405.

³⁴ Lockwood, 405.

as sources for information. Randy Stoecker's study of the research management processes of 80 Toledo, Ohio non-profit organizations, however, is relevant here. Stoecker found that this group of small-to-medium-sized organizations (an average of nine employees and volunteers per organization) was spending an average of 56 hours a week on data collection and research and lacked the training and resources to effectively manage, store, retrieve, and use that research.³⁵ He concludes with a call for better research methods training for non-profit organization workers,³⁶ a need that archivists could assist with filling. Applying his findings to the topic at hand, one might expect to find that non-profit organizations are stymied as to how and when to conduct archival research and might benefit from assistance in managing the research and documentation that they have already compiled.

Where the archival literature does touch upon the subject of activists performing archival research, it describes case studies which focus on the legal usage of archival documentation. Judith Roberts-Moore presents the case of the National Association of Japanese Citizens (NAJC), which, with the aid of government documentation preserved by the National Archives of Canada, successfully petitioned their government for redress for the forced relocation of Japanese-Canadian citizens to internment camps during World War II. Roberts-Moore's focus, as one might expect, leans more toward celebrating the role of the archives in preserving documentation which allows citizens to hold their government responsible for its past actions than the research processes of the NAJC.³⁷ While this article makes clear that archival documentation might be used by activists in seeking legal retribution for past

³⁵ Stoecker, "The Research Practices and Needs of Non-Profit Organizations in an Urban Center," 108.

³⁶ Stoecker, 113.

³⁷ Roberts-Moore, "Establishing Recognition of Past Injustices," 74-75.

abuses, the dearth of similar literature on this subject provides no further direction regarding other activist uses for archival materials.

Joel A. Blanco-Rivera writes of the use of archival materials in holding the Puerto Rican government accountable for the secret police surveillance of suspected subversives, particularly those activists who supported independence from the United States. The creation of surveillance files by the Intelligence Division of the Police of Puerto Rico was revealed in 1987, and subsequent court decisions provided the means for victims to see their files and sue the national government for the abrogation of their civil rights. As of 2005, files not claimed by victims were still pending transfer to an archival repository.³⁸ While Blanco-Rivera's summation does not quite speak to the use of archival materials in support of an activist movement, it does present another legal usage of (future) archival materials. Notably, significant legal barriers and battles were created around access to these files.³⁹ As the files were not yet in archival custody, it cannot be argued that archivists contributed to these obstructions, but it does raise the point that activists may wish to consult sensitive materials in support of their cause. In such instances, the Society of American Archivists' Code of Ethics provides guidance, stating that "archivists strive to promote open and equitable access to their services and the records in their care without discrimination or preferential treatment."⁴⁰ Thus, archivists are charged with removing—or fighting for the removal of—barriers to access placed upon the materials in their charge.

³⁸ Blanco-Rivera, "The Forbidden Files," 297, 306-308.

³⁹ Blanco-Rivera, 306-308.

⁴⁰ "Code of Ethics for Archivists," http://archivists.org/governance/handbook/app_ethics.asp.

Finally, Joan D. Krizack's account of Northeastern University's ten years of documenting social justice movements among Boston's African American, Chinese, Latino/a, and gay and lesbian communities leads to the observation that "surprisingly few requests for [manuscript collections] have been made by the organizations that created the collections."⁴¹ She does not specify whether or not these same organizations conduct *any* archival research, or to what purpose.

Documenting the Under-documented

Concluding her case study, Krizack writes eloquently about the justification for collecting documentation from marginalized populations:

Material that is created by members of underrepresented communities offers clues for understanding events that may have been ignored, misunderstood, or misrepresented in traditional sources. They document community issues and accomplishments; they describe the motivation for and the process of working for change; they provide insights into the diversity of individuals and the range of opinions within each community; and they help to instill pride in the community's successes and evaluate its setbacks.⁴²

In short, as these underrepresented populations find their voices and preserve them in archives, they are given new validity as makers of history. While such collection efforts are easily and obviously justified, some unique considerations in documenting these populations remain.

In their historical survey of women's archives, Kären M. Mason and Tanya Zanish-Belcher advise these archives not to "fall into the habit of collecting only what is easy, such as the papers of middle- and upper-class white women and the records of

⁴¹ Krizack, "Preserrving the History of Diversity," 128.

⁴² Krizack, 132.

mainstream women's organizations."⁴³ This understanding is key for all repositories attempting to fill the gaps in archival documentation: the definitive history of these groups cannot be established without evidence from all quarters. Yet Mason and Zanish-Belcher warn that "the real challenge is to persuade women that their reminiscences, ephemera, and oral histories have value and interest outside their families."⁴⁴

With the documentation of the powerful, the elite, the "rich white men" central to the establishment of so many archives, it is small wonder that so many "ordinary" people fail to consider the research significance of their own papers—if they even keep their papers at all. Still, as Diane F. Britton et al write, "the discovery and knowledge of one's own history can be empowering and a catalyst for social change."⁴⁵ In seeking this empowerment, community members become equal partners with archivists in documenting their community, something that Wurl refers to as "stewardship:"

It is characterized by partnership and continuity of association between repository and originator. In a stewardship approach, archival material is viewed less as property and more as cultural asset, jointly held and invested in by the archive and the community of origin.⁴⁶

By engaging with the community on an ongoing basis, by promoting these records to other segments of the population, and by acting in good faith as caretakers of these records, archivists demonstrate their commitment to a program of documenting under-documented populations. As Thomas Kreneck notes about his experiences collecting Mexican-American papers and records, "such papers are not donated

⁴³ Mason and Zanish-Belcher, "A Room of One's Own," 44.

⁴⁴ Mason and Zanish-Belcher, 45.

⁴⁵ Britton, Floyd, and Murphy, "Overcoming Another Obstacle," 222.

⁴⁶ Wurl, 72.

lightly by people of a culture whose family structure is such that they hold sacred remembrances of things past.”⁴⁷ This commitment, witnessed by the community, aids in bringing about additional donations of materials.

Wurl criticizes the “subject area or ‘theme’” approach to collecting records about the under-documented, arguing that “this paradigm of archival selection overlooks the rich reservoir of information originating deep within community infrastructures in favor of scattered products about communities, often generated by those on the outside looking in.”⁴⁸ Several case studies propose the use of “an intermediary, a person or persons respected within the group, interested in its history, and in sympathy with the needs and goals of [a collecting] project”⁴⁹ as a way to both gain entrée to members of the community and avoid scattershot collection development.

The need to establish credibility and communicate commitment within the community being documented lies at the heart of another issue: the possibility that donors may balk at placing their records in an academic institution likely run by and containing substantial documentation of the dominant culture.⁵⁰ While Britton et al suggest that the documentation of under-documented populations “connects the academy with the community” and “promote[s] another level of inclusion for the [under-documented community] as it was invited to share its stories and contribute to the scholarly record of its own experiences,”⁵¹ Krizack’s experiences in documenting

⁴⁷ Kreneck, “Documenting a Mexican American Community,” 278.

⁴⁸ Wurl, 69.

⁴⁹ Grabowski, “Fragments or Components,” 310.

⁵⁰ Neal, “Cultivating Diversity,” 38.

⁵¹ Britton, Floyd, and Murphy, 217.

various marginalized communities in Boston led to the observation that “some donors feared that [her] University was trying to take something away from the community.”⁵² Conversely, Carter wonders if the documentation of marginalized or under-documented populations truly belongs in these archival institutions of the dominant class, suggesting one possible alternative:

Groups that do not see themselves adequately represented in mainstream archives, unable or unwilling to preserve the documentary memory of marginalized or minority groups, have successfully established their own archives.⁵³

Here, the institutional archives is seen as an antagonist in efforts to create a representative record of society, a depiction which archivists should strive to counteract by forming partnerships with these community archives. John J. Grabowski describes such a partnership, which grew out of his ethnic collecting efforts on behalf of the Western Reserve Historical Society. His institution’s willingness to microfilm the important documentation of groups committed to developing community cultural centers and archives resulted in several successful additions—which the society would not have been able to acquire otherwise—to the historical society’s holdings.⁵⁴

Indeed, Kreneck believes that the impetus to document these populations should be undertaken on a largely local or community scale: “remote mainstream institutions have had little positive effect on the life of the average *barrio* resident; thus, that person rightly feels such an institution has little relevance and merits little of his confidence.” He also holds that such local institutions, because of their

⁵² Krizack, 130.

⁵³ Carter, 231.

⁵⁴ Grabowski, 309.

situation within the community, can be more responsive to the needs of community members.⁵⁵

Another concern raised in the literature is the use of non-paper-based sources among under-documented populations, particularly the use of oral history, folklore, and artifacts. Effectively documenting these cultures “requires archivists to traverse some of the boundaries they tend to place on what constitutes archival evidence and to look more closely instead at the ways ethnic communities actually convey information.”⁵⁶ Archivists may need to find room on their shelves and in their collecting policies for a new range of materials. To fail to do so constitutes what Carter refers to as an “archival silencing,” his phrase for the exclusion—either by force, neglect, or purposeful ignorance—of worthy material from the archives.⁵⁷ At the same time, Amy Cooper, writing about the paucity of Native American documentation, warns against a certain condescension on the part of the dominant—and, usually, the documenting—culture: “We have tended to see Native American culture as a throwback that must be preserved by the dominant culture, rather than as an active culture capable of collecting and telling its own story.”⁵⁸ Clearly, there is a dilemma which must be reckoned with between prescribing the manner in which—and through what materials—a community’s story is to be told and allowing that community the freedom to determine and preserve its history for themselves.

Continuing in this vein, Elisabeth Kaplan’s deeply-researched essay on the birth of the American Jewish Historical Society raises the question of the extent to

⁵⁵ Kreneck, 284.

⁵⁶ Wurl, 69.

⁵⁷ Carter, 218-219.

⁵⁸ Cooper, 46.

which archival documentation—an exceedingly small proportion of the sum total of a community’s documentation—limits the ways in which a community can be studied and understood. Documentation establishes a community after the fact; as the title of Kaplan’s essay suggests, “we are what we collect.” She writes, “authentic voices are authentic only because they declare themselves to be so, or because they reflect an authenticity that we have projected onto them.”⁵⁹ Her conclusion should be well-considered by archivists attempting to remedy lifetimes of bias in the archival record. Archivists seeking to do just that, she writes, “must reify identity, thereby making cultural differences immutable and eliminating individuality, personality, and choice within the group in question.”⁶⁰

Documenting Activism

Tracing the U.S. feminist movement’s history of publication, Karlyn Kors Campbell notes that “because they had no history to guide them, from the beginning, women activists endeavored to record what they had done in convention proceedings and pamphlets.”⁶¹ This does not necessarily mean that such documentation was organized, preserved, and ultimately donated to an archival repository. The University of Illinois at Chicago’s “Don’t Throw It Away!” project, which teaches local grassroots organizations and activists about the importance of maintaining and finding or creating a secure repository for their documentation is proof of the little

⁵⁹ Kaplan, “We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are,” 147.

⁶⁰ Kaplan, 148.

⁶¹ Campbell, “Consciousness-Raising,” 45.

thought that these organizations are able to give to their organizational records.⁶² As Brian Keough and Amy C. Schindler write, “our experience has shown that some of the most endangered records are those created by private organizations.”⁶³

Lack of time and resources is felt to be the primary reason that so many activists and activist organizations fail to maintain their documentation. David J. Klaassen writes, “the ad hoc, solve-the-problem-of-the-day nature of evolutionary organizational development tends to place priority on the effectiveness of current services,”⁶⁴ while Keough notes simply that non-profit groups especially lack the time and staff needed to establish and maintain a records management program.⁶⁵

Klaassen also writes that “many organizations do not perceive the need, value, or possibility of an identifiable legacy that would support, and derive support from, an archival program.” He cites frequent reorganizations, mergers, and redefinitions of mission statements as just a few of the reasons activist organizations might have a diluted sense of organizational history.⁶⁶ Building on this theme, Bruce Montgomery, who led the acquisition of Amnesty International’s records for the University of Colorado at Boulder, writes that staff turnovers at all levels of the organization have resulted in the loss of significant amounts of records.⁶⁷ The implication is that a stronger sense of the organization’s documentary legacy might have kept these records from going astray.

⁶² Strobel, “Becoming a Historian, Being an Activist, and Thinking Archivaly,” 181.

⁶³ Keough and Schindler, “Thinking Globally, Acting Locally,” 125.

⁶⁴ Klaassen, “The Archival Intersection,” 29.

⁶⁵ Keough, “Documenting Diversity,” 249.

⁶⁶ Klaassen, 29.

⁶⁷ Montgomery, “Archiving Human Rights,” 113-114.

Still, it is difficult to imagine how organizations, at least, might acquire this sense of their documentary legacy when a dangerous precedent has already been established. An acquisitions policy implemented in 1995 at Library and Archives Canada reflects the viewpoint that organizational records hold less archival value than personal papers; the policy itself stipulates that most organizations must contribute some funding to the maintenance of their records as a prerequisite to acquisition.⁶⁸ Fisher concludes that LAC has “no doubt” lost some organizational records “of national significance,” but that the situation does not seem as dire as was originally predicted.⁶⁹ Such a flippant point of view is at odds with the unequivocal need to document marginalized populations at least partially through the organizations which represent them.

Keough and Schindler suggest that activists are generally unfamiliar with archival policies and practices, and that it is incumbent upon archivists to provide education and to “reach out to save the documentary heritage.”⁷⁰ In another article, Keough cites examples of this understandable confusion about archival protocol among activists, particularly concerns over private information and worries about not being able to access organizational material once it has been placed in an archives.⁷¹ Jack Wertheimer et al propose a simple solution to this problem: training activists—either through workshops or paper or online guidelines—to serve as their own records managers.⁷² Presumably, this level of comfort with archival procedure will facilitate

⁶⁸ Fisher, “Records of Dubious Research Value,” 48.

⁶⁹ Fisher, 72.

⁷⁰ Keough and Schindler, 129.

⁷¹ Keough, 249.

⁷² Wertheimer, “Toward the Documentation of Conservative Judaism,” 379.

not only the ordering and preservation of documentation, but the ultimate transferal of these materials to an archival institution.

Julie Herrada observes a preference among activists for working with archivists that share their political viewpoints. In contrast to archivists' traditional claim of remaining apolitical, Herrada's personal views become her entrée to the activist community and have helped her to acquire collections for the Labadie Collection at the University of Michigan. She writes, "the donors share my deep concern about the world and the people in it, which usually provides an immediate rapport." Some archivists may be uncomfortable with the level of community involvement proposed by Herrada; at the very least, she notes the importance of staying current with movement publications, leading activists, and writers.⁷³

For Krizack, a spirit of cooperation is essential to acquiring the documentation of any community, activist or otherwise. She has successfully implemented that hallmark of the documentation strategy—the community advisory group—as a guide to her collecting strategies.⁷⁴ In speaking with potential donors, she bills the donation as a collaborative effort: "their historical records would be organized, preserved . . . and made available for research without any cost to them . . . and Northeastern would increase its research resources at the same time it provided a community service."⁷⁵ She also notes that demonstrating the archives's ongoing commitment to the materials and the community is necessary to win a donor's confidence.

⁷³ Herrada, "Collecting Anarchy," 139

⁷⁴ Krizack, 127.

⁷⁵ Krizack, 130.

METHODOLOGY

Definitions

A growing body of archival literature calls for the increased documentation of a more diverse human experience, a call that would necessarily involve those organizations and activists that advocate and work on behalf of marginalized populations. There is some evidence that these activists and organizations use archives—or have the potential to use archives—as they conduct research in support of their mission. Further, case studies suggest that, to some extent, these individuals and organizations maintain their personal papers and organizational records, recognize the importance of this documentation, and work with archival institutions to preserve and provide access to this material. But archivists have yet to systematically examine the archival needs and the archival practices of the activist community.

Of course, systematically examining the interaction between the activist community and archives is fodder for a lifetime of research. The activist community, without any particular definition, encompasses activists of all levels of intensity of involvement, from those who simply sign online petitions or sporadically attend organizational meetings to those in the core leadership of one or several organizations, and organizations of widely-varying resources, from local, all-volunteer groups to international organizations with staffs of thousands.

The issues promoted or disparaged by the activist community, too, cover the political spectrum, but share one commonality. John Lofland writes that social movement organizations “are associations of persons making idealistic and moralistic claims about how human personal or group life ought to be organized that, *at the time of their claims-making*, are marginal to or excluded from mainstream society.”⁷⁶ Before proceeding, then, to examine the intersections between archives, marginalized populations, and the activist community, definitions of the latter two must be established.

Marginalized populations have been defined along and across boundaries of gender, race, ethnicity and heritage, class, politics, sexuality, age, ability, and scores of other dimensions. As archivists begin to address the lacunae in the national documentation of American society, specialized archives dedicated to recovering the history of certain marginalized populations have begun to proliferate across the country. For instance, Duke University’s Sallie Bingham Center for Women’s History and Culture is one of several archives and special collections charged with documenting the lives of American women. The Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library and Tulane University’s Amistad Research Center document African American history, while the Southeast Asian Archive at the University of California at Irvine and the Cuban Heritage Collection at the University of Miami document the lives of new Americans from Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam and Cuba, respectively. Archival collections on organized labor and leftist political movements may be found at New York University’s Tamiment Library and Robert F. Wagner Labor Archives. The Lesbian Herstory Archives and

⁷⁶ Lofland, *Social Movement Organizations*, 2-3. Emphasis his.

the Stonewall Library and Archives are two of many community archives that give voice to the experience of LGBTIQ individuals.

This study concerns itself primarily with populations defined by gender, ethnic, racial, and sexual identities. Sanction for this decision comes from the Society of American Archivists (SAA), which recognizes the impact that archives dedicated to documenting these populations have had on the archival landscape through its establishment of specialized society roundtables: the Archivists & Archives of Color Roundtable; the Latin American and Caribbean Cultural Heritage Archives Roundtable; the Lesbian and Gay Archives Roundtable (LAGAR); the Native American Archives Roundtable; and Women's Collections Roundtable.⁷⁷ Although SAA has yet to establish a roundtable for Asian and Asian-American archival collections, organizations concerned with the rights and issues of this population have been included in this study.

The activist community that advocates for these marginalized populations, too, is broader than can be reckoned with in a single study. Here, a line is drawn between individual activists producing personal papers and organizations producing organizational records.

For this study, the activist community has been narrowed to a focus on non-profit organizations, specifically those tax-exempt organizations incorporated under sections 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) of the United States Internal Revenue Code. The largest of the 501(c) subsections, accounting in 2007 for approximately 68% of all

⁷⁷ "SAA Leader List, Sections, and Roundtables," http://saa.archivists.org/Scripts/4Disapi.dll/4DCGI/committees/Listing.html?Action=List_Committees&CommWGStatus=Roundtables. Accessed 14 March 2008.

501(c) organizations,⁷⁸ 501(c)(3) organizations are commonly known as charitable organizations—encompassing both public charities and private foundations, as well as religious organizations—and are eligible to receive tax-deductible contributions.

Organizations may qualify for 501(c)(3) status if their activities

are charitable, religious, educational, scientific, literary, testing for public safety, fostering national or international amateur sports competition, and preventing cruelty to children or animals. The term charitable is used in its generally accepted legal sense and includes relief of the poor, the distressed, or the underprivileged; advancement of religion; advancement of education or science; erecting or maintaining public buildings, monuments, or works; lessening the burdens of government; lessening neighborhood tensions; eliminating prejudice and discrimination; defending human and civil rights secured by law; and combating community deterioration and juvenile delinquency.⁷⁹

501(c)(4) organizations are known as social welfare organizations, which means, according to the IRS definition, that they “operate primarily to further the common good and general welfare of the people of the community.”⁸⁰ 501(c)(4) organizations form the second largest of the 501(c) subsections, or 8% of the total 501(c) universe in 2007.⁸¹ Unlike 501(c)(3) organizations, contributions to 501(c)(4) organizations are not tax-exempt; 501(c)(4) organizations are also allowed to engage in unlimited lobbying.⁸² These types of organizations, by virtue of the fact that they are registered with the Internal Revenue Service, lend themselves to the construction of a systematic sample.

⁷⁸ *Internal Revenue Service Data Book 2007*, <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-soi/07dbexemptact.pdf>.

⁷⁹ “Exempt Purposes—Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3)”: <http://www.irs.gov/charities/charitable/article/0,,id=175418,00.html>. Accessed 22 September 2008.

⁸⁰ “Social Welfare Organizations”: <http://www.irs.gov/charities/nonprofits/article/0,,id=96178,00.html>. Accessed 22 September 2008.

⁸¹ *Internal Revenue Service Data Book 2007*, <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-soi/07dbexemptact.pdf>.

⁸² Boris and Steuerle, “Scope and Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector,” 70.

Further parameters were then imposed upon the sample by an analysis of the type of work a non-profit organization performs. Unfortunately, at this time, none of the taxonomies used to classify the non-profit sector adequately capture the various functions which figure in a non-profit organization's work.⁸³ The best attempt may be the now unused IRS Activity Codes for non-profits.⁸⁴ In examining the IRS Activity Codes, it was found that those organizations falling under the categories of "Civil Rights Activities" and "Advocacy/Attempts to Influence Public Opinion" mapped best to both 501(c)(3) and 501(c)4 organizations, as well as to the marginalized populations under scrutiny.⁸⁵ These codes informed the development of an alternate strategy centering on the concept of "advocacy" organizations. Using an operational definition of "advocacy" (described below), each non-profit organization's mission statement was analyzed to determine whether or not advocacy activities figured primarily in their program.

Kenneth T. Andrews and Bob Edwards, synthesizing definitions of non-profit advocacy culled from the literature on the topic, write that "advocacy organizations make public interest claims either promoting or resisting social change that, if implemented, would conflict with the social, cultural, political, or economic interests or values of other constituencies and groups."⁸⁶ This rather traditional definition of "advocacy" focuses on political or legal action directed at official public policy.

Elizabeth Boris and Rachel Mosher-Williams suggest that such definitions of "advocacy" are too narrow, and argue instead for a conception that includes civic

⁸³ Boris and Mosher-Williams, "Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations," 491.

⁸⁴ "What Are IRS Activity Codes?":

<http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/FAQ/detail.php?linkID=785&category=120&xrefID=2956>.

⁸⁵ "IRS Activity Codes": <http://nccs.urban.org/classification/irsactivity.cfm>.

⁸⁶ Andrews and Edwards, "Advocacy Organizations in the U.S. Political Process," 481.

involvement—for instance, attempts by members of the public to influence public opinion or community educational efforts organized upon a political issue.⁸⁷ As opposed to the more circumscribed arenas of strictly legal or political advocacy, which focus on governmental decision-makers, “voluntary organizations are primary vehicles of citizen action and participation, and their presence depends on freedom to associate, to deliberate, and to act together in the public sphere.”⁸⁸

The National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities, the primary scheme for classification of non-profit organizations, goes some way toward concurring with Boris and Mosher-Williams’s arguments in defining “Civil Rights, Social Action & Advocacy” (major group R) groups as

private nonprofit organizations whose primary purpose is to protect and promote the broad civil rights of groups and civil liberties of individuals, to work for the realization of specific social or political goals or to encourage the participation of people in the public policy debate.⁸⁹

These latter two definitions form the basis of the concept of “advocacy” referred to in this study.

The choice of advocacy organizations dovetails with this study’s focus on marginalized populations. The concept of the “public interest,” referred to explicitly by Edwards and Andrews and implicitly by Boris and Mosher-Williams and the NTEE, is particularly tricky, as it raises difficult questions of who has the right to determine what is in the public’s best interest. J. Craig Jenkins writes, however, that

the public interest is not any specific policy or viewpoint . . . but rather a set of procedures for ensuring an open, competitive process in which all significant and relevant interests are represented. . . . Nonprofit

⁸⁷ Boris and Mosher-Williams, 488.

⁸⁸ Boris and Mosher-Williams, 490.

⁸⁹ National Center for Charitable Statistics, *National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities—Core Codes*, 140.

advocacy helps correct imbalanced political representation by ensuring that a broader set of interests are voiced.⁹⁰

Constructing a Sample

Founded in 1994, Philanthropic Research, Inc., itself a 501(c)(3) organization, is responsible for the GuideStar database of Internal Revenue Service Business Master File documentation for over 1.7 million tax-exempt non-profit organizations, including 900,000 charities, 118,000 foundations, and 500,000 other organizations incorporated under the 501(c) section of the United States Internal Revenue Code.⁹¹ The GuideStar database was chosen for this study because it is currently the most comprehensive online source of information on 501(c) non-profit organizations.

Additionally, the GuideStar database allows users to search for organizations according to their National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE) classification, an alphanumeric system developed by the National Center for Charitable Statistics in 1987 for classifying tax-exempt entities. Organizations are searchable on GuideStar through first two segments of the NTEE classification for each organization's record: the first designation—letters A through Z—describes the major function or field of activity of the organization, while the second segment of two digits reflects the major program activity of the organization.⁹² Searching by NTEE classifications was found to be a more standardized and reliable way to search for relevant groups than simple keyword searching.

⁹⁰ Jenkins, "Nonprofit Organizations and Political Advocacy," 308.

⁹¹ "GuideStar Launches Data Services": <http://www.guidestar.org/about/press/072902.jsp>. Accessed 17 September 2008.

⁹² Hodgkinson, "Mapping the Non-profit Sector in the United States: Implications for Research," 8-9.

Using Boris and Mosher-Williams's methodology as a guide,⁹³ a list of NTEE codes classifying non-profit organizations which advocate for the rights of the marginalized populations described above was selected:

- **A23:** Arts, Culture, and Humanities—Cultural/Ethnic Awareness
- **G81:** Disease, Disorders, Medical Disciplines—Specifically Named Diseases—AIDS
- **I70:** Crime, Legal Related—Protection Against and Prevention of Neglect, Abuse, Exploitation
- **I71:** Crime, Legal Related—Spouse Abuse, Prevention of
- **I73:** Crime, Legal Related—Sexual Abuse, Prevention of
- **L01:** Housing, Shelter—Alliances & Advocacy Organizations
- **P01:** Human Services—Alliances & Advocacy Organizations
- **P84:** Human Services—Services to Promote the Independence of Specific Populations—Ethnic/Immigrant Services
- **R01:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Alliances & Advocacy Organizations
- **R20:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Rights, Advocacy for Specific Groups
- **R22:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Rights, Advocacy for Specific Groups—Minority Rights
- **R24:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Rights, Advocacy for Specific Groups—Women's Rights
- **R26:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Rights, Advocacy for Specific Groups—Lesbian/Gay Rights
- **R30:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Rights, Advocacy for Specific Groups—Intergroup/Race Relations
- **R61:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Liberties Advocacy—Reproductive Rights
- **R62:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy—Civil Liberties Advocacy—Right to Life

⁹³ Boris and Mosher-Williams, 494.

- **R99:** Civil Rights, Social Action, & Advocacy Not Elsewhere Classified
- **S01:** Community Improvement & Capacity Building—Alliances and Advocacy

This resulted in a base sample pool of 10,451 organizations. Within each NTEE classification, every tenth organization was selected and analyzed for inclusion in the final sample. Ideally, organizational contacts would be added to the sample pool if they met the following criteria:

- The organization was a 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) organization.
- The organization performed advocacy functions for its target population.
- The organization had a current website.
- The organization's mission related to the needs of the marginalized populations delineated above.
- The organization's activities were local, regional, or national in scope (as opposed to international).
- A single organizational contact, with a direct e-mail address, could be found, either through the organization's web directory or GuideStar. (Executive directors of the selected organizations were the preferred contacts, as it was assumed that they would be the most fully apprised on the subject matter covered in the survey.)

In practice, of course, the lines between advocacy and other organizational functions often blur, or are often both included in the mission of a single organization; in these instances, the researcher chose to err on the side of inclusion in the sample population. Additionally, organizations focusing on controversial issues—such as LGBTIQ rights or reproductive choice—are often reluctant to disseminate staff contact information out of concern that those individuals could be targeted by opponents. Here, assuming that the organizations in question met all the other criteria

required for inclusion in the sample, the researcher considered it appropriate to use general organizational e-mail addresses.

The final sample pool consisted of contacts at 499 randomly selected non-profit organizations, which range across the country and cover the span of NTEE classifications. The following tables explore the demographics of the sample.

Table 1 presents the distribution of the sample population according to 501(c) designation. Four of the organizations in the sample, although present in the GuideStar database, had yet to be assigned a 501(c) status.

501(c) Designation	Sample Count	Percentage of Sample	National Percentage*
501(c)(3) organizations	476	95.4%	71%
501(c)(4) organizations	19	3.8%	7%
unassigned	4	0.8%	n/a
Total	499	100%	n/a

Table 1: Sample Organizations by 501(c) Designation

* Internal Revenue Service, Exempt Organizations Business Master File (June 2008)

When the sample numbers, which were limited to 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations only, are compared against the national total of all 1,492,407 registered 501(c) organizations (as of June 2008), the percentages represented in the sample are skewed. If the survey numbers are compared to the national total of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations only—1,166,639 registered organizations total (as of June 2008)—the national percentages, at least for 501(c)(3) organizations, correspond more closely with the sample distribution, with 501(c)(3) organizations comprising roughly 91% of the total and 501(c)(4) organizations comprising 9%.

The distribution of sample organizations according to the state in which they are registered is found in table 2. Comparisons against official statewide totals of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations are also made. Although New York, the

District of Columbia, and Massachusetts are overrepresented, and Texas and Ohio are underrepresented, the top five states for non-profit activity, with the exception of Florida, appear in the top seven places on the list. Wyoming and Kansas are not represented in this study's sample.

State	Sample Count	Percentage of Sample	Statewide Percentage of 501(c)(3)s and 501(c)(4)s*
New York	74	14.83%	6.80%
California	61	12.22%	11.00%
District of Columbia	41	8.22%	1.03%
Massachusetts	28	5.61%	2.48%
Illinois	23	4.61%	3.98%
Texas	16	3.21%	6.61%
Pennsylvania	15	3.01%	4.14%
Colorado	14	2.81%	1.92%
Minnesota	14	2.81%	2.18%
North Carolina	14	2.81%	2.86%
Georgia	12	2.40%	2.50%
Virginia	12	2.40%	2.63%
Washington	12	2.40%	2.35%
Florida	11	2.20%	4.97%
Michigan	11	2.20%	3.13%
New Jersey	9	1.80%	2.83%
Oregon	9	1.80%	1.46%
Arizona	8	1.60%	1.44%
Louisiana	7	1.40%	1.20%
Maryland	7	1.40%	2.20%
New Mexico	7	1.40%	0.68%
Ohio	7	1.40%	4.03%
Indiana	6	1.20%	2.21%
Vermont	6	1.20%	0.38%
Wisconsin	6	1.20%	2.16%
Connecticut	5	1.00%	1.31%
Iowa	5	1.00%	1.88%
Missouri	5	1.00%	2.27%
Montana	5	1.00%	0.63%
Alabama	4	0.80%	1.24%
Idaho	4	0.80%	0.47%

New Hampshire	4	0.80%	0.51%
South Carolina	4	0.80%	1.47%
Utah	4	0.80%	0.58%
Kentucky	3	0.60%	1.17%
Maine	3	0.60%	0.57%
Tennessee	3	0.60%	2.01%
Alaska	2	0.40%	0.35%
Arkansas	2	0.40%	0.85%
Delaware	2	0.40%	0.37%
Nebraska	2	0.40%	0.76%
Nevada	2	0.40%	0.53%
North Dakota	2	0.40%	0.34%
Oklahoma	2	0.40%	1.26%
West Virginia	2	0.40%	0.69%
Hawaii	1	0.20%	0.53%
Mississippi	1	0.20%	0.76%
Rhode Island	1	0.20%	0.45%
South Dakota	1	0.20%	0.40%
Kansas	0	0.00%	1.13%
Wyoming	0	0.00%	0.28%
Total	499	99.94%	99.98%

Table 2: Sample Organizations by State

Internal Revenue Service, Exempt Organizations Business Master File (June 2008)

Sample organizations are shown according to their NTEE major code assignment in table 3. Although subgroups represented by only seven major NTEE codes were used as search parameters for constructing the sample, the organizations ultimately included in the sample range across almost all of the NTEE major codes. This is due to the fact that organizations are often classified under more than one NTEE subgroup. As the majority of advocacy organizations responsive to marginalized populations are grouped under NTEE major code R, a disproportionate amount of the sample organizations are found there.

NTEE Classification	NTEE Major Category Definition	Sample Count	Percentage of Sample	National Percentage*
A	Arts, Culture, and Humanities	46	9.21%	8.00%
B	Educational Institutions	5	1.00%	13.10%
C	Environmental Quality Protection,	1	0.20%	2.30%
E	Health—General & Rehabilitative	2	0.40%	3.30%
F	Mental Health, Crisis Intervention	2	0.40%	1.20%
G	Disease, Disorders, Medical Disciplines	24	4.81%	1.80%
H	Medical Research	1	0.20%	0.20%
I	Crime, Legal Related	52	10.42%	1.50%
J	Employment, Job Related	6	1.20%	2.70%
L	Housing, Shelter	16	3.21%	2.30%
O	Youth Development	4	0.80%	1.50%
P	Human Services	52	10.42%	6.20%
R	Civil Rights, Social Action, Advocacy	257	51.50%	0.80%
S	Community Improvement, Capacity Building	12	2.40%	9.00%
T	Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Grantmaking	2	0.40%	7.50%
V	Social Science Research Institutes	1	0.20%	0.20%
W	Public, Society Benefit	3	0.60%	4.50%
Z	Unknown	3	0.60%	1.70%
Unassigned†		10	2.00%	n/a
Total		499	100%	n/a

Table 3: Sample Organizations by NTEE Classification

* Internal Revenue Service, Exempt Organizations Business Master File (June 2008)

† The Guidestar database records no NTEE classification for the organizations represented here.

Survey Development and Administration

An online multiple-choice survey of 18 questions was created using the Qualtrics Survey Software (please see Appendix C). The survey itself was divided into three parts. The first portion of the survey asked respondents to supply basic demographic data about themselves and their organizations: their position within the organization, the organization's size, and the cause or issue with which the organization is principally involved. The survey's second portion began with a brief definition and several examples of archival institutions. The questions posed here assessed respondents' use of archives for purposes related to their activism. The third portion of the survey inquired about the non-profit organization's self-documentation practices, as well as the interest that archival institutions had shown in this documentation. The survey concluded with an opportunity for respondents to note questions and comments about the survey instrument itself or about the subject matter of the study.

The survey was available for a period of three weeks, from May 7-28, 2008. Invitations to participate in the survey were e-mailed to each contact in the sample population at the start of the survey period (please see Appendix A); a reminder e-mail followed two weeks into the survey period, on May 21, 2008 (please see Appendix B). Returned e-mails prompted a search for alternate organizational contacts.

FINDINGS

Historians and other scholars, genealogists, students of varying educational levels, amateur history buffs: the archival usage of these “bread and butter” populations—as well as the opinions and practices of fellow archivists—have been exhaustively covered in the archival literature. Rarely, if ever, have archival researchers given the activist community or marginalized populations of any definition the broad attention intended by this study; often, singular case studies and anecdotes are relied upon as gospel approaches to these multi-faceted communities. This study broached questions that, for many respondents, were novel and significant. Overall, as this study ventured into communities not accustomed to attention from archival researchers, the response to the survey, and the study itself, was quite positive.

Of the 499 invitations to participate in the survey sent, four were automatically returned with failed e-mail addresses. Alternate e-mail contacts were sought for those particular organizations, and four additional invitation e-mails were successfully sent. Thus, the possible number of respondents to the survey is the full roster of 499 organizational contacts.

108 respondents began the survey, although only 84 respondents completed it. Incomplete responses to the survey were removed; of the 24 respondents who began, but did not complete the survey, all but four dropped out in the first section of

demographic questions. The response rate, based on the 84 complete surveys, was thus roughly 17%. A low response rate was expected, although it was hoped that the large sample size would counterbalance this likelihood. Based on previous research, however, it does appear that 17% is an acceptable rate of return for an online survey of this nature. Mark A. Hager et al report that surveys of organizations often see remarkably smaller rates of return when compared to surveys of individuals, with 15% being a low, but acceptable, return rate.⁹⁴

Demographics of the Survey Respondents

The goal of the first portion of the survey was to gather basic demographic data on the survey respondents. Because activists may be involved with multiple issues and multiple organizations, participants were asked to respond to the survey on behalf of their primary or employing organization.

Respondents were first asked to indicate their position within their organization. Out of 84 respondents, 65 (77.4%) reported that they were the executive director, president, or CEO of their organization. Of the remaining 19 respondents, 18 served in some leadership capacity, as board members, as associate or assistant executive directors, or as the directors of departments within the organization. Overall, this lends credibility to the survey's results, as those employees in executive positions are likely apprised of their organization's research procedures, as well as the disposition of the organization's records.

All of the marginalized populations under study were represented by at least one respondent (see table 4). Unfortunately, the designation of "other" was chosen by

⁹⁴ Hager et al, "Response Rates for Mail Surveys of Nonprofit Organizations," 255.

the majority—37 out of 84 (44.0%)—of respondents, indicating that many organization’s mission do not fit within the clearly delineated populations or issues of the response set. All of these respondents indicated mission orientations that ranged over at least two of the given populations or issues. “Wide groups and classes of disempowered people,” “HIV/AIDS, which includes all of the above,” and “social justice” are offered as example responses. As it is not permissible or desirable to reassign these 37 responses within the response set, correlation of survey questions with this data is largely impossible.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
African American Issues	2	2.4%
Asian American Issues	1	1.2%
Human Rights	5	5.9%
Latino/a American Issues	2	2.4%
LGBTQ Issues	13	15.5%
Multicultural Issues	2	2.4%
Native American Issues	1	1.2%
Poverty / Class Issues	9	10.7%
Women’s and/or Gender Issues	12	14.3%
Other	37	44.0%
Total	84	100%

Table 4: Issues and Populations Represented by Responding Organizations

Respondents were also asked to provide details on the number of employees—full-time and part-time—serving their organization. This question was predicated upon the hypothesis that organizations with larger staffs would have the resources to enable both archival research on behalf of the organization’s mission and the maintenance of the organization’s own records, topics covered in the succeeding

two portions of the survey. GuideStar's ranges of organizational size were used as the basis of the response set for this question.

As was expected, the distribution of responses to this question tended toward smaller organizations, although organizations of all size ranges were represented (see table 5). It is perhaps fitting that smaller organizations are particularly well-represented here, as these are the local and regional organizations that are more likely to flourish and die before coming to the attention of nearby archival institutions. These may also be organizations that, with fewer resources than those of their larger fellow organizations, may not yet have considered the importance of maintaining their own documentation or the possibilities afforded by archival research.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
1-5	42	50.0%
6-10	18	21.4%
11-20	12	14.3%
21-50	4	4.8%
51-100	6	7.1%
101 or more	2	2.4%
Total	84	100%

Table 5: Number of People Employed by Responding Organizations

The longevity of an organization was also seen as a potential correlative to both an organization's engagement in archival research and the extent to which they maintain their records. The ages of the responding organizations covered a wide range, from one organization in operation for less than a year to over 30 long-running

organizations in operation for twenty or more years (see table 6). Approximately 70% of responding organizations had been in existence for ten or more years.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
Less than one	1	1.2%
1-4 years	9	10.7%
5-9 years	15	17.9%
10-19 years	27	32.1%
20 or more	32	38.1%
Total	84	100%

Table 6: Longevity of Responding Organization

Archival Research

Based on Elizabeth Yakel’s findings that even the college-educated public has difficulty in defining “archives” and “primary sources,”⁹⁵ the second portion of the survey began by establishing a working definition of archival institutions. Notably, archival institutions were defined in terms of both the academic or research archival institution, such as the New York Public Library’s Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, and community archives, such as the Lesbian Herstory Archives. The questions that followed made no distinction between differences of procedure in and perception of each type of archives, and respondents were encouraged to consider research at both types as constituting their archival experience.

With the advent of the internet, activists may avail themselves of two ways to access archival materials: in person, or, as archives mount more and more digitized collections online, via an archives’s website. This study reports that almost half of the

⁹⁵ Yakel, “Listening to Users,” 115.

84 respondents (37 organizations, or 44.0%) have used archives or archival websites in the conduct of their research. With 39 out of 84 respondents (46.4%) reporting that they have not used archives or archival websites, the number of organizations *not* using archival materials barely outweighs the number using them. The remaining eight respondents were not sure if their organization had used archival materials in its research.

With such a sizeable percentage of non-profit organizations involved in archival research, it is a wonder that more space has not been given to this user community in the archival literature. Just as the archival community publicizes and reports upon historical research conducted in its collections, it might publicize and report upon similar research undertaken by non-profit organizations—in fact, such research might prove more newsworthy. Archivists commonly express an interest in demonstrating the relevance of archival materials to the current dialogue, and such partnerships between non-profit organizations and archival repositories might serve that purpose well.

In spite of the definition offered at the beginning of portion two of the survey, one respondent wrote, “the ‘archives’ I consulted were really departmental records and the files of my predecessor in this position.” Even though this comment does give rise to some concerns over the validity of this question’s results, there seems no reason to discount them as a whole.

Respondents indicating that they used archival materials in their activism-related research were then asked about the frequency with which they had visited archives and archival websites in the previous year (see tables 7 and 8).

Survey Response	Response Count (n=37)	Percentage of Total Responses
Zero times	14	37.8%
Once	3	8.1%
2-5 times	12	32.4%
6-11 times	4	10.8%
12 or more times	4	10.8%
Total	37	99.9%

Table 7: Number of Times Visiting an Archives

Survey Response	Response Count (n=37)	Percentage of Total Responses
Zero times	3	8.1%
Once	2	5.4%
2-5 times	19	51.4%
6-11 times	5	13.5%
12 or more times	8	21.6%
Total	37	100%

Table 8: Number of Times Visiting an Archives's Website

As expected, archival website traffic is greater than in-person visits; this shows potential for the development of online resources tailored to activists. Although web access to archival materials appears to be preferred, almost two-thirds of the survey respondents indicated that they had visited an archives at least once. Therefore, archivists cannot neglect to continue to provide services and develop resources for those activists who come through their doors. Unfortunately, the design of these questions does not reveal if activists are visiting several archival institutions and websites, or if they are making repeated visits to the same institution or website.

This same group of respondents was asked their purpose in conducting research with archival materials (see table 9). While almost 90% of these 37

organizations use archival materials to conduct subject research related to their activism, the other proposed research purposes post smaller numbers. In the free response portion of the survey, one respondent wrote that s/he didn't "know how to go about researching archival material or when it might be helpful." It is possible that these lower numbers result from activists not realizing that archival materials can be used for these purposes.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=37)	Percentage of Total Responses
Conducting general subject research related to an issue or cause	33	89.2%
Researching strategies/campaigns employed by similar activist organizations whose records are held by an archival institution	11	29.7%
Researching strategies/campaigns employed by opposition activist organizations whose records are held by an archival institution	7	18.9%
Consulting the records of your own activist organization, which are already held by an archives	6	16.2%
Researching information intended to prove or dispute a legal claim	5	13.5%
Attending a public program, symposium, exhibit, etc. sponsored by an archives	9	24.3%
Other	7	18.9%

Table 9: Purpose in Conducting Research with Archival Materials

It is also intriguing that the use of archival documentation for legal purposes posts the lowest numbers, as this type of usage forms the basis of the few case studies represented in the archival literature. While such cases might attract more public attention, it seems clear that the archival community should be careful not to give

such cases an undue amount of attention, as they do not represent the information that activists need most from archival repositories.

The range of “other” responses reveals the diversity of purposes to which archival materials can be put, and suggests that archivists may need to develop multi-faceted reference and research strategies to keep up with the needs of activists. Responses might be classed under either project or public program planning, but the swath of information they cover is wide, from “demographic research” and “legal/legislative history” research to “gathering background research for a community based research project” and “researching artists whose work has an activist bent.”

Alternately, inquiries were made to pinpoint the reasons why the other group of 39 respondents chose not to conduct activist-related research. Lack of time proved to be the leading reason precluding archival research (see table 10). As an interesting point of comparison, three of the eight “other” responses suggested that respondents simply hadn’t thought of using archival resources. It might be concluded, then, that those 22 strapped-for-time respondents know of archives and archival materials that might be of use to their activist work and do not question the utility of archives for activist research.

Three statements from the response set—“I didn’t think the archives would have materials related to my activism,” “I didn’t realize I would be permitted to use the archives,” and “I prefer to conduct my research online, and archives do not have enough materials available online to make a visit to their website worthwhile”—assess the extent to which archivists have embraced activists as a user community and

the barriers that have been erected around the usage of archival materials. The results posted for these statements paint a picture of an archival profession that has not been particularly welcoming to the activist community or responsive to their research needs. As a corrective to this, archivists may wish to consider developing resources—study guides, digital collections, and so on—and publicity campaigns targeted specifically at activist organizations.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=39)	Percentage of Total Responses
I didn't think the archives would have materials related to my activism	14	35.9%
I didn't have time to consult archival materials	22	56.4%
I didn't realize I would be permitted to use the archives	5	12.8%
I prefer to conduct my research online, and archives do not have enough materials available online to make a visit to their website worthwhile	9	23.1%
The archives that holds the materials I need is located far away from me, and I lack the resources to travel to it	1	2.6%
Other	8	20.5%

Table 10: Reasons Archival Research is Not Pursued

To conclude this section of the survey, all respondents were asked what archivists could do to better serve their organizations' needs. Given current trends in access to archival materials, it should come as no surprise that the greatest number of requests were for increased digitization of materials relevant to these activists' research needs. Local investigation will be required to discover what those specific research needs might be and what materials best fill them. Further, archivists who do

undertake this local investigation must be encouraged to share their results with the greater archival community as some commonalities of topic and patterns of usage are likely to be found.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
Provide online guides to archival materials related to your activism	63	75.0%
Provide online access to digitized archival materials related to your activism	69	82.1%
Provide online or paper guidelines for developing and maintaining your organization's records	44	52.4%
Offer in-person consultation or group workshops on developing and maintaining your organization's records	41	48.8%
Develop programming (exhibits, lectures, etc.) in collaboration with local non-profits and activist groups	39	46.4%
Provide information about donating your organization's records to an archival institution	42	50.0%
Host open houses or guided tours to acquaint you with archival institutions	19	22.6%
Other	2	2.4%

Table 11: Suggested Improvements to Archival Services

Curiously, while half the responding organizations requested information on donating their materials to archival institutions, a much smaller percentage displayed an interest in becoming acquainted with those same archival institutions through an on-site visit. While this does correspond well with the interest in online access to materials, this result raises another concern. The on-site visit is, of course, a staple of the archivist's donor outreach program, but it must be observed that busy employees

of non-profit organizations may not feel that they have the time to make such visits. Archivists may have to reconsider their approach when courting non-profit organizations.

Given the findings in the literature that non-profit organizations have difficulty managing the volumes of research that they compile, both during and after its use, it seems surprising that half or less than half of the respondents requested some sort of assistance from archivists in maintaining the organization's records. While it is possible that these non-profit organizations do not see this research as forming part of their records, these findings suggest the need for further research into information management among non-profit organizations. From this vantage point, a fair proportion of non-profit organizations seem competent in the management of their own records.

Organizational Documentation

Archival theory has brought archivists an understanding of the importance of documenting under-documented populations, but this theory does not always carry over to archival practice. While the preceding section of the survey focused on archival research conducted by an understudied user community, the third section of the survey approaches that same user community as potential archival donors. The aim of both sections is to assess this user community's "archival intelligence"⁹⁶ and to establish a baseline of record-keeping and research trends, all with the intent of creating a foundation upon which best practices for research services and donor relations specific to this community can be built. Ultimately, this portion of the

⁹⁶ Yakei and Torres, "AI," 52.

survey explores two points: the state of each responding organization's records and record-keeping practices and their interaction with archival institutions on behalf of those records.

To begin, respondents were asked both whether or not they maintained their organizational records (see table 12) and whether or not their organization had a designated organizational archivist (see table 13).

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
Yes	62	73.8%
No	22	26.2%
Total	84	100%

Table 12: Maintenance of Organizational Archives

Survey Response	Response Count (n=84)	Percentage of Total Responses
Yes	31	36.9%
No	53	63.1%
Total	84	100%

Table 13: Designation of Organizational Archivists

The majority of organizations report maintaining records. Only half of that number has designated an official or unofficial archivist. Given the preponderance of small organizations (between 1-20 employees) represented in these numbers, it might be expected that few organizations have the resources to support an organizational archivist, even in a part-time capacity. Yet the smaller organizations actually support the majority—27 out of 31 (87.1%)—of organizational archivists (see table 14).

Number of Staff Members	Have an Archivist (n=31)	Percentage of "Yes" Responses	Percentage by Size of Organization	Do Not Have an Archivist (n=53)	Percentage of "No" Responses	Percentage by Size of Organization
1-5 (n=42)	17	54.8%	40.5%	25	47.2%	59.5%
6-10 (n=18)	7	22.5%	38.9%	11	20.8%	61.1%
11-20 (n=12)	3	9.7%	25%	9	17%	75%
21-50 (n=4)	0	0%	0%	4	7.5%	100%
51-100 (n=6)	2	6.5%	33.3%	4	7.5%	66.7%
101 or more (n=2)	2	6.5%	100%	0	0%	0%

Table 14: Correlation between Size of Organization and Whether or Not It Has a Designated Archivist

Yet, because of the small sample size and the distribution of organizational sizes within it, no real trends can be conclusively ascertained from this data, nor can a similar trend be seen in the data comparing organizational size to whether or not the organization maintains its records. An examination of this correlation within each size bracket reveals that an average of 87.4% of organizations maintains their records. This result would seem to negate the literature's claim that a shortage of staff is often to blame for an organization's failure to maintain their records. Almost nine out of ten organizations maintain their records, proving that small organizations are just as likely as large organizations to find the wherewithal to carry out this valuable function.

The age of an organization seems to be a slight, although inconsistent, predictor of whether or not an organization maintains its own records, with organizations of ten years or older more likely to do so. These same organizations are

also more likely than their younger counterparts to have designated archivists (see tables 15 and 16). This may relate to Klaassen’s suggestion that a sense of organizational history contributes positively to the maintenance of the organization’s documentary legacy. Possessing a stronger sense of their organizational history and a desire to document their organization’s legacy, older organizations are likely to consider it more important to maintain their records.

Age of Organization	Maintain Records (n=62)	Percentage of “Yes” Responses	Percentage by Age of Organization	Do Not Maintain Records (n=22)	Percentage of “No” Responses	Percentage by Size of Organization
Less than one year (n=1)	1	1.6%	100%	0	0%	0%
1-4 years (n=9)	8	12.9%	88.9%	1	4.5%	11.1%
5-9 years (n=15)	9	14.5%	60%	6	27.3%	40%
10-19 years (n=27)	22	35.5%	81.5%	5	22.7%	18.5%
20 or more years (n=32)	22	35.5%	68.8%	10	45.5%	31.2%

Table 15: Correlation between the Age of the Organization and Whether or Not It Has an Archives

Age of Organization	Have an Archivist (n=31)	Percentage of “Yes” Responses	Percentage by Size of Organization	Do Not Have an Archivist (n=53)	Percentage of “No” Responses	Percentage by Size of Organization
Less than one year (n=1)	0	0%	0%	1	1.9%	100%
1-4 years (n=9)	1	3.2%	11.1%	8	15.1%	88.9%
5-9 years (n=15)	5	16.1%	33.3%	10	18.9%	66.7%
10-19 years (n=27)	12	38.7%	44.4%	15	28.3%	55.6%
20 or more years (n=32)	13	41.9%	40.6%	19	35.8%	59.4%

Table 16: Correlation between the Age of the Organization and Whether or Not It Has an Archivist

Notably, only one organization of less than five years of age reported having a designated archivist. A telling comment was offered by one respondent in the free response portion of the survey. S/he wrote, “We are a very young organization (incorporated less than three years). . . . I feel a bit presumptuous even thinking about [maintaining our records] now given our youth and the fact that we are not firmly established yet as a viable entity. If we can get past the five year mark then I might begin to think otherwise.” These findings highlight a major point for concern: if organizations aren’t beginning to think about their organizational records until they are five, ten, or even twenty years old, will the documentation of the organization’s early years be lost?

Countering this concern, eight out of nine organizations (88.9%) between the ages of one and four years report maintaining their records. A possible explanation might be that archivists have recently begun to increase their efforts to contact and instruct organizations in the methods of record-keeping; younger organizations, for a variety of reasons, might likely be selected as the beneficiaries of such a partnership. At the same time, it has been shown that these younger organizations are maintaining their records largely without the assistance of a designated organizational archivist. With time and staff at a premium in these small organizations, it is no wonder that organizational documentation may be a collective effort. Archivists interested in providing records management workshops or documentation to non-profit organizations will have to tailor their approach to this distributed form of organizational record management.

Building on the findings of the previous section of the survey, this study asks if a familiarity with institutional archives is of benefit to these nonprofit organizations as they establish and maintain their own records. There is, at least within the current respondent pool, little reason to suspect that an organization's research use of archives will necessarily lead to an organization's decision to maintain their official records (see table 17).

Survey Response (n=84)	Maintain Records (n=62)	Percentage of "Yes" Responses	Percentage by Survey Response	Do Not Maintain Records (n=22)	Percentage of "No" Responses	Percentage by Survey Response
Used archives or archives's websites (n=37)	27	43.5%	73%	10	45.4%	27%
Haven't used archives or archives's websites (n=39)	31	50%	79.5%	8	36.3%	36.4%
Not sure (n=8)	4	6.5%	50%	4	18.2%	50%

Table 17: Correlation between the Use of Archives and Archives's Websites and Whether or Not an Organization Maintains Their Official Records

One respondent spoke to this premise quite well in the free response section, writing that his or her organization "do[es] not have the time or resources (the staff) to do more than basic archiving." This respondent had not performed any activism-related research in archives, but, obviously, worked for an organization that did maintain at least some of their records. While her or his response cannot be taken as true for all respondents, it does repeat the findings in the literature that the availability

of resources (human and financial) are better indicators of an organization's ability to establish an in-house archives for their records.

The intent of the following question was to ascertain the extent of each organization's record-keeping practices. This question was asked of the 62 respondents who indicated that their organization maintained its records. Table 18 presents the detailed responses to this question; selections left blank were assumed to indicate a "no" response—in other words, the organization does not maintain these materials. On the whole, the range of document types post high numbers—nine out of 14 (excluding the "other" category) indicate retention rates of over 70%—in terms of whether or not they are maintained as part of these organizations' records, indicating that these organizations have excellent instincts in discerning archival material.

Among those few document types with low maintenance rates, the lack of documentation of older versions of website or blog content should be worrisome to archivists. While it is possible that organizations have simply not thought about archiving this content in some way, a possible truth is that organizations have not found a satisfactory way to preserve their digital content. This is one area in particular where archivists could be of service. It may also be of concern that only slightly more than half of these organizations maintain their subject and research files, as these files would necessarily provide researchers with much needed context for these organization's activities.

"Other" responses include organizational evaluation reports; materials on legal cases; media by and about the population(s) served by the organization;

photographs of organizational activities; and oral histories of members of the population(s) served by the organization.

Type of Archival Material	Survey Response: Collected (n=62)	Percentage of “Yes” Responses	Survey Response: Not Collected (n=62)	Percentage of “No” Responses
Organizational correspondence	54	87.1%	8	12.9%
Subject or research files	35	56.5%	27	43.5%
Membership records or documentation of member participation	45	72.6%	17	27.4%
Patient files or files about individuals served by your organization	15	24.2%	47	75.8%
Personnel files	44	71%	18	29%
Ephemeral materials relating to organizational events	50	80.6%	12	19.4%
Documents relating to organizational governance	59	95.2%	3	4.8%
Organizational meeting minutes	59	95.2%	3	4.8%
Financial records	59	95.2%	3	4.8%
Organization publications	59	95.2%	3	4.8%
Older versions of organizational website or blog content	16	25.8%	46	74.2%
Copies of media coverage about the organization	59	95.2%	3	4.8%
Information on organizations with similar missions	27	43.5%	35	56.5%
Information on organizations with opposing missions	12	19.4%	50	80.6%
Other	5	8.1%	57	91.9%

Table 18: Materials Maintained within Organizational Records

The state of each responding organization’s records could not be assessed without some inquiry into the 22 organizations reporting that they do not maintain their organizational records. These respondents were asked to offer reasons why their organization might have made this decision. The wording of this question required particular tact, as the intent was not to make these organizations feel they had made a “bad” decision. All 22 respondents of these organizations completed the question (see table 19).

Survey Response	Response Count (n=22)	Percentage of Total Responses
We didn’t realize anyone would use them in their research or find them valuable.	7	31.8%
We didn’t realize an archives would collect them.	3	13.6%
We didn’t have the staff time or resources to devote to archiving the organization’s records.	21	95.5%
We have concerns about maintaining the privacy of individuals documented in the records.	8	36.4%
Other	2	9.1%

Table 19: Reasons Organizational Records Were Not Maintained

Not surprisingly, 21 out of 22 respondents (95.5%) indicated that a lack of resources contributed to their inability to maintain their organizational records. Even among organizations that do maintain their organizational records, there were expressions of difficulty due to a lack of staff time and financial resources. As one respondent wrote, “mainly, we do not have the time or resources (the staff) to do more than basic archiving. We wish that we did have more time and resources to do so.”

These results should serve as a clarion call to archivists to assist non-profit organizations, particularly fledgling ones, in the development of record-keeping plans and in encouraging donations of these records before this important documentation disappears. There should also be concern that 10 out of 22 respondents (45.5%) do not seem to recognize the research value of their documentation, selecting either “we didn’t realize anyone would use them in their research or find them valuable” or “we didn’t realize an archives would collect them.” As one respondent wrote in the “other” response section, “we need assistance in thinking through this process, why it is important and how it is useful to our organization and the public, community at large.” Archivists must walk a fine line between providing these non-profit organizations with more information than they can possibly use and demonstrating to them the value of their documentation, both to their future progress and to the work of researchers and fellow activists.

Discussion of organizational interaction with archival institutions on behalf of their records begins with the 62 organizations reporting that they do maintain their organizational records. Perhaps echoing the sentiments of many of these organizations, one respondent wrote that her/his small, rural organization “[hasn’t] seen the need for an archive relationship.” This comment certainly supports the finding that 48 out of 61 organizations (78.7%; one respondent declined to answer this question) have not contacted an archival institution about donating their records. Certainly, if organizations struggle to maintain their records, it is highly unlikely that they would be ready to take the next step in the continued preservation of those records. Clearly, the burden of initial contact falls squarely on the shoulders of the

archival community. Archivists are compelled to make the case that a relationship with an archives is a worthwhile venture.

Unfortunately, it appears that archivists are not making these initial contacts. 48 out of 62 respondents (77.4%) report that their organization has not been contacted by an archival institution with the intent of soliciting a donation. Such a finding is regrettable and indicates room for improvement on the part of archivists. Multiple factors may account for this lack of aggressive collection development. From a practical standpoint, institutional archivists are typically responsible for a diverse slate of duties and can have limited time to research and solicit new donations of materials. At the same time, the fairly recent exhortations to collect the materials of marginalized populations found in the archival literature may not yet have had adequate time to become an integral part of archival practice. Finally, archives, particularly those responsive to higher administrative bodies, may shy away from collecting controversial materials, as much of this documentation may be believed to be. One respondent commented,

We had very extensive archival material about the early days of AIDS activism, and for many years were unable to find an archive that was willing to take it. The LGBT community center in Philadelphia has now taken over much of this. I don't know how much of a general problem it is, whether it is related to AIDS, lack of interest in LGBT archives, or what, but we experienced significant difficulty in this area.

It is significant to note that this documentation has been taken in by a community archives, rather than an archives affiliated with an academic or similar institution. As the literature shows, institutional archives are often subject to internal pressures that effectively prevent the collection of controversial materials; community archives, administered independently, are largely free from such pressures.

A hypothesis advanced above speculated that the high incidence of record-keeping among young organizations (approximately 89%) may be due to a new impetus among institutional archives and archivists to cultivate relationships with these organizations. The correlation between the age of an organization and whether or not it has been contacted by an archival institution is explored below (see table 20). The data here suggest that the earlier assumption is false, as none of the organizations between one and four years of age can definitively report having been contacted by an archival institution.

Age of Organization	Contacted by an Archives (n=12)	Percentage of "Yes" Responses	Not Contacted by an Archives (n=48)	Percentage of "No" Responses	Not Sure if Contacted by an Archives (n=2)	Percentage of "Not Sure" Responses
Less than one year (n=1)	1	8.3%	0	0.0%	0	0%
1-4 years (n=9)	0	0.0%	7	14.6%	1	50%
5-9 years (n=15)	1	8.3%	8	16.7%	0	0%
10-19 years (n=27)	4	33.3%	18	37.5%	0	0%
20 or more years (n=32)	6	50.0%	15	31.3%	1	50.0%

Table 20: Correlation between the Age of an Organization and Whether or Not It Has Been Contacted by an Archives

Simply knowing that archivists have considerable ground to make up in reaching out to these organizations is not enough. A comprehensive appreciation of the factors these organizations are likely to take into consideration as they decide where to place their records will assist archivists in developing tailored collecting

strategies. Of those organizations reporting that they maintained their records, respondents were asked which factors would be of importance in selecting an archival institution to receive their records (see table 21).

There is a significant preference among these organizations to work with archival institutions and archivists of shared viewpoints. This desire for sympathy may be explained by one respondent's comment that, "it would be important to know that the archives would be careful about how our records might accessed by people with opposing missions to ours." Archivists should remember that the actions of non-profit organizations, and activists in general, can be controversial and can generate communities of vociferous, if not threatening, opponents. For the sake of the safety of those donating their organizational records, archivists must establish policies aimed at balancing both the public's right to access—remember that approximately 19% of organizations conducting archival research were studying the strategies and campaigns of opposition groups—and the donors' rights to privacy. Organizations may feel that sympathetic archivists may be more likely to ensure that proper care is taken with this serious issue.

Proximity to the archival institution does not appear to be a factor for responding organizations in choosing where to place their records. Such a finding seems curious, as it had been assumed that organizations would want easy access to their non-current records. However, of those organizations using archival materials in their research, it was previously reported that only approximately 16% refer to their own records. This is perhaps because non-profit institutions are so focused on their

daily work—“the present fire,” according to one respondent—that they have little time to conduct research in their non-current records.

Survey Response	Response Count (n=62)	Percentage of Total Responses
The proximity of the archives to your organizational headquarters	22	35.5%
The ideological stance of archivist(s) at the archives	39	62.9%
The similarity between your organization’s mission and the archives’s mission	42	67.7%
The amount of public programming and other public outreach the archives does	15	24.2%
The collections that the archives holds that are related to yours	26	41.9%
The reputation or prestige of the archives	29	46.8%
The extent to which an archives will promote the use of your organization’s records to researchers and visitors to the archives	28	45.2%
The amount of resources and time the archives will be able to dedicate to preserving and caring for your records	28	45.2%
We are not likely to donate our organizational records to an archives	14	22.6%
Other	2	3.2%

Table 21: Factors Influencing the Choice of Archives

14 out of 62 respondents (22.6%) report that their organization would not consider donating their records to any archival institution. “We would not feel comfortable with our documents in any other hands except ours,” one respondent wrote. This reluctance may be tied to the desire to place organizational records in a sympathetic archival institution. Organizations inclined to do so may have difficulty

canvassing the archival landscape in search of a suitable home, which should prompt archivists to increase their efforts to reach out to non-profit organizations. Indeed, one of the “other” responses stated that the respondent’s organization “need[s] assistance in thinking through this process, why it is important and how it is useful to our organization and the public community at large.” What seems initially to be reticence to place an organization’s records in an archival institution may simply conceal over-cautiousness and a lack of knowledge about archival practice, both of which may be overcome by conscientious archivists.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

While this study appeared to produce very good results, some flaws in the methodology and survey must be accounted for, in the hope that future studies may correct these mistakes.

Because of time constraints, a pilot study was not conducted to assess the effectiveness of the survey questions. Of particular significance, the wording of question three (see appendix C), which asked respondents to report how many employees served their organization, was found to be problematic, as it excluded all-volunteer organizations. The question's intent, which was simply to discover the size of the core group of organization members—paid employees or otherwise—who might be available to perform archival research or to maintain the organization's records, was not adequately conveyed by the question's wording. Although three survey respondents commented upon this error, further review of these organizations' websites found no mention that these organizations operated on an all-volunteer basis. Of the 24 respondents who began, but did not complete, the survey, only three respondents (12.5%) dropped out at this particular question. This error was certainly unfortunate, but it does not appear to have seriously crippled the validity of the survey.

As the sample was constructed around non-profit organizations responsive to the needs of a limited number of specific communities, the representativeness of the

sample cannot be vouched for. Although random sampling techniques were stringently applied, the final sample was often imperfect when compared with national statistics on 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations.

Additionally, it should be recalled that, because the survey was to be administered online, organizations not possessing up-to-date websites or e-mail contact information were automatically excluded from the sample. While a variety of search strategies were employed to locate the online presence of each organization, no alternate attempts—for instance, by phone or mail—were made to contact those organizations unreachable online. It was rare to discover an organization that did not have a web presence in some form, but this requirement obviously limited the sample to those organizations with the means to establish and maintain a web presence and Internet access for its members or employees.

Finally, the survey did not make use of any suggested measures to counteract the typically low response rate of e-mail surveys, largely because none of the possible measures were deemed satisfactory. In a survey of nonprofit organizations, Hager et al. found a monetary incentive to be ineffective in bringing about higher return rates.⁹⁷ Alternatively, while preliminary contact with a sample before the administration of a survey has been found to improve return rates,⁹⁸ such contact was ultimately decided against, out of concern for overburdening busy non-profit executives with communications about the study. Both methodological options might still, however, be used to good effect in future similar studies.

⁹⁷ Hager et al, 264.

⁹⁸ Mehta and Sivadas, “Comparing Response Rates and Response Content in Mail Versus Electronic Mail Surveys,” 440.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As previously suggested, the systematic study of the use of archives by and the record-keeping practices of non-profit organizations is a relatively untapped area in the archival literature. There is room, therefore, for considerable further study. Several respondents commented upon the importance of this work, which should lend impetus to the development of this area of research.

This study defined its sample frame and sample quite narrowly. Future research possibilities lie in simply broadening the definitions—for instance, in surveying individual activists rather than organizations. Archives usage and documentation practices among organizations with all manner of missions—not just those that serve marginalized populations—also call for examination.

This research failed to consider the impact of organizational income and assets upon an organization's record-keeping practices. While a guess might be ventured that those organizations with greater monetary resources would be more likely to maintain their own records—perhaps with dedicated personnel—this assumption needs to be verified through further research.

A number of questions—particularly those asking for reasons why or why not archival research was conducted or those asking why or why not organizational records were maintained—need to be correlated with similar findings from the public at large, so it can be seen if any concerns are specific to the activist community. For

instance, one might wonder if the discovery that organizations would carefully consider the mission of an archives and the ideology of the archivist before deciding where to place their papers might also prove to be true for the whole of the donor community.

As this study discovered, in-depth, qualitative interviews with the target population would aid in the development of a survey instrument, and would certainly be valuable in their own right. More specifically, it should be recalled that approximately 70% of responding organizations had been in existence for ten or more years. Archivists may wish to undertake targeted research—particularly qualitative interviews—on the research needs and record-keeping practices of young organizations to discover what challenges and barriers they face in establishing and maintaining their own organizational records.

CONCLUSION

The title of this study—“Out of the Hollinger Box and into the Streets”—is a challenge. It asks archivists to engage with marginalized populations and the organizations that serve them from street-level, from the activist’s perspective, returning activism for activism. This study suggests that part of archival activism arises from responsiveness to the archival research needs of activist organizations and concern for helping those organizations maintain their records.

This study’s conclusions point to two positives. First, a large proportion of activist organizations conduct research with archival materials, either at brick-and-mortar institutions or via those institutions’ websites. Archivists should come away with a new awareness of—and a new willingness to better serve—a user population that has been heretofore systematically overlooked, both in the archival literature and in archival practice.

Secondly, the organizations surveyed here have a definite sense of the value of their non-current records as potential research materials (less so as materials intended to inform their current and future practice). Those organizations that fail to maintain their records do so predominately because of a lack of resources, not out of a belief that their records are worthless. Yet archival institutions and activist organizations have not, on either part, taken the initiative to form what might seem like a natural partnership. The fate of this valuable documentation requires a commitment from both parties: activist organizations must begin to find the time to

consider the ideal disposition of their materials, and archival institutions must begin to demonstrate their interest in collecting and preserving such materials. This marks a symbiotic relationship: as archivists pay increased attention to the records of these organizations, organizations will develop a stronger sense of the value—and the need to preserve—their records.

Responses to this study from the surveyed organizations were very supportive. One respondent wrote, “Thank you for conducting this study. This is very important research!” Such enthusiasm suggests that activists—both individuals and organizations—are eager for interest and assistance from archivists. A second respondent e-mailed the comment that she “was surprised to learn how well-archived [her organization’s] work is and how [she] had never put much thought into archiving our materials. It certainly offered me a new perspective!” The true intent of this research project was not simply to bring forth a paper. Instead, the hope was that the survey would inspire a small group of activist organizations to consider the possibilities of archival research and to take stock of their own valuable organizational records. On that account, the study seems to have succeeded.

A number of final questions present themselves, each more debatable than conclusively answerable. While Roberts-Moore argues that institutional archives—particularly governmental archives—are the appropriate repositories for these organizational records, as they provide a necessary citizen’s counterpoint to governmental actions,⁹⁹ Greene asks,

who has the right to own this documentation—the individuals and families, or repositories within the community (often underfunded or largely invisible to

⁹⁹ Roberts-Moore, 75.

outsiders), or traditional repositories (most of which are located in historical societies and universities that are seen as ‘other’ by these communities)?¹⁰⁰

Perhaps the true question here is whether or not—and how—institutional archives and community archives can work together in mutual support of the activist community and those researching it.

Much of this documentation, as it relates to the history of under-documented populations, will be acquired by repositories with missions or charges devoted to the documentation of one or several of these populations. Mason and Zanish-Belcher note that the question of whether or not such repositories should exist is invariably raised. They believe that the question carries two meanings: on the one hand, such repositories supposedly privilege the history of one population over that of another (usually an under-documented population is being privileged over a mainstream population—e.g. the privileging of women over men). On the other hand, the question might suggest that separation of the documentation of under-documented populations is, in effect, a re-marginalization of the population.¹⁰¹ They respond to such challenges with the suggestion that such repositories “[free] us from some of the blinders of traditional collecting, encouraging us to think in new ways about how to document various groups and subcultures.”¹⁰² If nothing else, the very fact that these question can be asked proves the disparity of documentation between the mainstream and under-documented populations; they are questions with which archivists will be forced to contend until the bias in the documentary record is corrected.

¹⁰⁰ Greene, “The Messy Business of Remembering,” 98.

¹⁰¹ Mason and Zanish-Belcher, 38.

¹⁰² Mason and Zanish-Belcher, 39.

Horton warns that as archivists begin to consider the myriad ways in which identity can be enacted, and the increasing granularity with which under-documented populations might be defined, “we come close to saying that everyone has a story and every story is worth telling, with the possible corollary that every story is worth saving, too.”¹⁰³ This truth, he writes, forces a retreat back to a “macro”—as opposed to a “micro”—level of archival appraisal. Still, archivists will need to develop satisfactory ways to effectively canvass the way identity is enacted in modern society if they hope to create a worthwhile and representative record of human experience.

While it is likely that such questions—and scores of others—will have to be resolved by individual archivists and will be enacted differently in each archivist’s practice, the existence of such theoretically rich questions indicates the importance of continuing to pursue this preliminary research into under-documented populations and the activists that serve them.

The importance of the role of the archivist in securing a place for this documentation cannot be overstated. To conclude with the words of F. Gerald Ham, if the archivist holds

a limited view of what constitutes the archival record, the collections that he acquires will never hold up a mirror for mankind. And if we are not holding up that mirror, if we are not helping people understand the world they live in, and if this is not what archives is all about, then I do not know what it is we are doing that is all that important.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Horton, 31.

¹⁰⁴ Ham, 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andrews, Kenneth T. and Bob Edwards. "Advocacy Organizations in the U.S. Political Process." *Annual Review of Sociology*. 30 (2004): 479-506.
- Blanco-Rivera, Joel A. "The Forbidden Files: Creation and Use of Surveillance Files against the Independence Movement in Puerto Rico." *The American Archivist*. 68.2 (Fall-Winter 2005): 297-311.
- Boris, Elizabeth and C. Eugene Steuerle. "Scope and Dimensions of the Nonprofit Sector." *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Ed. Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. 66-88.
- Boris, Elizabeth and Rachel Mosher-Williams. "Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Assessing the Definitions, Classifications, and Data." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 27.4 (December 1998): 488-506.
- Britton, Diane F., Barbara Floyd, and Patricia A. Murphy. "Overcoming Another Obstacle: Archiving a Community's Disabled History." *Radical History Review*. 94 (Winter 2006): 213-27.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. "Consciousness-Raising: Linking Theory, Criticism, and Practice." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*. 32.1 (Winter 2002): 45-64.
- Carter, Rodney G. S. "Of Things Said and Unsaid: Power, Archival Silences, and Power in Silence." *Archivaria*. 61 (Spring 2006): 215-233.
- "Code of Ethics for Archivists," 5 February 2005. Society of American Archivists. 10 November 2008. http://archivists.org/governance/handbook/app_ethics.asp
- Colman, Gould P. "Letter in The Forum." *The American Archivist*. 36.3 (July 1973): 483-486.
- Cook, Terry. "Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives." *Archivaria*. 51 (Spring 2001): 14-35.
- . "Remembering the Future: Appraisal in Records and the Role of Archives in Constructing Social Memory." *Archives, Documentation, and Institutions of Social Memory: Essays from the Sawyer Seminar*. Eds. Francis X. Blouin, Jr. and William G. Rosenberg. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2006. 169-181

---. "What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift." *Archivaria*. 43 (Spring 1997): 17-63.

Cooper, Amy. "Issues in Native American Archives." *Collection Management*. 27.2 (2002): 43-54.

Deodato, Joseph. "Becoming Responsible Mediators: The Application of Postmodern Perspectives to Archival Arrangement and Description." *Progressive Librarian*. 27 (Summer 2006): 52-63.

Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Trans. Eric Prenowitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Duberman, Martin. "Historical Interpretation and the Politics of Evidence." *Left Out: The Politics of Exclusion: Essays: 1964-2002*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2002. 39-57.

"Exempt Purposes—Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3)." Internal Revenue Service. 22 September 2008. <http://www.irs.gov/charities/charitable/article/0,,id=175418,00.html>.

Finch, Elsie Freeman. "In the Eye of the Beholder: Archives Administration from the User's Point of View." *American Archival Studies: Readings in Theory and Practice*. Ed. Randall C. Jimerson. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2000. 417-431.

Fisher, Robert C. "Records of Dubious Research Value: Developing and Implementing Acquisition Policy for the Records of Non-Profit Organizations at Library and Archives Canada." *Archivaria*. 62 (Fall 2006): 47-75.

Freedman, Estelle B. "'The Burning of Letters Continues': Elusive Identities and the Historical Construction of Sexuality." *Modern American Queer History*. Ed. Allida M. Black. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2001. 51-68.

Grabowski, John J. "Fragments or Components: Theme Collections in a Local Setting." *The American Archivist*. 48.3 (Summer 1985): 304-314.

Greene, Mark A. "The Messy Business of Remembering: History, Memory, and Archives." *Archival Issues*. 28.2 (2003-2004): 95-103.

"GuideStar Launches Data Services." 29 July 2002. GuideStar USA, Inc. 17 September 2008. <http://www.guidestar.org/about/press/072902.jsp>.

Hagan, William T. "Archival Captive—The American Indian." *The American Archivist*. 41.2 (1978): 135-142.

Hager, Mark A., Sarah Wilson, Thomas H. Pollak, and Patrick Michael Rooney. "Response Rates for Mail Surveys of Nonprofit Organizations: A Review and

Empirical Test.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 32.2 (June 2003): 252-267.

Ham, F. Gerald. “The Archival Edge.” *The American Archivist*. 38.1 (January 1975): 5-13.

Harris, Verne. “The Archival Sliver: Power, Memory, and Archives in South Africa.” *Archival Science*. 2 (2002): 63-86.

---. “Archives, Politics, and Justice.” *Political Pressure and the Archival Record*. Eds. Margaret Procter, Michael Cook, and Caroline Williams. Chicago: The Society of American Archivists, 2005. 173-182.

Herrada, Julie. “Collecting Anarchy: Continuing the Legacy of the Joseph A. Labadie Collection.” *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*. 8.2 (Fall 2007): 125-132.

Hodgkinson, Virginia A. “Mapping the Non-profit Sector in the United States: Implications for Research.” *Voluntas*. 1.2 (November 1990): 6-32.

Horton, Robert. “Cultivating Our Garden: Archives, Community, and Documentation.” *Archival Issues*. 26.1 (2001): 27-40.

“IRS Activity Codes.” 2008. National Center for Charitable Statistics. 23 September 2008. <http://nccs.urban.org/classification/irsactivity.cfm>.

Jenkins, J. Craig. “Nonprofit Organizations and Political Advocacy.” *The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook*. Eds. Walter W. Powell and Richard Steinberg. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006. 307-332.

Jenkinson, Hilary. *A Manual of Archive Administration*. 2nd ed. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co., Ltd., 1966.

Jimerson, Randall C. “Archives for All: Professional Responsibility and Social Justice.” *The American Archivist*. 70.2 (Fall-Winter 2007): 252-281.

Kaplan, Elisabeth. “We Are What We Collect, We Collect What We Are: Archives and the Construction of Identity.” *The American Archivist*. 63.1 (Spring-Summer 2000): 126-151.

Keough, Brian. “Documenting Diversity: Developing Special Collections of Underdocumented Groups.” *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*. 26.3 (Autumn 2002): 241-251.

- Keough, Brian and Amy C. Schindler. "Thinking Globally, Acting Locally: Documenting Environmental Activism in New York State." *Archival Issues*. 28.2 (2003-2004): 121-135.
- Klaassen, David J. "The Archival Intersection: Cooperation between Collecting Repositories and Nonprofit Organizations." *The Midwestern Archivist*. 15.1 (1990): 25-38.
- Kreneck, Thomas H. "Documenting a Mexican American Community: The Houston Example." *The American Archivist*. 48.3 (Summer 1985): 272-285.
- Krizack, Joan D. "Preserving the History of Diversity: One University's Efforts to Make Boston's History More Inclusive." *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage*. 8.2 (Fall 2007): 125-132.
- Lockwood, Elizabeth. "'Imponderable Matters': The Influence of New Trends in History on Appraisal at the National Archives." *The American Archivist*. 53.3 (Summer 1990): 394-405.
- Lofland, John. *Social Movement Organizations: Guide to Research on Insurgent Realities*. New York City: Aldine de Gruyter, 1996.
- Mason, Kären M. and Tanya Zanish-Belcher. "A Room of One's Own: Women's Archives in the Year 2000." *Archival Issues*. 24.1 (1999): 37-54.
- Mayer, Dale C. "The New Social History: Implications for Archivists." *The American Archivist*. 48.4 (Fall 1985): 388-399.
- Mehta, Raj and Eugene Sivadas. "Comparing Response Rates and Response Content in Mail Versus Electronic Mail Surveys." *The Journal of the Market Research Society*. 37.4 (October 1995): 429-440.
- Montgomery, Bruce P. "Archiving Human Rights: The Records of Amnesty International USA." *Archivaria*. 39 (Spring 1995): 108-131.
- Neal, Kathryn M. "Cultivating Diversity: The Donor Connection." *Collection Management*. 27.2 (2002): 33-42.
- Quinn, Patrick. "The Archivist as Activist." *Georgia Archives*. 5.1 (Winter 1977): 25-35.
- Roberts-Moore, Judith. "Establishing Recognition of Past Injustices: Uses of Archival Records in Documenting the Experience of Japanese Canadians During the Second World War." *Archivaria*. 53 (Spring 2002): 64-75.

“SAA Leader List, Sections, and Roundtables.” Society of American Archivists. 14 March 2008. http://saa.archivists.org/Scripts/4Disapi.dll/4DCGI/committees/Listing.html?Action=List_Committees&CommWGStatus=Roundtables.

Sahli, Nancy. “Commentary on ‘Decolonizing the Body: Kinship and the Nation.’” *The American Archivist*. 57.1 (Winter 1994): 100-104.

Schellenberg, T.R. *The Management of Archives*. New York City: Columbia University Press, 1965.

---. *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Stearns, Peter N. “The New Social History: An Overview.” *Ordinary People and Everyday Life: Perspectives on the New Social History*. Eds. James B. Gardner and George Rollie Adams. Nashville, TN: The American Association for State and Local History, 1983. 3-21.

Stoecker, Randy. “The Research Practices and Needs of Non-Profit Organizations in an Urban Center.” *The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*. 34.4 (December 2007): 97-119.

Strobel, Margaret. “Getting to the Source: Becoming a Historian, Being an Activist, and Thinking Archivaly: Documents and Memory as Sources.” *The Journal of Women’s History*. 11.1 (Spring 1999): 181-192.

Ulrich, Laurel Thatcher. “Of Pens and Needles: Sources in Early American Women’s History.” *The Journal of American History*. 77.1 (June 1990): 200-207.

Weinstein, Allen. “Remarks by Professor Allen Weinstein upon Being Sworn in as the Ninth Archivist of the United States,” 7 March 2005. National Archives and Records Administration. 6 July 2008. <http://www.archives.gov/about/speeches/03-07-05.html>.

Wertheimer, Jack, Debra Bernhardt, and Julie Miller. “Toward the Documentation of Conservative Judaism.” *The American Archivist*. 57.2 (Spring 1994): 374-379.

Williams, Heather Andrea. *Self-Taught: African American Education in Slavery and Freedom*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.

Wurl, Joel. “Ethnicity as Provenance: In Search of Values and Principles for Documenting the Immigrant Experience.” *Archival Issues*. 29.1 (2005): 65-76.

Yakel, Elizabeth. “Listening to Users.” *Archival Issues*. 26.2 (2002): 111-127.

Yakel, Elizabeth and Deborah A. Torres. “AI: Archival Intelligence and User

Expertise.” *The American Archivist*. 66.1 (Spring-Summer 2003): 51-78.

Zinn, Howard. “Secrecy, Archives, and the Public Interest.” *The Zinn Reader: Writings on Disobedience and Democracy*. New York City: Seven Stories Press, 1997. 516-528.

APPENDIX A: Initial Invitation to Participate in Survey

Hello,

My name is Amy McDonald and I am a candidate for the degree of Master of Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I'd like to ask for your participation, on behalf of the non-profit organization you represent, in a brief online survey. Your responses will be used as part of my master's paper study, titled "Out of the Hollinger Box and into the Streets: Activists, Archives, and Under-Documented Populations," which aims to assess both the familiarity of the activist/non-profit community with institutional archives and the extent to which activist/non-profit groups maintain documentation of their work.

This is not simply an academic pursuit for me. I began library school with the express intent of blending my interest in archives with my own activism. As an archivist, I hope to work closely with the activist/non-profit community to document the processes of social, political, and economic change that have shaped and continue to shape this country.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may end your participation without consequence at any time. You will not be asked to provide any sensitive or identifying information. The online survey should take about 15-20 minutes to complete, and will not require any follow-up participation from you.

The online survey will remain open for a period of three weeks. If you agree to participate in this study, please complete the survey by May __, 2008.

A reminder e-mail will follow halfway through the survey period, on April __, 2008. If you would prefer not to receive this reminder e-mail, please contact me at the e-mail address below.

The survey may be accessed at http://_____.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey or my research topic, I encourage you to contact me at either 919-345-9401 or amy_mcdonald@unc.edu. My advisor, Kathy Wisser, is also available to discuss this survey or research project; she can be reached at kwisser@unc.edu.

This research study has been approved by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Institutional Review Board (IRB #08-0722). You are encouraged to contact the board (919-966-3113 or IRB_subjects@unc.edu) at any time if you have any questions about this study or about your rights as a survey participant.

Regardless of whether or not you choose to participate in this study, I would be happy to send you an electronic copy of this research paper upon its completion in July 2008. Please contact me to request a copy.

Thank you for your time and support,

Amy McDonald
MSLS Candidate, May 2008
School of Information and Library Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

APPENDIX B: Reminder Invitation to Participate in Survey

Hello,

A week and half ago, I sent you an e-mail invitation to participate in an online survey, "Out of the Hollinger Box and into the Streets: Activists, Archives, and Under-Documented Populations," which I am conducting as part of my research for my master's paper at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's School of Information and Library Science.

If you are interested in participating, but have not yet done so, the online survey will remain open for another week and a half, until May ____, 2008.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary, and you may end your participation without consequence at any time. You will not be asked to provide any sensitive or identifying information. The online survey should take about 15-20 minutes to complete, and will not require any follow-up participation from you.

The survey may be accessed at http://_____.

If you have already completed this survey, thank you for your participation and please pardon this e-mail. Because the survey is administered anonymously, I am unable to track survey respondents.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey or my research topic, I encourage you to contact me at either 919-345-9401 or amy_mcdonald@unc.edu. My advisor, Kathy Wisser, is also available to discuss this survey or research project; she can be reached at kwisser@unc.edu.

This research study has been approved by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Institutional Review Board (IRB # 08-0722). You are encouraged to contact the board (919-966-3113 or IRB_subjects@unc.edu) at any time if you have any questions about this study or about your rights as a survey participant.

Regardless of whether or not you choose to participate in this study, I would be happy to send you an electronic copy of this research paper upon its completion in July 2008. Please contact me to request a copy.

Thank you for your time and support,

Amy McDonald
MSLS Candidate, May 2008
School of Information and Library Science
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

APPENDIX C: Online Survey

Welcome!

My name is Amy McDonald and I am a candidate for the degree of Master of Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Your responses to the following survey will provide the basis for my master's paper, titled "Out of the Hollinger Box and into the Streets: Activists, Archives, and Documenting the Under-documented." My research will explore two areas:

- 1) the extent to which activists use archival materials in their work and research
- 2) the extent to which activist organizations maintain documentation of their activities

Although you may be involved with several activist groups promoting several causes, you are being asked to participate in this study as a representative of the non-profit organization that you work for.

If you have any questions or comments about the survey or my research topic, I encourage you to contact me at either 919-345-9401 or amy_mcdonald@unc.edu. My advisor, Kathy Wisser, is also available to discuss this survey or research project; she can be reached at kwisser@unc.edu.

[next screen]

Survey Participant Consent Agreement

You are being asked to take part in a research study. Your participation in the study is completely voluntary. You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Details about this study are discussed below. Please read the following carefully, so that you can make an informed choice about whether or not to participate in this study.

All research on human volunteers is reviewed by a committee that works to protect your rights and welfare. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject you may contact, anonymously if you wish, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Institutional Review Board at 919-966-3113 or IRB_subjects@unc.edu.

- This online survey is estimated to take between 15-20 minutes and includes a total of 17 multiple choice questions.
- There will be no follow-up in response to your participation in the survey.
- You will not receive anything for taking part in this study.
- There are no known risks involved in participating in this study.
- The survey will not ask you for any private or identifying information. Your survey results will be recorded anonymously.

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the statement below:

“I have read the information provided above. I have had the opportunity to ask all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.”

I agree

I disagree

[next screen]

Part 1: Basic Information

1. What designation most closely matches your role or title in your organization?

- Executive Director / President / CEO
- Financial Administrator
- Development Officer / Fundraiser / Events Planner
- Publicist / Communications Officer
- Lead Project Coordinator / Organizer
- Program Assistant
- Volunteer
- Board Member
- Other: _____

2. What cause is your organization principally active in? (please select **one**)

- African American Issues
- Asian American Issues
- Human Rights
- Latino/a American Issues
- LGBTQ Issues
- Multicultural Issues
- Native American Issues
- Poverty / Class Issues
- Women's and/or Gender Issues
- Other: _____

3. How many staff members (full-time and part-time) does your organization employ?

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-20
- 21-50
- 51-100
- 101 or more

4. How long has your organization been in existence?

- Less than a year
- 1-4 years
- 5-9 years
- 10-19 years
- 20 or more years
- Not sure

[next screen]

Part 2: At the Archives

For the purpose of the remainder of this survey, I should take a moment to define an “archives.” Professional archivists have defined an archives as “an organization that collects the records of individuals, families, or other organizations.” An archives might be affiliated with a university, corporate, or public library (for instance, the Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture at the New York Public Library), or they might be independently-owned and managed (for example, the Lesbian Herstory Archives). Also, with the growing popularity of the web, many archival institutions have established websites, many of which present digitized collections of archival documents.

[next screen]

5. Have you, in the course of conducting research for your activism, used the materials available at an archives or on an archives's website?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

6. How many times have you visited an archives in the past twelve months (for reasons related to your activism)?

- Zero times

- Once
- 2-5 times
- 6-11 times
- 12 or more times

7. How many times have you visited an archives's website in the past twelve months (for reasons related to your activism)?

- Zero times
- Once
- 2-5 times
- 6-11 times
- 12 or more times

8. What was your purpose in visiting the archives and/or the archives's website? (please select all that apply)

- Conducting general subject research related to an issue or cause
- Researching strategies/campaigns employed by similar activist organizations whose records are held by an archival institution
- Researching strategies/campaigns employed by opposition activist organizations whose records are held by an archival institution
- Consulting the records of your own activist organization, which are already held by an archives
- Researching information intended to prove or dispute a legal claim
- Attending a public program, symposium, exhibit, etc. sponsored by an archives
- Other: _____

9. Why did you choose not to pursue archival research related to your activism? (please select all that apply)

- I didn't think the archives would have materials related to my activism
- I didn't have time to consult archival materials
- I didn't realize I would be permitted to use the archives
- I prefer to conduct my research online, and archives do not have enough materials available online to make a visit to their website worthwhile
- The archives that holds the materials I need is located far away from me, and I lack the resources to travel to it
- Other: _____

10. What could archivists and archives do to better serve your needs as an activist? (please select all that apply)

- Provide online guides to archival materials related to your activism

- Provide online access to digitized archival materials related to your activism
- Provide online or paper guidelines for developing and maintaining your organization's records
- Offer in-person consultation or group workshops on developing and maintaining your organization's records
- Develop programming (exhibits, lectures, etc.) in collaboration with local non-profits and activist groups
- Provide information about donating your organization's records to an archival institution
- Host open houses or guided tours to acquaint you with archival institutions
- Other: _____

[next screen]

Part 3: Your Organizational Archives

11. Does your organization have an organizational historian or archivist (official or unofficial)?

- Yes
- No

12. Does your organization maintain an organizational archives or some sort of centralized documentation of your past activities?

- Yes
- No

13. What types of documentation does your organization keep? (please select all that apply)

- Organizational correspondence (electronic or paper)
- Subject or research files
- Membership records or documentation of member participation
- Patient files or files about individuals served by your organization
- Personnel files
- Ephemeral materials relating to organizational events (flyers, invitations, programs, etc.)
- Documents relating to organizational governance (by-laws, constitutions, policy statements, etc.)
- Organizational meeting minutes
- Financial records
- Organization publications (newsletters, reports, etc.)

- Older versions of organizational website or blog content
- Copies of media coverage about the organization (newspaper clippings, TV or radio coverage, etc.)
- Information on organizations with similar missions
- Information on organizations with opposing missions
- Other: _____

14. Has your organization contacted an archives (or multiple archives) about donating your organization's records?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

15. Has an institutional archives (or multiple archives) contacted your organization about donating your organization's records?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

16. What factors would your organization consider in selecting an archives to donate your organization's records to? (please select all that apply)

- The proximity of the archives to your organizational headquarters
- Ideological stance of archivist(s) at the archives
- The similarity between your organization's mission and the archives's mission
- The amount of public programming and other public outreach the archives does
- The collections that the archives holds that are related to yours
- The reputation or prestige of the archives
- The extent to which an archives will promote the use of your organization's records to researchers and visitors to the archives
- The amount of resources and time the archives will be able to dedicate to preserving and caring for your records
- We are not likely to donate our organizational records to an archives
- Other: _____

17. What factors have contributed to your organization's decision not to maintain some or all of its records? (please select all that apply)

- We didn't realize anyone would use them in their research or find them valuable.
- We didn't realize an archives would collect them.

- We didn't have the staff time or resources to devote to archiving the organization's records.
- We have concerns about maintaining the privacy of individuals documented in the records.
- Other: _____

Part 4: Conclusion

If you would like to make any additional comments about your experience with institutional archives, documenting your organization's history, or this research project, please feel free to do so in the space provided below.

[text field]

[next screen]

This concludes your participation in the survey for "Out of the Hollinger Box and into the Streets: Activists, Archives, and Documenting the Under-documented." Your responses have been recorded and you may now close your browser.

Thank you so much for your participation!

