

Linking Het Amsterdams Stadsjournaal: A Case Study in Emerging Linked Open Data (LOD) Approaches to Audio-Visual Heritage

Meg Weijers¹ and Christian Olesen²

¹Eye Filmmuseum

²University of Amsterdam

Taking the case of *Het Amsterdams Stadsjournaal* (ASJ) as a starting point, this article aims to advance emerging Linked Open Data (LOD) approaches to AV heritage. The archiving of ASJ materials, a political film collective that produced politically engaged documentaries between 1974 and 1984, raises several challenges and questions concerning archival access to AV heritage and standardisation because the materials preserved are located at three different institutions with diverging missions and user groups: respectively Eye Filmmuseum (Eye), the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision (NISV), and the Stadsarchief Amsterdam (SAA). Addressing this circumstance, the article evaluates the potential of Linked Open Data as a way to connect and enhance data on ASJ to make the preserved materials more widely accessible. This entails critically discussing the current access given to ASJ films in the CLARIAH Media Suite in light of the infrastructure’s Wikidata features, focusing on how these functionalities may accommodate the user requirements identified at the institutions preserving ASJ materials. By emphasizing the specific challenges of AV archives, the article also seeks to broaden the scope of current digital humanities discussions concerning LOD as these have hitherto had a tendency to leave out collections preserved by AV heritage institutions.

Keywords: audiovisual archiving, linked open data, documentary cinema, Wikidata

1 Introduction

Focusing on the example of *Het Amsterdams Stadsjournaal*, this article aims to advance discussions around emerging Linked Open Data (LOD) approaches to AV heritage.¹

¹ The research for this article was initiated in the context of Meg Weijers’ MA thesis, and further developed in the context of the CLARIAH Media Suite Learn initiative.

Het Amsterdams Stadsjournaal, henceforth *ASJ*, was a political film collective that produced critical documentary productions about the misconducts and malpractices in capitalist society between 1974 and 1984 (Heijs, 1984). The archiving of the *ASJ* materials, and their associated datasets, raises several challenges and questions concerning archival access to AV heritage and standardisation because the materials are located at three different institutions with diverging missions, user groups and definitions of film works: Eye Filmmuseum (Eye), the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision (NISV), and Stadsarchief Amsterdam (SAA). Addressing this challenge, and elaborating on the reflection developed in the context of the DH Benelux 2024 Conference theme “Breaking Silos, Connecting Data”, this article discusses the research done on evaluating the potential of Linked Open Data as a way to connect and enhance data on *ASJ* to make it more widely accessible. Moreover, this article discusses and critically evaluates the access currently given to a part of *ASJ*’s films in the CLARIAH Media Suite and the environment’s recently developed LOD and Wikidata features, focusing on how these functionalities may accommodate the user requirements identified at the institutions. By pointing out specific challenges we deal with within AV archives, we aim to shed new light on discussions concerning LOD and digital humanities.

1.1 The Shared Custodianship of *ASJ*

One of the challenges raised by the ways in which *ASJ* materials are currently accessible is the shared custodianship over the collection. Currently, the films are preserved and documented by three different institutions, each operating with a distinct perspective and definition of the films, namely as respectively art (Eye), historical artefact (NISV), and as part of a specific urban history (SAA). Due to this shared custodianship, the records have been provided with different information and metadata that lacks standardisation, a topic we shall return to later in the article in more detail. This is problematic: the archives use different databases and have ingested them for different reasons. As a result, some films have been provided with elaborate metadata whereas other films are only provided with a minimal amount, as you can see in Figures 1 and 2, screenshots taken from Eye’s database CE, and Figure 3, a screenshot taken from the NISV’s database DAAN.

Because of an extensive research project by curators and volunteers of Eye on the *ASJ* collection, CE has an elaborate description of the film in its database, including keywords and metadata on the physical aspects of the material such as sound, color, and image ratio. In contrast, the metadata on the same film in DAAN lacks some metadata such as a description of the film but does have technical metadata and keyframes.

It should be noted that this incoherence is not a unique phenomenon within audiovisual heritage practices. Even within an archive, metadata can differ greatly between films from the same collection. At Eye for instance, metadata is continuously added when films are taken out of the vaults for research or viewings. However, a lack of metadata makes it harder to depart from the collection of an archive when doing research because it means you need a considerable amount of tacit knowledge to understand the information in a database.²

Authority Heading	
Identificatie	
ID:	FLM3085
Authority heading:	Amsterdams stadsjournaal 8 (NL, ASJ Collectief (corporatie), 1976)
Kopieën in eigen beheer:	14
Urls:	http://eye-d.ka.filmmuseum.nl/Home/Select/kopieId/KOP1291883 Open kopie-item http://eye-d.ka.filmmuseum.nl/Home/Select/kopieId/KOP1291884 Open kopie-item
Typering	
Categorie:	fictie/non-fictie
Korte beschrijving:	Documentaire/reportage uit een 36-delige reeks politiek georiënteerde films uit socialistische hoek over misstanden in de kapitalistische maatschappij.
Titels	
Originele titel:	Amsterdams stadsjournaal 8
Originele titel:	Surinamers in Nederland
Originele titel:	De terugkeer van het zwarte goud
Serietitel:	Amsterdams Stadsjournaal (serietitel)
Regie	
Regie:	ASJ Collectief (corporatie)

Figure 1: Screenshot of record of Amsterdams Stadsjournaal 8 in CE

Inhoudelijke ontsluiting	
Inhoudsbeschrijving NL:	Over de emigratie van Surinamers naar Nederland en hun inburgering (met de cursus 'Zó is Nederland'), neokolonialisme (export hout, bauxiet en fruit; met het geluid van een kassa als terugkerend element), de positie van Surinamers in Nederland en remigratie. De film eindigt met een landbouwcollectief (Vereniging Alladoti) dat naar Suriname gaat. De gestelde vragen aan de directeur van Bureau Rijksgenoten verschijnen als tekst in beeld. Film bevat ook een Surinaams lied. [gemaakt i.s.m. Centrum Anton de Kom]
Onderwerp (trefwoord):	etnische minderheden
Onderwerp (trefwoord):	migratie
Onderwerp (trefwoord):	integratie
Onderwerp (trefwoord):	koloniën
Onderwerp (trefwoord):	kolonialisme
Onderwerp (geografisch):	Nederland
Onderwerp (geografisch):	Suriname
Onderwerp (geografisch):	Amsterdam (Noord-Holland)
Onderwerp (geografisch):	Schiphol (Noord-Holland)
Onderwerp (datering):	1976
Fysieke kenmerken (eerste release)	
Geluid (eerste release):	geluid
Kleur (eerste release):	zwart-wit
Image ratio:	1.33:1 volbeeld

Figure 2: Screenshot of record of Amsterdams Stadsjournaal 8 in CE

² By tacit knowledge, we mean the knowledge possessed by individuals working at institutions that is not made explicit to others, for example user groups and coworkers. For a better understanding of the role of tacit knowledge within audiovisual archives, see *Share That Knowledge!: A Road Map for Sharing Knowledge across Generations of Audiovisual Archivists* (van Dalen and Šičarov, 2023).

METADATA				
Serie titel	AMSTERDAMS STADSDJOURNAAL			
Programma titel	Amsterdams stadsjournaal nr. 8: Surinamers in Nederland			
Licensor	Broadcast organisation NIET VAN TOEPASSING			
Asset Rights: License	License check			
Publication	Distribution channel overig-video	Publication type niet van toepassing	Broadcaster NIET VAN TOEPASSING	Broadcast organisation NIET VAN TOEPASSING
Material type	video			
Annotation	Dossiernr RVD: 07-7093			

Figure 3: Screenshot of record of Amsterdams Stadsjournaal 8 in DAAN

This need for adequate and coherent metadata is even more crucial for a collection like *ASJ*, dispersed over multiple archives. To be able to approach them as a collection, you need to be able to link the individual films to each other. In short, the shared custodianship requires a certain coherence in metadata without changing the databases of the three archives. Here, metadata should enhance the collection's access to a broad public. Moreover, the information needs to reflect these three perspectives on the nature of film and the different user groups of the institutes.

As interest in unlocking the materials grew, an alternative way had to be found to enable access to them as a whole, while being preserved at three different institutions. The research presented in this article first approaches this challenge conceptually and practically, while experimenting with potential solutions, focusing on the following main question:

- What are the potential affordances of metadata and Linked Open Data (LOD) in overcoming the challenge of shared custodianship and cataloguing contextual information in the archiving of the *Amsterdams Stadsjournaal*?

The overarching aim of this research is to contribute to two academic discussions in the AV heritage field, namely:

1. the archiving of films that are produced outside the mainstream film circuit from the perspective of archival access,
2. the emergence of Linked Open Data in the AV heritage field.

As these are relatively unknown topics in the AV heritage field, this research can be seen as an experiment with this technology, how it interacts with metadata in catalogues dealing with filmographic metadata, and to examine its potential and pitfalls within film archival practices, thus advancing discussions around LOD in connection to film and AV heritage, which still tend to be underrepresented.

In this research, we particularly focus on the two LOD-technologies Wikibase and Wikidata. By taking this focus, the article furthers research around film heritage and LOD, while also building on current efforts by considering non-theatrical films, a type of film that has not yet been a main focal point for LOD in film and AV archives. Moreover, Wikibase and Wikidata are already being used by one of the custodian archives (NISV) and incorporated in the annotation functions of the CLARIAH Media Suite. Hence, Wikibase and Wikidata were logical platforms to build this research on.

2 Theoretical Framework

Before diving deeper into the case of *ASJ*, we want to sketch the theoretical context and reference frame our endeavor is situated in. With the help of some examples, we

discuss archival access and linked open data in light of AV heritage to understand the link between the two and challenges that are particular to our field.

In the past decades, archival access has been considered an increasingly important archival paradigm in the (AV) heritage sector. From the 1980s onwards, with computerization and digitization, archival access has increasingly become a concern for AV archives. In "Access – the reformulation of an archival paradigm", Angelika Menne-Haritz (Menne-Haritz, 2001) defines access as a professional strategy that is user-oriented. In contrast to the precedent, custodial paradigm, in which records are considered as evidence of which archivists are impartial (but not really impartial) custodians (Cook, 2013), the access paradigm is "neutral towards the content but passionate concerning openness and availability of information potentials" (Menne-Haritz, 2001, p. 63). Within this paradigm, the role of the archivist is to enable the user to find their way through the archive and evaluate the relevance of the found records themselves. In other words, archival access is about providing tools rather than giving meaning to the records. Therefore, Menne-Haritz argues that archival descriptions and presentations should be user-driven, as each researcher has their own specific research question and is the only one to determine what is relevant for answering that question.

For Prelinger (2009), one of the more prominent voices within this debate, archival access helps AV archivists validate our work and ensure against institutional irrelevance. As he states about the current state of archives concerning access: "Unlike public libraries, which have long-established traditions of access, we lack a strategy that might help move us toward greater openness" (p. 168). This lack of strategy is related to a certain hesitation by many film archivists to open up their archives because of risks concerning copyright, piracy, and loss of control. In "Archives and Access in the 21st Century", (Prelinger, 2007) explains how, traditionally, archivists have privileged preservation over access for several reasons that are more or less tied to "copyright maximalism" (p. 115). However, he argues that access is more than a binary choice between publicly usable, fully available records or only private, in-house viewings. Between these options, there is a great range of possible uses that circumvent the risks of copyright infringement. An example of this is the solutions of the CLARIAH Media Suite for works of which film archives only partially have the rights, such as the Peter Rubin Collection of the Eye Filmmuseum. Peter Rubin was an American filmmaker and VJ active in the Amsterdam club scene and German techno collectives *Mayday* and *Love Parade* (Tzialli, 2017). His VJ works contain footage of television items filmed on VHS alternating the original work. Whereas Eye is allowed to put Rubin's work in the Media Suite, the segments with television items are at risk of copyright infringement. These parts can be blocked in the Media Suite, but users are still able to see where they were being used in the work in question. This allows users to see the 'copyright safe' segments in the right context.

In terms of archival access, the example above shows the particular challenges in AV heritage such as copyright. The emergence of digitization and digital tools have further complicated these challenges as they have changed users' perception of access. For many users, archival access means searching by theme or topic and accessing materials on a streaming platform, creating high expectations which often cannot be met because of insufficient finding aids (Heftberger, 2022). Cataloging is key here, as Adelheid Heftberger writes in "Access is Not a One-Way Street: The Relation Between Access to Collections and Cataloguing" (Heftberger, 2022). In this article, she explains how cataloging practices "define the kind of knowledge and concepts we make accessible

for our institutions” (p. 47). Hence, archival access and good quality cataloging are intertwined. In terms of the *ASJ* collection, LOD can potentially help in this regard to enhance cataloging practices.

The *ASJ* films are also present in the CLARIAH Media Suite. As a central access point to digitized AV collections and tools for analyzing them - among which metadata inspection and manual annotation tools - the Media Suite results from previous mass-digitization efforts and the emergence of digital humanities projects in the Netherlands (van Noord et al., 2021). Among others, this entails NISV’s Dutch public broadcasting collections, oral history collections from DANS, parliamentary debates, and a small number of collections from Eye. In this context, around 25 films from the *ASJ* have metadata descriptions in the Media Suite, of which around 15 films can be viewed directly in the Media Suite’s environment. In this context, the films are associated with metadata that have been created following descriptive practices at NISV. In a few instances, in particular for person categories, item descriptions have been enriched with wikidata identifiers that were used for cleaning names in NISV’s metadata by way of disambiguation, allowing users of the Media Suite to search in three different categories, namely person appearing in a broadcast program, person as subject of discussion, or person involved in a broadcast in a production crew role. For instance, the item *Amsterdams Stadsjournaal nr. 34: Hoeveel ging u naar school?* (1983), is one of very few items to have data in one of these categories, linking filmmakers Floor Kooij, Goert Giltay and Barbara den Uyl to these films. Clicking on the names in the items metadata description allows users to go either to the Wikidata identifier’s page of the person in question, or to carry out an additional search in NISV’s collection based on the name to explore other potentially relevant items featuring them. In this respect, the digitized *ASJ* items have to a limited extent already been enriched using Wikidata. Yet, these enrichments result from a generic approach that is taken for all items in the Media Suite, and do not reflect a tailor-made solution that take into consideration the specific challenges of the collection. However, it is possible for users of the Media Suite to add additional data of a higher level of granularity using the environment’s annotation functionality, to the potential benefit of developing a LOD approach further. The annotation functionality enables users to annotate items on item level or on segment level, based on personal segmentations and coding schemes, and researchers using this functionality create significant amounts of additional research data. Yet, the data resulting from this functionality are not currently automatically shared and streamlined with a LOD approach – among others because of data privacy – but it is an ambition to devise workflows in the future that may allow for such data to feed into an LOD approach. In the next section, we reflect on these challenges in relation to LOD in more detail.

2.1 *LOD as a potential solution*

Why take a look at LOD as one of the potential solutions for the challenge of shared custodianship of *ASJ*? In recent years, LOD-based technologies have sparked increased interest among film and AV archives looking for ways to make collections accessible online and to enrich metadata within existing systems. For example, workshops have been organised to discuss the usage and tasks of LOD in film archives, where this is still a very novel approach (FIAF, 2019). However, despite this growing interest, the promise of standardisation and interoperability between different systems has not been fulfilled, just as film archival data presents challenges that are mostly only sparsely covered in existing literature on LOD. As Seth van Hoogland and Ruben

Verborgh argue: “[a]gain and again, projects have demonstrated that even if people and institutions are using the same tools and standards, they implement them in different ways to accommodate the specific nature of their collection” (van Hoogland and Verborgh, 2014, p. 14). In other words, linked data is an interesting technology but still needs good-quality, standardised metadata to be used efficiently in film and AV archives.

In the community of film archives, explorations of possible solutions for metadata exchange between institutions go back to at least the 1970s, and were initially centered around MARC formats (machine-readable cataloging), yet without fulfilling promises of shared systems, standards and databases across national borders (Smither, 1987).³. For decades the process of developing shared standards for moving image metadata in the context of film archives was slow to catch on, but this has gained momentum in the 2010s. For instance, the launch of resources such as filmstandards.org or the Cinematographic Works Standard EN 15907 in 2011 may be considered significant steps forward in this regard.

In recent years film heritage institutions have begun taking a serious interest in LOD and Wikidata, particularly in the context of the organizational framework of FIAF (International Federation of Film Archives), as offering an approach that may fulfill needs for exchanging data that have long been difficult to realize.

Like explained in the introduction, Wikibase and Wikidata were examined in this article’s research. As a basis for this examination, we take a cue from Heftberger and Duchesne’s article “Cataloguing Practices in the Age of Linked Open Data” (Heftberger and Duchesne, 2020) which argues that “[b]y linking similar properties back to Wikidata we can have the best of both worlds, allowing for a higher level of specification on our platform, while also allowing the ability to push and pull data between other knowledge bases where desirable”. One example of why a personal Wikibase is desirable is the difficulty of adding different film titles as released in the distributing countries. Because Wikidata has the option to directly translate text, this causes some problems for film titles in a language different than the one of the country of release, but the same language as the original production country. In their article, Duchesne and Heftberger illustrate this problem with the film *The Hangover* (2009). In Wikidata, this title would be literally translated to “La gueule de bois” instead of the title in which the film was released in France, *Very Bad Trip*. As Duchesne and Heftberger argue: “This would be controversial, as it would be the primary metadata field against the film on French Wikidata, yet it is a title under which the film was never released. Essentially this is a conflict between following the strict logic of a machine - readable environment, while also allowing for human-readability”. This example shows a conflict between Wikidata’s machine-readability and human-readability, and the specificity of filmographic information thus complicates the mapping of information on Wikidata.

Based on this starting point, we consider a personal Wikibase (theoretically) desirable because of conflicts between Wikidata’s machine-readability and human-readability, and the specificity of filmographic information that complicates the mapping of information on Wikidata, while arguing that the shared custodianship of the ASJ materials suggests that the usage of Wikidata and Wikibase by AV-archives

³ For early discussions of moving image metadata standardization we refer to Roger Smither’s work. A more extensive account of metadata standards in the context of film archives can also be found in the work of one of this article’s authors, Christian Gosvig Olesen, *Visualizing Film History: Film Archives and Digital Scholarship*, published with Indiana University Press in 2025 (Olesen, 2025).

need to be revisited and tailored to the specifics of this collection. To identify what kind of information about the *ASJ* collection goes into the Wikidata and the personal Wikibases, it is necessary to analyze the potential use of this technology first.

3 Methodology

The methodology of this research was divided into three consecutive parts. The first part covered an inventory of the paper documents available about three *ASJ* films: *Werkloosheid* (1975, no. 4), *Surinamers in Nederland: De Terugkeer van het Zwarte Goud* (1976, no. 8), and *Gebroken Tijd* (1982, no. 30). These titles were chosen because together, they reflect different production phases of *ASJ* and a range of topics that are still pressing matters in today's society. For instance, *Surinamers in Nederland* touch on topics such as neocolonialism, and *Gebroken Tijd* is about the position of Turkish migrants in the Netherlands.

3.1 Contextualizing the individual films

The contextualization of the individual films included watching the three films and searching articles about these films on Delpher. These articles helped to acquire more insight into the context in which these films were made. Many people in the films of *ASJ* refer to developments and events that are not known to current viewers. These articles helped to understand what the people in the films referred to. For example, some articles helped to link the film *Surinamers in Nederland* to specific events and social developments, such as public discussions about remigration of Surinamese people (1976, *De Volkskrant*). These kinds of articles therefore contextualized the films in their time. Other articles were reviews of the films, showing how the films were received by the public. For the feasibility of this research, a maximum of 10 articles were written down and provided with a short description of the kind of information they contained.

Alongside the articles on Delpher, documents stored at Eye, NISV, and SAA were examined. For each film, the number of documents and the type of information these documents provided varied significantly, ranging from newspaper clippings to grant applications. Since the paper documents are not yet registered in the database, a full day was devoted at each institution to inventorying the available documents. Again, each document was recorded, categorized, and accompanied by a brief description in the spreadsheet. However, it soon became evident that this would be too time-consuming for the scope of this research, as many documents contained merely scribbles and notes, often difficult to read and identify the film they referred to. Therefore, only the documents containing information about the production process, distribution, and screening/reception of the films were documented. This information helped verify certain things, such as the target audience and the collective's perspective on the individual film. These were then either copied or photographed for further reading and analysis at a later stage. The insights gained from this thorough reading formed the foundation of the user requirement study.

3.2 User requirement study

The user requirement study, consisting of interviews with employees of the three institutions, assessed which insights gained from the archival research were vital to cataloging the records of *ASJ* as respectively a form of art, historical artefact, and

urban history. The term ‘user requirement’ was used as explained by Kathy Baxter and Catherine Courage, who define it as “the features/attributes your product should have or how it should perform from the user’s perspective” (Baxter and Courage, 2005, p. 3). In this research, the features refer to the kind of information and the product of archival descriptions or other kinds of metadata. This method was chosen because it helped to take inventory of a broad scope of users and programming ambitions based on the answers of those who would eventually work on the collaborative project of Eye, SAA, and NISV. As this has not been done before, the study should be seen as a first, qualitative test based on the findings from the first part. There was a specific focus on the *reasoning* behind the preferences for certain kinds of information. Where to place them instead was not intended to already determine which information needs to be cataloged and where and how this should be done.

3.2.1 Set up user requirement study

Three interviews were conducted for this research: one employee of each institution was interviewed who had knowledge about the users and records usage of their archives and about the possibilities their databases provide in terms of metadata and linked data.

Part 1: cataloging the records: The first part of the analysis of the paper documents was rewritten to discuss the findings of the selected films with the interviewees. These rewritten parts were structured in the same way, containing the following elements:

- Summary, including aesthetic features
- The film’s aims and target groups
- Production process
- Reception and reflection on the film, which included reviews from newspapers, comments during discussions afterwards, and the reflection of the makers themselves, if applicable
- Background information, including an elaboration on societal debates and topics

Standardizing the findings helped to determine what was considered relevant/useful in general, and whether there were certain circumstances in which these considerations varied. For the user requirement study, the interviewees were asked to read the descriptions, explain their general impression of the description and then cross out everything that they considered as not relevant to be added as descriptive metadata and provided with an explanation.⁴

Part 2: potential users and uses: The second part of the user requirement study consisted of three questions, if these had not already been answered in the first part:

1. What are the potential uses of the records by the NISV, Eye, and Amsterdams Stadsarchief?
2. Who are the potential users of the records?

⁴ Not relevant is defined as not useful for understanding the film or too elaborate for the database.

3. Which kinds of metadata are usually provided by the different databases and what are the differences between them?

The answers and insights derived from the user requirement study were used to analyse the affordances of Wikidata and Wikibase to determine if these were potential ways of linking the records with each other and other records in the three archives.

Finally, focusing on our ongoing research, we compared the results of the thesis research project to a selection of *ASJ*-films currently made available in the CLARIAH Media Suite infrastructure in relation to the infrastructure's LOD and Wikidata features, taking into account how they may (or may not) accommodate for the identified user requirements.

4 Analysis

Despite the many differences in production, distribution, and reception of the three films, the paper documents provided insight into certain aesthetic choices, the co-producing organizations, productional changes made during the process, and showed how the films were perceived by members of *ASJ* and the public. Some documents also covered research done by *ASJ* that contributed to the arguments made in their films. These documents provide clarity on what the film does not explicitly cover but what is nonetheless part of the meaning behind the film. This is especially true for societal developments depicted in these films. The newspaper articles from Delpher provide different arguments and the reviews and discussion notes show what the audiences added to the film. This was most prominent in the paper documents of *Surinamers in Nederland*. The discussion afterwards contained certain topics not explained in the film, such as discrimination that Surinamese people encountered. As the discussion was a very important part of the screening of the film, information like this helps to contextualize what cannot be extracted from the film's content. Hence, the paper documents provide layers inherent to the meaning of the film.

The user requirement study shows that there are metadata specific to *ASJ* as a film collective and metadata specific to *ASJ* as a form of art, a historical artefact, and part of urban history. For instance, the target groups, aims, societal developments and co-producing organizations were generally considered relevant to be added as metadata. However, the answers also offer different perspectives on film, shaping the relevancy of the contextualizing metadata for the interviewees. For instance, the interviewee from Eye had a clear focus on the visual structure of the individual films as well, which was in line with their perspective on film as a form of art. For SAA, on the other hand, one of the most important kinds of metadata was the locations shot in Amsterdam, as 80% of the queries covered locations. This shows the different aims and target groups of SAA as a city archive with the duty to provide service to the citizens of Amsterdam.

Although much of the information discussed in the findings was considered relevant, the findings suggest a need for providing this information on a meta-level. This means that elaboration on certain events, developments, or concepts should be noted down. However, in terms of access, this could be problematic for users who don't know what these references mean. For example, some users might not know about certain historical events, so this kind of metadata might not help them to contextualize these films. Hence, the interviews suggest the need for an external place in which this kind of information can be explained further.

Next to relevant metadata, this study also covered potential users and uses of the *ASJ*

collection. In terms of users, they can be divided into three groups, according to the way they will likely use the films and the metadata: film- and television makers, users with an education or research background, and citizens of Amsterdam and/or the target groups of the films. Film and television makers are expected to use only fragments of the films to integrate them into their work. For this group, the context of these films is of less importance, as it is about what they literally see to (re)use these images in their own context. On the other hand, users with an education or research background will likely use the films to study them in a broader context and illuminate current affairs from a historical point of view. However, as one of the interviewees pointed out, researchers are also more inclined to distrust the contextualizing metadata as this would be considered a secondary source. The last group, the citizens of Amsterdam and/or the target groups of the films, are likely to use the films to get a better understanding of their community's history. Whereas contextual metadata might be a convenient addition for researchers and filmmakers, it could be essential for this specific user group. For instance, individual users might not have certain research skills or tacit knowledge, and this could help them along with their search question and interest.

4.1 Wikidata

A first observation that emerges during the analysis is the practical way in which Wikidata can provide contextual information while remaining readable at the same time. This is relevant to the notion of describing contextual information on a meta-level. For instance, the mention of PvdA leader and Prime Minister Den Uyl was considered relevant for the film *Werkloosheid* to understand the political environment at the time, but not of additional value for the database. This means that the metadata should only highlight the main points, functioning as a first lead for the user in case they want to know more about it. In this case, '*Werkloosheid*' would become an item and 'Prime Minister Den Uyl' a value of a certain statement. However, the value 'Prime Minister Den Uyl' is an item at the same time, namely "Joop den Uyl" (Q318320) (Wikidata, c). Hence, Wikidata enables the archives to add contextualizing metadata by means of other items. This way, the item *Werkloosheid* does not get flooded by an extensive amount of information while providing the tools to navigate further if desired. This means that contextual information considered too elaborate to catalog can still be linked in the Wikidata.

As Wikidata supports other Wiki-projects, items and values can also be linked to their corresponding Wikipedia page, which contains much more information. For instance, the statement 'themes' in the item *Surinamers in Nederland* would get the values 'neocolonialism' and 'decolonization'. These values can then be linked to a Wikipedia page about these concepts. Although it is debatable whether a Wikipedia page is trustworthy, we argue that this is still a helpful beginning for users, especially for those without tacit knowledge. For instance, it can help them to gather a general impression and provide other sources for further research. Ultimately, it does offer the tools to navigate through the information. Another consideration is the items and values without a Wikipedia page. As the co-producing organizations, such as the Anton de Kom Centrum for *Surinamers in Nederland*, were considered relevant metadata by the interviewees, these would become statements in items. However, a Wikipedia page about the Anton de Kom Centrum does not yet exist. In the case there are many items and values like these, this could become too time-consuming. The three archives must therefore make practical decisions about which items and values

need a Wikipedia page and which do not.

Another way in which Wikidata helps users navigate through the information is the multilingualism of the technology. As explained on their introductory page, Wikidata is multilingual which means that “Data entered in any language is immediately available in all other languages” (Wikidata, b). This enables users for whom Dutch is not their native language to access the metadata as well. More specific to the films of *ASJ*, this affordance can also be used to open up the archive to certain user groups such as the target groups of the films. For instance, *Gebroken Tijd* and *Surinamers in Nederland* targeted Turkish and Surinamese immigrants. This affordance helps to make the collection accessible for those more fluent in Turkish and Sranantongo (or other languages spoken in Suriname) than Dutch.

Despite the helpful affordances described above, some affordances of Wikidata need more critical examination. One of the affordances is the free and openly collaborative nature of the database, which opens up some questions concerning ethics and the challenge of shared custodianship. As mentioned on Wikidata itself, their data is “published under the Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication 1.0, allowing the reuse of the data in many different scenarios” (Wikidata, b). This needs careful consideration of the information put on the Wikidata as reusing data could also mean recontextualization and loss of control. Therefore, the archives need to determine whether there is any data too sensitive to publish under creative commons. Next to ethical issues like these, one may also argue that co-editors outside the archives are not desirable in the case of *ASJ*. Because it is a collaborative data repository, solely using Wikidata means that all the contextual information could be edited by users outside the three archives. This could mean that the data will become unevenly described, further complicating the need for coherency between the films and thus the challenge of the shared custodianship. Therefore, the archives need to determine which data would fit in Wikidata and which data should only be created and edited by three archives in the Wikibase.

4.2 Wikibase

The section above shows that Wikidata has several affordances that can help with contextualizing and linking the films. However, as previously argued, it might not be desirable to contextualize and link the films by solely using Wikidata as the archives might want to retain some control over the information stored on this platform. Here, Wikibase could be used to create an individual platform to adapt it to the unique characteristics of the *ASJ* collection, circumventing the limitations of Wikidata while using the technology at the same time. This does not only help to archive the collection coherently, as argued in the previous section, but it also enables the archives to create collection-specific statements. For instance, *Surinamers in Nederland* as an item in the Wikibase would be followed by statements about the film. Some statements would be very generic, such as the length and spoken language. However, as the target groups, aims, and cooperating organizations were also considered relevant to be added as metadata, these statements could potentially be quite confusing if target groups were used as properties in a different context in other Wikidata items. Therefore, metadata that is very specific to *ASJ* needs to get a property in an individual platform to be as unambiguous as possible. In this sense, it shows similarities to the conclusions of Duchesne’s and Heftbergers article on cataloguing practices.

Another limitation in Wikidata that can be circumvented by creating an individual platform, is the descriptions of the items. As can be seen in Figure 4 below, items are



Figure 4: Screenshot of item *Spirited Away* and its discription

minimally described.

Wikidata itself has limited item descriptions, as they explain on their help page: “For those who are familiar with Wikipedia, it may be tempting to initially think of items as like the Wikidata version of Wikipedia articles. While items and articles are both pages for storing information about different concepts or topics of human knowledge, it’s important to keep in mind that Wikidata is not just a database of Wikipedia content” (Wikidata, a). In other words, the item’s description is just to distinguish the item from items with the same name. However, for the items referring to the films of *ASJ*, it would be helpful to state the film’s content more elaborately. Other contextual information, such as the societal debates and perspectives, can be put as statements. Here, Wikibase can be used to adapt the platform to the specific needs of the *ASJ* collection. In this respect, it would make sense to set up a dedicated Wikibase insofar as it offers more autonomy. Yet, on the other hand, it should also be highlighted that while such a solution may appear more accommodating when it comes to contextualizing the collections and defining ontologies, it also comes with significant technical overheads that the institutions involved may not be able to dedicate to a subcollection.

5 Conclusion

The user requirement study showed which contextual information was relevant specifically for understanding *ASJ* as a film collective and for understanding *ASJ* as a form of art, a historical artefact, and part of urban history. Moreover, the findings suggested a need for providing this information on a meta-level, noting down only distinctive events, developments, or concepts without further elaboration. However, this could be problematic for users who do not have the required knowledge or research skills. To solve this problem, the interviewees suggested an external place for this kind of information, helping this specific target group further without overloading the databases.

The findings from the affordances analysis implied that metadata and LOD-based technologies such as Wikidata and Wikibase can be used to capture contextual information of the individual *ASJ* films to adequately catalog the collection to such an extent that all users can understand it regardless of their background. Hence, their potential is to open up the collection for a broad group of users. Concerning the challenges of the *ASJ* collection, metadata should be used to capture the information relevant to all three institutes whereas Wikidata and Wikibase can be used to store more specific information and to link the individual films to each other, helping users

understand the collection as a whole. Additionally, it can offer users starting points for further research by providing links to other web pages containing contextual information. Therefore, LOD has two potential roles: to connect the films and to offer users specific tools to investigate topics, concepts, and persons further if wanted. The latter is currently facilitated in the CLARIAH Media Suite. Here, the results show the biggest potential of using LOD in audiovisual archives in light of current practices: as a way to contextualise political films without having to change an entire database.

References

- Terugkeer-plan Surinamers verworpen. *De Volkskrant*, 1976. URL <https://www.delpher.nl/nl/kranten/view?query=Terugkeer-plan+Surinamers+verworpen+&coll=ddd&identificer=ABCDDD:010880581:mpeg21:a0176&resultsidentificer=ABCDDD:010880581:mpeg21:a0176&rowid=1>.
- Kathy Baxter and Catherine Courage. *Understanding Your Users: A Practical Guide to User Requirements Methods, Tools, and Techniques*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 2005.
- Terry Cook. Evidence, memory, identity, and community: four shifting archival paradigms. *Arch Sci*, (13), 2013. doi: 10.1007/s10502-012-9180-7.
- FIAF. Linked open data for film archives. Website, 2019. URL <https://www.fiafnet.org/pages/E-Resources/LoD-Task-Force-Workshop-2019.html>.
- Adelheid Heftberger. Access is not a One-way Street: The Relation Between Access to Collections and Cataloguing. *Journal of Film Preservation*, 107, 2022.
- Adelheid Heftberger and Paul Duchesne. Linked open data for film archives. Website, 2020. URL <https://www.fiafnet.org/pages/E-resources/Cataloguing-Practices-Linked-Open-Data.html>.
- Jan Heijs. *10 Jaar Amsterdams Stadsjournaal: 1974-1984*. Uitgeverij NADA, 1984.
- Angelika Menne-Haritz. Access – the reformulation of an archival paradigm. *Archival Science*, 1, 2001.
- Christian Gosvig Olesen. *Visualizing Film History: Film Archives and Digital Scholarship*. Indiana University Press, 2025.
- Rick Prelinger. Archives and Access in the 21st Century. *Cinema Journal*, 46(3), 2007.
- Rick Prelinger. Points of Origin: Discovering Ourselves Through Archival Access. *The Moving Image*, 9(2), 2009.
- Roger Smither. Formats and Standards: A Film Archive Perspective on Exchanging Computerized Data. *American Archivist*, 50(3), 1987. URL <https://american-archivist.kglmeridian.com/view/journals/aarc/50/3/article-p324.xml>.
- Eleni Tzialli. On handling the peter rubin collection. Website, 2017. URL <https://www.eyefilm.nl/en/magazine/on-handling-the-peter-rubin-collection/326365>.

Janneke van Dalen and Nadja Šičarov. Share That Knowledge! A Road Map for Sharing Knowledge across Generations of Audiovisual Archivists. FIAF, 2023. URL https://www.fiafnet.org/images/tinyUpload/2023/11/share-that-knowledge-digital_book-spreads.pdf.

Seth van Hoogland and Ruben Verborgh. *Linked Data for Libraries, Archives and Museums*. Facet Publishing, 2014.

Nanne van Noord, Christian Olesen, Roeland Ordelman, and Julia Noordegraaf. Automatic Annotations and Enrichments for Audiovisual Archives. *ARTIDIGH*, 1, 2021.

Wikidata. Help: Items. Website, a. URL <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Help:Items>.

Wikidata. Wikidata:introduction. Website, b. URL <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Wikidata:Introduction>.

Wikidata. Joop den Uyl. Website, c. URL <https://www.wikidata.org/wiki/Q318320>.

