

Great Expectations or None at All: The Role and Significance of Community Expectations in the Appraisal Function

Stephen Yorke

Stephen Yorke works in the collections development area of the Commonwealth Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts. He is currently a member of the Council of the Australian Society of Archivists. This article is based on work undertaken towards a Masters degree in Information Management at Monash University in Melbourne.

The stimulus for this paper is the writer hearing many times the term 'community expectations' in records-related discussions; most frequently as the justification for an appraisal decision that will result in the long-term retention of a group of records. Australian Standard AS 4390 makes community expectations for appraisal one of a trinity of retention purposes along with accountability and business needs. The other two, while often arguable in the detail, can be regarded as orthodoxy to the archival community. But while AS 4390 does provide a listing of requirements or tests for decision-making for business and accountability purposes, no such list is provided for community expectations or even an explanation given for its absence. So just how orthodox are community expectations?

The question of standards

The explanatory statement for 'Appraisal' in the definitions section for AS 4390 has:

Appraisal – the process of evaluating business activities to determine which records need to be captured and how long the records need to be kept, to meet business needs, the requirements of organizational accountability and community expectations.¹

The overall nature and role of official standards can be described as:

Written standards set down mutually agreed requirements for products and services. A standard is a published document which sets out technical specifications or other criteria necessary to ensure that a material or method will consistently do the job it is intended to do.²

At a lower level, amongst other uses, the term 'standard' by definition provides for it being 'the ordinary procedure or quality...without added features'.³ Concomitant with such ordinariness, a reasonable expectation is that by using a standard a particular feature or characteristic (for example) of a nominated process can then be assessed in objective terms. For instance, by applying the appropriate standard to a consideration of a given matter, two or more persons will at least come to very similar views about it. Thus, in terms of standards, community expectations are matters that should be capable of logical assessment and for such requirements to be systematically implemented.

The view from the community

But the definitional issue alone represents tricky ground. For example, 'community expectations' does not appear to be a particularly common phrase or a concept known outside the recordkeeping or archival spheres and its actual derivation is unknown.⁴ Be that as it may, on first consideration the operation of community expectations conceptually could be taken as implying that there is only one community and that its expectations can be readily identified and implemented in similar fashion to those applying to business needs and accountability. But a dictionary will define community (inter alia) not only in a singular sense as 'all the people living in a specific locality' but also as a plurality as 'a body of people having [something] in common' within a larger body (community again).⁵ Thus if expectations do indeed represent some form of core common values across society as a whole, then we need them to have a common denominator (or marker) that is found in plural communities. In other words, we need either to discover similar values *across* the community as a whole (that is to say the community seen as representing the nation) or the same values to be found in each individual constituent community (however defined) *within* the nation.

The former approach to community (as a single entity) poses what I see as intractable problems of deciding just what values are in fact common across it and to adduce proof of their existence. On the other hand, if community is taken as really meaning a multiplicity of communities, how can we define all the various component communities, determine their number, or even to quantify their common expectations? Let alone give such expectations some concrete form in the appraisal and disposal processes?

We could, of course, argue that community expectations do in fact represent a perfectly discoverable repository of consensual high order values, belief systems, ethical concerns, common wisdom, or so forth that are abroad in society and which can be applied to the appraisal process. Space precludes discussion of this point. But – in short – I doubt it. However, it can be shown that archivists have made *assumptions* and made appraisal decisions accordingly. The traditional approach by archivists as appraisers to community expectations concerns (over perhaps the history of appraisal as a conscious act) has been to see community and expectations as residing more in the values of a particular class or section of society and their interests.⁶ By way of example, it has been stated for archives as a whole:

that the archival record in the United States is biased towards the rich and powerful elements in our society – government, business, and the military – while the poor and impotent remain in archival obscurity.⁷

Perhaps genealogical interests could be added to make a more up-to-date list.⁸ However, it is not quite so attractive for the self-image of archivists if this type of approach, and the forces involved, were to be described or represented in terms of being ‘cultural hegemony’.⁹

An alternative approach to understanding community expectations is to deconstruct it as a concept by, for example, seeking likely similar terms or concepts. From that perspective, the most immediate term that comes to mind is that very common – or even pejorative – one of ‘public opinion’. Essentially, are the *expectations* of the community any different to the *opinion* of the community about what it desires to happen – or its preferred state of affairs – regarding a given issue? To my mind it is difficult to adequately distinguish between the two. If we cannot, then could community expectations be seen as merely public opinion described or clothed in a much more cultured or polite form? Assume for the moment that community expectations is really only public opinion in an up-market guise, then what does an analysis of public opinion as a concept reveal about its nature and of relevance to community expectations?

It is fair to say that public opinion is subjective in its nature, volatile in its expression, and even mutually contradictory in its demands.¹⁰ In the words of one authority:

public opinion is a social process in constant flux, always changing in focus, direction, and definitiveness in reaction to both direct personal experiences and to the appeals of those who have control or access to mass communications.¹¹

As a result, if community expectations is really only a superior term for public opinion, or otherwise indistinguishable from it, then conceptually it must be

questioned whether it is an adequate basis for making sound, long-term appraisal decisions.¹²

However, if there is only the one community, an issue for consideration is: just how or by what mechanisms does the community express its views or make known what it expects? Some of the obvious mechanisms available to the community include options such as general elections, petitions to Parliament, representations to politicians, demonstrations and marches, and even letters to the editors of newspapers. But how much legitimacy should each option have in terms of deciding actual retention periods, and whose community and whose values should be represented in the final decision? The complexities are many. For instance, it could be argued that many of the views expressed on a given issue represent 'noise' or strong views on the part of a few rather than the real view (however determined) of the community as a whole.¹³

There are, of course, issues on the majority of the community may have formed a view and which may have records and appraisal-related implications. To determine just what they are would be hard enough at a fixed point in time. But a view may change over time and further complicate matters. One such example of complexity is with the forced separation of Aboriginal children in Australia from their parents. This separation was by governments for the greater part of the 20th century pursuing assimilationist policies. The debate about the issues within the community and government over the last decade has been long and complex, and in particular, it is a debate about how best to deal with community and personal issues raised by the report of the Inquiry into the events.¹⁴ As a whole, government and community attitudes have obviously diametrically changed over the past fifty years about assimilation of indigenous Australians. The National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families:

was established...in response to increasing concern among key indigenous agencies and communities that the general public's ignorance of the history of forcible removal was hindering the recognition of the needs of its victims and their families and the provision of services.¹⁵

But any reconciliation process as proposed by the Inquiry is not helped by the non-availability of many of the records documenting the separation process and subsequent actions, especially the case files of individuals. For example:

NSW Archives has identified an unexplained gap in Aborigines Welfare Board files for 1938–48. Also in NSW adoption records from 1922 to about 1950 were culled. A fire is reported to have destroyed files in Victoria prior to the Second World War...[and] personal files in the Northern Territory were culled back to only 200 records in the 1970s due to concerns their contents would embarrass the government.¹⁶

In brief, records were created and maintained documenting over a long period assimilation-related activities which were being conducted in principle at least in accordance with the community views of the day. But I would point out that on a related matter, Ray Evans in discussing the Mabo judgement quotes Mr Justice Brennan as stating:

Whatever the justification advanced in earlier days for refusing to recognise the rights in land of the indigenous inhabitants...an unjust and discriminatory doctrine of that kind can no longer be accepted. The expectations of the international community accord in this respect with the contemporary values of the Australian people.

The comment by Evans is that 'no evidence was produced in court during the long drawn-out hearings concerning the contemporary values of the Australian people'.¹⁷

From the recordkeeping perspective, the issue requiring investigation is the degree of actual or formal appraisal that occurred for the records (and which could have involved an archivist). It is hard to avoid the conclusion from the evidence presented in the Report of the Inquiry, that the loss of records in at least some instances was a deliberate act of destruction. Whether destruction of records was motivated by genuine broader concerns about the potential of the records to cause injury to those living, guilty consciences, or merely out of self-interest by those involved cannot be known. But it could be said that when community views on assimilation changed to at least one for its abandonment as a general policy, I do not believe it follows that community expectations for the records would automatically have been for their consequent destruction as a natural part of the change process.

But what if the community views regarding assimilation were that it is best to forget? Not to forget that the policies had existed and the actions occurred but rather that reliving the past via the record does not assist the community as a whole today?¹⁸ The ethical implications for archives and archivists are complex to say the least. And in practical terms, the community has yet to agree on the best approach to reconciliation processes – even in terms of 'apologist' and 'non-apologist' positions.¹⁹

Formal expectations

If community expectations do in fact exist in a formal sense, that is to say as something not directly linked to concepts of public opinion, then they must exist at a more deep-seated level in society. One means in this context is by legislation of Parliament and its associated delegated administrative rules

and regulations. For, after all, in a democratic society do not the people or community as a majority vote a party into power with expectation that it will govern, pass legislation as required to enable the governing process, and so on? ²⁰

It could be argued that in a democracy the community effectively abdicates responsibility for discerning and interpreting its expectation to the legal and political processes. It effectively only intervenes at general elections. If so, it could be argued that much or even all of the community expectations concerning records-related matters are really being met already. That is to say the delivery of community expectations is being achieved through the operation of the criteria of formal legal and legislative requirements providing for the retention of records for specified times for business needs and of organisational accountability as a whole. But political activity and legislation are designed to provide for the well-being of the community en masse and *not* for any underlying community expectations about any records-related processes. What at first sight may thought to be community expectations in action may just well be complements to accountability and business needs. For example, enforcing registration and maintenance of records for births, deaths, and marriages are for administrative purposes although they can and do possess other quite distinct values which some in the community certainly do value.²¹ Even on far more simpler issues the community has been conspicuously absent from any debate directly about overall retention policies for records with a notable few exceptions.²²

Appraisal is not a science, but what are the community expectations for appraisal in an environment such as the following?:

The electronic record itself is no longer a concrete object such as archivists have traditionally encountered. Compound, virtual, hypermedia, or 'smart' documents, for example, combine information extracted from many other electronic sources, whether data, text, voice, or graphics. The 'actual' document itself is but a fleeting image on the screen...[and] archivists will face the compound document displayed at the computer terminal that might exist in 2,000 versions each year, each version with different internal information values.²³

Indeed, the starting point in Cook's thesis for a new approach to appraisal is that 'traditional appraisal theory and established appraisal practice have failed archivists and researchers alike'.²⁴ Reality of community expectations for appraisal would then require that there is at least a reasonable degree of understanding by the community of the forces that generate records in the first place, and of the processes for their creation, management, and access. But is there?

The appraiser's view

The next issue is whether *standard* appraisal processes identify and acknowledge a role for community expectations or their equivalent. As a starting point, take the views expressed in a standard archival text. Such views, while arguable in the detail, would not be expected to be at all controversial to archivists. In the words of Barbara Reed:

Appraisal is concerned with...balancing sets of conflicting concerns. It aims to reach a set of decisions which can be scrutinised and which will allow the destruction of the majority of records, while identifying, securing and allowing us to justify the preservation of a small proportion of records of continuing value.²⁵

She then goes on to identify two major types of record value: evidential and informational. The evidential value:

is based on the function the records had for the office or person which created and used them. Our interest as archivists lies in their value as evidence of how that office or individual conducted their business.²⁶

The informational value records are defined as: 'those records which contain information of use not only to the creating person or organisation but also to researchers from a variety of fields of knowledge.' In addition: 'The goal of the appraiser is...that the archives reflect the best and most representative materials of the persons, organisations and events they seek to document'.²⁷ Thus could community expectations be expressed through selecting 'representative materials'? Consciously selected records are by their nature are not necessarily complete. So, is the appraiser expressing community expectations in this situation or merely applying various technical rules used by the appraiser but are not relevant to the community? As put by Cook: 'appraisal is a work of careful analysis and scholarship, not a mere procedure'.²⁸ It is not an exact science as Cook would be the first to state. In the words of another standard textbook:

Although much has been written about archival appraisal, no formula has yet been found – or is likely to be discovered – that will provide a simple way to infallibly evaluate records for archival retention.²⁹

But while appraisal outcomes have to consider the administrative environment in which the actual appraisal process occurs, there are always contributing factors to a final appraisal decision. These factors include volume growth of records; frequently declining resources in real terms; technological obsolescence of the record; preservation problems for given media; and the necessity for reappraisal at some stage. In short, there is always a trade-off between what someone would like to be kept and what can be kept. As the

capability to manage records varies (resources, staff etc.) then so is the appraisal decision affected – and never mind any community expectations about the records. I wish to finish on this point by quoting Michael Moss:

In all countries archivists have steadily arrogated the right to be the final arbiters of what records are deemed to be ‘historically interesting’ and therefore worthy of long-term preservation. Since they have to negotiate the budgets for their services, this is understandable; but it leaves them very exposed to criticism from scholars that important material that will inform new debates and disciplines is being discarded. Indeed some specialist archives owe their origin to academic conviction that records were either unnecessarily and wantonly being destroyed or simply being overlooked by existing provision. Academics are uneasy that selection criteria and cataloguing priorities reflect either current use in record office search rooms by family historians and enthusiasts or economic expediency, rather than the long-term needs of the discipline.³⁰

But does the community care about records?

I believe we need to consider the possibility that community expectations for records are generally – perhaps always – less than an appraiser typically assigns. That is to say the community at large has no expectations about records or at best has very little interest in records. For example, it is obvious that only the merest fraction of the community will ever enter an archival institution either through the front door or by electronic means, or would even wish to do so. But are archivists objective about this? Here is one instance of what I would see as community indifference and institutional optimism about the situation. The Public Record Office of the United Kingdom for its new appraisal policy:

launched the largest consultation exercise that the PRO has ever undertaken: copies...were sent...to every history teacher at a British university, to learned societies and to local archives, to genealogical societies and to grant-giving bodies...[and] placed on the PRO’s website.³¹

The exercise was described as a ‘success’: there were some 140 separate responses received. One could ask what total of responses would be deemed a failure? In the context of the size of the population of the UK, the long existence of the PRO, the amount of promotion given to promotion of the exercise, it would appear that it was more of a failure than a success.³² To the community, if as discussed their appreciation of archives was more as objects of intrinsic value, the Jenkinsonian approach could well appear eminently sensible. That is to say:

for an Administrative body to destroy what it no longer needs is a matter entirely within its competence...provided always that the Administration proceeds only on the grounds on which alone it is competent to make a decision – the need of its own practical business.³³

It must be remembered that not only community expectations change over time, but archival approaches and practices that deal with appraisal are mutating as well.³⁴ As put by Cook:

archival thinking over the century should be viewed as constantly evolving, ever mutating as it adapts to radical changes in the nature of records, record-creating organizations, record-keeping systems, record uses, and the wider cultural, legal, technological, social, and philosophical trends in society.³⁵

But never mind the appraisal outcome as such, the issue is whether the community can understand the appraisal process and associated complexities. How do such proposed policies stand in comparison with users (a community after all) with views expressed by users of archives such as:

The involvement of users in decisions on disposal and retention of documents is important...there is no way to really judge just how important certain records may be in the short term – and there are numerous examples of rash destruction based on the proximity of a period...Actual or potential users feel enormous frustration when they hear of document disposal and have no input into the decisions.³⁶

It is perhaps stating the obvious that that there is no easy way to reconcile these points let alone integrate with any over-arching community expectations.

The appraiser and the community

So far we have considered community expectations only from the records-related perspective. But surely other professional groups face very similar problems concerning the community's expectations of them? Then what do we have in common and in difference?

Much has been written on the nature of the professions and the factors determining that a nominated group is a profession rather than merely constituting an occupation.³⁷ For the sake of this argument, it is assumed that 'archivist' is a profession and appraisal of records is within its professional competency.

The community or society as a whole functions largely by delegating certain responsibilities and authority to the professions. In the words of Eliot Freidson, the function of the professions is as follows:

The professions serve as the ultimate authorities on those personal, social, economic, cultural, and political affairs which their body of knowledge and skill addresses. Their modes of formulating and interpreting events permeate both popular consciousness and official policy.³⁸

As a consequence, society relies on a relevant professional judgement in a field of competence to determine what is best course of action for an individual,

or society as a whole, in a particular situation. Freidson goes on to point out that:

The kind of work [professionals] do is esoteric, complex, and discretionary in character: it requires theoretical knowledge, skill, and judgement that ordinary people do not possess, may not wholly comprehend, and cannot readily evaluate...the kind of work they do is believed to be especially important for the well-being of individuals or society at large.³⁹

The expectation within society is that an authority delegated to a profession is exercised by it in a proper way. The professions are trusted to exercise such powers wisely and, to a large extent, are trusted to be self-managing in terms of setting standards for admission of new members, regulating their members' behaviour, and so forth. Professions, in turn, (and admittedly to their members economic benefit as well) attempt to demand higher qualifications, adopt exclusionary tactics (for example, the medical profession), and success is sustained by the 'power and prestige of its academic knowledge'.⁴⁰

But the key point I would emphasise is the concept of a delegation of decision-making authority by the community to the relevant profession. A qualified archivist would fulfil most if not all of Freidson's requirements and the function of appraisal in the interests of the community is performed very much in the same fashion by an archivist. For records, the consequences under such 'professional' conditions is that 'everything' cannot be kept indefinitely and that a decision has to be made by those who best understand the issues as to what should be kept and for how long. The community *does* reserve to itself a right to express a view in certain appraisal instances – if not change the outcome.

Under such conditions, then arguably the community expectations for appraisal are that the 'right' outcomes of an appraisal process will occur without the community understanding the actual process or making any real input to the decision.⁴¹ For Freidson:

Perhaps the most powerful claim [to professional status] is that there would be grave danger to the public if there were no control over those who offer their services...that only those who can be trusted should have[access to it]...and that serious consequences to the individual or the public at large can result from poor work.⁴²

The purpose of standards is (in part) to protect the community from 'poor work' and – as mentioned – the community expects the relevant professionals to live up to the name. With AS 4390 the position taken is that 'highly technical processes, such as records appraisal...require specialist resources from within the records management and archival professions'.⁴³ There is no explanation given for the training needs or qualifications for entry to these 'professions'.

Indeed, the Foreword to AS 4390 states rather that 'records management is the discipline and organizational function of managing records to meet operational business needs, accountability requirements and community expectations'. But a 'discipline' – no matter how generously one looks at the concept – is *not* a profession.

Conclusion

Community expectations for appraisal do demonstrably exist from the activities of various groups at large within society who express views (special pleading in some cases) about the values of particular groups of records such as those of the census. But there does not appear to be community expectations exhibited by the community as a whole – a unity of community – that can be demonstrated for appraisal. If there are community expectations in some form for records-related matters then they would be exhibited via indirect means such as the community delegating its authority and responsibilities to the various specialities in the area. But we should be very wary of claiming a standard meaning for our functioning when it does not exist or does not have common meaning to the archival community at least.

To go further: first, 'delegatory behaviour' by society suggests the community as whole does not care about records as a whole and therefore is not concerned with the appraisal process as such. This is because it does not attribute a need for a profession (as opposed to a discipline) for the process of managing records and thus the responsibility for appraising them (or even that it should occur at all). On the other hand, it could be argued that the community as a whole *does* have various concerns about records (and appraisal), including a belief that it has indeed delegated the responsibility to a true profession. I would find the former situation regrettable but not likely to be true. This is because of the demonstrable number of archival institutions and archival collections that do in fact exist and, ultimately, only could only continue to exist because of some form of active community expectations for their continued existence.

As for the latter situation, if appraisal is really so complex a function (as for Cook) then for it to be conducted by a non-profession has troubling implications for records and archives as a whole. Not the least problem arising from such a situation is that general or lowly treatment of a profession undermines any claims by it to possessing a special understanding or a responsibility in a particular area. In addition, non-professionals and their work are treated lowly by the community as a whole in terms of the status and resources accorded to them both now and in the future. Thus they will face grave risks for their survival in the longer term.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Australian Standard AS 4390 – 1996, *Records management*, Part 1: General, 4.3.
- 2 Standards Australia, 'Standards Australia Frequently Asked Questions' at www.standards.com.au.
- 3 *The Oxford Concise Australian Dictionary*, Oxford University Press.
- 4 For example, 'community expectations' does not appear in dictionaries (eg *The Oxford Concise Australian Dictionary* or the *Macquarie Dictionary*) as a separate term. Also, it is not a searchable term in the catalogue of the National Library of Australia.
- 5 *The Oxford Concise Australian Dictionary*, OUP.
- 6 Jenkinson speaks of 'we have been speaking and thinking throughout...of the interests of the Historian' (*A Manual of Archive Administration*, 2nd edition (reissued 1966), Percy Lund, Humphries and Co. Ltd, 1937, p. 145). Schellenberg has 'ordinarily...an archivist, no matter what his training, will appraise records primarily on the basis of their historical value or interest' (*Modern Archives*, National Archives and Records Service, 1956, p. 150).
- 7 Howard Zinn quoted by F Gerald Ham, 'The Archival Edge', in Maygene F Daniels and Timothy Walch (eds), *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*, National Archives and Records Service, 1984, p. 326.
- 8 As an aside, the question could be asked whether the attention now being given to genealogical issues by archives represents a genuine interest in catering for user interests, or community expectations, or whether it more represents recognition of a need to find allies in a climate of shrinking resources generally.
- 9 Cultural hegemony can be described in terms of the extent '...“haves” impose their ideology on “have nots” by dominating such sources of political ideas as the media, the schools, the workplace, political parties, and interest groups' (Calvin F Exoo, *Democracy Upside Down: Public Opinion and Cultural Hegemony in the United States*, Praeger, 1987, p. 4).
- 10 For example, community demands for increased services from government but at the same time the community being opposed to increases in taxes.
- 11 Irving Crespi, *Public Opinion, Polls, and Democracy*, Westview Press, 1989, p. 130.
- 12 But doubts about the process and outcomes for community expectations does not, of course, deny the place for input by community into the appraisal process. Indeed, it opens up the separate issue of whether the relationship of archivists to the community should be (as alluded to earlier) one of leader or servant; prophet or follower.
- 13 For example, the result of the Australian Republic referendum in 1999.
- 14 See *Bringing Them Home: Report of the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families*, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, April 1997.
- 15 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 16 *Ibid.*, p. 326.
- 17 Ray Evans, 'Gnosticism and the High Court', *Quadrant*, June 1999, p. 24.
- 18 As with the debate about the holocaust in Germany today and to what extent it should be put aside in contemporary Germany.
- 19 For a vigorous defence of – and justification for – removal of Aboriginal children, see Reginald Marsh, 'Lost, Stolen or Rescued?', *Quadrant*, June 1999, p. 18.

20 Even here there are problems with expectations. The introduction of a new tax, for example, is based on the views of the party in power and its expectation that the party will not be rejected by the electorate which at the same time may vigorously oppose the particular tax.

21 This is not to ignore direct legislation for the establishment and maintenance of government archival programs. However, even such legislation can be deficient in providing guidance as to appraisal principles and disposal arrangements. For example, see *Australia's Federal Record: A Review of the Archives Act 1983* [Commonwealth], Australian Law Reform Commission, Report No. 85, 1998, p. 132.

22 One such instance is demands for the retention of Australian census records after processing is complete rather than their destruction as the norm. Following representations from communities and individuals, and other protests, there is no certainty that the records of the next census will be retained. The government has announced that, as a Centenary of Federation measure, respondents to the 2001 census may elect to have their name-identified returns preserved by the National Archives for release after 99 years. The number in the community who took up the cudgels in the debate was small. Indeed, it could be argued that the Australian Bureau of Statistics' position is, in part, that there are community expectations for the census records to be destroyed.

23 Terry Cook, 'Mind over Matter: Towards a New Theory of Archival Appraisal', in Barbara L Craig (ed.), *The Archival Imagination: Essays in Honour of Hugh A Taylor*, Association of Canadian Archivists, 1992, p. 39.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 38.

25 Barbara Reed in *Keeping Archives*, 2nd edition, DW Thorpe, 1993, p. 158.

26 *Ibid.*, p. 159.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 160.

28 Terry Cook, p. 47.

29 Maygene F Daniels, 'Records Appraisal and Disposition', in *Managing Archives and Archival Institutions*, Mansell Publishing Ltd, London, 1988, p. 53.

30 Michael Moss, 'The Melancholy Events in a Mean Abode in the Shankill Road – an Allegory for our Time?: The Management of Business Record Collections within a University', Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Conference of the Business Archives Council, p. 50.

31 'An Acquisition Policy for the Public Records Office' at www.pro.gov.uk/recordsmanagement/acquisition/intro.htm.

32 Some submissions will, of course, represent members of professional associations, interest groups, and the like.

33 Hilary Jenkinson, p.148.

34 For a discussion, see Frank Boles, *Archival Appraisal*, Neal-Schuman Publishers, 1991, p. 4.

35 Terry Cook, 'What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift', *Archivaria*, no. 43, 1997, p. 20.

36 John Bannon, 'What do archives' clients want from them? What do clients want from archives?', ASA Conference Proceedings, Adelaide, 1997, p. 220.

37 See for example: Andrew Abbott, *The System of Profession*, University of Chicago Press, 1988.

38 Eliot Freidson, *Professionalism Reborn: Theory, Prophecy and Policy*, Polity Press, 1994, p. 33.

39 *Ibid.*, p. 200.

40 Abbott, p. 54.

41 Paradoxically, the community resents overweening behaviour in terms of claims of competence by a profession while at the same perhaps disproportionately rewarding the members of that profession (for example, medicine).

42 Freidson, p. 174.

43 AS 4390.3, Clause 6.6.1.