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Fruits of Their Labors Digital Collection: A Case Study

Elizabeth Smart
Kristi Young

ABSTRACT

University folklore archives are expanding collections through cultural documentation projects run by students and community members. These new collections are a rich source of potential digital content. Bringing these collections online requires keeping the research audience in mind with thoughtful processing, modernizing traditional folklore archives description techniques, and working collaboratively with multiple library departments. The end results include expanded holdings and new digital resources for local historians.

Introduction

For years, college and university folklore archives have focused on collecting student projects and professorial papers, but it is becoming more common for archives to sponsor cultural documentation projects and, with the help of community members, actively collect ethnographic materials. In 2004, the William A. Wilson Folklore Archives of the Harold B. Lee Library (HBLL) at Brigham Young University (BYU) co-sponsored a field school with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress with the purpose of documenting orchards and orchard growing in Utah Valley. To make the materials collected during the field school—taped interviews, field notes, and photographs—more easily accessible to local researchers, the folklore archivist proposed digitizing the entire collection.

During the process of creating the online collection, the authors navigated the complicated issues of:

- how the research audience impacted processing (and re-processing) decisions,
- conflicts between long-standing folklore practice and trends in archival processing (item versus folder-level processing), and
- collaboration in digitization work.
This case study recounts how the Wilson Folklore Archives worked with the digital collections team to navigate these complexities from project setup to implementation, including challenges and successes, to create a multi-format digital resource.

Literature Review

Few articles have been written about the digitization of folklore collections. Projects in Bulgaria and Greece have been described in connection with achieving online interactive learning and creating specific institutional metadata policies.1 Lourdi describes in detail the diverse holdings of the University of Athens’ Greek Literature Department and the careful work undertaken to link research notebooks with accompanying photographs, maps, and folk objects. While Lourdi’s example outlines a specific solution to a unique collection, the Wilson Folklore Archives—following general policies established by its parent department, L. Tom Perry Special Collections—opts to treat folklore collections as standard archival collections that could benefit from the standards outlined in both Encoded Archival Description (EAD) and Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS).

In the United States, case studies in digitizing oral histories are few, with Caroline Daniels’ 2009 article written “to fill that gap.”2 Daniels’ case study illustrates how the University of Louisville Oral History Center made its oral histories available to the public. She pays particular attention to selecting content and creating a sensible structure for compound objects within CONTENTdm, achieving the goals of improving user experience, and managing the project within a budget.

Literature on collecting oral histories commonly focuses on the role of academic institutions in using students to further collection goals.3 Like the project Stevens describes, the field school materials described in this case study were also collected by students who followed the scope and guidelines of existing collection development policies. Also like Stevens, the decision to digitize was made after the field school materials were collected. For future folklore projects with a strong narrative component, the decision to digitize will impact how and why materials are collected.


Some archives use oral history projects as an approach to round out archival holdings. Swain examines the impact of professional standards on archival practice and the potential benefit of these standards to the discipline of oral history. This is an issue that is also of importance to folklorists and folklore archives. Blouin and Cook have both written about the historian/archivist divide. A similar divide exists between folklorists and archivists. Esoteric organizational and descriptive practices in folklore archives may favor one unique collection in a specific institution but do not crossover to dissimilar collections and therefore, do not benefit the discipline as a whole. Originally folklore archives' holdings grew from folklorists' research and their students' papers. With little or no archival training, folklorists were more influenced to organize collections according to folklore's longstanding tale/motif indices. More recently, standard archival practices have had more of an influence on folklore archives and archivists. This is the case with the Wilson Folklore Archives, and this journey is reflected in the processing, description, and digitizing of the Fruits of Their Labors collection.

A recent project documenting oral history provides further insight into current practice. The Institute of Museum and Library Services' Oral History in the Digital Age (http://ohda.matrix.msu.edu/) contains a plethora of information about all aspects of oral history. “Reservoir of Memories: A Student Oral History Project” by Anna Wada and Nate Weisenberg outlines an oral history project completed by students in Providence, Rhode Island. They chose to create a project-based website using the free web publishing software, Omeka. While the Providence project chose to include only snippets of their interviews—partly due to storage limitations, and also their philosophy of not overwhelming patrons—the Wilson Folklore Archives chose to provide total access to each interview in its entirety, through digital audio files and complete transcripts.

Another article from Oral History in the Digital Age, “Mapping Approaches to Oral History Content Management,” illustrates the many possibilities of providing access to oral histories beyond just cataloging them. It divides the approaches into


cataloging versus indexing, transcript versus recording, and content mapping versus multidimensional meaning mapping.

Finally, “Case Study: Baylor Institute for Oral History” outlines the management of a range of oral history materials—from 1970s reel-to-reel tapes and typewritten documents to digital records and CONTENTdm. The author concludes, “technology has made documenting, processing, and archiving oral history seamlessly connected.” This seamless connection of digital technologies has improved access to multi-format collections—including oral histories and folklore collections—that would have been impossible only a few years earlier.

Fruits of Their Labors Field School

In July 2004, BYU’s Wilson Folklore Archives co-sponsored with the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress a field school entitled Fruit of Their Labors: Orchards in Utah Valley. At the time, the American Folklife Center (AFC) regularly sponsored field schools with academic partners in order to teach the skills necessary for practicing public folklore, including planning and implementing ethnographic field research, documentary photography, optimal sound recording, and archiving. The Wilson Folklore Archives’ working relationship with the AFC started a year earlier with a 2003 folklore archives conference sponsored by BYU. AFC director Peggy Bulger was invited to participate in the conference as a keynote speaker. The BYU University Librarian approached Bulger about possible future partnerships and the Utah Heritage Project was the result. The Utah Heritage Project has sponsored multiple field schools and cultural documentation projects, of which Fruits of Their Labors was the first.

Until 2003, the Wilson Folklore Archives consisted of items and papers collected by undergraduate students enrolled in BYU’s folklore classes. This was a rich source of material, but the resulting papers seldom focused on local cultural heritage. The archives’ collecting policy was expanded to include carefully crafted field projects that would generate new folklife collections of local significance—especially targeted to Utah County—along with folklorists’ papers. As these new collections made their way into the archive, the archivists realized that they would be served best by following best practices of the archival profession rather than the narrow cataloging practices that had previously governed the organization of student papers. (This older method of classification was based on a Finnish cataloging system adapted by William A. Wilson, the archives’ founder.)


When the Wilson Folklore Archives began its field school partnership with the American Folklife Center, the library’s folklore archivist was appointed director of the Utah Heritage Project and selected the topic of Utah Valley orchards for the archives’ first field school. The topic was sufficiently complex to allow for in-depth research. Utah Valley—especially along what once was known as the Provo Bench—had long been the location of fruit orchards that impacted the valley both financially and culturally. With encroaching urbanization, the orchards were sold primarily for housing developments. Despite the decreasing number of orchards, many in Utah County still had some connection or involvement with orchards. It was important to document this orchard connection through interviews and photographs before it disappeared entirely. The field school provided the funding and structure for researchers to go out into the community and gather information through interviews with knowledgeable orchard growers, fruit sellers, and others supporting orchard production.

Of the total fifteen students who enrolled in the field school, thirteen came from across the United States, with two students traveling from Egypt. The students received training in fundamentals of folklife research (creating field notes, writing interview logs, successful interviewing, etc.) as well as local history and culture (geography of the valley, orchard growing, etc.). Based on interests expressed during class discussions, field school faculty narrowed a list of topics to be studied. Students divided into five groups, with each group focusing on a particular topic relevant to orchard growing: 1) values derived from orchard work, 2) fruit stands, 3) families and their orchards, 4) crop usage and 5) church orchards (http://net.lib.byu.edu/scm/fruitexhibit/). The next step in the field school was identifying potential interviewees. Many of the interviewees were found through community ties with the Utah Heritage Project, while others were found by students researching local orchard culture and contacting potential interview subjects, such as individuals who own and work in local fruit stands.

Utah County orchards were also the subjects of a 2002 documentary film *The Best Crop: A History of Orchard Farming in Orem, Utah*, directed by April Chabries. Chabries generously shared her contacts with field school students and introduced film participants to the folklore archivist. The documentary was required viewing for the students, and Chabries and her colleagues were guest lecturers at the field school.

In addition to documenting the cultural heritage of orchard growers in Utah Valley, the field school was designed to increase the holdings of the Wilson Folklore Archives. During the field school, 25 interviews were conducted and the five linear feet of material resulting from the interviews—tapes, transcripts, photographs, photo logs, audio logs, and field notes—were accessioned by the archives as MSS 6044.

It was unusual for BYU library to solicit community help in creating new collections, and the *Fruits of their Labors* field school was the first curator-directed project undertaken by Wilson Folklore Archives. By involving students in the collection of these materials, it captured an opportunity identified by authors Stevens and Latham, who observe (quoting Dopke-Wilson), “Academic libraries find
themselves in a unique position for acquiring oral histories: interviews with those who lived through historic events are sometimes assigned by history professors as projects for their students. In addition to allowing students to experience history in action ‘this activity energizes students and teachers alike. It’s real world. They are making a difference.’ The field school, while sponsored by the Wilson Folklore Archives, was also a credit-bearing course that provided this type of real-world experience for the students. Community involvement was recognized and honored when the field school hosted a concluding open house for those who had participated in the project. Additionally, an exhibition was mounted based on the research results and the community response was enthusiastic.

Digital Collections at the Harold B. Lee Library

At the same time the Wilson Folklore Archives was expanding its collecting policy to seek out additional local collections, the library was expanding its digitization lab (established in the late 1990s) to make more materials from L. Tom Perry Special Collections available online. These digital collections (http://lib.byu.edu/digital/) primarily feature photographs, but also include diaries, newspapers, print materials, and maps on subjects ranging from western American history and Mormonism to 16th century French political pamphlets and World War II military communiqués.

While some digitized content represents entire collections—one example is the digital collection of letters from Philip II, King of Spain in the 16th century (http://lib.byu.edu/digital/phil2/)—most of the content in HBLL’s digital collections represent selections from larger collections. For example, the Mormon Missionary Diaries collection (http://lib.byu.edu/digital/mmd/) features 376 digitized missionary diaries from 117 individuals. These diaries were selected from larger manuscript collections. In one instance, five diaries representing James E. Talmage’s experiences as a mission president in England during the 1920s were selected from a much larger collection totaling more than 30 volumes of personal journals, along with notes and student memorabilia, plus records of professional responsibilities. In total, the entire collection (James E. Talmage Collection, MSS 229) includes 34 boxes, or 17 linear feet, but just a fraction was selected for digitization and inclusion in the subject-specific missionary diary project. To date, digital collections at the Harold B. Lee Library do not generally represent complete physical collections, which is just one difference between special collections’ physical collections and their digital surrogates.

Another difference between the physical collections and their digital versions is the level of detail describing the materials. While photograph collections in their physical format are typically described in the aggregate, in their digital format, photographs have been described at the item level under the direction of the photo archivist.

The desire to support more precise search results for digital collections was a key justification for item-level description. For some on the digital collection team, the descriptive elements should be as detailed and precise as possible to function optimally in a digital world. While this level of detail potentially improves discoverability, an unintended consequence is that physical objects are described differently (perhaps at the folder or series level) than their digital surrogates (often described at the item level). This approach also misses an opportunity to reuse existing metadata, an efficient way to streamline the process of digitizing and loading new digital collections.

In 2009, against the backdrop of having a long experience in creating representative collections of single-format materials (photographs, diaries or newspapers) with description generally enhanced from the existing finding aid, the folklore archivist proposed digitizing the multi-format collection, *Fruits of Their Labors* (MSS 6044), in its entirety, loading only existing metadata from the finding aid into CONTENTdm.

**Digitizing Fruits of Their Labors**

The first step in digitizing the *Fruits of Their Labors* collection was putting together a proposal for approval by the special collections board of curators and library administration. *Fruits of Their Labors* was a good candidate for digitization because the content has strong local appeal and making interviews available online vastly improves their accessibility. Patron access to oral histories is a problem nationwide. A survey of Georgia academic libraries in 2007 indicated access to oral histories is negatively impacted by “lack of staff time; insufficient communication among oral historians, archivists, and/or catalogers; technological issues; cataloging issues such as multiple formats, standards, and procedures; and preservation issues.”

Upon project approval, key stakeholders from the digital imaging lab, the multimedia unit, the metadata team, and the collection curator met to clarify project objectives and made decisions that guided the project. CONTENTdm was used as the repository because of an existing agreement to host the library’s digital collections.

*Fruits of Their Labors* featured 25 taped interviews, plus accompanying transcripts, tape logs, field notes, and photographs. Release forms signed by interview subjects made online access possible without restriction. With the exception of one interview deemed to be too personal and with little information relevant to Utah Valley orchards, all interviews were digitized and made accessible online.

---

The workflow for the project began with reformatting audio files, then continued with scanning photographs, formatting Word files, and finally testing the compound object structure in CONTENTdm.

**Audio Files:** From the interview cassettes, the team opted to create .mp3 files for access and .wav files for preservation. Because intellectual access to the content was aided by a full transcript and an audio log (a roughly time-coded summary of contents; see Figure 1), the team decided against creating several short audio files (5–10 minute) and instead opted to produce one monolithic audio file of each interview. Audio files are available for download for playback using the user’s default audio player.

**Photographs:** Photographs (35 mm) were scanned at 300 dpi by the digital imaging lab.

**Text files:** Additional files, including field notes, transcripts and tape logs were converted from Word to PDF format by students working in the folklore archives and...
then delivered to the digital imaging lab’s network project folder for loading into CONTENTdm, the library’s digital collections management system.

**Structure of digital objects**: Interviews, images, and text documents were loaded as compound digital objects grouped by interviewee. The structure of each compound digital object follows this pattern (see Figure 2 and Figure 3):

- Family Photograph (one photograph selected by the curator to identify the interview subject)
- Audio
  - Audio log
  - Audio file
- Transcript
- Field Notes
  - Contributor/fieldworker A
  - Contributor/fieldworker B
  - Contributor/fieldworker C
- Additional photographs

Though not all compound objects include all elements, identifying a basic structure at the beginning of the project provided a way to present the materials in a consistent manner. In total, student employees spent 380 hours scanning, processing images, running optical character recognition, checking for post-scan image quality, formatting metadata, and loading images and metadata into CONTENTdm.
Lessons Learned

Challenges in creating the digital collection ranged from a philosophical shift in who should be identified as collection creators (interviewers vs. interviewees), resolving conflicts between traditional description practices in folklore archives and modern archival practice, to communicating effectively across a large complex organization.

Impact of Target Research Audience on Collection (Re)Processing

Traditionally, the “creator” or main access point of an ethnographic collection is the interviewer, or the person who collects the data. A significant example is the American Folklife Center’s Alan Lomax Collection in the Library of Congress. Lomax created 5,000 hours of sound recordings and more than 400,000 feet of film and video
documenting the cultural heritage of the southern United States as well as Europe and the Caribbean. The collected folklore—representing hundreds of artists and musicians—is described using Lomax’s name as the primary access point. Similarly, when the *Fruits of Their Labors* field school collection (MSS 6044) was originally accessioned, arranged, and described, the materials submitted by each field school student were grouped into individual series named for each researcher. This resulted in some materials relating to one family of interviewees being separated in the physical arrangement of the collection. While there was nothing inherently wrong with this arrangement, it represented only one possible way of grouping the materials, reflecting an old (though changing) tradition of the fieldworker being the focal point of the collected materials.

During the *Fruits of Their Labors* field school, it became apparent that the collection would be of particular interest to local and family historians. Some of those interviewed were prominent in the valley and it was likely that their recorded oral histories would be of interest to local researchers. When it came time to digitize MSS 6044 materials, one of the project’s key goals was to make the collection easy to search and navigate for this local audience interested in family history research. Family history researchers are a significant user group for HBLL’s digital collections. According to an internal 2006 HBLL online user survey, most respondents accessing the library’s digital collections (nearly 400 of 450 total) self-identified as genealogists or family history researchers. More than 70% of all respondents indicated they visited HBLL’s digital collections to search family history resources.

Though the physical collection had originally been divided into one series for each field school student researcher, in planning for digitization, the metadata team suggested organizing the digital content by family groups rather than by field school researcher. This would highlight the families featured in the ethnography rather than the interviewers themselves. To maintain consistency between the physical and digital collections this meant re-organizing and re-processing MSS 6044. Consistency between descriptions of physical collections and their digital surrogates is a growing priority for L. Tom Perry Special Collections as it strives to reuse existing metadata whenever possible.

Reorganizing the collection by interviewee followed the reasoning increasingly adopted by folklorists and put forward by the World Intellectual Property Organization, which considers the interviewee (or performer) to be the holder of the intellectual property rather than the collector. One prominent example of this comes from the royalties paid for the soundtrack of the 2000 film, *O Brother, Where Art Thou?* One of the tracks, “Po Lazarus,” was sung by inmate James Carter and recorded by Alan Lomax during a 1959 visit to the Mississippi State Penitentiary. This

track was included in the film’s commercially released soundtrack. Though it took years of research to locate Mr. Carter, who had since moved to Chicago, he (rather than the archives) eventually received all royalties for his performance.\(^{13}\)

One slight complication of reorganizing the collection by family group was that some interview subjects had the same surname but were not related. The impulse was to group like names together (as with the Stratton families), but in some instances the result was a mass of disparate people and subjects only distantly (or not at all) related. The folklore archivist worked with the metadata and digitizing team to correct these errors. Now, the interviewees are grouped by biological families rather than surnames.

Filling the Gap between Practice in Folklore Archives and Modern Archival Practice

Nearly a third of the items digitized from the library’s special collections—more than 27,000 images—are historic photographs. These digitized photographs from the C. R. Savage Photographs, the Edith Irvine Photographs, the George Edward Anderson Photographs, and the Huntington Bagley Photographs (amongst others) have been described at the item level. Digitizing manuscript collections—especially a multi-format collection such as *Fruits of Their Labors*—and then creating digital objects at the folder level was a new process that required a shift in thinking which will benefit future digitization projects.

For some, item-level access is the ideal, especially for folklore collections. Lourdi asserts, “The main target of the identification and digitization of folklore collections is to facilitate wide access to the items they contain and promote education, academic research and preservation of cultural heritage and folklore features... Hence, digital folklore collections should bring together various user groups of the scientific community and enable resource discovery and foster item-level access. Information about the cultural heritage and oral tradition of a country is interesting for a wide audience of varied educational levels...”\(^{14}\) However, for our purposes, folder-level description was adequate for several reasons. Student ethnographers took multiple photographs of the same object, with little variation in view or angle (e.g. fruit trees). Though the project initially described these photos individually, it quickly became apparent that describing photos as a group would suffice for descriptive purposes and would also save time and money. This decision was in large part a result of the adoption of “more product, less process” concepts by L. Tom Perry Special Collections, along with a greater emphasis on meeting EAD and DACS standards. In order to digitize more content over time, the Wilson Folklore Archives continues to


create compound digital objects of folders or series within folklore collections. This is in line with new departmental policies discouraging item-level processing. However, all student submissions to the Wilson Folklore Archives are still processed at the item level following a Finnish-based cataloging system introduced by the archives’ founder.

When the *Fruits of Their Labors* collection was created, it was decided that it would be best to follow archival best practices rather than using the modified Finnish system. Introduced by folklorist William A. Wilson, the system was based on his experience at the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society in Helsinki during the mid-1960s. The system is outlined in the Wilson Folklore Archives’ internal document, “A Manual-Based Information Retrieval System: A Genre-Based Accessioning, Classification, Indexing, Storage, Information-Retrieval System.” This reflects an allegiance to organizing practices coming out of archives rather than an idiosyncratic system peculiar to only a few folklore archives. In the early 20th century, archives were generally administered by historians who processed collections according to historical principles. By the end of the 20th century, the archival profession was established (see Blouin and Cook).15 While many archivists had historical training, they approached their jobs with the problems of archives foremost in their minds. Folklore archivists are now receiving archival training and are applying these principles to the unique qualities of folklore archives. Folklorists wanting extremely detailed information about each item might find the new ways lacking.

Communication and Collaboration across Multiple Library Divisions

HBLL’s strength continues to lie in skills and resources supporting digital reformatting. The digital imaging lab trains its student employees in best practices for handling and scanning photographs and other source material. Digitizing the audiocassettes was also managed in-house in the Multimedia Unit. Regardless of the source materials’ format—photograph, newsprint, manuscript materials, printed materials, and audio—HBLL has a skilled set of employees to efficiently and efficiently produce digitized versions.

The HBLL Digital Imaging Lab and Multimedia Unit are just two contributors to the process of creating digital collections. Reporting lines for digital collections are spread across three library divisions: Special Collections (source material), Technical Services (metadata) and Information Technology (digital imaging lab). Communicating across so many divisions and personnel is an ongoing challenge. One way the project team tried to improve communication was by clearly outlining

---

project deliverables in a “project definition document” that was written by the group and distributed to all parties. This was especially helpful when one colleague working with metadata moved to new responsibilities and another stepped in to help with *Fruits of Their Labors*. In future projects, a weekly group meeting would resolve questions in a more timely manner and make sure all team members were aware of all updates. Grimsley and Wynne found that “procedures must be streamlined enough to allow several employees between two departments, Archives and Cataloging, to integrate oral history acquisition, preservation, cataloging, and processing activities into their workflows.” Workflow was clearly delineated between departments, but with personnel from multiple library divisions working together, routine communication among all parties lacked consistency.

**Conclusion: Improved Strategies for Building Folklore Collections**

One of the primary reasons behind the digital project was to make the information collected more available to HBLL patrons. That the Wilson Folklore Archives was able to do so is its greatest success. The *Fruits of Their Labors* project was designed to build an oral history and ethnography collection focused on Utah Valley in support of “piecing together history.” The cultural heritage of orchards was selected as a topic because of its significance to local and regional history. Collecting materials in multiple formats helps create the “total archives” described by Wallot with greater online accessibility advocated by Swain.

The origin of this collection about Utah Valley orchards is different from the origin of other collections where the papers are created from real life situations. *Creating* a collection (rather than gathering a collection) is particularly suited for folklore archives and is becoming a more common practice, especially when guided by collection policies. These policies shape the types of folklore projects that the Wilson Folklore Archives undertakes. Currently the main guideline is a focus on Utah County, although materials from nearby counties have been sought as time and finances allow. Because students are the primary fieldworkers and archive funding is limited, collecting has been confined to a 90-mile radius. The archivist, in consultation with other faculty members in L. Tom Perry Special Collections, has selected the focused topics for creating collections. Interests by other curators have been considered so that the folklore materials are complementary to other departments’ collections. It makes sense to process these materials in traditional

---

archival methods since the collections are not intended for use only by folklorists. Following archival best practices allows all patrons to effectively discover and use these materials.

Because of the lessons learned and successes of the *Fruits of Their Labors* project, the folklore archivist is planning to make other folklife projects available online. While processing procedures at BYU have been influenced by Greene and Meissner’s “More Product, Less Process” guidelines, incoming folklore collections will be processed and described with digitization in mind, specifically considering when folder- or series-level description suffice for adequate intellectual access, regardless of format (physical or digital). Metadata for digital collections will be copied directly from existing finding aids.

Future folklore archive projects will be aided by a shift in recording interviews as digital audio files, eliminating the need to digitally reformat cassette tapes. Field school students also use digital cameras now and select photographs to submit to the archives, eliminating the need to scan photographic prints and reducing the number of duplicate images accessioned. Digital collections on the horizon include *Tradition Runs through It: Recreation and Environment in Provo Canyon; By the Sweat of Their Brow: Changing Agrarian Culture in Utah County*; and a project on recreation in Utah County.
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