

Jodi M. Berkowitz. An Assessment of the Impact of Content Standards on the Creation of MARC Records for Archival Collections. A Master's Paper for the M.S. in L.S degree. July, 2006. 26 pages. Advisor: Dr. Jerry Saye

Cataloging practices for archival collections are not standardized. While finding aids rather than MARC catalog records are the descriptive tool of choice for archival collections, in order for archival collections to be included in a repository's catalog, MARC records must be prepared for these collections. This research investigates the impact of successive content standards for archival description on the preparation of MARC records for archival collections in order to improve representation of archival collections in MARC records.

Headings:

Anglo-American cataloguing rules.

Archives.

Cataloging of archival material -- Standards.

Descriptive cataloging -- Rules.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF CONTENT STANDARDS ON THE  
CREATION OF MARC RECORDS FOR ARCHIVAL COLLECTIONS.

by  
Jodi M. Berkowitz

A Master's paper submitted to the faculty  
of the School of Information and Library Science  
of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Science in  
Library Science.

Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July 2006

Approved by

---

Dr. Jerry Saye

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	2
Literature Review.....	3
Methodology.....	6
Findings.....	13
Discussion.....	14
Conclusion.....	20
Bibliography.....	22

**Introduction.**

Rare books, manuscripts, and special collections are often regarded as a showcase of sorts of a repository. While general collections in libraries can be quite special in their own right, they are, for the most part and in terms of availability, easily replicated. Often the materials comprising the rare book, manuscript, and special collections (which includes archival collections) of an institution are unique, and if not unique, uncommon at the least. Given the added artifactual value of these materials, their presence should be known and they should be accessible to users. However, these items are typically more difficult to locate using an online public access catalog, and this is primarily due to the Machine Readable Catalog (MARC) record created for it, which serves as an item's surrogate in a catalog.

This type of record is most conducive to single monographs, and while it can be adapted to other formats, it does not accurately or comprehensively portray other formats, including archival collections. This results in a conundrum, as the primary vehicle through which a user locates sources is an online catalog, but if an item (such as an archival collection) is not represented comparably in that catalog, it is much less likely to be found. This is especially frustrating because the materials contained within an archival collection are potentially significant to researchers. Additionally, locating archival material through an online catalog is often serendipitous, and achieved through keyword or subject searches, as opposed to title or author searches, because the

researcher will likely not be aware of the presence of a particular collection at a repository. If the researcher is already familiar with the collection, he or she can proceed directly to the repository to peruse a more complete finding aid, or guide to the collection.

Standards for creating MARC records for archival collections did not emerge until 1983, with the publication of *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: a Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries* (APPM). This volume was warmly received by the archives and special collections community, which until this point did not have a resource upon which to rely for cataloging its collections. APPM enabled more consistent cataloging, both within and across repositories. A second edition of APPM (APPM2) was published in 1989, and the latest standard available to catalogers of archival materials is *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS), released in 2004. Each manual has had an impact on the cataloging of archival collections. It is the goal of this paper to examine the differences between the respective manuals (APPM, APPM2, and DACS), and assess the impact these successive content standards have had on the creation of MARC records for archival collections.

### **Literature Review.**

Cataloging practices for special collections are not standardized, nor are recommendations available to guide staffing protocols and assignment of responsibility for special collections cataloging. As Russell reports, “very little research has focused specifically on the organization of special collections cataloging.” Bradshaw and Wagner

note that cataloging of special collections, in contrast to other, clearly defined departments, exist in different permutations from institution to institution. Catalogers and curators might report to completely different departments, though the work of each significantly effects, or exists in conjunction with, the work of the other. In order to ameliorate this situation, the authors advocate communication between cataloger and curator such that each is familiar with the work completed by the other, and ideally a cataloger will work exclusively in a special collections department. Similarly, Lundy and Hollis recommend a “participatory management” technique be used by special collections and cataloging departments in order to produce catalog records and “create access to invisible special collections” more efficiently.

Meyer posits herself as one offering recommendations on how to enhance patron access to archival collections (or “boxes of ‘stuff’”) within a library, but limits her discussion to creating an Internet presence for the library and its collections. She makes no mention of the library’s catalog. Hyland recommends implementing policies to address “controlled access” to “atypical” items, such as those included in archival or special collections. However, as these collections are almost universally housed in a closed-stacks atmosphere and the interest of this paper is in access via a catalog versus physical access, her suggestions are not applicable.

Bradshaw and Wagner recommend implementing “customized cataloging” which will “emphasize careful subject analysis and appropriate, more extensive use of notes (especially content and local notes) and added entries.” They reinforce the importance of creating enhanced, more comprehensive catalog records, noting, “in an era of reduced travel budgets and networked online library catalogs, scholars are becoming more—not

less—dependent on fuller cataloging records.” I posit that the ramifications of this statement can be expanded to include the increasing dependency on finding as much information as possible, including a sufficient amount to complete one’s research, online.

Archival descriptive standards were designed to suit aggregate groupings of materials, as opposed to individual items (Davis). Haworth argues that MARC is an inadequate standard to portray the hierarchies inherent in archival collections, and further, “that the MARC data structure was never designed to accommodate” [the hierarchies of these collections]. However, Hensen points out that “since many archival and manuscript repositories were already part of libraries that were involved in creating MARC cataloging records...many of the necessary infrastructures were already in place” and all that remained to be done was to create “an adaptation of the MARC format that met the descriptive needs of the archival and manuscript repositories.”

While admitting difficulties with MARC, he notes that “the increasingly interdisciplinary nature of much research required information systems to deliver *all* relevant materials on a subject, not just the standard monographs and serials.” In order for this to be possible, these relevant items each need a MARC catalog record. Hensen continues to argue that MARC records for archival materials are indeed necessary and cites a report released by the Council on Library and Information Resources:

“The most significant impediment to greater access to manuscript materials is the lack of adequate finding aids, in easily located sites. The highest priority, therefore is to continue to create machine-readable records of manuscript holdings and make those records easily accessible on the Web or on a bibliographic utility.”

While a MARC record might not completely portray the extent of an archival collection, it allows the cataloger to insert a link to a finding aid, and the finding aid will satisfy this lack.

Bradshaw and Wagner contend that “minimal” cataloging is inadequate for special collections. They note that even given the demands of cataloging these collections in a timely fashion, “cataloging special collections materials simply demands more time and effort to do well than other types of cataloging.” Further, cataloging these materials “demands expertise and training beyond what is required in most cataloging departments.” Russell, too, notes that “the use of minimal records [sic] are inappropriate for special collections.”

### **Methodology.**

This study is based exclusively on MARC records created by the Manuscripts Department at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. As this repository is known to create MARC records for their archival collections and a chronological list of collections processed was accessible to this researcher, using this institution as the site for this research seemed appropriate. The department maintains a database in which an entry is made for each collection processed, in chronological order. For the purposes of this study, this list was separated into three sub-lists based on the estimated dates of implementation of APPM2 and DACS, respectively. An estimation of two years for implementation of each new content standard was made. The second edition of APPM was published in 1989 and DACS in 2004. MARC records for collections processed through 31 December 1990 were assumed to have been created in accordance with the

first edition of APPM; records created between 1 January 1991 and 31 December 2005 were assumed to have been created in accordance with APPM2; and records created as of 1 January 2006 were assumed to have been created in accordance with DACS.

A systematic sampling approach was applied to the generated sub-lists. Forty-five records, 15 records from each sub-list, were examined for this paper. The sampling interval of the first sub-list (that containing records assumed to be created in accordance with APPM) was 7 (total population: 110); the sampling interval of the second sub-list (containing records assumed to be created in accordance with APPM2) was 144 (total population: 2177); and the sampling interval of the final sub-list (containing records assumed to have been created in accordance with DACS) was 2 (total population: 37). From the list records, the collection numbers, which serve as unique identifiers for each collection within the repository, were obtained. This method ensured that records were not chosen based on the date(s) of the materials included in each collection, but rather based on the time when they were processed. While providing collection numbers, this method also yielded searchable information about each collection.

The selected MARC records, once retrieved, were evaluated based on a number of factors which had been identified prior to retrieval. These factors were determined by differences found between the two editions of APPM and DACS. Altogether, two sets were created. Records created in accordance with the first edition of APPM were evaluated based on the former set of factors while records created in accordance with DACS were evaluated based on the latter. Records created in accordance with APPM2 were evaluated based on both sets of factors.

Four differences between the first and second editions of APPM were identified. These differences pertain to the title of the collection, date information, edition statements, and notes.

An optional rule was added to APPM allowing for the inclusion of the name of the person, family, or corporate body primarily associated with, or responsible for, the collection or item in the title statement, unless the name is more appropriately recorded in the Statement of Responsibility area (Hensen 1989 13). Previously, APPM instructed to omit this name element from the title statement “if it is equivalent to the main entry or if the title is implicit and clear when taking the main entry and form of material together, or if it is more appropriate in the Statement of Responsibility area” (Hensen 1983 12).

While the entity chiefly responsible for the creation of the materials being described needs to be indicated in the statement of responsibility, the inclusion of the name element in the title statement is of paramount importance when cataloging archival collections. This greatly increases the likelihood of creating a unique title for the collection which can be of assistance to both the researcher and the repository staff. If the cataloger were to adhere to the rules in APPM, a multitude of collections would bear similar, if not identical, titles, which would consist of the form of the material (e.g., papers, letters, diaries, etc.) and the date span represented by the materials. Such titles lack sufficient information to convey an accurate representation of collections. Even if the title is implicit and clear in combination with the main entry and form of material together, users should not be compelled to rely upon combining these data elements to make sense of the record. While the name of the person, family, or corporate body primarily associated

with, or responsible for, the collection ought to be included in the statement of responsibility area, it also belongs in the title statement.

The limitations of the date element were also relaxed in APPM2 with the addition of an optional rule. This rule stated that bulk dates (dates for which the materials bulk largest or are most significant), if known, may be added to the inclusive dates of collections or records series (Hensen 1989 15). No allowances for bulk dates were made in APPM. These dates, if applicable, are useful in that they indicate more clearly to researchers the breadth of collections and reduce the effects of misleading larger date spans. Thus, an improved representation of the collection is offered through the inclusion of bulk dates. By adding specificity to the catalog record (or, indeed, the finding aid) more information is available to the researcher, and unnecessary travel, expense, and effort may be reduced.

An edition area was added for individual manuscripts in APPM2 due to changes approved for the second edition of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2). APPM stated that the edition area was not used for manuscript and archival materials. Its successor acknowledged that edition statements are necessary for "...versions of manuscript works existing in two or more versions or states in single or multiple copies. Examples are different manuscript drafts of a work and film scripts existing in various versions (Hensen 1989 19). The use of an edition statement is important for manuscript collections, especially for those of writers, who often preserve and donate progressive editions of their works. Admittedly the addition of this provision will not have a great impact on the majority of catalog records created for manuscript and archival collections.

The approach to the notes area of catalog records was updated from one version to the next of APPM. In the preface to APPM2 it is stated that “In the note area (see [rule] 1.7) there is now more congruity between the various notes and the equivalent USMARC fields. In addition, there is no longer any stated or preferred order of notes” (Hensen 1989 viii). There were no discernible differences in the content of the notes to be included, as applicable, between APPM and APPM2. As implied, APPM prescribed an order to the notes included in catalog records, while APPM2 does not, although it recommends that the order be more closely related to the importance of a note in the record. For example, notes relating to the scope and content of the collection, or biographical and/or historical information about the collection and its creator(s), ought to be included earlier in the record according to APPM2. Initially, the first notes to be included concerned relationship complexity (if the material formed part of or was an amalgamation of other collections) and to different versions of the collection and the location(s) of those copies. Those changes contributed to creating a catalog record that was more attuned to manuscript and archival materials, as opposed to monographs, within the parameters of a cataloging schema intended for monographs.

Five factors distinguishing DACS from APPM were identified. These factors pertain to positive, perceivable differences in content of records created in accordance with DACS as opposed to those created in using either edition of APPM. That is, DACS prescribes omitting certain elements included by APPM. Accordingly, this study did not investigate the absence of these elements in catalog records created under DACS guidelines. Factors that were examined relate to title, date, and extent elements, as well as the use of abbreviations and square brackets, both of which are prohibited by DACS.

The primary factor discerning DACS from either edition of APPM, especially for the purposes of this paper, is that DACS omits areas in APPM that have little or no relevance to the description of archival materials, such as bibliographic series, parallel titles, and most notably, statements of responsibility. This change in position from the optional rule added to APPM2 illustrates the more comprehensively archival approach adopted by DACS as opposed the more bibliographical approach to which AACR2 and APPM adhere. It is permissible for a statement of responsibility to be omitted because, for archival and manuscript materials, this information inherently belongs in the title. The statement of responsibility field of the MARC record is still present in catalog records, but is included under the creator label in finding aids.

The title information rule in DACS dismisses that appearing in APPM2. While APPM2 encouraged the cataloger to consider the title and statement of responsibility in conjunction with each other, albeit in separate locations, DACS directs the cataloger to act otherwise. DACS states, “When supplying title information, compose a brief title that uniquely identifies the material, normally consisting of a name segment, a term indicating the nature of the unit being described, and optionally a topical segment” (DACS 17-18). Two parts compose the supplied title: the name of the creator(s) or collector(s), and the nature of the material(s) being described. Inclusive dates of the material(s) comprising the collection in question are also included in this statement. Formal titles are not supplied by the archivist, but are already indicated on the material being cataloged. However, formal titles are typically provided when the material has been published or distributed. Normally, this material would not usually be collected as an archival collection in its own right.

Rules pertaining to the date element in DACS provide allowances for predominant or bulk dates, gaps, and estimated dates or date ranges. APPM2 recognized that bulk dates are a useful inclusion in descriptions of archives and manuscript collections. DACS takes this further, recognizing possible gaps in coverage of the material and providing for them. The archivist is instructed to “explain significant chronological gaps in the materials in the Scope and Content Element” (DACS 26). In listing the dates, a comma is used to separate dates or date ranges. This allows an archivist to create a more accurate representation of the material(s) comprising the collection. For example, if the materials in a collection date from 1845-1890, but there also are some materials from 1905-1910, the archivist can now state that exactly, and not use the misleading all-inclusive date range 1845-1910.

In creating descriptions which are more archives-focused, DACS includes an optional rule which allows an archivist to “qualify the statement of physical extent to highlight the existence of material types that are important” (DACS 30). For example, 45 linear feet, including 200 photographs and 16 maps, can be used to indicate that the materials consist of items beyond papers. Multiple statements of extent are also permissible, as are approximate statements of extent, which can be indicated through the use of terms such as “about” or “approximately” (31). These rules are less prescriptive than APPM or AACR2, and are more in keeping with the content of archival material and finding aids.

Finally, DACS recommends implementing two stylistic conventions not seen before: eliminating abbreviations and eliminating square brackets when listing dates. The use of abbreviations might limit effective searching. Accordingly, it is suggested

that the full name of the entity be included, followed by an abbreviation, if applicable. Once the full form of the name is used in a single area of the finding aid, an abbreviation may follow. However, as finding aids are not written with the intention of being read from beginning to end, it is critical that archivists repeat the full form of the name as needed (i.e., in the abstract, the collection-level scope and content note, and the series-level scope and content note). As the MARC record will not contain all of these entities, the full name will not need to be repeated as often, but definitely needs to be included.

Square brackets around dates are typically used to indicate that the date or date range listed is assumed, but not certain, based on the material to which the dates given are applicable. DACS recommends listing the date(s) but states date(s) should be qualified with terms such as “approximately” or “circa.” Additionally, if no date is known, it is to be described as “undated,” rather than the use of “n.d.” or “s.d.,” as was done previously.

### **Findings.**

Fifteen records from each generated sub-list were identified for evaluation. Of the records assumed to be developed using APPM, 11 were successfully retrieved. Fourteen records using APPM2 were retrieved; similarly, 14 records from DACS guidelines were retrieved. Each record was evaluated according to the previously identified criteria.

Two of 11 (18.2%) APPM records included the creator’s name in the title element, compared with six of 14 (42.9%) of APPM2 records. Bulk dates were present in two of 11 (18.2%) APPM records as well as two of 14 (14.3%) APPM2 records. Edition statements were not found in any of the records chosen for evaluation from either of the

APPM and APPM2 sub-lists. Of records created in accordance with APPM, five of 11 (45.5%) included a 545 field (biographical or historical note). Of records created in accordance with APPM2, 12 of 14, or 85.7%, included such a note. Records created using both of these standards included consistent implementation of notes fields aside from the selective inclusion of the biographical or historical note field in APPM.

Thirteen of 14 (92.9%) records created with DACS contained the creator's name in the title element. The record which did not include the creator's name was of a collection assembled by the Southern Historical Collection staff entitled, "Miscellaneous Papers." Bulk dates were included in two of 14 (14.3%) APPM records and one of 14 (7.1%) APPM2 records. Multiple dates appeared in one of 14 (7.1%) APPM records and four of 14 (28.6%) APPM2 records. A more detailed or archival materials-specific extent element was included in one of 14 (7.1%) of both the APPM and APPM2 records. No abbreviations were found in any of the APPM records, while four of 14 (28.5%) APPM2 records included DACS-compliant abbreviations, i.e., abbreviations were provided following the inclusion of the full name or phrase in each section of the record in which it appeared. Square brackets were not used in any of the records evaluated from either the APPM sub-list or the APPM2 sub-list.

### **Discussion.**

This study contributes to the research on cataloging practices for archival and special collections. While not all institutions collecting such materials choose to create MARC records for these collections, relying instead on finding aids and other research tools, preparing MARC records affords for the representation of these collections in the

catalog of an institution. This discussion will reflect on the findings of the study in order to identify advances made in cataloging practices of archival and special collections. The paper will conclude with suggestions for future changes in cataloging practices for archival and special collections.

It was the intent of this research to begin a study of the impact of different content standards on cataloging practices of archival and special collections with an examination of catalog records prepared at a time when no guidance in the form of content standards was available (i.e., prior to the publication of APPM). If records from this period had been available, it was hoped that they would have assisted in providing a more comprehensive understanding of changes experienced in the archival and special collections cataloging community, and a clearer view of the effects of different, or any, content standards on cataloging practices for these materials. However, due to limitations in gathering cataloging data to which a chronological aspect could be ascertained, an examination of such records was not possible.

The first area of focus of the study yielded what is also its most significant finding: the inclusion of the name of the creator(s) in the title element of the collection. While the first edition of APPM did not instruct the cataloger to include the creator name in the title element, APPM2 included an optional rule allowing the cataloger to do so, while DACS insists upon it. Of records created under APPM, 18.2% were found to reference a creator in the title element. Inclusion of the creator increased in records prepared under APPM2, to 42.9%, and nearly all records examined created in accordance with DACS included the creator in the title element (92.9%). The single record of the final group which did not include the name of a specific creator was a record for a

collection assembled by the staff of the Manuscripts Department, designed as a collection of miscellaneous papers and was referred to as such in the title. This shift in cataloging practice for creator reflects the increase in pertinence of cataloging practice to archival and special collection materials as opposed to one focused more on the nature of monographs. While it would be unnecessary, and indeed confusing, to the monograph cataloger and researcher in search of monographs to include the author's name in the title element of every monograph cataloged, it behooves the archives and special collections cataloger to include this information in order to provide the best service to the user. This clearly delineates the individual collection and increases its accessibility through browsing as well as searching.

The inclusion of bulk dates to offer a more detailed and clear representation of the collection was first made permissible in APPM2 and was similarly sanctioned by DACS. The latter also recommended including multiple dates or date ranges if applicable. A similar percentage of records evaluated from each sub-list included bulk dates (18.2%, 14.3%, and 7.1%, respectively), though this information was based on information provided in the 520 scope and content note field of two APPM records from which bulk dates could likely be surmised or were included. As this practice was occasionally implemented prior to its being officially sanctioned in APPM2, the inclusion of bulk dates, if applicable, was already a part of UNC Chapel Hill Manuscript Department local practice. The inclusion or absence of bulk dates, as with other factors examined in this study, cannot indicate the influence of emerging content standards definitively for such factors do not apply to all collections cataloged. However, the presence of bulk dates

among each data set indicates the relative commonness of collections which contain material spanning a longer period of time than the majority of the collection represents.

Permission to include multiple sets of dates or date ranges in catalog records of collections is perhaps a more significant contribution of DACS. While one of 14 (7.1%) records created based on APPM2 included multiple dates, four of 14 (28.6%) based on DACS included such dates. This might indicate an increase in options available to the archives and special collections cataloger that were not previously considered, or it might simply reflect the particular collections included in this study's sample. However, the sampling methodology utilized should have prevented that occurrence, or at least significantly reduced its impact. The use of multiple date spans can be a helpful tool in clarifying the contents of a particular collection, especially when describing smaller collections. It helps to ascertain dates of all materials in smaller collections, and particularly useful to the researcher, as materials outside of the given date spans will likely be minimal, especially compared to larger collections, which would have larger amounts of material across the dates covered.

Edition statements, while permissible in APPM2 and in DACS, were not included in any records evaluated for this study developed under those codes. As previously suggested in the methodology section, this element is not regularly applicable to archival and special collection materials, which likely explains its absence. Additionally, edition statements might be excluded, even where applicable, due to the cataloger's ability to present this information in other ways, or because they could be misleading. For example, even if a collection includes various editions of a manuscript produced by the creator of the materials in the collection, the collection also likely includes other

materials. The inclusion of an edition statement could be confusing and/or not entirely accurate. However, a cataloger can include in a 520 scope and content note a statement regarding multiple editions of a manuscript. Further, the finding aid, which is a more detailed guide to the collection than is afforded in a MARC catalog record, will likely mention the various editions of the manuscript included in the collection, as well as a description of the way(s) in which the editions vary, e.g., date produced.

Although a factor examined was the change in approach to notes outlined in APPM2, this study found that, without exception, the notes included in each MARC record were presented in numerical order, regardless of the particular significance of each note to the nature of the collection described. This could be attributed to local practice. In reality, the cause is unknown. More notable was the 54.5% of records created using APPM examined did not include a 545 biographical/historical note, while a clear majority (85.7%) of those created in accordance with APPM2 did include such notes. The inclusion of this field provides additional information and context for a user, and based on the material included in the collection, even if it is a very small collection, some relevant biographical and/or historical information about the creator also may be gleaned. The more consistent and regular inclusion of the 545 note in later records likely reflects a change in procedures followed by the repository, although this issue was not explored.

DACS offers the cataloger an optional rule allowing the cataloger to provide a more detailed extent statement or multiple extent statements. This allows for a clearer representation of the materials comprising the collection, if they are indeed of varied genres, to be presented in the extent statement. However, this study found that a fuller extent statement was included in the same percentage of records produced under both

APPM2 and DACS (7.1% (or one record) of each sub-list). In both cases, the situation was a bit anomalous to more typical collection description situations. In both cases, all parts of the collections were of one form of material, and so that form (volumes and albums, respectively) was indicated, as opposed to items. This too likely reflects local practice in cataloging, as different forms of material are clearly delineated in the finding aids prepared by this repository.

The use of abbreviations is called for in DACS only if the full name of the entity is included when it first appears within each section of the descriptive tool being prepared. Abbreviations, however common they are perceived to be by the cataloger, are not to be used according to DACS. No records produced in accordance with APPM2 included abbreviations. Four of 14 records produced in accordance with DACS did contain DACS-approved use of abbreviations. This likely indicates a lack of a need for abbreviations in the APPM2 records examined, as well as the implementation of the DACS convention for the use of abbreviations.

Finally, DACS prescribes the elimination of the use of square brackets to indicate uncertainty regarding dates or other information, but into that is assumed to be likely by the cataloger. These brackets were not found in any of the APPM2 or DACS records evaluated. However, this factor is difficult to study, because the use of square brackets is not applicable to all collections and it is difficult to make an assessment based on an absence rather than a presence of an element. An absence might indicate acceptance of the prescribed practice or simply that uncertain dates were not an element of the collections whose records were evaluated for this study. The elimination of square brackets from descriptive practice simplifies the presentation given the user in that the

same information is provided, but a user is not possibly perplexed by the use of symbols whose meanings are not plainly evident or easily determined.

### **Conclusion.**

It is a challenge to accurately and adequately create catalog records for archival collections. Representing collections comprised of various types of material and of various sizes is difficult to accomplish within the constraints of a cataloging format originally intended for monographs or other singular items. APPM offered a starting point for repositories eager to include records of their archival collections in their catalog. Changes from APPM to DACS reflect the evolution of the standard to be more conducive to applying the MARC format to archival collections. Creating MARC records for smaller collections is easier in that there is less material to accurately represent, and so the limited fields available in MARC records are more sufficient for those collections versus larger ones. Larger collections may benefit from multiple MARC records: a record may be created for each series within the collection, and reference can be made from each record to the others indicating that the record composes part of an item, i.e., the collection. This allows a more complete representation of the materials comprising an archival collection without relying to item-level cataloging. Item-level cataloging is both prohibitive in terms of resources required to complete the task, and it also presents an inaccurate image of the collection: archival collections are cohesive groupings of materials whose sum is greater than its parts.

Not all repositories choose to create MARC records for their archival collections, and instead focus available resources on creating fuller finding aids and implementing

and/or expanding the use of Encoded Archival Description (EAD) to encode these finding aids. When MARC records are created for archival collections as well as monograph materials, the catalog of a repository presents a more complete image of the repository's holdings, and thus the repository is able to offer more resources to its users who interface with the repository's catalog. Utilizing MARC records for archival collections increases the presence of these collections as well as use of them. The use of APPM, APPM2, and now, DACS, to prepare these records allows for standardization of these records, and ultimately an even more precise representation of these records.

## References

- Bradshaw, Elaine Beckley and Wagner, Stephen C. (2000). A Common Ground: Communication and Alliance between Cataloger and Curator for Improved Access to Rare Books and Special Collections. *College & Research Libraries*, 61(6), 525-534.
- Davis, Susan E. (2003). Descriptive Standards and the Archival Profession. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 35(3/4), 291-308.
- Epstein, E. (1995). Masters of all we survey: Preparation for cataloging special collections. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 13(1), 1-16.
- Haworth, Kent M. (2001). Archival Description: Content and Context in Search of Structure. *Journal of Internet Cataloging*, 4(3/4), 7-26.
- Hensen, S. L. *Archives, personal papers, and manuscripts : A cataloging manual for archival repositories, historical societies, and manuscript libraries*. Washington D.C. : [Manuscript Division Library of Congress] 1983.
- Hensen, S. L. *Archives, personal papers, and manuscripts : A cataloging manual for archival repositories, historical societies, and manuscript libraries* (2nd ed.). Chicago : Society of American Archivists 1989.

- Hensen, S. (2001). Archival cataloging and the internet: The implications and impact of EAD. *Encoded archival description on the internet*. (pp. 75-95)Haworth Information Press; Haworth Information Press.
- Hoffman, Herbert H. (2003). Better Recall of Exact Work Titles in Online Catalogs. *Public Libraries*, 42(6), 344-346.
- Hyland, Anne Maureen. (2004). Providing Access to Atypical Items in an Academic Library. *Collection Management*, 29(1), 57-72.
- Lundy, M. Winslow and Deborah R. Hollis. (2004). Creating Access to Invisible Special Collections: Using Participatory Management to Reduce a Backlog. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(6), 466-475.
- McCrary, A., & Russell, B. M. (2005). Crosswalking EAD: Collaboration in archival description. *Information Technology and Libraries*, 24(3), 99-106.
- Meyer, Linda M. (2005). Boxes of "Stuff": Enhancing Patron Access to Archival Collections Within the Library. *Colorado Libraries*, 31(2), 38-39.
- Russell, Beth M. (2004). Special Collections Cataloging at a Crossroads: A Survey of ARL Libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(4), 294-303.

Society of American Archivists. *Describing archives : A content standard* Chicago :

Society of American Archivists c2004.

Taraba, S. (1992). Administering the cataloging of special collections materials. *Rare*

*Books & Manuscripts Librarianship*, 7(2), 87-90.