Tamara Nikolić Đerić
Ethnographical Museum of Istria
Pazin
Croatia
tamara@emi.hr

UDK 069.27:39
Review paper
Received: March 21, 2011
Accepted: March 29, 2011

Importance of Secondary Documentation in Ethnographic Museums

Issues of information literacy and human factor and establishment of standards for the processing of secondary documentation

The work questions several basic issues connected to information system for the processing of secondary documentation, stressing also the importance of human factor and knowledge management in creating a data base. The move of ethnographic museums towards intangible culture and heterogeneity of material objects in connection with inadequate information literacy and the system of secondary documentation which is still under development, threaten with inadequate processing of material that is, for several reasons, essential for the realisation of the contemporary roles of ethnographic museums. Besides conceptual problems, the work also brings a view on the technical issues related to information systems for the processing of secondary documentation.

Keywords: museum documentation, secondary documentation, ethnographic museums

What is understood under secondary documentation?

According to the *Rules on the Content and Mode of Maintaining Museum Documentation* (Narodne novine, 108/02) "museum documentation is a systematically processed, collected, organised and stored set of data, developed during processing, protection and presentation of museum material, and it is based on the arranged and determined number and quality of data on the object, group of objects or the entire holdings." In the process, *secondary museum documentation* includes accompanying and additional holdings of museum activity that can be organised according to presentation media and content, in contrast to *primary documentation*, which is the "basic", according to the *Rules*, and "includes the first and the greatest set of data in museum material". The term *secondary documentation* can at a first glance imply a lower value in relation to *primary*, but documentation specialists and numerous curators who

also, for lack of documentation specialists, have to deal with secondary documentation, know very well that this in not so. Furthermore, Ivo Maroević understands under *primary documentation* information that develops in direct contact with the object, while *secondary documentation* includes the transfer of primary documentation into other media (Maroević, 1993: 191-192). With the development of modern technology as well as new museum trends we become more aware of the fact how the boundaries between these divisions of documentation are erased. Professor Maroević was also aware of that, because he proposed a division of documentation which brings out its content already in 1993 (Maroević; 1993: 191 in Zlodi, 2003: 18). Zbynek Z. Stranski lists under *secondary documentation* not only the accompanying documentation on museum objects, but documentation about museum activity as well (Stranski, 1970: 45 in Maroević, 1993: 16). The *Rules* were also conceived on the same principle. With no intention to equate the *secondary documentation* with the *primary* and completely supporting the necessity to differentiate among two mentioned groups of documentation and the given names in this context, the author wants to stress the importance of secondary documentation in performing contemporary museum roles and management of a large quantity of textual and audiovisual information. The necessity to have a documentation specialist and follow the development of contemporary technology, and constant learning are stressed as keys to successful management and understanding of the importance of secondary documentation in ethnographic museums.

Special attention is today devoted to different museum activities. Classical museum roles, like collection, protection, research and basic interpretation of museum objects are considered to be basic, but not sufficient for a successful running of a museum. As Pruulmann-Vangerfeldt and Aljas remark in their work on the challenges of digitisation of cultural heritage, the community expects that museums "justify their existence". This can be realised by opening up to the public, involving the community in the work of museums to become active partners in learning about and interpreting cultural heritage. One of the possible ways to establish a higher quality relationship, the authors sees in digitised heritage and online access to it (Pruulmann-Vangerfeldt and Aljas, 2009: 110). It should be added that museums realise their social responsibility through exhibitions, publications, pedagogical activities and other manifestations that are documented, and later on managed by information system for the processing of secondary documentation. Specificity and richness of secondary documentation, as perceived in museological community today, lie in the considerable presence of various media that have to be appropriately stored and documented to enable easier management of the galloping growth of information. While doing so, it is extremely important to precisely determine the size of the picture file that the system we use supports, establish a thesaurus for ethnographic collections, adapted first of all to our academic community, and in the long run perhaps also to the international environment. It is also necessary to define the size and type of information necessary to satisfy user's needs (in perspective the possibility to access the holdings of secondary documentation online), especially taking into account the need for interpreted content as Samis and Roberto

point out in their work[1] (Pruulmann-Vangerfeldt and Aljas, 2009: 110). In short, standards should be established not only at the level of processing museum material, but more specifically, at the level of processing ethnographic material and activity of ethnographic museums. Although the programs for secondary documentation processing follow all directions listed in the *Rules* and provided by CIDOC[2], the practice showed that new measures should be introduced so that the *secondary documentation* system for ethnographic collections would be more efficient. The need for standards in the field of documentation of ethnographic collections is not only indispensable because of the nature of museum objects themselves and the *primary documentation* that was mainly adopted, although still subject to change, but because of the accompanying activities like field researches and holdings of audiovisual material that are more often used in documenting, protection, presentation and interpretation of intangible heritage. Authors especially emphasizes the holdings, deeming them essential in the holistic approach to ethnographic collections of tangible and intangible nature and ethnographic researches that provide the context for objects and phenomena. With the development of technology, audiovisual holdings prevail in almost every domain since the documents are created in the digital form or are "transferred" to digital media from the traditional carriers like photographs, paper, slides, magnetic tapes and so on. According to Zlodi "Proliferation of visual material in digital form (whether it is the result of digitisation or digitally born) increases the importance of this, once rightfully called unconventional, and now more and more usual material, that with great possibilities of processing and distribution, demands new forms of management and protection." (2003: 11). Zlodi concludes that the key role of documentation is the protection of museum object itself (ibid.) Let us mention Peter van Mensch's division, who introduced the terms *idealistic and materialistic protection*: "Materialistic protection is displayed in the protection of the material of the heritage object and its characteristics, and idealistic is manifested in protection of the ideas stored in the material world via other media." (van Mensch, 1985: 2-4 in Zlodi, 2003: 14). The essence of intangible heritage is manifested exactly in the idea that could be "materialised" through audiovisual media and stored, documented and interpreted by museum professionals via information system for secondary documentation processing and management. Although intangible culture is not explicitly mentioned in the *Introduction to Museology* by Ivo Maroević, in the paragraph on documentation it is stated that documentation is not only connected to the protection of the meaning of museum object, but it is also shown through documentation of forms (with the aid of mock-ups and other media, today mainly digital).[3] In this case, a copy can in exceptional circumstances

[1] Roberto, Frankie 2008. Exploring Museum Collections On-line: The Quantitative Method. - Jennifer Trant, David Bearman (eds.). *Museums and the Web 2008.: Proceedings*. Toronto. Archives and Museum Informatics. http://www.archimuse.com. Samis, Peter 2008. Who has the responsibility for saying what we see? Mashing up Museum, Artist, and Visitor Voices, On-site and On-line . - Jennifer Trant, David Bearman (eds.). *Museums and the Web 2008.: Proceedings*. Toronto. Archives and Museum Informatics. http://www.archimuse.com

[2] Committee for Documentation of the International Council of Museums (ICOM)

[3] Author's remark

take over a part of original meaning (Maroević, 1993: 178). Finally, Maroević concludes that the "role of documentation in the protection of objects in museums becomes ever more important and exigent, the more we move away from the material structure of the object" (ibid.). Although the author refers to what is today called *primary documentation*, the thesis is important in the context of the connection between secondary documentation and intangible culture.

A great number of Croatian museums use the S++ program for the processing of secondary documentation. S++ is a "relational database designed for maintenance of secondary museum documentation. S++ module was developed as a supplement to the module M++ for the management of primary documentation. Although they are two physically separate and mutually independent databases, a link to M++ is inbuilt in S++. Consequently, each of the two modules can be managed separately, but museums using both can link their primary and secondary documentation. This improves consistency and quality of museum documentation as a whole. S++ is created in the same technology as M++, in MS Access 97, designed for work in a local network" (Link2, 2007: 3).

According to the *Rules on the Content and Mode of Maintaining Museum Documentation*, secondary museum documentation constitutes of: inventories of audiovisual holdings, inventory of hemeroteque, records of exhibitions, records of conservation and restoration procedures, record of pedagogical work, of professional and scientific work, of publishing activity, documentation on marketing and public relations and documentation on the establishment and history of the museum. But, "In the holdings of secondary documentation in the S++ program, included are also holdings of *Book of Negatives, Special Events, Media library* and *Documents* that are not mentioned in the Rules, but the practice in some museums indicated the need to manage those as well." (Link2, 2007: 5). In the recent years the program was supplemented with the following holdings: *Records of field reports, Catalogues, Archive, Notifications.*

Specificities and importance of secondary documentation in ethnographic museums

Ethnographic Museum of Istria uses the S++ program for information management of secondary documentation. Due to the lack of documentation specialists, curators reached an agreement about dividing the management of secondary documentation according to their affinities and abilities. Thus the author of this work, who is curator of the Photo collection and manager of the film festival organised by the Museum, deals with audiovisual holdings like Record of prints and negatives, Film library and Video library. A colleague whose research focus is related to oral tradition is in charge of record and tape library and records of various field researches, the museum pedagogue is in charge of the records of exhibitions, marketing and public relations and pedagogical activities.

Approximately one year ago, when the idea to create a working group for secondary documentation at Museum Documentation Centre in cooperation with the company Link2 was developed, I was invited to a working meeting at which we started discussions about general problems encountered by documentation specialists and curators in their work. It turned out that curators of art collections have different needs from the curators of ethnological or historical collections; actually this was obvious for some time already. Since then the staff of the Ethnographic Museum of Istria has been more intensively involved with secondary documentation with the aim to find the obstacles and ways to improve the information system for the management and processing of secondary documentation, primarily from the conceptual and not so much from the technical point of view. Namely, although the entire museum community is aware of the need for a more intensive cooperation of individuals and the entire institutions in the field, it is good to start researches, discussions and find potential solutions within the Museum in the meantime, so that later on we can adjust to other museums and/or other institutions in the field of culture.

A very complex exhibition *Valiže i deštini: Istria out of Istria* by Lidija Nikočević was chosen as a case study to observe possible disadvantages of the S++ program. I begun by entering the basic data, authorship, number of visitors into the records and started linking them with other holdings, and later on with objects used at the exhibition. At that stage I realised that even in a defined scientific field like (museum) documentation, it was indispensable to include intuition or according to Gladwell (2005) "the power of thinking without thinking". Namely, curators/documentation specialists are entrusted with the creation of knowledge according to different classification systems. In that way we often petrify knowledge. Since the guidelines are often not enough and we have to find the best solution to a problem ourselves, we come to the terms of intuition and/or emotional intelligence. Confronted with new questions we reconsider the already existing systems, realise the limitations of classification systems and try to offer alternative views at a problem. But, let us get back to the exhibition. Whoever had a chance to visit the exhibition must agree that it was very complex and that its essence were field researches. An enormous amount of information was collected during field researches: discussions (Record and tape library) with persons presented at the exhibition, photographs (Photo library) dating back to the beginning of the 20th century, and even video recordings (Video library) that the immigrants themselves recorded for the exhibition. This is what I understand to be "materialisation" of intangible culture that was discussed earlier. After field researches, the collected material had to be entered on inventory, old photographs that the owners often did not want to give away had to be scanned, scans, digital photographs, video recordings and films on immigrant themes had to be stored. Only a smaller part of the exhibition included "classical" museum objects. In brief, everything we brought from the field – stories recorded on dictaphone, digital photographs or scans, represented the basic material of the exhibition, but all this material in museological practice actually represented secondary documentation. The material was stored and entered on inventory in the S++ program. The obtained experience resulted in this work that stresses the importance and suitability of secondary documentation for the

processing of a part of ethnographic collections. To the uninitiated, the term *secondary documentation* that is not so important in this case, may be confusing. M++ information system is designed for (at least this was shown by the practice up to now) for inventory and management of "classical museum material", while S++ helps in systematising enormous quantities of information that numerous ethnographic museums, performing classic field researches, have to store and process.

In addition to records of exhibitions, pedagogical and other activities, secondary documentation can be perceived from the point of view of processing or documenting of intangible heritage that is slowly entering all the aspects of ethnological work and thus museum practice. It can be entered on inventory and interpreted in the S++ program, and afterwards it can be further distributed and used many times. I shall mention the example of the film workshop ETNOFILm festival that has been organised by the Ethnographic Museum of Istria for three consecutive years. Significant contributions are created in the workshop every year, since the participants have to make a film on an ethnographic theme. In 2011 participants were concerned with the heritage of Rovinj, and this resulted in short films about a fisherman, a painter, a member of the Albanian national minority, and so on. It must be pointed out that lectures of the visual anthropologist from the University in Aarhus (Denmark) were organised prior to film making and editing, and he also supervised the participants and advised them and taught them techniques of ethnographic research and interpretation by a visual medium. The recordings, i.e. the films, enter the system of secondary documentation in the holdings of the Video library. One may ask why the films were not stored in the holdings of Film library, but after long discussions we have concluded that there is really a thin line between Video library and Film library, so that for instance a documentary film of VHS could be recorded in both holdings. Because of that, I have suggested that the holdings of Video library are used for all videos (in the sense of visual perception), regardless of the medium, and the holdings of Record and tape library for the collection of audio perceived material, also regardless of the medium. Although our contribution to documenting intangible heritage and to deliberation on this topic has been modest so far, the Ethnographic Museum of Istria strives constantly towards an all-encompassing approach to researched areas. CIDOC leads the way in recognising the importance of documentation of intangible culture and challenges that such documentation confronts us with. Already in 2002 it organised a conference entitled *Preserving Cultures – Documenting Intangible Heritage*.[4]

All the mentioned represents the foundation of contemporary ethnological practices, and S++ is designed for systematisation, processing and further management of this material. Finally, by applying the S++ program or its possible variant we "obtain well laid out and systematically processed holdings that give precise information about every aspect of museum activity and this improves the quality of museum work."(Zenzerović, 2009: 205). It must also be mentioned that museum material and

[4] For more information about the conference see: Šojat Bikić, Maja "ICOM/CIDOC 2002.: Očuvanje kultura – dokumentiranje nematerijalne baštine, Porto Alegre, Brazil", in: *Informatica Museologica 34 (1-2), 2003.*

museum documentation are protected as cultural heritage and the regulation about the protection of cultural heritage is applied accordingly (*Law on Museums*, Narodne novine, 142/1998). In conclusion, all documentation is cultural heritage and result of our work so it is necessary to question, harmonise and constantly strive towards new knowledge that would eventually lead to a more efficient system of protection and use of these assets.

Possible problems in managing secondary documentation

at the beginning of digitisation of museum material it was necessary to transcribe the paper object cards into computer database, and today we are gradually transferring information from CDs and DVDs to the server (daily back-ups are performed) or external memory, and there has also been talk of blue ray disc. Since everything is progressing incredibly fast, it is only a matter of time when new trends and needs will knock on our door. The most important issue is the storage of digital material, but also division of secondary documentation holdings according to media type. Since the development of modern technology forces us constantly to transfer information from one carrier to another to avoid the danger that in several years we would not have technical possibilities to use some types of material (e.g.VHS), it is important to find new storage methods. I think that in the documentation itself, but also in recording of intangible heritage, it is the information that is important and not the carrier. In this connection I am not talking about destroying video cassettes, but of the necessity to digitise in order to protect the content, while only several pieces of carrier can be stored, or samples of different carriers and technological achievements could be left to technical museums. One should take into account the material in question, but it is definitely not necessary to store dozens of DVDs if their content can be stored on external memory or on a server. Let us take the example of holdings of Media library. At the time the S++ program was created it was surely considered to be indispensable, but today this is questionable. In the S++ manual there is an example of usage: "if a great number of photographs is made at the exhibition opening that you do not want to enter on inventory individually, first enter the medium into holdings *Media library* – CD or DVD – of the photographs. Then enter the selected photographs individually into holdings of Photo library, and make a link from each record to the record in Media library." (Link2, 2007: 30).

Although this is a way to use the holdings of Media library, in the long run the photographs could perhaps be stored in a file on the server. Then the selected photograph could be entered on inventory in Photo library, listed the location of others, i.e. input the link to the file on the server. Thus we would slowly get rid of a great number of CDs and DVDs that can also be damaged by handling as well as other "more traditional" media. Undoubtedly, a number of reasons can be found for storing information on the once unconventional, and today common media, but is must be spoken about the fast technological changes that surprise us daily and create a platform for

discussion about the problems within the mentioned areas. The speed of changes in technological environment is so great that it is necessary to have somebody who will follow contemporary trends (documentation specialist) and in keeping with that process *secondary documentation*, and that is not the case in all museums. Human capital is extremely important if we really want to protect what we consider worthy of protection.

It was already stressed that the needs of museums are different according to the type of material they are dealing with, and human and technological/financial resources it has. Digitisation cannot be done without financial support. But this problem is solved to a great extent by the Ministry of Culture that grants considerable resources to digitisation projects. It seems that, in the end, the key problem is the human factor, individual responsibility at the time when the material is processed, inadequate education in the field of information sciences and lack of cooperation between museums on the issue of *secondary documentation*, which all lead to inevitable slowness in solving the problem. Since several museums do not have a documentation specialist, and on the basis of talks with the colleagues from the working group for *secondary documentation*, I shall stress how very present is the problem of information (ill)iteracy in our museums. Despite the fact that today almost everybody uses web platforms with different internet browser, electronic mail and at least a part of the *Microsoft Office* package, these skills are often not enough for correct management of information systems for processing and management of *secondary documentation*. We are encountered with numerous difficulties, from the basic concepts like the term medium (carrier) to format and size of picture file and so on, till the final linking of "objects" with metadata. If we add the necessity of scanning, reduction of material, transfer to other formats and the like, it seems that our trouble never ends. Of course, there are shining examples, but very often without the help of the company Link2, many of these questions would remain hanging in the air. Despite numerous workshops on working in the M++ and S++ programs, it seems that we lack the basic knowledge.

> "Traditional literacy (reading and writing, numerical/mathematical, and recently computer literacy) is not enough today. Literacy for the 21st century introduces a new set of skills and knowledge for a successful and quality life in the knowledge society. Competences to which it is more and more often referred in literature and educational strategies as a basis lifelong educations are called information literacy." (Špiranec, 2003: 6)

But at the sane time, "it was shown that technology is not enough on its own. An individual has to able to use the technologies to find the necessary information and to select the information he/she needs from the myriad and how to use it." (ibid.)

It is significant to point out that from the very beginning of the usage (1974) of the term information literacy it was understood that it meant "efficient use of information in the context of problem solution." (Bawden, 2001: 9 in Špiranec, ibid.). "D. Bowden (2001) puts under the concept of contemporary literacy, not only information, but also media, library, information and digital literacy, defining each of them separately." (Špiranec, 2003: 7-8). Library literacy precedes information which brings together different types

of media, while computer literacy is often levelled with information, but Špiranec explains in her work that "they are positively two very different phenomena. While information literacy deals with content, computer relates to technology, infrastructure and technological "know-how" (ibid.). From this it is clear that both skills are necessary for secondary documentation. Let us conclude that human factor corresponds to the term information literacy. Namely, with all technology, it is the man who rules all knowledge, creates and stores it. Any mistake or erroneous estimate on our side will result in the mistake in the program. New fields of psychology, direct more attention to research and stressing the way in which we make decisions. "A part of our brain that with such [quick][5] motions reaches a decision is called adaptively unconscious (Gladwell, 2005: 12). Without going deeper into the analysis of Gladwell's work and numerous examples where the importance of subconscious, experience and intuition stands out, I would simply like to stress the fact we are rarely aware of. Despite guidelines, rules and laws, with which we are also not completely acquainted, the problems of professional nature are usually handled without any special difficulty. The term itself of such *knowledge* can be defined as "intangible material, picture of reality expressed by human thoughts while he/she observes the world around him: space, objects, relations and events in that reality. It consists of intuition, a set of ideas, experience, skills and knowledge and has a potential to create new values." (Ljubetić, 2005: 13).

It is necessary to question all the time whether our *knowledge* will be used in contemporary museum practices and social needs. Knowledge management is one of the key areas of contemporary management. Although it can sound cruel and not adapted to museum practices this work wants to stress the fact that the so-called explicit knowledge can be transferred by information systems, but "tacit or empirical" knowledge[6] is transferred and used by people inside the organisation. Translated to our model, cooperation and exchange of ideas and experiences at the level of a museum or museum community would represent the basis of the mentioned model.

Let us mention several other, technical limitations of S++ program that are interesting for this work. Although I refer to a text devoted to archaeological collection, I think that observations are relevant for other museum/collections.

> "S++ base shows some shortcomings, like depending on holdings, too big or too small, that is too extensive of inadequately worked out number of data for input. For example, on the interface of the holdings of Expositions the field for input of the extent of exhibition is often not big enough since the exhibitions of Archaeological Museum of Istria are mainly archaeological and often different and numerous materials are exhibited. Also, expositions of the Museum often travel, and there is no field to input place and time of previous instances of the same exhibition." (Zenzerović, 2007: 204-205).

[5] Author's remark.

[6] "According to the author who was among the first to deal with questions of creating and using knowledge, Michael Polany, knowledge can be divided into explicit and tacit or empirical knowledge." (Ljubetić, 2005: 13)

In the following text the author indicates the issue of storage and archiving digital material with regard to, as it was mentioned earlier in the text, the problem of permanence of material in the era of constant development of information technology.

In addition to all that was stated, the need to introduce standards into control and management of terminology is one of the top priorities. As Kolbas and Vuković mention in their work "vocabulary control has a very important role in documenting museum material for better search, so a thesaurus is prepared as quality aid. In addition to providing control, it also ensures consistent use of terms in processing and searching" (Vlatković and Kolbas, 2009: 387). If we go back to modern museum roles, online access to collections, increasing number of users, and even the networking at the level of museum, it is clear how important it is to use standards in entering terms to avoid mistakes, inefficient searching and work as whole. In addition to inadequate cooperation at the level of Croatian museum community, there are again minor technical problems in control and management of vocabulary. Buršić mentions in her work the importance of correct input of terms regarding the fact that they are recorded into terminology table and later on they are offered to users by drop-down menu. Vagueness can be the result if some other term is used for the same notion, another order of writing the notion, use of coma and other symbols, space and so on. Although there were thoughts at the level of Archaeological Museum of Istria to lock the control of terminology, author concludes that in the long run it would only restrict the growing number of users, and development of the program itself (Buršić, 2009: 214). On the basis of the experience of other specialised museums, ethnographic museums of Croatia and those that have ethnographic collections might leap over some technical problems and direct all the forces towards thesaurus development. According to the 2009 report on the work on *Thesaurus* during 2008, Vlatković and Kolbas say that a great number of museums have sent their vocabularies and that during 2009 implementation of the existing thesaurus will begin (ibid). According to the available data, Ethnographic Museum of Istria has not participated in the project till 2011, either by sending the terminology or in implementation of the existing thesaurus.

Development perspectives of ethnographic museums in information environment

Although there were talks about information systems in museum activity, digitisation of heritage and its online access for many years, and more recently about documentation of intangible heritage via different computer applications, it seems that there is still a lot of work on integration of existing ideas and information systems in everyday work of museum staff in Croatia. In the first place, the issue of inadequate information and computer literacy, then of lack of documentation and/or information specialists should be solved at the level of individual museums, and learn to use various fundings that the Ministry and other sources offer for digitisation of cultural

heritage. According to the investigation that Pruulmann-Vangerfelds and Aljas undertook in some museum in Estonia, I have tried to use a half structured questionnaire and gain a picture on usage, efficiency and cooperation in the field of secondary documentation in Croatian museums with ethnographic collections. Unfortunately, out of 44 museums to which the questionnaire was sent out, I have not received a single answer after two weeks. It is possible that the deadline was too short or that, given the time of the year, colleagues were on holiday, but this does not undermine the surprise of the unsuccessful questionnaire.

Despite that, if I refer to Pruulmann-Vangerfelds and Aljas, who were actually dealing with online access to digitised materials from the point of view of the user in a broader sense, it seems that inadequate usage of information system's potential and the internet itself (see Pruulmann-Vangerfelds and Aljas, 109-127) is also observed in other countries. It is interesting that museum staff perceives the digitisation as a mainly technical process, and less attention is devoted to information architecture, interpretation and contextualisation of objects (ibid.) The solution of the problem of information (il)literacy definitely lies in the concept of life-long learning, but also on the individual will to succeed based on cooperation. By solving the problem of information (il)literacy, we automatically gain a new look on contemporary museum roles that are realised together with contemporary technology.

Further on, thanks to the work and professionalism of our cultural workers, Croatia is today proud to have nine phenomena listed on the UNESCO representative list of intangible heritage of the humanity. In this context, information systems are indispensable during research, documentation and interpretation of intangible heritage.

Finally, despite geographical spread out of Croatia, digital age brings us also new possibilities of communication. In that sense, the greater level of cooperation between Croatian museum specialists is necessary, even on a daily basis, so that the listed ideas and contemporary trends can be integrated into our museum community.

Information environment offers numerous gains if the tools are used correctly. The protection of object/phenomenon and communication with users maybe the most important goals we wish and must realise in the end. In addition to networking at the level of museum that facilitates the work of professionals, digitisation of heritage, communication with visitors, possibility of reproduction and multiple uses of material and discovery of new ways of documenting and presenting intangible heritage, it seems that the information age offers a multitude of possibilities that still need to be used.

Translated by: Jasenka Zajec