ARMA International Education Foundation

A Minor Nuisance Spread Across the Organization: Factors Leading to the Establishment and Support of Records and Information Management Programs

By

Richard J. Cox, Ph.D.

October, 2005

Project Underwritten by:

ARMA International Educational Foundation

Endowment Fund

1609 Terrie Drive
Pittsburgh PA 15241 USA
www.armaedfoundation.org

Table of Contents

Introduction: Looking for Programmatic Benchmarks

Archives, records, and information management programs extend back in their modern form far more than a century. Archival programs originated with the creation of historical societies commencing in the late eighteenth century, and by the end of the early third of the twentieth century they had evolved to their modern form as represented by federal, state, and local government archives, a variety of institutional archives (corporations, colleges and universities, museums and other cultural organizations – nearly every type of organization is represented by some form of program), and, of course, historical societies and other collecting programs with the oldest traditions of collecting and preserving historical documents. Records management programs emerged by the middle of the twentieth century in government agencies and corporate entities striving to administer their current or active (apart from their historical) records, often by first establishing archival operations caring for their historical records and gaining experience with the challenges of managing organizational records that pressed for new approaches to the rapidly increasing array and volume of current records. Information management programs were being regularly established in the last half of the last century as organizations began to adopt computers and other office automation systems, sometimes in conjunction with archives and records management programs but just as often independently as the needs to manage hardware and software became more complex and challenging.

In more recent decades, these various kinds of records and information management programs have converged, although not to the extent that some have predicted and even though the assertions of such a convergence continue. In the 1980s some predicted the end of some aspects of the records professions, and in the 1990s others forecast that all the various segments of the records and information management programs would merge into one seamless disciplinary entity.[1] This never happened, and the evidence for this not occurring can be readily seen in the disparate array of records and information management programs residing in organizations. Nevertheless, there are a growing number of institutions with operations focused on the information and evidence found in records and documents, combining archives, records, information, and knowledge management functions and responsibilities in practical and functional ways. With all these developments and changes came a variety of professionals – archivists, records managers, information resource managers and others challenging these older experts (an example of a recent addition to the array of information professional is the knowledge manager) – who were to play critical roles in how organizations administered records and information.

While this is clearly a sweeping summary of the origins of archives, records, and information management programs, the point is that these operations have been around for a very long time, leading one to expect that there would be a sizeable literature about their origins and the factors leading to their establishment. Every type of organization – government, corporate, college and university, hospital, cultural agency, citizen group –

supports archives, records, and information management operations to some extent and most have had long experience with these functions. Given this reasonably long history, along with the long-standing establishment of organized professions supporting such institutional functions, one would expect to find a rich descriptive and research literature about the factors leading to the establishment of successful records and information management programs. There is a literature describing how and why these organizational operations come into being, but it is one that varies wildly in quality and one that is more anecdotal than systematic, autobiographical or public relations-oriented rather than the outcome of objective research. Amazingly, to some extent, there is as much (maybe more) writing predicting future trends about technologies and their implications for records and information management technologies, written with great confidence, then there is about case studies, looking back and drawing lessons from reality; both are needed, and the latter is definitely required to assess how good are the predictions.[2] It may be that it is easier to write future predictions, often mixed with grandiose claims for the importance of records and information management professionals if they re-invent and re-engineer themselves, than it is to prepare detailed accurate analyses of how records and information management programs have been created, how they have evolved, and whether and how they have prospered or declined.

Records professionals, or others who might be interested in these records and information management programs, have not created a strong literature of case studies, institutional and programmatic histories, and the like. Some have commented on this professional lacuna. Bruce Dearstyne comments, “While we have a vast literature and canons of good practice on RIM techniques, there is much less by way of descriptions of elements, benchmarks, and objectives for RIM programs. Leaders therefore need to devise their own program standards rather than rely exclusively on professional literature.”[3] The lack of such benchmarks and objectives may be due, partly at least, to the absence of serious case studies from which realistic professional and institutional goals and objectives can be formulated. Larry Hackman, considering the development and subsequent management of archives programs, echoes Dearstyne’s commentary: “Despite the key role played by individual programs, our archival literature provides few formal case studies of their development, either during a critical juncture or over a long period of time. Nor do other archival writings provide systematic or comparative analyses of archival programs. Archival writing has concentrated on theory and practice, focusing chiefly on treating materials and making them available to users; we have given less attention to ways to envision, create, advance, protect and sustain an archival program that supports the core archival functions.”[4] Hackman’s critical assessment certainly can be extended to a broader sweep of records and information management programs. Records and information management professionals, searching for practical help or a basis for comparison with their own programs, face considerable challenges when undertaking such tasks because of the weaknesses in professional scholarship.

Such assessments also seem rather surprising given the long history of the records professions, and the many journals, conferences, and publishers providing outlets for research and writing about their programs, but, in fact, it is quite understandable when considering the attributes of these professions (a matter I will return to when I describe the purpose of this report). This is not meant to suggest that there is not a major literature, with strengths and insights, supporting the work of records and information management professionals. Indeed, there is a mountain of publications, but much of it is characterized by general discussion, especially basic manuals about practice, rather than specific and realistic case studies or a theoretical literature that might stimulate additional research.[5] We encounter either many hypothetical cases or discussions about generic reasons organizations will establish records management programs. Many of these we can assume are the product of experience or consulting, but it is nevertheless very difficult to ascertain the level of reality represented by such discussions. This is a weakness of the present study, in that it builds off of the existing literature, warts and all; however, it is only in doing such projects as this one that we can evaluate more closely and rigorously the quality, needs, strengths, and weaknesses of the professional literature. In other words, this is a start (as most research projects are).

Such problems are especially evident in the basic textbooks in the field, the backbone of practice and the codifier of shared knowledge for many archivists, records managers, and others who consider themselves information professionals. Suzanne Gill's book on file management systems, published in 1993, provides many hypothetical cases of file systems, presented in order to provide a "brief historic overview of indexing, from manual, 'first generation' automation to the present."[6] The Lundgrens' 1989 basic records management textbook, for example, contains many case studies of corporate, government, and other organizations' records management programs, but nearly none of them described in any detail the reasons why records management programs were established, other than for the many benefits of economy, efficiency, compliance, and other such well-known factors generally ascribed to by records managers in their professional discussions or conversations with their bosses in their organizational homes.[7] These are typical of textbooks in the records and information professions. It is as if archivists and records managers are content with the arguments or rationales for the organizational and societal needs for their programs and their services, and, of course, these professionals have spent considerable time and resources in developing and marketing these rationales. Case studies, of real life situations, scrutinize just how accurate is the rhetoric justifying records and information management programs.

Archivists, records managers, and information management professionals often seem to have been content with general platitudes about the nature of their programs and their activities, leading to a professional literature that is difficult to build programmatic benchmarks:

- It is surprising, given the long history of archives, records, and information management programs, that we have not had clear identification of the factors creating and sustaining these programs.

- We have more focus on the rhetoric of why these programs are established and predictions about future trends about records and information management work than on developing specific case studies about how these programs are created and sustained

- The professional literature, while vast, is more focused on basic practice rather than on real case studies, basic principles, or theoretical models

These weaknesses have been significant in affecting the eventual direction and outcomes of this project.

This Report's Purpose

There is still much to be learned by a project of this sort. It is possible to examine the existing literature, taking into account its weaknesses, and develop a stronger (by which I mean more coherent) sense of the reasons that records and information management programs are created in organizations. The purpose of this study is to develop a working set of the factors causing organizations to establish records and information management programs, a set that must be considered to be preliminary given the great need for additional research. I posed no specific hypothesis in this study to be tested, but I tried to answer a simple research question – What causes any organization to establish a records and information management operation? I framed my answer by a close examination of the professional literature and a preliminary survey of a representative group of organizations known to support records and information management operations. As I started out, my commission was to identify the factors leading to the establishment of "successful" programs, but the substance of what constitutes a successful records and information management operation is a topic requiring another study (especially given the preponderance of the relevant literature, written by individuals usually closely associated with the subject of their essay, to describe unabashedly their program as a success). For this present study, I assumed that a records and information management program was doing well if it was established and continued to have some degree of support by the parent organization. Clearly one might wonder if a records and information management program needs to have an archives, records management, electronic records or digital documents administration, or even knowledge management sub-unit or emphasis for it to be considered truly successful. There continues to be great debate about the nature of records and information management and disciplinary fragmentation in orientation to even framing questions like this.[8]

The main purpose of this report is to examine the reasons why archives, records management, and information management programs are established in various kinds of organizations. A secondary purpose, in light of the factors identified, is to consider how records and information management programs can sustain themselves over time. I have drawn on two sources. First, I have examined the existing literature that considers why and how such programs are established. As I have already hinted, the literature is somewhat sparse and weaker than one might expect. While there are some detailed case studies, these are the exceptions. Nevertheless, there is an array of case studies and writings with allusions to particular cases that can provide some valuable insights into why these programs are founded within organizations. Given that no one has made an effort to mine the existing literature in this fashion, this report makes at least this modest contribution to professional knowledge. Second, I have queried individuals working at about fifty different kinds of archives, records, and information management programs in the Pittsburgh region, the area where I live and work; I had originally planned to do follow-up interviews but most of the individuals responding declined to be interviewed or stated that their organizations would frown on their providing any additional information about the circumstances of their programs. The purpose of these queries is to develop more first-hand, practical knowledge of real-life cases of the development of these programs, both testing out and enriching the observations embedded in the professional literature. To be honest, this second source is a minor one, since I both spent far more time striving to find a fuller published case study literature than I anticipated, and, I sought to use these surveys as a way of testing and ranking the factors I had already identified. The hesitancy of individuals to engage in interviews suggests the need for a follow-up study of more in-depth interviews and more deliberate individual institutional case studies, an effort that would require more negotiation with the organizations and fieldwork and observation in them.

What I am doing here is not a case study; rather, I am trying to generalize from existing case studies (no matter what their level of rigor and sophistication may be) in order to develop some broader principles or theory about why archives, records management, and information management programs are established. I am striving to pull together a variety of existing descriptions of specific cases to form a collective portrait, while technically the "case study is a research strategy which focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings." Also, "case studies typically combine data collection methods such as archives, interviews, questionnaires, and observations," and while I have done some interviewing and used the existing literature as a kind of archives, there is clearly a difference between what my study represents and the optimal use of case study methodology.[9] One of the dangers of case study methodology, the researcher losing his or her way in a mass of data, is not present in my effort. One experienced researcher suggests that the result of case study work "can be theory which is very rich in detail, but lacks the simplicity of overall perspective. Theorists working from case data can lose their sense of proportion as they confront vivid, voluminous data."[10] The problem faced by records and information management professionals is that they have very little data to begin with and very few case studies. Hopefully, this report will suggest why archivists, records managers, and information professionals need to correct this.

Again, the purposes of this report are as follows:

- To examine the reasons why archives, records management, and information management programs are established in various kinds of organizations, drawing on two sources, the existing literature considering why and how such programs are established and selective interviews individuals working at different kinds of archives, records, and information management programs in the Pittsburgh region, the area where I live and work.

- To stimulate the records and information professions to recognize their need for formalized case study literature, ones that can be used in the field's textbooks, training videos, and as the foundation for building a stronger knowledge supporting work with archives, records, and information systems.

- To generalize from existing case studies (no matter what their level of rigor and sophistication may be) and the interviews in order to develop some broader principles about why archives, records management, and information management programs are established and sustained or not sustained as they evolve over time.

Hopefully, these aims have been met.

The Challenge of Using Stories Rather than Case Studies

The tone of this report is exploratory and interpretive, namely, to set up an agenda or to generate ideas for new and more systematic research in the field that can be generalized, related to existing knowledge, assist in the education of records and information professionals, and help records and information management practitioners understand the situation they are presently in. Gummesson describes a research process where a foundation for research is constructed examining existing paradigms, assumptions, and values, then moving to generate systematically data leading to concepts, conclusions, generalizations, and then ends in a presentation of the outcome – the results and meanings, along with recommendations for future research. He argues that we need to turn research into stories, and that "These stories must be told in a readable and condensed way or they will not get published, nor read by practitioners. They become story telling and an informed interpretation of reality, but not fiction."[11] So, this is an assessment from a set of stories told by records and information management professionals about why their programs and services are important and necessary. Perhaps, records and information management professionals are good at spinning these stories because the records and documents they work with are also stories.[12] While the professional literature is full of such stories, it is also obvious that archivists, records managers, and other information professionals need more that are richer in detail and more useful for developing practical observations and working theories about why and how their services are deemed useful by organizations.

In a certain sense, archivists, records managers, and information management managers have been spinning good stories for a long time. Some individuals striving to develop theoretical aspects of records management have articulated general factors that lead to success or failure of records and information management. David Stephens, examining aspects related to development in national environments, identifies these factors as influencing the establishment and subsequent development of records and information management programs: the type of economic system, government system, the nature of the legal and regulatory system, the nature of management practices, and administrative systems and traditions.[13] Mark Langemo, more in the storytelling mode, says, “More and more business owners – as well as executives in corporations and administrators at all levels of government – are learning that organization-wide records management programs usually pay for themselves at least once annually in documented savings to the organization. Similarly, the results of computer systems research and the experience of veteran IS/MIS professionals show that appropriate investments in computer-based systems can be shown to pay for themselves often in short periods of time. Good information systems can pay for themselves and positively affect their organizations, their customers and clients, their own personnel, and the ‘bottom line’ in several ways . . .” He then enumerates that the ways that this happens are “higher quality and faster service to customers and clients,” “increased executive and managerial effectiveness,” “measurable increases in staff productivity,” substantial reductions in data and records volumes,” “vital data and records can be identified and protected,” “more appropriate implementation and use of technology,” “greater assurance of being in legal compliance,” and “increased profits and improved bottom-line position.”[14] Both authors are drawing upon their own work, observations, and existing stories prevalent in the information professions.

Why do the records and information professions lack a sufficient quantity and quality of *real* case studies? Michael Pemberton provides one explanation, when he notes that “Records management practitioners. . . take a dim view of matters theoretical. Generalizations failing to address a practitioner’s specific task at a particular time may be dismissed as ‘mere theory.’ Yet without theoretical foundations, there can be no meaningful research effort, and without research we have little more, only hearsay, conjecture, anecdote, isolated case studies, and sometimes propaganda and commercialism. . . . By any standard, records management today is the most research poor of the several information disciplines. . . .”[15] Records managers are not alone in the records and information professions in facing this kind of problem. An archivist suggests that the lack of research supporting archival practice might stem from the problem of knowledge and status of theory in the field. The archives component of the records professions has been far more theoretical in its orientation and, even there, insiders worry about state of knowledge: “If archival studies are to be taken seriously as a discipline with a theoretical or philosophical basis, they must offer something beyond solutions to problems of description, arrangement, preservation, and so on.”[16] This commentator on the state of archival research argues that a profession must have “shared attitudes and assumptions,” and a common theory and knowledge are a crucial part of this; case studies are one means by which these attitudes and assumptions can be discerned and strengthened.[17] Experts on case study research contend that good case study research must start from a theoretical base: “Every case study must begin with theory. Like with all other research methods, it is the degree to which theory and related hypotheses have been developed prior to data collection that allows for the testing of the theory. When research hypotheses do not drive the research, findings can only be thought of as exploratory and/or descriptive.”[18] And, for sure, the study being reported here can be viewed as an exploratory, descriptive analysis of the factors leading to the establishment of archives, records, and information management programs.

There are certainly problems with the studies that exist. The vast majority of the studies are written by individuals working in the institutions and involved with the cases being described. In an assessment about the lamentable lack of police archives in the nation, as just one example, the author describes the histories undertaken by the International Association of Police Chiefs: "These are excellent and professionally written histories. Unfortunately, they have one thing in common: For the most part they have all been prepared from selected contemporary agency records and reports by individuals closely associated with the activities. None appears to have been written by an unbiased jury or historians who have had access to all of the available files and records with which to render their verdict." He argues that this is a similar problem with business histories: "We are not necessarily looking forward to reading commemorative public relations efforts. We are looking for accurate (with as little bias as possible) statements of social and political conditions and our agencies' responses to these conditions in their day-to-day activities."[19] There is little evidence of individuals from outside the records and information management professions studying any aspect of archives, records, or information management programs, although there are some excellent exceptions and some evidence that certain aspects are beginning to be analyzed.[20]

The results of the present case studies and other research literature represent a dilemma for the records and information management professions. Dearstyne cogently argues that "There is a need for a practical research/development agenda or framework to help the records management community and others concerned with these changes. This framework could be used to address issues, share solutions, and generally approach pressing records management issues in a systematic way. The most critical needs are at the meeting point of technology, strategy, and alliance building."[21] Given such needs and concerns, one might wonder why case studies just don't naturally emerge from the practical, daily work of records professionals. And, given that consultants play such an important role in the records professions, one might wonder why more of these kinds of reports are not transformed into workable case studies, even if the practical aims of consultant reports are different from the research purposes generally undertaken in case study investigation.[22] Surely, the latter problem may have to do with contractual matters of confidentiality and proprietary information, but these are problems that can be worked out by generalizing the cases or by seeking permission from the sponsors for publication of some form of the cases.

Archivists, records managers, and information professionals could develop conceptual and other models to consider how their programs and particular activities are developed by documenting carefully their own work. For example, the area of project management – the "science of getting things done" – is a common way that many organizations operate. Project management has been connected to the creation of institutional memory: "How smart is your company? Industry-standard PM practices require a critical project closeout phase that collects lessons learned and gives your organization powerful historical knowledge from across the enterprise."[23] There are elements of project management that are directly related to records and information management activities, such as developing strategic objectives, developing time limits for projects, empowering teams, measuring and quantifying project performance. Also project management works within organizational cultures, and each form of culture brings different problems and challenges for implementing and monitoring successful projects; in this there is a lesson for archivists, records managers, and information managers -- the need for understanding the typical culture influencing the potential of success for any project.[24] Detailed case studies of archives, records, and information management programs are definitely needed to accomplish such an aim. Without these case studies, some within the information community see that the various professional missions are endangered. One records manager, for example, concludes, "Records management today is in danger of becoming the snake oil of the business community with records managers the hucksters touting its grand benefits from the backs of corporate and government wagons. We have for 50 years made claims of what records management can do, but so far little result has been realized."[25]

The records and information professions have a need for formalized case study literature, ones that can be used in the field's textbooks, training videos, and as the foundation for building a stronger knowledge supporting work with archives, records, and information systems. And archivists, records managers, and information managers also need clearinghouses for sharing case studies.[26] Most importantly, these professionals need case studies that have "three essential elements: They are realistic, they rely on careful research and study, and they provide data for consideration and discussion by users."[27] There is a need for case studies reflecting a variety of methodologies, but ones where the methodologies are explicitly described and that are designed to support the development of broader theoretical and explanatory models.[28] Perhaps the problem may be a lack of rigorous training within the records and information management fields in such applied research methods as that of the case study.

One of this study's primary limitations was its being hampered by the greater existence of stories rather then research case studies, because

- Records and information management professionals are not as keen on theoretical matters or the building of professional knowledge as they are on practical applications
- What passes for case studies are weakened by being written by individuals associated with the cases
- Consultants, plentiful in the records and information management community, do not seem inclined or able to prepare case studies for the professional literature
- Records and information management professionals may lack formal training in the use of research methods such as case studies

Nevertheless, there is a sufficient literature to at least start building a working set of factors relating to the creating and sustaining of records and information programs.

What Is Meant by Records and Information Management Programs?

One could derail a study such as this by becoming too particular about what is meant by records and information management programs. As I was working on completing a first full draft of this report (in June 2005), a discussion erupted on the Records Management listserv about archivists and the controversy that surrounded the process of nominating the recently appointed Archivist of the United States. In this brief but acerbic discussion all the cracks and fissures existing in the relationship between archivists and records managers appeared. Truth be told, it is hard to know how to draw the parameters of what constitutes archives, records, and information management programs – and this is not a new problem. In 1990, Kenneth Hayes wrote, "The definitions and boundaries utilized in our profession have been the subject of much discussion, and sometimes outright verbal battle. The terms records management, filing, archives, libraries, media preservation, research data bases, electronic data, micrographics, etc., all have differing connotations to different persons. Their boundaries, standards, and interfaces all vary depending on the point of view of the individual drawing the lines and making the definitions."[29] We often talk and write about ARM (archives and records management) or RIM (records and information management) as if there was some strong defining and binding aspects to these terms. For this reason, I have opted not to use such acronyms in this report, but instead I have spelled out my terminology so as to strive to be as clear as possible, as well as to not suggest that we are all living and working in one happy professional community.

Like Presbyterians (of which I am one), records and information professionals are products of nearly too many schisms to count. Records managers split from archivists, some records managers have gone on to become information managers, archivists have split into many different camps, and new variations such as knowledge managers have swept by and pulled with them some archivists and records managers. All of these different groups have different educational backgrounds, read different journals, and attend different professional meetings. Even though all ascribe to some basic foundational principles, such as the life cycle of records, few cross over the lines or act as if they are part of one professional group. Nevertheless, many times these individuals find themselves working in the same administrative units within their organizations; just as often, however, they work apart and hold what can only be characterized as stereotypical perspectives of the others. Thirty years ago, some were striving to derive what any of it meant. Artel Ricks started an essay by asking, "What is records management?" He explained that there was no easy answer "since every records manager and archivist is likely to define it quite differently, an indication that records management remains an emerging concept."[30] Of course, then there were just records managers and archivists; today, there are data managers, document managers, records managers, archivists, strategic information managers, knowledge managers, competitive intelligence administrators, information auditors, information policy managers, information architects, and librarians.[31] All believe they are the capstone of the information professions, and all believe they have contributions to make that are far more useful and practical than the others.

When I embarked upon this study did I strive to consider how all of these groups had programs established within a range of corporate, government, and not-for-profit organizations? No, this would have been unwieldy and would have turned an already lengthy report into a major monograph, a task that neither I nor the ARMA International Educational Foundation anticipated being carried out. Rather, I have focused on what might be called fairly traditional archives and records management programs, encompassing those that also seem to define their responsibilities to include information management programs. A large portion of archivists and most records managers believe they are part of the information professions, even though most all would provide basic definitions and functions that reveal substantial differences. Sue Myburgh argues that they are part of a "metacommunity," sharing certain tasks and objectives, including "identifying information needs; understanding how individuals search for and use information identified as being useful to them; identifying and making accessible the documents which provide such information, by describing the documents; protecting the information, both physically and virtually, and preserving documents (and their information) that are believed to have long-term historical or social value."[32] These are all important components, and they are certainly included in how I have defined the tasks and responsibilities of the kinds of programs I am examining and the factors leading to their establishment and support. At times, I have made comments about differences of opinions and approaches within this metacommunity of information professionals that seem particularly relevant to why organizations support particular programs, but, in general, I have tried to avoid too much analysis of this sort because it might lead more to obfuscation of the main purpose of this report.

There are other means by which we can get at this definitional issue as well. ARMA provides a one-page document, "What Is Records Management?" that is one useful means by which to consider this matter. This document starts out by stating that "information is at the center of everything an organization does," and that the "systematic control of records throughout their life cycle is the definition of records management." It then defines records, enumerates why records management is important, and then strives to answer the question of "who is responsible for managing records and information?" The issue to this latter question suggests that ARMA's articulation of records and information management poses more questions than it answers: "Everyone is. Each employee has an important role to play in protecting the future of the organization by creating, using, retrieving, and disposing of records in accordance with the organization's established policies and procedures."[33] While this latter statement sounds good from an advocacy perspective, it is particularly weak as something to assessed and evaluated in the kind of study being done here. A better way to approach the definitional barrier is to draw on the international standard for records management (ISO 15489-1), as do the Australians who were the original and chief architects for the standard, which focuses on the notion that organizations keep records to enable business processes, deliver services, provide consistency and continuity, meet legislative and regulatory requirements, protect organizational interests and employee rights, provide evidence of business and personal activity, and maintain corporate personal and collective memory.[34]

Records and information management professionals and their programs are complex and difficult to define, resulting from

- Numerous professional schisms
- Differing educational backgrounds
- Reading different professional literature
- Attending different professional meetings
- Diverging professional missions

This particular study has focused on traditional archives and records management programs, with a stress on administering records and the information found in these records. My sense is that the factors that result in the establishment of such programs are the same, or very close to the same, as those stressing more complex information management functions. Moreover, most information management programs have evolved from or in reaction to the traditional archives and records management programs mostly stressed in this report.

Factors Contributing to the Establishment of Records and Information Management Programs

Whatever the weaknesses of the professional literature about the factors sustaining archives, records, and information management programs, there is reasonably strong consensus about seven factors that cause the establishment of such operations. These are as follows:

- Organizations tend to establish records and information management programs, especially archival units, when they reach a landmark anniversary or other critical juncture in their development.
- Many archives, records, and information management programs are the results of efforts of individuals or groups, mostly from within the organization but sometimes working from the outside, who function as champions or advocates for their creation or strengthening.
- Professional and technical standards can be used to encourage organizations to create new or strengthen existing records and information management programs.
- Laws, the fear of litigation, and the news about the impact of mismanaged records and information systems on court cases all can influence organizations to pay closer attention to the administration of their records.

- Records and information management programs are often established because organizations believe that they will help their employees enhance their productivity, make the organizations more competitive, enable the better use of information technologies, or contend with a problem such as the growing volume of records.

- Various crises and disasters inflicting an organization, including threats about not complying with rules, best practices, and industry standards, often inspire or force an organization to establish a records and information management program.

- Organizations often see access to records and information as sources for supporting public relations and marketing.

Each of these factors has been described in detail below. These factors seem to reflect the elements found in the ISO standard on records management, the result of a consensus-building (if not research-driven) process.

***Anniversaries*.** One of the major factors leading to the establishment of archival programs within organizations is when organizations reach a critical time, such as an anniversary, in their existence. A business archives consultant, in a matter of fact fashion, describes it this way: "Most business firms at one time or another have an anniversary – of their founding, or of some other important event. It is at these times that they are apt to discover unsuspected values. Ideally the interest generated by the anniversary will not die out on the last day of the anniversary year, but a way will be to found to use this asset that is the company history."[35] Some records managers have described how their programs should and can encompass both an archives and the supporting of writing an official institutional history, since the "archives section of the records center is the company's memory."[36] Often, an impending anniversary stimulates interest in an organization having a commemorative history written, and the need to consult the institutional archives brings closer attention to the condition of these archives. A church, approaching its sixteenth anniversary, planned to celebrate the occasion by doing a videotape history, and the inspection of available sources led to concerns about the lack of centralized archives, resulting in the establishment of an archives program in 1991.[37] The origins of a corporate archives at Boeing, formally established in 1962, extended back to efforts to publish an authorized history of the company in 1955 on its fortieth anniversary.[38] Likewise, the Bank of America's archives program also grew from efforts to have an official history written.[39]

Sometimes, the catalyst for pushing an organization to establish a records program is an anniversary, impacting other interests evident within an institution for more systematic administration of its records. One of the two critical factors in the 1978 establishment of an archives program of the Archdiocese of Boston was the "balance between historical and administrative concerns. The motive for establishing the archives was distinctively historical." There was an "impending anniversary."[40] The importance of anniversaries in generating interests leading to an archives program has been recognized for a long time. Forty years ago one observer, an experienced business archivist, described the connection in this way: "If the decision to preserve important records can be made early in the life of the organization, so much the better. However, it may be the approach of an important anniversary that brings management to the point where it is willing to begin an archival program. The decision to have a company history written may be the deciding factor."[41] There are limitless testimonies to the importance of institutional anniversaries in the establishment of archives programs, and from these programs often emanate interest in current records administration and the management of digital information resources. In other words, once some sort of records and information management program is established, other aspects of what these programs can encompass usually emerge.

Such impressionistic evidence suggests that when either an archives or records management program is established, the other is most likely to be created because of the lessons learned about the creation of records, anniversaries and other critical junctures in an organization's development play important roles among the factors leading to records and information management programs. The Oncology Nursing Society, founded in 1975, showed efforts to preserve its history when it appointed an historian in 1980, although the person was not a trained archivist or historian. The Society formed a standing Archives Committee in 1988, with volunteers, to strengthen its work with the archival records. "As ONS's fifteenth anniversary approached, both the Archives Committee and the Executive Director became concerned that the histories of the organization and the discipline were vanishing, while at the same time ONS's records were becoming increasingly voluminous and disorganized. They sensed the general problem with contemporary records: two much (volume), yet too little (information)." In 1990, the Society hired an archival consultant, and two years later it hired a director of a new Department of Archives and Records.[42] Over time, the greater focus that can be placed on the potential values of an organization's records and information sources, the more likely that these sources will be provided the professional care and other support necessary for managing them.

Sometimes, the interest in a particular time in an organization's history is motivated by external events. The celebration of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution is an example. Despite the long history of the Catholic Church in America, there was a very slow development of archival programs in the church. "By the mid-1970s, however, a change in attitude occurred as Catholic prelates began to show more concern for the archival records in their possession," observes one archivist. The National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a report as part of its Committee for the Bicentennial, concerning the needs for fostering the establishment of ecclesiastical archives. "The timing could not have been more auspicious. With preparations underway for America's bicentennial, communities and institutions alike became more cognizant of the need to locate, collect, preserve, and make available materials that could help document their contributions to the nation's past. In the area of Catholic archives, support arrived from two other directions as well. Shortly after the close of the bicentennial, the Vatican admonished American bishops to make diocesan archives more available to scholarly researchers instead of treating them as 'private property.

Concomitant with this concern, scholarly interests had also broadened in the preceding decade."[43] Organizational and, better yet, public scrutiny about the importance of records and information sources is likely to breed more resources being provided for their care. Sometimes, it takes just a small seed to start what can become an effective records and information management program.

The American Revolution Bicentennial also spread interest in corporate archives. As one corporate archivist reflected, "Companies may have realized that an emphasis on history could bring positive public relations benefits." The interest of these companies at the time was also helped by the era's positive economic growth, shifts in corporate culture from family oriented environment to more transient workforces and arguments by historians and archivists about the value of corporate history.[44] Others have painted even more complex portraits of the factors stimulating interest in corporate archives in that era. For a long time, there was little interest in corporate archives, then a "rebirth of interest" in them emerged in the early 1970s for "many reasons." According to David Smith, "The nostalgia craze made instant antiques or 'collectibles' out of the relatively recent products of many of our companies. Universities were turning out large numbers of history graduates who, finding jobs scarce in the field of education, helped convince some businesses that they could be useful in an archives program. The U.S. Bicentennial celebrations on the horizon brought renewed interest in history. Many companies were reaching major anniversaries and needed organized collections so that their histories could be written. And, lawsuits against companies were becoming all the more common, making easy access to historical files necessary to company attorneys."[45] Celebrations of anniversaries, marked by special publications and exhibitions, have tended to generate positive public relations for existing records programs.[46]

The degree to which such anniversaries and other landmarks result in the establishment of viable archives and records management programs may be counterbalanced by general suspicions about such programs and lack of understanding about their purposes and activities. As a business archivist reflects on such matters, "If one of the company's founders is vitally concerned about the matter this can be an important asset, particularly if he himself is historically minded. But even so, it may be difficult to convince others of the importance of preserving historical records."[47] Establishing business archives has proved to be a considerable challenge, as attitudes about these programs are often quite negative. One analysis of such archives mused, "Many business managers view archives as little more than gloomy spider-infested repositories of crumbling paper and rusty artifacts. These executives are often unaware of the meaning of archives and do not understand their potential value."[48] One prominent archivist, nearly four decades ago, lamented the then lack of development of substantial business history and business archives, noting that "most business history is still the history of firms and government policy and is based on published sources. Research based on the records of firms tends to accept the values of business community and narrow issues to questions of internal administration."[49] Maynard Brichford surmised that business archives are usually established for public relations value, records management, and as a hobby or point of pride by the organization and its leadership. Business archives, according to Brichford, are not established because of businesses not wanting to spend money on something with little promise of return or because of fear of having proprietary information stolen, but they are usually established for public relations and marketing, protecting patent rights, and for maintaining a valued old employee on the payroll.[50]

Some of these challenges are due both to general misunderstanding about the nature of archives and records programs. While business archives have been identified as being useful for many reasons -- including economic, legal, public relations, new product development, orienting new employees, and other activities – the task of explaining why these programs are useful can be onerous. As one expert writes, "The principal problem in the establishment of a business archives is justification of the archives to top management. Corporate executives are often unaware of the meaning of the word or do not understand the potential value of an archives. The records manager or historian who approaches top management with the idea of creating an archives should come prepared with definite justification and perhaps a sample policy statement for management to study."[51] Such advice is apropos for government agencies, cultural institutions, higher education, and virtually every other kind of organization, due to the fact that the importance of records, both current and archival, is often not understood by organizational managers and executives. Records professionals must often start from the beginning in explaining the importance of records and their mission, striving to overcome the stereotypes that predominate in society, equating paperwork with inefficient bureaucracy and records maintenance as merely potential legal liabilities.

Again Maynard Brichford demonstrates that the challenge here is both misconceptions about such records programs and mistaken ways that they have been advocated about. Brichford argues that "business attitudes toward archival programs include a reluctance to spend money on an activity with little promise of a financial return, a desire to preserve records needed to protect patent rights and defend the firm in tax and anti-trust litigation, and a willingness to impress the public with the story of the firm's accomplishments and its interest in keeping basic records and relics. . . . Management may harbor a suspicion that outsiders are likely to find valuable trade secrets or company 'skeletons' in the old files, and they often nourish a hostility toward muckraking historians, federal agents, and Ralph Naders." These are understandable concerns given the purpose of businesses to turn a profit and to support the investments of their stockholders. Brichford provides a sense of a much broader mandate for these programs: "Business archives exist primarily to serve the needs of management, not historians. Records management is the most important reason that companies have used to begin archival programs. The others are tax advantages, public relations values, and the owner's or manager's personal interest in history. Historians often fail to understand that governmental archives are primarily concerned with the needs of government rather than the convenience of historical researchers. This is also true of business archives. I believe that the interests of the historical researchers are best served where the archives are established to meet corporate administrative needs."[52] As other organizations, such as museums and universities, adopt the corporate model, records professionals might expect that they need to at least address such issues. However, there are many in the records and information management community who have long advocated that the primary reasons for managing and preserving (at least a portion) records stem primarily from the needs of the records creators, even when acknowledging that historians, other scholars, genealogists, and a host of researchers have important needs for access to the records.[53]

Anniversaries, or other critical times in an organization's history and development, tend to foster new interests in records and information management programs by

- Stimulating reasons for marking a particular occasion in ways that focus on records and information

- Drawing attention to possible new uses of records and information

- Sponsoring the preparation of corporate histories and special reports

- Developing means for understanding basic, practical values of records and other information sources

- Bringing together the disparate interests of historians, scholars, and other researchers with the interests of organizational administrators

Champions. Probably the most obvious reason for why organizations create records and information management programs, or any program, is the existence of a champion within the organization who promotes such programs. Historically, this reason for spurring on the establishment of records programs extends far back to the traditional origins of many special collections and archives being the result of a single scholar or collector.[54] Moreover, sometimes the champions come in the form of professional and citizenry groups lobbying for creation or strengthening of a records program. We can see this in the development of the Ohio state archives. From 1803 (statehood) to 1904 when a historian surveyed state records, there was only neglect in terms of the care of these archives. When a survey of the archives was published in 1906, historians began to pressure for improvements in the care of these records. Ohio's private historical Society also lobbied on and off until 1927, when legislation was introduced and transfers of state records began to be made to the historical society. In 1957 the Ohio Historical Society hired a state archivist and in 1959 state law officially named the Ohio Historical Society the state archives.[55] However, it is also the case that since the establishment of this state archives, that it has had a very checkered history of success and support, at least partly because of the sustaining of any kind of leadership within it or support for it on the outside.

Such examples abound. We can see similar trends in the success of North Carolina's local government records program, although in this instance there was a more deliberate and progressive focus on building partnerships that generated strong and sustained advocacy. "If there is a lesson that every state can learn from North Carolina," North Carolina's former State Archivist H. G. Jones argues, "it is that the unconscionable condition of local government records can be improved if the state assumes its own responsibility by providing a substantive program that enlists local officials as partners with archivists and records managers. Time and labor spent on studies, surveys, and grant applications may be spent more profitably on missionary work among one's own legislators and community officials. Archival salvation will be found at home, not in Washington, D.C."[56] Jones's criticism was being aimed at the archives community, since he believed that it spent far too much effort touting local successes at national conferences that were tentative accomplishments at best.

The nature of such salvation can be seen in the origins of the University of Pittsburgh's Archives of Industrial Society. As its first archivist recounted, "Pittsburgh and its metropolitan satellites represented an urban industrial society which offered a stimulating challenge for testing new historical hypotheses or investigating the relevancy and applicability of conclusions reached in other studies in different geographical loci. It soon became apparent that there was a paucity of diverse historical records readily available to enable extensive and intensive study."[57] The Archives of Industrial Society was established to deal with the lack of records for historical and other research: "The Department of History at the University established the Archives in 1963 in an attempt to locate, gather, preserve, and make known and available records which had not appeared important in the past but which had become invaluable."[58] My own observations of this program in my nearly two decades of working on the faculty of this university also suggest that a champion is necessary for its success. During my time, I have seen two interim university library directors and two permanent holders of this position, and with each the varying level of interest and support has resulted in both troubles and successes for this program. When I arrived in the late 1980s, the program was dormant, understaffed, and run by a demoralized group; today, it is quite active, with a large and knowledgeable staff – the latter principally due to the interests of the present incumbent in the university library system directorship.

Pressure from the outside often materializes into action in the creation of new records archives, records, and information management programs. This has been especially the case in the government sector, where citizens often demand access to public records in order to hold officials accountable, be able to use records for genealogical and other research purposes, and where archival agencies are often seen to play public memory and other culturally significant roles. Describing the passage of a Maryland law on forms management, that state's then new forms managers states that the impetus for a series of efforts to pass this law from 1975 to 1978 came from legislators "acting upon complaints emanating from private citizens and businesses about the burdens that State reporting requirements have imposed upon them . . . ." Previous efforts before 1978 failed because of new administrative burdens, perceived "infringement" of various agencies' "managerial prerogatives, and requirements for large staff." Meetings were held to produce a "more workable bill." The bill gave responsibility to the existing Records Management Division to "coordinate the program and establish guidelines for use by all departments and agencies. Each department and independent state agency is permitted much latitude and independence in managing its forms," with a series of requirements for department and agency to have plans and appoint a forms management officer.[59]

Sometimes such efforts are confounded by misinformation and misassumptions. The many efforts, dating back to the early nineteenth century, to create a state archives in Maine, finally being successful in 1965, were weakened by the idea that the records were being administered adequately. As one chronicler of the movement suggests, the "fact that Maine has a quasi-official establishment in the office of the Secretary of State, which provides reasonably adequate storage for the more important State papers, has undoubtedly led many to believe that all State records were well cared for. This belief, combined with continuing indifference on the part of the public and the legislature concerning the overall condition of State records, seems to account adequately for the lack of concern for their care and preservation and the delay in recognizing the need for an efficient archival program."[60] This kind of scenario is a perfect illustration why an individual champion is often necessary, someone who can see through political and other rhetoric to discern the real needs and problems associated with the administration of records and information sources. In New York State government, for example, the energetic and creative leadership of its state archivist transformed its records program into a national leader.[61]

More often than not the champion or champions arise from within the ranks of an organization. One of two critical factors in the 1978 establishment of an archives program in the Archdiocese of Boston was due to the efforts of such champions. "At the outset, the archives faced the usual range of administrative interest: there was some skepticism, little outright hostility, and plenty of indifference." Two leaders emerged, one being the Bishop: "He was a genealogist and local history enthusiast, but more importantly a man who instinctively asked historical questions of current-day management problems."[62] A similar situation can be seen in the 1980 origins of the Yale University's "first systematic archives/records management program." This program developed because of the earlier appointment in 1968 of a professional archivist to head Yale's then new Department of Manuscripts and Archives. This person and his successor led the efforts to establish a far more comprehensive records program. Lawrence Dowler joined Yale in 1975, and he was "convinced that the quantities of records moldering in university attics and basements had immense research value" and that the university also needed to cope better with its paperwork. He began a "systematic campaign" to establish the program. The first critical factor in the successful establishment of the program was "outstanding managerial and professional leadership provided" by Herman Kahn and Lawrence Dowler. "Both Kahn and Dowler stressed professionalism and the importance of archival training and standards. Dowler's managerial style was well matched to the context; he delegated responsibility readily, encourage staff to take initiative, and treated subordinates collegially. The result was a highly motivated, professionally committed staff that functioned as a well-balanced team."[63] Many records professionals can point to individuals who have functioned in this way, and probably most records programs are the result of their activities.

How champions operate and where they get their inspiration as well as their will to become advocates has not been systematically studied, but there is a plentitude of anecdotal evidence chronicling their activities. The origins of one corporate archives emanated from a visit to another company possessing such a program. A librarian from "one of the large pharmaceutical companies" visited the established Lilly Archives, leaving with enthusiasm for starting an archives in her own company. While the program was never developed because of other pressing responsibilities, the seeds were planted: "Later the director of institutional advertising became concerned about the company archives and since his retirement from his administrative position he has been named company historian and is now turning his attention to historical records."[64] Sometimes the most serendipitous of events leads to the establishment of a program. The description of the evolution of one corporate records management included this commentary on the catalyst for the program's origins: "One day the company president asked for everything we had in file on a certain subject. Dutifully, we produced a file about one-half inch thick, whereupon a thunderous roar arose announcing that we should have reams of records on the given subject. A thorough search in various departments did, in fact, produce a small mountain of records. This little incident became the impetus which launched our company records management program."[65] It is probably an event that was ingrained in the program's memory, and one that prompted it to strive to provide similar service every time the organization requested information that could be supplied from its holdings.

Sometimes, the champion is a group of people or a committee, as this assessment of how a university records management program came about suggests: "Records management at the University of Alberta came about as a result of the activities of an historically oriented Archives Committee. . . ." A rare books and archives section had been established in 1963, and a full-time archivist appointed in 1968. An archives policy was formulated in 1969, the "first concrete step in the establishment of a records management program at the university." The policy included a section on records management. All of this occurred because of an advisory committee, with a broad vision, working with the institutional archives operation and that committee morphing into champions advocating for serious change and new commitment by the university.[66] Again, this kind of success is dependent on how an organization normally functions, but so many continue to work through committees, standing and ad hoc, that this is a fairly normal success story in the establishing of records and information programs or in their gaining their continued support from parent organizations. Whether this is a possibility or not rests on what one discerns about how the organization makes decisions and functions on a daily basis.

Advocates for establishing or further developing archives, records, and information management programs sometimes emerge from efforts to contend with and resolve particular problems. Archivists and other records professionals like to fix things. In late 1985 some members of the University of Delaware professional staff began a study of issues related to electronic recordkeeping on decentralized computers. An ad hoc task force consisting of two members of the Archives & Records Management department and one staff member of the Management Information Services started the effort. In February 1986 they sent out a survey on the topic to see how other organizations were dealing with the issue. In mid-1986 they reported their findings to the Provost. Following the recommendation of the report, the Provost appointed on February

24, 1987 the Information Resource Management Committee with broader representation of the units of the university. The new committee sent out a survey to every unit within the university, leading to a policy on electronic recordkeeping, approved August 9, 1988.[67] We can find many examples of such stories, although they are often shared informally at conferences and via listserv discussions rather than as part of formal case studies; systematizing our understanding of how such successes are achieved through case studies would help records and information management professionals to develop basic principles and models for replicating such successes.

Champions, at least those who have some prospects for being successful, must have interpersonal skills as well as a cogent message to market. A business archivist provides a sense of such issues, stating, "There are many basic arguments an archivist must utilize if he is going to persuade top management of the need for such a program. While the exact nature of the program includes legal, public relations, production, educational, and historical arguments, much also depends on the archivist. He must be a salesman, able to communicate his program effectively to a group of businessmen who are essentially opposed to it. Advocates must justify the costs and the risks. To be successful, a business archivist must formulate historical problems and develop historical products and series that bear on the current concerns of business management."[68] Likewise, records managers have the opportunity to bring their experience and expertise to bear on solving critical organizational records and information challenges. One consultant describes three cases where a records manager takes leadership in creating new, practical solutions for electronic records management, by observing a problem, inquiring about employees needs, and cobbling something together. "Records managers have assets that do not require large staffs and generous budgets to build," the consultant contends. "Credibility is one of the most valuable, and it should never be squandered. Records managers establish credibility by being current on the principles, practices, laws, and regulations relating to ERM." They also "sell" the benefits, define the problems, and communicate the values.[69]

Such successes do not always, or even frequently, occur in organizations. Reporting on the 2003 ARMA International/AIIM International/Cohasset Associates "Electronic Records Management Survey," Cynthia Launchbaugh summarizes details about how most organizations have not set in place electronic records management programs, putting the organizations at risk. She writes, the "results suggest that records management professionals have not adequately communicated the fundamentals of including electronic records in their organization's records management program. Nor have they effectively educated their employers and colleagues about the significance of electronic records and the special challenges associated with their management." She argues records managers "should view this as an opportunity."[70] But such opportunities can create confusion and other problems.

What if records professionals don't have models or success stories that they can easily point to in building their cases? David Stephens, in one of his international commentaries, in this instance looking at Africa, wisely argues that the "role of the national archives is of crucial importance in 'sponsoring' records management within the country, and serving as a model for its development at lower levels of government throughout the country."[71] Or, what if records professionals are unable to convey a message that can be understood? A corporate records manager indicates that organizational administration often does not understand and is not interested in records management because the administrators do not understand it. They are also preoccupied with other more important issues.[72] In describing the archives and records management situation in Ghana, we can discern how such a lack of understanding about these programs occur: "Primarily there was a lack of interest on the part of the political class. The fundamental reasons for this indifference was the typical lack of understanding of the authorities of the contribution that a properly functional archives and records service can make to nation building, in providing the mechanism for governmental efficiency, accountability, human rights, or in supporting national economic, social and intellectual development through the preservation of the documentation of the past so necessary to carrying out the government's mission."[73] Bruce Dearstyne aptly sums up the challenge in this fashion: "Records management has in the past been known as a valuable but not essential administrative support service. In the future, it needs to be accepted more as a central operating requirement. Records managers need to demonstrate to administrators, legal counsel, auditors, and others the importance of sound records management to the successful operation of the enterprise."[74] While Dearstyne is issuing a particular call for action, it is call that could be substantially assisted by the availability of well-documented case studies that either provide insights into successes or enable records and information management professionals to learn from mistakes.

Many internal critics in the records professions point to the inadequacy of the messages often conveyed by archivists, records managers, and others about their professional and organizational missions. One records manager argued that records professionals tend to provide the wrong message and, as a result, they lose influence in their organizations. Records professionals don't respond to problems, but, instead, they offer grandiose long-term benefits and schemes, certainly a discernible problem when searching for realistic case studies for this present project.[75] Others have taken a much broader view, contending that organizations and their managers are really interested in information not records.[76] Indeed, many have focused on the latter problem. Jim Coulson argues that many records management programs are "underfunded, limited in scope, and poorly positioned within their parent organizations." He gives as the reason the fact that their records management RM programs focus on inactive records, seem to be interested only in paper records, and lack a "well-defined, consistent set of professional skills and experience." Administrators often don't think of records, he argues, because records are managed well below them. Coulson argues that records managers must think like administrators and not janitors.[77]

Champions, in the form of individuals and groups, often create new interests in organizations for establishing records and information management programs by

- Lobbying for the improvement of care and effective administration of records and information

- Identifying particular reasons, such as accountability, genealogical research, and historical and other research, for why such records and information management programs should be cared for

- Raising above individual or group needs, concerns, and interests to make a compelling reason for the establishment of these programs

- Encouraging individuals with particular skills and vision to become advocates for the improved administration of records and information, often against commonly held stereotypes of records and information management

- Building on memorable events, such as visits to established records and information management programs or particular failures to retrieve effectively evidence and information, to grow interest and support within the organization to build such programs.

Standards. Archivists, records managers, and other information professionals have devoted considerable attention to the role of professional, technical, and other forms of standards in supporting and improving their work. Much of their activity has been in responding to particular standards, but records and information professionals have also put considerable energy into creating standards that will assist organizations in establishing and supporting records and information management programs. Archivists, for example, have worked on various descriptive standards over the past three decades to formalize the production and use of finding aids to their holdings. Records managers, in the past decade, have created an international standard defining and enumerating the functions of their programs. In considering the array of existing standards, one records manager notes, "As with any good investigation or analysis, these standards help resolve the who, what, when, where, and why of RIM protection."[78] This statement captures the sentiment about standards shared by many records professionals, that standards are the backbone of what they do and that they are critical to helping others to understand records and information management work.

One of the chief sets of standards records managers have been concerned with has been that of the ISO 9000 standards on quality assurance.[79] David Stephens provides an excellent assessment of these standards when he asserts that "Multinational companies which sell products or services to the European Community need to establish recordkeeping systems and procedures that comply with the International Standards Organization's 9000 Series of standards, which addresses quality assurance (QA) issues." One of these standards, ISO 9004, states that, 'The quality management system should establish and require the maintenance of a means for identification, collection, indexing, filing, storage, maintenance, retrieval and disposition of pertinent quality documentation and records . . . Quality records should be retained for a specified period in such a manner as to be retrievable for analysis in order to identify quality trends. . . . While in storage, quality records should be protected from damage, loss, and deterioration due to environmental conditions.'"[80] Records and other information professionals strive to use such standards not only to measure the effectiveness of their own programs, but they use these standards to advocate for additional support or the creation of new aspects of their operations. Most organizations, especially governments and corporations, will be sensitive to standards that guide, affect, or make possible their business and other dealings. Records and information management professionals need to be aware of those standards with implications for the creation and maintenance of particular kinds of records and information systems.

Records and information management professionals not only monitor standards but they create and sustain them, sometimes for the purposes of influencing organizations in comprehending and supporting the importance of their mission, work, and programs. One of the main standards achievements of the records management field was the development of the Australian national standard (Australian Standard AS 4390 Records Management), "a national standard, comprehensively describing 'best practice' in records management, issued by the nation's standards setting organization, [and with] the potential to elevate records management as a professional business practice in a way that nothing else can, not even legislation."[81] As advocates for this standard argued at the moment of its creation, such a standard provides "a benchmark, a model, against which to evaluate the status and effectiveness of their records management program." The standard is a tool a records manager can use to obtain stronger support. "But perhaps the greatest significance of a national standards lies in its potential impact on those thousands of organizations, in both the public and private sectors, which have no formal records management program at all. While not mandatory, a national standard for records management will provide a strong incentive for an organization's management to take a serious look at records management and its benefits in improving the quality of information and recordkeeping throughout the enterprise. When used in this way, a national standard will provide a legitimacy for records management that is, in some ways, even better than laws mandating the implementation of these programs."[82] The hope for this standard was, at least in part, to motivate organizations of all types to establish records programs. Clearly, more research about its practical impact, especially in the creation and maintenance of programs, would be very useful.

The Australian standard ultimately became an international standard, ISO 15489-1: Information and Documentation – Records Management. The development of the international standard generated considerable optimism for the positive role such standards can play in establishing and strengthening established records management programs. Standards can be useful in assisting companies that have merged consider how to establish their document and records management program. ISO 15489 has been declared to be particularly useful in this. The standard was used in one merger as a "global best practice to use as a model and tool" for considering records management implications of a merger.[83] As one consultant reflects, "Using ISO 15489 as a framework, the merger transition team's checklist was useful for evaluating and determining the strengths and weaknesses of each company's program. While one company had already implemented an enterprise functional retention schedule, the other company and a departmental retention schedule process and system. ISO 15489 clearly provided the global model to follow. Using the standard to develop an objective checklist helped to reduce change resistance and to minimize the politics inherent in merger planning."[84] Another observer of the utility of this standard suggests that ISO 15489 changes management's orientation to records from costs and other concerns to improving quality of service and reducing risks. "Applying the principles of ISO 15489 can help organizations avoid expensive litigation or counter litigation. Moreover, the standard can offer protection against reputation damage by providing accurate evidence of activities."[85] Likewise, the United Kingdom, as part of a series of sweeping legislative and administrative changes, issued from the Lord Chancellor's Office a *Code of Practice on the Management of Records*, consistent with the new ISO standard on records management and designed to help government leaders and policymakers understand the basic components of such programs. An early assessment of the code indicates that it is "proving to be a valuable tool for persuading organizations to take records management seriously by providing a quasi-statutory standard of good records management practice."[86]

There have been few serious efforts to prepare specific, detailed case studies about the impact of these standards on the creation or strengthening of records management programs. The reasons may be the general weaknesses described earlier about such research, or it may simply be the fact that the more important standards are relatively recent in origin. Most records professionals would agree that a lack of standards harm the creation and nurturing of records management and other records and information programs. Considering the need to preserve and manage Web-based records, John Phillips comments on some recent ideas suggesting that organizations experiment and try different approaches. Phillips writes, "The moving target of managing information properly in technology-driven environments often precludes waiting for industry standards or best practices to be firmly established. Increasingly, professional records and information managers will need to take the initiative to advise their management of recordkeeping solutions, even when elements of those solutions will need to be developed internally." With this assessment, we have the other challenge of working in a field that seems to be always evolving and quickly.[87]

Professional and technical standards often promote the establishment of records and information management programs by

- Enunciating the nature and importance of such programs
- Providing clear and useful tools that can be used to advocate for such programs
- Providing benchmarks or models to measure the success and performance of records and information management programs
- Helping organizations understand records and information management programs by providing clear, unambiguous descriptions

Legal. Records professionals, especially records managers, have given serious attention to the legal requirements of organizations for administering records and information systems. Legal requirements are seen as being precise for identifying what the organization must do in regards to administering records, such as establishing specific retention periods, but there are also a lot of legal considerations that are not as specific, where risk management is more of a need.[88] Or, to state matters much more bluntly, if records are destroyed too soon, without adequate records retention schedules, there will be serious, negative consequences for the organization engaged in such activities.[89] Some records and information management professionals have critiqued the concept of evidence used in their community because they have seen it as too confined to legal definitions and case law.[90]

Some of the emphasis on the legalistic aspects of evidence may have to do with seeking to motivate organizations to administer properly their records and information management systems. In fact, there are numerous essays in the records management literature that are more generally scare tactics, offering no advice or commentary about how litigation may lead to new or better records management programs. Citing a number of legal cases, one records manager concludes that writing on documents creates new documents, that notes taken during meetings may be harmful, that organizations must have records retention schedules in place, that if items are disposed of via retention schedules, courts will not hold any organization liable, and that poor records management will hurt the organization.[91] Again, what are needed are more specific case studies of the actual impact of legal cases on how and why organizations manage their records. One records management textbook describes a company paying a million dollars in lawsuits "resulting from non-compliance with several federal statutes. Immediately after the suits were settled, Sampson's Board of Directors demanded that a total program of records management be implemented." It would be good to have more details of cases such as this.[92]

In quieter days, the advice about the legal implications of records work seemed reasonably straightforward and calm. As one corporate archivist wrote nearly four decades ago, "Important legal advantages can be derived from the possession of old company records." This individual describes the case of the Lilly capsule trademark, first manufactured by Lilly in 1898 and refined over the years. "In 1960 an application was made for trademark registration. Archives personnel were asked to gather material to accompany the application which would prove that Lilly gelatin capsules have been and are sold in bulk form and that there was a need to distinguish between the Lilly filled capsule and those of other manufacturers. Much of the documentation that accompanied the trademark application came from the archives files." The trademark for the capsule was registered on June 5, 1962.[93] Such straightforward concerns about the importance of archives and records management purposes shifted a decade later as new and more pervasive federal legislation about matters like privacy began to have an impact. Writing about the 1974 amendments to FOIA and the 1974 Privacy Act, one federal records manager notes that these acts "powerfully influence their professional lifestyle, for they place burdens on them which affect just about every phase of records management."[94] This observer then argues that records managers should seek to take responsibility for

FOIA/Privacy Act programs in their agencies, making sure that records creation is done according to the laws and that the agencies are more efficient in retrieving records.

The times have changed. A decade ago, one consultant wrote, "No records manager in this day and age can afford to be caught off guard. For a company with even a low litigatory profile, the need for a basic records program is essential."[95] Fear of, or mechanisms for coping with, litigation seems to have become a major catalyst for the establishment of records management programs. Ira Penn argues, for example, that the litigious era of the 1980s brought or forced records management out of the basement and into the boardroom because of legal decisions determining that records management programs were poor and fining agencies and organizations were one result of this.[96] The problem may be that such hopes have been expressed before, and the resulting impact has not been well-documented or long-lasting. Writing in the wake of Watergate investigations thirty years ago, one observer notes: "No longer can any records manager or archivist operate within the quiet backwaters of his or her organization's operations. The bright spotlight of publicity involving the records problems affecting the rights of citizens has brought the records managers to the forefront in their agencies in plain view of top managers. Similarly, the many headlines also have focused on the work of Federal archivists, particularly in dealing with Presidential papers. For the time being, at least, the occupational obscurity of the records profession appears to be a thing of the past."[97] This is a statement that could have been written yesterday, with the same hopes (unfulfilled) and promises (not yet met) expressed.

There have been, nevertheless, shifts over the years in how organizations consider, in the wake of various social, economic, political, and legal crises, their records programs. Long before, in the 1980s, the unfortunate events of Enron/Arthur Andersen, businesses were speeding up the destruction of records in order to avoid litigation, protect corporate secrets, reduce storage of records, and to try to do this as part of a regular program seen as a regular part of the business routine.[98] Moreover, within a decade essays began to appear in business magazines with dire predications of the implications of the increasing uses of new technologies, such as email and personal computers, and the possibilities of companies being sued and losing court cases because of incriminating records being discovered. These essays generally offered advice for the creation of electronic document retention programs and the enhancement of existing, mostly paper-oriented, records operations.[99] By the early twenty-first century, the old mantra of destroying as many records as fast as possible right up to the point of litigation and the first subpoena had dissolved, as the growing number of court cases now suggested that companies must administer and shred records carefully.[100]

Concerns about the potential liability of companies in the administration of their records has led to the establishment or strengthening of records and information management programs. Various federal legislative acts such as The Privacy Act of 1974, The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1994, the Economic Espionage Act of 1996, and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act all have worked as catalysts for new and improved records and information management operations. The Economic Espionage Act, making it a federal offense to violate trade information protections, "heralds a landmark of protection for corporate America whereby the federal government itself will protect trade information and severely punish the culprits. The only impediment is that the organization victimized by the trade information violation must be able to prove that it took all reasonable measures to identify and protect that information."[101] So organizations are advised to establish records programs and to destroy more carefully and deliberately unnecessary and obsolete records. Indeed, this may be good advice because the more recent government regulations have "teeth." For example, "Five Wall Street firms were fined $1.65 million each for not properly saving and retaining their email in 2002. Regulatory compliance failure can result in censure or fines, litigation, reduced market capitalization, federal and/or state suspension from normal business activities and criminal penalties. As a result, enterprise records management (ERM) – the systematic control of records throughout their lifecycle from creation/receipt to use/circulation to maintenance to disposition – has become a high executive-level priority." The risks of improper records management – censure or fines, litigation and high legal discovery costs, reduced market capitalization, regulatory suspension of normal business activities, and criminal penalties – are all good reasons for the establishment of records programs.[102]

Of course, every records professional is now aware of the importance of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, enacted in the aftermath of the colossal failures of Enron and the unethical activities of Arthur Andersen, events that should have shaken the foundations of what records managers do since they attacked the very root of assumptions about critical professional practices. According to one observer, "The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 represents the most meaningful and consequential corporate accountability legislation passed by the federal government since the 1930s." This individual continues, "How the federal government will enforce the provisions of the Act remains to be seen, but Sarbanes-Oxley already has opened a lot of executive's eyes to the critical importance of records and information management in corporate America."[103] Among other things, the Act creates the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board to establish or adopt "auditing, quality control, ethics, independence, or other standards for preparing audit reports"; inspecting public accounting firms; doing investigations and imposing sanctions on public accounting firms; and enforcing compliance with the Act, Board rules, professional standards, and securities laws.[104] The Act requires companies to manage electronic records, including email: "The new rules demand that records managers familiarize themselves with information technology concepts in order to implement and maintain the records and information management policies that Sarbanes-Oxley necessitates."[105] At the crux of this new legislative mandate is an impetus for companies to establish strong, effective records and information management programs: "It is important to understand that if a record cannot be found or retrieved, the legal onus is on the organization to prove its innocence. Whether a record was 'lost' intentionally or as a result of sloppy records management is of no concern to government investigators. Thus, organizations large and small should consider this legislation a wake-up call to clean up, reorganize, or revise their records management procedures. To not do so is to risk their company's well-being."[106] If records and information management professionals can demonstrate how they can reduce their organizations' risks, they will have a much better chance of generating continuing support for their programs.

The increasing uses of electronic information systems have also caused many organizations to reconsider the potential porous nature of using these systems for records creation and maintenance. A recent assessment of such matters indicates that "high-profile court cases have outlined the consequences of not managing information properly through secure, tamperproof retention to timely destruction. Those cases have in parallel raised the profile of technologies like ERM, but their main effect has simply been to convince organizations of the need to retain their information in an orderly manner, fast." Given the new regulations related to these systems, organizations must consider both long-term storage and orderly destruction of records, with an increased need to focus on records retrieval on demand in an as efficient and effective a way as is possible. "For example," these authors contend, "if you can quickly find a record of last year's customer contracts, verify the discounts you gave and use them as a baseline for this year's contract, you're saving time and money, as well as looking good in the eyes of the customer."[107] Here, of course, we have it all – from being compliant and efficient to generating positive public relations, all given by others as being important factors in the reasons organizations establish records programs.

New technological approaches to managing information are useful to organizations, but there must be safeguards concerning the nature and reliability of the records and information, and these safeguards also fall over into reasons that are critical to the establishing of records and information management programs. "For electronic information to be stored and processed in a manner that assures the data are just as reliable, authentic, and secure as the information processed in paper based systems, both new information policies and new technology solutions must be developed and implemented," writes one consultant. "In order to properly address business concerns about potential litigation, business audits, and government regulations or compliance issues, it is especially important that these new technology driven business solutions be integrated with existing policies and procedures to prevent dual sets of operating requirements. It is also very important to assure that new computer systems implement embedded records management controls to enhance the ability of both users and records managers in making decisions about retaining or disposing of electronic records."[108] Obviously, a records management program is needed to ensure that any of this happens.

The changing nature of both recordkeeping technologies and laws governing or influencing how records and information systems are managed has caused many records professionals to rethink their role and activities in organizations. Donald Skupsky argues that legal counsel don't have the time to be on top of every legal requirement for keeping records, so records managers can assist by applying legal issues to retention matters, even though legal counsel must review the work done. "When upper management. . . is concerned about legal issues, costs are generally not a major factor. For example, when the organization is confronted with important litigation or a tax audit, all necessary resources – staff, facilities, equipment and supplies – are provided to bring about a favorable resolution. Records management, too, will often be provided additional resources when it is clearly demonstrated that it makes a significant contribution to protect the organization related to legal actions and legal compliance."[109] In other words, the need for organizations to observe legal guidelines and requirements should be a major factor why records and information management programs are established and supported.

Legal requirements and litigation cases (or their possibility) have promoted the establishment of records and information management programs by

- Focusing on the potential damage done to organizations when they keep records too long or destroy them too quickly

- Drawing attention to the potential role of record and information management programs for assisting organizations in protecting their proprietary information or for dealing with intellectual property cases

- Highlighting important government laws with implications for records and information management

- Enabling organizations to understand the problems generated by digital records and networked environments

- Providing an interpretative framework for comprehending the corporate and government scandals and controversies with records and information management implications

Administration. Archives, records, and information management programs are established when organizational leaders and managers recognize how having such programs can support, in practical ways, the efficient and effective running of their organizations. This seems so obvious that it might not be deemed mentioning, except that it enables us to understand how such programs and the various professionals that staff them must be integrated into the heart of any institution's culture and mission if they are to have any chance to prosper. This relates to the classic formula of records values, long ascribed to by archivists and records managers, encompassing administrative, legal, fiscal, and research uses of documents, often used in conjunction with the concept of the records life cycle or continuum. Records and information professionals, as well as others considering such functions within modern organizations, have written extensively about such matters, but not always in a specific or convincing manner. Some, at least, have written about such matters with self-effacing humor. In an essay describing the successful installation of a microfilm retrieval system, the article begins – "In many organizations records management is a minor nuisance that's spread across the company."[110] This seemed like a good working title for this report, since in nearly every reason ever given for how a records and information management program came to exist, one senses that there was some nuisance involved.

Successes where records and other documents are drawn upon can result in generating increased support for establishing archives, records, and information management programs. As one corporate archivist explained decades ago, institutional archives can provide answers about company employees, relating "Earlier this year

[1969] the archives was asked to assist in locating survivors of deceased Lilly employees. On January 1 when new benefits for survivors were added to the company's survivor benefits program, they were made retroactive for eligible survivors of every qualified active or retired employee who had died at any time since the company began its retirement program. With information provided by the archives and from other sources, more than 300 eligible survivors have been located and are now receiving monthly benefits from the company."[111] The obvious, abundant public relations benefits derived from such activities can go a long way in building support for records operations. And, of course, records professionals understand that administering records and information is a need for any organization, no matter what its size, age, or business. Donald Skupsky matter-of-factly notes that organizations maintain records so that employees can perform their duties and meet legal requirements, but these are two very separate activities and these values should be considered independently when developing records schedules. Historical and research needs also emerge, but they too are very different than legal concerns. While Skupsky cautions that user interests can result in keeping records too long, whereas the organization's needs must be overriding ones in order to keep costs down, management more practical, and litigation problems under control, his connecting of normal business to all records and information work is a message records and information professionals must learn to convey.[112]

This relationship between records and information and normal business functions is why we find so many records professionals trying to sidle their programs up against key activities and projects in their organizations. Coulson, for example, connects records work with strategic planning, arguing that records managers must think like executives not janitors: "Records managers are often wrapped up in the detail orientation required by such activities as developing effective filing systems or retention schedules. This sometimes makes them too focused on specific problems to see the total organizational impact of innovations. Senior management, however, is oriented in this type of overall thinking and planning, called *strategic planning*."[113] Dearstyne, in his advocacy for strategic information management, argues that a "lack of systematic, reliable information flow causes business failure and decline." This can result from many reasons, such as employee inability to be able to "evaluate information for its strategic importance" or because "executives suppress negative information or information that might reflect negatively on their decisions or performance," leading everyone to be "reluctant to share negative information."[114] Presumably, one would think that any organization would grasp this obvious connection and support records and information management programs.

Others commenting on the role of established records and information management programs have shown how these programs need to react to changing organizational trends and needs, blurring the administrative rationales with that of the championing and marketing attributes. Michael Pemberton and Raymond McBeth wrote a decade ago that there were "significant trends" influencing what records and information management professionals should be doing. They identified the trends as including "mergers, acquisitions, business process re-engineering, downsizing, outsourcing, broad-banding of salaries, and related phenomena." They added to these the "widespread availability and use of powerful information processing technologies in the form of personal computers (Pcs), software, networks, and related developments which are changing the nature of work in unprecedented ways."[115] Pemberton and McBeth argue, in the light of such changes, for records managers to "aggressively seek out and analyze the records and information management needs and practices throughout their organization and [to] make specific recommendations for change at the unit level as well as organization wide." For the records and information management professionals to be successful, they "must forge beyond the familiar – but limiting – records management processes and techniques. They must also become aware of the rapid acceptance of such technologies as telefacsimile, electronic mail, electronic data interchange (EDI), and imaging systems, which are changing the forms and flows of information in their organizational environment."[116] These observers stress that records professionals could use their basic knowledge to deal effectively with such transformations and threats by opening their own business for companies to outsource to, becoming an independent contractor, taking on a vendor role, or joining with an established outsourcing company – all suggesting stronger entrepreneurial and marketing roles. Of course, they have written a general blueprint for change, providing no case studies of actual success stories that would support how individuals can transform their organizations' outlook about records and information systems or their own careers and professional aspirations.

In reality, much like when organizations reach a particular benchmark like an anniversary, institutions turn their attention to the necessity of professional, comprehensive records and information management programs when they reach a certain critical point in their development. A company that has "experienced rapid growth in services provided and in the number of personnel employed in the past two years," has reached the point when it determines it must undertake the hiring of a records manager to help the organization "out of their paperwork jungle."[117] The same authors describe a company, founded three years earlier, storing all of its records within its departments, records that were active, inactive, and archival. They note that little attention was given to the records as the company grew rapidly because of other priorities, but that filing cabinets had become crowded and there was no available space for additional storage. The end result was the company considering implementing a records management program.[118] One article describes the establishment in 1967 of the Port of Portland's records management program, noting that "because the Port of Portland is a quasi-governmental agency, it must carefully document activities and authority to conduct its business."[119] The authority underwent rapid growth and the management of its records and information became a serious problem. The commentary about this case continues, "Access to information had become tedious and frustrating. Valuable time was lost searching for information because correspondence was not properly collected and retained in the central file. There was no program for the disposition of outdated records or the preservation of vital records."[120] The authority finally, then, established a records management program.

At times, fairly routine interests in improving some aspect of the administration of an organization is transformed into concerns about records and information management. One observer equates records management surveys with the start of records management programs: "Most Records Management Surveys are initiated by an operating component that is experiencing some difficulty with its paperwork handling operations. Many start because the office chief feels the secretary cannot retrieve the requested information from the files; some stem from registry problems (document control, lack of or over control, mail backlog, and the like); others involve poor office arrangement, wasted motion, fatigue, inappropriate file equipment, poor utilization of floor space; while others result from lack of a uniform file plan or operating procedures manual, the need for more effective correspondence control and more appropriate clear and concise forms, reports, and the like." Such matter-of-fact, routine origins of records management may account for the general sparseness of detailed case studies.[121] Of course, such routine surveys often can languish unless a champion emerges. The Los Angeles City Council passed an act in 1948 to survey the records of the municipal government, but this did not lead to a full-fledged records management program until 1967 when the City Clerk's office was made responsible for municipal-wide records, leading to the establishment of a Records Management Division in this office.[122]

As it turns out, such observations are often written by an external records management consultant, and engaging consultants also seems to be a catalyst for the establishment of records programs, although as I indicated before, there has been little written about such a connection between their use and the establishment of records and information management programs. Often, for example, consultants are hired to establish records management programs when organizational administrators realize that they need to be more proficient in how they manage records and information. One report described how a large real estate developer decided to engage consultant to establish comprehensive records management program because of problems in getting access to information in a competitive way: "The client company's files were not in bad shape. In fact, they were functioning well enough to enable it to rise to a position of world stature. The main problem was that nothing was coordinated. A lot of individual efforts had been initiated to control the accumulation of paper records, but there was no overall program to ensure that what was being done was correct and in the best interests of the company."[123]

Just as administrative foresight, cleverness, and wisdom are seen as catalysts for archives, records, and information management programs, at least by the records and information professionals who guide these operations, so management can be the source of factors resisting the establishment of such programs. In discussing electronic records, David Stephens sees technology obsolescence as a main problem, but perhaps not the greatest problem. "Organizational commitment" may be the bigger problem: "The vicissitudes of organizational life make it highly problematic to sustain any management program in perpetuity. Organizations and the people who run them change frequently."[124] Sometimes, traditional perceptions of records management held by upper management works against an organization developing an interest in supporting this function. Coulson believes that records management programs are not supported for three reasons: the programs often focus on inactive records of the organization, records management is seen as only being concerned with paper records, and the field lacks a well-defined set of professional skills and experience.[125] What such matters imply is that the corporate culture of an organization, as well as how the records and information management professions portray (deliberately or inadvertently) themselves, has a substantial impact on whether an organization adopts and continues to support the administration of records and information.

Concerns such as corporate culture take us back to the role of champions, discussed earlier. In a discussion of the transformation of the Utah State Archives in thee mid-1980s from a "program primarily devoted to the microfilming and storage of inactive records" to a "balanced archives and records management program," it was acknowledged how important the governor was to the process. "The governor was committed to improving the management of information," this assessment goes, "recognizing it as a valuable resource to be managed effectively and shared as appropriate. The plan called for a more active role for the State Archives in information management." In other words, the state government's corporate culture was also being transformed: "The active sponsorship of state government administration was a key factor in the development of the Utah State Archives. The success of the archives was linked directly to the achievement of broader goals of the administration."[126] It would have been easier if this state archives had opted for a less active role in the changing government approaches, although this would have weakened its role in the government and lessened its credibility for working on more difficult records and information management challenges.

One aspect of administrative decisions and activities that has not necessarily led to the development of substantial records and information management programs has been organizations' increasing interest in adopting and using sophisticated modern digital information technologies. Given the rhetoric suggesting the evolution of archivists and records managers into information professionals, this assertion may seem odd. Cynthia Launchbaugh provides one glimpse into this problem, writing "As organizations look at managing information to gain a strategic advantage within their industries, the pressure is on at all levels of the organization to make information management a business imperative." There comes a shift from a focus on technology to a focus on information, a change that ought to bring a realization of the importance of the role of records management. Launchbaugh explains, however, that "Unfortunately, records management has also traditionally been tied to the medium – specifically paper – as opposed to the information. The role records management can and should play in managing information enterprise-wide consequently has gone unnoticed in many organizations and even by some records managers. Slowly but surely, records management has been forced to reinvent itself, moving away from being medium-focused to being information-focused."[127] One wonders, however, whether this kind of re-invention has really happened?

Records professionals have long argued that the adoption of new information technologies have had substantial impact on how organizations view them and how they support records and information management programs. In some cases, there have been notable shifts in the array of functions that define the work of records management units. One observer, a quarter of a century ago, argued that the development of an array of copying equipment had something of a negative effect on organizations and their work. The immense number of copies "fosters waste and laziness," "stifles creativity," "damages our ability to write effectively," and "infringes upon the copyright law and the concept of confidentiality."[128] The end result was the emergence of copy management, a "relatively new member of the Records Management family" involving the management of copying practices, office procedures, and the copiers and duplicators themselves, leading to a remarkably positive assessment about the continuing evolution of office technology where word processing, data processing, communications, graphics, and copying capabilities will all be married together. "What this means is that in the future," this assessment continues, "much more of the burden for the responsible use of office technology will fall upon the individual office worker. Therefore, this is where we [records managers] must focus our attention – not on the machines, but on the real live people who use them. This is the thrust of the emerging program called Copy Management."[129]

Among the records and information management professionals, records managers, at least, can point to the growth of records volume and the need for organizations to control these records as important reasons why such programs are established. Most basic records management textbooks play up this aspect. One of the classic textbooks, more than thirty years ago, includes such statements as "The advent of World War II increased the need for more effective records management programs because emergency agencies began to proliferate and create voluminous records with no organized plan for disposition and no restraint upon quantity" and "Records continued to accumulate at a greatly accelerating rate during World War II. The need to keep this accumulation from becoming unmanageable resulted in the establishment of records administration programs on records disposition in the federal government."[130] For a long time records managers have focused on the reduction of paper records, with general statements such as this: "Typically, a records management program initially results in the destruction or transfer of approximately 50% of the records maintained in high cost office space. This, in turn, means a reduction in filing equipment and supplies; less space required for files and fewer file clerks. The end result is that dollars spent on costly, antiquated systems are released."[131]

From time to time, specific references to real institutional cases are also made. Boeing established a records management program decades ago in order to reduce the bulk of paper records and to meet legal requirements.[132] Describing the establishment of the records retention program, at roughly the same time as Boeing's, at Northwestern National Life Insurance Company, one assessment ties its creation to the problems with the proliferation of records: "Immediately after the installation of our computer it became apparent at NWNL that careful and rapid progress must be made in cutting down the bulk of our stored records. A crowded Filing Department, heavy computer output and the impending move to a new building were the final factors which caused Management to appoint a Retention and Microfilm Committee (sometimes referred to as the Destruction Committee) to make a complete review of all NWNL's retention schedules."[133] The origins of the District of Columbia Police Department records management programs, fully established in 1947, dates to the establishment in 1942 of a D.C. Committee on the

Microfilming and Disposal of Obsolete Records, charged to study how to reduce storage space and costs by microfilming and destruction of obsolete records. The police department did its own study, reporting in 1944, with a proposed records retention schedule. Later records surveys and studies were done, supporting the establishment of a records management program.[134] Records management was introduced to Plantation Pipeline Co. in 1964, also developing from renewed attention on the volume of records. "Each office in the company was keeping records just as the Supervisor in charge wanted to maintain his files. Practically no records were ever destroyed for fear they might be needed some day. A pending move to a new office building pointed to management the high cost of storing records. The need to implement some techniques for cost reduction in this area was apparent. Our problem had been studied and in April, before our move to the new office building in July, the decision was made and Records Management was created."[135]

Even when consultants are hired to do some simple analysis of how much records storage space is needed, the end result might turn out to be far more ambitious. Well-known records manager Ann Balough relates this story of a consulting experience: "My first consulting contract was for six months. The client wanted me to inventory some boxes of records and tell them how many file cabinets to buy. I quickly convinced them that the organization needed to establish records management, as it had none. I also made a good inventory of the boxes in question. The contract lasted three and one-half years and the organization ended up with a complete records management department."[136] Another consultant, describing a project in an oil company in a South American nation, notes that the company's interest in considering what would be involved in establishing a comprehensive records management program emanated from a smaller, earlier consulting effort to "better organize the technical exploration and production information." That earlier project "increased an overall awareness of the benefits of records management. That awareness coupled with the constant growth of paper within support services departments, prompted senior management to explore the benefits of developing a full records management program for the non-technical and administrative records."[137] While this consultant offers no explanation of what prompted the company to undertake the earlier project, it is obvious from such descriptions that once a good consultant gets inside an organization they can act as advocates, champions, and educators to transform their projects into more meaningful and influential projects with permanent or long-term benefits.

Sometimes, however, intense needs about the control of the growth of records are counterbalanced by weaknesses in particular organizational cultures. The University of Washington had four commissions between the Second World War and 1965 to study the management of university records, a movement that finally took hold with results in 1965. As later described, after a program was established, "While various estimates of the volume of inactive records on campus had been made with an eye toward the establishment of a centralized records storage facility the obvious economy of such an operation was always overshadowed by the belief that Departments would be unwilling to release their records to a centralized depository. Thus, the best planning and deliberation must include many of the pervasive psychological factors in its agenda if the program is to succeed."[138] Fortunately, however, there are as many success stories suggesting where very practical concerns override internal turf wars and professional divisions. Covington & Burling, a large law firm in the District of Columbia united everything having to do with information: "Among other things, the move reflected the firm's recognition that records management is a critical element in the management of information. The fully integrated department . . . comprises five functions, including the corporate library, IT, and records and information management." Only time will allow us to see just how successful this consolidation will be against other divisive forces.[139]

The strong association of records management with growing quantities of paper records a few decades ago also may have worked against stronger organizational support for such programs, especially as organizations became enamored with and immersed in new information technologies. In the early 1970s one records manager mused, "As a profession, Records Management is fighting the same battle Accountants were up against 35 to 40 years ago when many operating people thought of Accountants as a bunch of pencil pushers. But then Accountants began to think creatively about their responsibilities. In many circles today the mention of Records Management is a reminder of a file clerk rather than a profession providing information to management in the most efficient manner possible."[140] The reference to the success of accountants in our post Enron/Arthur Andersen era may be a bit eerie, but this commentary does show that the image of records professionals has been an issue for many working in these fields for a long time. The legacy of the split between archivists and records managers has not helped organizational leaders understand what records professionals do, who should be hired, or how the programs they staff should be structured and placed within the organizations.[141] After all, the general perception is that records managers want to destroy records as fast as possible, while archivists want to preserve as many as possible.[142] Nearly forty years ago, a corporate archivist describes how few companies hired an archivist, opting instead to assign archival duties to the records manager, the librarian, or the secretary.[143] Some might argue that the complexities of professional identities and functions among archivists, records managers, and information managers have not alleviated such problems.

Some of this concern has translated into great angst about whether these various fields within the information professions represent true professions or not.[144] Much of these concerns have been buried under broad and far-reaching projections about future trends in the records professions. Many observers continue to see the growth in electronic records and systems as outstripping paper systems, with fundamental implications for a shift from records to information, from administrative support to supporting business processes. Many, however, discuss in generalities and with convincing predictions but not with hard data about how organizations really view RM.[145] While these are real issues, they may be far down the list of concerns of organizations concerned about their records and information management programs.

Such aspects may explain why records managers often put a premium on their roles as communicators, facilitators, and partners. Looking at the split between records management programs and computer operations in organizations, one records manager says that this is the "failure of the computer people and the records management people to coordinate and work with each other as systems are being developed. The lack of communication between the two groups can, in part, be explained by the tremendous parallel growth of both groups during the last ten years."[146] Noting the problems many organizations have with effective management of information technology, another records manager argues that the source of these problems is due to communication and other "gaps" in the organizations: "Being familiar with the operations of all units in the organization, RIM practitioners are in the most logical position to facilitate communications and cooperation among the stakeholders, to mend the tear in the organizational fabric as they maintain ongoing contact with all of them." They can do this by "becoming true internal consultants who facilitate communication and improve understanding between all of the stakeholders," but these professionals must not only understand records and information management, they must also have a firm grasp of program management, information technology, and legal concerns.[147] That this is difficult to achieve can be seen in the Cohasset Associates report revealing that a large portion (46%) of U.S. corporations have no "formal process" for electronic records and more (59%) lack policies for e-mail and other electronic documents. One reason cited in the report on this research report is that "often, information technologists are responsible for electronic records though they lack records management experience." In other words, the partnerships are not forming and the proselytizing of traditional records managers is not happening or is not being effective.[148]

Those individuals who have been engaged in intensive research projects about the organizational administration of records in all forms have developed more specific recommendations, usually involving skill sets and working relationships. Phil Bantin believes records professionals must define their focus and responsibilities, work to form partnerships with other information professionals as needed, identify and acquire the right skills to manage digital records, understand the nature of the organization's recordkeeping systems, develop approaches for both paper and electronic records, and have in mind conceptual models to guide their work and enable the development of appropriate strategies.[149] Elizabeth Yakel argues that records and information professionals need to recognize that there are many players trying to assist organizations how to manage information and knowledge. For example, "In the college and university environment . . . multiple offices are in direct competition with records managers in providing information (i.e., libraries, academic departments, intranets)."[150] And, as well, there are many other sources, other than records, for organizational memory. Yakel writes, "Records have long been seen as a source of organizational memory. To some extent this is true; however, organizational memory is also embedded in routines, stories, rituals and gossip, among other aspects of organizational life."[151]

Many of the reasons why organizations create records and information management programs derive from fairly straightforward administrative reasons including

- Recognizing successful and valuable uses of records and information to support organizational mandates and goals

- Supporting critical organizational functions such as strategic planning

- Contending with increasing volume of records and growing complexity of digital records and information systems

- Hiring of consultants to pinpoint solutions for administering records and information systems

- Administrative leadership assuming the role of champions in supporting work with records and information management systems

Crises and Disasters. No one can think or write about the nature, mission, and activities of the records and information management professions and their manifestations within organizations after September 11, 2001 without considering the impact of security and other needs. We can add to this, as well, the corporate scandals occurring nearly at the same time. One records manager writes about all this as follows: "In the aftermath of 9/11 and the Enron/Arthur Andersen scandal, legislators rushed to pass reforms aimed at better securing our nation and protecting against corporate abuses. National identification cards and data sharing among federal and state government agencies were among the proposals. These two events, together with the subsequent war on terrorism and heightened emphasis on national security and individual privacy, changed everything."[152] For this particular individual, much of the reactions to these events suggest a renewed interest in the activities of records and information professionals: "Indeed, the past year's events have forced business and government worldwide to realize just how valuable and critical their information managers are. Now more than ever, these professionals are called upon to provide strategic information, global knowledge, and disaster-recovery planning. RIM professionals must help make crucial policy decisions that will affect the future of their organization and their profession."[153] Some of the specifics of these events related so directly to the administration of records so as to make the case about the significance of this work much easier to explain; for example, we can reflect on the Enron case/Arthur Andersen case: "While Enron's demise has been a boon for document shredding businesses, it has served as a wake-up call to all senior executives, who are keeping a closer eye on their accounting practices as well as their records retention policies."[154] The events of 2001 constituted a "critical turning point for the RIM profession and that RIM professionals' jobs will never be the same," especially leading to new needs for disaster-recovery and business-continuity planning.[155] Or described more dramatically, "The sight of documents raining from the sky as the World Trade Center towers fell to the ground September 11 will stay in the public mind for some time. As a result of this massive destruction, many organizations are now examining how they are protecting their records and information – especially those records that are vital to the survival of the organization."[156] While the impact of these events will linger in public memory, the issue of whether they will transform records and information management work and status within organizations and public policy remains to be seen.

Along with most others (from journalists to scholars), records and information management professionals made sweeping initial conclusions about the importance of the corporate scandals and the events of September 11th. Archivists and historians, in their race to document the events of September 11, 2001 nearly threatened to re-imagine the nature of their work and the definition of historical evidence, not always in a positive fashion.[157] The prolific commentator David Stephens, while admitting that the impact and implications of 9/11 will be felt and only fully understood over decades, also reveals how most companies immediately realized that their disaster preparedness plans needed to be revised and that companies that most relied on paper systems were the most susceptible to major problems in the event of such disasters. He argues: "The major conclusion and lesson to be learned: The 9/11 tragedy is very likely to spur use of the Internet and Internet protocol (IP)-based networking as the next generation of disaster recovery plans evolve."[158] Companies affected by the destruction of the World Trade Center on that day and that possessed effective disaster preparedness plans were able to recover remarkably quickly, gaining both knowledge and experience about the importance of such aspects of records and information management plans that most likely will influence how such organizations will support these programs in the future.[159] Again, while it is difficult to imagine the long-term consequences of these events, it is not difficult to understand that such disasters and crises have been generating organizational and societal interests in records and information management for a very long time. One Australian commentator, Frank Upward, reflected, "The United States' 150-year history of battling against carpetbagging in their own society has reemerged within accountability discussions as economists, archivists and regulators look at the catastrophic economic effects of massive corporate collapses at the beginning of the twenty-first century. The War on Iraq, with its public justifications based on hopelessly inadequate and unreliable intelligence information, can only deepen the need for the United States to give even greater thought to recordkeeping-based activity-theory."[160]

There are countless examples of disasters that in their aftermath leave a newly created or strengthened records and information management program. In describing the impact of a 1989 hurricane on the City of Charleston's records, that city's records manager notes: "Since I have been honest about the horrors of a hurricane, I would like to conclude on a semi-positive note. A hurricane can be the impetus for the acquisition of new equipment and a reason to publicize the importance of records management. I firmly believe that the City budgeted funds for a new microfilm camera because of the fear factor of "What If" the worst had happened. Departments that had been very reluctant to participate in the records management program now call for assistance with microfilming and off-site storage."[161] Even if such a disaster occurs, just planning for the possibility can pay dividends for the organization. "One of the most apparent benefits of scenario planning for RIM managers is its value as a means of sharing within an organization the urgency of addressing records and information issues," writes one proponent for such planning.[162] "Scenarios are an excellent way to evaluate and communicate risk to decision makers," the argument continues. "For a RIM manager, creating various *information scenarios* that describe possible implications for different records and information strategies in light of potential events (e.g., cyber-terrorist attack) can be a powerful tool that contributes to creative thinking, strategy formulation, contingency planning, and risk assessment."[163]

Unfortunately, such hypothetical planning is critical since disasters are more frequent than we generally want to think about. Most companies/organizations will experience a disaster. As one report clarifies, "The research statistics are just too clear-cut to refute. National Fire Association (US) figures show that 40% or organizations that suffer a major disaster go out of business within a year. A study by Datapro Research maintains that 43% never re-open and a further 29% go under within two years. A survey of insurance companies supports the findings that a company without a disaster recovery plan for its computer systems has a less than 10% chance of surviving a major disaster."[164] This assessment, now a decade old, was compiled before the heightened tensions of terrorism. A more recent assessment indicates that "93 percent of companies that suffer a significant data loss are out of business within five years" and "only 35 percent of small and midsize businesses have a comprehensive disaster recovery plan in place," a portion that is not much higher (36 percent) in larger companies and government agencies.[165]

Disasters destroying records and information systems are nothing new. Forty years ago the following astounding statistic was offered by one records manager: "Today, the Seattle average stands at six businesses per year that lose their records due to fire, with an average daily loss of $3,297.00 in 1967."[166] Indeed, many records management programs have their origins in organizational sensitivity to such matters, something that can be detected in the growth of vital records functions as well. One corporate records manager provided this analysis of how such a program came about: "International Harvester Company's concept of vital records protection, like that of many other organizations and institutions, emerged from World War II. Originally, the vital records protection efforts were nuclear disaster oriented and integral part of the Company's civil defense planning." Gradually, other potential disasters were recognized, including "local disasters, which are not the result of military action, but which could cause the destruction of a segment of the Company, such as – explosion, fire, flood, earthquake, windstorm, theft, riots, and vandalism. New threats are posed by the spread of industrial espionage and related activities which might compromise the value and integrity of records by unauthorized copying or by deliberate alteration of record content."[167] The connection between the loss of records and information and the health of an organization has been discussed frequently, leading one observer to frame this particular principle: "History has repeatedly shown that losses or damages to information cause irreparable harm to businesses."[168]

The increasing use by organizations of information technologies, especially those that are networked, has led to concern about another form of disaster – the security breach. There were two cases in the mid-1990s where New Zealand organizations, one a financial institution and the other a government agency, had records discovered on old personal computers discarded by them: "A comprehensive information management program, covering both paper based and electronically stored information, would have been instrumental in preventing [these] careless losses. . . ."[169] One observer says, the "need for a centralized view of security has led to a worldwide rise in interest in the position of chief risk officer," with responsibilities for developing an "integrated framework," policies, implementing "metrics," training programs, and so forth, building off of ISO 17799, the standard for information security management.[170] Another observer, commenting on the rise of personal security theft, a concern for all companies and government agencies, suggests that existing records and information management professionals "can play a key role in preventing identity theft," since "many of the information manager's responsibilities dovetail with prevention measures: creating retention schedules, properly tracking and filing information, and training staff on information management procedures." In other words, organizations do not necessarily need to hire new, specialized staff; "new opportunities await records and information managers who are open to additional responsibilities."[171]

Despite the potential positive impact that a crisis or disaster might have, leading to the establishing of a new or strengthening of an existing records and information management program, many individuals still believe that some sort of organizational or societal stability is necessary for such programs. Looking at Africa, David Stephens reflects, "In order for records management to take root and develop in a country, a reasonable degree of economic and political stability is required. This enables a 'records management infrastructure' to develop, consisting of a community of vendors to distribute products and services, educational courses of study, and professional association activity."[172] Others see in the chaotic and uncertain times, new opportunities for records and information management professionals. Many things are changing. We are coming to realize more about the challenges of information overload, that the problems have more to do with people than technology, the continuing critical stance of courts about inadequate records or information management, and other similar problems. Dearstyne writes: "The opportunities for records and information managers have probably never been greater or more promising. As the central importance of strategic information grows, so also grows the need for professional RIM expertise. The definition of what it means to be an 'information professional' also continues to evolve."[173]

Closely related to the notion of contending with disasters and crises is that of transforming records and information management programs to play a role in assisting organizations to be compliant. One expert advocates the notion of "information management compliance," merging compliance with records management, and requiring "good policies and procedures," "executive-level program responsibility," "proper delegation of program roles and components," "program dissemination, communication, and training," "auditing and monitoring to measure program compliance," "effective and consistent program enforcement," and "continuous program improvement."[174] For example, electronic records management in the wake of the formation of the European Union reflects the kinds of compliance records and information management professionals now face. One of the factors "driving ERM in Europe is the increase in regulations affecting both private and public sector organizations. Regulations have spread to virtually all sectors, not just traditionally regulated ones such as pharmaceuticals and aerospace. More companies must implement strategies for managing business information and plan for long-term data storage and retrieval. Not only must these entities act properly, but they must also have proof of doing so, and such records are not limited to financials but include personnel records and others covered by new laws. Increased regulation intensifies focus on ERM as the discipline needed to meet compliance requirements."[175]

Case after case demonstrates the importance of records and information management programs for assisting organizations to be compliant. Discussing why Pfizer, a "United States-based international pharmaceutical company employing some 46,000 people in 57 countries," has created a digital archive program, David Stephens observes, "As creator, user, and custodian of electronic records, Pfizer's needs include long-term, secure, managed storage of identified, business-critical records. In the pharmaceutical industry, new drug products may take 10 years or longer to develop. Products are subject to rigorous inspection by national regulatory bodies to establish their safety for human (or animal) use and their effectiveness for intended purposes. Records and data that support a marketed drug's development must be available for regulatory inspection during the compound's lifetime, a period generally assumed to be 40 years or longer."[176] Development of a "management portal" for the University of North Carolina health care system started with "investigating solutions to help it meet federal mandates for the privacy and security of patient information." The impetus for this effort emerged from the "need to support numerous applications centered attention on operational issues related to meeting HIPAA guidelines and improving internal utilization of information."[177] In the area of local banking enterprises, we can see how their efforts to administer their records and information management systems often derive for their need for compliance: "Storage continues to be an especially challenging issue for community banks because nearly every banking document involves compliance, legal, administrative, or managerial risks, and rules governing those factors vary at both the federal and state levels," concludes the executive editor of a banking journal.[178]

The focus on compliance is not one that is perfect, nor universally acclaimed. There is a strong role for vendors in the records management community, for example, and many vendors try to scare organizations, at least according to some critics, that unless one's organization obtains their product that it will face "impending compliance horrors." In records managements it seems to be a "truth universally acknowledged that a business problem must come accompanied by scare tactics to make us all take notice."[179] Ira Penn is another critic of the importance of legislation as a chief source for promoting compliance in a way that leads to the establishing or strengthening of records and information management programs. Discussing the problem with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, legislation seeking to minimize the paperwork burden and to set up uniform information policies and practices, Penn notes: "Managerial concepts do not usually result in legislation – and for good reason. One cannot legislate good management any more than one can legislate morality."[180] OMB Circular A-130 was an effort to implement the act, and it deals mostly with information technology with poor language and platitudes. Penn argues that the circular focuses on the equipment rather than the information itself, providing no real definition of information resources management. Penn also considers the occurrence of NARA independence in 1984, giving up records management, sending all the trained and experienced records management personnel into the General Services Administration (GSA), and the GSA seeing records management as nothing more than technology; Penn believes that the records management function in both NARA and the GSA has disappeared. The Paperwork Reduction Reauthorization Act of 1986, while defining IRM, had not one mention of records management in it, according to Penn. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 did not improve matters. For Penn, all of this is an indication that there is no federal leadership on records management: "The information management legislation of the last quarter of the 20th century has been a records management disaster. One law is based on the erroneous assumption that information is synonymous with media and machines, and another focuses on separating the inseparable – dividing the archives and records management functions."[181] So, the issue becomes, what does the stress on compliance result in, in terms of records and information management programs? And, as well, it should be obvious that the debate about how compliance matters affect an organization do draw attention to the role of records and information management programs.

Organizations, in facing crises or recovering from disasters, often focus anew on records and information management functions by

- Creating new programs focused on security and recovery to deal with the kinds of disruptions potentially caused by terrorist attacks

- Preparing disaster-preparedness plans to protect records and information management, including establishing new records and information management programs if one did not exist

- Stimulating reformatting and off-site storage of records and information sources in order to protect such sources

- Providing new opportunities for records and information professionals to make a stronger case for establishing or strengthening a records and information program

- Forming an environment for organizational and external champions to make a case for records and information management programs

- Focusing on compliance needs as new laws and greater public awareness occur

- Contending with security breaches on digital and networked records and information management systems, highlighting the importance of the evidence and information these systems maintain

Public Relations and Marketing. We live in an age of hype and advertising, and there are few organizations, whether for-profit or not-for-profit, which do not engage in public relations and advertising. Given that the objective of such work is often to create an image that may have little to do with the reality of what is going on in an organization, it is reasonable to surmise that many would not think that records and information management programs have much of a role to play in such efforts. However, many organizations seek to draw from their archives, records centers, and corporate libraries records and other documentary sources, images, and other materials that may assist an organization to demonstrate its historic functions, positive societal benefits, and significant connections with local communities and social groups. Given the fact that records and other information documents include both positive and negative evidence of any institution's activities, it is obvious that the public relations and marketing role that records and information management programs can play can lead to organizational controversies and professional debates.

We can see how such roles can be difficult for organizational records and information programs. Elizabeth Adkins, a leader in business archives and the Director of Global Information Management for Ford Motor Company, describes how the "history of the Ford Motor Company Archives is intertwined with the efforts to tell the story of the company. Both of these initiatives – the creation of the Archives and the telling of the Ford Motor Company story – began with the approach of the fiftieth anniversary [in the mid-twentieth century]. Company executives and the Ford family realized the importance of Henry Ford and his company in the development and progress of the twentieth century. They accepted the obligation to gather and organize the company's historical legacy to ensure that the broader story could be told. As a result, the first fifty years of the company (including its early international expansion) are fairly well documented and accessible to the public in research materials and in books."[182] Another anniversary in the mid-1990s renewed efforts for corporate support of this particular archives, but Adkins also suggests both how difficult it is for corporations to become interested and why public relations and marketing efforts may be the rationale for the creation of such operations: "It is still an uphill battle to get corporate support for archival programs, and large volumes of unprocessed records still challenge under-resourced corporate archivists. But the difficult lessons of the last two decades have taught corporate archivists to be resourceful and above all else, to focus on delivering the services needed by their employers. Therefore, not many corporate archives programs allow direct public access to their records, and business historians still have difficulty gaining access to the records they need for their research."[183] This is a refreshingly candid assessment of the challenges in defining the role of corporate archives programs.

Adkins's detailed history of the Ford Archives is perhaps the best analysis of such a program, and her lengthy essay suggests that it is quite possible for individuals involved with a records and information management program to write good, objective case studies that increase our understanding of these programs. Her essay also reveals how archives can be used in positive ways about difficult and testy matters. Adkins describes how "In early 1998, the Archives was handed an opportunity to demonstrate its indispensability. It came in the form of an important company project entrusted to the newly re-engineered Archives by senior management. As Archives manager, I was asked to lead a global research effort to uncover any information that might shed additional light on Ford's German subsidiary during the Nazi era. The project was launched in response to an inquiry from the British Broadcasting Corporation and other news media." She continues with the comments that "Ford's top executives directed the Archives to leave no stone unturned in trying to find information that might add to the historical record. The company realized that the subject matter required both candor and sensitivity. Therefore, it was decided at the outset that when the research was completed, Ford would present the results as straightforwardly as possible – no conclusions, no interpretations, no speculation and definitely no "spinning" of the facts for public relations purposes. To the company's credit, senior management never pulled back from these guidelines, despite the fact that the project required nearly four years, during which time there were major changes in the company's executive leadership."[184] Clearly, this is a company that has learned how being more open with access to its records can generate positive vibes about it. As Adkins concludes, "Today the Ford Motor Company Archives is a vital resource for enabling company employees to understand the legacy of the company's first one hundred years. In partnership with Benson Ford Research Centre at The Henry Ford, the Archives is also working to make the company's records more accessible to outside researchers."[185]

Some of the kinds of values suggested by this leading corporate records and information management professional have been alluded to since the advent of the first corporate archivists. A half century ago, in a discussion of why corporations sponsor the writing of company histories, an observer of such activity suggested that writing a corporate history was deemed to be important for building on corporate experience, customer relations, and public relations – many of the same reasons attributed to starting an archives.[186] Corporate archivist Helen Davidson, nearly forty years ago, wrote about the important role business archives play in both sustaining organizational culture and in general business marketing. She noted that, "valuable background material for articles in company house organs may be found in the archives files or may be used to document statements made by people outside the organization."[187] Davidson also emphasized the straightforward public relations value of the corporate archives: "For several years the archives has become a repository for samples of Lilly products and other items that pertain to the company such as anniversary souvenirs, advertising promotional pieces, bottles and packaging materials. These are used for displays, as illustrations for articles and for slides to be used by company speakers."[188] In truth, there are multiple models for corporate archives, records, and information management programs that also emphasize factors ranging far beyond public relations and marketing.[189]

That the value of records for public relations and marketing may be a major factor in the establishing and sustaining of records and information management programs can be certainly agreed upon as an important one, but it is also one that is a bit more elusive to grasp or describe. Long before the problems of corporate scandals, terrorism, the assault on civil liberties, or the challenges of intellectual property, consultant David Rintoul actually contended that many businesses are not able or willing to establish records management programs because they are "marketing oriented." Rintoul argues, "Many organizations do an excellent job of producing and marketing their products. They are well managed and enjoy enormous growth. The reason they seek external assistance in terms of records management is usually that, because of their outward focus, routine administrative functions like records management have been overlooked in the process."[190] This may be an assessment that has more to do with the organizational records management programs that that of the archival programs or archival components of records and information management operations.

The times have changed, of course, and many organizations are striving to ensure that they have positive public images, suggesting that their records and information management sources might be drawn on more for such purposes. Another consultant indicates that, "what increasingly drives the discussion today is the organization's goal to be perceived as a good corporate citizen. Corporate directors, executives, and investors all demand assurance that the records management program will not negatively impact them and will provide a degree of protection from claims of wrongdoing."[191] Of course, determining just exactly what the public relations value of an archives or records management program is or how to calculate it is a matter that has vexed records and information professionals for a long time. Considering some of the classic models for return on investment, Andolsen notes how some aspects of this for records management are hard to calculate, such as the risk of someone being imprisoned or hurting the public profile of a company. Such possibilities have to be built into a "business case that justifies the investment of staff, time, and money through the returns of profits, reduced expenses, streamlined processes, increased revenues, and/or augmented productivity."[192]

Organizations engaged in public relations and marketing may focus on records and information management programs, because

- They begin to understand that these programs contain ample records and information that may assist organizations in constructing positive public images

- They may grasp that open access to their records and information, even on controversial and contentious issues, may in itself be received very positively by people on the outside

Testing the Factors

Although the professional literature, in terms of substantial case studies, may be weak and uneven, there nevertheless appears to be consensus about a relatively small cluster of factors that lead to the establishment of records and information management programs and can strengthen these programs after they are created. However, in order to further test the validity of these factors, it was decided to send a brief survey and to plan to do some follow-up interviews with archivists, records managers, and other records and information management professionals in the field to determine how they viewed the identified factors in terms of their own programs. However, the strong consensus about the factors leading to the creation and sustaining of programs of the individuals responding to the brief survey suggested, at this time, no need to do an interview. Rather, I began to try to generate interest in the production of more formal and comprehensive case studies, a matter I discuss near the end of this report, and clearly a long-term effort.

Selecting a group of records and information professionals and their programs was not an easy task. The diversity of such programs is extreme. To select large, well-supported programs might skew the litany of factors, especially since the examined literature reflects in its own right a great diversity of institutional programs in terms of age, size, resources, organizational type, programmatic foci and approaches. I opted to send a brief survey out to the membership of the Pittsburgh ARMA Chapter, believing that this group provided a reasonably representative array of programs and also understanding that it would be easy for me to make follow-up contacts. In late June 2005 I sent 52 surveys out via electronic mail to records and information management professionals working in financial institutions, manufacturing and service industries, law firms, government agencies, and universities. Realizing that this particular mailing list under-represented professionals working in archives, I sent out an additional eight surveys to individuals working in universities, religious institutions, museums, and local historical agencies. I received sixteen responses (not counting some responses of individuals declining to participate).

The survey introduced individuals to the purpose of this project, provided them a description of the seven identified factors, and then sought some basic information about the nature of their own affiliation, and then asked two basic questions: What factor or factors led to the establishment of your program? What are the most important factor or factors in establishing a records and information management program? Despite the small number of responses, the pattern of responses provided a good sense of consensus about the relative importance of the various factors influencing the origins and sustenance of records and information management programs. The respondents were situated at a variety of organizational types, including businesses (7), not-for-profit (2), college and university (2), government agencies (2), law firms (2), and vendors (1). The small number of responses in each of these categories precluded any validity in trying to categorize differences or subtleties in the nature of the responses by organizational type, but the general consensus about the relative merit of each of the factors suggested that not a great variation would be found in the various weighting of the role of these factors.

What factor or factors led to the establishment of your program? In reflecting on the origins of their own programs, most respondents (10) stated that administrative needs was the most important factor, cutting across in a consistent fashion every organizational type (see Table One). The next highest factor was that of legal or compliance needs, although less than half (6) identified this as playing an important role. Respondents also suggested that a champion (4) or professional or technical standards (4) can play important roles in motivating an organization to establish an archives, records, or information management program. One respondent, representing a corporation, had something to say about each of these factors. This individual noted, “Four years ago, the [organization’s] Library Team Leader added the Records Management Leadership role to his portfolio and began to lobby executive leadership to adopt a formal, company-wide records management policy. Prior to this, records management was handled on an ad hoc

Table One

Weighting of Factors Leading to the Creating of the Respondent's RIM Programs

N=16

Factor	Important
Administrative Needs & Interests	10
Legal Mandates or Litigation	6
Professional & Technical Standards	4
Champion Advocating for the Program	4
Crisis or Disaster	3
Anniversary or Critical Landmark	2
Public Relations & Marketing	0

basis by each area." This same individual noted that his company "belongs to an industry group called Responsible Care. Responsible Care mandates industry standards on things like environmental reporting, worker safety, and product stewardship. Included in these mandates are guidelines on recordkeeping. These guidelines were influential in selling the program to executive leadership."

The chief value of the responses is in how they rank the various factors identified as playing some role in the creation and sustenance of archives, records, and information management programs (see Table Two). Given the relatively small number of responses to the survey, I calculated just the mean (average) of the rankings, based on a scale of 1 being very important and 7 being the least important. The respondents affirmed that legal (laws, the fear of litigation, and the news about the impact of mismanaged records and information systems on court cases) and administrative (that records and information management programs will help their employees enhance their productivity, make the organizations more competitive, enable the better use of information technologies, or contend with a problem such as the growing volume of records) factors are by far the most important factors. The respondents also suggested that public relations or marketing values and anniversaries (when organizations reach a landmark anniversary or other critical juncture in their development) are the least important factors by a substantial margin. Crises, professional and technical standards, and the role of advocates or champions are all ranked as more important factors, but considerably less significant than that of the legal and administrative factors.

Table Two

Ranking of Potential Importance of Factors In Creating RIM Programs

N=16

Factor	Mean Response
Legal Mandates or Litigation	1.9
Administrative Needs & Interests	2.3
Crisis or Disaster	3.1
Professional & Technical Standards	3.4
Champion Advocating for the Program	3.8
Public Relations & Marketing	5.1
Anniversary or Critical Landmark	5.6

Admittedly, this is a very crude testing of the factors I identified in the literature search, and it is one that begs for additional research and analysis. For example, would a more comprehensive survey of the professional staff of existing programs discern major differences in how they assess the factors? I was surprised at the lower ranking of the importance of anniversaries or critical landmarks in an organization's development in establishing archives, records, and information management programs, since so many in the professional literature made reference to this as an important factor in creating and, sometimes, sustaining, a program. The most recent documented meeting of the Corporate Archives Forum included, for instance, discussion about the preparation of corporate histories and the administering of anniversary celebrations, indicating an importance that the respondents to my brief survey did not see.[193] It seems that a more elaborate, detailed survey might draw different conclusions than what I discovered in my efforts. For the time being, however, my rankings provide a sense of the relative importance of the factors that could be tested out in future research.

Visualizing the Factors

Archivists, records, and information managers hold to a few common principles about the nature of records and information systems that guide their work. Chief among these principles is the idea of the life cycle of records, suggesting that records are born, live a useful life, and then are destroyed or reborn in an archives. Although there have been criticisms of this concept, suggesting that the concept is not as orderly or as cyclical as one might expect, the notion of time and experience influencing how we envision the importance of a particular record or recordkeeping and information system remains important. For that matter, most aspects of organizational activity can be said to possess a lifecycle of one sort or another. For example, the notion of project management brings with it the idea of a project lifecycle, with "distinct phases": "Projects start with a feasibility phase, then the project is realized and finally implemented into an organization. The project realization phase is frequently expanded into more detailed phases such as design, material purchase, and fabrication. In some industries these phases are sequential, while in others they are overlapped to a large extent, frequently in an attempt to shorten the overall project duration."[194] All organizational activities, as well as the records that are generated as part of these activities, follow a life cycle of some sort. And life cycles reflect the passage of time, bringing with the tick of the clock changes in how records and information are viewed as well as challenges to face and problems to resolve.

How should records and information management professionals consider this group of factors identified in this report? They can be grouped into three segments, all suggesting a particular time reached by an organization. The influence on establishing records and information management programs via anniversaries and other important benchmarks, along with that of the occurrence of crises and disasters, both clearly reflect an element of time. As an organization ages and evolves, the problems with its records and information systems will also increase, including matters such as the growth in the scale of its records, needs to upgrade and adopt new technology systems, and the likelihood that the organization will face a natural or manmade disaster of some sort. One can reasonably safely state that every organization will reach a critical juncture where it will have to make a decision to adopt in a more formal fashion a records and information management program.

This influence of time also can be seen in the administrative factors leading to the establishment of these programs. As an organization evolves, and the records and information management challenges increase or become more noticeable, a champion will arise to take up the cause of improving the situation. The champion can be in the form of an individual or a group, and the champion can emerge from within or come from the outside. Also, as organizations continue their normal rates of change, differing competition, and other challenges, it is likely that at some point they will recognize the values of their growing accumulation of records and information as a resource they can draw on for making themselves more competitive or for public relations and marketing purposes that will enhance their share of whatever marketplace they operate in. The embrace by many organizations of ideas such as knowledge management and records managers' interest in the idea of strategic information management suggest the value of the corporate memory of organizations, and as archivists and records managers are quick to point out, a primary source of such memory resides not just in the minds of employees or the culture and traditions of the organizations but in their records and accumulated stores of information.

Organizations also work in societal and professional environments and communities that are constantly changing. For a long time, records professionals seemed to discuss matters as if laws and best practices were generally stable, as many still base their practice on concepts developed in the mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century. Recent events from international politics to corporate malfeasance should have taught records and information management professionals that this is not the case at all, that they will constantly be challenged to re-evaluate their principles, practices, and professional assumptions about their missions and mandates. Laws are created, revised, and disappear over time as circumstances warrant. Professional and technical standards also evolve, and the evidence seems to suggest that this evolution is more dramatic than previously thought.

Since every organization possesses a unique culture and operates in different marketplaces, it is impossible to predict just what of the seven broad factors identified here will prompt an organization to reconsider how it is administering its records and information sources or when the organization will determine that now is the time to establish a records and information management program. For example, when Consumers Union/*Consumer Reports* decided to merge into one administrative unit records management, archives, and consumer research operations in order to manage more effectively its information (because it is an "organization where testing and reporting are based on solid facts and deep investigation and research"), this decision was based on a complex variety of organizational and industry needs and trends.[195] The lesson in this particular organization seems to relate to the general significance of records and information management programs: "The role of the information professional continues to grow. Whether involved in records, archives, research, or a combination of these activities, information professionals have a place at the heart of organizations. They possess the skills and knowledge not only to help organizations understand the investment but also to help them best leverage the resources, both human and material, in which they are so heavily invested."[196] The growth of recognition of these records and information professionals can only truly occur within their organizations, once their programs are established and they are presented opportunities to demonstrate their worth.

The factors leading to the establishment of records and information management programs can be grouped on a time continuum, as follows

- As an organization ages and evolves, the problems it faces in administering records and information will grow until either a champion arguing for more systematic approaches to records and information management emerges or a disaster occurs

- Renewed attention to records and information sources within an organization will begin to recognize these sources as being important for corporate memory (often expressed in the writing of histories honoring an anniversary and leading to the establishment of records and information management programs)

- The establishment of records and information management programs will generate increased attention to professional and technical standards and importance of records and information sources for organizational compliance, especially as records and information management professional staff market the potential value of their activities

It is difficult to place these various factors on any kind of precise visualization of how records and information management programs are created, since there is nothing (or very little at least) that suggests any such time sequencing. Most likely this occurs differently in different organizations, but it is certainly a model worth exploring in future research.

Can These Factors Sustain Records and Information Management Programs?

The reasons organizations initially establish records and information management programs may not be sufficient for sustaining them over the long-term. All of these factors generally have to do with a particular instance or the activity of a particular individual, and, as a result, the professionals staffing these programs will have to renew (in a nearly constant fashion) an organization's interest or interests in supporting these operations.

Yet, each of these factors have the potential to be renewed in ways that will maintain the organization's interest in supporting a records and information management program. For example, anniversary events are notoriously short-lived in any organization's memory, especially as the preparation of a product, such as a history or an exhibit, will attract attention for a very brief time; the completion of a history, for example, can be seen as a project that has a finite ending (occasionally, stories emerge even that organizations have sought to destroy their archival records once a history is completed and the records have been consulted). Records and information management professionals will need to look for other anniversaries, such as the launching of a successful product or a tie-in to a societal event of historical importance (such as a famous local or community happening connected to the organization or the anniversary of the ending of a major war) that maintains focus on the value of the records and information held by their programs. The key here is the memory component of the records and information management program, an aspect that records professionals will need to constantly draw attention to in practical and relevant ways. Every time an organization embarks on a new project or product development or activity that is similar to earlier key activities in the organization's past, the records and information management professional must be prepared to make his or her resources known to the organization.

If the program is always associated with one anniversary event, its relevance to the organization at later times can and probably will recede in importance. Moreover, the positive public relations or marketing value that these benchmark events can generate need to be nurtured by the records and information management program once it is established. The professionals need to look for other events that can generate goodwill about the importance of its records and information management program, even if this means something as seemingly innocuous as tying their records to a popular television documentary series, cinematic release, or best-selling book. Archivists need to convince others than their holdings are not merely dusty files that are never consulted, while records managers may need to convey the idea that they are not merely administering inactive files or that they are only in the business of destroying records when they are no longer needed. The currency or relevancy of the records and information sources always need to be stressed. Anniversaries, like personal birthdays, are fun for a brief time, but soon the cake and ice cream are gone, the presents opened, and the daily business routine again the focus of our attention. Organizations are much more likely to focus on the urgency of the daily routines.

The advocacy of champions for the establishment of records and information management programs is, perhaps, the most vulnerable to having only a short-term impact on the sustaining of these programs. Individuals who emerge as advocates for a particular activity in an organization will tend to have very short time periods in which they will be effective; their effectiveness might be measured in the space of a few years or, at best, a decade. The history of archives, records, and information management programs is replete with testimony to the changing cycles of particular programs that serve as models or beacons to their professional communities. A state government archives might be a stellar leader in one decade and fall into obscurity the next, all due to the tenuous role of champions or leaders within such programs.[197] Moreover, the nature and level of public support for records and information management programs certainly cannot be described as being that of continuous, unabated support. Societal crises and stresses, from economic problems to political and international instability, often have a tendency to divert attention from the necessity of archives, records, and information management programs.

Under such circumstances, it is obvious that for records and information management programs to continue to have support within organizations after the programs have been started, they must work to gain the championing of additional effective leaders and advocates within these organizations. This is, of course, easier said than done. It is also easier stated than explained. If in fact other advocates are not nurtured, these programs will wane in their support from their organizations. Records and information management professionals must work to keep their programs visible within their organizations by demonstrating how and why what they do supports the organizations' mission or mandate. Bruce Dearstyne has argued persistently for a new kind of leadership within the records and information management profession: "The challenge for records and information management programs is similar to that faced by businesses in general: develop a vision for the program, define core competencies, change with the times, keep moving, and meet customer needs."[198]

We can always draw on anecdotal evidence to find examples of what we mean by such leadership. I remember clearly how one such program I worked for once or twice a year had the opportunity to make a presentation about its activities before the organization's governing board, and it always made presentations bringing concrete examples of how their records and information sources had been used by researchers both from within and outside the institution. Why this was effective was dependent on an accurate assessment of the organization's culture, an understanding of the organization's mission and how it evaluated its effectiveness in meeting that mission. In other words, what was successful for this records and information management program in renewing organizational support, essentially making the governing board an advocate for its activities, might not work in another organization. The leader of this program was adept at reading the culture, comprehending what were the priorities of this organization's governing board, and good at making effective and succinct presentations. In this instance, the head of this records and information management program was able to nurture additional advocates for the program that provided a foundation for the sustaining of the program even after his departure; how long these advocates would continue to support the program depends, of course, completely on someone else developing the skills to work with them. This is why so many who write about the roles of records and information management professionals usually include something such as selling or marketing the program.

The existence and use of professional or technical standards perhaps provides one of the more stable ways of developing support that can be used to sustain records and information management programs. As was mentioned in the earlier description of the role of these standards in the establishing of these programs, they can be used as points of discussion by records and information managers to build support for their functions and activities. The standards are often designed to be succinct and universal, allowing records and information managers to adapt them to their own situations. Relying on these standards can be quite effective, especially in an atmosphere where organizations are striving to be compliant. Yet, the use of standards is also fraught with potential problems, especially since all of the standards supporting the work of records and information professionals tend to be advisory, not compulsory.

The effectiveness of standards really rests upon the ability of records and information management professionals to market, explain, and insert them into the daily activities of their organizations. The potential of professional and technical standards is that they provide an authority to point to, provided, of course, that archivists, records managers, and other information professionals can gain an audience to assert their authority. The challenge of standards is that while they bring together the best minds of the professional community for development, their ultimate effectiveness depends on the ability of professionals in local organizations to learn how to use the standards. Some of the standards are among the clearest documents in the professional community, at least to records and information management professionals, but they still require explanation to those outside the field; otherwise, they can be like press releases encumbered with professional jargon. This is only part of the challenge, however, in the use of these standards. Traditionally, records and information management professionals have put considerable attention into developing handbooks of policies and procedures, inserting professional and technical standards where appropriate, but the use of these handbooks is generally restricted to the archivists, records managers, and information managers themselves. The handbooks are excellent as reference works, but they are not always useful as advocacy or educational devices for gaining support within the organizations. Such problems may explain the general lack of case studies about the utility of standards in the records and information management community.

Records and information managers need to use the standards in ways that reach, easily and effectively, the individuals in the organization who are making decisions about the administration of records and information and the systems supporting them. Archivists, records managers, and other information management professionals need to connect the standards to the daily activities going on in the organization, perhaps through electronic mail messages or the use of a Web site orienting employees to the existence of these standards and specific cases where the standards have been useful. Not too many years ago Ann Balough recommended that records and information management professionals build Web sites – featuring resources such as services provided, frequently asked questions, contacts, various procedures, and so forth. She provided this wise advice: "If you write a novel, a white paper, or an issue of a technical journal, you need to make it excellent only once. If you are building a knowledge center [using the Web], you must have a program ensuring continuing excellence. This means keeping the message accurate and up-to-date."[199] Archivists and records managers have long used short-term workshops to train individuals responsible for records and information management tasks, and standards would be an excellent focus for such training.

Records and information management professionals, especially records managers, have long relied on legal requirements as guides for how records should be administered. Legislative acts, and case law developed by court cases, have always seemed to be excellent ways of conveying to upper management how records and information systems need to be administered. There has always been a sort of scare tactic involved, as highly publicized litigation and other cases often provided worse case scenarios about the mismanagement of records and other information sources. The records destroyed too soon, the records that should have been obliterated but were not, the far too revealing electronic mail message that will be found in an act of discovery, and so on, all concentrate an organization's focus on the orderly and legal management of its records and information systems. Clearly, if this is done well, the organization will see its benefits and support a records and information management program providing such benefits and security to the organization.

As with the above other factors leading to the establishment of records and information management programs, there needs to be a very conscious effort on the part of archivists, records managers, and other information professionals to explain how they are helping the organization to be compliant and to protect itself in this difficult age of lawsuits, negative publicity, and a constantly evolving set of laws that raise complicated challenges to how records and information sources should be administered. These are volatile times. Not too long ago, for example, corporate legal offices argued that "companies should err on the side of document disposal rather than retention." Then the laws and times changed. "So the cardinal rule of any document retention or destruction program must be simple and clear: Be consistent."[200] Such evolving circumstances mandates that records and information management programs become centers of advice about regulations and guidelines for the administration of records and information sources. Records and information managers need to be able to track the implications of important laws impacting on their organization's records and, as well, be able to work with their organization's legal counsel to develop and adopt reasonable approaches for administering records and information. And this is not always easy, since the archival component often seems to be in conflict with the records management approach to how records are handled, despite the seeming consensus about the value of the records life cycle concept that incorporates both ends of the spectrum. Records and information managers will need to document thoroughly how maintaining certain records with archival value can support not just the organization's memory but help it to be an effective and competitive organization in its niche of the world. To succeed with the legal aspects of persuading organizations to sustain records and information management programs, the professionals guiding these programs will need to persuasive, well-informed about the legal dimensions, and act with authority when it comes to balancing various aspects of the approaches to archives, records, and information management.

What most of us have learned through commonsense and experience is that events that scare us into acting differently often have a short-effect on our behavior. So it may be the case with new laws, spectacular litigation cases, and the predictions about the impact of new or revised legislation regulating organizations and their activities. If an organization is scared into establishing a records and information management program because of the negative news stories it hears about the dire consequences of handling records and information in certain ways, once the initial fears and concerns fade (which they almost certainly do) the level of support for a records and information management program may also evaporate as well. It is incumbent upon the archivists, records managers, and information managers to demonstrate other values for the duties they carry out in the organization or, if warranted, to demonstrate that there are other equally threatening laws and problems on the horizon. Fortunately, there are always complicated issues out there, such as the management of electronic mail, which merits having records and information management experts to advise on. As a recent report on the legal consideration of electronic mail administration suggests, "lack of an ideal solution applicable in every instance forces any organization contemplating e-mail management into an analysis of its own needs and characteristics."[201] If records and information management professionals are willing to embrace the vagaries, complexities, and contradictions often involved in administering organizational records and information sources, then they will surely establish their value to the organization and have a strong case for their program's sustenance. This will require them to build new kinds of relationships, as Bruce Dearstyne remarks: "We may well be on the verge of dramatically increasing our scores in the area of information proficiency; that will depend on CEOs, CIOs, information professionals, and others working together. It will mean considering insights from the development of information policy, the advent of digital libraries, archivists' and records managers strategies for electronic records, and the growing body of literature from the emerging field of knowledge management."[202]

There is no question that most records and information management programs are established because the organizations believe that they bring some positive administrative benefits. There is lots of testimony, although mostly from records and information management professionals, that managerial features and functions are what drive the creation of their programs. It stands to reason, therefore, that these programs, once established, must continue to demonstrate some practical administrative values to their organizations. Solving problems is one thing, but it is just as important that records and information managers document their solutions in a way that can demonstrate to the organizational leadership that their programs have worth. For a very long time, records and information managers placed their faith in documenting cost savings, but this is the old paradigm. Documenting success with dealing with administrative concerns such as electronic mail management, preservation of digital records and resources, protection of intellectual property, and supporting corporate memory are all examples of efforts that can demonstrate cost expenditures rather than financial savings but that benefit the organization in many other ways that outweigh the financial considerations. In working in this way, records and information management professionals need to become experts in how their organizations function, their nature of their mission or mandate, and their corporate culture affecting the values of the organization. Obviously, there is no single template that fits all types of organizations.

As with so many of the aspects of the potential of the factors sustaining the records and information management programs, the key is the creativity and adaptability of the archivists, records managers, and information managers. For example, the head of a records and information management program might be asked by the organization to develop a workable policy for administering proprietary information that might be on personally-owned computers. As John Montaña indicates, "this is an area of law with many grey areas, and with many undecided issues. No statutes are directly on point, and past cases focus exclusively upon employer-owned computers and systems. Expectations and course of dealings between the parties may heavily influence the outcome in any particular case, as may the idiosyncrasies and inclinations of the judge before a case is heard. Both employer and employee should proceed cautiously and prudently, and not make assumptions about ownership of data."[203] This does not imply, of course, that the records and information manager should back away from the problem (that would be a good way to ensure that the program is not sustained). Rather, such difficult administrative (as well as legal and fiscal) challenges should prompt the records and information manager to demonstrate their true worth to the organization in carving out approaches that help the organization while taking into account the challenges and problems inflicting such efforts; the records and information management program will have to monitor legal cases, legislation, and new approaches in order to revise their own practical solutions as necessary.

Indeed, it is likely that organizations facing the most contentious and complicated threats to their records and information systems are the ones most likely to gain the appreciation of their parent organizations – *if* the records and information management professionals tackle the difficult problems and seek to resolve them. Many archivists and records managers complain about popular stereotypes held about them, such as being packrats or file clerks, but sometimes it is because these professionals have opted to work on the safer and less controversial aspects of records and information management work (such as administering records centers, processing records in the archives, and focusing on paper files). Uneven progress with developing workable solutions to electronic records management does not bode well, however, for the ability of records and information professionals to demonstrate their effectiveness in resolving the more difficult problems. The real successes in reducing volumes of paper records and developing cost-efficient storage and retrieval approaches may be forgotten as these other problems continue to grow and be unresolved.

And successes in dealing with some of the daunting technological concerns having to do with electronic records also requires archivists, records managers, and other information professionals to develop new means for working together, overcoming more than two generations of drifting apart. In considering how to market records and information management programs, Taylor and Astoorian observe, "Reclaiming the identity of the profession won't happen from records and information managers talking to each other. It won't happen through simply informing the organization about what the RIM function does, no matter how heavy the promotional efforts." Instead, they argue, "Reclaiming and reinventing RIM's identity can only happen in the conversation between records and information managers and their organizations, and it is up to RIM professionals to create and manage that conversation on a way that creates new perceptions and agreements about what RIM is and the value it provides."[204] As I suggested earlier, it is likely that organizations developing records and information management programs do not understand such professional barriers and disciplinary rivalries anyway, and the prospects of stressing commonalities and more ambitious cooperative mechanisms have far more likelihood of sustaining organizational support of these programs. Again, the organizations are only interested in the solutions to their records and information management problems or in achieving more effective uses of their records and information sources for their ongoing work, not in the academic and theoretical debates that keep records and information management professionals apart.

Judging by the literature, crises and disasters befalling organizations and destroying or threatening records have had more to do with encouraging organizations to establish or to strengthen records and information management programs. Yet, it does not take a genius to understand that crises, unless they are continuous and severe, are not a good way to keep an organization interested in supporting records and information management programs. The measure of success when a records and information management program is established under these circumstances is that disasters no longer have an impact on the continuing functions of an organization, at least those dependent on records and information management systems, so that they might even be classified as a disaster or crisis.

Crises and disasters are usually severe, dramatic, sudden and brief in duration. The drama of these events causes any organization to see immediately what works and does not work, usually prompting an immediate response, sparing little expense, to make the organization better prepared for the next crisis or disaster. However, as suddenly as these events occur and organizations resolve to be better prepared the next time around, the memory and implications of crises and disasters tend to fade. Records and information managers really can only use these kinds of occurrences as starting points for establishing programs or for strengthening the programs that exist; after these events fade in importance, records and information management practitioners will have to build justification for sustaining these programs via other benefits, paybacks, and successes. Should another disaster occur, and the records and information management program is prepared and responds well, then it will certainly gain increased trust from and support in by the organizational leaders. But what archivist, records manager, or information resources manager would want that to occur? Crises and disasters, even with enhanced business contingency plans and repeatedly evaluated and revised disaster-preparedness plans, are not factors likely to sustain a records and information management program.

Public relations and marketing values of existing holdings in records and information management programs may prove to have lasting power to help such programs sustain themselves, especially the archives component. However, since records and other information documents often capture a wide range of evidence, good and bad for the organization creating it, this factor may be a dangerous and convoluted one to play with. Just as organizations have to be extra-sensitive to discovery and spoliation when considering the destruction of records, so they have to be careful not to elevate the public relations and marketing values of their records and information management programs so that there is the impression that records will be sanitized to protect the corporate image. As John Isaza argues, "Companies . . . must balance such severe consequences with proper management of all records, including electronic ones, during litigation. A central and difficult issue surrounding an otherwise sound retention policy is the determination of how and what records must be held from destruction, especially when faced with determining what is considered 'potential' (or threatened) litigation or investigations as opposed to clear 'pending' litigation."[205] What worries some, including me, is that there is a fine line between using records and information management programs to promote the success of an organization with the other responsibilities and activities of these programs.

Nevertheless, some judicious attention to the positive benefits of the activities of records and information management programs can go a long way in encouraging an organization to support such programs. Archivists, records managers, and information managers need to be alert to every possibility for participating in organizational activities that can build positive public relations. More importantly, however, the records and information management program staff need to document their own activities that can shine a positive light on their own operations, even if this means that these professionals must constantly monitor their own ethical and professional convictions. Records and information management professionals need to focus on their own disciplinary and personal ethics codes in a manner that reflects well on their professionalism as well as their loyalty to their employer. While this may not always be easy, if done appropriately it can bring benefits to the programs that propel organizations to provide higher levels of support.

Embedded in all these factors leading to the establishment and potential sustaining of the records and information management professionals is a higher authority because of demonstrations of greater expertise, possessing knowledge, and layers of relevant and valuable experience. In my search of the literature for this exploratory study, I could find little consensus that there was much of any direct evidence that somehow appropriate education and experience of the records and information management professionals led organizations to establish such operations. Clearly, however, such backgrounds will sustain these programs, as the archivists, records managers, and information managers demonstrate their effectiveness and gain the trust of the organizations supporting them and their programs.

In order to sustain their programs, records and information management professionals must build from the factors leading to their establishment by

- Looking for opportunities (events and special occasions) to celebrate (such as anniversaries) in a manner drawing attention to the benefits of records and information management work

- Working to convince individuals to assume the role of champions or advocates for the records and information management programs

- Using professional and technical standards to promote the practical benefits of records and information management programs

- Establishing records and information management programs as centers of advice (knowledge) and legal and compliance issues

- Documenting successes involving records and information management programs in solving organizational problems

- Building lasting and easily remembered lessons from crises and disasters that can support records and information management programs

In such activities, records and information managers need to seek to establish their authority within the organization.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Near the beginning of this report, I endeavored to provide a set of working parameters for the kinds of programs I was examining. Many would argue that I am a traditionalist because of my persistent focus on records. In a twenty-year old textbook in the field, Milburn Smith considers the power of records within organizations and society at large. Smith states, “records contain the information that is the lifeblood of any organization, without which it could not function. Records management, therefore, is a vital task for all companies or organizations.”[206] This is a statement I can work with, although I would add the archives management as an essential aspect of how records need to be administered, because of the critically important concept of the life cycle of records (meaning that all records include phases of “generation, active use, inactive use, and disposal"),[207] a concept that must also include records that are maintained for long periods of time in an institutional archives for a variety of research, administrative, legal, and fiscal reasons. Smith's rather simple statement includes information and suggests evidence, and it could be easily used as a bridge for connecting archives and records management to information, knowledge, document, and other variations on the theme of the information professions. Indeed, other records and information management professionals have expanded on the basic life cycle concept in order to incorporate the archival function as well as the changing nature of information technologies that suggest not a cycle but a continuum.[208] The point is, in all this, that records remain very important, serve a multiplicity of uses within organizations and society, and encompass many of the information and knowledge purposes identified by other records and information management professionals as somehow operating on a higher plane.

Other well-meaning and thoughtful commentators on the nature and state of records and information management would disagree with my parameters, seeing in them a traditional bent that would be too limiting for them. Myburgh believes, for example, that traditional information professionals are "in many ways, marginalized by contemporary society." She mentions as factors in this marginalization, feminization, high culture, and the public library as an agency for social change, but mostly Myburgh stresses the "confusion between information, knowledge and documents, and the practicable distinctions between these concepts, has meant that the traditional information professions lack fundamental theory to support their practice: a theory which could help interpret changing technologies and the application of professional knowledge to changing information problems." With this there is much to contemplate, especially as she lashes out about too much emphasis on "document management and the management of warehouses of documents," factors so stressed by the traditional information professions that they have not been "managing information at all."[209] Yet, in all this there is considerable irony. A decade before Myburgh's book, David Stephens believed that "what people refer to as 'records management' is rapidly evolving into a 'two-tiered discipline," with "traditional records management" "organized around the management of physical records on visible media" on the "low-end" and "document management" "organized around the management of electronic documents in computing environments" on the "high-end."[210] I am sure my focus on records, in my writings, makes some nervous, but I am willing to suggest that each of the newly emerging aspects of the information professions could be examined in a more isolated and comparative fashion to see how organizations come to accept them and recognize them with a formalization as an administrative unit, program, or activity. For example, if I were to study the factors that went into the establishing of a knowledge management program, would they look so different from the ones that I have identified here by primarily considering very traditional archives and records management programs? I am skeptical that there would be much difference.

There is also considerable need to analyze over time how, once established, a records and information management program fares within the organization. In compiling this particular report, one that I can only describe as very preliminary, I made no effort to go back and examine what happened to programs described as being established in the 1960s and 1970s; my focus was on the factors leading to the establishment of the programs, and while these factors probably play a sort of continuing role in the significance of the program, there are likely many other variables influencing why and how the records and information management function might continue to be supported or strengthened. Records and information management professionals have been sensitive to this for a long time; in 1970 Donald Evans used the phrase "advanced records management" to demarcate when a "program has been in effect and has its part in the corporate structure. It also informs us that documents and paperwork is following a controlled pattern from conception and throughout the life cycle." Evans used "advanced" as a modifier to suggest that basic records management work was improving, expanding to include new approaches and new recording technologies, and generally that the program was "changing with the times."[211]

The real critical issue in all this is how records and information management professionals position their programs within organizations in a way that makes them useful and relevant to the organization. For example, the notion of "fast-cycle companies," pursuing the idea of transforming an "organization that performs without the bottlenecks, delays, errors, and inventories" so that decisions can be made more quickly and products gotten to customers faster, suggests a means by which records and information management professionals should operate. "People in fast-cycle companies think of themselves as part of an integrated system," argue Joseph Bower and Thomas Hout, "a linked chain of operations and decision-making points that continuously delivers value to the company's customers. In such organizations, individuals understand how their own activities relate to the rest of the company. They know how work is supposed to flow, how time is supposed to be used."[212] I am not suggesting that this particular model captures how all organizations work. Instead, the point is that records and information management professionals need to understand the managerial styles and practices of their employing organizations in order to understand how and why records and information systems are used, as well as making their programs better appreciated within these organizations. Too often, the literature supporting records and information management work has been prepared with too little focus on such issues, almost with an assumption that the value of records and information systems should be appreciated by the managers and leaders of various kinds of organizations. Archivists, records managers, and other information professionals know that such assumptions are not good enough, if they want to gain deeper understanding about how and why their programs are supported within their organizations.

The above aspects suggest additional research. We could certainly use, for example, more work on case studies of the origins, subsequent history, and effectiveness of records and information management programs within particular types of organizations, along with the other kinds of research suggested above. Developing a richer and more varied body of such case study research would enable the records and information management community to extract more generalizable principles and trends concerning their programs. I have tried to suggest some of these in this report, but given the nature of the available literature, it is difficult for these to be considered as anything more than preliminary ideas.

There is also additional theorizing to be done about how such programs are established, evolve, and either succeed or fail over time within particular kinds of organizations. Again, for critics such as Myburgh, the theoretical foundation of a professional knowledge is fundamental to the well being of that profession. Yet, there are limits to how important a role theoretical knowledge can play within the range of daily activities professionals take on in their institutions. In an important new book about professional education in American universities, David Labaree examines the tensions between faculty in education schools and teachers in the field, with some insights applicable here. Labaree writes, "Problems of teaching and learning, curriculum and governance, educational organization and educational reform – all of these resist efforts by researchers to establish causal claims about them that are verifiable, definitive, and cumulative in anything like the way hard-knowledge disciplines can. For one thing, of course, education is the social product of actors – teachers, students, administrators, parents, and policymakers – whose actions both shape this institution and are shaped by it."[213] Later on, this author adds, "Teacher research and action research together constitute an emerging genre in the field of educational scholarship, which seeks to promote a more analytical approach to education among teachers and other practitioners by encouraging them to carry out systematic research projects within their own context of practice, while at the same seeking to inject a more normative approach (grounded in the purposes and problems of the practitioner) into a research literature dominated by the analytical perspective of university researchers."[214] I did not set out to develop a theory about how and why records and information management programs are established; rather, my aim (and consistent with my mandate to do this report) was to develop a set of working factors that influence the formation of these programs. Others can proceed from here to ascertain what such a theory might look like, but my aim is in clearly describing a set of factors archivists, records managers, and other records professionals in the field can identify and use in practical ways.

As I finished writing this report, it occurred to me that there was one direct action I could take in helping to improve the records and information management community's understanding of how their programs are established and what influences them to succeed or fail. In my capacity as Editor of the *Records & Information Management Report*, I issued in mid-July a call for case studies that could be published in this technical report series. I posted this call on the Archives and Records Management listservs, indicating that in undertaking a study for the ARMA International Educational Foundation, I had found that the case study literature on the establishing and sustaining of archives, records, and information management programs is sparse in coverage, uneven in quality, and in need of vast improvement.[215] I indicated that I would be making a report on my work at the forthcoming ARMA conference in Chicago and that my full report would be published electronically, pending review and acceptance, at a later date by the Foundation.

I described the *Records & Information Management Report*, a technical report published 10 times a year by M.E. Sharpe, as a possible venue for individuals or teams interested in writing case studies, indicating that authors are well compensated for essays in the 7 to 9,000-word range (25-35 double-spaced pages). I noted that I was issuing this call to archivists, records, and information managers who may have an interest in writing a case study about their own program; consultants who either can make anonymous a report or who have permission to publish an institutional study; faculty who have been engaged in research about particular institutional cases; and graduate students who have prepared case studies as part of course research assignments. I also indicated that I hoped to publish not just substantial studies but to feature good stories that can serve as models and guides for the developing and strengthening of archives, records, and information management programs.

I indicated that I was looking for essays describing the origins and subsequent development of archives, records management, and information management programs that provide details of the successes, failures, challenges, issues, obstacles, and lessons learned about the nature of these programs and their contributions to their organizations and society. Case studies about these programs in a variety of organizational settings – corporations, universities and colleges, cultural institutions, all levels of governments – were welcome and encouraged. The aim should be to contribute to advancing the profession's knowledge about why they are established, how they evolve, and what factors play a role in their success or failure. Ideally, I suggested, that I was looking for assessments done by individuals on the outside of these programs, but I was open to balanced accounts by individuals associated with these programs as well. Finally, I indicated I was not interested in essays merely promoting a program or organization.

I also described that authors could explore these topics using any methodology they believe is appropriate (such as historical case study), as long as the program is described in a manner enabling the field to discern factors affecting these programs' origins and subsequent development. Each case study should describe a real situation, possess a solid methodological approach, include appropriate citations, and draw on real data (ranging from archival documentation to interviews). I argued that my short-term aim was to strengthen the field's understanding of how archives, records, and information management programs are established, what affects their evolution, and what influences their success and failure. My long-term aim was to draw together these essays into a single volume that can be used to advance the understanding of the nature of these programs, teasing out principles and developing a working set of factors that provides a stronger theoretical or conceptual base for predicting success in these programs.

The response to my call was heartening. Within a few days I was in discussion with more than a dozen individuals proposing cases on local government records and information management programs, foundation funding as a means for establishing an archives program, the development of a records management program in a pharmaceutical company, the evolution of appraisal and retention scheduling in a museum, various projects of state government archives and records management programs, and the origins of archival and special collections in historical societies and universities. Only time will tell what comes from this effort, but it suggests that there is interest in building a stronger case study literature. While most of the proposals came from individuals associated with these programs, it nevertheless represents a start. If some of these discussions result in more detailed case studies, it may be possible to build from there to develop the kind of case study literature that we have seen in professional schools such as law and business. For example, the Harvard Business School provides a case study of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, described as follows:

> The Historical Society of Pennsylvania (HSP) runs one of the nation's most important research libraries and a museum focusing on colonial history. Financial analysis shows that the society has absorbed increased costs of operation over the past decade through slow but steady depletion of its endowment and deferment of capital investments. Now the board is faced with three options: 1) continue to operate both the research library and the museum on a dwindling resource base; 2) continue to operate the research library, but de-access the museum, using proceeds to fortify the research library; and 3) continue to operate the research library, but turn over the artifact collection to a new Philadelphia-wide museum to be created in collaboration with three other organizations.

While the learning objectives go beyond the scope of what archivists, records managers, and information management professionals might be interested in – these objectives are stated as “The role of the board and CEO in mission reformulation; achieving board consensus; and assessing the institutional and financial costs of different mission change strategies, including the implications of alternate missions for staff implementation” – it is still a noteworthy object to build a bookcase of case studies that emanate from outside, objective analysts.[216] It is a doable task, and one that can be started now.

It may be hard to argue or accept that the creation of a more systematic and comprehensive set of archives, records, and information management case studies will transform the knowledge of these disciplines; perhaps, the best we can state is that it can’t hurt. There have been past indications that the development of case studies might not help, such as in the creation by the Society of American Archivists a decade ago of a set of electronic records management case studies for use in graduate classrooms and workshops (but their failure may have been due to the subject matter affecting the durability of these case studies). Yet, maybe there is hope. Lawrence Friedman describes how, in 1870, Christopher Columbus Langdell, the dean of Harvard Law School, revolutionized legal education by introducing the case study method to teaching, even though the “Harvard method of question and answer, of plowing through casebooks, was slow and intensely impractical.” The reason for the revolution may have been because the “Langdell method . . . with its pretension to science and rigor, brought prestige to law teaching. Whether students learned much was almost irrelevant. They learned to think – or were supposed to. In any event, Harvard Law School was a much tougher place than before, and the same was true of its clones.”[217] My focus in this report is more on generating a stronger bit of professional knowledge, not arguing about how to strengthen the education of archivists, records managers, and information managers – but it is obvious that one goes with the other. At the least, perhaps, we can agree that our professional knowledge can be “tougher.”

In the meantime, while waiting for more substantial case studies to be written, there are numerous actions that archivists, records managers, and information managers can take short of formal research, submission to print or electronic journals, review, and the like. The most practical thing that records and information management professionals could do is to put more detailed information about the origins and evolution of their programs on the World Wide Web sites that nearly every program seems to have created. These Web sites are loaded with good information about services, the nature of records and information sources administered, contacts, exhibitions, practice primers, forms for various services offered, and a host of other information about the entire range of activities. Why could these sites also not include case studies about the origins of archives, records, and information management programs and their evolution as background information for researchers and others interested in the institution and its programs? In my own career, on more than one occasion, I worked on background histories of the programs I headed as a way of acclimating myself to the programs, understanding their issues and challenges, and planning their futures.[218] If I were doing this today, I would put the information up on a Web site as a means of helping others – patrons, advocates, supervisors, and other interested parties – to have the same point of reference. One could imagine slowly building a clearinghouse of case studies that provides a fuller portrait of the origins, evolution, and success and failure factors for archives, records, and information management programs.

Records and information management professionals, in order to gain more understanding about how and why their programs are established and how they are supported or not supported, will need to do the following:

- Conduct comparative analyses of factors leading to the establishment and organizational support of other programs, such as knowledge management, information policy, libraries, and so forth.
- Study programs longitudinally – over time – to see how they fare, what strengthens them, and what weakens them.
- Analyze different managerial styles and corporate cultures to understand their implications for sustaining records and information management programs.
- Ramp up more systematic case study research about records and information management programs in a wide variety of organizational settings that can generate principles and theoretical models about the factors involved in their origins and continued development.

This is a long-term set of activities, but they are ones that can promise great benefits, both practical and academic, in our understanding of records and information management programs.

List of Works Cited

Adkins, Elizabeth W. "The Development of Business Archives in the United States: An Overview and a Personal Perspective," *American Archivist* 60 (Winter 1997): 8-33.

Adkins, Elizabeth W. “A History of the Ford Motor Company Archives, With Reflections on Archival Documentation of Ford of Europe’s History,” in *Ford, 1903-2003: The European History*, pp. 27-67, available at http://beagle.u-bordeaux4.fr/ifrede/Ford/ (accessed June 29, 2005).

Akotia, Pino. “The National Archives of Ghana: New Responsibilities and Challenges,” *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (October 1994): 33-35, 38.

Allen, Michael. “Cleaning Houses: U.S. Companies Pay Increasing Attention to Destroying Files; Major Motive is Eliminating Possible ‘Smoking Guns’; The Ethics of Shredding – A Telltale Cocktail Napkin,” *Wall Street Journal* September 2, 1987, p. 1.

An, Xiaomi. “An Integrated Approach to Records Management,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (July/August 2003): 24-30.

Andolsen, Alan A. “Investing Wisely for the Future,” *Information Management Journal* 38 (September/October 2004): 47-50, 52, 54.

Andolsen, Alan A. “On the Horizon,” *Information Management Journal* 36 (March/April 2002): 23-26, 28-29.

Association of Records Managers and Administrators, “What Is Records Management?” available on its Web site at www.arma.org.

Bakken, Douglas A. “Corporate Archives Today,” *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 279-286.

Balough, Ann. “Building a Knowledge Center for Records and Information Management,” *Records & Information Management Report* 17 (April 2001): 1-14.

Balough, Ann. “Compliance: Getting Program Participation,” *Records & Retrieval Report* 13 (May 1997): 1-14.

Bantin, Philip C. “The Indiana University Electronic Records Project: Lessons Learned,” *Information Management Journal* 34 (January 2001): 16, 18-20, 22-24.

Barata, Kimberly and Piers Cain. “Records Management Toolkits from Across the Pond,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (July/August 2003): 40-42, 44, 46-47.

Barr, Jean. “A Disaster Plan in Action: How A Law Firm in the World Trade Center Survived 9/11 with Vital Records and Employees Intact,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (May/June 2003): 28-29.

Betton, Vicki. “Implementing a Corporate Records Management Program in Columbia, South America,” *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (January 1994): 3-6, 8-11.

Blum, David. “Establishing a Forms Management Program in the State of Maryland,” *Records Management Quarterly* 13 (October 1979): 11-14, 16.

Bower, Joseph L. and Thomas M. Hout, “Fast-Cycle Capability for Competitive Power,” *Harvard Business Review* 66 (November-December 1988): 110-118.

Brichford, Maynard. “Business Use of Business History,” *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (October 1970): 14-16, 43.

Brichford, Maynard. “The Relationship of Records Management Activities to the Field of Business History,” *Business History Review* 46 (Summer 1972): 220-232.

Brown, Jean K. and Linda L. Ruggerio. “Establishing Policy and Standards for Decentralized Electronic Information Management at the University of Delaware,” *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 34-36, 38-43, 46-47.

“Building In for Access and Usability: North Carolina Health System Achieves Multiple Data Access and Report Management Goals with IT,” *Health Management Technology* 25 (September 2004): 68-69.

Charman, Derek. “The Expanding Role of the Archivists: Roles of Archivists and Records Managers in the UK,” *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 16-20.
Chase, Charles G. “RIM: A Liberal Arts Model,” *Information Management Journal* 35 (July 2001): 10, 12-14, 16-17.

Cocheo, Steve. “Shrinking the Paper Mountain,” *American Bankers Association Journal* 96 (October 2004): 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 32.

Coulson, Jim. “Our Professional Responsibility (Records Management),” *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 8ff.

Coulson, Jim, “Our Professional Responsibility,” *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (April 1993): 20-25.

Cox, Richard J. "Alabama's Archival Heritage, 1850-1985," *Alabama Review* 40 (October 1987): 284-307.

To “Cox, Richard J. *Archives and Archivists in the Information Age* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2005).

Cox, Richard J. *Flowers After the Funeral: Reflections on the Post 9/11 Digital Age* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 2003).

Cox, Richard J. "The Historical Development of the Manuscripts Division of the Maryland Historical Society," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69 (Winter 1974): 409-17.

Cox, Richard J. *Managing Institutional Archives: Foundational Principles and Practices* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992).

Cox, Richard J. *Managing Records as Evidence and Information* (Westport, Conn: Quorum Books, 2001.

Cox, Richard J. "The Need for Comprehensive Records Programs in Local Government: Learning by Mistakes in Baltimore, 1947-82," *Provenance* 1 (Fall 1983): 14-34.

Cox, Richard J. "On the Value of Archival History in the United States," *Libraries & Culture* 23 (Spring 1988): 135-51.

Cox, Richard J. "The Plight of American Municipal Archives: Baltimore, 1729-1979," *American Archivist* 42 (July 1979): 281-92.

Cushman, Helen. "Using Business History," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (July 1977): 5-8, 16.

Davidson, Helen L. "Selling Management on Business Archives," *Records Management Quarterly* (July 1969): 15-19.

Davis, Greg and Robert M. Barker, "The Legal Implications of Electronic Document Retention," *Business Horizon* 38 (May 1, 1995): 51-56.

Dearstyne, Bruce W. "The Information-Proficient Organization: Mastering and Using Information for Strategic Advantage," *Records & Information Management Report* 16 (December 2000): 1-16.

Dearstyne, Bruce W. "Leadership and Management of Records and Information Programs: Issues and Strategies," *Records & Information Management Report* 16 (March 2000): 1-14.

Dearstyne, Bruce W. "Leading Information Programs: Ten New Insights for Success," *Information Management Journal* 37 (September/October 2003): 48-50, 52-54.

Dearstyne, Bruce W. "Records Management of the Future: Anticipate, Adapt, and Succeed." *Records Management Quarterly* 33 (October 1999): 4-6, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-18.
Dearstyne, Bruce W. "Strategic Information Management: Continuing Need, Continuing Opportunities," *Information Management Journal* 38 (March/April 2004): 28-30, 32-36.

Dearstyne, Bruce W. "Tragedies, Controversies, and Opportunities: Redefining RIM's Role in a Turbulent Time," *Information Management Journal* 37 (March/April 2003): 37-40, 42.

“Do You Know Where Your Vital Records Are?” *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2002): 10.

East, Dennis. “The Ohio Historical Society and Establishment of the State’s Archives: A Tale of Angst and Apathy,” *American Archivist* 55 (Fall 1992): 562-577.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. “Building Theories from Case Study Research,” *Academy of Management Review* 14 (October 1989): 532-550.

Evans, Donald F. “Advanced Records Management,” *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (January 1970): 9-11.

Farrell, Linda A. “Preparing a Facility for Large Document Productions,” *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (April 1995): 12-14, 16, 18-19, 28.

Field, David D. “The Paper Fall Out – Controlled.” *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (October 1970): 9-13.

Flood, Gary. “Don’t Let the Fear Factor Blind You,” *Information World Review*, December 2004, Issue 208, retrieved through Business Source Premier, April 17, 2005.

Fogarty, Kevin. “Electronic Records: Courting Disaster?” *Baseline* 33 (August 2004): 70.

Friedman, Lawrence M. *Law in America: A Short History* (New York: Modern Library Chronicles Book, 2002).

Galvin, Thomas J. "Convergence or divergence in education for the information processions," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science* 21 (August/September 1995): 7-12.

Geary, James W. “Catholic Archives in a Public Institution: A Case Study of the Arrangement Between Kent State University and the Diocese of Youngstown, Ohio,” *American Archivist* 46 (Spring 1983): 175-182.

Geiser, Will and Bob Johnson. “A Brave New World,” *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 47-50, 52-53.

Ghetu, Magia. “Two Professions, One Goal.” *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 62-66.

Gill, Suzanne L. *File Management and Information Retrieval Systems: A Manual for Managers and Technicians*. Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1993.

Gordon, Stanley B. “The Los Angeles Story: A Case Study in Records Administration,” *Records Management Quarterly* 5 (July 1971): 9-13.

Gregory, Richard. "Managing Your Records," *Manufacturing Systems* 8 (May 1990): 46-47.

Griffith, Sally M. *Serving History in a Changing World: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania in the Twentieth Century* (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Philadelphia, distributed by the University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

Groves, Shanna. "Protecting Your Identity," *Information Management Journal* 36 (May/June 2002): 27-31.

Gummesson, Evert. "All Research is Interpretive!" *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 18, no. 6/7 (2003): 482-492.

Guthrie, Kevin M. *The New-York Historical Society: Lessons from One Nonprofit's Long Struggle for Survival* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1996).

Hackman, Larry J., James M. O'Toole, Liisa Fagerlund, and John Dojka, "Case Studies in Archives Program Development," *American Archivist* 53 (Fall 1990): 548-560.

Hambleton, William A. "Vital Records Protection," *Records Management Quarterly* (April 1969): 27-31.

Haynes, Kenneth V. "Managing Archives and Archival Institutions," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (April 1990): 46ff.

Hefner, Loretta L. "The Change Masters: Organizational Development in a State Archives," *American Archivist* 51 (Fall 1988): 440-454.

Henn, James D. "Some Basic Elements of a Vital Records Program," *Records Management Quarterly* 8 (July 1974): 24-25, 28-29.

Hogan, Kathryn C. "An Historical Overview – Records Management at the Metropolitan Police Department," *Records Management Quarterly* 13 (July 1979): 5-8, 11.

Iker, Eugene E. "Selling Records Management: A Practical Approach," *Records Management Quarterly* 7 (October 1973): 5-6.

Isaza, John J. *Legal Holds & Spoliation: Identifying a Checklist of Considerations that Trigger the Duty to Preserve* (Pittsburgh: ARMA International Educational Foundation Endowment Fund, 2004).

Jenkins, O. Crawford. "Principles of Effective Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 5 (April 1971): 9-12.

Johnston, Wesley J., Mark P. Leach, and Annie H. Liu. “Theory Testing Using Case Studies in Business-to-Business Research,” *Industrial Marketing Management* 28 (1999): 201-213.

Jones, H. G. “Clio in the Courthouse: North Carolina’s Local Records Program at Age Twenty-Five,” *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 41-51.

Jones, Robert D. “Don’t ‘Sell’ Records Management – Give It Away,” *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 3-6, 8-10. 17.

Jones, Virginia A. “Protecting Records – What the Standards Tell Us,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (March/April 2003): 70-72, 74-75.

Joseph, Anthony J. “Safety Considerations in Designing Accommodations for Information Systems,” *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (October 1993): 28-31.

Kahn, Randolph A. “Records Management and Compliance: Making the Connection,” *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 28-34, 36.

Kane, Gerald J. “Techniques for Conducting Records Management Surveys,” *Records Management Quarterly* 12 (July 1978): 8-11.

Kesner, Richard M. Kesner, “Automated Information Management: Is There a Role for the Archivist in the Office of the Future?” *Archivaria* 19 (Winter 1984/85): 162-172.

King, Susan L. “What If: A Case Study of a Hurricane,” *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (July 1994): 30-32.

Kittmer, Sarah and Alan Pelz-Sharpe. “The Electronic Records Management Challenge,” *KM World* 13 (October 2004): 14, 28.

Kohl, Michael. “It Happens Only Once Every Hundred Years: Making the Most of the Centennial Opportunity,” *American Archivist* 54 (Summer 1991): 390-397.

LaBrosse, Michelle. “Build the Business with Powerful Project Management,” *Industrial Management* 47 (January/February 2005): 22-26.

Lagerstrom, Gordon W. “A Retention Program for Insurance Records,” *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (July 1970): 19-22, 37.

Lambrecht, Kirk N. “Records Management at Athabasca University and the University of Alberta,” *Records Management Quarterly* 14 (October 1980): 21-26.

Lando, Robert H. “There Ought to Be a Law,” *Records Management Quarterly* 10 (April 1976): 5-8, 19.

Langemo, Mark. “Strategies for Developing and Strengthening Records Management Programs,” *Records Management Quarterly* 31 (July 1997): 3-4, 6-7.

Launchbaugh, Cynthia. “E-Records Management: A Sad State of Affairs or Golden Opportunity?” *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 20-22, 24.

Launchbaugh, Cynthia. “The Writing on the Wall,” *Information Management Journal* 36 (March/April 2002): 18-21.

Levene, Ralph. “Project Management,” in *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Operations Management*, ed. Nigel Slack. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Business, 1997, 10: 156-158.

Lindorff, Dave. “The New Corporate Motto: Shred Carefully.” *Treasury & Risk Management* 12 (June 2002): 24-27.

Lukenbill, W. Bernard. “Historical Resources in the Local Church: A Field Report on a Largely Gay and Lesbian Congregation,” *American Archivist* 61 (Fall 1998): 384-399.

Lundgren, Terry D. and Carol A. *Records Management in the Computer Age* (Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Co., 1989).

McAdams, Arthur C. “Security and Risk Management: A Fundamental Business Issue,” *Information Management Journal* 38 (July/August 2004): 36-40, 42, 44.

McKemmish, Sue, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, and Frank Upward, *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, Topics in Australasian Library and Information Studies, no. 24 (Wagga Wagga, New South Wales: Center for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005)

McLean, Bob. “The ISO 15849 Imperative,” *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 25-28, 30-31.

McLellan, Peter M. “The Boeing Archival Program,” *American Archivist* 29 (January 1966): 37-42.

McLellan, Peter M. “The University of Washington Records Management Program and Its Impact on Campus Records,” *Records Management Quarterly* 6 (July 1972): 9-12, 23.

McLellan, Peter M. “A Sense of History,” *Records Management Quarterly* 12 (July 1978): 16-18.

To Maedke, Wilmer O., Mary F. Robek, and Gerald F. Brown. *Information and Records Management* (Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press, 1974).

Manion, Kevin. "Integrating Archives, Records, and Research," *Information Management Journal* 39 (January/February 2005): 50-52, 54-55.

Marking, B. Thomas. "Copy Management: An Emerging Program," *Records Management Quarterly* 14 (January 1980): 20-22, 38.

Meyer, Christine Benedichte. "A Case Study in Case Study Methodology," *Field Methods* 13 (November 2001): 329-352.

Montaña, John C. *Access Rights to Business Data on Personally-Owned Computers* (Pittsburgh: The ARMA International Educational Foundation Endowment Fund, 2004).

Montaña, John C. *Legal Obstacles to E-Mail Message Destruction* (Pittsburgh: The ARMA International Educational Foundation, October 19, 2004).

Morgan, Owen J. and Miranda Welch, "Protecting Confidential Computer Records Against Careless Loss," *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (July 1995): 16-20, 65.

Mortensen, Preben. "The Place of Theory in Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 47 (Spring 1999): 1-26.

Myburgh, Sue. *The New Information Professional: How To Thrive in the Information Age Doing What You Love* (Oxford, England: Chandos Publishing, 2005).

Orndoff, Keith. "Strategic Tools for RIM Professionals," *Information Management Journal* 65 (November/December 2002): 65-66, 68-71.

O'Shea, Michael F. "A Case Study," *Records & Retrieval Report* 4 (June 1988): 1-15.

Pember, Margaret. "Information Disaster Planning: An Integral Component of Corporate Risk Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (April 1996): 31- 34, 36-37.

Pemberton, J. Michael. "Does Records Management Have a Future?" *Records Management Quarterly* 25 (January 1991): 38, 40-41, 45.

Pemberton, J. Michael. "Toward a Code of Ethics: Social Relevance and the Professionalization of Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 51-57.

Pemberton, Michael J. "Who Cares About Records Management? Social Relevance and Professional Standing," *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (October 1996): 52-57.

Pemberton, J. Michael and Raymond R. McBeth, "Opportunities Out of Chaos: Survival Strategies in the Information Age," *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (July 1995): 8-12,14-15, 71.

Penn, Ira A. "Information Management Legislation in the Last Quarter of the 20th Century: A Records Management Disaster," *Records Management Quarterly* 31 (January 1997): 3-6, 8-9.

Penn, Ira A. "Records Management: Still Hazy After All These Years," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (January 1993): 3-4, 6-8, 20.

Phillips, John T. "The Challenge of Web Site Records Preservation," *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2003): 42-44, 46-48.

Phillips, John T. "Do Electronic Objects Create Business Risk?" *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (January 1997): 37, 40-42.

Pomrenze, Seymour J. "The Freedom of Information and the Privacy Acts and the Records Manager – Some Selected Considerations," *Records Manager Quarterly* 10 (July 1976): 5-9, 14.

Posner, Ernst. *American State Archives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

Ricks, Betty R. and Kay F. Gow. *Information Resource Management: A Records Systems Approach*, 2nd ed. (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., 1988).

Rike, Barb. "Prepared or Not . . . That is the Vital Question," *Information Management Journal* 37 (May/June 2003): 25-27, 30-33.

Riley, Thomas W. and John G. Adorjan, "Company History: A By-Product of Good Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 15 (October 1981): 5-7.

Rintoul, David. "Records Management in the Corporate Environment," *Records & Retrieval Report* 6 (May 1990): 1-16.

Ross, Linwood. "The Adoption of an Archival Program for Maine," *American Archivist* 29 (July 1966): 395-402.

Sanders, Robert L. "Archivists and Records Managers: Another Marriage in Trouble?" *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 12-14, 16-18, 20.

Sanfelippo, Nancy A. and Charles P. McLarnon. "Obtaining Maximum Benefits from Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (July 1970): 9-12.
Santone, Joseph. "Records Management in the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (April 1977): 7-11.

Shkolnik, Leon. The Role of the Archive in the Corporate Structure," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (October 1990): 18-20, 22-23, 57-58.

Shukla, Rakesh. "The Case for Electronic Records Management," *Financial Executive* 20 (October 2004): 50-51.

Skupsky, Donald S. "Destroying Records Too Soon Under a Records Retention Plan," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 60, 62-63.

Skupsky, Donald S. "Law and Records Management: Toward a Greater Professionalism," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 30, 32.

Skupsky, Donald S. "Legal Considerations for Records Management-Business Risk Decisions," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (July 1989): 54, 56-57.

Skupsky, Donald S. "User Requirements for Records Retention Programs," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (January 1990): 28, 33-35.

Smith, David R. "An Historical Look at Business Archives," *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 273-278.

Smith, George David. "Dusting Off the Cobwebs: Turning the Business Archives into a Managerial Tool," *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 287-290.

Smith, Milburn D., III. *Information and Records Management: A Decision-Maker's Guide to Systems Planning and Implementation* (New York: Quorum Books, 1986).

Soltrow, James H. "The Business Use of Business History," *Business History Review* 29 (September 1955): 227-237.

Stephens, David O. and David Roberts. "From Australia: The World's First National Standard for Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (October 1996): 3-7, 62.

Stephens, David O. "Digital Preservation: A Global Information Management Problem," *Information Management Journal* 34 (July 2000): 68-71.

Stephens, David O. "The Globalization of Records Management in Multinational Corporations," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (October 1993): 66, 68,-70, 72.

Stephens, David O. "Lies, Corruption, and Document Destruction," *Information Management Journal* 36 (September/October 2002): 23-26, 28-30.
Stephens, David O. "Megatrends in Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (January 1998): 3-6, 8-9.

Stephens, David O. "Protecting Records in the Face of Chaos, Calamity, and Cataclysm," *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2003): 33-36, 38-40.

Stephens, David O. "Records Management in Africa South of the Sahara," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (July 1993): 56, 58-61.

Stephens, David O. "Towards a Global Theory of Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 26 (October 1992): 3-4, 6-11.

Summerville, John R. "Records Management: A 'Now' Kinda Thing?" *Records Management Quarterly* 26 (January 1992): 10-13.

Swartz, Nikki. "Six Months That Changed the Face of Information Management," *Information Management Journal* 36 (July/August 2002): 18-20, 22, 24-25.

Taylor, Sheila and Gregg Astoorian. "Marketing Strategy for Records & Information Management Programs," *Records & Information Management Report* 19 (January 2003): 1-14.

Theroux, James and Claire Kilbane. "The Real-Time Case Method: A New Approach to an Old Tradition," *Journal of Education for Business* (January/February 2004): 163-167.

Tillman, Bob. "Who's Afraid of Sarbanes-Oxley?" *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 16-18, 20-21.

Van Slyke, Deborah. "Records Management and the Law," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (October 1989): 26-28.

Vogland, Jane P. "Managing Information Resources," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (October 1977): 12-14, 16-17.

Voss-Hubbard, Anke. "'No Documents – No History': Mary Ritter Beard and the Early History of Women's Archives," *American Archivist* 58 (Winter 1995): 16-30.

Wagner, Stephen C. "Integrated Archives and Records Management Programs at Professional Membership Associations: A Case Study and a Model," *American Archivist* 62 (Spring 1999): 95-129.

Walker, Bill. "Records Managers and Archivists: A Survey of Roles," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 18-20.

Waldron, Martin. "Adopting Electronic Records Management: European Strategic Initiatives," *Information Management Journal* 38 (July/August 2004): 30-32, 34-35.

White, Karen. "Establishing a Business Archives." *Records Management Quarterly* 15 (October 1981): 10-12.

White-Dollmann, Mary M. "ISO 15489: A Tool for Records Management Mergers," *Information Management Journal* 38 (September/October 2004): 39-42, 44.

Whitehill, Walter Muir. *Independent Historical Societies: An Enquiry into Their Research and Publication Functions and Their Financial Future* (Boston: Boston Athenaeum, 1962).

Wilson, O. G. "Bank of America's Archival Program," *American Archivist* 29 (January 1966): 43-48.

Wolfe, Joseph. "New Developments in the Use of Cases for Learning," *Journal of Workplace Learning* 10, no. 6/7 (1998): 320-323.

Woodside, Arch G. and Elizabeth J. Wilson. "Case Study Research Methods for Theory Building," *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 18, no. 6/7 (2003): 493-508.

Wright, Joseph L. "The Unfinished Symphony," *Records Management Quarterly* 6 (January 1972): 5-6, 10.

Yakel, Elizabeth. "Knowledge Management: The Archivist's and Records Manager's Perspective," *Information Management Journal* 34 (July 2000): 24, 26-30.

Young, Jeanne. "Electronic Records Management on a Shoestring: Three Case Studies," *Information Management Journal* 39 (January/February 2005): 58-60.

Youker, Robert. "Organization Alternatives for Project Managers," *Management Review* 66 (November 1977): 46-53.

To "Zabrosky, Frank A. "The Archives of Industrial Society at the University of Pittsburgh," *Records Management Quarterly* 3 (April 1969): 8-11.

Endnotes

[1] Such as Richard M. Kesner, "Automated Information Management: Is There a Role for the Archivist in the Office of the Future?" *Archivaria* 19 (Winter 1984/85): 162-172 and Thomas J. Galvin, "Convergence or divergence in education for the information processions," *Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science* 21 (August/September 1995): 7-12.

[2] For an example of the prediction literature, see Alan A. Andolsen, "On the Horizon," *Information Management Journal* 36 (March/April 2002): 23-26, 28-29.

[3] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Leading Information Programs: Ten New Insights for Success," *Information Management Journal* 37 (September/October 2003): 52.

[4] This is from his introduction to Larry J. Hackman, James M. O'Toole, Liisa Fagerlund, and John Dojka, "Case Studies in Archives Program Development," *American Archivist* 53 (Fall 1990): 549. Case studies here examine the role of mission and corporate culture, internal alliances or sponsorship, external influences, and formal written documents such as plans.

[5] For a characterization of the professional literature, see Richard J. Cox, *Archives and Archivists in the Information Age* (New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc., 2005), chapter 9.

[6] Suzanne L. Gill, *File Management and Information Retrieval Systems: A Manual for Managers and Technicians* (Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1993), pp. 209-231.

[7] Terry D. and Carol A. Lundgren, *Records Management in the Computer Age* (Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Co., 1989).

[8] See, for example, Sue Myburgh, *The New Information Professional: How To Thrive in the Information Age Doing What You Love* (Oxford, England: Chandos Publishing, 2005) and Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, and Frank Upward, *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, Topics in Australasian Library and Information Studies, no. 24 (Wagga Wagga, New South Wales: Center for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005) as recent and informative examples.

[9] Kathleen M. Eisenhardt, "Building Theories from Case Study Research," *Academy of Management Review* 14 (October 1989): 534.

[10] Eisenhardt, "Building Theories," p. 547.

[11] Evert Gummesson, "All Research is Interpretive!" *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing* 18, no. 6/7 (2003): 490.

[12] Barbara Reed writes, for example, "records have to be able to tell the story of exactly what has happened to them during the course of their existence. They need to reflect who has assessed them, in what circumstances, whether redacted versions of them have been created, whether multiple renditions in different formats have been made, what associations with other records have been made, whether they have been migrated, when and what guarantees of success, when they are due for destruction, when their security access is reviewed and so on. These additional contextual details are provided by the processes that manage records – the recordkeeping processes, which themselves must leave a record of the action. These are the processes which provide the means of achieving the critical characteristics of records – authenticity, reliability, integrity and usability." Reed in McKemmish, et al, *Archives*, p. 128.

[13] David O. Stephens, "Towards a Global Theory of Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 26 (October 1992): 3-4, 6-11.

[14] Mark Langemo, "Strategies for Developing and Strengthening Records Management Programs," *Records Management Quarterly* 31 (July 1997): 4, 6.

[15] J. Michael Pemberton, "Does Records Management Have a Future?" *Records Management Quarterly* 25 (January 1991): 41.

[16] Preben Mortensen, "The Place of Theory in Archival Practice," *Archivaria* 47 (Spring 1999): 3.

[17] Mortensen, "The Place of Theory," p. 16.

[18] Wesley J. Johnston, Mark P. Leach, and Annie H. Liu. "Theory Testing Using Case Studies in Business-to-Business Research," *Industrial Marketing Management* 28 (1999): 205.

[19] Peter M. McLellan, "A Sense of History," *Records Management Quarterly* 12 (July 1978): 17. McLellan, at the time, was a management systems analyst with the Seattle police department.

[20] JoAnne Yates, in her major studies *Control Through Communication: The Rise of System in American Management* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989) and *Structuring the Information Age: Life Insurance and Technology in the Twentieth Century* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005), is the best evidence of scholars from outside of the records and information professions exploring topics and issues of substantial interest to these groups. Yates, a historian by training and orientation, reflects the growing interest by such scholars in the history of archives, records, and recordkeeping systems, that I considered in my "The Failure or Future of American Archival History: A Somewhat Unorthodox View," Libraries & Culture 35 (Winter 2000): 141-154.

[21] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Records Management of the Future: Anticipate, Adapt, and Succeed." *Records Management Quarterly* 33 (October 1999): 14.

[22] The main reason may have to do with the contractual and proprietary nature of much of consulting work. Still, specific consulting projects can be generalized in ways that can benefit the larger professional community. I have done this in two of my books, the aforementioned *Archives and Archivists in the Information Age* and my earlier *Managing Institutional Archives: Foundational Principles and Practices* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1992).

[23] Michelle LaBrosse, "Build the Business with Powerful Project Management," *Industrial Management* 47 (January/February 2005): 23.

[24] See Robert Youker, "Organization Alternatives for Project Managers," *Management Review* 66 (November 1977): 46-53.

[25] John R. Summerville, "Records Management: A 'Now' Kinda Thing?" *Records Management Quarterly* 26 (January 1992): 12.

[26] For an example of the kind of case study support the records and information professions require, see Joseph Wolfe, "New Developments in the Use of Cases for Learning," *Journal of Workplace Learning* 10, no. 6/7 (1998): 320-323.

[27]James Theroux and Claire Kilbane. "The Real-Time Case Method: A New Approach to an Old Tradition," *Journal of Education for Business* (January/February 2004): 163.

[28] See, for example, Christine Benedichte Meyer, "A Case Study in Case Study Methodology," *Field Methods* 13 (November 2001): 329-352 and Arch G. Woodside and Elizabeth J. Wilson. "Case Study Research Methods for Theory Building," *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing* 18, no. 6/7 (2003): 493-508.

[29] Kenneth V. Hayes, "Managing Archives and Archival Institutions," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (April 1990): 46.

[30] Artel Ricks, "Records Management as an Archival Function," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (April 1977): 12.

[31] See Myburgh, *The New Information Professional*.

[32] Myburgh, *The New Information Professional*, p. 156.

[33] Association of Records Managers and Administrators, "What Is Records Management?" can be downloaded from ARMA's website (www.arma.org).

[34] See, for example, the way Hans Hoffman uses the standard in McKemmish, et al, *Archives*, p. 138.

[35] Helen Cushman, "Using Business History," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (July 1977): 7.

[36] Thomas W. Riley and John G. Adorjan, "Company History – A By-Product of Good Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 15 (October 1981): 5.

[37] W. Bernard Lukenbill, "Historical Resources in the Local Church: A Field Report on a Largely Gay and Lesbian Congregation," *American Archivist* 61 (Fall 1998): 384-399.

[38] Peter M. McLellan, "The Boeing Archival Program," *American Archivist* 29 (January 1966): 37-42.

[39] O. G. Wilson, "Bank of America's Archival Program," *American Archivist* 29 (January 1966): 43-48.

[40] Hackman, et al, "Case Studies," 1990, p. 552.

[41] Helen L. Davidson, "Selling Management on Business Archives," *Records Management Quarterly* (July 1969): 16.

[42] Stephen C. Wagner, "Integrated Archives and Records Management Programs at Professional Membership Associations: A Case Study and a Model," *American Archivist* 62 (Spring 1999): 97.

[43] James W. Geary, "Catholic Archives in a Public Institution: A Case Study of the Arrangement Between Kent State University and the Diocese of Youngstown, Ohio," *American Archivist* 46 (Spring 1983): 177.

[44] Elizabeth W. Adkins, "The Development of Business Archives in the United States: An Overview and a Personal Perspective," *American Archivist* 60 (Winter 1997): 12-13, 14-15.

[45] David R. Smith, "An Historical Look at Business Archives," *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 276.

[46] See, for example, Michael Kohl, "It Happens Only Once Every Hundred Years: Making the Most of the Centennial Opportunity," *American Archivist* 54 (Summer 1991): 390-397.

[47] Davidson, "Selling Management," p. 16.

[48] Leon Shkolnik, "The Role of the Archive in the Corporate Structure," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (October 1990): 18.

[49] Maynard Brichford, "Business Use of Business History," *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (October 1970): 14.

[50] Brichford, "Business Use," p. 15.

[51] Karen White, "Establishing a Business Archives," *Records Management Quarterly* 15 (October 1981): 10.

[52] Maynard Brichford, "The Relationship of Records Management Activities to the Field of Business History," *Business History Review* 46 (Summer 1972): 228.

[53] See Richard J. Cox, *Managing Records as Evidence and Information* (Westport, Conn: Quorum Books, 2001) as one example.

[54] See, for example, Anke Voss-Hubbard, "'No Documents – No History': Mary Ritter Beard and the Early History of Women's Archives," *American Archivist* 58 (Winter 1995): 16-30.

[55] See, Dennis East, "The Ohio Historical Society and Establishment of the State's Archives: A Tale of Angst and Apathy," *American Archivist* 55 (Fall 1992): 562-577.

[56] H. G. Jones, "Clio in the Courthouse: North Carolina's Local Records Program at Age Twenty-Five," *American Archivist* 49 (Winter 1986): 51.

[57] Frank A. Zabrosky, "The Archives of Industrial Society at the University of Pittsburgh," *Records Management Quarterly* (April 1969): 8.

[58] Zabrosky, "The Archives of Industrial Society," p. 9.

[59] David Blum, "Establishing a Forms Management Program in the State of Maryland," *Records Management Quarterly* 13 (October 1979): 11.

[60] Linwood Ross, "The Adoption of an Archival Program for Maine," *American Archivist* 29 (July 1966): 399.

[61] See, for example, Larry J. Hackman. "State Government and Statewide Archival Affairs: New York as a Case Study," *American Archivist* 55 (Fall 1992): 578-599 for a description of his efforts, providing a kind of autobiography of an effective champion..

[62] Hackman, et al, "Case Studies," p. 552.

[63] Hackman, et al, "Case Studies," pp. 557, 558, 559. Other factors in the successful establishment of the university records program included planning, "effective communication," "external alliances" (funding), "coalition building," and professional standards; Hackman, et al, "Case Studies," p. 560.

[64] Davidson, "Selling Management," p. 16.

[65] Joseph Santone, "Records Management in the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (April 1977): 7.

[66] Kirk N. Lambrecht, "Records Management at Athabasca University and the University of Alberta," *Records Management Quarterly* 14 (October 1980): 22.

[67] Jean K. Brown and Linda L. Ruggerio. "Establishing Policy and Standards for Decentralized Electronic Information Management at the University of Delaware," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 34-36, 38-43, 46-47.

[68] Shkolnik, "The Role of the Archive," p. 19.

[69] Jeanne Young, "Electronic Records Management on a Shoestring: Three Case Studies," *Information Management Journal* 39 (January/February 2005): 60.

[70] Cynthia Launchbaugh, "E-Records Management: A Sad State of Affairs or Golden Opportunity?" *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 22.

[71] David O. Stephens, "Records Management in Africa South of the Sahara," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (July 1993): 61.

[72] See, for example, Eugene E. Iker, "Selling Records Management: A Practical Approach," *Records Management Quarterly* 7 (October 1973): 5-6.

[73] Pino Akotia, "The National Archives of Ghana: New Responsibilities and Challenges," *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (October 1994): 34.

[74] Dearstyne, "Records Management of the Future," 1999, p. 10.

[75] Robert D. Jones, "Don't 'Sell' Records Management – Give It Away," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 3-6, 8-10, 17.

[76] See, for example, Pemberton, "Does Records Management Have a Future?"

[77] Jim Coulson, "Our Professional Responsibility (Records Management)," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 3.

[78] Virginia A. Jones, "Protecting Records – What the Standards Tell Us," *Information Management Journal* 37 (March/April 2003): 70.

[79] Another frequently discussed and cited standard is the U. S. Department of Defense 5015.2 Standard for records management applications (1997).

[80] David O. Stephens, "The Globalization of Records Management in Multinational Corporations," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (October 1993): 70.

[81] David O. Stephens and David Roberts, "From Australia: The World's First National Standard for Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (October 1996): 3.

[82] Stephens and Roberts, "From Australia," p. 4.

[83] Mary M. White-Dollmann, "ISO 15489: A Tool for Records Management Mergers," *Information Management Journal* 38 (September/October 2004): 40.

[84] White-Dollmann, "ISO 15489," p. 42.

[85] Bob McLean, "The ISO 15849 Imperative," *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 27.

[86] Kimberly Barata and Piers Cain, "Records Management Toolkits from Across the Pond," *Information Management Journal* 37 (July/August 2003): 44.

[87] John T. Phillips, "The Challenge of Web Site Records Preservation," *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2003): 46.

[88] Donald S. Skupsky, "Legal Considerations for Records Management-Business Risk Decisions," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (July 1989): 54, 56-57.

[89] Donald S. Skupsky, "Destroying Records Too Soon Under a Records Retention Plan," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 60, 62-63.

[90] See, for example, some of the discussion in chapter four on documents in McKemmish, *Archives*.

[91] Deborah Van Slyke, "Records Management and the Law," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (October 1989): 26-28.

[92] Betty R. Ricks and Kay F. Gow, *Information Resource Management: A Records Systems Approach*, 2nd ed. (Cincinnati: South-Western Publishing Co., 1988), p. 27.

[93] Davidson, "Selling Management," p. 17.

[94] Seymour J. Pomrenze, "The Freedom of Information and the Privacy Acts and the Records Manager – Some Selected Considerations," *Records Manager Quarterly* 10 (July 1976): 6.

[95] Linda A. Farrell, "Preparing a Facility for Large Document Productions," *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (April 1995): 13.

[96] Ira A. Penn, "Records Management: Still Hazy After All These Years," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (January 1993): 3-4, 6-8, 20.

[97] Robert H. Lando, Robert H. "There Ought to Be a Law," *Records Management Quarterly* 10 (April 1976): 5. The author was a consultant, retired from NARA.

[98] Michael Allen, "Cleaning Houses: U.S. Companies Pay Increasing Attention to Destroying Files; Major Motive is Eliminating Possible 'Smoking Guns'; The Ethics of Shredding – A Telltale Cocktail Napkin," *Wall Street Journal* September 2, 1987, p. 1.

[99]Greg Davis and Robert M. Barker, "The Legal Implications of Electronic Document Retention," *Business Horizon* 38 (May 1, 1995): 51-56.

[100] Dave Lindorff, "The New Corporate Motto: Shred Carefully," *Treasury & Risk Management* 12 (June 2002): 24-27.

[101] Will Geiser and Bob Johnson, "A Brave New World," *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 49-50. Geiser is owner and president of a shredding company and Johnson is former president of the National Association for Information Destruction -- NAID.

[102] Rakesh Shukla, "The Case for Electronic Records Management," *Financial Executive* 20 (October 2004): 50.

[103] Bob Tillman, "Who's Afraid of Sarbanes-Oxley?" *Information Management Journal* 36 (November/December 2002): 16.

[104] Tillman, "Who's Afraid of Sarbanes-Oxley?" pp. 16-17.

[105] Tillman, "Who's Afraid of Sarbanes-Oxley?" p. 20.

[106] Tillman, "Who's Afraid of Sarbanes-Oxley?" p. 21.

[107] Sarah Kittmer and Alan Pelz-Sharpe, "The Electronic Records Management Challenge," *KM World* 13 (October 2004): 14.

[108] John T. Phillips, "Do Electronic Objects Create Business Risk?" *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (January 1997): 37.

[109] Donald S. Skupsky, "Law and Records Management: Toward a Greater Professionalism," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 32.

[110] Richard Gregory, "Managing Your Records," *Manufacturing Systems* 8 (May 1990): 46.

[111] Davidson, "Selling Management," p. 19.

[112] Donald S. Skupsky, "User Requirements for Records Retention Programs," *Records Management Quarterly* 24 (January 1990): 28, 33-35.

[113] Jim Coulson, "Our Professional Responsibility," *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (April 1993): 23.

[114] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Strategic Information Management: Continuing Need, Continuing Opportunities," *Information Management Journal* 38 (March/April 2004): 32.

[115] J. Michael Pemberton and Raymond R. McBeth, "Opportunities Out of Chaos: Survival Strategies in the Information Age," *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (July 1995): 8.

[116] Pemberton and McBeth, "Opportunities Out of Chaos," p. 10.

[117] Ricks and Gow, *Information Resources Management*, p. 48.

[118] Ricks and Gow, *Information Resources Management*, p. 83.

[119] Jane P. Vogland, "Managing Information Resources," *Records Management Quarterly* 11 (October 1977): 12.

[120] Vogland, "Managing," p. 13.

[121] Gerald J. Kane, "Techniques for Conducting Records Management Surveys," *Records Management Quarterly* 12 (July 1978): 8.

[122] Stanley B. Gordon, "The Los Angeles Story: A Case Study in Records Administration," *Records Management Quarterly* 5 (July 1971): 9-10.

[123] Michael F. O'Shea, "A Case Study," *Records & Retrieval Report* 4 (June 1988): 2.

[124] David O. Stephens, "Digital Preservation: A Global Information Management Problem," *Information Management Journal* 34 (July 2000): 69.

[125] Coulson, "Our Professional Responsibility," 1993, p. 20.

[126] Liisa Fagerlund's discussion in Hackman, et al, "Case Studies," pp. 554-555. The strategic planning process, endemic to this shift in corporate culture and providing an opportunity for new archival leadership, was also critical to success of the state archives' reinvention. See Loretta L. Hefner, "The Change Masters: Organizational Development in a State Archives," *American Archivist* 51 (Fall 1988): 440-454.

[127] Cynthia Launchbaugh, "The Writing on the Wall," *Information Management Journal* 36 (March/April 2002): 19.

[128] B. Thomas Marking, "Copy Management: An Emerging Program," *Records Management Quarterly* 14 (January 1980): 20.
[129] Marking, "Copy," p. 22.

[130] Wilmer O. Maedke, Mary F. Robek, and Gerald F. Brown, *Information and Records Management* (Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press, 1974), p. 20.

[131] Nancy A. Sanfelippo and Charles P. McLarnon. "Obtaining Maximum Benefits from Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (July 1970): 9-10.

[132] David D. Field, "The Paper Fall Out – Controlled." *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (October 1970): 9-13.

[133] Gordon W. Lagerstrom, "A Retention Program for Insurance Records," *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (July 1970): 20.

[134] Kathryn C. Hogan, "An Historical Overview – Records Management at the Metropolitan Police Department," *Records Management Quarterly* 13 (July 1979): 5-8, 11.

[135] Jenkins, "Principles," p. 10.

[136] Ann Balough, "Compliance: Getting Program Participation," *Records & Retrieval Report* 13 (May 1997): 3.

[137] Vicki Betton, "Implementing a Corporate Records Management Program in Columbia, South America," *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (January 1994): 4.

[138] Peter M. McLellan, "The University of Washington Records Management Program and Its Impact on Campus Records," *Records Management Quarterly* 6 (July 1972): 10.

[139] Launchbaugh, "Writing on the Wall," p. 20.

[140] O. Crawford Jenkins, "Principles of Effective Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 5 (April 1971): 10.

[141] The literature about the professional schism and its implications is voluminous, but Robert L. Sanders, "Archivists and Records Managers: Another Marriage in Trouble?" *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (April 1989): 12-14, 16-18, 20 and Bill Walker, "Records Managers and Archivists: A Survey of Roles," *Records Management Quarterly* 23 (January 1989): 18-20 provide examples. Magia Ghetu, "Two Professions, One Goal." *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 62-66 is a more recent argument of the need for archivists and records managers to work together.

[142] Derek Charman, "The Expanding Role of the Archivists: Roles of Archivists and Records Managers in the UK," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 16-20.

[143] Davidson, "Selling Management," p. 16.

[144] See, for example, Michael Pemberton's essays "Who Cares About Records Management? Social Relevance and Professional Standing," *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (October 1996): 52-57 and "Toward a Code of Ethics: Social Relevance and the Professionalization of Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (October 1998): 51-57.

[145] David O. Stephens, "Megatrends in Records Management," *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (January 1998): 9.

[146] Joseph L. Wright, "The Unfinished Symphony," *Records Management Quarterly* 6 (January 1972): 5.

[147] Charles G. Chase, "RIM: A Liberal Arts Model," *Information Management Journal* 35 (July 2001): 12.

[148] Kevin Fogarty. "Electronic Records: Courting Disaster?" *Baseline* 33 (August 2004): 70.

[149] Philip C. Bantin, "The Indiana University Electronic Records Project: Lessons Learned," *Information Management Journal* 34 (January 2001): 16, 18-20, 22-24.

[150] Elizabeth Yakel, "Knowledge Management: The Archivist's and Records Manager's Perspective," *Information Management Journal* 34 (July 2000): 26.

[151] Yakel, "Knowledge Management," p. 27.

[152] Nikki Swartz, "Six Months That Changed the Face of Information Management," *Information Management Journal* 36 (July/August 2002): 18. See also, for another perspective, David O. Stephens, "Lies, Corruption, and Document Destruction," *Information Management Journal* 36 (September/October 2002): 23-26, 28-30.

[153] Swartz, “Six Months,” p. 19.

[154] Swartz, “Six Months,” p. 20.

[155] Swartz, “Six Months,” p. 24.

[156] “Do You Know Where Your Vital Records Are?” *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2002): 10.

[157] See, for example, Richard J. Cox, *Flowers After the Funeral: Reflections on the Post 9/11 Digital Age* (Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 2003).

[158] David O. Stephens, “Protecting Records in the Face of Chaos, Calamity, and Cataclysm,” *Information Management Journal* 36 (January/February 2003): 38.

[159] See, for example, Jean Barr, “A Disaster Plan in Action: How a Law Firm in the World Trade Center Survived 9/11 with Vital Records and Employees Intact,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (May/June 2003): 28-29.

[160] Frank Upward in McKemmish, *Archives*, p. 220.

[161] Susan L. King, “What If: A Case Study of a Hurricane,” *Records Management Quarterly* 28 (July 1994): 32.

[162] Keith Orndoff, “Strategic Tools for RIM Professionals,” *Information Management Journal* 65 (November/December 2002): 70.

[163] Orndoff, “Strategic Tools,” p. 71.

[164] Margaret Pember, “Information Disaster Planning: An Integral Component of Corporate Risk Management,” *Records Management Quarterly* 30 (April 1996): 32.

[165] Barb Rike, “Prepared or Not . . . That Is the Vital Question,” *Information Management Journal* 37 (May/June 2003): 25.

[166] William A. Hambleton, “Vital Records Protection,” *Records Management Quarterly* (April 1969): 27.

[167] James D. Henn, “Some Basic Elements of a Vital Records Program,” *Records Management Quarterly* 8 (July 1974): 25.

[168] Anthony J. Joseph, “Safety Considerations in Designing Accommodations for Information Systems,” *Records Management Quarterly* 27 (October 1993): 29.

[169] Owen J. Morgan and Miranda Welch, "Protecting Confidential Computer Records Against Careless Loss," *Records Management Quarterly* 29 (July 1995): 18.

[170] Arthur C. McAdams, "Security and Risk Management: A Fundamental Business Issue," *Information Management Journal* 38 (July/August 2004): 38.

[171] Shanna Groves, "Protecting Your Identity," *Information Management Journal* 36 (May/June 2002): 31.
[172] Stephens, "Globalization," p. 58.

[173] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Tragedies, Controversies, and Opportunities: Redefining RIM's Role in a Turbulent Time," *Information Management Journal* 37 (March/April 2003): 42.

[174]Randolph A. Kahn, "Records Management and Compliance: Making the Connection," *Information Management Journal* 38 (May/June 2004): 32.

[175] Martin Waldron, "Adopting Electronic Records Management: European Strategic Initiatives," *Information Management Journal* 38 (July/August 2004): 31.

[176] Stephens, "Digital Preservation," p. 69.

[177] "Building In for Access and Usability: North Carolina Health System Achieves Multiple Data Access and Report Management Goals with IT," *Health Management Technology* 25 (September 2004): 68.

[178] Steve Cocheo, "Shrinking the Paper Mountain," *American Bankers Association Journal* 96 (October 2004): 22.

[179] Gary Flood, "Don't Let the Fear Factor Blind You," *Information World Review*, December 2004, Issue 208, retrieved through Business Source Premier, April 17, 2005.

[180] Ira A. Penn, "Information Management Legislation in the Last Quarter of the 20th Century: A Records Management Disaster," *Records Management Quarterly* 31 (January 1997): 3.

[181] Penn, "Information Management Legislation," p. 9.

[182] Elizabeth Adkins, "A History of the Ford Motor Company Archives, With Reflections on Archival Documentation of Ford of Europe's History," in *Ford, 1903-2003: The European History*, p. 27, available at http://beagle.u-bordeaux4.fr/ifrede/Ford/ (accessed June 29, 2005).

[183] Adkins, "A History of the Ford Motor Company Archives," p. 31.

[184] Adkins, "A History of the Ford Motor Company Archives," p. 53.

[185] Adkins, "A History of the Ford Motor Company Archives," p. 62.

[186] James H. Soltrow, "The Business Use of Business History," *Business History Review* 29 (September 1955): 227-237.

[187] Davidson, "Selling Management," p.19.

[188] Davidson, "Selling Management,"p.19.

[189] See, for example, Douglas A. Bakken, "Corporate Archives Today," *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 279-286 and George David Smith, "Dusting Off the Cobwebs: Turning the Business Archives into a Managerial Tool," *American Archivist* 45 (Summer 1982): 287-290.

[190] David Rintoul, "Records Management in the Corporate Environment," *Records & Retrieval Report* 6 (May 1990): 2.

[191] Kahn, "Records Management and Compliance," p. 30.

[192] Alan A. Andolsen, "Investing Wisely for the Future," *Information Management Journal* 38 (September/October 2004): 50.

[193] See the minutes of the forum, held in June 2004, at http://www.hunterinformation.com/caf_2004.htm.

[194] Ralph Levene, "Project management," in *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Operations Management*, ed. Nigel Slack (Cambrdige, MA: Blackwell Business, 1997), 10: 157.

[195] Kevin Manion, "Integrating Archives, Records, and Research," *Information Management Journal* 39 (January/February 2005): 51.

[196] Manion, "Integrating Archives, Records, and Research," p. 56.

[197] A reading of Ernst Posner, *American State Archives* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964) and Walter Muir Whitehill, *Independent Historical Societies: An Enquiry into Their Research and Publication Functions and Their Financial Future* (Boston: Boston Athenaeum, 1962) provide interesting benchmarks from which the subsequent sagas of these archives and records programs can be evaluated. For example, consider these interesting updated histories of two historical societies, both of which were prominent leaders in their field for many decades: Kevin M. Guthrie, *The New-York Historical Society: Lessons from One Nonprofit's Long Struggle for Survival* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1996) and Sally M. Griffith, *Serving History in a Changing*

World: The Historical Society of Pennsylvania in the Twentieth Century (Philadelphia: Historical Society of Philadelphia, distributed by the University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

[198] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "Leadership and Management of Records and Information Management Programs: Issues and Strategies," *Records & Information Management Report* 16 (March 2000): 6.

[199] Ann Balough, "Building a Knowledge Center for Records and Information Management," *Records & Information Management Report* 17 (April 2001): 3.

[200] Dave Lindorff, "The New Corporate Motto: Shred Carefully," *Treasury & Risk Management* 12 (June 2002): 26.

[201] John C. Montaña, *Legal Obstacles to E-Mail Message Destruction* (Pittsburgh: The ARMA International Educational Foundation, October 19, 2003), p. 40.

[202] Bruce W. Dearstyne, "The Information-Proficient Organization: Mastering and Using Information for Strategic Advantage," *Records & Information Management Report* 16 (December 2000): 15.

[203] John C. Montaña, *Access Rights to Business Data on Personally-Owned Computers* (Pittsburgh: The ARMA International Educational Foundation Endowment Fund, 2004), p. 4.

[204] Sheila Taylor and Gregg Astoorian, "Marketing Strategy for Records & Information Management Programs," *Records & Information Management Report* 19 (January 2003): 4.

[205] John J. Isaza, *Legal Holds & Spoliation: Identifying a Checklist of Considerations that Trigger the Duty to Preserve* (Pittsburgh: ARMA International Educational Foundation Endowment Fund, 2004), p. 1.

[206] Milburn D. Smith, III, *Information and Records Management: A Decision-Maker's Guide to Systems Planning and Implementation* (New York: Quorum Books, 1986), pp. 4-5.

[207] Smith, *Information and Records Management*, p. 9.

[208] Xiaomi An, "An Integrated Approach to Records Management," *Information Management Journal* 37 (July/August 2003): 24-30 provides a handy discussion of this concept. For a concentrated discussion about the essential aspects of the records continuum idea to the theoretical dimensions of records and information management endeavors, see McKemmish, *Archives*.

[209] Myburgh, *The New Information Professional*, p. xvii.

[210] David O. Stephens, “Megatrends in Records Management,” *Records Management Quarterly* 32 (January 1998): 9.

[211] Donald F. Evans, “Advanced Records Management,” *Records Management Quarterly* 4 (January 1970): 9.

[212] Joseph L. Bower and Thomas M. Hout, “Fast-Cycle Capability for Competitive Power,” *Harvard Business Review* 66 (November-December 1988): 111.

[213] David F. Labaree, *The Trouble With Ed Schools* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), p. 64.

[214] Labaree, *The Trouble With Ed Schools*, p. 95.

[215] I posted both messages on these listservs on July 12, 2005.

[216] This case study is described at http://harvardbusinessonline.hbsp.harvard.edu/b02/en/common/item_detail.jhtml?id=597062.

[217] Lawrence M. Friedman, *Law in America: A Short History* (New York: Modern Library Chronicles Book, 2002), pp. 166, 167.

[218] For example, see my "The Historical Development of the Manuscripts Division of the Maryland Historical Society," *Maryland Historical Magazine* 69 (Winter 1974): 409-17; "The Plight of American Municipal Archives: Baltimore, 1729-1979," *American Archivist* 42 (July 1979): 281-92; "The Need for Comprehensive Records Programs in Local Government: Learning by Mistakes in Baltimore, 1947-82," *Provenance* (Fall 1983): 14-34; and "Alabama's Archival Heritage, 1850-1985," *Alabama Review* 40 (October 1987): 284-307. I described some of the possibilities of using one’s program as a laboratory in understanding the nature of the development of archives and records management programs in "On the Value of Archival History in the United States," *Libraries & Culture* 23 (Spring 1988): 135-51.

Richard J. Cox is Professor in Library and Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh, School of Information Sciences where he is responsible for the archives concentration in the Master's in Library Science degree and the Ph.D. degree. He has been a member of the Society of American Archivists Council from 1986 through 1989. Dr. Cox also served as Editor of the *American Archivist* from 1991 through 1995, and he is presently editor of the *Records & Information Management Report* as well as serving as the Society of American Archivists Publications Editor. He has written extensively on archival and records management topics and has published eleven books in this area: *American Archival Analysis: The Recent Development of the Archival Profession in the United States* (1990) -- winner of the Waldo Gifford Leland Award given by the Society of American Archivists; *Managing Institutional Archives: Foundational Principles and Practices* (1992); *The First Generation of Electronic Records Archivists in the United States: A Study in Professionalization* (1994); *Documenting Localities* (1996); *Closing an Era: Historical Perspectives on Modern Archives and Records Management* (2000); *Managing Records as Evidence and Information* (2001), winner of the Waldo Gifford Leland Award in 2002; co-editor, *Archives & the Public Good: Records and Accountability in Modern Society* (2002); *Vandals in the Stacks? A Response to Nicholson Baker's Assault on Libraries* (2002); *Flowers After the Funeral: Reflections on the Post-9/11 Digital Age* (2003); *No Innocent Deposits: Forming Archives by Rethinking Appraisal* (2004), winner of the Waldo Gifford Leland Award in 2005; *Lester J. Cappon and Historical Scholarship in the Golden Age of Archival Theory* (2004); and *Archives and Archivists in the Information Age* (2005). A second edition of *Understanding Archives and Manuscripts*, co-written with James M. O'Toole, will appear in 2006. He is presently working on several new books on archival ethics and accountability, professional education, and personal recordkeeping. Dr. Cox was elected a Fellow of the Society of American Archivists in 1989.

The ARMA International Educational Foundation

The ARMA International Educational Foundation is the non-profit, (501(c)3, affiliate of ARMA International, the primary professional association for the records and information profession in the world.

Mission

The ARMA International Educational Foundation supports education and research initiatives that promote the advancement of both information managers and the information management profession. Recorded information is the lifeblood of the modern organization, but rarely is it treated as a critical asset, primarily because there is little quality research to create the comprehensive body of knowledge required to support information management as a profession. The AIEF purpose is to answer that need by soliciting funds for this research and then providing a vehicle through which conclusions can be tested, documented and communicated to the information management community.

If you found value in this publication, please consider making a financial contribution to the Endowment Fund of the Foundation. This can be accomplished by visiting the Foundation's web site, www.armaedfoundation.org, or by contacting

Foundation Administrator
ARMA Int'l Educational Foundation
1609 Terrie Drive
Pittsburgh PA 15241
USA

Additional information about the Foundation can be found at GuideStar

The National Database of Nonprofit Organizations
http://www.guidestar.org/search/report/gs_report.jsp?ein=31-1556655

Comments about this publication and suggestions for further research are welcome. Please direct your inquiry to the Foundation Administrator.