
Time and Space in the Organization of Online Graffiti Art Image Collections

ANN M. GRAF

ABSTRACT

The research presented herein provides insight into the use of chronological and geographical organization in the management of noninstitutional graffiti art image collections online. The use of smartphones and other GPS-enabled technology may lead one to expect precision in the geographic location of images, but this is not the norm when image galleries are often based on submissions from a large variety of sources, a small percentage of which may include the artists of the original works. The fact that graffiti art is very often carried out illegally influences the granularity of geographic information provided by those who submit photos to online graffiti art websites, as well as the willingness of those managing the websites to divulge precise information. Concerning the element of time, images added to the websites also lack precision in the differentiation of when a work was completed, modified, painted over, buffed or otherwise removed, photographed, or added to the image collection. Despite these challenges, time and, even more so, space remain commonly encountered organizational divisions used by those who manage online image galleries of graffiti art.

INTRODUCTION

While research has looked at several cases where museums have solicited information from collection users and attempted to leverage this information in the online environment (for examples, see Trant 2009; Cairns 2013; Chae and Kim 2011; and Chan 2007), research is lacking on the actual practice of art collection organization and description originating from outside the formal institution. Because by definition graffiti art is found outside museums, the greatest amount of documentation is taking place outside museums as well. Srinivasan et al. (2009), still writing from

the institutional point of view, advocate for expanding the curatorial voice of museum documentation, allowing for multiple viewpoints to be added in along with the museum's authority. Terras (2010) speaks directly to the value of online collections curated by amateurs, or professional amateurs. Such pro-amateurs must often rely on the information they receive from their image donors, but they also know enough about what they are documenting to provide organization by divisions that will be useful to users of their collections. After studying several virtual collections by amateur enthusiasts, she concludes that "ephemera and popular culture materials are often better served by the pro-amateur community than memory institutions" (436). This is an example of what Dallas (2016) refers to as documentation in the wild. Citing the work of Terras and others, he warns against the tendency to assume that formal institutions are best equipped for all types of curation. The extrainstitutional context of graffiti art is a perfect example of the value of community insiders and the specialized knowledge they bring to bear on the curation of these works. As such, the research reported herein constitutes documentation practice in the wild using Dallas's description, another way of referencing everyday documentation, the theme of this special issue.

The way in which images of graffiti artworks are gathered by the collectors in this study impacts the ability of the curators to organize their collections. Submissions of images are received from varied individuals including the artists themselves, admirers and photographers who actively seek out the works or who have stumbled across them serendipitously, and the curators themselves. Because it would be extremely difficult, or even impossible, to gather a large collection of images without the help of those who contribute to the websites, submissions of images are often accepted gladly and even sought out actively. When image collections are built in this way, the metadata accompanying individual images will also vary greatly. Someone who submits an image taken in London, for example, may include information that says only that the image was taken in London. On the other hand, they may identify a part of London, a London landmark that is nearby, or even an address. The exchangeable image file format (EXIF) data attached to digital camera images may include GPS coordinates if location was enabled on the camera when the image was taken or may exclude this information or not have original EXIF data at all. For information related to time, the results are the same. The contributor of an image may know the exact date the photo was taken, or this may be available in the EXIF data. They may remember only the year or the season of the year or a range of years. All of these factors influence the amount of usable metadata for graffiti art images submitted to collection curators.

Ephemerality is also an issue. The works themselves disappear, remaining only as photographic traces of the originals in various stages of each

work's lifecycle. Graffiti art is commonly exposed to the elements and to the vagaries of urban life and as such is not protected by artistic sanction, institutional interest, or municipal charter. Works may be found on transient supports, such as construction fencing, that disappear as work in the area progresses through to completion. They may be intentionally removed by property owners or painted over by municipal crews or by other graffiti writers. They may peel, wash away, erode, or fade as sun, wind, rain, and other forces of nature take their toll. Other graffiti artworks may last much longer, situated in out-of-the-way places where they are left largely undisturbed and often undiscovered by the general public, but made visible online in image galleries by those who know where they are, or by those who come across them while walking more remote, though usually urban, trails. Some works are particularly intricate, socially powerful, or deemed beautiful by the masses and in this way are afforded informal protections earned by respect for the aesthetics or the message. Others, like those of British street artist Banksy, take on a life of their own and are highly valued, with efforts made to preserve them in perpetuity. There are differences in documentation between such ephemeral works of art on the street and those created with ephemerality in mind and purchased by a museum, though certain aspects of the record of each often come down to photographic or videographic recordings by the institutions that have purchased or support them, the artists who make them, and the general public who view them (Windon 2012).

Modern graffiti practice is generally agreed to have begun in Philadelphia in the latter half of the 1960s and soon thereafter became solidly embedded in New York City. Once train writing became popular, works could travel and styles were passed on from one location to the next. By the 1980s several graffiti zines had begun sharing images of graffiti art, first by those developing the zines and soon via submissions from readers, mirroring today's online practice. In this way, through the zines and the trains, graffiti styles were seen further and further from their original sources, and writers from other parts of the country and soon the world were able to copy artistic interventions and develop further lettering techniques (Austin 2001). This is greatly expanded in the online realm today where graffiti image galleries carry styles from one part of the world quickly and easily all over the globe. Students of the art form, art historians, and other scholars value the ability to see how styles are borrowed, copied, and modified, highlighting the evolution of the art form across time and space. Such documentation may also demonstrate how one artist or crew travels and leaves their mark on different parts of the world as they move through various cities. The knowledge of when something was executed is equally valuable for those who study graffiti art. Because these works are located on the streets, often in public spaces where they may be modified (either by the original artist or by others), painted over (again by the original

artist or by others), buffed out, or otherwise removed, documentation of the life cycle of a work provides valuable contextual information for those studying graffiti art.

What is considered outside the traditional art canon may become, over time, part of the mainstream. Today graffiti art may not be valued in the same way as a Michelangelo or da Vinci, but there may come a time when it is more generally accepted as worthy of collection, documentation, or preservation within a professional environment (Pollock and Battleground 2013). Acknowledging the gaps in documentation of graffiti art, Lederman and Jindani (2018) attribute this in part to the common belief that it is mere vandalism and not worth recording. While this attitude appears to be waning, even in the traditional art world, hundreds of websites exist that are tackling this type of documentation independently and are discussed in this research. Some of them have been doing it successfully for many years and provide insight into aspects of the works that are salient and useful to those in the graffiti art community.

Some works may gain a sort of public art status and remain in place for years on end, which is also valuable information (Santabárbara 2018). Very well-known artists, such as Banksy or Swoon, produce works that are critically documented, with location and dates carefully recorded and the condition of the work followed in great detail; however, the bulk of graffiti art around the globe is recorded by a great variety of actors in a very distributed and ad hoc fashion. In order to understand the state of graffiti art documentation around the world, 241 graffiti art websites were examined to discover which aspects of the works were being used to organize graffiti image collections. In the next section, website selection is discussed, along with the methods used to discover aspects of organization. Then the focus turns to those related to time and geographic location to illuminate the state of these aspects of graffiti art documentation online.

A BRIEF LOOK AT INSTITUTIONAL ART DOCUMENTATION

The history of art documentation practice grew out of directives already in place for libraries around the turn of the twentieth century. Museum roles were professionalized more slowly than those of libraries, and registration methods really did not experience the standardization that was seen in libraries until the 1990s when computerization became the norm (Buck and Gilmore 2010). Technology, therefore, has had a great impact on the types and amount of information added to records of museum artifacts, as well as the development of standards for description of material collections.

In a museum setting, there are several parts of a standard art documentation record that are considered core categories relating to time and place. Looking briefly at several standards for the description of artworks will set the stage for a comparison of practice between institutions and the

following report on online graffiti image galleries when recording this type of information. It is noted that although standards include guidance on recording time and place information, this does not mean that corresponding institutions always can or do abide by these directives. It does indicate the value placed on such information when available.

The VRA Core, maintained by the Library of Congress, includes a set of core elements for the description of visual resources and their associated images. Within the core category for agent are elements for date, including refinements for earliest and latest date, though this refers to the artist more directly than the date of the work itself. Another core category is for location information. The *stylePeriod* core element can be said to correspond to time, using associated style terminology of a particular period.

The Cataloging Cultural Objects (CCO) standard includes, in chapter 4 on stylistic, cultural, and chronological information, detailed guidelines for recording “the date or range of dates associated with the creation, design, production, presentation, performance, construction, or alteration of the work or its components” (Baca et al. 2006, 157). Chapter 9 of the standard includes guidelines for documenting dates associated with images of works as well. Chapter 5 is dedicated to location and geography. Four very basic guiding questions are given in the introduction to this section of the standard: “Where is it now? Where was it before? Where was it made? Where was it discovered?” (Baca et al. 2006, 183). This is more granular than what would normally be appropriate, or discoverable, for the recording of graffiti art, though some works are produced in places other than where they are eventually situated and recorded, as in the case of wheatpaste. Wheatpaste works are created off site, often in a studio, and pasted in place on various supports.

The Getty Vocabulary Program maintains *Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA)*, a set of guidelines for describing art, architecture, and works of cultural heritage (J. Paul Getty Trust 2019). CDWA includes core categories for the creation date of a work, refined by earliest and latest date, and the current location of a work, whether in a named repository, a geographic location, or a combination of both. Birth and death dates for creators are also considered core categories.

The United Kingdom uses the collection management standard *Spectrum* for best practices in museum documentation. The core record according to the *Spectrum* standard indicates inclusion of the current location of an object as well as the date when the information associated with an object was recorded. Beyond the core categories for description, *Spectrum* provides for the age, place, and position of an object, as well as any dates or places associated with the object, a field collection date and place, and an object production date and production place. Their guidelines for indexing catalog information also include a production date and associated places information (Collections Trust 2017).

The Canadian Heritage Information Network (CHIN) maintains data dictionaries that provide guidance on the types of information to be documented for cultural heritage collections. The data dictionaries contain metadata fields for numerous types of chronological and location data, including differentiation for when a work or object was created (with beginning and ending dates), when it was found, when it was photographed, when it was tested for dating, and how it was tested, plus numerous fields for chronological periods and styles as well as cataloging, acquisition, and registration dates. The data dictionary for origin/use includes a very granular list of geographic subdivisions for both of these types of data, from the broad continent level down through countries, counties, districts, municipalities, provinces, townships, and other geographic data (CHIN Data Dictionaries 2013).

The preceding information from a sample of popular standards for the documentation of art and cultural heritage objects demonstrates the importance of recording information concerning time and place for such objects and their images. The creation, discovery, gathering, and imaging of art and cultural heritage objects within institutions differs from that of graffiti art curated in online image galleries, but the value of time and place information is not in question in either environment. The practices of those who gather and share graffiti art images online may differ, but the research highlights current organizational practices and the possible reasons why they differ from institutional practice.

METHODOLOGY

In order to discover how aspects of time and space are being recorded to document graffiti art, it was necessary to look at collections of graffiti art images online. There are numerous websites in existence today that share images of graffiti art. Of these, the website Art Crimes is well known in the graffiti art community as the earliest and one of the largest (graffiti.org). Art Crimes began in 1994 by Susan Farrell and grew over the next two decades to host a very large gallery of graffiti art images from around the world. Along with hundreds of thousands of images to date, Art Crimes also collects links to other graffiti art websites. This list of links became the starting point for data collection.

At the time this research began in 2017, there were 709 websites linked from Art Crimes. Each of these 709 sites was visited and judgment was made regarding suitability for inclusion in this study based on a number of criteria. Websites were removed from the list when they were dead links, when they were solely in languages other than English, when they were an artist's professional site, when they were links to a site that did not focus on sharing graffiti art images (such as sites only for music groups, advertising, art sales, or art supplies), or when they were links only to other social media accounts, such as a Flickr or Instagram stream. While platforms such as

Flickr and Instagram host numerous accounts that share graffiti art, these platforms were excluded because of the structural limitations they place upon users for organization of images. Bilingual sites were accepted only if navigation labels were included in English alongside other languages, so effectively only English labels were coded for this research. Once these criteria were applied to the 709 sites, 241 remained for inclusion in this study. The list of sites and their URLs can be found in the appendix.

The 241 websites were each visited and the text from all labels used as navigation within the sites was gathered. These were imported into QDA Miner software and coded for various aspects of organization, using the text of the navigation labels. At the beginning, aspects of organization that were familiar were coded, such as location, time, styles, and surfaces upon which the artworks were found. As coding progressed, subdivisions of these broad aspects formed and became warranted, such as the repeated use of a specific type of time or geographic division, or common features of the websites themselves, such as an “about” page, use of a map, a page to contact the website curators, and pages for selling artwork or art supplies. When a specific country was named, it was coded as “country,” and likewise individual named cities, states, and so on. When different wording was used, labels were coded conceptually. For example, many websites had a standard “about” page, but some used natural language phrases such as “who we are” or “what we do,” and these were also coded “about.” Four broad categories of organization became apparent during analysis and were grouped into general, supports, types, and locations. These broad categories were further refined with numerous individual codes, using the conventions discussed above. Such codes for time and place are found within the general category and the entire location category, both shown in table 1. Complete category and code information can be found in Graf (2018).

The general category includes the time-related codes of year, month, day, and decade. It may seem odd to have something as important as time in a category labeled general, but this is simply the result of grouping aspects of works as coding progressed. This research was part of a larger study that examined more than time and space and included other aspects of the works themselves relating to artistic style and the supports upon which works were committed. Grouping chronological information in a general category is not prescriptive, but reflects management of a large number of codes, of which those reflecting aspects of time were not numerous. Only this subset of the general category that relates to time will be discussed.

The new code may refer to works that were new to the site, and not necessarily newly created works. The old code was also not precisely defined across the websites and may refer to historical graffiti works, instead of those uploaded first. Neither the old nor new codes were defined or used

Table 1. The general codes category, showing codes relating to time in italics, and the location codes category, showing all location-related codes.

General Codes	Location Codes
Artist	Cities
Event	Countries
Gallery	SpecificLandmarks
<i>Year</i>	CityParts
New	World
Old	Continents
Featured	States
Inside	CountryParts
RIP	Address
RatedHigh	Intersection
Legal	Undisclosed
Outside	
<i>Month</i>	
Color	
<i>Day</i>	
<i>Decade</i>	
Illegal	

consistently across sites, so they are not included in the analysis of time. The entire location category will be discussed.

THE TIME CODES

Looking at all 241 websites, navigation labels that relate to time were coded as shown in table 2. The four time-related codes are for year, month, day, and decade. Each time an individual year, month, day, or decade was used to organize a group of graffiti art images, this was coded accordingly. The table shows how often each of these codes was warranted in the count column, what percentage of all codes it represents, how many sites warranted that code, and what percentage of all 241 sites warranted that code. Some sites warranted a single code several times by having numerous galleries for various time elements. For this reason, it is useful to know both the number of times a code was assigned and the number of websites that warranted each type of code. The application of codes and the information represented in tables 2 and 4 include all codes in the larger research, including codes for graffiti styles and supports, all other general codes, and location codes.

Overall, time was not a very popular way to organize graffiti art images in this study, but when this type of information was used, it was most often in the form of a given year. If a writer dates a work, the year is the most common form of date given. Sometimes a writer will sign a work with a complete date of month, day, and year, but these details are not seen to be used as data by which sites organize images of works. Twenty-seven sites employed years as an organizational tool for graffiti artworks, while only five used months and only four sites used day and/or decade. The use of

Table 2. Time codes and how often they were used across all sites.

General Codes	Count	% of Codes	Sites	% of Sites
Year	227	1.1	27	11.2
Month	35	0.2	5	2.1
Day	5	0.0	4	1.7
Decade	8	0.0	4	1.7

decade was more common on sites that focus on historical graffiti. The day code was most often warranted when referring to a particular event, such as a graffiti festival or noted gathering.

It is unknown whether the labels refer to when the works were completed, when they were photographed, or when they were submitted to the sites. These are important distinctions that are not explicitly accounted for by the websites. Because of the aforementioned ephemeral nature of most graffiti and street art, it is important for researchers to know the difference between when a work was completed and when an image of the work was created. This distinction was found lacking in general. While disappointing from a researcher standpoint, it is understandable that this information is not present in these galleries because of the nature of graffiti art. Because it is often illegal, it is not advertised with dates and artists names in an effort to protect those who create it from prosecution. Many images on the websites are donated by visitors to or members of the sites, and curators must rely on the information they are given at the time of submission, which may be incomplete, untrustworthy, or absent.

HOW SITES COLLECT IMAGES AND ASSOCIATED DATA

To provide background on how the sites collect the images they feature, each site from the original research that was listed as accepting image submissions was revisited. Each of this subset was examined for stated parameters for those submissions, specifically for things relating to what kind of data they wanted along with each image. A small number of the 241 sites are no longer active or have updated their submission guidelines since 2018. When new submissions guidelines could not be found, what had been given within the data collected in 2017 was used. At this time, 31 out of 241 websites stated that they would accept images for posting to their websites. Of these 31 websites, only 9 state anything specific about additional information that they require to be submitted along with images, aside from technical specifications such as image size and format. Of these 9 websites, all of them ask for location information. Only 3 of the 9 ask for date information. The names of the 9 websites can be seen in table 3. The type of location and time-related data that they require with image submissions can be seen in the corresponding columns, using the wording taken from the websites.

Table 3. Location and time data requested to accompany image submissions on websites studied.

Site	Location Data Required	Time Data Required
Bombing Science	City	
Bristol Street Art	Where image taken (as precise as possible)	Date the photo was taken
GraffNet	Country and city	Date it was done
Intergraff	Town or city	
Miami Graffiti	Location—the location the graffiti was done (e.g., “Hialeah Penit,” “Freight,” “NW 1st Ave. & 21st St.”)	Date—the most accurate date that you know (e.g., “February 1st, 1992,” “June 2003,” “1998”)
Midnite Run	Where it was painted	
Spray City	City	
Stencil Archive	Location	
Upptown Graffiti	Country	

Looking at this table, one can see that there is more consistency in the data requests for location information, though variations exist. The most commonly requested type of location data is that for a named city, which will be shown below to be the most common aspect of location information used across all 241 websites. One website requests only country name, while two websites request more specific information. The latter two websites, Bristol Street Art and Miami Graffiti, focus on graffiti and street art from specific named cities, so it makes sense that they would want information that is more precise than just the name of the city. These two websites request more differentiation to place works within their individual city areas. Two other websites, Midnite Run and Stencil Archive, simply ask for the location of the work, or “where it was painted.”

Among the requested data relating to time, there is plenty of ambiguity. Bristol Street Art asks for the date the photo was taken, which is straightforward. GraffNet asks for the “date it was done,” but this does not specify whether this refers to the date the work was done or the date the photo was taken. Miami Graffiti asks for “the most accurate date that you know” and gives examples with specificity varying from one day to a specific month or year. Again, it is not clear whether they mean the date of the work featured in the image or the date of the photograph. What can be easily ascertained by examining the details of what the website curators request from those who submit images to the sites is that information regarding time is less often requested than that for location, and it is solicited in ways that exhibit imprecision and inconsistency. This lack of specificity is not surprising considering the previous discussion of how graffiti art is created and often serendipitously discovered. The circumstances of its creation render

precise dating difficult. The following section of the article discusses the use of place-related divisions for the organization of graffiti art images across the 241 websites.

THE LOCATION CODES

There is greater granularity found in the codes that relate to location than to time. The focus of individual sites will determine the granularity of location codes. As mentioned earlier, sites that feature work from one city will use a finer location granularity to distinguish locations within a smaller geographic area than sites that accept image submissions from around the world. Similar to table 3, table 4 shows how often each of the location codes was warranted in the count column, what percentage of all codes each represents, how many sites warranted that code, and what percentage of all 241 sites warranted that code. Some sites warranted a single code several times by providing numerous galleries for various location elements. Nine sites used an interactive map as part of their location-based organization. Users can click on various parts of a map to see images of works from the areas represented on the map, whether it is a city, state, country, or world map.

Organization of graffiti art images by cities was by far the most commonly encountered geographic division for location. Individual cities were used as galleries 1,637 times over 42 websites, representing nearly 10 percent of all codes in the study and used by about 18 percent of all sites. In general, the larger the landmass, the fewer uses of the particular location code, which makes sense considering that there are many more cities than there are countries and more countries than there are continents. Most sites using geographic divisions for organization used cities and countries as organizational divisions, though numerous exceptions exist.

Specific landmarks were used as organizational divisions by thirteen sites. Specific landmarks indicate places that are known areas commonly used by graffiti writers. Examples include named buildings, parks, and train yards. These often required additional research during coding to determine what they were. City parts were also used by thirteen sites to further narrow down named geographic areas such as the Mission District, the Castro, and Tenderloin in San Francisco, or Crouch End, Tottenham, and Plaistow in London. These names represent areas broader than specific landmarks.

The world division was used by websites that generally focus on a specific country or part of a country, but which have accepted submissions of images that fall outside that area. It is a very general descriptor to indicate simply that a work is from an area other than the main focus of the website. Continents is used as a division often on sites that feature work from around the world, and normally the application of this code is found in use with numerous other subdivisions for individual countries and cities.

Table 4. The location codes and how often they were used across all sites.

Location Codes	Count	% of Codes	Sites	% of Sites
Cities	1,637	8.6	43	17.8
Countries	543	2.8	37	15.8
SpecificLandmarks	73	0.4	13	5.8
CityParts	94	0.5	13	5.4
World	22	0.1	12	5.0
Continents	42	0.2	11	4.6
States	117	0.6	6	2.5
CountryParts	10	0.0	5	2.1
Address	2	0.0	1	0.4
Intersection	27	0.1	1	0.4
Undisclosed	2	0.0	1	0.4

Often a large site would offer users the ability to browse images from individual continents, or to go narrower within a continent to a country or a city, or possibly even more precisely to part of a city. All levels were coded for sites that offered this granularity.

States and parts of countries were not used very often—by six and five sites, respectively. Navigation labels were coded as states when indicating individual states in the United States, Canadian provinces, and Australian territories. Labels were coded as country parts when referring to geography such as the Midwest, the South, various coasts of the United States, Puerto Rico, or Andalusia, for example. Rarely was geographic information encountered as granular as actual street addresses or intersections. Use of GPS coordinates was never seen in the data, though it may have been used behind the scenes to populate navigational mapping on any of the nine sites that used maps.

Returning again to the previous discussion of what the curators requested from image contributors, information about location was requested more consistently than that for time. The presence of location information used to organize images of graffiti art was common practice across the websites, most often using named cities and countries as gallery divisions. While information relating to when a work of graffiti art is created can be difficult to precisely ascertain, location information is straightforward. The photographer usually knows where they are when they are taking a photo of a graffiti work, with varying levels of precision. The most often used divisions of city and country would normally be easily provided by the photographer, but the lag of time between taking a photograph and submitting the image to a graffiti collection online may result in forgotten information if it is not otherwise recorded or remembered. Forgotten location information may sometimes be retrievable within the EXIF information digitally attached to an image. Despite these challenges, location information remains easier to obtain and more often used as a way to organize images in online graffiti image galleries.

DISCUSSION

Time and place are basic aspects of description in the traditional art world. They are also important in the documentation of graffiti art, based upon the results of this research. But there are differences in how this information is added to collections of graffiti art images. The websites studied provided more consistent information regarding location than information regarding time. This difference is understandable when considering the often illegal and secretive practices surrounding graffiti art, the ephemerality of the works themselves, and how the images of the works are collected from a broad base of submissions.

Location information regarding graffiti artworks aligns more closely with institutional documentation practice. Art institutions are normally very precise regarding where a work of art is physically located, but this precision reflects aspects of ownership and maintenance responsibilities that do not apply to virtual collections of graffiti art. The core categories for professional documentation reviewed in various standards at the beginning of this report notably recommend information on where a work was created, which equates to a city or country, but sometimes is attributed only to a culture, especially with historic works. When location information is included in the organization of online collections of graffiti art images, it is relatively similar to that used in records of museum artworks.

It must be noted that although similarities exist in the addition of location information between museum works and graffiti art images, location information was used to organize works only about 18 percent of the time in this study by graffiti art image curators. Further research is needed to review the other 82 percent to discover whether or not the stated geographic focus of the individual websites provides implicit location information. This research also focused on organizational practices, not on the captions or titles of individual images, which may raise the percentages of the occurrence of time- and space-related metadata, but again which were beyond the scope of this research. It must also be noted that the practices of formal institutions when documenting artworks or objects will be much more detailed than what might be seen on the website for a museum, sharing images of artworks, for example. In contrast, the available records of graffiti art images in this study are those that are shared online, with the emphasis on the images themselves, and not on documenting actual works. This is an important distinction.

Comparison of Practices

Returning to the earlier discussion of institutional standards for documentation of artworks and objects of cultural heritage, it was noted that information relating to where a work or an object is created, where it is placed or found, and where it is held if moved are all important. Location information is very useful to situate artworks within a canon of related

works, possibly revealing the influence of those producing works in a similar place and time, whether among more traditional artists or the modern graffiti artist. Geographic information is shown to have value to those who curate images of graffiti, though this type of information is not easy to confirm, commonly though not consistently used to organize image galleries, and there are no standard means evident for requesting such information from those who contribute images to these collections. In order to host large image collections of graffiti art, the curators rely on submissions from a varied audience, members of which may or may not be aware of the value of this information, or because of the passing of time between photographing a work and supplying an image, the location is no longer known. If a graffiti artist is the one supplying images, the illegal nature of the works may cause reticence to share precise location information.

Despite these challenges, those who organize such collections do often rely on geographic divisions to organize works. The biggest difference between the collections in this research and those of art institutions appears to be that the location information is much less precise among the graffiti image collections. Whereas in an art museum the exact location of an artwork is most often known and recorded, a graffiti artwork may often be known to be only in a named city or, if a large city, a named part of a city. Often works are identified only at the level of a named country. The larger difference remains between the use of time-related information in institutions and in online graffiti image galleries.

The same standards discussed earlier also place importance on the date that a work was created as well as on the birth and death dates of individual artists. This report does not approach the use of artists' names as organization, though the broader study does reveal that this is one of the most common ways that online graffiti image galleries are organized (Graf 2018). Nonetheless, the use of time-related information for organization in this report and in the larger study both indicate that this is not one of the preferred ways to organize graffiti art image galleries. Only a small number of websites used organizational practices involving time-based information, and when they did, the most commonly used division of time by far was year. This type of organization was seen more commonly in websites that have a stated focus on historical graffiti.

In some ways, this mirrors the documentation practices in the traditional art museum. Best practices according to the standards discussed would provide for a date that an artwork was completed, sometimes providing dates for starting and finishing a work as well. Dates are also used to record when a work is acquired by an institution. Like location information, dating a work enables placement within a canon and may reveal similarities and differences to others produced in the same general time frame, evidencing evolution of style and technique. This is true in the traditional art world and in the graffiti art community. In both realms, date

information is often missing, especially for very old works in the art museum. Records may indicate a general time frame or even simply a century or even broader era as a best guess. Unless the one supplying an image of a graffiti work is the one who created it, or who saw it appear within a certain time frame, it is again very difficult to verify when a work was completed. Some works may last only hours, while others persist over decades, depending on the location, protection from the elements, and respect for the work by other graffiti artists. Often works are found serendipitously, photographed, and supplied to an online website without knowledge of the year of creation, let alone a specific date. When this information is lacking, but the image records a desirable work to be shared, the missing data do not preclude adding it to the collection. The visual record reigns, whether accompanying information is present or not.

Further Research

Considering how chronological and geospatial information is documented or overlooked, and the possible reasons for both, and comparing the practices reported herein with the best practices already discussed earlier from the point of view of institutional curation, a few important questions have been raised. How might institutions that wish to document graffiti art moderate between “best practices” and leveraging what is available through the efforts of those already carrying it out? How might an art institution learn from this example of curation in the wild to better serve users of their own collections? How are those already researching graffiti art from an art historical perspective using available records, such as those found on websites from this research? A first step along the way to answering these questions would be to design research to discover what users of graffiti art image websites want from these collections. This information is a very important piece of the puzzle. What institutions may do to document artworks and what the graffiti art community does to document graffiti artworks do not matter until it is known what users of those collections want and need from them. The author is continuing research toward this end.

CONCLUSION

This research has demonstrated that similarities exist between art institution standards and best practices for documenting time- and space-related information and the common practices of those documenting graffiti art around the world in online image collections. Those wishing to research graffiti art over time and space will have challenges to face in obtaining reliable data, often more so for chronological data. Understanding the limitations inherent in attempting to document an ephemeral, often illegal art form may inform institutional practice. Understanding how the graffiti art community is already documenting the works around the world

paves the way for accompanying research on users of graffiti art images and their needs regarding aspects of the works relating to time and space.

APPENDIX. THE WEBSITES.

Site	Home URL
12 Oz Prophet	www.12ozprophet.com
123 Klan	www.123klan.com
@ 149 St	www.AT149ST.com
156 Crew	http://156allstarz.net
187 Crew	www.graffiti.org/187/main.html
50mm Los Angeles	www.50mmlosangeles.com
abc @rtindustry—Vince	www.vince.de
Area 33	www.freewebs.com/area33
Airone	www.air-one.net
Amoeba	www.mauerpark.de/index2.html
AOS	www.aoscrew.com/index.htm
Armed Rob	www.armedrob.dk
Art Crimes	www.graffiti.org
Art of Graffiti	http://keusta.net/blog
The Art of Rocket	www.rocket01.co.uk
Art of Wall—Tokyo	www.big.or.jp/~kizuku/k.html/art.html
Artistic Bombing Crew	www.artisticbombingcrew.com
Askew	http://askew1.com
As One	www.styledepth.com
Australian Graffiti	http://australiangraffiti.blogspot.com
Azek	http://azekone.blogspot.com
Bandit77	www.bandit77.com
Banksy	www.banksy.co.uk
Bates	www.greatbates.com
Blade	www.bladekingofgraf.com
Blek le Rat	http://bleklerat.free.fr/stencil%20graffiti.html
BOL23	www.bol23.com
Bombing Science	www.bombingscience.com
Brave Arts	www.braveone.co.uk
Brikk Graf	www.graffiti.org/tranzit/brikkgraff
Bristol Street Art	www.bristol-street-art.co.uk
Burglar	http://burglar.massatto.net
BurnerzOnly	http://burnerz.pl
Can Two	www.cantwo.de
Can Control	http://cancontrolone.com
Cenz	www.mrcenz.com
Ces53	www.ces53.com
CMPSPIN	www.cmpspin.com
CNS Skillz (Checkin' new skillz)	www.cnskillz.com
Connections	http://members.tripod.com/~fr8connections
Crash	www.crashone.com
Crazy Apes	www.ca-crew.com
Cres	www.cres.dk
Crushing Miami	www.crushingmiami.com
The Cypher	www.graffiti.org/cypher
Dabs / *Dbsk1	http://dbsk1.com/main.php
Dabs & Myla	www.dabsmyla.com
Daim	http://daim.org
The Dark Site	http://home.kabelfoon.nl/~gio
Day-Z	www.day-z.com
Deace	www.deace.com

Site	Home URL
Deace—Old Version to 2009	www.deace.com/oldversion
Dest	www.dest.ch
DFM	www.rapschrift.de
Mr Dheo	www.mrdheo.com
Digital Jungle	www.graffiti.org/dj/index_dj.html
Does	www.digitaldoes.com
Dofi	www.dofitwo.com
Dome	www.domeone.de
Dondi CIA Kings	https://dondicia.wordpress.com
Double-H	www.double-h.org
Dr. Revolt's Graffiti Page	www.nytrash.com/Revolt.html
Drone	http://drone.withtank.com
Duncan Cumming	www.duncancumming.co.uk
DuroCIA	http://durocia.com
Dytch66	www.dytch66.com
EGR	www.EGRart.com
Eiresol Style	www.eiresol.com
Ekosystem	www.ekosystem.org
Elan Wonder	www.elanwonder.com
Endstation	www.graffiti.org/endstation
Eron	www.eron.it
Eyegasm	www.graffiti.org/eyegasm
Eyeone	www.eyelost.com
Ezra	www.ezraone.com
FAB	http://fabcrew.com
Faith47	www.faith47.com
Fatbombers	www.fatbombers.com
Fatcap.com	www.fatcap.com
Flashbereich.de	www.flashbereich.de
Fly ID	www.flyidcrew.com
Freon	http://freon1.free.fr
Full Color	www.fullcolor.gr
Full Time Artists	www.fulltimeartists.com
Ger	www.graffiti.org/ger
Getting Up	www.getting-up.en
Giant	www.graffiti.org/giant
Global Street Art	http://globalstreetart.com
Graffart	www.graffart.eu
Graffhead	http://graffiti.graffhead.com
Graffiti Collector	http://graffiti.white-tree.net
Graffiti Hamburg	www.graffitihamburg.de
Graffiti Planet	www.graffitiplanet.com
GraffitiFilms.TV	www.graffitifilms.tv
GraffNet	www.graffiti.org/graffnet
Haero	www.haero.com/muridxeng.htm
The Helsinki Connection	www.graffiti.org/hc/indexold.html
HUH?	www.graffiti.org/huh
The Hull Warehouses	www.angelfire.com/in/warehouse
Hurt You Bad	www.hurtyoubad.com
I Love Graffiti	http://ilovegraffiti.de
Intergraff international graffiti archive	www.intergraff.com
Invisible Made Visible	www.invisiblemadevisible.co.uk
Irish Street Art	www.irishstreetart.com
Iron Crew	www.ironcrew.narod.ru/home.htm
Iz The Wiz	www.izthewiz.com
Jersey Joe	www.JerseyJoeArt.com

Site	Home URL
Jiall	www.jialone.com
JoeyOne	www.joeyone.com
Jolt	http://guerillagarden.blogspot.com
Jor	www.jorgallery.com
Kazzrock	www.kazzrock.com
Keep Drafting	www.keepdrafting.com
Kelzo	www.kelzo.com
KGM	www.kgmcrew.ru
Kiam77	www.kiam77.de
Kings of New York	www.kingsofnewyork.net
Koma	www.mrkoma.com
Komik	www.komart.ch
Kromi	www.krmi.net
Lame Face crew	www.graffiti.org/lf
Legends Of Rare DeSign	www.graffiti.org/lords
Ler	www.lerart.com/english/home.html
Location 12	www.graffiti.org/dj/index-112.html
Loomit	www.loomit.de/version1/home.htm
Lounge37	www.lounge37.com
Love Graffiti	www.lovegraffiti.com
Lunar	www.lunar75.com/studio
Macia Crew	www.macia-crew.com
Mad C	www.madc.tv
Marka 27	www.marka27.com
Mason	www.mason.de
Mass Appeal Magazine	https://massappeal.com/news/art/graffiti
Mesh	http://meshrock.com
Miami Graffiti	www.miamigrffiti.com
Midnite Run	www.graffiti.org/midniterun
Most Valuable Players	www.xs4all.nl/~fromage
Mr W	www.misterw.com
MSG Cartel	www.msgcartel.com
Nasher	www.nasher.fr
Nashwriters	http://angelfire.com/art/nashwriters
Neck CNS	www.neckcns.com
Needy Greedy Graf Page	http://members.tripod.com/~pilot66/NG-GRAF.html
Neon	www.writingneon.de
New York City Trains, Mid '80s	www.graffiti.org/nyctrains/index.html
N-Igma	www.graffiti.org/dj/n-igma1/introduction.html
NWO	www.nwocrew.ru
OBS	www.obsekte.de
One Name	www.eldar.cz/onename
One Truth	www.one-truth.ch
Os Gemeos	www.osgemeos.com.br/en
Overspin	www.overspin.it/HOMEPAGE.htm
Paid3	www.paid3.com/Home%20Final/Home%20Revamped%20copy.html
Paint.dk	www.paint.dk
Pastor	www.angelfire.com/pe/past/link.html
Peacez	www.peacez.com
Peta	www.peta.net
Peru143	http://peru143.com
Pest	www.pest-p19.com
PTA2	www.petados.com
Phat Flemish Styles	http://members.tripod.com/~ooz_one/main.html
Philly Graffiti	www.angelfire.com/biz2/MYZONE/new.html
Pigz	www.tarestyles.com/pigz

Site	Home URL
pinkjuice	www.pinkjuice.com
Pose2	www.pose2.com
Protest Graffiti	http://protestgraffiti.blogspot.com
Psyckoze	www.psyckoze.com/desk.htm
Queen City Tribe	www.graffiti.org/cincinnati/qct/index.html
Railwhores	http://railwhores.tripod.com
Replete	www.repletes.net
Rezine69	www.rezine69.com
Rime MSK	http://rimemsk.com
Robots Will Kill	www.robotswillkill.com
Romanian Graffiti	www.romaniangraffiti.ro
Rosa	http://cathlove.com
Rosy	www.rosyone.com
Rusl	www.rusl1.de
Sacramento Graffiti	www.graffiti.org/sac
Sal	http://sal-one.com
Sane2	www.sane2.com
Savager	www.thesavager.com
Scab	www.scabbage.com
Scribe	www.scribeswalk.com
Shame	www.shame.dk
Shame	www.shameabc.com
Sherm	www.shermgrafik.com
Shizentomotel	www.shizentomotel.com
Shok	www.shok1.com
Siner	http://sinergraf.com
Sir Two	www.sirtwo.net
Skize	www.skize.se
Smart	www.smart-one.com.au
Smog-One	http://smog-one.com
Son 103	www.graffiti.org/son103
Souline	www.souline.it
Specimen	http://spe6men.graffiti.free.fr/pge/specimen.htm
Spray City	www.spraycity.net
St. Louis Freights	www.graffiti.org/stlouis/freights/index.html
Steel City	http://members.tripod.com/~Steel_City
Stencil Archive	www.stencilarchive.org
Stomp and Crush: The Great Gallery of Graffiti	http://graffiti.stompandcrush.com
Streets are Saying Things	www.saster.net
Style Only Workgroup	www.graffiti.org/styleonly
Style Wars	www.stylewars.com
Subway Outlaws	http://SubwayOutlaws.com
Scott Sueme	www.suemenow.com
Suiko	www.suiko1.com
Tare	www.tarestyles.com
Tatty Seaside Town	www.graffiti.org/brighton
TC5	www.tcfive.com
TDR	www.thedarkroses.com
Team Alostá	www.waf-alosta.be
Tes	http://graffiti.no/tes
Third Decade	www.third-decade.co.uk
Thoms	www.thoms.it
Toronto's Unauthorized Permanent Artifacts	www.angelfire.com/mo/tupa
Totem2	www.mr-totem.com
Toys of Denmark	www.toyscrew.dk

Site	Home URL
Tracy 168 Wild Style	www.bronxmall.com/tracy168
Train Writers	http://trainwriters.com/home.htm
Trash	http://cargocollective.com/trash
Trixter	www.mrtrixter.com
TXMX GRAFFITI & STREET ART : INDEX	www.txmx.de/graffindex.html
Uberdose	www.ueberdose.de
UK Graffiti	www.ukgraffiti.com
Undastream	www.undastream.com
Uptown Graffiti	www.uptown.eu.org/index2.htm
Ups Online	www.graffiti.org/ups
Vandals Movement	http://vandmove.unas.cz/index2.php
Visual Cancer	www.graffiti.org/fr8
Visual Orgasm: The Canadian Climax	www.visualorgasm.com
Vyal	www.vyalone.com
Wall Nuts	www.graffiti.org:8080/cincinnati/wallnuts
Wany	www.wanyone.com
Weeno	www.weeno.fr
Wet Paint	www.Aerosolart.it
WonABC.de	www.wonabc.de
Woozy	www.woozy.gr
Xenz	www.xenz.org
Zedz	www.zedz.org
Zephyr	www.zephyrgraffiti.com

REFERENCES

- Austin, Joe. 2001. *Taking the Train: How Graffiti Art Became an Urban Crisis in New York City*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Baca, Murtha, Patricia Harpring, Elisa Lanzi, Linda McRae, and Ann Whiteside. 2006. "Cataloging Cultural Objects: A Guide to Describing Cultural Works and Their Images." Chicago: American Library Association. <http://vraweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/CatalogingCulturalObjectsFullv2.pdf>.
- Buck, Rebecca A., and Jean Allman Gilmore, eds. 2010. *MRM5: Museum Registration Methods*. 5th ed. Washington, DC: AAM Press.
- Cairns, Susan. 2013. "Mutualizing Museum Knowledge: Folksonomies and the Changing Shape of Expertise." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 56 (1): 107–19.
- Chae, Gunho, and Jungwha Kim. 2011. "Rethinking Museum Management by Exploring the Potential of Social Tagging Systems in Online Art Museums." *International Journal of the Inclusive Museum* 3 (3): 131–40.
- Chan, Sebastian. 2007. "Tagging and Searching—Serendipity and Museum Collection Databases." In *Museums and the Web 2007: Proceedings, San Francisco, CA, April 11–14, 2007*, edited by Jennifer Trant and D. Bearman. Toronto: Archives & Museum Informatics. <http://www.archimuse.com/mw2007/papers/chan/chan.html>.
- CHIN Data Dictionaries. 2013. Government of Canada. <https://app.pch.gc.ca/application/ddrcip-chindd/description-about.app?lang=en>.
- Collections Trust. 2017. "Cataloguing." Spectrum 5.0. <https://326gtd123dbk1xdkdm489u1q-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Cataloguing.pdf>.
- Dallas, Costis. 2016. "Digital Curation Beyond the 'Wild Frontier': A Pragmatic Approach." *Archival Science* 16: 421–57.
- Graf, Ann. M. 2018. "Facets of Graffiti Art and Street Art Documentation Online: A Domain and Content Analysis." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee.
- J. Paul Getty Trust. 2019. "Categories for the Description of Works of Art." https://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/cdwa/categories.html.
- Lederman, Alexandra, and Farah Jindani. 2018. "Drips Gallery: A Community-Driven Graffiti

- Library and Archive." In *Developing In-House Digital Tools in Library Spaces*, edited by Laura Costello and Meredith Powers, 227–49. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Library of Congress. 2014. "VRA Core 4.0 Element Outline." http://www.loc.gov/standards/vracore/VRA_Core4_Outline.pdf.
- Pollock, Caitlin M. J., and Andrea L. Battleground. 2013. "A Gallery for the Outlaw: Archiving the Art of the Iconoclast." In *Proceedings of the 2013 Association of College and Research Libraries, Indianapolis, Indiana, April 10–13, 2013*, 240–45. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Santabábara, Carlota. 2018. "Street Art Conservation: Beyond Mural Restoration." *OPUS* 2: 149–64.
- Srinivasan, Ramesh, Robin Boast, Jonathan Furner, and Katherine M. Becvar. 2009. "Digital Museums and Diverse Cultural Knowledges: Moving Past the Traditional Catalog." *Information Society* 25: 265–78.
- Terras, Melissa. 2010. "Digital Curiosities: Resource Creation via Amateur Digitization." *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 25 (4): 425–38.
- Trant, Jennifer. 2009. "Tagging, Folksonomy and Art Museums: Results of steve.museum's Research." <https://repository.arizona.edu/handle/10150/105627>.
- Windon, Katrina. 2012. "The Right to Decay with Dignity: Documentation and the Negotiation Between an Artist's Sanction and the Cultural Interest." *Art Documentation* 31 (2): 142–57.

Ann M. Graf is an assistant professor in the School of Library and Information Science at Simmons University in Boston. She teaches courses on information organization, art documentation, and cultural heritage. Her research examines documentation standards and practices and knowledge organization systems, both within professional settings and without.