Title
Further Comments on Publishing Large Compilations of Archaeological Data

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/13b445gp

Journal
Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology, 16(1)

ISSN
0191-3557

Author
Glassow, Michael A

Publication Date
1994-07-01

Peer reviewed

available in highly compressed format—if not diskette then perhaps microfiche. This moves the series closer to its oft repeated, but seldom achieved, goal of reporting the results of research—particularly archaeological research—"in full." It will raise costs but probably not greatly. The interesting question begged by this approach is whether general distribution of comprehensive data sets is as necessary as members of the profession so often tell each other it is.

We repeat: the UUAP series cannot publish in hard copy everything that authors define as data. On at least four occasions over the last five years, we have been approached with projects that the authors envisioned publishing as multiple volume sets. Depending on the negotiated schedule, *each project* would have tied up the series for periods of two to five years! Welcome as these submissions would have been (and indeed might still be), in no case was it clear that they justified such a preemptive investment of resources. Authors must exercise editorial judgment and restraint in these matters. Either they submit manuscripts of a size the Press can handle on a reasonable schedule and make raw data available in other media on request, or they anticipate publication of parts of their work in other formats, some of which will inevitably engender the problems of the sort detailed in Madsen's review.

We are open to further discussion on this matter. Meanwhile, we have sent Madsen a free replacement of his badly abused copy of Lyneis's excellent monograph.

❁

Further Comments on Publishing Large Compilations of Archaeological Data

MICHAEL A. GLASSOW
Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

As members of the advisory board of the *University of Utah Anthropological Papers,* Duncan Metcalfe and James O'Connell point out that the University of Utah Press cannot afford to publish the reams of data that accompany some submissions of monograph-length reports, even though the stated goal of the series is to publish research "in full." Recognizing the value of making data available to interested researchers, they offer two solutions: (1) publish only those data "needed to insure basic comprehension" and encourage authors to make the complete data available for the asking in machine-readable form, or (2) publish the data in a "highly compressed format" with the paper. These two proposals do not limit the possibilities, and I offer here a third.

It seems to me that most archaeologists have not considered seriously the role that collections repositories can play in making more than just collections available for research. Every archaeologist recognizes that artifact catalogs and various field documents should accompany a collection submitted to a repository. In addition, a collections repository is in a position to house many other forms of information associated with collections and to provide this information for the cost of duplication. When an archaeologist writes a monograph, or any other form of publication for that matter, he or she might consider providing data compilations to the same repository housing the collections from which the data were derived, and simply report in the publication the availability of the data at the repository.

I agree with Metcalfe and O'Connell's position that presentation of data in publications should be abstracted and should be directly related to a specific argument or conclusion. Indeed, devising concise and meaningful presentations of data requires a good deal of skill, and perhaps we who teach at universities and colleges do not place enough emphasis on the development of these skills. A survey of dissertations in archaeology would support this

suspicion: commonly, more than half the pages of a dissertation are tables of relatively raw data.

Considering that the modern archaeologist produces tables and lists of data using a data management or spreadsheet program on a desktop computer, the task of making large compilations of data available is easy and cheap. However, instead of the author of a publication taking on the responsibility of providing the data, as Metcalfe and O'Connell suggest, it makes better sense to turn over this responsibility to a collections repository. As mortal beings, archaeologists sooner or later will not be in a position to provide the data they have compiled.

However, a responsibly managed collections repository should be able to provide that data into the indefinite future.

In conclusion, I see the role of a collections repository, whether a small facility attached to a department such as the one I supervise at UCSB or a large museum with a substantial curatorial staff, as the source for all types of documentation associated with collections. While the staffs of collections repositories often recognize this role, archaeologists generally do not. In conceiving efficient ways to store and disseminate archaeological information, certainly we should.