
DOMAIN ANALYSIS AS AN APPROACH TO THE CLASSIFICATION OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC DOCUMENTS

Alexia Guimarães Monteiro da Silva (1), Luis Miguel Nunes Corujo (2), Jorge Manuel Rias Revez (3)

(1) Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal, alexia_guimaraes@hotmail.com

(2) Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal, luiscorujo@campus.ul.pt

(3) Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal, jrevez@campus.ul.pt



Abstract

Information Science and Archival Studies do not yet have a relevant theoretical production on the classification and organization of documentation originating from cinematographic production. This exploratory research aims to understand how Domain Analysis can assist Knowledge Organization applied to cinematographic documentation in the archival context. One of the main problems concerns the documents generated during cinematographic production not being custodied together with the movie, which is the main product of a complex artistic, technical, and administrative process. A constructivist perspective is adopted, in which the domain of cinema is explored concerning its language. The aim is to understand the domain that influences the materialization of information, thus producing records of a diverse range of genres, from audio-visual to textual. The concept of Domain Analysis and its relationship with Archival Studies is explored, including the benefits of provenance as a Domain Analysis approach to the classification of cinematographic documentation. The importance of cultural and social context is revealed to link the different dimensions of cinematographic production, which allows knowledge to be built from its information.

Keywords: Knowledge organization; Domain analysis; Cinematographic documentation; Cinematographic language.

1 Introduction

This paper aims to reach the objective of understanding the use of domain analyses in the Knowledge Organization of cinematographic documents and its relationship with Archival Studies, perceiving how it can be organized and classified documents produced in the context

of cinema. This is an artistic field with a strong administrative dimension, assuming the nature of an industry.

Cinematographic archives have responsibilities regarding the organization and classification of documents, not only audio-visual ones, but of the whole "family" created in the filmmaking process. In most archives, cinematographic-related documentation is not preserved (Cordeiro 2000). These documents are part of the context of cinematographic production, being important to structure the classification process and to understand the relations of the movie with the producer. They are also a source of knowledge, enabling a broad understanding of a particular project and of cinematographic art itself.

It's found as base to the analysis of Cinema as a domain of knowledge, its language, and from this point begins the quest to understand how documentation is generated in the process of cinematographic production, and how it can be classified, from an archival point of view. The concept of Domain Analysis is presented, and its relationship with Archival Studies. The theories of filmmaking are identified, based on its language and its production process. The documents (types and genres) produced in the cinematic process are identified, and the role that Domain Analysis can play in the classification of archival documents, which emerge from cinematic practices, is perceived. In this research the terms document, documentation and records are used to express interchangeably the same object.

Domain Analysis is one of the research areas of Knowledge Organization, making possible the mapping of a certain domain. Cinematographic documentation can be approached from the perspective of organization for future memory, as heritage and as a source of information for research. This research takes language as its starting point, in this case cinematographic language. Mai (1999) points to social praxis as the root of the Knowledge Organization, and this praxis is expressed through language. Society and culture are transformed through practices that use language as a tool. The Knowledge Organization is structured through discourse communities, words, and their meanings.

Postmodernist ideas regard the world as a social construction, as opposed to a positivist perspective in which classifications are thought of as objective and neutral. Reality is a product of its time and space (Cook 2001), which is reflected in the records produced: "Thus, the domain-analytic approach in Information Science (Hjørland and Albrechtsen 1995; Hjørland 2002) may also be seen as a criticism of positivist assumptions within LIS" (Hjørland 2005 p. 148).

2 Methodology

This paper adopts a constructivist perspective, with a qualitative and exploratory approach, which uses bibliographic research for data collection, associated with its interpretative analysis. It seeks to gather, select, and interpret monographic texts and papers related to domain analysis, and the connection between Archival Studies and KO/domain analysis. For the cinematographic field, sources that address its language and the filmmaking process were collected.

Through bibliographic research, data are collected for the theoretical framework and for the empirical study. In this way, an interpretative analysis is made, as suggested by Lima and Mito (2007). Sources on Cinema and Information Science are analyzed, which identify the problems surrounding cinematographic production. From the analysis and interpretation, it is possible to develop ideas and inductive hypotheses regarding the object.

It was mostly used Web of Science as data source, as Google Scholar and RCAAP were used as well, only in a smaller scale. The searched terms were either in Portuguese or English, obtaining a broader range of results in the use of English mainly on Web of Science. Terms such as “film”, “film theory”, “Domain Analysis” and “Knowledge Organization”. The range of year of publication was delimited, when possible, between 2015 and 2021. Among the results obtained, the texts were chosen through a reading of the abstract and a superficial reading of the text, to visualize the relevance to the study.

Articles and books chapters were the most consulted, some dissertation and theses were also used. Important and recognizable authors in Knowledge Organization (such as Hjørland, Smiraglia, Mai, Tennis, Tognoli and Guimarães) and Cinema (Metz, Mitry, Martin and Aumont) were vastly used due to their contributions on the advances in their fields of study. Publications present in the bibliographies of the sources found were also utilized, regardless of the year of publication, when relevant.

The search started on 2020, September 26, the term “film” was searched on the Web of Science. Within “film” was searched for “organization” and was restricted to Information Science and Library Science only, with twenty-three results. On the same platform, a search was made for the term “domain analysis” with a result of 13,825, then it was restricted to the range of years between 2015 and 2021, thus obtaining 5,165 results. Subsequently, was selected only the Information Science and Library Science category, with a total of sixty-seven results. On October 10th, the term “knowledge organization” was searched on the Web of Science,

which retrieved 1,455 results, so the search was refined with the keyword “archival”, thus retrieving twenty-one results.

In the Cinema field, on September 27, it was searched for “Film Theory” on Google Scholar, obtaining the highest result of books, being explored only the first pages. The search for the same keyword on Web of Science gave 1,581 results, refining the type of document to only articles, the result dropped down to 1,227. Selecting the years between 2015 and 2020, and the categories “Multidisciplinary Sciences”, “Film Radio Television”, “Information Science/Library Science”, “Social Sciences Interdisciplinary”, eighty-three results were obtained.

On November 3, was searched “documents” on the Web of Science, receiving 588,682 results, was then refined, being searched in the results for the term “audiovisual”, having 407 results. Of these, only those in the Library and Information Science area were selected, yielding fifty-seven results. Selecting the years of publication between 2015 and 2020, a result of thirty-five was obtained.

Analysis was developed by relevant associations between the objects of investigation and the data collected. In the interpretation, the aim was to make a deeper examination, starting from the assimilated data up to the understanding of the investigation (Minayo 2002). For data validation, Johnson (1997 p. 286) points out several approaches to do so. An important one comes from the increasing reading and interpretation of data for the inductive hypothesis, solidifying the theoretical framework.

3 Domain Analysis

What is domain analysis? As Hjørland (2017) wrote: the “Domain Analysis is a body of knowledge” (p. 441). It is a social construct developed by society and the analyst's prior understanding of a given domain: “As a ‘field of work’ the domain is constructed in and through the process of planning, design and construction of a particular KOS” (Albrechtsen 2015 p. 559). It can be seen as an approach and a theory on Knowledge Organization:

Domain analysis approaches the issues of KOSs (Knowledge Organization Systems) and KOPs (Knowledge Organization Processes) from a combined sociological and epistemological perspective and emphasizes the importance of subject knowledge (Hjørland 2017 p. 437).

Domain Analysis is an area of Knowledge Organization research, which aims to organize bodies of knowledge, which appear as concepts/units: “Knowledge by itself cannot

be grasped or represented unless it is presented by knowledge units and their many possible combinations in words/terms or statements” (Dahlberg 1993 p. 211). Concepts can be identified from language, not only coming from scientific fields, but also from human knowledge related to the maintenance of the human societies (Andersen and Skouvig 2006). The domains are diverse: “may be added: academic tradition, conceptualization, (a) literature, (sub)culture, hobby, (a) science, sect, specialty, subject area, topic, and trade” (Hjørland 2017 p. 454).

Due to the constantly changing knowledge in our society, a classification can never fully reflect the universe being studied: “a postmodern theory of knowledge organization rejects this assumption and instead places focus on the social praxis and the language of the community for which the knowledge organization is created” (Mai 1999 p. 548). The point of view, the community and its language, culture, and practices and habits can affect and dictate the behavior of a domain in each society.

Smiraglia (2015 p. 19) wrote that Domain Analysis is “one methodological paradigm within the science of knowledge organization”. Gnoli (2008) also pointed out that a knowledge domain can be approached ontologically, since it is both ontological, by the relationship between parts/class, and epistemological, by how knowledge is understood by people:

In domain analysis, the purpose is to reveal the contours of held knowledge, whether that be in the form of live discourse or recorded documentation, by analyzing the elements of specific communities who share a common ontology, or knowledge base. The objectives of domain analysis are to map and visualize the intellectual parameters of shared knowledge in a given community, such that results can be put to use in knowledge organization systems for the furtherance of the community’s own discourse and for its intellectual contributions at large (Smiraglia 2015 p. 19).

Among the different approaches to domain analysis, Hjørland (2017) points out Domain Analysis within Library and Information Science in its broad and narrow sense. The broad sense is an approach to interpret a domain, while the narrow sense considers different paradigms of the domain in the study.

The present paradigm of domain analysis, as pointed out by Hjørland and Albrechtsen (1995), is a social and functional paradigm, and a philosophical-realist approach. On the functional side, it seeks the understanding of the functions of information. In this way, an individual approach such as cognitivism may not be the best option for study, even if individual knowledge can be taken into consideration, social methodologies fit better since Domain Analysis is a social science, which deals mainly with life and experience.

The field of Archival Studies, unlike Library and Information Science, had a late development in relation to Knowledge Organization, because the object of Archival Studies was only the record, not its information. This changed with the emergence of postmodern Archival Studies, which modified the archival domain as it was known (Tognoli and Guimarães 2011). Hjørland (2016) recognizes the archive as part of Knowledge Organization, as it contains records of various types, written or graphic. Thus, it is possible to understand the organization of archival information as a way to organize knowledge.

3.1 Archival Studies

In the context of the proximity of KO and Archival Studies, Guimarães and Tognoli (2015) point out the provenance as an approach for domain analysis. In Archival Studies, provenance is one of the fundamental principles for records and archives classification. Its importance was reaffirmed mainly with the postmodern archival theory of Canadian authors such as Cook (1993; 2001), Millar (2002), Douglas (2010), Nesmith (2002; 1999): “Postmodern is thus concerned about creation and nature of records and their designation, survival and preservation as archives” (Cook 2001 p. 6). For Douglas, provenance can be understood as an organizing principle, intellectual construction, and socio-historical context (2010). Regarding Domain Analysis from an epistemological and social study, it is evidenced its own construction based on communities (Guimarães and Tognoli 2015). With provenance, it is possible to organize the archival knowledge from its context:

determining the content of a document is no longer under a thematic view, but rather, from the identification and recognition of a given discourse community that is responsible for its production, from pre-determined institutional goals (Guimarães and Tognoli 2015 p. 566).

The principle of provenance should focus on the process and its producer, rather than the document (Millar 2002). In both Domain Analysis and provenance, context is key. Provenance, in a set of archival documents: “consists of the social and technical processes of the records’ inscription, transmission, contextualization, and interpretation which account for its existence, characteristics, and continuing history” (Nesmith 1999 p. 146). Through social change, the context is always changing, as is the domain. Thus, the principle of provenance assists the understanding and organization of information and its knowledge within the present construction.

4 Cinema as a domain

Art can be seen as a domain. For Knowledge Organization it is necessary to consider both language, form, aesthetics, genre and the organizational context and cultural production.

Cinema began to develop in the early 20th century in various places around the world. It was a phased process of development, not only technologically, but in terms of practices and aesthetics. It originated from photography, which emerged in the previous century, making it possible to capture many frames per second (Aumont et al. 1995). The main movements in Cinema, in terms of filmmaking practices and aesthetic choices, were Hollywood Cinema in the United States until the late 1920s (1908-1927), Expressionism (1916-1926) in Germany, Impressionism and Surrealism (1918-1930) in France, and Soviet Montage between 1924 and 1930 (Bordwell and Thompson 2013).

4.1 Cinematographic language

Language is one of the variables that allow us to study and understand a given domain, in a community, in time and space. Language allows discourse to materialize, becoming the human expression of its creativity and culture. Products are then created with a social/historical context and an administrative context. As the world transforms, knowledge transforms with it. It is important to build an epistemological approach to cinematographic theory, regarding its language and its business process, as cinema has become an industry with a complex production process.

Cinema theory stems from practice, as Metz explains that theorists analyzed the movies already made, and from there the construction of the discipline begins. The movie, the main document of a cinematographic production, has a complex structure, which through its language materializes all human choices regarding the temporal flow of the narrative, the form, and the aesthetics. The cinematographic message is expressed by several codes, specific or general, which may or may not come from the cinematic universe (Metz 1980).

Some theorists have discussed the limits of what can or cannot be considered cinematic language. An important point for its evolution was the inclusion of sound in movies (Bazin 1991), as it changed the dynamics of how the narrative can be told and the possible elements in the scene that can be portrayed by sound. Aumont et al. (1995) believe that Cinema has a universal language that can be understood by anyone, for which there is no need for translation. Besides Béla Balázs, already in the 1920's, other theorists such as Martin, Metz and Mitry are

also pointed out, with their studies concerning the grammar of Cinema, through which it is possible to recognize studies in Semiology.

The artistic expression in Cinema is compared to theatre by Bela Balázs (1952), because both cinema and theatre are arts with moving images. From the three basic principles of theatrical art - all in space, fixed distance, and fixed viewer's angle of vision - cinema and theatre differentiate themselves. Films present a new dynamic: distance between spectator and scene, division of the integral image of the scene into sections and change of angle, perspective and focus within the same scene (Balázs 1952).

Metz (1972; 1980) used Semiology for the understanding of cinematographic language. The author also recognizes cinematic form and aesthetics as a large part of what is known theoretically as the language of cinema. Metz (1980) discusses Gilbert Cohen-Séat's (1946) notion of analysis applicable to movie and cinema as it divides the filmic fact from the cinematic fact. Connected directly to the cinematographic fact is Semiology, which Metz (1980) defines as an object of study for the semiotician, as it consists of a set of codes that combine into discourses. Whereas for Cohen-Séat (1946 qtd in Metz 1980) it is an object of study that concerns other fields such as the economic, the social and the technological.

As for the filmic fact, it is defined by Metz (1980) as a limited object with its locatable discourse. The difference consists in the fact that the movie is created. The cinematographic fact is responsible for the codes (cinematographic or otherwise), while the filmic fact uses these codes to produce the film. The filmic fact is intrinsically linked to Semiology, insofar as it is configured by the choices of those responsible for the production/construction of the art: the cinematographic object, in fact, is immense and heteroclitic, sufficiently immense that some of its aspects - such as the technological or economic aspect - come to exclude themselves by themselves from the semiological approach (Metz 1980).

From Semiology, it is understood that the cinematographic language can contain several codes and other languages, such as verbal and musical (Metz 1980). By focusing on the cinematographic codes, common only to Cinema, we can discover cinematography. These codes are, for example, the angle, the photographic composition, and montage. From this stem the artistic differences between periods of Cinema, by the techniques and aesthetics used by filmmakers (Metz 1980).

Along with cinematography, montage (or editing) has established itself as one of the main pieces for the cinematic language, as it gives a temporal flow to the narrative, in a

chronological sense (Balázs 1952). In Oliveira and Colombo's (2014) definition, montage is a combination of artistic effects in the narrative, giving Cinema its aesthetic character.

Editing occurs at the end of the production process, in post-production. In a technical way, editing is responsible for the decoupage of the script, for the unity of action, takes and shots of the same scene (Aumont et al. 1995). With the development of digital technology, editing is done on the computer. Even though editing is an important part for cinematographic production, Metz (1980) criticizes the idea of Cinema as an art of editing since the filmic message does not present only this code.

However, **Mitry (1997)** does not see Cinema as a language, but as a means of expression. Language refers to the objects in the scene and their place in the action, related to the rhythm and narrative of the film. Film can be considered a language in its moment of reproduction, which gives continuity to the aesthetics used, since the very process is one of recording and reproduction:

A film is something other than a system of signs and symbols (at least it does not present itself as that exclusively). A film first and foremost comprises images, images of something. A system of images whose purpose is to describe, develop, and narrate an event or series of events. However, these images - according to the chosen narrative - become organized into a system of signs and symbols; in addition they become (or have the possibility of becoming) signs. They are not uniquely signs, like words, but first and foremost objects and concrete reality, objects which take on (or are given) a predetermined meaning. It is in this way that the cinema is a language; it becomes language to the extent that it is first of all representation and by virtue of that representation. It is, so to speak, a language in the second degree (**Mitry 1997 p. 15**).

Martin (2005) also points out that Cinema is beyond language, meeting with aesthetics and having the image as its basis. The image is a reproduction of reality, of what we see and is subject to interpretation. Language, common to all filmmakers, is the meeting point of technique and aesthetics; the specific style of each one is the sublimation of technique in aesthetics (Martin 2005).

4.2 Semiology

Semiology is a science that, in the words of Saussure (2013), studies the role of signs as part of social life. It is the science of signs, where language is configured as a system of signs (Jakobson 2007). However, in Hjelmslev's (1961) view, language is not only a system of signs, as it is configured as a system of figures used in the construction of signs. Thus, language

should not be understood only as systems of signs, but as systems of figures for the construction of signs.

Language, like everything present in our reality, is in constant transformation. It can be approached by human cognition, as much as by social communication (Saussure 1959). It is responsible for the way society accumulates and transmits its information and knowledge (Lotman 1978): “A language is a system of signs expressing ideas, and is therefore comparable to a system of writing, the alphabet of deaf-mutes, symbolic rites, polite formulas, military signals, etc.” (Saussure 1959 p. 16).

Semiology can also present itself as an approach for Information Science and Knowledge Organization to realize the process of organizing and representing information through language (Barros and Café 2012; Friedman and Thellefsen 2011). Information can be understood as a sign (Raber and Budd 2003):

a comprehensive understanding of information would, from a semiotic view, perceive objects of information as signs that hold objective (ontological) features having interpretive (epistemological) features as well (Thellefsen et al. 2018 p. 373).

In the field of psychology, language is studied as an expression of culture, which can be found in various types of art. In psychoanalysis, Lacan differentiates three levels in human reality, the first being nature, the second is when nature becomes culture, and the third is culture itself - the symbolic level - where language can be found (Dayan 2005). Dayan also points out that semiotic systems within the arts, such as cinema and painting, are dependent on history and human ideology, unlike language which are not exactly dependent on historical influences (Dayan 2005).

According to Barthes (2006) the sign is the main component of a semiological system, it is a (bifacial) piece of sonority, visuality etc. For Hjelmslev, the sign is composed of two layers, form, and substance, where form can be represented by linguistics, while substance cannot, as it requires "extralinguistic premises" (Barthes 2006).

For Saussure (2013), the sign is formed by the signified and the signifiers. It is responsible for reflecting the objects and phenomena it represents. The process of signification occurs so that the meaning is the representation of something (Barthes 2006), because the signifier cannot be defined without a meaning. For Oliveira and Colombo (2014), signifier is an image and the signified is what represents that image, and that image - in Cinema - is equivalent to one or more sentences (plans), and the sequence of sentences is a complex

segment of discourse - imagetic discourse. The camera has a great participation in this process because it captures everything. At that moment, signification occurs, and meaning is produced (Martin 2005).

In the context of cinematographic discourse, the systems can be seen as language associations (Barthes 2006). While the syntagma is related to speech, the system and syntagma are two parts of the semiological system, in which metaphor and metonymy are housed, which also maintain relations with other systems of meaning (Barthes 2006). According to Jakobson (2007), metaphor and metonymy are essential elements for the cinematographic structure, as they reconcile and order time and space from their planes. The shots can be seen as a visual parameter of the image from its frames, and the montage creates a movement, configuring itself as an editing unit (Aumont et al 1995).

Cinematographic language is seen by Metz (1980) as less advanced compared to linguistics, as there are no connections between its components, as there are in linguistics with syntax and phonetics. However, Cinema contains a wide range of codes, which exist independently and can be combined in the movie (Metz 1980). For Martin (2005), camera movement is a code, in which each movement is configured as a sign, due to the reason and meaning of each movement. Jakobson (2007), on the other hand, writes that each shot is the sign, having the same role as the letter in grammar. Metz (1980) divides the codes into specific and non-specific of the cinematic language. For this author, the domain of Cinema, to exist, is distinguished first by its great extent: the messages (the movies) are large in number, many of them are long messages, each of which comprises many images, many sounds, many lines (and therefore many mixed configurations). Even the superficial level of the field can only *a priori* increase the chances of optical multiplicity (Metz 1980).

4.3 Aesthetic and form

Form is a grouping of techniques to put the ideas for the movie into practice. Bordwell (2013) wrote that form, aesthetics, genre, and its types, such as documentary or fiction, complete the cinematographic study. In Bordwell et al.'s (2017) perspective, form is the union of the movie's elements, making them influence its rhythm, meaning and feeling transmitted to the people watching it.

In Eisenstein's (2002) conception, form does not arise only from techniques. There must be the emotional part of the form, so that the constructed content is not irrelevant and incomprehensible. Only a well-executed technique, showing a quality aesthetic work, does not

guarantee the quality of the movie. The organization between form and content is necessary to characterize a work of art, enabling unity in the movie.

Style presents the patterns used in cinematographic techniques. It is a pattern of technical choices within the form of the movie. According to Bordwell (2013) style is the texture of the images and sounds of the film, the result of choices made by the filmmaker(s) in specific historical circumstances. For Cordeiro (2000), in Cinema, style occurs in dialogues, moving images, music and noises, which are not always registered in the script, especially in the cases of American scripts, which exclude camera details (camera position).

Mise-en-scène means 'to set the scene' and portrays the control that directors have over movies, with their technical and artistic decisions, in this case within the image (Bordwell et al. 2017). Cinematography means "writing in motion", where the issues regarding the image in its space are decided (Bordwell et al. 2017). From each shot, different variables are determined, such as exposure and frame rate, colors, lighting, speed of movement, etc. (Bordwell et al. 2017). For Betton (1987), the image, the main channel of communication of the message and representation of reality, includes techniques that make it possible to maintain time and space in the narrative.

5 Cinematographic productions

Cinematographic production can be seen as a technical process conditioned by the artistic component. Producers and directors manage a team responsible for each sector of the process, with diverse activities and functions, to realize all formally planned forms and aesthetics. The three main moments of cinematographic production are pre-production, production, and post-production. It looks like a factory in activity, with its various sectors, workers, artists, and machines (Marques 2007).

The first phase is pre-production, but this definition may vary. For example, Rodrigues (2007) divides the production moments in a less generalist way. First, there is the creation of the script, project development and fundraising. Then the preparation phase begins followed by pre-production, filming, 'de-production' and finalization. The phases placed before pre-production can be understood as pre-production for other authors. In preparation, decisions regarding the process are established in the administrative sphere, such as the choice of locations for filming, the schedule and the various decoupages that are done by the different teams.

Marques (2007) sees the preparation phase as constituting pre-production, which is done by the production and direction department. It is at this moment that all the details about the activities to be carried out are agreed upon. At this point, the decoupage of the script is an important task, as artistic expression comes down to this. For Marques (2007), the script, the filming plan and the budget are the processes (materialized in documentation) necessary to enter the production phase.

According to Cordeiro (2000), the whole process starts from an idea, which leads to the feasibility phase, such as the preparation of the script and fundraising. Then comes pre-production, to prepare the production (filming), followed by post-production, and then the launch and marketing of the final product.

Production is the phase in which filming takes place. Everything that has been planned is carried out by the different departments. Production activities allow the schedule and budget to be met, while artistic departments such as photography, art direction and directing, take responsibility for transposing what was decided in pre-production - such as technical analysis and decoupage (Marques 2007). In post-production, the editing of the film to its final form is present. Napolitano (2003) places distribution as part of this phase, in which the film is marketed and presented to the public.

6 Documents from cinematographic practices

The complex process of filmmaking is made up of artistic as well as administrative decisions. To support the decisions and technical activities, in which form and aesthetics are put into practice, documents of various types are created. These documents arise in association with production management, so that the production takes place within its planning.

The family of documents produced by a movie comes from the functions and activities of the process, which is divided into its production phases. This process is standardized and followed by most studios and filmmakers. The documents produced may be of administrative, financial, or artistic nature, such as photography, recorded sounds and shots that make up the whole cinematographic work.

A significant part of the documents produced in conjunction with the movie are not usually organized and preserved (Cordeiro 2000), however they are part of the context of the movie, and its creation process, and even of the companies which own them. It is a source of information, knowledge, and memory.

In the following tables, connections are presented between the production phases, their activities, the team responsible, the objectives of each activity and the documents generated, as well as their genre.

Table 1 - Activities of film pre-production and document production

Production phase	Activity	Responsible team	Objective/Specificities	Document (document genre)
Pre-production	Script development	Screenwriter	Base text for the development of the audio-visual product. It is a work of transition, with no end in itself (Marques, 2007)	<i>Storyline</i> , synopsis, script, <i>scalette</i> , screenplay (text)
	Project development	Production and Direction Team	Present the details outlined in relation to the project, such as the justification, literary script, the producer's and director's curriculum, company documents, initial schedule, preventive budget, etc.	Film project (text, may contain imagens)
	Budget development	Production and Direction Team	Estimate the total cost of production, always considering the unforeseen events that may occur during filming and post-production	Final budget, supply request, Expenses forecast, Receipt for services rendered (also present in production) (text)
	Fundraising (private or public)	Production and Direction Team	The project developed is used to raise funds and benefit from government incentives	Production letter, contracts (text)
	Contract preparation	Production and Direction Team (team leaders)	Hire technical staff for the various departments, actors, and extras.	Authorization of images, Assignment of rights to the film, extras' attendance sheet (text)
	Scheduled development	Production and Direction Team	Where all the dates referring to the stages to the movie's production are presented.	Flowchart (text)
	Director's decoupage	Direction team	Define shots, lenses, camera, and actor movements (Rodrigues, 2007)	Director's decoupage (text)
	Decoupages	Each creative team responsible for its sector	Creative indications from technical analysis. (Ex: technical script made by the direction's team with indication of shots and sequences)	Decoupage by department, locations, cast, set design, costumes, props, stage vehicles, equipment. (text)
	Technical analysis	Production team	Systematize all information regarding locations, characters (actors), scenes and sequences, technical material, clothing, and props	Technical analysis (text)
	Filming Location Search	Direction and production teams	Choice and rental of the spaces where the scenes will be filmed	Authorization for use of locations for filming, contract for the provision of property rental services for filming (text)

	Equipment rental	Direction and production teams	Equipment necessary for the execution of filming, such as cameras, electrical equipment, lenses, microphones, etc.	Equipment rental contract
	Filming plan development	Direction and production teams	Presented by Rodrigues (2007) as an analytical chronogram (production map), which determines which scenes will be filmed during the days of production. In addition, the order of filming locations, objects and the technical team and actors required for each place and days are defined. It is a technical-administrative instrument that gathers all the numerous necessary elements, at different times (Marques, 2007).	Filming plan

Source: Based on Rodrigues (2007); Marques (2007); Cordeiro (2000).

Table 2 - Activities of film production and document production

Production phase	Activity	Responsible team	Objective/Specificities	Document (document genre)	
Production	Schedule compliance	Production team	Maintain the scheduled dates, as delays can imply a higher production cost, thus going over budget. Control of locations, teams, transport, food, accommodation	Schedule	
	Control of budget, costs, and purchases in general	Production team (especially executives)	To avoid going over budget	Purchase receipts, expenses reports (text)	
	Photograph (Action to produce the <i>Still</i>)	Production team (<i>still</i> or scene photographer)	Publicize the film, and preserve the production's memory	Set photos (iconographic)	
	Filming, actors, crews, and stage elements direction		Production team (production director), Direction team (1 st . direction assistant)	Ensure that the filming plan is being followed.	Agenda (per day), filming plan
			Photography team	Control the camera during filming and comply with the technical choices of camera movements, framing, shot used, as well as lighting and filters.	Camera bulletin, light bulletin (text) Scenes photographs (iconographic)
			Direction team (Director)	Establish the artistic choices in the film	Scenes, sequences, and shots from the film - raw material (audio-visual)
			Direction team (continuity)	Ensuring the continuity of the scenes (space and character characteristics in the scene, position of objects) since the takes can be filmed days or weeks apart. Control of what is filmed daily, and the takes that the director wants to discard from the editing.	Continuity sheets; costume and accessories sheets; costume map; continuity binder (text)
	Sound capture	Sound team	Capture the sound to be edited with moving images, either directly or dubbing	Sound bulletin (text) Raw sound (sound)	
	Set, costume, and make-up follow up and maintenance of filming plans (according to the artistic choices)	Art direction (costume designer, set designer, prop designer, etc.)	Maintain the artistic choices regarding costumes and sets defined in pre-production, together with the director and the photography team.	Technical analysis spreadsheet, purchase receipts (text)	

Source: Based on Rodrigues (2007); Marques (2007); Cordeiro (2000).

Table 3 - Activities of film post-production and document production

Production phase	Activity	Responsible team	Objective/Specificities	Document (document genre)
Post-production	Film editing or montage	Editing team (image editor/sound editor)	Putting takes, shots, and scenes in a narrative sense, together with the captured sound (sound staging).	Editing decision list (text) Edited movie (audio-visual)
	Application of special effects, animations, 3D	Editing team	Introduction and development of digital visual effects	Movie (audio-visual)
	Color correction	Photography team	Coloring and correction of the image according to the chosen aesthetic	Movie (audio-visual)
	Soundtrack creation	Editing team	Creation of music for the movie	Music album (audio-visual)
	Sound mixing	Editing team (mixer)	Finalize the sound treatment of the movie, with dialogues, music, and ambient sounds.	Mixing map (text)
	Finalization	Editing team	Finishing the whole of the movie in terms of editing, aesthetics, effects, credits.	Movie – final version (audio-visual)

Source: Based on Rodrigues (2007); Marques (2007); Cordeiro (2000).

These tables show that the direction and/or production teams play a preponderant role in the pre-production and production phases. The post-production phase is essentially the responsibility of the photography, editing or production teams. One can also perceive the primacy of the textual document in the first phase, while the remaining phases are characterized by a majority of audio-visual typologies. The systematization of the activities, their objectives and the resulting documentation constitutes an added value for the understanding of the cinematographic practices from a [macro]functional perspective (and if we associate the identification of the teams responsible, we can even suggest an organic-functional perspective). The explicitness of the documentary genres and typologies and their production context serve as a starting point for records appraisal. These tables also provide insight into the business process logic, useful for formulating proposals for processing, procedures, classification, and records schedule. This supports the contextualization of the artistic object in question, ensuring its understanding within the memory and cultural heritage of the Society of which it is part.

By viewing the documentation produced from the cinematographic production process, and considering the cinematographic language, it becomes possible to visualize the context of the production, whether artistic or administrative. The Domain Analysis makes it possible to understand what makes up a certain domain, evidencing its context within a community. The related documents are a link that strengthens the context around the movie and its integration

with its producer. In this way, not only the movie should be organized and preserved, but also all the documents produced to concretize the movie.

7 Conclusion

Domain analysis was used to structure a theoretical proposal for archival classification in cinematographic archives. The context is evidenced in the domain analysis, which is a primordial characteristic in the functional analyses of archival documents. In this way, it is possible to associate the two analyses, aiming at the organization of the cinematographic archive. The functional aspect of documentation also comes from its social context, which is also applicable to Cinema.

In the process of documentary production in the cinematographic field, language is a tool to understand how documents are produced and what they are used for in the context of the process. The movie and related documents arise from aesthetic, technical and administrative decisions made throughout the project, developed through a complex process that requires various activities, functions and people to be carried out. The related documents are also part of the production context, integrating the movie to which they belong. For the classification of the documentation, the knowledge of the production phases is essential for the organization of the archive since it is the functional organization context of the company/studio responsible for the movie. Furthermore, the analysis of the domain of Cinema, from its language, also benefits the representation of the content, which is an indispensable activity in the organization of an archive, promoting access to users. Understanding the cinematography, the composition of the image, and so on, are ways of recognizing the message and its meaning. Recognizing the meaning of the image itself and describing it makes it possible to generate information for subsequent knowledge production.

The literature on the organization of audio-visual and cinematographic documents is scarce. The Knowledge Organization shows itself as a possible way to approach the organization of cinematographic documents, relying on domain analysis. As a functional analysis, the study of context makes it possible to understand the domain of cinema more comprehensively

References

- Albrechtsen, Hanne. "This is Not Domain Analysis". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 42, no. 8, 2015, pp. 557-61, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-2015-8-557. Accessed 09 Oct. 2020.
- Andersen, Jack, and Skouvig, Laura. "Knowledge Organization : A Sociohistorical Analysis and Critique Author". *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy*, vol. 76, no. 3, 2006, pp. 300–22.
- Aumont, Jacques, et al. *A Estética Do Filme*. Papirus Editora, 1995.
- Balázs, Béla. *Theory of the Film*. Dennis Dobson LTD, 1952, <http://marefateadyan.nashriyat.ir/node/150>. Accessed 21 Mar. 2021.
- Barthes, Roland. *Elementos de Semiologia*. Editora Cultrix, 2006.
- Bazin, André. *O Cinema*. Brasiliense, 1991.
- Betton, Gerard. *Estética Do Cinema*. Livraria Martins Fontes editora LTDA, 1987.
- Bordwell, David, et al. *Film Art: An Introduction*. University of Wisconsin, 2017.
- Bordwell, David, and Thompson, Kristin. "A Arte Do Cinema: Uma Introdução". *São Paulo, Campinas: Edusp, Editora Da Unicamp*, EdUSP, 2013, https://scholar.google.com.br/scholar?q=a+arte+do+cinema+bordwell&btnG=&hl=pt-BR&as_sdt=0%2C5#3. Accessed 02 Apr. 2021.
- Cook, Terry. "Archival Science and Postmodernism: New Formulations for Old Concepts". *Archival Science*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2001, pp. 3–24, doi:10.1007/BF02435636. Accessed 07 Mar. 2021.
- Cook, Terry. "The Concept of the Archival Fonds in the Post-Custodial Era: Theory, Problems and Solutions". *Archivaria*, vol. 35, 1993.
- Cordeiro, Rosa Ines de Novais. *Informação e Movimento: Uma Ciência Da Arte Fílmica*. 2000.
- Dahlberg, Ingetraut. "Knowledge Organization: Its Scope and Possibilities". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 20, no. 4, 1993, pp. 211–22, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-1993-4-211. Accessed 14 Nov. 2020.
- Dayan, Daniel. "O Código Tutor Do Cinema Clássico". *Teoria Contemporânea Do Cinema - Vol. I*, Senac São Paulo, 2005, pp. 321–38.
- Barros, Camila Monteiro de, and Café, Lígia Maria Arruda. "Estudos Da Semiótica Na Ciência Da Informação: Relatos de Interdisciplinaridades". *Perspectivas Em Ciencia Da Informacao*, vol. 17, no. 3, 2012, pp. 18–33, doi:10.1590/S1413-99362012000300003. Accessed 08 Jun. 2021.
- Douglas, Jennifer. "Origins: Evolving Ideas about the Principle of Provenance." *Currents of Archival Thinking*. Edited by Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil, Libraries Unlimited, 2010, pp. 23–44.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. *A Forma Do Filme*. Edited by Jorge Zahar, 2002.
-
- Silva, Alexia Guimarães Monteiro da, et al. Domain Analysis as an approach to the Classification of Cinematographic Documents. *Brazilian Journal of Information Science: Research trends*, vol. 16, *Dossier Domain Analysis*, 2022, e02141. DOI: 10.36311/1981-1640.2022.v16.e02141

- Friedman, Alon, and Thellefsen, Martin. "Concept Theory and Semiotics in Knowledge Organization". *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 67, no. 4, 2011, pp. 644–74, doi:10.1108/00220411111145034. Accessed 10 Jul. 2020.
- Gnoli, Claudio. "Ten Long-Term Research Questions in Knowledge Organization". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 35, no. 2–3, 2008, pp. 137–49, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-2008-2-3-137. Accessed 01 Nov. 2020.
- Guimarães, José Augusto Chaves, and Tognoli, Natália Bolfarini. "Provenance as a Domain Analysis Approach in Archival Knowledge Organization". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 42, no. 8, 2015, pp. 562–69, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-2015-8-562. Accessed 02 Nov. 2020.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. *Prolegomena to a Theory of Language*. The University of Wisconsin Press, 1961.
- Hjørland, Birger. "Domain Analysis in Information Science: Eleven Approaches - Traditional as Well as Innovative". *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 58, no. 4, 2002, pp. 422–62, doi:10.1108/00220410210431136. Accessed 17 Aug. 2020.
- Hjørland, Birger. "Empiricism, Rationalism and Positivism in Library and Information Science". *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 61, no. 1 SPEC. ISS., 2005, pp. 130–55, doi:10.1108/00220410510578050. Accessed 07 Feb. 2021.
- Hjørland, Birger. "Knowledge Organization (KO)". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 43, no. 6, 2016, pp. 475–84, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-2016-6-475. Accessed 06 Mar. 2021.
- Hjørland, Birger. "Reviews of Concepts in Knowledge Organization: Integrative Levels". *Knowledge Organization*, vol. 44, no. 5, 2017, pp. 349–79, doi:10.5771/0943-7444-2017-5-349. Accessed 14 Nov. 2020.
- Hjørland, Birger, and Albrechtsen, Hanne. "Toward a New Horizon in Information Science: Domain-analysis". *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, vol. 46, no. 6, 1995, pp. 400–25, doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199507)46:6<400::AID-ASIS2>3.0.CO;2-Y. Accessed 16 Aug. 2020.
- Jakobson, Roman. *Linguística. Poética. Cinema*. Perspectiva, 2007.
- Johnson, R. Burke. "Examining the validity structure of qualitative research". *Education*, vol. 118, no. 2, 1997, pp. 282.
- Lima, Telma Cristiane Sasso de, and Miotto, Regina Célia Tamasso. "Procedimentos Metodológicos Na Construção Do Conhecimento Científico: A Pesquisa Bibliográfica". *Revista Katálisis*, vol. 10, no. spe, 2007, pp. 37–45, doi:10.1590/s1414-49802007000300004. Accessed 23 Dec. 2020.
- Lotman, Yuri. "Introdução". *Estética e Semiótica Do Cinema*, Editorial Estampa, 1978.
- Mai, Jens Erik. "A Postmodern Theory of Knowledge Organization". *Proceedings of the ASIS Annual Meeting*, vol. 36, no. January 1999, 1999, pp. 547–56.
- Marques, Aída. *Ideias Em Movimento*. Edited by ROCCO, 2007.

- Martin, Marcel. *A Linguagem Cinematográfica*. Dinalivro, 2005.
- Metz, Christian. *A Significação No Cinema*. 1972, pp. 295.
- Metz, Christian. *Linguagem e Cinema*. Editora Perspectiva, 1980.
- Millar, Laura. "The Death of the Fonds and the Resurrection of Provenance: Archival Context in Space and Time". *Archivaria*, vol. 53, no. 1, 2002, pp. 1–15.
- Minayo, Maria Cecília de Souza. *Pesquisa Social: Teoria, método e criatividade*. Vozes, 2002, pp. 80.
- Mitry, Jean. *The Aesthetics and Psychology of the Cinema*. Translated by Christopher King. Bloomington, IN, USA: Indiana University Press, 1997.
- Napolitano, Marcos. "Elementos de Linguagem e História do Cinema". *Como Usar o Cinema na Sala de Aula*, Editora Contexto, 2003.
- Nesmith, Tom. "Postmodernism and the Changing Intellectual Place of Archives." *The American Archivist*, vol. 65, no. 1, 2002, pp. 24–41.
- Nesmith, Tom. "Still Fuzzy, But More Accurate: Some Thoughts on the 'Ghosts' of Archival Theory". *Archivaria*, vol. 47, no. 47, 1999, pp. 136–50.
- Oliveira, Robespierre de, and Colombo, Angélica Antonechen. "Cinema e Linguagem: As Transformações Perceptivas e Cognitivas." *Discursos Fotográficos*, vol. 10, no. 16, 2014, pp. 13–34, doi:10.5433/1984-7939.2013v10n16p13. Accessed 27 Mar. 2021.
- Raber, Douglas, and Budd, John M. "Information as Sign: Semiotics and Information Science". *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 59, no. 5, 2003, pp. 507–22, doi:10.1108/00220410310499564. Accessed 08 Jun. 2021.
- Rodrigues, Chris. *O Cinema e a Produção*. Lamparina, 2007.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. The Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. "The Object of Study". *Course in General Linguistics*, Bloomsbury, 2013, pp. 9–19.
- Smiraglia, Richard P. "Domain analysis as a methodological paradigm in knowledge organization". *Domain Analysis for Knowledge Organization*, 2015, pp. 19-40.
- Thellefsen, Martin Muderspach, et al. "Information as Signs: A Semiotic Analysis of the Information Concept, Determining Its Ontological and Epistemological Foundations". *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 74, no. 2, 2018, pp. 372–82, doi:10.1108/JD-05-2017-0078. Accessed 13 Jun. 2021.
- Tognoli, Natália Bolfarini, and Guimarães, José Augusto Chaves. "A Organização Do Conhecimento Arquivístico: Perspectivas de Renovação a Partir Das Abordagens Científicas Canadenses". *Perspectivas Em Ciencia Da Informacao*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2011, pp. 21–44, doi:10.1590/S1413-99362011000100003. Accessed 29 Out. 2019.

Copyright: © 2022 Silva, Alexia Guimarães Monteiro da, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons CC Attribution-ShareAlike (CC BY-SA), which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, under the identical terms, and provided the original author and source are credited.

Received: 11/09/2021 Accepted: 18/03/2022