Paper citation:

Abstract:
Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) is the new archival content standard published by the Society of American Archivists (SAA). The publication of this forward-thinking and comprehensive response to changing information needs and technologies should be of interest to all cataloging communities. DACS raises issues about content standards for resource description that should be addressed much more broadly. The library cataloging community is in the process of an extensive revision of its cataloging codes, and new approaches in this standard appear to be embodying some of the same concepts as DACS. DACS, therefore, can be seen as a smaller and more focused implementation of some of the principles that will emerge in the new Resource Description and Access (RDA). Simultaneously, the standard can be used to examine whether taking some of these developments further would improve access to materials.

Text of paper:

DACS and RDA
Insights and Questions from the New Archival Descriptive Standard

Beth M. Whittaker

Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) is the new archival content standard published by the Society of American Archivists (SAA).[1] Not simply an updated manual for cataloging archives, it is a forward-thinking and comprehensive response to changing information needs and technologies. Although a relatively recent publication, *DACS* has already generated discussion in the archival community. *DACS* raises issues about content standards for resource description that should be addressed beyond the archival community, as well. As the library cataloging community is in the process of an extensive revision of its cataloging codes, *DACS* can be seen as a smaller and more focused implementation of some of the principles that will emerge in the new *Resource Description and Access (RDA),* which will replace the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR).

Archival Description and Library Cataloging

In order to understand how innovative *DACS* truly is, surveying the context from which it emerged is necessary. This paper will not provide a detailed history of archival cataloging, although general sources are available to do so.[2] Since *DACS* owes its structure to the characteristics of archival material, a few points are worth mentioning, particularly historic milestones in archival content standards and cataloging codes.

One of the most prominent features of archival material (from a cataloging point of view) is the lack of a chief source of information. Kiesling has called archives a "non-transcription

community," while books and serials catalogers form a "transcription community," in which bibliographic descriptions are based largely on transcription of information on items at hand.[3] Other non-transcription communities are becoming more interested in exploring the role of their descriptive information in a more bibliographic context. In this way, archivists can serve as a model for film and video catalogers, computer files catalogers, museum objects catalogers, and others.

Another prominent feature of archival description is the relationship among several types of abstracts of collections: standard bibliographic records, finding aids, inventories, and so on. A one-to-one correspondence between the record and the "thing" being cataloged is not present. By the time descriptions of huge archival collections are recorded in bibliographic records, much information has been lost due to system restrictions and descriptive conventions. In observing this hierarchy of metadata in 1995, Hensen wrote, "It is absurd to imagine that the conventions of author-title cataloging with two or three subject headings could even begin to capture the complexity of most archival materials (even if they *had* authors and titles.)"[4] This perception of the limitations of library cataloging to describe archival materials heavily influenced the development of *DACS*. Prior to 1967, rules for manuscript cataloging did not appear in library cataloging manuals at all. Choice of entry for manuscripts was addressed in the 1949 *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries,* but no guidance for description was given.[5] The 1967 *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (*AACR1*) introduced rules for describing both individual manuscripts (200–204) and collections (205–207).[6] *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules,* 2nd ed. *(AACR2)* deviated from *AACR1*'s approach.[7] This edition created rules in chapter 4 for cataloging manuscripts that are have been characterized as "not archival."[8]

Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts (APPM) was a response from the archival community to *AACR2,* which was seen as inadequate for modern manuscript and archival description.[9] *APPM* demonstrated that "the system of library-based cataloging techniques embodied in the second edition of *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (*AACR 2*) could be adapted to serve the needs of the archival com-munity."[10] In this way, it filled a niche for archives similar to other format-specific implementations of AACR.

In recent years, two major developments affecting archival description have emerged: the International Council on Archives' *General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G))* and *International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (ISAAR (CPF)).*[11] Just as the Anglo-American cataloging community interprets the larger International Standard Bibliographic Description *(*ISBD*)* framework, American archival cataloging rules have attempted to respond to changes in the international *ISAD(G). ISAD(G)* might be seen as an archival Dublin Core set of descriptive elements. These core elements can be used at any level of description (e.g., folder or series)

Attempts to create a joint descriptive standard for the American and Canadian archival communities and to accommodate international standards *ISAD(G)* and *ISAAR(CPF)* reached a state of hopeful optimism. Although there was not enough common ground between American and Canadian archivists to create joint content standards, "the dialogue between Canadian and U.S. archivists will surely continue."[12] In the meantime, *DACS* corresponds very closely to the elements of *ISAD(G)* and *ISAAR(CPF)* with only one element excluded. The Level of Description element is excluded based on the acknowledgement that no consensus exists on how to apply terminology for more than five levels of description, and that recording such complexity does not in itself link multilevel descriptions.[13]

DACS, like *APPM* before it, serves as a replacement for the skeletal rules in *AACR2* chapter 4 for cataloging manuscripts, but makes conscious departures from AACR tradition in some ways. It "provides more specific guidance in the description of contemporary archival materials and eliminates some of the less user-friendly aspects of *AACR2,* including many abbreviations and the

coded recording of uncertain dates, conventions necessitated by the space limitations of 3 x 5 catalog cards but no longer helpful or necessary in modern information systems."14 Eliminating these less user-friendly aspects may pose the greatest challenge to our thinking about cataloging rules.

Structure of *DACS*

DACS begins with a "Statement of Principles," a "recapitulation of generally accepted archival principles."15 This section recaps essential ways in which describing archival materials may differ from describing library materials, particularly in fundamental areas such as *respect des fonds,* the relationships between arrangement and description, and the description of creators. Next is an "Overview of Archival Description," which outlines both Access Tools such as MARC 21 and Encoded Archival Description (EAD) finding aids, as well as Access Points that should be provided. "Part I: Describing Archival Materials" includes "rules to ensure the creation of consistent, appropriate, and self-explanatory descriptions of archival material."16 "Part II: Describing Creators" offers a uniquely archival perspective. Naming creators is not sufficient. "Additional information is required regarding the persons, families, and corporate bodies responsible for the creation, assembly, accumulation, and/or maintenance and use of archival materials being described."17 This indicates the importance of context in archival description.

"Part III: Forms of Names" consists of "information about creating standardized forms for the names of persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with archival materials . . . . These can be used in descriptive elements, archival authority records, or as index terms."18 Finally, *DACS* concludes with appendixes, a glossary, a list of companion standards, crosswalks, and full EAD and MARC 21 examples.

DACS, AACR2, and *RDA*

At the time of *DACS'*s publication, its departures from *AACR*2 were nearly revolutionary. In summing up the changes in archival cataloging practices brought about by the possibilities of EAD-encoded finding aids and their relationship to cataloging, Hensen suggested that new cataloging paradigms had not yet emerged. Referring to the promise of revolutionary bibliographic control at the International Conference on the Principles and Future Direction of AACR convened in 1997, he believed the inertia inherent in existing catalogs of millions upon millions of bibliographic records is sufficient to discourage most library bureaucrats and administrators from undertaking massive and systematic changes—particularly in an environment that is itself so volatile as to defy reasonable calculation. . . . [The] archival community . . . concluded that it must proceed on its own, while the library world may yet move more decisively. 19

In the last few years, the ongoing process of development of new cataloging standards for mainstream materials has revealed more obvious parallels between *DACS* and the emerging successor to *AACR2*. The prospectus for *RDA* illustrates clearly that some of the major issues articulated in *DACS* are being considered within the library cataloging community as well.20 Prominent among them is that these rules should be based on principles, should cover all types of materials, should be easy to use and interpret, and "will be used as a resource beyond the library community to facilitate metadata interoperability."21 This broadening of the scope of AACR underscores the emerging Web-format world. Also important is the statement that "the language needs to be clearer and more direct, and that library jargon should be avoided."22 In keeping with the idea that *RDA* is marketed more towards metadata communities beyond libraries, rules will be structured "to facilitate application to a wide variety of resources" with general instructions that are "formulated in clear, concise, and simple terms," supplemented with more

detailed instructions applicable to complicated situations.[23] In addition, the standard will encompass a "general movement towards simplification and an emphasis on principle-based cataloger's judgment."[24] Another point of similarity is that *RDA* "establishes a clear line of separation between the recording of data and the presentation of data."[25]

RDA's three-part structure seems to also closely parallel that of *DACS,* with the first part focusing on resource description. The second will cover the provision of access points for "relationships" and the third covering the formulation of name and title access points and other data used for authority control.[26]

The development of format-specific rules for archives and manuscripts within the context of *RDA* also merits mention. The Library of Congress (LC) and SAA have both responded to proposed archival rules to supersede *AACR2* chapter 4 in *RDA*. While the future integration of these comments and *DACS*'s format-specific rules into *RDA* remains unclear, the standards will likely continue to overlap to some degree.[27]

Major Issues Addressed in *DACS*

Output Neutrality

The output neutrality of *DACS* underscores a major question for the cataloging community at large. Is it necessary for cataloging standards, which have existed in a MARC-based world for at least twenty years (and a card-based world for much longer) to become output neutral? In fact, MARC records are simply manifestations of descriptions that could be output in any number of ways. For archival material, longer, more complex descriptions can be created and coded as instances of EAD finding aids, which is why *DACS* provides examples to accompany its guidelines in both MARC and EAD formats.

Catalogers do not need to be convinced of the value of standardization. Digital projects describing images at the item level, for example, may use part of our descriptive conventions in formulating name headings, and bibliographic descriptions themselves have been exposed to a larger audience (and divorced from the context of the catalog) through the Open WorldCat project.[28] Since data exchange formats could change, the future needs of the archives community could continue to be served by *DACS* descriptions in an increasingly mapped and cross-walked environment. Descriptions (or parts of descriptions) coded in an XML format (such as EAD) are potentially reusable in limitless ways.

This bifurcation of content and carrier appears to be the direction being taken by *RDA*. The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR states that "what is being developed is in effect a new standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world" and that the new approach for *RDA* will have "instructions for recording data [that] will be presented independently of guidelines for data presentation."[29]

This major change likely will be more difficult to implement in a library world wedded to forms of display derived from catalog records than in the archival world, accustomed to many different forms of description. For example, how many catalogers still spend time "upgrading" records while copy cataloging by changing punctuation to conform to ISBD conventions? While this is nearly instinctive behavior among many catalogers, the content may remain essentially the same but time and energy is being spent on adapting the carrier.

Content versus Context

Closely related to output neutrality is the separation of descriptive content from historical or biographical context. In the cataloging world, these two factors have been closely linked. For example, although authority records reside in library catalogs, they provide context for understanding name headings, rather than describing materials created by the entities represented in the authority records themselves. The increasingly common use of library authority files (particularly the LC Name Authority File) for nonlibrary cataloging indicates a potential need to broaden their usefulness. Tillett asserted, "as we open our authority files for access through the Internet, we find the authority file becoming a useful tool for other librarians and information professionals and even end-users."[30] How much more might this be the case in the archival world, where archivists who maintain official files are often the acknowledged experts on a particular person or organization? Although not explicitly mentioned in *DACS,* the creation of a parallel structure for creator information to EAD, called Encoded Archival Context, is worth exami-nation.[31] Archives have traditionally maintained extensive supplemental documentation on creators, necessary to fulfill their missions, particularly when the creators have a relationship with the archives themselves (such as in institutional archives.) *DACS* explicitly separates these two types of information in theory, with the potential to allow other users to benefit from this information in a variety of ways, rather than simply serving as a reference for librarians and archivists. Users with systems that combine these types of records can continue to create functional descriptions.

Levels of Description and Data Elements

The existence of levels of description in archival practice is a central factor in *DACS,* meriting a brief but important first chapter. Haworth has argued that "given its hierarchical structure, archival description presents complex challenges that the MARC data structure was never designed to accom-modate."[32] This complexity of relationships is not unique; museum collections, digital projects, and other emergent communities have similar, if not identical issues. In cultural-heritage communities, descriptions of collections are often as—if not more—important to users than are descriptions of individual items, since the presence of an item within a larger collection often conveys important information about its provenance and use.

Although many catalogers (and perhaps most non-catalogers) think of the MARC structure as flat, *AACR*2 did articulate levels of description; MARC has developed to accommodate relationships among these levels, most notably with linking fields and series tracings. These mechanisms are often difficult to exploit in library systems, but they exist. The widespread inclusion of table of contents information in MARC records, for example, has changed the nature of the relationship between the piece and the record and opened the possibility of a network of relationships among descriptions. The inherent relationships among serials, which merge, cease, resume, and split off from one another, highlight another area where complexity built into MARC could be illustrated better in catalog records. Outside the MARC world, links between digital files, such as images and the metadata describing them within a database, show additional possibilities to highlight these relationships. The importance of levels of description successfully articulated by *DACS* for archival material should encourage us to explore this concept in other types of materials as well.

The *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (*FRBR*) model also will be on the minds of catalogers examining the new standard. This is particularly interesting as it points out parallels between ―levels of description‖ and the *FRBR* model. For example, if collections are treated as works, what is the role of *FRBR* in archival descriptions of archival series or even items?[33] Can individual letters be seen as manifestations of the content of a larger collection?

Another bold statement that appears, at first, to contradict existing MARC structure is *DACS*'s assertion that data elements are mutually exclusive―"The purpose and scope of each

element has been defined so that the prescribed information can go in one place only."[34] How would this principle be applied in a MARC universe, particularly where catalogers have often deliberately replicated information from coded fixed fields in narrative variable fields in an attempt to overcome limitations of library systems? Perhaps restricting information to one place only would force the issue of displaying now-invisible content hidden in coded strings (such as 007 fields.) An approach more consistent with the spirit of *DACS* might call instead for standardizing such information in eye-readable fields in ways that are immediately comprehensible to users.

Abbreviations

This spirit of user-friendliness is very prominent in *DACS'*s recommendations rejecting standard abbreviations. Specific examples include the extent element (2.5) where a note explains, "It is recommended, though not required, that terms reflecting physical extent be spelled out rather than abbreviated, as abbreviations may not be understood by all users."[35] The emphasis on the user is one of *DACS'*s more controversial recommendations.

When considering the amount of time spent to type "feet" versus "ft.," for example, enhancing clarity for a variety of users perhaps not fluent in English and very likely unfamiliar with jargon is worth a sacrifice of a few keystrokes. Depending on the system used for creating *DACS*-compliant descriptions, abbreviations could be expanded automatically, in much the same way that some integrated library systems expand relator codes into relator terms between MARC records and public displays. In rejecting a holdover from a paper-based descriptive environment, *DACS* is pushing the envelope in a way that could be revolutionary if applied more broadly.

Creatorship and Name Headings

DACS takes a different approach to authorship than *AACR2,* defining "creator" as "a person, family, or corporate body that created, assembled, accumulated, and/or maintained and used records in the conduct of personal or corporate activity. A creator can also be responsible for the intellectual content of a single item."[36] *AACR2* does not define a creator at all, but instead defines personal author as "the person chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work," along with specific functions like "editor," "producer," and "collaborator."[37] Rules in *AACR2* chapter 21 also detail concepts of shared responsibility and mixed responsibility. Despite this sophistication, even experienced catalogers sometimes have trouble determining how to apply these rules in complex situations.

One example highlights the difficulty of applying these concepts in the current bibliographic context. Though an individual could be a "personal author" for a blog, the content linked from the author's comments on news articles complicates the authorship to a mind-boggling degree. A blogger may be a creator, but—according to *AACR2* terminology—is probably not an author. This complexity of creatorship is present in other formats as well, although mainstream cataloging practice has tended to try to fit these formats into a bibliocentric box, with detailed rules for determining chief responsibility even for works with complex creatorship.

One of many frustrations wrought for catalogers by the specificity of the MARC format is the distinction between creators as names and as subjects. Depending on a library system's indexing rules, as well as local indexing decisions often driven by cost, creators of collections may need to be indexed twice, as both 6xx (subject) and 7xx (name) fields, in order to ensure users will be able to locate relevant material however they search. This leads to duplication that in itself can sometimes be misleading. Cataloging rules continue to appear needlessly complicated to the outside world.

One way in which these distinctions between "author" and "subject" headings have been acutely confusing is the use of family names. *AACR2* does not allow for describing families as "authors," yet "the use of family names as creators in the description of archives was part of previous bibliographic cataloging codes, has a long tradition in archival descriptive practice, and has been officially sanctioned at least since the first edition of *APPM* was published by the Library of Congress in 1983."38 *DACS* makes this explicit in 12.29A, calling for the addition of the word "family" to the family surname.39 Although this raises the question of how *DACS*-based records would function in a MARC catalog of AACR records, library cataloging guidelines also are moving in this direction.

A final challenge to traditional cataloging practice is hinted at in *DACS*'s treatment of name headings, a challenge that may deserve to be taken up much more broadly. Is including detailed and often confusing rules about how to form name headings in each cataloging code necessary? Could one simply point creators of descriptions directly to the (de facto) authority file, and provide abbreviated guidance about forming headings when catalogers encounter names that are *not* in the authority file? *DACS* begins the process of removing specialist names from its basic content standard with the reference to AACR rules to create Islamic names.40

Artificial Collections

Finally, one of the major differences between *DACS* and earlier archival cataloging standards is the elimination of the concept of the "artificial collection." "Materials that are gathered together by a person, family, or organization irrespective of their provenance are intentionally and consciously assembled for some purpose. Most repositories in the U.S. have such collections, and they need to be handled and described the same way as materials traditionally considered to be 'organic.'"41 In addition to standardizing the way archival collections are described, this development has a potentially interesting implication for handling non-archival material, as well. Recent national efforts to reduce backlogs in special collections, for example, have often called for greater use of collection-level records for materials such as books, maps, or pamphlets. The forthcoming edition of the new descriptive rules for rare books include an appendix on collection-level cataloging, which bridges an uncomfortable gap between the transcription and non-transcription approaches.42

Areas for Further Exploration

While *DACS* and *RDA* both seem revolutionary in many respects, perhaps some of these suggestions have not been taken far enough. If a drive to simplify records and tailor resource description to both users and the materials themselves are noble goals, several areas could be further developed. Although none of these suggestions are novel and provocative, and authors have proposed many of them in the literature before, the emergence of new codes provides another opportunity to raise the questions. It also allows some context for examining how major changes might be made. First among these seems to be abbreviations. Separating the content of a bibliographic description from its format finally divorces, at least in theory, the description from the legacy of the catalog card. Many abbreviations continue to persist from that legacy. What is the reason, for example, to insist on abbreviations such as "ca." before dates, when other, fuller syntax might make the point much more clearly to a universal audience?

RDA promises to "minimize the need for retrospective adjustments when integrating data produced using *RDA* into existing files."43 This is also the case with *DACS*, which should cause very little conflict between descriptions created using it and *APPM*, for example. In the major source of potential conflict, family names, the Anglo-American cataloging community could learn from the specialists in archives. For example, even if *RDA* does not adopt the user-friendly recommendations

on abbreviations, records will be no more difficult to interpret than those records created using pre-AACR rules and punctuation conventions that exist in our combined catalogs to this day. Another major opportunity is to use *DACS* as a springboard to examine all aspects of archival description, from initial processing documentation to final finding aids and catalog records. Particularly in those environments where these functional tasks are undertaken by different people, *DACS* can provide a common ground for archivists, catalogers, and other personnel to look for efficiencies and improvements in the process, an area that some in the profession have identified as a pressing need.[44]

The authority work required by both libraries and archives might benefit from a more collaborative approach, as well. Would maintaining an authorized heading be possible in a wiki-like environment, allowing any institution to contribute additional information or references as they see fit? This is already present in the popular environment, where hyperlinks to explanatory materials often point readers to Wikipedia as an authoritative source.[45] This allows readers unfamiliar with a topic or concept to be introduced to further information without interrupting the narrative flow of the text. It also might lead to greater standardization simply through forcing the blogger to consider the relationship between the term as used and the term as "authorized" in Wikipedia as the link is constructed. The same principle might work well with the kinds of historical or biographical contexts provided for names and even subjects in resource descriptions. Particularly among specialized communities, this decentralized approach might be more beneficial than limiting references based on the constraints of our old library systems, and would leverage subject expertise where needed. Another area where such cooperative authority work might benefit both users and libraries is in the realm of serial title changes. Although *DACS* proposes no such thing, a broad interpretation of the rules for recording administrative structure, predecessor and successor bodies, and names of corporate bodies might allow such context, removed from the heading, to serve as an innovative way to handle serial title changes. For example, if long narratives of administrative histories were provided outside the context of resource catalogs, including references contributed cooperatively for varying names and titles, with a single entry point for the serial itself, the function of a serial title name might be served without ongoing maintenance currently required by current cataloging rules. The final, and perhaps most challenging, development might be to take simplification of creator heading rules further. For example, *AACR*2 currently devotes the bulk of chapter 22 to the "exceptions"—headings that are not commonly encountered in most libraries and archives in the English-speaking world. They are even called "Special Rules for Names in Certain Languages," a title that acknowledges just how obscure these headings are. Entire sections are devoted to Indonesian and Malay names, which are so complex that even the detail found in these rules cannot clarify them for an audience with no knowledge of these languages. Since catalogers working with large collections of Malay materials are likely to have greater knowledge about the formation of these names, as well as reference sources not available to average librarians, cataloging codes could be simplified and shortened tremendously by removing these rules entirely and pointing people who need to formulate these headings to another source.

This would have several benefits. The code itself would be shorter and underlying principles would be more apparent, leading to better-developed cataloger judgment. The perception of complexity that is often seen as a reason *not* to create descriptions using AACR-type rules might be mitigated. Finally, the disconnect between subject expert usage and cataloger usage that has plagued library history (most recently with the romanization of Chinese characters) possibly could be avoided.

Conclusion

      DACS has foreshadowed *RDA* in transforming description of cultural heritage materials for an Anglo-American world. Many of its innovations, such as separating content from carrier and content from context, are being incorporated in the revision of library standards. Others, such as reducing or eliminating the use of abbreviations, may be more controversial in the larger library community. Nonetheless, catalogers not familiar with archives would do well to think about how archival materials mirror in many ways the types of materials they increasingly are being expected to organize for retrieval. The parallels are not exact, but they are informative.

      The impact of *DACS* at this time is limited to the archival community in the United States, since it is an SAA standard. Just as harmonization between AACR and other non-English speaking standards has been difficult to achieve due to differing descriptive traditions, the efforts to address standards for archives across the world will prove as frustratingly complex. Unlike the MARC environment, where catalogers are largely dependent on bibliographic utilities, archivists retain a high degree of control over their own descriptive records, making compliance difficult, if not impossible, to ensure. *DACS* attempts to address this problem through flexibility, but that same flexibility may lead to a high degree of non-standardization, even when archivists and catalogers are attempting to follow its guidelines. The legacy of archival description residing in other systems, such as paper finding aids, card files, or even databases, must be addressed.

      This leads to one last question that must be asked about the future of all descriptive standards in the cultural heritage community: why should other communities care? Certainly the profession has been successful at standardizing bibliographic description of books and serials to a high degree, even across the English-speaking world. Other types of materials have remained segregated within systems that seem to work for them. Even communities such as museums, which often share libraries' emphasis on standardized vocabulary for descriptive fields (such as terms from the *Art & Architecture Thesaurus*) may not see a need to adopt more library-like practices for their entire descriptive framework, despite the best intentions of the drafters of *RDA*. We must ask ourselves what we are offering these other communities before attempting to create a standard that we hope they may want to use.

      Any effort to revise descriptive standards must balance the historical value and proven results of our rules with the promise of the future. *DACS* succeeds in doing this for archival materials, while still retaining a refreshing simplicity and brevity. We might hope descriptive standards for library materials could achieve the same.

References and Notes

1. Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2004).
2. Kent M. Haworth, "Archival Description: Content and Context in Search of Structure," in *Encoded Archival Description on the Internet,* eds. Daniel V. Pitti and Wendy M. Duff (Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 2001), 7–26; Kathleen Roe, *Arranging and Describing Archives and Manuscripts,* Archival Fundamentals Series II (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2005).
3. Kris Kiesling, "Describing Archives: A Content Standard, or What Do EAD, MARC, APPM, ISAD (G), EAC, and ISAAR (CPF) All Have in Common?" Presentation, 46th Annual RBMS Preconference, St. Louis, Missouri, June 24, 2005.
4. Steven L. Hensen, "Archival Description and New Paradigms of Bibliographic Control and Access," in *The Future of the Descriptive Cataloging Rules,* ed. Brian E. C. Schottlaender (Chicago: ALA, 1995), 91.
5. Clara Beetle, ed., *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries* (Chicago: ALA, 1949).
6. Charles Sumner Spalding, ed., *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (Chicago: ALA, 1967).
7. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules,* 2nd ed., 1998 rev. (Ottawa: Canadian Library Assn.; London: Library Assn. Publishing; Chicago: ALA, 1998).

8. Michael J. Fox, "Describing Archives: A Content Standard, or What Do EAD, MARC, APPM, ISAD (G), EAC, and ISAAR (CPF) All Have in Common?" Presentation, 46th Annual RBMS Preconference, St. Louis, Missouri, June 24, 2005.

9. Steven L. Hensen, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1983); Steven L. Hensen, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries,* 2nd ed. (Chicago: Society for American Archivists, 1989); Michael J. Fox, "Describing Archives."

10. Hensen, *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts,* 2nd ed., v.

11. International Council on Archives, *ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description,* 2nd ed. (Ottawa: International Council on Archives, 2000). www.ica.org/biblio/ cds/isad_g_2e.pdf, (accessed May 1, 2006); International Council on Archives, *ISAAR (CPF): International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families* (Paris: International Council on Archives, 2004). www.ica.org/biblio/ISAAR2EN.pdf (accessed May 1, 2006).

12. Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard,* vi.

13. Ibid., vi–vii.

14. Ibid., vi.

15. Ibid., xi.

16. Ibid., 3.

17. Ibid., 85.

18. Ibid., 117.

19. Steven L. Hensen, "Archival Cataloging and the Internet: The Implications and Impact of EAD" in *Encoded Archival Description on the Internet,* eds. Daniel V. Pitti and Wendy M. Duff (Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 2001), 87.

20. *RDA: Resource Description and Access: A Prospectus* (Jul. 27, 2005). www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-prospectus .pdf (accessed May 1, 2006).

21. Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, to ALA Committee on Cataloging: Classification and Description, June 6, 2005, "Report on the JSC Meeting, Chicago, Apr. 24–28, 2005," 2. www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ ccda/docs/jsc0506.pdf (accessed May 1, 2006).

22. Ibid.

23. *RDA: Resource Description and Access: A Prospectus,* 2.

24. Bowen, "Report on the JSC Meeting," 3.

25. *RDA: Resource Description and Access: A Prospectus,* 2.

26. Bowen, "Report on the JSC Meeting," 5.

27. Mary Lacy (SAA Liaison to CC:DA), e-mail to the author, Sept. 15, 2005.

28. OCLC, Open WorldCat. www.oclc.org/worldcat/open/default .htm (accessed May 1, 2006).

29. Joint Steering Committee for the Revisions of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, ―Outcomes of the Meeting of the Joint Steering Committee Held in Chicago, U.S.A., 24–28 April 2005 (Date posted: May 12, 2005; Minor revisions: May 19, 2005). www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0504out.html (accessed May 1, 2006). See section "Change in Direction for New Edition of AACR."

30. Barbara Tillett, "Authority Control: State of the Art and New Perspectives," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 38, no. 3/4 (2004): 28–29.

31. *Encoded Archival Context Beta* (revised Nov. 29, 2004). www .iath.virginia.edu/eac (accessed May 1, 2006).

32. Haworth, "Archival Description: Content and Context in Search of Structure," 21.

33. Manon Foster Evans, "FRBR and Archival Collections," online posting, July 19, 2005, ARCHIVES discussion group. http://listserv.muohio.edu/scripts/wa.exe?A2=ind0507C&L =ARCHIVES&P=R14921&I=-3 (accessed May 1, 2006).

34. Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard,* 3.

35. Ibid., 30.

36. Ibid., 203.

37. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules,* 2nd ed., 2002 rev., appendix D-6.

38. Society of American Archivists, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard,* vi.

39. Ibid., 152.

40. Ibid., 130.

41. Ibid., viii.

Whittaker, Beth M. "DACS & RDA: Insights and Questions from the New Archival Descriptive Standard." Library Resources & Technical Services 51 (2007): 98-105. Publisher's official version: http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/lrts/archive/51n2.pdf. Open Access version: http://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/dspace/.

42. While still being revised, the latest versions of the Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books) Standard DCRM (B) Draft Texts can be viewed at www.folger.edu/bsc/dcrb/ dcrmtext.html (accessed Sept. 29, 2006). Appendix B is entitled "Collection-Level Records."
43. *RDA Prospectus,* 2.
44. Mark A. Greene and Dennis Meissner, "More Product, Less Process: Pragmatically Revamping Traditional Processing Approaches to Deal with Late 20th Century Collections," *American Archivist* 68, no. 2 (2005): 208–63.
45. For an example of a link to Wikipedia used in a library-oriented blog in a role similar to an authority record, see Robin K. Blum, "LISNews Interview with Librarian Nancy Pearl"(Aug. 9, 2005). http://interviews.lisnews.org/Interviews/ 05/08/08/1918226.shtml (accessed May 1, 2006