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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION
Statement of Problem

*An element in the situation that must never be left out of account:*
the function an image is expected to serve.

Ernst Hans Josef Gombrich

Until recently, the number of textual documents greatly exceeded the number of visual art
documents held by libraries, archives, museums, and even individuals. Therefore, information
specialists developed schemes for representing textual documents with words. Visual documents
such as paintings, drawings, sculptures, architectural plans, and photographs are not made up of
words; this made it often difficult for institutions as well as individuals to organize, describe,
structure, and make use of those documents. Useful access tools for those visual documents
require ways of describing documents other than the means which have been used for word-
based texts.

There are several reasons why the number of textual materials exceeded that of visual
materials in the past. The cost of making, producing, and reproducing visual materials was high;
the number of artists, art producers, and art curators was relatively low; creating an art work
required significant technical skills and knowledge; and visual art documents were often outside
the normal parameters (e.g., size, cost, and fragility) of standard texts.

The advancement of technology and education have increased the number of visual art
works, visual materials, and visual documents, especially photographic images produced by
professionals, semi-professionals, and amateurs, on the Internet. According to a study conducted
by Lyman and Varian (2003), the highest number of information transfers on the Internet from the selected sample of 9,806 websites was comprised of images, at 23.2%, more than the transfers of any of various other file types on the Web. Beaver (2008) stated that in October 2008, Facebook had seen over 10 billion photos uploaded, and 2-3 terabytes of photographic images were being uploaded daily.

As a result, the use and the purpose of using visual documents such as photographic images have also changed. For example, institutions and individuals have realized the significance of preserving history in the form of photographic images, and the importance of the use of those historical photographic images for many reasons including communication and documentation.

For several decades, ‘bibliographic agencies,’ as described by O’Connor in O’Connor, Kearns, and Anderson (2008) have focused on a top-down model for representing mainly textual documents such as books, articles, and journals. Bibliographic agencies, in the past, minimized the role of individual seekers in the representation process for documents. As a result, documents were difficult to retrieve even if they were in the system. A model of typical representation by a bibliographic agency had three components for subject representation. First, there was the “document representation rule,” defining what could be included in the subject headings. Second, the “retrieval mechanism rule” determined what document could be retrieved and according to what criteria. Third, the “question representation rule” determined how a question by a patron could be represented in the description (as shown in Figure 1.1).
At a time when most of the documents consisted of words on paper and when catalog descriptions and requests were words on paper, this made sense, but the seeker was excluded from most of the processes. Bibliographic agencies did their best to keep their users in mind, but not being able to focus on individual needs, uses, and functions that a document could serve was often problematic for users. For the most part, though, the questions and the documents were both represented by words. The digital environment, by contrast, makes possible seeker input together with the tracking of individuals and groups of seekers; the same environment makes it possible for others to thicken the descriptions of documents by means of additional descriptive terms, ratings, and reviews.

Photographs as documents change the problem of description; since words are not ‘native elements’ of photographs, they may not be sufficient for describing photographs (O’Connor & Wyatt, 2004). Users of photographic images may have diverse purposes they wish to accomplish with the photographic images they seek and use. Photographic images can have multiple
meanings. Each person sees, interprets, and uses photographic images differently. Thus, a robust bottom-up model, as suggested by Wilson (1977) in which users are observed, their uses for the images are determined, and the functions they want to accomplish with photographic images are focused on may improve retrieval and accuracy for users with similar needs.

The number of photographic materials including photographic images collected by individuals and shared on Social media (SM) is increasing. In 2013 the following was reported about the number of images shared on Facebook:

Facebook revealed in a white paper that its users have uploaded more than **250 billion photos**, and are uploading **350 million** new photos each day. To put that into perspective, that would mean that each of Facebook's 1.15 billion users have uploaded an average of 217 photos apiece. (Smith, 2013)

The number of Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp users has increased recently, thus increasing the amount of personal information and photographic information uploaded daily. According to “Facebook Company Info” (2015), the number of active users monthly has reached 1.49 billion, and 1.31 billion people were mobile users as of June 30, 2015. Instagram, which was acquired by Facebook in April 2014, has had over 400 million users since their launch in October 2010. WhatsApp, a real-time mobile messaging service acquired by Facebook in 2014, has approximately 450 million uses each month. According to Kremerskothen (2014), the number of photos uploaded to Flickr has increased 200% in less than four years, from 2 billion in November 2007 to 6 billion in August 2011. In 2013, Flickr introduced a new interface design and offered its users 1TB of free space. As a result, in February 2014, the number of groups in Flickr reached 2 million with a total contribution of 1 million photos uploaded each day.

There is a significant increase in the number of users and in the uses of visual communications and visual content over SM serving personal, commercial, and non-commercial
purposes. Hochman (2014) suggests that visual materials used on SM such as photographic images provide a platform for studying the visual knowledge and meaning attached to those photographic images and their uses. At the same time that personal creation and use of images has increased, there is a lack of research about personal information management (PIM) in relation to personal photo collections. According to Rodden and Wood (2003), few studies have been conducted about how individuals organize and browse their printed and digital photo collections. Kirk, Sellen, Rother, and Wood (2006) indicated that researchers have paid little attention to what happens between people and their photo collections after people have captured digital photographs, but before they have utilized or shared them. Park (2011) asserts that there is a need in the field of PIM to understand and investigate the practices and activities performed by people on their personal information collections.

Moreover, imaging technology is increasing image quality and ease of production of images so quickly that even the practices of PIM with photos from five years ago would be out of date today.

Preliminary observations of the uses of photographs on Facebook (as illustrated in Figure 1.2) suggest a model quite different from the standard bibliographic model in Figure 1.1. Images of all sorts, from selfies to historic photographs, from birthday parties to exotic wildlife, and from cute cats and dogs to Hubble deep space pictures, are uploaded and sometimes shared. There is no central source of descriptions, and there are no set rules for describing the images.
Several institutions (for example the Library of Congress (LC) Prints and Photographs Division) have realized the potential value of personal information and now seek out individuals who have knowledge about a particular place or subject and invite their contributions. Some institutions seek the public in order to acquire personal information and personal photo collections, especially seeking historical photographic collections. Those institutions sometimes advertise through mass media such as TV, radio, newspapers, books, magazines, and the Internet, and sometimes advertise or seek public knowledge through the use of SM such as Flickr and Facebook. Library of Congress joined Flickr in 2007 and opened its images to public view, public use, and public input. Figure 1.3 shows the initial page of the site with a sample of the most recently added images; Figure 1.4 shows both the formal bibliographic data provided by LC and a sample of a user contribution to the description of one of the photographs (Mrs. H.K. Duryea (LOC), n.d.).
Figure 1.3. Screen capture of Library of Congress page on Flickr image sharing site, showing that there are more than 66,000 followers and more than 25,000 photographs on the site. From Library of Congress Photostream (n.d.), https://www.flickr.com/photos/library_of_congress/
Figure 1.4. Screen capture of Library of Congress Flickr page showing detail of formal description and viewer contributed description. From LC Flickr page, https://www.flickr.com/photos/library_of_congress/25077548783/in/dateposted/

Figure 1.5 provides an example of an advertisement by the Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation, Inc. in *Living Magazine*, a local magazine, seeking information from the public.
Oral history program hopes to gather stories, donate archives to public library

The Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation, Inc., is seeking to record the oral histories of area residents on a variety of subjects. Audio recordings will be carefully archived and then donated to the Plano Public Library System.

"Do you have a story to tell? We want to talk to you," said Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation Co-Director Jeffrey C. Campbell. "These oral history recollections are an invaluable teaching tool and community resource."

The group is seeking to speak to community members on a variety of topics. Did you ride Plano’s interurban railway? Did you live in the area in the 1970’s when much of today’s Plano was farm land? Are you a war veteran? These are just a few of the examples of the types of topics that can be addressed in an oral history interview.

"Many in our community can speak to little-known details of current and past life in this area or may have stories of their experience during a pivotal time in history," Campbell said. "Some may think their stories are inconsequential or trivial, but sometimes those tiny bits of information lead to wonderful tales that are a great treasure—hidden gems that we can preserve and share with others."

Those interested in being interviewed can call 972-941-2117 or email info@planoconservancy.org for more information.

PlanoConservancy.org

Figure 1.5. Screen capture of the Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation, advertisement (Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation, Inc., 2015, p. 18).

Figure 1.6 shows a statement by the Library of Congress – National Child Labor Committee Collection website stating that the photographic information they provide may include inaccurate information, and they seek the aid of the public and especially “researchers” who have additional information.
Figure 1.6. Screen capture of a statement by the Library of Congress - National Child Labor Committee Collection (*National Child Labor Committee Collection*, n.d.).

Figure 1.7 shows a statement by Manchester Historic Association (MHA) on their website, seeking the help of individuals who are interested in donating their personal collections, including items such as photographic images, related to Manchester, NH.
Figure 1.7. Screen capture of a statement by the Manchester Historic Association – Research Center (Research Center, n.d.).

Figure 1.8 shows a statement by LC on their page “The Commons” on Flickr, seeking the public to contribute to their Flickr page by adding tags, notes, and comments.
Figure 1.8. Screen capture of a statement on inviting tags and comments on photographs in the collection of the Library of Congress on Flickr – “The Commons” (Library of Congress profile, n.d.).

Figures 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, and 1.8 show that significant institutions like LC, MHA, and the Plano Conservancy for Historic Preservation seek contributions of personal knowledge and personal collections from the public through the different types of mass media and SM.

It is clear that personal knowledge and personal collections may be important in contributing to public knowledge and public collections. The figures mentioned in the previous paragraph also indicate that historical collections sometimes do not have enough information or may have no information at all about a certain subject, and thus personal knowledge that is related to the collections held by those institutions can be considered value-added.

Information may be held by members of the public who have personal knowledge, who have a hobby interest, or who are formal researchers in other fields or institutions. Facebook groups based on a topic of interest can provide useful information to the available collections “about” and “related” to a particular topic. “About” or “aboutness” as discussed by Shatford
(1986) denotes the subjective meaning that is not visible through a photographic image, unlike “ofness” which is objective, that is, visible to the eye without interpretation. For this research, “about” as described by Shatford (1986) will be used to represent both posts and comments on conversations that depict any attributes in the photographic images that a viewer includes in a post or comment. O’Connor in O’Connor and Wyatt (2004) distinguished between (a) topical representation and “diachronic” attributes, which were referred to by Shatford (1986) as “aboutness,” and (b) functional representation and “synchronic” attributes, which were referred to by Shatford (1986) as “ofness.” Actual users are the source for functional descriptions; it is assumed that the descriptions were meaningful or useful to the individual user, and so they might be useful to others.

According to O’Connor in Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008),

Meaning does not reside in the image. It resides in the beholder. Hence, thresholds of meaning are approached through interpretation because the image itself makes no statements, and those statements of interpretation arise from neither knowledge nor ignorance. They arise from experience. (p. 139)

Purpose and Significance of the Study

This study investigates the conversational use of historical photographic images by users who share a common interest on Facebook. Use of images on Facebook can be assumed to be functional, so descriptors based on use emerge. This research aimed to achieve three goals.

This study investigates the conversational use of historical photographic images by users who share a common interest on Facebook. Use of images on Facebook can be assumed to be functional, so descriptors based on use emerge. This research aimed to achieve three goals.

The first goal was to observe the online engagements and interactions of users who have added to their personal photo collections images that appear on formal archives on the Web, such
as LC and MHA. The second goal was to fill in gaps in the literature about online PIM practices, especially about the use of photographs on SM. The third goal was to design a robust model that instantiates Wilson’s (1977) notion of functionality, by examining real world usage of words describing photographic images and uses of photographic images on SM. In other words, this research aimed to discover a bottom-up process rather than the top-down model of representation by a formal agency (O’Connor et al., 2008).

Moreover, this study will contribute to the existing literature about PIM, communities of interest (CoI), and the use of photographic images. Some of the descriptors, categories, and forms of use that have emerged from this study’s examination of the conversational use of photographic images on Facebook will likely be significant for formal historical archives.

**Research Questions**

*Indeed the worth of a photo in historical and social research is not restricted to what it depicts and how: a very poor quality image can be as useful for stimulating questions as an exceptionally well-preserved one; amateur photos are as useful as professional ones.*

Penny Tinkler

The general research question for this study was “How do participants in social media use and describe photographic images and their functions?” The specific research questions for this study of the practices of PIM by members of a Facebook group focused on Manchester, NH were divided into two parts. The first part examined uploaders of photographic images, and the second part examined commenters and their interactions with posts that include photographic images and photographic information. The goal was to devise a model of conversational use of photographic images on SM and the descriptors generated within the conversations. An initial
model was generated from the literature and from preliminary observations of Facebook conversations, as shown in Figure 1.9. The preliminary model simply presents five actors and five types of action within the conversation space; it does not include multiple roles for individual actors or emergent characteristics of a conversation over time.

Figure 1.9. Preliminary model of Facebook conversation with sample actions.

The following questions guided the research and the evaluation of the preliminary model:

Research Question 1: How do members of the Manchester, NH group on Facebook describe photographic images they have posted?
Research Question 2: How do members of the Manchester, NH group on Facebook engage and interact with the photographic images posted by other members?

Research Question 2A: What forms of conversations emerged from members interacting with photographs posted by themselves and by others?

Definitions

- Art Image: “An art image may be a work of art; it may be an image of a work of art; or it may be both a work of art and an image of a work of art” (Layne, 2002, p. 9). In other words, an image, such as a photograph, could be an art work by itself such as a black-and-white photograph of the American West landscape, and it could be a photograph of an artwork such as a photograph of a painting such as the Mona Lisa by Leonardo de Vinci. In this study, image, photograph, art image, art work, and work of art will be used interchangeably to represent a photographic image, unless otherwise noted.

- The word conversation has many definitions, such as “the informal exchange of ideas by spoken words” (“Conversation,” 2016). In another: “a conversation may start involving just two people, but the number involved can soon increase spontaneously if somebody picks up an interesting buzzword in passing. The group can, in turn, shrink in size again if individual participants move away to continue a conversation confidentially, or if interest in continuing disappears or current tasks and appointments require a person to leave” (Englich, Remmers, & Wilkhahn, 2008, p. 280). In this study, the term “conversation” includes the interpersonal communication between members of a community that engage and interact mainly online using photographic images as tokens for communication. What distinguishes the current conversational use of photographic images from traditional face-to-face communication, and
from the initial communication model, is not only the social aspect, but also the availability of the content, and the freedom as to what kind of content, such as post or comment, with which to engage and interact.

The definition of the term personal archive has changed with time.

Not long ago, there was little question that personal archives were the sum of published and unpublished material written and collected by an individual. That definition has become inadequate as the boundaries between what is personal and what is social have blurred. It may now be more accurate to say that personal digital archives are collections of digital material created, collected, and curated buy individuals rather than institutions (Ubois, 2013, p. 3).

This study focuses on individuals and the social engagements and interactions that occur surrounding photographic images on an informal archiving platform on the Web like Facebook; comparisons with institutional practices illuminate the PIM systems.

Limitations

Several Facebook conversations might start with similar information, and some may include similar photographic images. Conversations might be deleted at anytime by the uploader or the administrator of the Facebook group. Any member can delete his/her comment at any time. Conversations that were selected in this research study may by now include new comments added after the data collection of data for this study. Images and conversation contents were gathered over a six-month period, but that does not necessarily ensure that every conversation used for this study had come to closure.

Delimitations

There were several communities studied in this research that met offline and online, which included communities of practice (CoPs) and communities of interest (CoI). Among individuals and members of a similar community, there were several conversations that started with the
sharing of verbal information and several that started with the sharing of a photographic image; thus, it would be hard to say that all conversations were of the same sort. The research was focused on only Facebook groups, and mainly on the conversations that had started with a historical photographic image of Manchester, NH in the United States of America that had appeared on either the LC or MHA archives; however, the proposed model of the conversational use of images was applied to a sample of conversations of other sorts in order to make possible an assessment of its reliability and validity.

Revisiting the Research Questions

The preliminary questions and the preliminary examples of the use of photographs by formal organizations, together with the preliminary model of interactions in the conversation space of Facebook, as shown in Figure 1.9, all lead to a more complex model, as shown in Figure 1.10, and an additional element of the research question. There are relationships between an uploader, a commentator, and a spectator; they might even be overlapping roles sometimes. The notion of overlap in the model is not meant as analogous to that in a Venn diagram; it only represents possibilities, and is not meant to stand for any form of logical intersection or other particular set of relations. In order to adjust the model and examine the describing of photographs in SM, the test set of documents will be photos that are described both in a Facebook group and in the collections of formal archives.
Figure 1.10. Working model for framing the research
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Social media (SM) provide a new sort of platform for PIM. We have access to essentially all types of information every day whether in relation to work or for everyday life and leisure. Information, both printed and digital, comes in many forms, such as in a document, e-mail, text message, voice message, note, audio, video, or photo. Additionally, with the advancement of technologies such as the Internet and with the increasing variety of devices for interacting, we are now not only acquiring information, but also producing and sharing information such as photographic images with others. In addition, as we acquire and produce more and more information, we sometimes store that information on our personal computers, online, and even on remote storage devices, often referred to as the Cloud, to ensure their availability and accessibility when we need them. Moreover, we sometimes find it difficult to re-find or retrieve information that we have already stored, in order to fill an information gap that we have encountered.

Personal information management (PIM), as defined by Jones and Teevan (2007), is:

Both the practice and the study of the activities people perform to acquire, organize, maintain, retrieve, use, and control the distribution of information items such as documents (paper-based and not) and to fulfill a person’s various roles (as parent, employee, friend, member of community, etc.) (p.3)

Personal information management (PIM), such as the managing of personal photographic collections, is a process that involves several activities individuals engage in regarding information that they own or have some control over. According to several researchers in the field, PIM includes activities such as acquiring, producing, storing, organizing, maintaining,

In every step in using a photographic image, there is a cognitive process involved; one example is decision-making. Decision-making starts with determining what photographic images to include, and is present throughout the processes of organizing, archiving, and using an image and, perhaps, sharing it with others. According to Whittaker (2013), the core of curating personal information is to exploit it. Otherwise, the personal information that we accumulate and consume will not be fruitful.

The advancement in the technologies associated with photography over the years has been very noticeable, and it has affected the photographic information produced daily and the PIM practices directed towards managing our personal information. In the past, the majority of people could not own a camera or have their photo taken by a photographer for many reasons such as the high cost or sometimes the necessity to travel miles to have their photo taken. However, with the technological advancements over time, camera manufacturers introduced consumer film cameras, which became smaller and smaller. The prices of these cameras dropped gradually, and printing became more affordable than before. Digital cameras became very affordable and easier to use than earlier models of cameras. Recently, mobile phone manufacturers have produced camera phones that enable people to easily take photos and instantly share them with others. This has enabled people to take more photos than before for all kinds of purposes and functions, and they can photograph nearly everything around them at any time they want. This has increased the number photographs produced daily, thus resulting in a need to manage our information for future utilization (Ames & Naaman, 2007; Hakkila, Huhtala,
Organizing, or putting together information documents such as photographic images involves decision-making and making sense of the information that the person would like to organize. Points an individual considers when organizing his or her personal information, such as photographic images, include naming and labeling information items, grouping similar information together based on an organization scheme, and annotating information. Putting together information whether textual or visual may not only serve the need of the individual, but also can satisfy the need of others, especially when using SM, for instance Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, Snapchat, and even WhatsApp.

Personal Information Management (PIM) Within the Area of Information Science (IS)

According to Borko (1968), information science (IS) is an interdisciplinary science that aims for the development and improvement of the processes followed by institutions that accumulate and transmit knowledge to others. Information science is “concerned with that body of knowledge relating to the origination, collection, organization, storage, retrieval, interpretation, transmission, transformation, and utilization of information” (p. 3). Even though many studies noted that PIM discipline are derived from human-computer interaction and human-information interaction, the core concepts of PIM are dependent not on computers, but on information, and on precisely managing our personal information (Jones & Teevan, 2007).

Personal Information Management (PIM) is not a new subject; but the term was coined in the late 1980s by a psychologist Mark Lansdale in his study of the issues associated with managing personal information focusing on the problems of categorizing information and recognition and remembering in order to recall the labels used with categorizing information for
purpose of retrieval (Lansdale, 1988).

**IS Contribution to the Field of PIM**

Studies from different disciplines, including cognitive psychology, information retrieval (IR), and information science (IS), have contributed to the field of PIM. In 2005 the National Science Foundation (NSF) sponsored a 3-day workshop to discuss the problems, development, and improvements in the field, so it could benefit individuals in their everyday life, individuals in their roles in organizations, and educators through information literacy programs by providing skills, knowledge, tools, and techniques which they could acquire in order to benefit from better PIM. A number of researchers participated as facilitators or presenters in the two sessions, including scholars from the field of IS such as Marcia Bates, Nicholas Belkin, Harry Bruce, William Jones, Diane Kelly, David Levy, and Wanda Pratt (Jones & Bruce, 2005).

Several researchers have recently presented frameworks of PIM; some of these frameworks consist of different and similar activities in which individuals engage in managing their personal information for the purpose of retrieval, consumption, and curation (Jones, 2008, 2010; Jones & Teevan, 2007; Whittaker, 2013).

Dervin’s concept of “sense-making” has been applied to PIM activities and their outcomes, and has been employed as a model that can be used to understand the PIM behavior of users (Dervin, 1998). According to Jones (2010), “making sense is, or should be, an integral part of all other PIM activities, including activities to keep, find, organize, maintain, manage information flow, and measure and evaluate” (p. 245). It was also claimed that making sense, as part of the activity of reorganizing our information and our need of information will help soubrette organize our personal information. In addition, Spurgin (2006) stated that sense-making helps researchers
to deepen their knowledge and better understand the activities which users engage in to manage their personal information, and why they manage it that way. This can help in identifying the gaps in our knowledge, and thus in designing better tools and systems that could aid users to manage their personal information more effectively.

**PIM Studies**

Malone (1983) found that office workers store information in piles as a means of reminding themselves of uncompleted tasks and as a way to ensure easy access of frequently used documents. In addition, the difficulty of classifying and categorizing information for future retrieval can be mitigated by utilizing an electronic office system. Jones, Dumais, and Bruce (2002) found that depending on the function of the task performed and the role of the worker, people have different ways of keeping found web information for future use. Rodden and Wood (2003) stated that participants realized the relative easiness of managing digitized photographic images in comparison to non-digitized photographs due to the browsing feature of the digital photograph management tool used in the study. Kirk et al. (2006) examined the processes people tended to perform after taking pictures and before using them. The analyses and the framework presented relating to the different activities performed by individuals can aid in developing digital photo management tools. Park (2011) realized that participants performed three tasks in managing their personal information including collecting, organizing, and storing electronic documents.

**Functionality of PIM**

People have begun to take more photos than before, and their personal photo collections have increased in size for many reasons including the reasonably low cost of taking digital
photographs as compared to the printing of film and the lower cost of digital storages. Even though technologies have made it easier for people to take more photographs, they also led to some issues involved with managing their personal photographs such as finding a photograph, managing multiple copies such as edited and resized photos, and the locating of duplicates in multiple storages and/or folders, which also creates another issue with the organizational scheme used by the user (Ames & Naaman, 2007; Gurrin et al., 2005; Kirk et al., 2006; Wilhelm, Takhteyev, Sarvas, Van House, & Davis, 2004). The growing use of handheld devices, including cameras, has enabled people to archive and to share their personal photo collections with others but has raised an issue with searching those personal photo collections uploaded or archived in handheld devices (Gurrin et al., 2005).

In a study conducted by Malone (1983), it was found that individuals in an office organized their information based on “files” and “piles.” One of the reasons why people place information documents on piles is because it is difficult to place information documents in one specific category. Lansdale (1988) noted that there are two psychological problems involved in managing personal information. The first issue is how individuals decide to categorize information items and how to classify the categories, and the second issue is how to remember those classifications for retrieval.

Several digital devices nowadays have built-in wireless technology, which enables users to upload their photos to their desired storage space, as well as to download photos from their archives either to their other devices or elsewhere to their handheld devices. This wireless technology has enabled people to share their photos, while creating an obstacle to searching multiple devices at once (Gurrin et al., 2005). Generally, searching through digital images can
be done quickly just by browsing or skimming through fairly large numbers of images with some general anchor points, such as these: sometime last week, before the holiday, about half way through all the pictures on this device.

Making decisions about what to keep, discard, archive, and share with others seems to be an activity that could reduce information anxiety and overload. According to Marshal (2007), studies have shown that there are three obstacles many people face specially with long-term PIM, including “predicting value and metaphors for long-term access,” “distributed storage and format opacity,” and “curatorial effort and predicting value” (p. 57-58). This includes storing information that has an emotional value for a specific period of time, for example, a wedding invitation card and wedding photographs. Storing the card and photographs in an album or folder will act as a reminder of good memories in the future. An example of distributed storage includes having copies of the same or different photographs in multiple storages such as in our personal computers, online, and on the cloud. Format opacity includes practices like storing personal photographs in different image formats, printed or digital, RAW or jpeg or even compressed files for the purpose of, for example, sharing. Curatorial effort and predicting value occur when a person accumulates information over time and keeps it in multiple storages as a way for future retrieval.

According to Jones (2008), it is necessary to control the flow of information. For every kind of information, such as the information “about us,” there are issues of privacy associated with it. In the first place, it’s very important to control what is in our PSI before it comes under the control of others. In addition, we also need to control what we receive because our time spent interacting with information on a daily basis is also considered our private time, so
controlling the inflow of information can reduce the problem of information overload.

Personal Space of Information (PSI) and Personal Information Collections (PIC)

According to (Jones, 2008; Jones & Teevan, 2007), each individual has his/her own information space. The notion of PSI is the idea that we make sense of all the information we interact with directly or indirectly, whether we own it or it is owned by others but related to us, including information that is in printed format or in an electronic format.

People are motivated to manage information that relates to them in one way or another. PSI includes not only information items “owned by me” such as our notes; “about me” such as medical records; “directed to me” such as an advertisement; “sent by me” such as an e-mail; “already experienced by me” such as a video we watch or a book, which we borrow from a library; and information “useful to me” that sometimes is not at hand such as information about a vacation package; but also includes all the applications, tools, and objects that contain, or that we use to manage, any of the six senses of our personal information (Jones, 2008, 2010, 2012; Jones & Teevan, 2007).

Our PSI includes all the information that makes sense to us whether we have control over it or not. However, when we gain control over our personal information by managing and organizing it, then it becomes part of our personal information collections (PICs) (Jones, 2012).

Similar to the proposals of Jones (2008, 2010, 2012) and Jones and Teevan (2007) about PSI, this researcher also believes that we can make sense of photographs that we interact with whether they are related to our work or everyday life. For example, there are photographs that are “captured by me” including all the photographs which the person captured; “photographs of me” but taken by others, such as a photograph that included me but took by a friend; and
photographs “related to me,” which include photographs that relate to what we do such as the photographs that we use as an illustration for a presentation, and also include photographs of relatives or people we know, as well as photographs of things we use as illustrations, such as photographs of places that we want to visit.

Decision-Making (Keeping Decision)

There are several definitions of decision-making and keeping decisions from different perspectives. From a psychology perspective, according to Goldstein (2011), decision-making is a day-to-day activity in which everyone engages. It is simply “making choices between alternatives (Goldstein, 2011, p. 360). From an information science perspective, Case (2012) stated that in decision-making, a person seeks information to evaluate alternatives and then chooses one option. In other words, decisions people make, as information behavior, “are typically characterized as choices made from among alternatives; that is, at least two options are available, and the decision maker must gather information that allows each potential choice to be evaluated and compared to the alternative(s)” (Case, 2012, p. 97). From the PIM perspective, ‘information keeping’ is

Decision-making and actions relating to the information item currently under consideration that impact the likelihood that the item will be found again later. Decisions can range from: (1) ‘ignore, this has no relevance to me’; (2) ‘ignore, I can get back to this later’ (by asking a friend, searching the Web, or some other act of finding) to purposive seeking of information as a consequence of a need to satisfy some goal; and/or (3) ‘keep this in a special place or way so that I can be sure to use this information later.’ (Jones & Teevan, 2007, p. 39)

Jones (2008) stated that people sometimes do not seek information intentionally, but instead they receive information unintentionally. If they feel that it is important, or they might need it in the future, they keep that information (advertisements are one example), and it will become part of their PSI. Goldstein (2011) calls this expected emotions, and it affects our
decision-making.

According to two studies conducted by Jones et al. (2001) and Jones et al. (2002), individuals have different keeping behaviors for information found on the web. Some find useful information and send it to themselves or save it in a document, whereas others print from the web the information they find interesting to them and keep it on a file with other related documents. It was also found in the same studies that instead of saving a URL or printing the Web page, some people tend to write down and important URL on a sticky note and place it on their computer monitor to remind themselves of it.

Decision-making is also involved in managing personal photo collections. According to Rodden and Wood (2003), photographers who took digital photographs had an advantage in seeing results which aided in making decisions about, for example, deleting, retaking, or keeping photographs before transferring the photographs to their personal computers.

Interacting with photographs, such as deleting unwanted photographs, is sometimes an activity done before or after uploading photographs to the personal computer or the Internet. According to a similar study conducted by Kirk et al. (2006), some participants evaluated their photos, as a pre-download step; this include alliterativeness before uploading photos to their personal computer and decisions to deleting them for many reasons such as technical elements that were part of ‘poor’ photos such as shaky and slightly or out-of-focus images. Some participants deleted unwanted photos due to the limited memory capacity of their devices. In the same study, it was shown that people who had enough memory storage capacity evaluated their photographs at a later stage and not immediately after taking them, while some other participants made decisions about transferring their photos at an earlier stage to avoid the time consuming
Rodden and Wood (2003) noted that participants made decisions in relation to their printed photographs regarding what to place in their photo albums and what to discard. Even though this task was considered a low priority to participants, they placed only the ‘good’ ones in photo albums, separating albums by events, and discarded what they considered “bad” or “boring” photographs. In addition, Whittaker (2013) stated that some people decided to delete some photos because they were technically poor or did not capture the object or event that they were targeting. He also stated that people tended to ignore the task of deleting photos because of the low cost of keeping them.

Individuals behave differently toward finding and then keeping information. These keeping methods influence our short-term and long-term memory. Moreover, some people may avoid making a decision due to the risk associated with it (Goldstein, 2011). According to Whittaker (2013), people need to have a vision of what information they will exploit; otherwise, they might be overwhelmed due to errors of keeping too information, which the author refers to as “over keeping--keeping things that are never accessed” (p.23). Whittaker (2013) also stated that decision-making regarding keeping information such as photographs is not an easy task for three reasons. First, it’s difficult to predict the future value of the information. Second, information needs sometimes change with time. Third, making decisions when the person is overloaded with information is sometimes risky and has consequences.

Thus, some people may keep all photos they take to avoid the regret of deleting a photo that they later needed. Everyone has the choice of making a decision either to toss the information item such as a photograph, or to keep it for later use. However, decision-making
alters how individuals interact with their personal photo collections.

Organizing Information

Organizing information is one of the activities in PIM that also involves cognitive processes such as making decisions about how to organize information items. According to Jones and Teevan (2007), “information organizing” is

Decision-making and actions relating to the selection and implementation of a scheme of organization and representation for a collection of information items. Decisions can include: (1) How should items in this collection be named? (2) What set of properties make sense for and help to distinguish the items in this collection? (3) How should items within this collection be grouped? Into piles or folders? (p. 39)

According to a study conducted by Park (2011), graduate students organize and maintain their electronic personal information for their academic projects. Organizing includes activities such as grouping related items; naming information items; and structuring folders by combining, expanding, and ordering information collections. On the other hand, maintaining information items include activities such as renaming, re-grouping, and deleting unwanted information items.

Emotional and Functional Use of Photographs

People use camera-phones more frequently to take photos without prior planning, than they do with their stand-alone or traditional cameras; with the latter people usually take photos for a specific occasion or event. As a result, participants take photographs using camera-phones to preserve an emotional aspect and for the functional purposes such as to record addresses and notes like shopping lists, or to locate where they have parked their car in a shopping center. In addition to using camera-phones to aid memory, individuals also take photographs using their camera-phones and share them with others for many reasons, for instance, to help them in their decision-making when buying a product or to share photographs for selling their own personal
products (Wilhelm et al., 2004; Hakkila et al., 2012).

Photographs as “Information-as-thing” and “Information as evidence”

“The organization of knowledge is more than the organization of documents and more than the organization of the evaluated and synthesized contents of documents; it is also the organization of knower” (Wilson, 1977, p. 34). A photograph is a form of message, data structured for communicating between the photographer and a viewer. Determining the function and attributes of the photograph may help in determining how we interact with our photographs and our personal photo collections. A significant difference between the bibliographic agency and the PIM system is that the user of the PIM system is in both the describer role and the seeker role, so differences in the vocabulary of the describer and the vocabulary of the user are greatly reduced. Also, since the maker of the PIM system knows both the data content of each message and the significance of external factors involved in making the message, when a conversation is taking place in which a photograph might be useful, the maker can put aside whatever description has been made earlier. This might even result in the adding of new descriptors.

PIM and Interaction with Photographic Images

Managing personal photo collections is one example of PIM. The developments and improvements of digital cameras and digital devices equipped with cameras have influenced people to shift from using their regular cameras to using digital technologies. As a result of this advancement, people started to have more photos than before (Gurrin et al., 2005; Hakkila et al., 2012; Kirk et al., 2006; Rodden & Wood, 2003; Wilhelm et al., 2004). Moreover, due to the increasing number of storage devices and the relatively low cost of these devices, many people carry their personal photo archives with them (Ames & Naaman, 2007; Gurrin et al., 2005).
Adults and children sometimes have boards in their bedrooms or living-rooms on which they pin pieces of paper: letters, snapshots, reproductions of paintings, newspaper cuttings, original drawings, postcards. One each board all the images belong to the same language and all are more or less equal within it, because they have been chosen in a highly personal way to match and express the experience of the room’s inhabitant. Logically, these boards should replace museums.

John Berger

With the variety of photo management software available, users have the ability to change the names of albums or folders as well as to change the names of the information items such as the names of photos, and to annotate photos when desired. According to a study conducted by Rodden and Wood (2003), some participants preferred to organize photos by folders and separated folders based on events, while others had no organization strategy for digital photographs and placed all photos of different events in one folder. In the same study, it was found that participants had rarely changed the names of their photos, while changing the names of folders/albums was more common. In addition, according to a study conducted by Park (2011), naming files and folders using a feature, such as topic, time, or people, is one of the organization practices that has been found to be useful by many users.

Photographs and Words

Words and photographs are very different sorts of messages. Words are not native elements of photographs (O’Connor and Wyatt, 2004, p. 105). This means describing photographs can be very different from describing the word documents that have been in the majority in libraries and other institutions. Since with photographs there are no formal grammar...
rules and no set of nouns to count or cluster, there is no simple way to say what a photograph is about. Also, since there are no words or word-like elements, there is no simple way to extract an element or set of elements that represent the document. For each viewer, looking at a photograph is a personal response to the data of the photograph. For a cataloger, the professional consequence of this difference in native elements is the strategy of describing a reaction about what seems to be the main topic; for any other viewer the consequence is the strategy of compiling a set of nouns, stories, associations, and even emotional reactions (O’Connor and Wyatt, 2004, p. 107). Words still work for describing some aspects of photographs and for describing questions, but new elements and new ways of describing now make it possible to describe photographs in different ways.

Annotating Photographic Images

The simple fact is that no organization has the memory of the image that the photographer who took it has.

Dirck Halstead

Annotating for personal use is different from annotating for the purpose of helping others to retrieve and use the information. Rodden and Wood (2003) stated that managing of personal photo collections is different from institutional descriptions of photographs. Institutions generally describe for general usage and often do not have access to the intentions of the photographer. In spite of that, Dirck Halstead sends his archive of the history he has recorded, including information and photographs, to the University of Texas, where his archive resides, every 18 months in order to make his photo collections available for the public and for future generations (Halstead, 2006).
Several researchers have stated that the function, stories, and memories attached to photographs can be generated by users and by the photographer who took them (O’Connor & O’Connor, 1999; Rodden & Wood, 2003). According to O’Connor and O’Connor (1999), the categorization of documents for the public can be improved through the use of functional descriptors generated by actual users. Functional descriptions include descriptors that are more than topic nouns, such as memories and feelings attached by users to photographs.

Naming, Labeling and Tagging Photographic Images

*A digital photo is more than just the image content; it is also the metadata the camera records, the metadata the photographer adds (for example, tags to identify the subject of the photo), and its membership in a set of photos the photographer has taken at the same event.*

Catherine C. Marshall

While Ames and Naaman (2007) stated that annotations such as tags, which are considered unstructured textual labels, are used not only for organization of personal photos, but also for communicating and sharing photographs with others through applications such as Flickr. Flickr enables a photographer to provide some context about a photo such as the name of people in the photo, or the location where the photo was taken, although that is not required. Annotations can play a crucial role in recall, searching, retrieval, and providing descriptive information that cannot be understood by just looking at the title or even the caption on photographs (Ames & Naaman, 2007; Marlow, Naaman, Boyd, & Davis, 2006).

Gurrin et al. (2005) note that the automatic labeling of photographs that can be generated by mobile devices that are equipped with technological functions such as geo-tagging, along with the actual time when the photograph was captured can enhance the annotation process.
Geographical data attached to photographs can provide data about the country, state, and city, as well as even more precise information of coordinates such as longitude and latitude; maps showing pins at each point where a photograph was taken can provide a visual interface to a collection. In addition, combining geographical data with the time when the photograph was taken can assist in generating daylight/darkness information (sunrise, sunset, dawn, and dusk), which can be generated from the multiple Internet weather stations, thus enabling users, for example, to access and browse personal digital photograph archives of a specific location. In a study conducted by Rodden and Wood (2003), participants stated that annotating the date was not necessary in digital photography because in each photo, the date was embedded automatically by digital cameras.

Photojournalists as Visual Producers and Describers

*I was once asked, on the National Press Photographers’ discussion list, what it was like to discover a two-year-old picture that would turn out to be the ‘picture of the week.’*

Dirck Halstead

Photojournalists and photo documentations have played a major role in the historical photo collections of several institutions. Lewis Hines and Carl Mydans are examples of photographers who have contributed to the wealth of photographic collections about Manchester, NH and many other cities in the United States of America. Professionals and non-professionals have produced photographic images that convey stories, and documented people such as in the documentation of child labor or an era such as the great depression. Those captured photographs, as parts of the personal collections of those photographers, have been archived in several institutions and have also been archived and used by individuals who have interest in their topics. Social media (SM)
have recently facilitated the keeping and sharing of those photographic images. As stated by Bruce, Jones, and Dumais (2005); Jones and Teevan (2007); and Jones (2010), the main objective of PIM is keeping and re-finding information when needed. Whittaker (2013) adds that “exploitation is the heart of curation practices” (p. 9).

Photography and photojournalism are no longer practiced exclusively by professionals and dedicated amateurs. Professionals, domain experts, and even ordinary users also participate in documenting places, covering events, and sharing those photographic images with others as tokens for conversations through not only magazines and newspapers, but also through SM. The sharing of photographic images, commenting, augmenting, gathering in new ways, and other new forms of “exploitation” have now become easily available to almost everybody.

Photography has become part of our daily life and work, and the advancement of technologies in cameras and other devices equipped with cameras has led people to take more photos of everything around them, see them right away, annotate the good ones, print some, and tag and share interesting or functional photographs for a specific purpose with others anytime they want at almost no cost (Ames & Naaman, 2007; Hakkila, Huhtala, Sarjaanoja, & Schmidt, 2012; Kirk et al., 2006).

Facebook as an Example of Informal Archive on the Web

_We mean by ‘provocation’ a stimulus, starting point for thought, less a set of answers than a set of threads of thought from which to weave appropriate systems of access and use._

Brian C. O'Connor & Roger B. Wyatt

Users of Facebook use the platform not only to keep, organize, and annotate their personal photo collections, but also to archive selective photos produced by them or by other
photographers by adding them to their personal page or album, or even by archiving those personal photographic images in a group to which they belong. Sharing interesting photographic images found on the web or from the photo collections of others with other group members plays a vital role in starting a conversation.

As stated by Jones (2008, 2010, 2012) and Jones and Teevan (2007), information can be personal, and information items can be made part of the individual’s PSI if the individual makes sense of the information items found or produced; further, it can be part of the individual’s PIC when the person has some control over it and organizes it in a way that makes sense to him/her. According to Jones (2010), “a PIC includes not only a set of information items, but also their organizing representations, including spatial layout, properties, and containing folders” (p. 47). Facebook and other SM sites and applications enable people to archive and share their personal information and documents; they are a sort of PIC.

Social Networks

A social network is one in which individuals are connected for a specific need or purpose (Farkas, 2007), or as Ryan (2011) noted: "a cluster of people connected for a specific reason” (p. 4). People build relationships with others through networks. Some of these relationships are temporary, and some last for a longer period of time. Relationships can be formed among family members, friends, and colleagues, and even with strangers. Some relationships can be established face-to-face, and some can be established online, and sometimes relationships can be established both ways. Social media enhances social networks by enabling members to share and exchange information, knowledge, and resources such as photographic collections among members rapidly and conveniently. According to Zhang (2010), the stronger the bond between
members of a social network, the more communication, collaboration, interaction, and sharing can be noticed.

Internet technologies, such as Web 2.0, have transformed communication, conversation, and collaboration among online users from a one-way communication and dissemination of information, as it used to be in Web 1.0, to a two-way collaborative effort. According to Farkas (2007), social networking sites have enabled people to connect not only with people whom they know, but also with people whom they know only online.

Terms, Definitions, and Applications

Barnes (1954), a social anthropologist, was notably among the first founders to coin the concept of “social networks.” Based on his anthropological study, he formed a theory called “social network theory,” which analyzed the social relationship between individuals in a network based on nodes and ties. Nodes in networks are the individual actors, whereas ties are the relationships between those actors in networks.

Zhang (2010) asserted that social science research had focused mainly on the behavior of individuals, thus it had neglected the social part of how individuals are structured in networks, their interaction, and how their behaviors influence each other. As a result, the science of social network analysis (SNA) was formed to study the nodes in a network and their interaction based on a structural approach, including studying the characteristics of nodes and the rational links among them (p. 4).

Hinds and Lee (2011) stated that social network theory is a subset of both computational and mathematical organization theory that has been known as social capital theory. Social capital theory holds that the whole group, and each individual within the group, has a capital
benefit from some of the social attributes (known as social capital) added in the network. The communication process that happens between individuals within a network can be beneficial in supporting learning, problem solving, decision-making, and task accomplishment at an individual and group level. In addition, individuals can take advantage of the flow of information, knowledge, and other resources among them (pp. 196-197).

Online social networks are empowered by social software, SM. Farkas (2007) noted that social software enables two-way communication that allows users to achieve three things: collaboration, sharing of information and knowledge, and building of online communities. Social software allows the syndication of web content that can be used, reused, and shared with others. In addition, social software tends to be an effective and supportive tool that enables people to share information and knowledge with others, crossing boundaries of distance and time (pp. 1-7).

Coates (2005), a technologist and early blogger in his personal blog Plasticbag.org, defined social software as “software which supports, extends, or derives added value from, human social behavior - message-boards, musical taste-sharing, photo-sharing, instant messaging, mailing lists, social networking.”

Describing Photographic Images

O’Connor, in O’Connor and Wyatt (2004), stated that “pictures are not words and words are not native elements of photographs. However, people routinely describe pictures with words” (p. 107). There is a difference between giving verbal description to a textual document and to a visual document such as a photographic image. An archivist or a librarian uses professional strategies to extract keywords from a textual document and then decide which
keywords would be appropriate for enabling retrieval. Giving verbal description as a reaction to a visual document is harder than it is in the case of a textual document. Unlike a textual document, there are no “native elements” that can be extracted from a photographic image (O’Connor & Wyatt, 2004, p. 107). In formal archival systems, an archivist or a librarian is restricted to the boundaries set by the rules and regulations they are expected to follow in regard to their professional strategies when they describe or assign keywords to a document, whether textual or visual. Those boundaries can be considered as limitations to visual document retrieval. If a user is searching for a visual document using a keyword for an object in a photographic image that is not listed in the description or in one of the keywords assigned by the archivist or librarian, the user will not be able to retrieve that visual document. Giving word tags to an archivists’ interpretation of what a picture is about can be a problem because there is no algorithmic relation between parts of a photograph and words. The traditional model of subject representation privileges the knowledge and authority of the archivist or the librarian, assuming their idiosyncratic verbal description will be appropriate for a patrons and their uses (O’Connor, 1996; O’Connor & Wyatt, 2004).

According to O’Connor in Gresisdorf and O’Connor (2008), descriptions of photographic images can be generated by answering two main questions: What does the individual see in the photograph in front of him/her? What does that photograph mean to him/her? Identifying elements in a photograph such as objects, people, or scenery is the answer to the first question. Second, external information about elements identified by the viewer enhance the meaning; these may be personal, historical, emotional, confusing, and even simply wrong.
The advancement of technology, SM, and social network sites and applications has given a knowledgeable social group of users’ self-privilege authority and power to give their verbal descriptions as reactions to photographic images with which they engage in their online conversations. SM users do not necessarily have professional license to describe, but their personal knowledge has given them the privilege to provide their real uses and their reactions as descriptions. Modeling the conversational use of images on SM sites is expected to complement and bridge the gap between ‘typical representation by agency’ and idiosyncratic descriptions and uses of conversants in a SM setting.

Pictorial Semiotics – ‘Studium’ and ‘Punctum’

We seem as a species to be driven by a desire to make meanings; above all, we are surely homo significans – meaning-makers. Distinctively, we make meanings through our creation and interpretation of ‘signs.’

Daniel Chandler

Several researchers have noted factors that influence our seeing (Berger, 1972; Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008). Berger (1972) noted that either what we believe or what we know has an impact on how we see things. Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) assert: “we don’t always know what we are seeing, but we always see what we know” (p. 145). Berger (1972) and Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) stated that looking and seeing are associated with each other; looking is a matter of choice, while seeing involves an extensive looking. According to Berger (1972), literature lacks the richness and preciseness which images can provide. O’Connor, in O’Connor and Wyatt (2004), calls this “richness and preciseness” “specificity” and “exquisite empiricism”; they then go on to distinguish between describing photographs with nouns for the objects seen.
and describing them with adjectives, including adjectival phrases, and stories for the reactions of individual viewers.

Ronald Barthes, in *Camera Lucida - Reflections on Photography*, makes a similar distinction, proposing two notions concerning looking at a photograph: “studium,” derived from Latin for “a busying one’s self about or application to a thing; assiduity, zeal, eagerness, fondness, inclination, desire, exertion, endeavor, study” and “punctum,” derived from Latin for “that which is pricked or pricked in, a point, small hole, puncture” (Lewis & Short, 1879). In other words, Barthes distinguishes the photograph from the photographer, and he distinguishes the photograph from the objects that were in front of the camera, thus making the viewing experience dependent on the viewer’s interaction with the photo. The studium is the decoding event dependent on shared codes; the punctum is that which pricks the individual viewer, causing an emotional impact (Barthes, 1981). The studium stands for the experience of viewing those photos that “the spectator” shows some inclination toward or analysis of and having a reaction such as the act of liking or disliking the photograph; the punctum stands for the experience where “the spectator” shows a loving or hateful reaction to the photo. The studium viewings involve those photographs that we naturally evaluate as “all right” (p. 27). The “spectator” may use the photograph for some purpose but is fairly likely to forget the photograph. The punctum viewings involve photographs that function as a “sting,” or a “speck, or a “cut” to the “spectator,” so recall happens more quickly, accurately, and vividly, and the small detail of a photograph could become the main subject. In some cases, the detail of the photograph “fills the whole picture” (p. 45). Barthes (1981) claimed about one of the photographs that he encountered, “this particular ‘punctum’ arouses great sympathy in me,
almost a kind of tenderness. Yet the ‘punctum’ shows no preference for morality or good taste: the ‘punctum’ can be ill-bred” (p. 43). A photograph’s punctum includes those photographs that prick and bruise, and those that create “a certain shock” in whoever sees them (p. 40).

Moreover, the punctum in a photograph makes “the object speaks, induces us, vaguely, to think” (p. 38).

**Meaning as “Thick Description” of Visual Art**

*A thick description goes beyond a simple narration that merely delineates the information (‘thin’ description), but explores the deeper and often hidden meanings behind the words, gestures, actions, and practices observed during the project. A thick description explores the possible meanings of a sign.*

Tim Sensing

Several researchers have indicated that photographs can have multiple meanings, and the process of interpreting, generating meanings, and providing image access points may be quite difficult (Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008; Layne, 2002; Tinkler, 2013). Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) noted that a photo may have “pheromones of meaning,” trails and clusters of meanings attributed by different users (p. 78). Both Greisdorf and O’Connor, 2008, and Layne (2002) note the importance of having several access points to images. Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) note that access points can increase accessibility of images since there is an increase in the number of images produced. Layne (2002) states that subject access to art images is sometimes complicated because it involves answering two main questions: “What is the subject of a work of art? How should that subject be described in order to provide access to it?” (p. 1). Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) note that one of the ways to achieve the maximum efficiency of image retrieval is through determining how to assign words effectively. This efficiency can be achieved only by
knowing just how it is that numerous people describe and assign meaning to the images they see. Tinkler (2013) asserts that “Audiences are not homogenous and individuals may see different things in the same photo” (p. 30), and a single image is likely to be “polysemic” (p. 27).

Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) and Tinkler (2013) stated that the presentation and structure of images influence how people engage with photographs and thus effect how people perceive and provide meaning for what they see. According to Tinkler (2013), materiality is an essential part in conceptualizing a photographic image of a two-dimensional object that portrays three-dimensional objects, which can be used in both social science and historical studies.

Several researchers have addressed the meaning and how it can be derived from the content of the image (Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008; Layne, 2002; Tinkler, 2013). Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) and Layne (2002) have emphasized the notion of “of-ness” and “about-ness” that are associated with describing work of art including photographs. Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) state that image’s “of-ness” depicts what people see clearly and definitely in an image, while “about-ness” is about concerns, or in other words, what is in the image, and what people relate to in this photographic image. Layne (2002) states that “of-ness” is the most noticeable aspects in the art work, while “about-ness” is associated with the interpretation and the representation of what is in the image and what the content of the image means to the viewer, which is less clearly perceived than “of-ness.”

Tinkler (2013), in Using Photographs in Social and Historical Research, suggests there are four approaches that produce the meaning of images. First, meaning can be constructed in a specific context from social places such as libraries, museums, archives, and newspapers; this is what Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) refer to as structuring images within a collection. In other
words, structure refers to “something whose parts relate to each other in some pattern of organization” (Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008, p. 71). Second, meaning can be derived from the interpretation of viewers who may provide different interpretations of the same sign, based on their experiences and interests. In social and historical studies, the focus of meaning should be based on the specific time when the photograph was taken, unless the researcher aimed to determine the meaning of the photograph at some other point of time, such as “how people today interpret this photo” (Tinkler, 2013, p. 30). Third, meaning can be derived from the photographer who captured an image. Fourth, meaning can be derived from the subjects pictured in the photograph.

**Access Points to Visual Arts**

_A picture may be worth a thousand words, but one hopes that the words themselves have value for the image seeker as well._

Christine L. Sundt

Descriptions of photographic images can be generated by analyzing the interactions and reactions of viewers with the photographic images they see. According to O’Connor and Wyatt (2004) and O’Connor, O’Connor, and Abbas (1999), functional descriptors can provide a richer palette of descriptions than can formal subject headings.

Several authors have mentioned that visual arts such as paintings and photographs can have multiple versions or copies for a single art work whether the work of art was tangible such as a painting or intangible such as a photograph of a painting or, in other words, an art image (Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008; Sundt, 2002).

O’Connor in Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) provides an example, the Mona Lisa by
Leonardo da Vinci in the Louvre Museum in Paris, France. On the World Wide Web there are thousands of copies duplicated from the original source, edited and cropped, or even photographs of the Mona Lisa taken by people. The resolution, color balance, and even how much of the original painting is included vary considerably.

Sundt (2002) provides another example, a painting titled *Lot and His Daughters* by Ozario Gentileschi. Sundt states that there were several images of the original *Lot and His Daughters* painted by the artist himself or perhaps by his students or other devoted artists and students. These paintings were exhibited in several collections such as the Gemaldegalerie in Berlin; Museo de Bellas Artes in Bilbao; Museo Thyssen-Bornemisza in Madrid; the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa; and the Paul Getty Museum in California. Some of the paintings have the same title, measurements and dimension, and similar dates; however, some of the paintings have noticeable differences between them such as the color of dresses in the painting, some missing objects in the background and foreground, and even the brightness, saturation, and contrast of colors between the paintings under the same title.

Even though a particular image may fill the need of a particular image seeker, it may be not fill the need of another image seeker (Greisdorf & O’Connor, 2008; Layne, 2002; Sundt, 2002). Greisdorf and O’Connor (2008) point out that while the making of the photography may be a unitary action with a single intended function, people other than the original photographer or even the original photographer at a different time might make a purposeful use of some photograph, and the use might or might not have some relation to the original intended function. Our premise is that every image that strikes a human eye has the potential for being useful. (p. 85)

Meaning derived from a reaction to seeing a reproduction of an image may be different from meaning derived from seeing the original subject. Berger (1972) asserts meaning can be different depending on whether one is seeing a ‘real’ object or seeing a reproduction of reality,
such as a painting or even a photograph of a painting. Berger argues that the meaning of a reproduction of an art piece can multiply and can diversify: “when the camera reproduces a painting, it destroys the uniqueness of its image. As a result, its meaning changes. Or, more exactly, its meaning multiplies and fragments into many meanings” (Berger, 1972, p. 19). As an example of a reproduction, Berger (1972) provides a version of “Venus and Mars” by Botticelli, cropped to become a portrait of a young woman.

According to O’Connor in O’Connor and Wyatt (2004), a photograph has two types of attributes, “diachronic” and “synchronic.” The “diachronic” attributes are those that do not change with time or viewer, such as the subject, the date taken, the place taken, and who made the image, while “synchronic” attributes are those that are subject to change with time or the viewer, such as judgment about appropriateness, whether soft focus is a good technique now, and whether the once fashionable clothes now look silly. In other words, the term “synchronic” could describe a “functional representation,” while “diachronic” could describe a “topical representation.” The synchronic view relates to what viewers can do with each photograph, how each works for them (p. 95).

The notions of diachronic and synchronic attributes, as well as functional and topical attributes, resemble Barthes’ (1982) notions of connotative and denotative messages. The denotative message is that which we factually see or that which existed in front of our eyes or through a camera lens that can be described literally; that is, that which is “at once visible and active,” (p. 198). The connotative message, which is derived from the denoted message, is what we describe and associate with things not seen in front of our eyes or through our lenses; that which might be called personal or subject. None of these pairs of terms describes absolute
boundaries between what is in front of the eye and what is a personal reaction; still, they may provide a useful model of what would be needed to present a useful thick description of a photograph or a need for a photograph.

One way to obtain meaning of photographic images is by engaging people in a conversation that interests them; this is referred to as “photo-interviewing”. Tinkler (2013) stated that there are at least two benefits from using photographs in “photo-interviewing,” also known as “photo-elicitation.” Social and historical studies use photographs with interviewees to engage people in conversation and generate all-inclusive data from photographs that are meaningful and relevant to the interviewees, such as personal photographs. As noted by O'Conner and Wyatt (2004), photographs can be used to provoke memories and stories by making sense of generated information. This can be achieved through “thinking in, with, and about photographs.”
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Introduction

*If a picture were worth one thousand words, which one thousand words would those be?*

Brian C. O'Connor & Roger B. Wyatt

The goal of this study is to understand how people describe photographs while using them in conversations on SM. An exploratory study of engagement and interaction with photographic images by members of a social network was conducted using a mixed-method content analysis. The primary focus was a set of conversations on Facebook, among members who share an interest in a particular geographical location – Manchester, New Hampshire; elements of interest were the sharing of photographs as conversational tokens, the number and roles of conversants, and the words and phrases used to describe photographs and their uses.

PIM and Content Analysis

“The development of methodologies especially suited to PIM is still in its infancy” (Jones, 2010, p.397). One way to better understand the PIM practices of members of an online community is through navigating and exploring real engagements and interactions of participants with their uploaded photographic images, together with the interactions engaged in by other members of the same group without interruption or guidelines. Content analysis serves as a useful initial research approach.

Content analysis is potentially one of the most important research techniques in the social sciences. The content analyst views data as representations not of physical events but of texts, images, and expressions that are created to be seen, read, interpreted, and acted on for their meanings, and must therefore be analyzed with such uses in mind. Analyzing
texts in the contexts of their uses distinguishes content analysis from other methods of inquiry. (Krippendorff, 2004, p. xiii)

Jones (2010) suggests ways of studying participants during their active practice of managing their personal information, since there is a significant likelihood that participants will rely on their memories in managing their personal information. Naumer and Fisher (2007) state that one of the ways to fully understand PIM behavior and an individual’s PIM style is through naturalistic approaches, including observation, and text analysis. Zhang & Wildemuth (2009) report that as in many other fields, researchers in library and information science (LIS) have adopted qualitative content analysis in their studies “to examine meanings, themes, and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text” (p. 308). Moreover, White and Marsh (2006) assert that content analysis is a flexible methodology that has been widely used in several fields, among them communication and library and information science (LIS).

Unit of Analysis

The central unit of analysis for this study of conversational use of photographic images was any conversation that initially started with a photographic image or included photographic images attached as part of the conversation. This also included photographic information, or “art information” as discussed by Layne (1994):

Both visual and textual, just as any apparently conveyed through images and through words, it may take the form of pictures, both still and moving, or of books, it may take the form of scripts. Art information includes representations of works of art and text about those works; it also encompasses, more broadly, any information that may be used in the creation of art works or in understanding or giving context to those works. Indeed, almost any information might at some time or another be considered ‘art information’: for example, an artist may find inspiration in music or in scientific phenomena, while an art historian, trying to understand the context of a work of art, may draw on sources in history or literature. (p. 24)
A second criterion was applied to the selection of conversations in order to make it possible to compare formal archival descriptions with the conversational descriptions in the Facebook conversations. The photographic images that were selected were historical images in the collections of the LC and MHA, and which were also in Facebook conversations participated in by the Community of Interest (CoI).

Library of Congress (LC)

Library of Congress (LC) has different types of collections including 14.4 million prints and photographs. The collections of visual images include rare and historical images. Patrons of the library can visit the LC building in Washington, DC, or can access online over one million digitized prints and photographs available through their Print & Photographs Online Catalog at http://www.loc.gov/pictures/ (“Fascinating facts,” 2015).

Figure 3.1 is a screenshot of the list of terms that were returned as a result of searching for “Manchester” with the LC search function. Some are related to Manchester, NH, and some are not (such as Manchester, Connecticut; Manchester Essex; Manchester Essex County; and Manchester Street).
Figure 3.1. Screen capture of the list of terms associated with Manchester on Library of Congress online catalog.

Table 3.1 presents the total number of prints and photographs returned by the LC search function that were related to Manchester, NH.

Table 3.1

Number of Visual Documents Per Search Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search Term(s)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester New Hampshire</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester NH</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester N H &amp; Manchester N. H.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manchester Historic Association (MHA)

Manchester Historic Association (MHA) focuses on collecting, displaying, and interpreting historical artifacts from Manchester, New Hampshire. The MHA was established in 1896 with a variety of collections from times ranging from that of the native peoples, to that of the earliest settlers, to the present time; these include a large number of photographic images, books, and other materials. There are over 7,500 photographic images available through their online catalog returned for the keyword “Manchester.” Figure 3.2 presents a screenshot of the keyword search page on the Online Library & Photograph Catalog of MHA, which is available at http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=ks

![Screen capture of the keyword search page on the Online Library & Photograph Catalog of Manchester Historic Association.](image)

*Figure 3.2. Screen capture of the keyword search page on the Online Library & Photograph Catalog of Manchester Historic Association.*
The Sample

From the Manchester, NH Facebook group, 38 conversations featuring photographic information and 39 photographic images were selected; one of the conversations involved two images. Those 38 conversations were accompanied by 277 comments. The conversations and photographic images included posts concerning objects, events, people, and places in Manchester, NH. The sample was selected from a set of 65 conversations that took place between December 2015 and May 2016.

Some of the conversations that were selected originated from the same person, while the content in those posts was different. Some of the conversations that started with an image did not contain any photographic information; others contained information that ranging from public knowledge to personal knowledge, sometimes including very detailed information not available through the descriptors applied by LC or MHA. Some of those conversations that contained little or no information generated several comments. Some similar photographs appeared several times with little or no interaction.

Sampling in Research

Several researchers have indicated the notion of “saturation” in data collection as a primary goal for qualitative studies (Marshall, Cardon, Poddar, & Fontenot, 2013; Mason, 2010). The main goal for such research is not to generalize results, but to draw meaning from the qualitative data.

Marshall et al. (2013) conducted a study on 83 qualitative research studies in several Information System (IS) journals and found that there was no consistency among the sample sizes or sampling methods used. Elo et al. (2014) and Sandelowski (2000) mentioned purposive
sampling as one of the methods that is used frequently in content analysis. Sandelowski (2000) states: “in any qualitative study, the ultimate goal of purposeful sampling is to obtain cases deemed information-rich for the purposes of study. The obligation of researchers is to defend their sampling strategies as reasonable for their purposes” (p. 338).

The Community of Interest (CoI) as Study Participants

The Manchester, NH group on Facebook had approximately 2,700 members at the time observation began in April 2015; new members joined on a regular basis. Some of the members knew each other personally and communicated both face-to-face and online, while others communicated only on Facebook. Some of the members had known each other several years earlier, had lost touch with one another, and had reconnected on Facebook even if they now lived in different parts of the country. Some of the members indicated having a stronger or renewed interaction with each other due to the conversational use of photographic images in Facebook conversations. Frequently people indicated that engaging and interacting with each other were the value and saturation of engaging with the contents, whether visual, textual, or semi-textual, provided by members of the community.

Members of the Manchester, NH CoI were currently living in that city, or had been born or raised there, or had relatives or friends from that city. According to Henri & Pdelko (2003):

A community of interest is a gathering of people assembled around a topic of common interest. Its members take part in the community to exchange information, to obtain answers to personal questions or problems, to improve their understanding of a subject, to share common passions or to play. Their synergy cannot be assimilated into that of a formal group motivated by a common goal. (p. 478)

Wenger (2004) provided a clear definition of communities of practice (CoPs), which have three characteristics that distinguish them from other types of networks and groups: domain, community, and practice. “Communities of practice are groups of people who share a passion
for something that they know how to do, and who interact regularly in order to learn how to do it better” (Wenger, 2004, p. 2).

The Manchester, NH group on Facebook included not only members of a CoI, but also members of a CoP. Members are knowledgeable in different fields, either because of their profession or because of their deep personal interest and study. Trust in the information, knowledge, and experience provided by members contributed to the regular interaction around photographic images. Some members shared personal photographs they had taken or had gathered from their relatives and friends. Some also gathered photographs from external sources, such as websites, blogs, wikis, and academic and public institutions, including LC and MHA. Some of these external images were gathered during searches related to personal interests and then are shared if the member thought the group might be interested or if the member needed help in understanding the image; some of the external images were gathered specifically to contribute to an existing conversation.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

Content analysis of 38 Facebook conversations, in Appendix B, containing photographs, in Appendix A, provided results to be used for refining the preliminary model of description and conversational use of historic photographs (Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1. Preliminary model of relationships between group members and photographs.
Participants

Those members of the Facebook group on Manchester are in two major groups that can be labeled “engagement” and “interaction.” The definitions of these words in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) seem similar, but the differences are important to modeling the participants. The definition of engage is “To entangle, involve, commit, mix up (in an undertaking, quarrel, etc.)” (“Engage,” n.d.), while the definition of interact is “To act reciprocally, to act on each other” (“Interact,” n.d.). Both words indicate having a significant commitment; engagement could be accomplished alone, while interaction, in the case of modeling a Facebook group means doing something with other users. The focus of interaction, in a conversation, is on the reciprocity between users through describing and commenting on photographic images, not just the involvement in the act of viewing or liking an image, description, or a comment. The same person could be just engaged at one time and interacting at another time.

Participants in the conversations on Facebook had three sorts of roles: those of uploaders, commenters, and spectators. In the conversations with photographs as tokens, the uploaders were those who posted a photograph to the group; the commenters were those who reacted to the initial photograph with text, or a photograph, or a link to another source; the spectators were those who simply viewed the photograph and subsequent comments and, perhaps, clicked a “like” button. The participants consisted of 112 members of the Manchester, NH group on Facebook. In the 38 conversations, in Appendix B, there were two uploaders; there were 106 commenters, and four of these members had overlapping roles as both uploaders and commenters.
Actors as Participants

In the conversational use of photographs on Facebook, there are four roles that any participant can play: those of content providers, content consumers, content seekers, and content spectators. An actor can initiate a conversation as well as engage and interact with other members and with the photographic contents; an actor might join into an initiated conversation; or an actor might simply be present. An actor’s role can be identified by his/her place on the timeline of the conversation and by what, if anything, has been uploaded, asked for, or given as a response. In any one conversation, an actor can play multiple roles, such as content provider and content seeker. For example, a person who uploads a photographic image, may include some information, and at the same time seek information by asking a question, such as “does anybody know where this is?”

The Content Provider

A content provider is a member who provides the textual content, the semi-textual content and/or the photographic images. Content can be provided both from the uploader side and from the commenter side. Provided content could include content that members did not know about or content that reminded members of some aspect of life in Manchester through photographic information and photographic images of Manchester, NH.

The Content Consumer

A content consumer can be any member who uses either photographic information or photographic images provided by others. For this analysis, the consumption could include that of photographic information or photographic images from other sources such as from the LC or the MHA. All the conversations in the sample were initiated by actors who were content
consumer of LC & MHA photographic information and images.

*The Content Seeker*

A content seeker is a member who seeks photographic information and photographic images from other members in the community. For example, “Does anyone have a picture of Pine Island Park? Why are there train tracks near where Mammoth Mills used to be? Are there any pictures of Wilson School where the play area was dirt?”

*Figure 4.2*. Engagement by spectators: “likes” on posts (blue), and “likes” on comments (green).
The Content Spectator

“We only see what we look at. To look is an act of choice. As a result of this act, what we see is brought within our reach - though not necessarily within arm’s reach” (Berger, 1972, p. 8). A content spectator is any member of the community who visually engages and interacts or who only engages, but does not necessarily interact. The majority of members in the current study engaged more with the 38 posts than with the total of 277 comments (as illustrated in Figure 4.2).

Conversational Use of Photographic Images

*Images can induce pheromones of meaning that extend beyond language for laying down a path to collection structure and access to images within that structure, then we can suggest better ways for structuring such collections.*

Howard F. Greisdorf & Brian C. O’Connor

The following paragraphs are analysis to answer research question 1: How do members of the Manchester, NH group on Facebook describe the photographic images they have posted? Conversations that appear in this chapter were organized based on the the conversations on Facebook in Appendix B and the photographic images that appear on LC and MHA in Appendix A.

Personal Engagement (PE)

The 38 conversations contained 39 photographic images retrieved from public collections (the LC and the MHA). Fifty-nine percent of the photographic images posted were from the LC, while 41% of the photographic images were from the MHA. When the content in the titles and descriptions posted by members on Facebook was compared against the titles and descriptions of
the same photographic images on the websites of the LC and the MHA, it was found that 77% of the photographic descriptive material was derived from formal, professional practice (in the LC and the MHA), while 23% was from the personal knowledge of the Facebook group members.

In the descriptions from both the formal institutions and group members, the terms mills, millyard, and Amoskeag appear frequently; these are terms relating to the primary industry in the city, the Amoskeag textile manufacturing company. Seventy-four percent of the conversations included the year as part of the title/description, while only 26% of the conversations did not have the year in their title/description. This indicated the importance of the year of publication of the document (such as the photographic image) in the title/description. One uploader, in conversation number one, included the name of the photographer, which was also from the LC. An uploader in conversation number seven, instead of using “cigar,” which appeared in the LC description, used a synonym, “tobacco.” An uploader in conversation number 13 provided information that was not attached to the photograph on the LC website, “10 years old at the Millyard.” Another uploader, in conversation number 14, which included no title or description from the LC, provided detailed information: “1936 / French section / Amoskeag Note* nuns & the smoke stack?” An uploader in conversation 15 provided information that did not appear in the LC description: “The biggest US flag made by the workers of the Amoskeag mills!” Another specific detail was found in conversation number 37, where the uploader gave the location of the photographic image “Rear of Amoskeag houses off Payson Street ….” Another uploader sought input from other members for the street or neighborhood location of an image that was not available in the description from the MHA. Another uploader, in conversation number 23, uploaded two photographic images from the MHA and wrote as the title/description “before and
after.”

Several photographs in the sampled conversations from the Manchester, NH Facebook group were posted more than once. Some of the photographs were identical, some of them were related, and some did not have any interrelationship (as shown in Table 4.1).

Some of the conversations started with some text, a number, or even a punctuation mark that played a role, perhaps, in provoking a conversation. Examples of this included conversations such as number 2 “guess...................1936”; conversation number 9 “????”; conversation number 23 “before & after”; and conversation number 33 “self explanatory.” Some other conversations, such as conversation number 22 “😊,” contained a photographic image with only an emoticon.
Table 4.1

*Duplicated Photographic Images in Conversations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Duplicate</th>
<th>Related</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure A.7.1</td>
<td>Figure A.20</td>
<td>Figure A.1</td>
<td>Figures A.7.1 and A.20 share the same LC ID: LC-USF33-000906-M2 [P&amp;P]; image A.1 has preceding: LC-USF33-000906-M1 [P&amp;P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure A.5</td>
<td>Figure A.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures A.5 and A.13 share same LC ID: Call Number: LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0748-A [P&amp;P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure A.9</td>
<td>Figure A.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures A.9 and A.15 share same LC ID: Call Number: Illus. in G1.N27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure A.12</td>
<td>Figure A.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures A.12 and A.24 share the same MHA ID: Catalog Number: 1978-049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure A.22</td>
<td>Figure A.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Figures A.22 and A.25 share the same MHA ID: Catalog Number: 1971.135.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personal and Social Engagement and Interaction (PSEI)

When looking at an image, the viewer is experiencing levels of engagement that we posit as a four-step process of appearance that includes attention, interest, involvement, and attitude.

Howard F. Greisdorf & Brian C. O’Connor

The following paragraphs are analysis relating to research questions 2 and 2A: How do members of the Manchester, NH group on Facebook engage and interact with photographic images posted by other members? What forms of conversations emerged from members interacting with photographs posted by themselves and by others?

Members of a community of interest (CoI) such as the Manchester, NH group on Facebook engage and interact with posts and their comments. The total number of likes for the 38 conversations, including posts and their comments, was 803, representing 74% of the registered reactions following the posts, while the total number of comments for the 38 conversations was 277, representing 26%.

In order to make sense of the conversations and the personal and social engagement and interaction, the researcher created a matrix of engagement and interaction based on the total average of likes and the total average of comments. The matrix consisted of four parts: Box (A), (B), (C), and (D) (as shown in Table 4.2).
Table 4.2

The Engagement / Interaction Matrix (E/I Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement (E)</th>
<th>Interaction (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>Low (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>HE / HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE / LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (L)</td>
<td>LE / HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LE / LI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The median of likes for posts and comments was 21, while the median of comments was seven. If the number for engagement was at or above the median, the post was considered High Engagement (HE) and if the number for interaction was at or above the median, the post was considered High Interaction (HI); similarly, if the number for engagement was below the median, then it was considered as Low Engagement (LE), and if the number for interaction was below the median it was considered Low Interaction (LI). Fifteen conversations (39%) were in the LE/LI cell; 10 conversations (26%) were in the HE/HI cell; 8 conversations (24%) were in the HE/LI cell; and 4 conversations (11%) were in the LE/HI cell (as shown in Table 4.3). The values in the cells of the matrix are not intended to represent the quality or the significance of any of the conversations; rather, they simply give an indication of levels of engagement and interaction.
Table 4.3

*The Engagement / Interaction Matrix (E/I Matrix) for the Manchester, NH Group on Facebook*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement (E)</th>
<th>Interaction (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High (H)</td>
<td>(A) 1, 7, 9, 14, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (L)</td>
<td>(C) 3, 4, 6, 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of likes or comments on a conversation is not necessarily a measure of how important that conversation was to any particular user; for example, conversation number 26 is tagged as “low interaction,” but it provides data deeper than the formal description and presents a narrative that might be very useful:

I believe Webster Restaurant is the first sign on the leg. Busy Bee Restaurant & the Webster Restaurant were pretty close to each other on Elm St. The Albanian Family that owned the Busy Bee eventually move their restaurant near the Palace Theater in the 60's and renamed it the Candle Light. The Webster owned by a Greek Family closed permanently.

Conversation number 9 was in the cell for High Engagement / High Interaction (HE/HI), while the same image, posted on another day, was in the cell for Low Engagement / Low Interaction.

Measurement of the interaction by comments per day for the 277 comments in the 38
conversations showed that most of the comments were posted on Wednesday, while the lowest number of posted comments was on Friday. Two hundred and four comments (74%) were posted on Monday through Friday; while 73 comments (26%) were posted on Saturday and Sunday (as illustrated in Figure 4.3). By itself, this finding is not especially useful for modeling conversation activity; however, it might be of use in future research.

Figure 4.3. Comments (interactions) per day

More useful for modeling the conversations is the finding that 72% of the comments were posted within 24 hours of the original upload, while 21% of the comments were posted between 24 and 48 hours after the original upload, and only 7% of the comments were posted more than
48 hours after the original upload (as shown in Table 4.4). This distribution of more frequent comments shortly after the original posting is somewhat characteristic of what might be expected of a normal face-to-face conversation, and this may suggest that, although the conversation space is digital, the participants are physically separated, and the data do not normally disappear, the conventions of face-to-face conversations are still a strong influence. The conversations in such a Facebook group result in the formation of an archive of the group’s interests and concerns at the same time as it works as a shared conversation space.

Table 4.4

*Timing Intervals for Comments (Interactions)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval (hours:minutes)</th>
<th>Conversation No.</th>
<th>Conversations per interval</th>
<th>Percentage per interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00 - 05:59</td>
<td>2, 3, 7, 8, 11, 18, 21, 33, 35, 36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:00 - 11:59</td>
<td>9, 10, 13, 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 23:59</td>
<td>4, 6, 12, 14, 16, 31, 38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:00 - 47:59</td>
<td>1, 22, 24, 27, 28, 32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:00+</td>
<td>30, 37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Posts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine conversations did not have any interaction: numbers 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 29, and 34. The total percentage showing participation in the form of comments was 76%, while the total
percentage not showing participation in the form of comments was 24%. Possible reasons why some of the conversations did not have any interaction include the following: members were not interested in the photographic image posted, especially when the same image appeared several times, or when related images were posted in the same day; it may have been that nobody who was online within the usual one-day or two-day widow for comments had any interest in the topic; and the image may have been posted and discussed before the current poster joined the group.

Some of the conversations did not have any text accompanying the initial upload. For example, conversation number 35 began with the posting of a photographic image with no content; however, the photographic image by itself was a token of sufficient interest to start a conversation. Members sought ‘challenging information’ in ways such as asking about the geographical location “Where was this?”; while others started to provide “supplementary information” such as “Looks like the corner or chestnut and Manchester”; while another commenter provided “validated information” “[yes, that is] Chestnut and Manchester”.

Conversational Container of Contents (CCC): Types of Comments

The 38 conversations, in the CCC, generated multiple comments about their textual, semi-textual, and visual content. There were three types of comments in conversations relating to the conversational use of photographic images on Facebook. The 277 comments contained the following kinds of contents:

1) Content “About” the photographic image or the photographic information;
2) Content “Related” to the photographic image or the photographic information; and
3) Content “Redirected” from the photographic image or the photographic information
“About” the Content

One conversation can have several types of comment. Several comments were directly “about” the photographic images or the photographic information uploaded by uploaders. This include any comments of what viewers see, think of, or remember.

“Related” to the Content

Comments that were “related” to the photographic images or the photographic information included comments that were indirectly associated with the photographic image or the photographic information. This was the case, for example, when a commenter uploaded a similar photographic image such as, in conversation number 7, the photographic image of “Eagle Fruit”; in conversation number 32, “After the store…,” a cropped photographic image from the uploaded photographic image such as in conversation number 14 “I blew a part of the house up in this photo …”; or a screenshot taken from Google Earth or Google Map such as in conversation number 3, “Google Image Could be ? …”; conversation number 31 “My take would be Stark Street …” and “Those bridges are no longer there …”; and in conversation number 8 “only had to have been alive in the 70s, …”.

Additional examples of “related” comments included in conversation number 2, “They used to let Woolco burn all sensitive documents in there …”; in conversation number 3, “Looks like the old Supreme Roast Beef!” and “I also remember hot dogs in beer?”; in conversation number 4, “Upstairs was Western Electric, I think …”; and, in conversation number 6, “Looks like Superman! …”.

“Redirected” from the Content

Comments that were “redirected” from the photographic images or the photographic
information included comments that had no direct or indirect connection with the provided content. For example, in conversation number 3, “Did people ever call you Kat?”; in conversation number 4, “His daughter and I went skiing together …”, and “We moved to Manchester in 1956”; in conversation 10, “The Flood of ’36 happened months later …”; and in conversation number 37, “Indian Head Shoe used to be on the fifth floor of 7204 cigar.”

Conversational Container of Contents (CCC): Categories of Contents

There were 12 categories that emerged, in the CCC, from the conversational use of photographic images in the Manchester, NH group on Facebook.

Informative

This category is comprised of three types of providing of information: “initial,” “supplementary,” and “revising and auditing.”

First, the provided information, as in a description of a photograph or a comment, in a conversation can be “initial” or new information when the visual document provides little or no photographic information in the formal title/description of the image, as in the photographic images in Appendix A, Figure A.6, Figure A.7.2, Figure A.14, and even in Figure A.27, in which the title/description contained general information such as “Manchester, New Hampshire.” Any information provided by the uploader or by the commenters can be considered ‘initial’ information. For example, this occurs in conversation number 6: “Selling papers on the corner of Hanover and Elm?”, and “The most popular corner of the city”; or in the title/description of the uploaded content for conversation number 14: “1936 / French section / Amoskeag Note* nuns & the smoke stack? ….” Even the information in the other categories assigned to conversation number 27 can considered “initial” and even “related” to the photographic image
Second, the provided information can be “supplementary” or “secondary” when there is a title/description in the formal cataloging, but the information provided by the uploader or commenters provides details or reactions. For example, in conversation number 1, “It’s a female Indian!”; in conversation 2, “Looks like a Sterling truck … chain drive”; in conversation 3, “Also notice the cobble stone pavement” and “both cars in the photo are from the 40’s”; in conversation 6, “I keep looking for my relatives in those photos”; in conversation 8, “Seven-twenty-four”; in conversation number 9, “Largest American Flag ever made”; and in conversation number 10, “Panama hats…” It is important to say here that not all the supplementary data will be of the kind one expects from a formal source and might even require insider knowledge or some explanation from the commenter. For example, “It’s a female Indian” is not actually technically correct; the commenter is either being humorous because of the skirt-like clothing, or is, perhaps, simply incorrect.

Third, the provided information can be “revising and auditing” when a member of the conversation corrects an apparent error or confirms that what looks like an error is actually correct. Members of the community who are knowledgeable about their city do the revising and auditing. For example, this happens in conversation number 4, “… We both know that LeMay’s was a jeweler”; in conversation 14, “No….it is not St Patrick’s church and school…”; and in conversation number 36, “YES A BANK AT ONE TIME.” Those are some examples of knowledgeable members validating information provided by other members. There was no imposed authority, just knowledge acknowledged by members of the community.
Inquiry

Some members would seek information in their posts, and even in their comments. The primary type of information that members sought was the geographical location of the photographic image and whether a place such as a building or a monument is still there or not. This happens, for example, in conversation number 6, “Was Mike the little old man who said, ‘Read a Paper-Leader?’ …”; in conversation 7, “Was the Indian still around in the late 60s …?”; in conversation number 8, “I wonder if it is still there?”; and in conversation 14, “… Isn’t it St. Patrick’s church & school?”

Mentioning

There were two types of mentioning in comments. The first type was mentioning others as a reply to their comment or as a way to provide additional information or seek detailed information. Some commenters included the symbol “@” before the name to notify the intended recipient of the comment, while others just mentioned the name of the member whom they wanted to reply to their comment. The second type was mentioning others who might be interested in the conversation, or who were knowledgeable about a specific subject. Examples of mentioning other members who were considered subject experts included the following: in conversation 3, “Al … ! Just a point of reference! At first it looked like it was north of Auburn Street!”; in conversation 30, “@Andy … is that the Fox??” -- “Andy” replied, “Yea it is Dave … that would be one of the bigger pumps too. look and the longer hood than the one we have back now. If I remember correct that would be a 1250 GPM pump powered by a straight 6 motor”; in conversation 30, one member mentioned another “Jon …,” and that person replied with “In the old days, the doors and bay space were sized to suit horse drawn equipment … I just saw a pic of
a ‘6000’ gpm pumper posted the other day. But, try feeding it and then moving that water. How times are changing.” In another case, one member in conversation 32 mentioned another “invisible member” or “invisible spectator,” “@Shirley …, did you live in that building to the right?” but that person did not engage nor interact in the conversation.

Examples of mentioning the source of reference include, in conversation 3, “…FYI description is from MHA…”; in conversation 4, “… this is all from MHA, not me!”; and in conversation 26, “This photo is from the Library of Congress.” Some members or their relatives could be identified as sources of information that could provide valuable information. For example, in conversation 12, one member said, “I shot 8mm film of the demolition.”; in conversation 16, one member said, “father in law was good friends with the owner.”; in conversation 24, “… My dad was president of the national bank!”; in conversation 25, “My grandpa’s worked at Leavitt’s”; in conversation 28, “Just heard from someone in Weare who said Fern had a beauty salon at the Corner of 144 and Riverdale Rd. in Weare.”

Members interacted with other members by replying to their comments. Some members sought other members for additional information, and some members or their relatives had a wealth of information about the photographic images that appeared in the 38 conversations. Some members mentioned others, and some of those who were mentioned became engaged and interacted by replying back, while others just became “spectators.” Much of what appears in the category of narrative includes personal experience with the objects, events, and people that appear in the photographs.
Location

Several posts and comments in the 38 conversations included either the providing of a geographical location, seeking of a geographical location, or validating of a geographical location in the narrative. Some of the geographical locations provided were very specific, such as in conversation 1, “Granite st then on Elm”; in conversation 3 a member provided a specific location of stores on Elm Street based on the photographic image he/she saw, “Old Pete Forest Harley dealer, then Manchester Tire & Battery Tydol station”; in conversation 7, “… the corner of bridge and elm st”; in conversation 14, “The school yard was between the church and Wayne Street on the right in this picture.”; in conversation 31, “Stark St. Entrance”; and in conversation 32, “Parking lot at Cypress and Massabesic Streets.” Some of the members were sure about the geographical location or the location of the subjects that appeared in the photographic images, while other were not sure and needed validation from other members.

Emotion and Emotional Icons

Several comments included expressions of positive and negative emotions towards the historical photographic images that appeared in the 38 conversations including the photographic images that appeared as comments. Positive comments included words that appeared in different conversations such as “wow,” “cool,” “cute,” “beautiful,” “love it,” and “great photo.” There were also some emotional reactions to what appeared in those historical photographic images, such as, in conversation 6, “Look how neat & tidy it is” and “good memories”; in conversation 7, “I would love to go back to maybe early 1900's just to see the beautiful mansions in our city”; in conversation 8, “proud to be American!!”; in conversation 9, “Stylish at the time…”; in conversation 10, “pretty dressed up for mill workers”; in conversation 11, “I love how the
buildings look new,” “the photo resolution for them times is impressive,” and “great memories … thank you!”; in conversation 14, “love the prices” and “That is an awesome picture!”; in conversation 27, “love his shoes,” “nice knickers,” and “love the knickers on the gentlemen”; in conversation 28, “wow, that is a garage door?”; and in conversation 33 “what a wonderful store”.

Some of the expressed emotions were negative, such as, in conversation 12, “What a loss” and “… It was a shame to have it torn down”; in conversation 13, “sad child labor! I hate to think of the abuse these kids suffered besides being overworked & underpaid!”; in conversation 19, “I don’t like the idea of the gates”; in conversation 22, “I still miss the red neon Amoskeag sign, lit at night!”; and in conversation 24, “what a shame,” “shame on Amoskeag bank and their narrow mindedness …,” and “Manchester lacks foresight. Its an ongoing problem that affects all of the residents.”

Some of the historical photographic images brought two different emotions. One was attached to the old memories, while the other emotion was related to the current state of mind toward what the viewer saw in the photographic image. Usually with the historical photographic images on the Manchester, NH group on Facebook, the opposition was old positive memory vs. current negative reaction. Emotions were also presented visually through emotional icons like emoticons. Some of the examples that appeared on posts and comments included “😀,” ”😊,” ”😍,” ”😎,” and “😉.” Members used several different emoticons to represent their emotions toward what they saw as part of the conversation about the photographic images.

**Internet Slang, Slogans, Abbreviations, and Idioms**

Several examples of Internet slang, slogans, abbreviations, and idioms were used in the
conversations about the photographic images, including examples like “LOL,” “FYI,” “O.M.G.,” “TY,” “IDK,” WOW,” “those colors don’t run,” and “Trashy but Classy.” Like emotional icons, Internet slang, slogans, abbreviations, and idioms were also used as part of the conversations about the photographic images.

*Narratives and Personal Experience*

One of the most significant categories in the conversational use of historical photographic images in the Manchester, NH group on Facebook was the narratives and personal experience communicated by members of the community or their relatives and friends, perhaps along with little stories that they knew and wanted to share with other members. For example, in conversation 2, “my dad used to have one”; in conversation 4, “His daughter and I went skiing together,...best friends,” and “My father worked upstairs”; in conversation 6, “Mike .... was always on Elm St. in the' 60's when I was at Central,” “… Had no wallet, Roll of money in his stockens,” and “I heard he was rich as can be!”; in conversation 7, “My mom said this was on the corner of bridge and elm st,” ”She is 95 ...,” “… she remembers a man named Bernie who worked there,” ”my Dad used to stop there for his newspaper, of course smokes, and always a treat for me and my sister...,” and ”My mother took me there to buy cigars for my father for Christmas”; and “Saw that photo on a wall in Denny's in CA a couple years ago. Asked our young waiter if he knew where it was taken and why. He didn't so we told him. He found the story interesting and promised to share it with the rest of the staff”; in conversation 14, “I remember the fire escapes on the sides of the school when I attended school there. The girls always went down first”; in conversation 22, “Remember the Christmas Clubs. Add to it on Thursday pay day. Was nice to have that cash to spend in shops on our Elm St. Down town”; in
conversation 26, “... Busy Bee Restaurant & the Webster Restaurant were pretty close to each other on Elm St. The Albanian Family that owned the Busy Bee eventually move their restaurant near the Palace Theater in the 60's and renamed it the Candle Light. The Webster owned by a Greek Family closed permanently”; in conversation 33, “Hey my mom owned that building for a while...and the furniture store on the bottom.... ‘The Furniture Den’ ..”; and in conversation 34, “where my grandmother, Mary …. worked.”

Members who shared the interest of a specific geographical location shared many little stories that were associated with the photographic images that appeared in the conversations. Comments that included narratives and personal experience also appeared in several categories, especially in the “mentioning” category as sources of reference and in the “emotional” category. A photographic image played a role, as a token, in engaging members in a conversation. Those photographic images evoked memories such as emotions, narratives, and personal experience of commenters and the people they knew.

Image Editing

Several conversations included “related” images that were uploaded by either an uploader or a commenter. Some members cropped an image posted by others just to focus on an area in order to have a conversation about it. For example, in conversation 14, “I blew a part of the house up in this photo / click photo below”; in conversation 38, one member provided a recent image similar to the one uploaded, highlighted some areas, and provided some detailed information such as names of streets, names of places, and their precise locations on the image using different colors and arrows. Consequently, a reproduction, as well as making its own references to the image of its original, became itself the reference point for other images. The
meaning of an image was changed according to what people saw immediately beside it or what came immediately after it. “Such authority as it retains, is distributed over the whole context in which it appears” (Berger, 1972, p. 29).

Summary

“The biggest” and “workers of the Amoskeag mills” were two suggested subject headings for those who had a specific need for a photographic image such as in conversation 9. Also, it was noted that in conversation 10, the uploader mentioned, LC, the source of the public collection of the photographic image. Even though this might not have been beneficial, organizing or putting together two photographic images, such as in conversation 23. It might have helped archivists and information specialists at MHA to use appropriate terms or subject headings, and maybe to look at information provided by commenters from both photographic images. According to Greisdorf & O’Connor (2008), “It might seem that image creators, collectors, and viewers should be put on an equal footing to have a strong foundation to support an image collection” (p. 91).

The preliminary model of conversational use of photographic images on SM (see Figure 4.1) about a Facebook group can be elaborated here with the specification of types of comments, additional categories of contents, and information that were detected in the Manchester group. The final version of the model (see Figure 5.1), some thoughts on what emerged from the research, and some suggestions for what might follow are presented in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, PRESENTED MODEL, AND FUTURE STUDY

Summary of Findings

Unless, then, indexing is done specifically for me, and on the basis of intimate knowledge of my interests and requirements, it is likely that I shall always have to engage in exploration, in searching, for the things that are most important to me. Indeed, in any but the hypothetically completely exhaustive "concept bibliography," we may find it necessary to explore, or search, for things which have not been collected or arranged or identified in a fashion that suits our purpose.

Patrick G. Wilson

In this quotation, Wilson provides a summary of the findings of the current study. The photographs from formal archives that were used in conversations on the Facebook group about Manchester, NH were described by the archives mostly with nouns and metadata about the making of the photograph, such as the name of the photographer, the date, and the place. The Facebook conversations generated more detailed descriptions and descriptions of many kinds.

Members of the Manchester community of interest (CoI) used both personal and public knowledge and image collections as conversational tokens in the SM conversations. Members were participating socially as actors in "providing," "consuming," and "seeking" content from other members. Some "spectators" were invisible and did not engage or interact in conversations, while others engaged visually through liking the photographic contents provided by either "uploaders" or "commenters." The goal of provoking a conversation was noticeable in that some of the conversations were initiated through the provision of provocative terms and numbers in the title/description, which acted as a token for "looking deeply" at the photographic
images provided before responding to the post. Asking questions and having the opportunity to refine questions and answers in a conversation enabled description that was “done specifically for me, and on the basis of intimate knowledge of my interests and requirements” (Wilson, 1968, p. 101).

The selected conversations generated a total of 1080 visual likes, characterized for the purposes of this study as “engagements” and 277 comments, characterized as “Interactions.” Some of the comments included images such as a photographic image, a postcard, a screenshot, or other visual materials. The CCC featured three types of comments about the photographic images used in SM, including comments “about” the content provided, comments “related” to the content provided, or/and comments “redirected” from the content provided.

There were eight categories that emerged from the CCC: “informative” (“initial”), “supplementary” (“secondary”), and “revising and auditing”; “inquiry”; “mentioning”; “location”; “emotion and emotional Icons”; “internet slang, slogans, abbreviations, and idioms”; “narratives and personal experience”; and “Image Editing.”

Modeling the Conversational Use of Photographs on Social Media (SM)

The preliminary model which was applied was derived from three sources. The first source was the model of typical representation by agency presented by O’Connor in O’Connor et al. (2008). The second source was the notion presented by Wilson (1977, p. 120) of functionality – “…a reorientation toward the functional, rather than the topical or disciplinary.” The third source was an exploratory study of the conversational use of historical photographic images conducted as an internal report in the Visual Thinking Laboratory at the University of North
Texas. The results of the current research provide more detail and suggest that the relationships among participants is fluid. Thus, the model is elaborated as shown in Figure 5.1.
Figure 5.1. Modeling the conversational use of photographic images on social media.
Future Study

To discuss recommendations for future studies, I will speak first of my own background. I came to doctoral studies from Kuwait with a background in information science and in photography. I have been a serious amateur photographer for many years, and I have worked as a professional photographer. I was an early adopter of digital photography and Internet platforms such as Flickr and Instagram. I became a member of the Visual Thinking Laboratory (VTL) at the University of North Texas, a group of researchers engaged in making and analyzing photographic documents and conducting research on how people make, find, and use photographs. One of the important figures to the VTL is Oliver Wendell Holmes, who in 1859 published an article on stereo photography (Holmes, 1859). There are many interesting points in the article, two of which are important for future study.

In 1859, Holmes was writing to an audience that might not even have known about photography, since photography had been invented only 20 years before. His descriptions of photography are written with a scholarly knowledge and with a photographer’s interest. In fact, Holmes invented a stereo photograph viewer that he made available in plans without a patent. Maybe more important for us is that we are not much more advanced than Holmes’s readers; photography is still less than two centuries old, so we do not have as much experience understanding photographs as we do understanding writing. Thus, almost every study of how people use photos is an exploration of new ground. Also, we have to remember that pictures and words are very different, so we do not want to overlook these differences and just believe that what worked with words will work the same way for photos. We could see a little bit of this
when Manchester Facebook participants brought other pictures into a conversation or when they edited the original uploaded picture.

In the 1859 article, *The Stereoscope and the Stereograph*, Dr. Holmes looks to the future and makes a prediction which was perhaps radical for his time:

…millions of potential negatives …spawning …billions of pictures. The consequence of this will soon be such an enormous collection of forms that they will have to be classified and arranged in vast libraries, as books are now.

It is surprising that Holmes could foresee the “billions of pictures” that are on the Internet now; it is maybe not surprising that he could not see the ease with which these photos could be made and shared. The billions of pictures do not have to be in single or small printings that are classified and arranged in what are sometimes called “brick and mortar” libraries. The easiness of making and sharing them means the photos can be used and described outside of the vast libraries. This can mean easily crossing boundaries.

Continuing study of social media conversations should include other sorts of groups, different topics, and even different cultures. I made a limited study of another Facebook community of practice group, and I made a very small study of an Instagram conversation on Arabic language and culture. The Facebook group yielded results consistent with the model developed by observing the Manchester group on Facebook, and it presented an interesting problem.

The Denton Camera Club on Facebook is open to hobby photographers and professionals. Members share photographs, technical knowledge, and critiquing. Since the group is made up almost completely of a community of photographers, photographs are a major
token within the conversations, and the descriptions are often long and technical. Four
categories within the CCC that emerged within the Denton Camera Club but that were not in the
Manchester group are the following: “promoting” of a product or service like a workshop or
training course; “negotiating” of a better price selling photographic equipment or doing a job for
a client; “action,” such as accepting or rejecting an offer; and “learning,” such as instructions,
tips and techniques to take better photographs. The problem with this initial study is in the topic
of the group – photography. Even if names are hidden in the reporting of results, the photographs
themselves are often copyrighted, have watermarks with the maker’s name, and are of
identifiable style. Even so, it would seem that it would make sense to approach a group of
photographers and either by examination or some form of interviewing, to test the model and
amplify our understanding of the uses of photographic documents.

I also conducted an examination of a conversation at the personal level on Twitter. The
photograph, as shown in Figure 5.2, showing an image of four men, served as a conversational
token for a group of friends and relatives. The conversation, started by an uploader,
@nawafalhamly, included a photographic image with a description that listed the names of three
people that appear in the image, but did not list the name of the man that stands second from the
right.

The first person who commented on this image, commenter (a) known as
@bunasser1981, was not sure about the second person from the right, but he had a guess. He
posted the guess, which could be characterized as “supplementary” or “secondary” information
and “mentioned” several users who might know the answer, or might be interested in the
conversation, including the uploader. Commenter (b), @Fahad1967, did not have the answer, so
he mentioned the uploader, along with commenter (a), and said “we have to ask a friend.”

Commenter (a), in several comments, provided several “guesses” and often mentioned the uploader and commenter (b).

Commenter (c), @Talbannai, forwarded this image using the WhatsApp application to his father, Retired Major General Naser Albannai, who appears in this photograph, and asked him about the person standing second from the right. Subsequently, commenter (c) returned to the conversation and gave the name of the unidentified man from the authoritative source (the father). The contribution from commenter (c) was considered as a “revision” to what had been said in previous comments. Next, there was a private conversation between the uploader and commenter (c), and the conversation was “redirected” to another subject. These interactions are shown in Figure 5.2.
Figure 5.2. A screen capture of a conversation surrounding a photograph on Twitter.

A conversation like this one can continue and can have several other commenters and spectators. A user in a conversation can have multiple roles, as shown in the model presented in Figure 5.1. Commenters can continue their conversation “about” an image or information provided by an “uploader.” Some may provide information and images “similar” or “related” to, for example, an image above, while, in some cases, some users, “commenters” or “uploaders,”
may initiate a conversation “redirected” from the originated conversation. Consequently, some “commenters” may become uploaders to a new type of conversation that may include an image only, or could include information, or could include both. A photograph may be a personal image or from a personal collection or, in some cases, can be from a public collection.

There is an interesting shift of the intended use of a photograph as a token to initiate or to continue a conversation. The weaving or loosening of the boundaries about the transition of knowledge and images between a public collection to a personal collection and vice versa, as in the model presented in Figure 5.1, and the “thick description,” as well as the “level of specificity” of information and description generated from the engagement and interaction provided in social media, such as in the Facebook group of Manchester, by “real people”, as characterized by O’Connor in O’Connor and Wyatt (2004), can enrich, saturate, and provide different layers to the “typical model of representation by agency” (O’Connor et al., 2008).

In closing, I want to quote again the early writer on photography, Oliver Wendell Holmes, as we look forward to understanding photographs as a still new, still developing tool for being who we are.

Parents sometimes forget the faces of their own children in a separation of a year or two. But the unfading artificial retina retains their impress, and a fresh sunbeam lays this on the living nerve as if it were radiated from the breathing shape. (Holmes, 1861, p. 170)
Figure 5.3. Thinking of my children (from left to right: Naser, Abdulmohsen, and Ghanima).
APPENDIX A

PHOTOGRAPHIC IMAGES USED IN THIS STUDY
Figure A.1
Title: Cigar store Indian, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33-000906-M2 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002855/PP/
Figure A.2
Title: Highway Department—Incinerating Plant, City Yard, Lincoln Street
Description: Off loading trolley tracks from the back of a truck at the Incinerating Plant, City Yard, Lincoln Street
Catalog Number: 1977-186-006
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=601B8397-7473-4CBC-84B1-597967479711;type=102
Figure A.3
Title: Highway Department— Incinerating Plant, City Yard, Lincoln Street
Description: Shows men from the highway department removing tracks on Elm Street at Auburn Street. Possibly looking south Tydol Gas Station is seen on the left (see 1977-186-009)
Catalog Number: 1977-186-008
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=601B8397-7473-4CBC-84B1-597967479711;type=102
Figure A.4
Title: Elm Street looking north from Pearl Street
Description: View of Elm Street looking north from Pearl Street. On the west side of the street is Floyd’s of Manchester, Clothing Store, 934 Elm Street; Hollis Street and Larry’s TV and Radio Store. On the east side of the street is Pearl Street, then the LeMay Restaurant.
Catalog Number: 1971.135.015
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=F1F4F5F6-8636-439B-B3B3-904579494380;type=102
Figure A.5
Title: George Brown. Measures a little over 50 inches in height. See also photo #748.
Description: None
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001526/PP/
Figure A.6
Title: [Untitled photo, possibly related to: Street corner, Manchester, New Hampshire]
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33-000908-M3 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002866/PP/
Figure A.7.1
Title: Cigar store Indian, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33-000906-M1 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002854/PP/
Figure A.7.2
Title: [Untitled photo, possibly related to: Manchester, New Hampshire]
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33- 004253-M5 [P&P] LOT 1222 (Possible associated group of images)
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997014781/PP/
Figure A.8
Title: Lawn statue off Elm Street. Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF34-006921-D [P&P]
Other Number: D 25477
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1998020353/PP/
Figure A.9
Title: Flag woven and made up by mill-workers at Manchester, New Hampshire / photograph by Harlan A. Marshall.
Description: None
Call Number: Illus. in G1.N27. [General Collections]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/93508164/
Note: Not available online. Larger images display only at the Library of Congress.
Figure A.10
Title: Street scene, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33- 004255-M1 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997014785/PP/
Figure A.11
Description: None
Call Number: LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0806 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001658/PP/
Figure A.12
Title: Amoskeag Bank, 875 Elm Street During Demolition
Description: View of the Amoskeag Bank, 875 Elm Street during demolition
Catalog Number: 1978-049
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record&id=9EB74BC4-42BD-4AF7-9637-835808081680&type=102
Figure A.13
Title: George Brown. Measures a little over 50 inches in height. See also photo #748. Location: Manchester, New Hampshire.
Description: None
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001526/PP/
Figure A.15
Title: Flag woven and made up by mill-workers at Manchester, New Hampshire / photograph by Harlan A. Marshall.
Description: None
Call Number: Illus. in G1.N27. [General Collections]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/93508164/
Note: Not available online. Larger images display only at the Library of Congress.
Figure A.16
Title: [Untitled photo, possibly related to: Fellows and Son casket manufacturers. Employs from 200 to 350 people, Amoskeag, New Hampshire]
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33- 000821-M1 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002690/PP/
Figure A.17
Title:  Name: Little girl (48 inches high) work in Amoskeag Mfg. Co., Manchester, N.H. She seemed to be 11 or 12 yrs. old. Photo taken at noon, May 25, 1909. Location: Manchester, New Hampshire.
Description:  None
Call Number:  LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0786 [P&P]
Source:  Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL:  http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001554/PP/
Figure A.18
Title: 6:00 A.M. May 21, 1909. Going to work in Amoskeag Mfg. Co., Manchester, N.H.
Location: Manchester, New Hampshire.
Description: None
Call Number: LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0797 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001649/PP/
Figure A.19
Location: Manchester, New Hampshire.
Description: None
Call Number: LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0813 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001665/PP/
Figure A.20
Title: Cigar store Indian, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33-000906-M1 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002854/PP/
Figure A.21
Title: Public park scene, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33- 000900-M2 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997002825/PP/
Figure A.22
Title: Amoskeag National Bank, south east corner of Elm and Hanover Street
Description: View looking east up Hanover Street at the Amoskeag National Bank. Cars are seen on Elm Street and Hanover Street, and people are visible in front of the bank. Leavitts Department Store is seen on the south side of the bank.
Catalog Number: 1971.135.019
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=F46F48E1-5839-423A-8326-803284209470&type=102
Figure A.23.1
Title: Copy Photograph—Barton’s Department Store, Elm Street
Description: Copy Photograph of Barton’s Department Store, Elm Street. In the foreground people are seen on the side walk and a horse drawn sled is in front of the store.
Catalog Number: 1951-060-001
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=3C8DB4F8-4502-46D6-8406-494688191922;type=102
Figure A.23.2
Title: Demolition of Merchants Bank Building and Barton Building, Elm Street
Description: 1993-02L-001 view looking east at the demolition site, on the first floor signs for Leavitts Department Store are visible
Catalog Number: 1993-002L-001
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record:id=DAA8E4BE-6A37-40AA-8530-858523235080;type=102
Figure A.24
Title: Amoskeag Bank, 875 Elm Street During Demolition
Description: View of the Amoskeag Bank, 875 Elm Street during demolition
Catalog Number: 1978-049
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record&id=9EB74BC4-42BD-4AF7-9637-835808081680&type=102
Figure A.25
Title: Amoskeag National Bank, south east corner of Elm and Hanover Street
Description: View looking east up Hanover Street at the Amoskeag National Bank. Cars are seen on Elm Street and Hanover Street, and people are visible in front of the bank. Leavitts Department Store is seen on the south side of the bank.
Catalog Number: 1971.135.019
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=F46F48E1-5839-423A-8326-803284209470;type=102
Figure A.26
Title: Elm Street Looking North
Description: View of Elm Street looking north from Central Street (seen on the right the east side of the street); next is Veterans Memorial Park; Merrimack Street; and the James W. Hill Company in the Pembroke Block; North is the John B. Varick Company. On the left, the west side of the street there are a number of signs but the only one that can be read is for the Busy Bee Restaurant. Cars are visible on the street.
Catalog Number: 1971.135.018
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=D617CA8B-ABF5-4F92-A4DC-928428203535;type=102
Figure A.27
Title: Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33-004244-M4 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997014735/PP/
Figure A.28
Title: Receiving Poppy from a Service Veteran on Elm Street
Description: Photograph of Fern Bolivier (center) and Doris Clement (right) receiving a poppy from a Service Veteran (left) to commemorate Memorial Day (or possibly Veteran’s Day).
Pictured in front of the Amoskeag Bank building, corner Elm and Hanover Streets.
Catalog Number: 2012.032.001
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record&id=B0E46C14-4F9D-466E-B22D-025507948080&type=102
Figure A.29
Title: Construction of the Amoskeag Bank Building
Description: Image from inside the construction site of the Amoskeag Bank Building, 875 Elm Street, looking towards City Hall and the Franklin Street Church. Construction workers are visible within the site.
Catalog Number: 2014.016.007
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=9E18778A-228F-414C-9405-043397260144;type=102
Figure A.30
Title: Group Portrait—Firemen of Engine Company #9, South Elm and Bakersville Streets
Description: Group portrait of ten firemen of Engine Company #9, South Elm St and Queen City Ave, standing in front of a fire engine with the station house in the background. Station house razed in the 1963 to make way for the Queen City ave extension connecting Elm to South Willow Street.
Catalog Number: 1949-091-001-J
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=EAD98D12-14AA-4393-BE89-485022942381;type=102
Figure A.31
Title: Factory workers, Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF33- 004259-M2 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa1997014801/PP/
Figure A.32
Title: Hallsville Grocery Company
Description: View of the Hallsville Grocery Company. An example of a two story vernacular building with Greek elements such as gable roof, returns, and pilasters, to the right a wagon shed has been added to the side of the building. A horse drawn buggy is in front of the store to the right, a wagon is in the shed, and two horses are seen in the foreground to the left. A man in an apron talks with another man on the porch, to the left railroad tracks are visible.
Catalog Number: MHAGN 230
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=7DC8A9F2-B0BD-4BCA-B2A8-705194817002;type=102
Figure A.33
Title: Copy Photograph—Barton’s Department Store, Elm Street
Description: Copy Photograph of Barton’s Department Store, Elm Street. In the foreground people are seen on the side walk and a horse drawn sled is in front of the store.
Catalog Number: 1951-060-001
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=3C8DB4F8-4502-46D6-8406-494688191922;type=102
Figure A.34
Description: None
Call Number: LOT 7479, v. 2, no. 0792 [P&P]
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/ncl2004001644/PP/
Figure A.35
Title: Harness maker's shop. Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF342- 015576-A [P&P] LOT 1222 (corresponding photographic print)
Other Number: D 6093
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa2000000386/PP/
Figure A.36
Title: Postcard, N.H. Fire Insurance Co., Manchester, N.H.
Description: None
Catalog Number: 2012.027.042
Source: Manchester Historic Association Online Library & Photograph Catalog
URL: http://manchester.pastperfect-online.com/31557/cgi/mweb.exe?request=record;id=8DE75062-0D4D-4DD6-A1F3-137963548390;type=301
Figure A.37
Title: Amoskeag housing. Manchester, New Hampshire
Description: None
Call Number: LC-USF342-015584-A [P&P]
Other Number: D 2588
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/fsa2000000394/PP/
Figure A.38
Title: AERIAL PHOTO #15: VIEW FROM THE NORTH NORTHWEST LOOKING TOWARD THE NEW GINGHAM MILL (CENTER) - Amoskeag Millyard, Canal Street, Manchester, Hillsborough County, NH
Description: None
Call Number: HABS NH,6-MANCH,2-15
Source: Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Online Catalog
URL: http://www.loc.gov/pictures/item/nh0041.photos.105115p/
APPENDIX B

SCREEN CAPTURES OF MANCHESTER, NH CONVERSATIONS

(REDACTED)
Conversation 1
and 3 others like this.

valley and maple?

yes, old city yard 😊

Incinerator

They used to let Woolco burn all sensitive documents in there….gee guess who got that job…lol...

Looks like a Sterling truck, my dad used to have one, chain drive

good eye Al Lawrence...

Manchester incinerator

Write a comment...
1936 / shows men from the highway department removing tracks on Elm Street at Auburn Street. Possibly looking south Tydol Gas Station is seen on the left.

and 11 others like this.

Old Pete Forest Harley dealer, Then Manchester Tire & Battery Tydol station

Louis Roy Google Image Could be?
Conversation 3.2
1953 / View of Elm Street looking north from Pearl Street. On the west side of the street is Floyd's of Manchester, Clothing Store, 934 Elm Street; Hollis Street and Larry's TV and Radio Store. On the east side of the street is Pearl Street, then the LeMay Restaurant.

O.M.G. I was wondering when this would pop up. His daughter and I went skiing together, ...best friends. Pearl and Elm St.

Lemay What ??????

OMG you do this all the time to me! You KNOW that this is all from MHA, not me!

Sorry I wont do it again.

I don't mind if you correct these photos, that's all good. Not my fault what they actually say LOL
Conversation 4.2
1909 / George Brown. Measures a little over 50 inches in height.

Similar to Commodore Nutt who had his home on South Willow St and where Nutt's Pond got its name.

May 13 at 5:38pm · Like · 1

Write a comment...
1936

May 13 at 4:32pm

Conversation 6

s and 10 others like this.

Hanover and Elm?

May 13 at 4:39pm: Like

Look how neat & tidy it is 😊

May 13 at 4:40pm: Like · 1

By a fire hydrant???? I'd be kind of leery of selling newspapers there... Doggy duty post!

May 13 at 4:49pm: Like · 2

The most popular corner of the city---

May 13 at 5:51pm: Like · 2

That was Mike's corner

May 13 at 5:59pm: Like

I keep looking for my relatives in these photos!

May 13 at 6:03pm: Like · 1

Was Mike the little old man who said, "Read a paper-Leader"? He was always on Elm St. in the '60s when I was at Central,

May 13 at 7:04pm: Like · 1

Yes, that was his corner, Had no wallet, Roll of money in his stockers.

May 13 at 7:42pm: Like

And I heard he was rich as can be!

May 13 at 8:27pm: Like

That's awesome!!! Looks like Superman!

May 14 at 11:42am: Like · 1
1936 Tobacco store

May 13 at 1:49pm

My mom said this was on the corner of bridge and elm st
May 13 at 2:05pm · Like · 2

She is 95...she remembers a man named Bernie who worked there
May 13 at 2:35pm · Like · 1

wow
May 13 at 2:36pm · Like

It could be where Eagle Fruit was. That would be the only surviving building on that corner.
May 13 at 2:55pm · Like · 1

My thoughts too.
May 13 at 3:37pm · Like
Conversation 7.2

My thoughts too.
May 13 at 3:37pm · Like

Eagle Fruit 😊

This place was still there in ’69...my Dad used to stop there for his newspaper, of course smokes, and always a treat for me and my sister...good memories
May 13 at 3:40pm · Like · 2

Seven-twenty- four. But I remember off Canal St. My mother took me there to buy cigars for my father for Christmas. And I remember a sporting goods store in that area too.
May 13 at 3:48pm · Like · 1

Was the indian still around in the late 60s William Sean Dircks?
May 13 at 7:12pm · Like

Write a comment...
1936 / Lawn statue off Elm Street.

Like · Comment · 14 · 5

14 people like this.

Cute.
May 13 at 1:40pm · Like · 1

I wonder if it is still there.??
May 13 at 4:49pm · Like

I wonder where it is located
and if it is still there. 😊
May 13 at 6:49pm · Like

How cute is that? I would love to
go back to maybe early 1900's just to see the beautiful
mansions in our city.
May 13 at 6:56pm · Like

Only had to have been alive in the
70s, here's were it was, you can see again how well our city
fathers have planned https://goo.gl/maps/o0Vli

Write a comment...
May 7 at 7:51pm

Largest American Flag ever made... here in the millyard!
May 7 at 7:58pm · Like · 2

YES!!! 😊
May 7 at 8:05pm · Like · 1

That’s huge ..... Beautiful!
May 7 at 8:09pm · Like · 3

love that pic
May 7 at 8:07pm · Like · 2

Proud to be an American!!
May 7 at 8:14pm · Like · 2

!!
May 7 at 8:16pm · Like · 3

Those colors don’t run....
May 7 at 9:10pm · Like · 1

That’s the Amoskeag flag! Saw that photo on a wall in Denny’s in CA a couple years ago. Asked our young waiter if he knew where it was taken and why. He didn’t so we told him. He found the story interesting and promised to share it with the rest of the staff. 😊
May 8 at 6:48am · Like · 1

Love it.....😊
May 8 at 8:04am · Like

Write a comment...
True grit in Manchester during the Great Depression. The Library of Congress has a collection of photographs taken during FDR's works program to fund professionals. One set is of Manchester after the Amoskeag Mills closed suddenly on Christmas Eve, 1935. My dad had just started work there in the summer and it was traumatic for him and my mom. That was before I arrived in 1940 so don't blame me. I have made an album of these photos of Manchester in the depression (thanks to the Library of Congress and FDR):

FLICKR.COM

Like · Comment · Share · 21 · 3

and 20 others like this.

LOVE IT! ty for sharing
May 6 at 2:11pm · Like

The Flood of '36 happened months later. Impossible to imagine what that must have been like. My Mom still talks about it.
May 6 at 8:08pm · Like · 1

Panama hats...Stylish at the time...
May 6 at 11:55pm · Like · 1

Write a comment...
Conversation 11
and 11 others like this.

What a loss

That building was so nice. It was a shame to have it torn down. The woodwork in the bank was beautiful.

I shot 8mm film of the demolition.

So sad.

And then they went out of business, ended up being Citizens, and the place is for sale. How wonderful.

Write a comment...
Conversation 13
1936 / French section / Amoskeag
Note* nuns & the smoke stack?
click photo to enlarge

Like · Comment · 15 · 21

15 people like this.

If I am not mistaken, that is the Holy Angel's Parochial Grammar School next to Ste Marie Church. The school yard was between the church and Wayne Street on the right in this picture.
April 19 at 10:10pm · Like · 4

Great photo. I love how the buildings look new.
April 19 at 10:11pm · Like · 1

I remember the fire escapes on the sides of the school when I attended school there. The girls always went down first.
April 19 at 10:11pm · Like · 2

I blew a part of the house up in this photo / click photo below

The trees in the school yard were full grown when I attended school here in the late 50's.
April 19 at 10:12pm · Edited · Like · 2

Great memories.....thank you!
April 19 at 10:13pm · Like · 1
This looks like St Patrick's Church. Corner of Coolidge and Kelly Streets. I recognize the house in the background.
April 19 at 10:47pm · Like

I remember going down the fire escape at Parker School, when I was in 2nd grade. I was scared to death. I think that is when I first started hating heights!
April 20 at 12:16am · Like

I love this rare photo
April 20 at 4:34am · Like

I'll take a picture of Coolidge and Kelley Sts today. The photo above is wrong.
April 20 at 7:48am · Like

Both my girls went to that daycare my family are long time members of saint Marie's
April 20 at 9:10am · Like

Isn't it St. Patrick's church & school?
April 20 at 3:59pm · Like

I thought that pic didn't look right of Coolidge and Kelley Street lol
April 20 at 4:32pm · Like

No...it is not St Patrick's church and school.....referring to Cathy's first posted photo.
April 20 at 8:01pm · Edited · Like

That pic is correct...that is Coolidge and Kelly.....the building on the right is church rectory.....used to be St. Patrick's.....closed in 2008.....now it is part of family services.....Casa I believe.
April 20 at 5:40pm · Like · 1

Also.....note brick building.....old St. Patrick's School.....new parking lot too, used to be just grass.
April 20 at 5:41pm · Edited · Like · 1

I went to St. Patrick's School and that's not it.
April 20 at 6:03pm · Like
Conversation 14.3
March 23

1936 / Untitled photo, possibly related to: Fellows and Son casket manufacturers. Employed from 200 to 350 people, Amoskeag, New Hampshire

Like · Comment · 17 ↓ 1

17 people like this.

Clyde Baker... is this before your families' time?
March 23 at 2:29pm · Like

lol
March 23 at 2:29pm · Like · 1

Location?
March 23 at 2:57pm · Like

Wasn't this by Singer Park??
March 23 at 3:04pm · Like

Oh no, we bought caskets from them, my father in law was good friends with the owner.
March 23 at 3:05pm · Like · 2

Might be Pine and Valley.
March 23 at 6:33pm · Like · 1

If this is same one across from BB Shoe, we used to go there at lunch time and try out caskets (laid in them)
March 24 at 11:39am · Like · 1

Write a comment...
March 22

6:00 A.M. May 21, 1909. Going to work in Amoskeag Mfg. Co

Like · Comment · 15 · 2

15 people like this.

The hats!
March 22 at 1:08pm · Like · 1

I don't like the idea of the gates.
March 22 at 5:07pm · Like

Write a comment...

Conversation 18
Conversation 19
Conversation 21
Remember the Christmas Clubs. Add to it on Thursday pay day. Was nice to have that cash to spend in shops on our Elm St. Down town.

I loved the Christmas Club concept too! By the way, it seems to me that there were two Amoskeag Banks...am I dreaming? It seems that at branches you had to go to different sides depending on what you were there for...

Amoskeag Bank, on Elm Street. You had to go to different sides, of the lobby depending on your transaction. I still miss the red neon Amoskeag sign, lit at night.

Bank and Leavitt's!

Amoskeag Bank
Conversation 23
February 27

GREAT PHOTO

1978 / Amoskeag Bank, 875 Elm Street During Demolition

Like · Comment · 19 · 6

and 18 others like this.

Was this all part of the bank? did only the
tower remain?
February 27 at 8:40pm · Like

I love this! My dad was president of
the national bank!
February 27 at 8:44pm · Like · 1

what a shame
February 27 at 8:50pm · Like · 1

shame on amoskeag bank and their
narrow mindedness. all steel construction that could have
easily been reinvented for their needs but they were
followers not leaders of progressive design. instead they
hired a well known architect to build a blase’ th… See More
February 27 at 9:09pm · Like · 3

Manchester lacks foresight. Its an ongoing
problem that affects all of the residents.
February 27 at 9:17pm · Like · 2

February 28 at 9:25am · Like

Write a comment…
February 27

1958 / View looking east up Hanover Street at the Amoskeag National Bank. Cars are seen on Elm Street and Hanover Street, and people are visible in front of the bank. Leavitts Department Store is seen on the south side of the bank.

Like · Comment · 12 · 3

12 people like this.

my grandpa's worked at leavitts.
February 27 at 10:56pm · Like · 1

February 27 at 11:20pm · Like

February 28 at 9:22am · Like

Write a comment...
1958 / View of Elm Street looking north from Central Street (seen on the right the east side of the street); next is Veterans Memorial Park; Merrimack Street; and the James W. Hill Company in the Pembroke Block; North is the John B. Varick Company. On the left, the west side of the street there are a number of signs but the only one that can be read is for the Busy Bee Restaurant. Cars are visible on the street.

I believe Webster Restaurant is the first sign on the leg. Busy Bee Restaurant & the Webster Restaurant were pretty close to each other on Elm St. The Albanian Family that owned the Busy Bee eventually move their restaurant near the Palace Theater in the 60's and renamed it the Candle Light. The Webster owned by a Greek Family closed permanently.

February 27 at 5:18pm · Like · 1

Write a comment...
Conversation 27
February 21

1938 / Photograph of Fern Bolvier (center) and Doris Clement (right) receiving a poppy from a Service Veteran (left) to commemorate Memorial Day (or possibly Veteran's Day). Pictured in front of the Amoskeag Bank building, corner Elm and Hanover Streets.

Like · Comment · 24 · 7

and 23 others like this.

February 21 at 9:01pm · Like · 2

Love his shoes. 😊

February 21 at 9:55pm · Like · 1

Used to make these with my Dad.

February 21 at 10:03pm · Like · 2

Nice knickers

February 23 at 8:42am · Like

Love the knickers on the gentleman. I had a suit with knickers liked them in the 60s

February 23 at 8:42am · Like

One or two of those names sound like Weare names.

February 23 at 9:17am · Like

Fern I think had a beauty salon.

February 23 at 9:18am · Like

Just heard from someone in Weare who said Fern had a beauty salon at the Corner of 144 and Riverdale Rd. in Weare.

February 23 at 10:03am · Like · 1

Write a comment...
1912 / Image from inside the construction site of the Amoskeag Bank Building, 875 Elm Street, looking towards City Hall and the Franklin Street Church. Construction workers are visible within the site.
Conv. 30.1
Conversation 30.2
February 2

1937 factory workers

[Image]

23 likes, 12 comments

1. and 22 others like this.
2. Stark St. Entrance.
   February 2 at 3:56 pm · Like
3. Dressed very well in those days. What no ripped jeans, dirty t or sweat shirts and flip flops.
   February 2 at 4:39 pm · Like · 4
4. That looks more like Market or Merrimack St.
   Look at the apartment building on the left. They are still there.
   February 2 at 5:41 pm · Like
5. My take would be Stark Street. That's about the only one that could have gone through.
   https://www.google.com/.../data...m4f1e13m21sfHnbeZ...
6. Google Maps
   Find local businesses, view maps and get driving directions in Google Maps.
   GOOGLE.COM
   February 2 at 6:13 pm · Like · 1
7. Those bridges are no longer there. If you look thru the buildings you can see the mill buildings that appear off Bedford St. Across from either Market or Merrimack st.
   https://www.google.com/.../data...m4f1e13m21sGh...
8. Google Maps
   Find local businesses, view maps and get driving directions in Google Maps.
   GOOGLE.COM
   February 2 at 6:45 pm · Edited · Like · 1

Conversation 31.1
Yes that does look like the buildings.

February 2 at 8:03pm · Like

[private message]

Pleasant Street might have run through before the canal was filled in. I can't remember, though. Any thoughts?

February 3 at 7:27am · Like

[private message]

After the upper canal was filled, the spillway to the lower canal became an extension of Pleasant st. The photo is most definitely the Stark St entrance to Amoskeag. South of the tenement building was the textile club.

February 3 at 7:49am · Like · 1

[private message]

is 100% correct. I remember the hut for the track guard and the bridges that we drove across to get to my grandfather's machine shop.

February 3 at 9:01am · Edited · Like · 1

[private message]

I'm going to defer to on this one. The link shows a closer view of the one I posted and I took mine from Stark Street where it seems to line up with the photo. Unfortunately, the tenement to the left has been replaced by NH Grocers Association.

February 3 at 8:05am · Like

[private message]

I had family who lived in that tenement Building.

February 3 at 8:10am · Edited · Like · 1

[private message]

Everything going up the hill on that side of the street is either a modern building or a parking lot.

February 3 at 10:25am · Like

[private message]
View of the Hallsville Grocery Company. An example of a two story vernacular building with Greek elements such as gable roof, returns, and pilasters, to the right a wagon shed has been added to the side of the building. A horse drawn buggy is in front of the store to the right, a wagon is in the shed, and two horses are seen in the foreground to the left. A man in an apron talks with another man on the porch, to the left railroad tracks are visible.
Conversation 32.2
Conversation 33

January 26
self explanatory

Like · Comment · 20 · 7

Brian O'Connor and 19 others like this.
levittets
January 26 at 7:30pm · Like · 1
Jim Leavitts me thinks
January 26 at 7:33pm · Like · 1

What a wonderful store...
January 26 at 7:43pm · Like

Sign on building says "Bartons"
January 26 at 7:45pm · Like · 1
where my grandmother, worked.
January 26 at 8:49pm · Like · 1

I just found out it was first called Barton's then became Leavitt's. Found it under flicker but the picture there has cars parked in front of store. Need to sign in to flicker to get more info.
January 26 at 9:48pm · Like · 1

Also it had the name of George Lane
January 26 at 9:52pm · Like · 1

Write a comment...
Conversation 34
Conversation 35

January 24

Like · Comment · 11 · 4

and 10 others like this.

January 24 at 12:26pm · Like

Where was this?

January 24 at 12:26pm · Like

manchester

looks like the corner of chestnut and

January 24 at 12:32pm · Like

Looks like Belmont & Massabesic

January 24 at 2:22pm · Like

Chestnut and Manchester

January 24 at 4:59pm · Like

Write a comment...
Conversation 36.1
Conversation 36.2
Rear of Amoskeag houses off Payson Street.
1936
click to enlarge

and 32 others like this.

Are they still standing
December 27, 2014 at 10:58pm · Like

Yes they are. I delivered mail there back in the late 80's. Seen inside a couple of times when people would invite me in while they signed for a certified letter or a package. Very nice inside.

December 27, 2014 at 11:01pm · Edited · Like · 2

Property Information: Renovated one, two and three bedroom apartments are located on Bedford, State, Payson and Newell Streets in Manchester, N.H.'s historic Amoskeag Milltown. Originally built in the 1850s as housing for the mill workers, these renovated apartments today allow for the ultimate in convenient access to the city's top employers and amenities as well as the city's largest venues such as the Verizon Arena and Fisher Cat Park.

December 27, 2014 at 11:58pm · Like · 2

Conversation 37.1
Conversation 37.2

December 27, 2014 at 11:15pm · Edited · Like · 3

I stayed in 1 of these apartments for sleepovers and was so excited since they had feather matresses back in those days but of course the creature habits were not as lavish as today

December 28, 2014 at 12:27am · Like · 1

Maybe because i'm a history enthusiast, but i've always wanted to live in the Millyard area. So much has happened in those homes.

December 28, 2014 at 7:29am · Like · 1

I did live there and had a lot of fun finding adventure in between the railroad tracks and the Merrimack River.

December 28, 2014 at 2:04pm · Like · 1

In the top photo I grew up in the third building to the right on the second floor. Those apartments were huge and so beautiful inside. Classic New England molding and woodwork. Our address was 62 Bedford Street. When I 13 some company from Mass took th... See More

December 28, 2014 at 2:08pm · Like · 3

My brother who worked at MKM and Waumbec lived in one of the aps. on Payson st. It was beautiful inside....woodwork was beautiful.

December 28, 2014 at 4:16pm · Like · 1

Can someone help me, I can't remember where this street is

December 28, 2014 at 4:40pm · Like · 1
Conversation 37.3
Amazing how the Mill yard has changed TODAY!

December 20, 2014 at 4:08am · Like · 1

I love how you do this stuff. Like the detail you pay attention to TY
December 20, 2014 at 12:03pm · Like

site of one of the largest anthrax outbreak on US soil
December 20, 2014 at 12:27pm · Like

Really??
December 20, 2014 at 12:31pm · Like
1957 Arms Textile anthrax outbreak. Killed four people. The building was covered, burned and buried down by the new baseball stadium. Goat hair from Pakistan was found to be the reason. There was a big debate about calling the park there now Arms Park, because the company left the city with the problem of cleaning up the site.

December 20, 2014 at 12:35pm · Like · 4

Thanks!
December 20, 2014 at 12:37pm · Like

Arms Textile was cordoned off with barbed wire with NO TRESPASSING signs had been affixed, but pigeons were free to come and go through the broken windows. In addition to being dumped at Delta Dental Stadium, much of the refuse was dumped in the ri... See More
December 20, 2014 at 12:48pm · Like · 2

Here's an article the I remember reading online several years ago.
http://www.nytimes.com/.../nation-challenged-epidemic...
December 20, 2014 at 1:29pm · Like · 1

what is still the nation's only outbreak of the disease. .............. YIKES great story TY
December 20, 2014 at 1:31pm · Like

A quote: "Bill Arnold was the director of the Manchester Health Department from 1966 to 1986 where he was known for his progressive and innovative ideas."
December 20, 2014 at 2:02pm · Like · 1

What does "Arms Park" stand for? anyone?
December 20, 2014 at 2:04pm · Like

Arms Park was named after the Arms Textile Mill that had been on the land now the park.
December 20, 2014 at 2:08pm · Like · 1

please edit your post to remove your line regarding Officer Bill Arnold's dismissal for incompetence. We are not sure that this is a fact and don't want speculation TY
December 20, 2014 at 2:24pm · Like · 1

As you may or may not recall, I actually worked with Arnold. If my post needs to be removed, I can take care of that, expert that he is in censorship.
December 20, 2014 at 4:38pm · Like

hmmm..... pretty sure I can't jump high enough to get this shot. 😊
December 20, 2014 at 7:12pm · Like · 1

Write a comment...
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