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1. The Archiving Experience

"Designing for experiences is fundamentally about people, not technologies, and the culture of these activities..."

RAMP contributed an increased capacity (200%) to accession materials, but was it equally successful in reaching its intended audience?

2. Social Attitudes of Linguists

Nordmoe (2011) claims that archiving meta-schemas remain too complex for linguists. We find this objection un-grounded coming from linguists who devise meta-schemas for describing language. Though we make no claim that any schema is innate, linguists use a variety of complex metadata schemas during their working day - though some linguists may be unaware of them. The user experience challenge for archivists is: can archivists access these data at the point of first use or at other encountered.

3. Task perception

Linguist: How does RAMP relate to my other tasks in my work巡逻? How do I get training on RAMP? Where can I get help if I need it? Archivist: The perception of where RAMP is situated in the entire eco-system is foundational to widespread user adoption.

From when do these items come?

604 items archived in 2012 are known to have been created or published in 2012.

SL has nearly 80 years of history working with minority language communities.

About 1 million relevant non-digital objects are estimated to exist in SL networks.

About 50 million relevant digital objects are estimated to exist in SL networks.

Are items being accessioned in appropriate amounts of time?

Or, do linguists retain the attitude: archiving is my last task before death?

4. Management Strategies

Submission methods used

5. Archives, a dispensable service

The RAMP "e" solution is not about the marketing of its relevance, other content promotion and curation services, or to both submitter and content users. The more it can convince each group of the value, the more it becomes the eco-system.

Unlike most other sides markets, viewing the interaction of users and the measurement of their impact on the archive are not just a function of the tool's fit, but the tool itself.

6. Conclusions

The challenge is not creating a tool, but rather a tool which fits the frame of reference of linguists and monopolizes on metadata created by linguists at the time of object use or object creation.

Archives have relatively little return on investment for linguists to archive.

Working with existing metadata

Most metadata have metas of some kind embedded to them, making it easy for users to find (rather than completely ignoring) it would cause the user effort, and in some cases time. The perceived value would make the user appreciate the archive. They would have to devise fewer workarounds or address answered questions. But these questions are and can be pertinent in accessions of non-digital objects.

What kinds of digital objects are being submitted?

One of the big questions in archiving is: are digital objects clumped or divided appropriately?

To answer, this archivist would look at how many .zip files and archive files (.iso, .tar, .gzip, etc.) it might have accumulated. This year the SL archive added 1,113 new .zip files. Zip files may be a convenient transmission or storage format, but if the reason for the submission is in a different format because the submission object is something that is to archive at the digital object independently, when the file is more appropriate for it to be added to and not part of the archive system, then something is wrong with the experience in the submission process. These pressure points become the normative values in distributed archive submissions.

Another way to assess charging and meeting is through relationships with a tool or platform, or a reliance on it.

1,821 of the items added in 2012 have relationships to other items in the archive.
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