ADVANCES IN KNOWLEDGE ORGANIZATION
Proceedings of International ISKO Conference - ISSN: 0938-5495 - 2026 - São Paulo

Archival Representation as Knowledge Organization: The Centennial Context of the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa

Isabella Henrique Lima Pereira

Fluminense Federal University, Brazil

Bianca Therezinha Carvalho Panisset

Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa, Brazil

Abstract

Institutional commemorations often transform archival practices into mechanisms for constructing public memory. This study examines the centennial commemorative context of the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa, a Brazilian house museum dedicated to preserving the legacy of Rui Barbosa, its historical building, garden, and collections. The paper investigates how archival classification and description practices developed during the commemorative process function as Knowledge Organization (KO) practices that shape institutional memory and archival narratives. Adopting a qualitative and interpretative approach, the study analyzes selected museum records produced through the activities of the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa and organized within the institutional archival system of the Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa, including records related to conservation and restoration works, restoration of collections, activity reports, exhibitions, commemorations, and tributes. The analysis shows that functional classification ensures institutional coherence, while archival description introduces contextual, material, curatorial, and symbolic specificity. By enabling museum activities to become intelligible as cultural memory and potential sources for public engagement, archival representation emerges as an active mediator of institutional memory.

1.0 Introduction

Institutional commemorations often prompt memory institutions to revisit and reinterpret their documentary heritage through archival representation practices, particularly classification and description, that support the construction of public narratives about their past. In such moments, archival practices that usually remain invisible, such as classification and description, become central mechanisms through which institutional history is selected, organized, and communicated. The centennial of the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa (MCRB) constitutes one such context, in which the processing of documentation transferred[1] from the museum to the institutional archives has required

1The term transferred is used in this study to designate the movement of records from the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa to the institutional archives of the Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa within the same organizational structure. Although related to the archival process of accession, understood as the formal acceptance and recording of records into archival custody providing initial physical and intellectual control, the term emphasizes the functional relocation of records for archival processing. MAT. Multilingual Archival

renewed classificatory and descriptive efforts aimed not only at documentary control but also at enabling archival-based exhibitions and historical interpretations.

Archival records, however, do not convey institutional history independently of the systems that organize and represent them. Classification schemes establish conceptual hierarchies, while archival descriptions frame records within specific contextual and interpretative boundaries. These representational practices influence which relationships become visible, which institutional functions are emphasized, and which narratives become possible. Rather than neutral technical procedures, archival classification and description operate as mediating processes that shape how records acquire meaning and how institutional memory can subsequently be articulated and accessed.

These characteristics resonate with discussions in Knowledge Organization (KO), a field concerned with the conceptual structures and representational processes through which knowledge is organized and made accessible. While KO research has traditionally focused on bibliographic and information retrieval systems, increasing attention has been directed toward KO practices embedded in memory institutions such as archives and museums. From this perspective, archival representation, understood in this study as the combined processes of classification and description, cannot be regarded merely as a technical activity but as a domain in which KO processes operate through classificatory and descriptive decisions that structure access to institutional knowledge and shape interpretative possibilities.

Although growing scholarship has explored the relationships between KO and memory institutions, discussions often remain divided between conceptual analyses of KO systems and practice-oriented archival studies. Similarly, research on institutional memory has frequently emphasized social and historical dimensions without examining how classificatory and descriptive infrastructures actively participate in shaping memory construction. Consequently, limited attention has been given to how KO processes embedded in archival representation operate within commemorative contexts, where institutional narratives are actively rearticulated. This gap becomes particularly evident in museum-archive environments, in which documentary production, cultural mediation, and memory construction intersect.

This study examines the centennial context of the MCRB, an administrative unit of the Fundação Casa de Rui Barbosa (FCRB) dedicated to preserving and interpreting the legacy associated with Rui Barbosa and the historical house that hosts the museum. As part of the commemorative preparations, documentation produced and accumulated through the museum's activities has been transferred to the institutional archives of the FCRB, where it is processed by the Serviço de Arquivo Histórico e Institucional (SAHI). The classification and description of this documentation aim not only to ensure archival control but also to support archival-based exhibitions and historical narratives developed for the commemorative celebrations, thereby creating a context in which KO processes embedded in archival representation become particularly observable.

Terminology. https://www.ciscra.org/mat/mat/term/30/50.

Against this background, this study aims to demonstrate how archival classification and description function as KO practices within institutional archives. Focusing on museum records transferred to the institutional archives of the FCRB during the preparations for the centennial commemorations of the MCRB, the paper examines how archival representation mediates the organization of knowledge and contributes to the construction of institutional memory.

To respond to this problem, the paper examines selected documentary examples associated with classification codes that represent different dimensions of museum activity: conservation and restoration of the historical building and garden, restoration of collections, activity reports, exhibitions, and commemorations or tributes. These examples make it possible to observe how functional classification organizes institutional records and how archival description expands their meaning by revealing material, curatorial, historical, and public dimensions that are especially relevant in the centennial context.

The article is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the conceptual framework on KO and archival representation; Section 3 describes the institutional context and methodological approach; Section 4 discusses the analytical findings; and Section 5 concludes with the main theoretical implications of the study.

2.0 Archival Representation and Knowledge Organization

KO has been established as an epistemological field concerned with the principles through which knowledge domains are conceptualized, structured, and made accessible. Rather than neutral technical arrangements, systems of organization express socially and historically situated understandings of knowledge production (Hjørland 2008; Hjørland 2017). From this perspective, organizing knowledge involves interpretative and cultural decisions that shape how entities, relationships, and contexts become intelligible within specific communities. Beghtol (2002) further emphasizes that classification systems are culturally embedded structures reflecting particular worldviews and value systems. Expanding this perspective, García Gutiérrez (2002) argues for a transcultural ethics of mediation in KO, highlighting the role of representational systems in negotiating cultural boundaries and epistemic diversity. Such approaches allow archival representation to be examined as a knowledge-organizing activity through which institutional knowledge is structured and mediated.

Representation constitutes a central operation in KO because descriptive systems determine how objects are identified, contextualized, and related. Frohmann (2004) demonstrates that documentary practices materialize knowledge through institutional procedures that stabilize meaning and enable circulation. Within archival theory, representation has increasingly been understood as an interpretative mediation, rather than a purely technical activity. Yakel (2003) conceptualizes archival representation as the process through which archives construct intelligible surrogates of records, enabling users to access complex documentary realities. Similarly, Zhang (2012) highlights that archival representation in digital environments expands mediation processes by reshaping relationships between records, metadata, and users. In contemporary archival thought,

representation operates as a framework through which documentary aggregates are transformed into structured knowledge about institutional action (Tognoli 2012).

Classification provides one of the primary mechanisms through which representation becomes operational. By establishing hierarchies and functional relationships, classificatory systems articulate institutional activities in conceptual form. In archival science, functional classification reflects organizational processes rather than thematic similarity, emphasizing provenance and institutional action. Sousa (2022) questions whether functional classification should be understood as an intellectual abstraction or a practical instrument, demonstrating how classificatory structures simultaneously model organizational reality and guide documentary management practices. From a KO perspective, classification systems inevitably privilege certain perspectives while marginalizing others (Olson 2002), thereby revealing their epistemological and cultural implications. Thus, classificatory decisions shape not only documentary control but also the interpretative pathways through which institutional narratives become possible.

The meanings attributed to archival records emerge through representational and classificatory processes rather than residing inherently within documents themselves. Yeo (2010) argues that records acquire significance through contextual relationships and interpretative frameworks connecting them to actions and social understandings. Archival representation therefore mediates how records function as evidence, information resources, and memory artifacts. Jardim (2015) emphasizes that contemporary records management operates within contexts of institutional transformation, in which documentary organization directly influences accountability, access, and historical interpretation. From a KO perspective, meaning is produced through organizing infrastructures that enable particular interpretations, while constraining alternative readings.

Institutional memory may thus be understood as an outcome of KO processes embedded in archival representation. Through classification and description, institutions stabilize interpretations of their past and render certain activities more visible than others. Guimarães (2017) highlights the cultural dimension of KO, emphasizing its role in mediating collective memory and heritage narratives. In commemorative contexts, representational decisions acquire heightened relevance, as archival organization directly supports the construction of public narratives and exhibitions. KO in archival representation therefore functions as a mechanism through which institutions articulate identity, continuity, and historical meaning within broader cultural and social frameworks.

3.0 Institutional Context and Method

The study is situated within the centennial commemorative context of the MCRB, an administrative unit of FCRB. As part of the preparations for the centennial celebrations to be held in 2030, the complete body of documentation produced by the museum throughout its activities, including administrative, cultural, educational, and exhibition-related records, has been systematically transferred to the institutional archives of the FCRB over the years. The processing of this documentation is conducted by the SAHI, the archival unit

responsible for records management and historical archives within the institution. This process creates a unique moment in which archival representation practices become directly connected to commemorative memory production.

The corpus analyzed in this study comprises the documentation accumulated by the museum as a result of its institutional functions, reflecting the diversity of activities through which the institution operates and represents itself socially. Rather than focusing on isolated document types, the analysis considers the classificatory structures and archival descriptions developed during the organization of the transferred records. Particular attention is given to the classification code applied to the fonds, understood as an intellectual structure that models institutional functions and establishes relationships among documentary series. In archival theory, such relationships correspond to what Duranti (1997) defines as the *archival bond*, understood as the necessary and organic relationship linking records created within the same activity or transaction. Archival classification reinforces and makes this bond visible by situating records within functional and procedural contexts, allowing their meaning to emerge relationally rather than individually. The study therefore examines archival representation not only as a technical procedure but as a KO process that structures institutional action in documentary form.

In order to examine how archival representation operates as a KO practice, the analysis focuses on selected classification codes rather than on the entire institutional classification scheme. These codes were selected because they correspond to documentary functions directly related to the centennial narrative of the MCRB and to the public interpretation of its institutional history. They include records concerning conservation and restoration works, restoration of collections, activity reports, exhibitions, and commemorations or tributes.

The selection of these codes allows the study to compare what functional classification makes visible and what archival description adds in terms of context, materiality, institutional trajectory, and public engagement. The analysis considers descriptive elements such as producers, functions, activities, dates, affected spaces, objects, agents involved, documentary forms, and potential uses in exhibitions, educational initiatives, and public narratives. Records classified under codes 1.9.5 and 5.7.3.4 support the analysis of preservation at two complementary levels: the museum as a historical building and garden, and the museum collections as cultural objects. Records classified under code 1.4 provide a synthetic view of the museum's institutional activities, while records classified under codes 2.1.4 and 2.1.7 reveal how exhibitions, commemorations, and tributes contribute to the construction of public memory. These examples were therefore selected for their analytical relevance to understanding how archival classification and description mediate institutional knowledge in a commemorative context.

Methodologically, the research adopts a qualitative and interpretative approach grounded in conceptual analysis of archival representation practices. The study analyzes classificatory decisions, descriptive procedures, and their relationship to institutional memory construction within the commemorative context. Inspired by domain-analytical perspectives in KO (Hjørland 2017) and interpretative approaches in archival theory (Yeo

2010; Yakel 2003), the analysis seeks to identify how representational infrastructures mediate access, visibility, and narrative potential within institutional archives. The centennial context is treated as an analytical lens through which the epistemic and cultural dimensions of archival KO become observable.

4.0 Analysis: Archival Representation in a Commemorative Context

The analysis of records produced through the activities of the MCRB and organized within the institutional archival system of the FCRB revealed that the existing classification scheme effectively models the institution's general functional structure. To examine how archival description expands the understanding of museum records, the analysis focuses on selected classification codes that are directly connected to the centennial narrative of the MCRB. Rather than reproducing the entire institutional classification scheme, Table 1 presents only the codes most relevant to the discussion: activity reports, conservation and restoration works, restoration of collections, technical processing, exhibitions, and commemorations. These categories were selected because they reveal different dimensions of museum activity and allow the comparison between what functional classification makes visible and what archival description further adds in terms of context, materiality, interpretation, and public engagement.

The selected codes indicate that museum records cannot be fully understood through functional classification alone. While the classification scheme situates records within broad institutional functions, such as administration, preservation, technical processing, and cultural dissemination, archival description is responsible for revealing the specific contexts through which these functions acquire meaning in museum practice. In this sense, Table 1 shows a representational movement from institutional function to interpretative mediation: activity reports document institutional trajectories; restoration records reveal material care and conservation processes; technical processing records support the interpretation of museum objects; and exhibition or commemorative records connect archival documentation to public narratives. This movement is particularly relevant in the centennial context, since the described records may support exhibitions, educational initiatives, digital mediation, and other forms of public engagement with the history of the MCRB.

Table 1 Selected classification codes analyzed in relation to archival description and public engagement

Classification Scheme					
Analytical axis	**Classification code**	**Documentary examples**	**What classification reveals**	**What archival description adds**	**Potential for public engagement**
Institutional trajectory	1.4 — Activity Reports	Annual or sectoral reports	The museum's activities as	Information on projects, priorities,	Supports a chronological narrative of

Classification Scheme					
		produced by the Museu Casa de Rui Barbosa	part of the general administrative functioning of the institution	institutional changes, preservation actions, educational initiatives, and cultural programming	the museum's institutional history and its role in society over one hundred years
Preservation of the historical building	1.9.5 — Conservation and restoration works	Records related to architectural conservation, restoration works, maintenance, or interventions in the historical house and garden	The preservation of the museum building as an institutional responsibility	Technical details, intervention contexts, responsible agents, stages of conservation, and the relationship between the building and heritage preservation	Makes visible the museum as a preserved historical house and helps the public understand the material care involved in maintaining cultural heritage
Preservation of collections	5.7.3.4 — Restoration of Collections	Technical restoration records, before-and-after photographs, conservation reports, and documentation of restored objects	The preservation of collections as a broad institutional function	Object identification, materiality, conservation techniques, responsible professionals, visual evidence of intervention, and museological significance	Allows the public to access the "behind the scenes" of collection care, transforming technical records into narratives of preservation and cultural responsibility
Museum and society	2.1.4 — Exhibitions / 2.1.7 — Commemorations and Tributes	Exhibition records, commemorative programs, curatorial documents, invitations,	Cultural dissemination and commemorative activities as institutional	Themes, audiences, curatorial choices, commemorative narratives, institutional	Demonstrates how the museum communicates with society and how archival

Classification Scheme					
		photographs, and public event records	functions	actors, and forms of public communication	records support public memory, exhibitions, and centennial narratives

4.1 Preservation at two levels: the historical building and the museum collections

The comparison between classification codes 1.9.5, “Conservation and Restoration Works,” and 5.7.3.4, “Restoration of Collections,” allows the analysis to distinguish two complementary levels of preservation represented in the institutional archives of the FCRB. The first concerns the museum as a historical building and heritage environment, including its roof, rooms, garden, physical installations, and architectural surroundings. The second concerns the museum collections and objects preserved within that space. Together, these codes show that the preservation of the MCRB is documented both as architectural and environmental care and as museological care for cultural objects.

Records associated with code 1.9.5 include memoranda, official letters, technical reports, and budgets concerning damages caused by rainfall, infiltrations, roof problems, garden deterioration, and repairs required in museum rooms and furniture. These records indicate that concern with the material conditions of the building and its surroundings was not occasional, but recurrent throughout the institutional history of the museum. At the classificatory level, these documents are placed within the broad function of conservation and restoration works. Archival description, however, expands their meaning by identifying the causes of damage, the affected spaces, the type of intervention requested or executed, the administrative agents involved, and the relationship between material preservation and the continuity of the museum’s public mission.

In this sense, records classified under 1.9.5 do more than document repairs or administrative procedures. When described in detail, they reveal the historical house and its garden as objects of continuous institutional care. This descriptive enrichment makes it possible to communicate to the public that the museum’s centennial history is not only preserved through exhibitions and collections, but also through repeated actions aimed at maintaining the physical space that gives meaning to those collections.

Records classified under code 5.7.3.4, “Restoration of Collections,” reveal another dimension of preservation. At the classificatory level, these records are situated within the broad institutional function of collection preservation, ensuring coherence with the archival system and with the administrative responsibilities of the FCRB. However, this functional category does not, by itself, reveal the museological specificity of each record. It does not indicate which object was restored, what materials were involved, which

conservation procedures were adopted, or how the intervention contributed to the preservation of the museum's historical collection.

Archival description expands this understanding by incorporating contextual and material information that is essential for interpreting restoration records. Descriptive elements such as object identification, technical observations, responsible agents, dates of intervention, and, when available, visual or technical documentation transform technical-administrative records into sources for understanding museum practice. These elements make visible the material care involved in preserving cultural heritage and allow the records to be interpreted not only as evidence of institutional procedures, but also as part of a broader narrative about preservation, memory, and public responsibility.

From the perspective of public engagement, the comparison between 1.9.5 and 5.7.3.4 is significant because it reveals that the museum's preservation history is not limited to the care of objects or collections. It also involves the continuous maintenance of the historical building, garden, rooms, and physical environment that sustain the museum experience. By making these preservation processes intelligible to non-specialized audiences, archival description helps reveal the "behind the scenes" work of the museum and strengthens public understanding of preservation as an active, continuous, and institutionally documented practice.

4.2 Activity reports and institutional trajectories

Records classified under code 1.4, "Activity Reports," provide a broader view of the institutional trajectory of the MCRB. Unlike records related to a single intervention or documentary procedure, activity reports and programmatic summaries bring together different dimensions of museum work, including cataloging cards, collection management, conservation, exhibitions, educational activities, cultural mediation, and public programs. They therefore function as synthetic records through which the museum represents its own priorities, projects, and forms of social engagement.

The 1996 programming summary of the MCRB is a significant example. At the classificatory level, the document is situated within the general category of activity reports. However, archival description reveals a much richer institutional narrative: the document mentions the computerization of the collection, the preparation of museological records, the "Museum Memory" project, exhibitions, conservation of the museum building, restoration of collection items, restoration of the historical garden, guided visits, activities for schools, commemorative events, and multimedia resources for visitors. These elements show that the museum's activities cannot be reduced to preservation alone, but involve the articulation of documentation, conservation, research, education, and public communication.

From a KO perspective, this type of record is particularly relevant because it connects several functional domains within a single documentary unit. Archival description makes these relationships visible and allows the document to be used not only as administrative

evidence, but also as a source for reconstructing the museum's institutional development and its changing relationship with different publics. In the centennial context, activity reports may support public narratives about how the museum expanded its role from the preservation of Rui Barbosa's legacy to broader practices of museological documentation, cultural mediation, and public engagement.

4.3 Exhibitions, commemorations, and public memory

The relationship between classification codes 2.1.4, "Exhibitions," and 2.1.7, "Commemorations and Tributes," reveals another dimension of archival representation within the MCRB: the transformation of institutional records into public memory narratives. While code 2.1.4 refers to records produced in the organization of exhibitions, code 2.1.7 concerns records related to commemorative practices, tributes, and symbolic forms of recognition. Together, these categories show how the museum documents not only the preservation of its collections, but also the public circulation of meanings associated with Rui Barbosa and the institution itself.

A dossier related to the exhibition "Rui Barbosa e seu mundo" provides a clear example of code 2.1.4. At the classificatory level, the record is identified as part of the cultural dissemination function. However, archival description reveals the intellectual and museographic structure of the exhibition by identifying lists of selected objects, panel texts, technical records of the pieces, and curatorial observations. These descriptive elements allow the record to be understood not merely as evidence of an exhibition, but as a source for analyzing how the museum organized knowledge about Rui Barbosa and communicated it to its publics.

Records associated with code 2.1.7 operate differently. Original caricatures produced in honor of Rui Barbosa, plaques donated to the museum as tributes, and lists of inscriptions from funeral wreaths document forms of public recognition and symbolic attachment to his memory. When described archivistically, these records reveal who paid tribute, what forms of homage were mobilized, how Rui Barbosa's public image was constructed, and how such gestures were incorporated into the institutional memory of the museum. In this sense, archival description transforms dispersed records of tribute into evidence of broader social and cultural relationships surrounding Rui Barbosa's legacy.

From a KO perspective, the comparison between these two codes demonstrates that archival classification operates as an abstraction that stabilizes institutional structure while only partially representing domain-specific knowledge production (Sousa 2022; Hjørland 2017). Exhibitions show how the museum actively constructs narratives for the public, while commemorations and tributes show how society addresses, recognizes, and reinforces the symbolic value of Rui Barbosa and the museum. In the centennial context, these records may support new forms of public engagement by making visible the historical processes through which memory has been selected, exhibited, celebrated, and institutionally preserved.

4.4 Classification, description, and public engagement

The examples analyzed in the previous subsections indicate that functional classification is expanded when we analyze the archival description applied to the technically processed documents. Archival description operates as the layer in which these specificities become visible. In the examples analyzed, description expands the semantic density of records by identifying affected spaces, restored objects, technical procedures, institutional actors, curatorial choices, commemorative gestures, and forms of public communication. This descriptive enrichment allows records originally produced for administrative, technical, or organizational purposes to be interpreted as sources for understanding museum practice, institutional memory, and cultural mediation.

In this sense, functional classification establishes institutional stability, while archival description articulates epistemic specificity. When museum activities are classified under broad functional categories, such as preservation, restoration, activity reporting, cultural dissemination, or commemorations, the descriptive layer reintroduces domain-specific distinctions, including object typology, materiality, authorship, historical relevance, exhibition context, affected spaces, and forms of public recognition. Archival representation therefore assumes a structuring role that exceeds documentary control and actively mediates the intelligibility of museum practice.

From a theoretical standpoint, this finding reinforces the view of archival representation as an interpretative infrastructure (Yakel 2003; Zhang 2012), in which meaning is produced through contextualization rather than inherent in documents themselves (Yeo 2010). The descriptive apparatus functions as a site of epistemic negotiation, where museum-specific knowledge is articulated within the constraints imposed by institutional functional classification. KO in archival representation therefore emerges not only through hierarchical structure but also through semantic enrichment at the descriptive level.

The ongoing organization of museum records at the FCRB takes place within the broader context of preparations for the institution's centennial commemorations. Although the archival materials are still undergoing processing, their intended use in future exhibitions, digital initiatives, editorial productions, educational activities, and commemorative narratives reveals how archival representation actively participates in the construction of institutional memory rather than merely documenting it retrospectively.

In this context, KO practices extend beyond documentary control and become mechanisms through which institutional narratives are shaped and communicated. Decisions regarding classification, description, and contextualization influence which aspects of museum activity become visible and how historical continuity is articulated to different publics. Archival representation thus operates as a mediating layer between institutional functions and cultural memory production, enabling records originally created for administrative or technical purposes to acquire new interpretative roles. Archival representation therefore participates not only in documentary control, but also in the construction and communication of institutional memory, allowing the museum to present its history through practices of preservation, interpretation, public recognition, and continuous care.

5.0 Discussion and Conclusions

This paper examined how archival representation operates as a form of KO within the institutional archives of the FCRB, focusing on museum records processed in preparation for the institution's centennial commemorations. The analysis demonstrated that functional archival classification effectively stabilizes institutional structure by organizing records according to administrative functions. Archival description introduces contextual, material, and interpretative elements that enable the articulation of museum-specific knowledge otherwise subsumed under broader functional categories. In this sense, archival representation assumes an organizational role, mediating meaning and enabling the intelligibility of records beyond the hierarchical logic of classification.

From the perspective of the cultural and social dimensions of KO, the case illustrates how archival representation shapes not only access to records, but also the conditions under which institutional memory is constructed, communicated, and publicly activated. KO therefore emerges as a cultural practice embedded in institutional temporality, linking archival mediation to processes of remembrance, interpretation, and public engagement.

By framing archival representation as a KO practice, this paper contributes to ongoing discussions in KO concerning the role of memory institutions in shaping cultural knowledge. The case of the MCRB shows that classificatory and descriptive infrastructures participate in the production of institutional memory and may support exhibitions, educational initiatives, digital mediation, editorial projects, and commemorative narratives. In the centennial context, these records allow the public to understand the museum not only as a historical house and a preserved collection, but also as an institution continuously shaped by practices of care, interpretation, recognition, and memory construction.

Although the analysis is based on selected examples from records still undergoing archival processing, it suggests avenues for further research on KO in archival and museum environments, particularly in commemorative contexts where documentary organization directly influences the construction and communication of institutional histories.

AI Usage Statement

No generative artificial intelligence tools were used in the preparation of this work.

References

Beghtol, Clare. 2002. "A Proposed Ethical Warrant for Global Knowledge Representation and Organization Systems." Journal of Documentation 58: 507–532.

Duranti, Luciana. 1997. "The Archival Bond." Archives and Museum Informatics 11: 213–218.

Frohmann, Bernd. 2004. Deflating Information: From Science Studies to Documentation. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

García Gutiérrez, Antonio. 2002. “Knowledge Organization from a ‘Culture of the Border’: Towards a Transcultural Ethics of Mediation.” In Challenges in Knowledge Representation and Organization for the 21st Century: Integration of Knowledge Across Boundaries, edited by Maria José López-Huertas. Advances in Knowledge Organization 8. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 516–522.

Guimarães, José Augusto Chaves. 2017. “Slanted Knowledge Organization as a New Ethical Perspective.” In The Organization of Knowledge: Caught between Global Structures and Local Meaning, edited by Jack Andersen and Laura Skouvig, 87–102. Bingley: Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-537720170000011012.

Hjørland, Birger. 2008. “What Is Knowledge Organization (KO)?” Knowledge Organization 35: 86–101.

Hjørland, Birger. 2017. “Domain Analysis.” Knowledge Organization 44: 436–464.

Jardim, José Maria. 2015. “Caminhos e perspectivas da gestão de documentos em cenários de transformações.” Acervo 28, no. 2: 19–50.

Olson, Hope A. 2002. The Power to Name: Locating the Limits of Subject Representation in Libraries. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sousa, Renato Tarciso Barbosa de. 2022. “A classificação funcional de documentos de arquivo é uma abstração intelectual ou um instrumento prático?” Acervo 35, no. 2: 1–21.

Tognoli, Natália Bolfarini. 2012. “A representação na arquivística contemporânea.” Revista Ibero-Americana de Ciência da Informação 5: 79–92.

Yakel, Elizabeth. 2003. “Archival Representation.” Archival Science 3: 1–25.

Yeo, Geoffrey. 2010. “Nothing Is the Same as Something Else: Significant Properties and Notions of Identity and Originality.” Archival Science 10: 85–116.

Zhang, Jane. 2012. “Archival Representation in the Digital Age.” Journal of Archival Organization 10: 45–68.