Standards for Archival Description

Reconciling Sibling Rivalry in the *AACR 2* "Family": The Potential for Agreement on Rules for Archival Description of All Types of Materials

MARION MATTERS

Abstract: Archivists and others faced with the cataloging of special materials have been searching for ways to resolve existing conflicts among a number of special descriptive cataloging manuals that have been prepared to clarify or expand upon rules presented in the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd edition (*AACR 2*). The author discusses the problems, issues, and conflicts that surfaced when cataloging rules in *AACR 2* and the special manuals were compared with each other and with the 5XX fields (the "containers" available for notes) in the USMARC format. Three manuals used widely by archivists in their own repositories and in bibliographic networks that include archival materials receive special attention: *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts*; *Graphic Materials*; and *Archival Moving Image Materials*.

About the author: Marion Matters works for the Minnesota Office of Library Development and Services and as a consulting archivist. She previously worked for the Minnesota Historical Society and served as the Society of American Archivists automation program officer, 1988-89. She prepared this background paper for the June 1989 meeting of the Working Group on Standards for Archival Description in response to issues raised at the group's December 1988 meeting.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS study, as defined in the Working Group meeting of 3-4 December 1988, is to examine the *AACR 2* "family" of special descriptive cataloging rules manuals in order to determine whether conflicts between other special manuals and *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts* (*APPM*) can be resolved. The Working Group felt it would be desirable to establish *APPM* as the primary manual of description for any type of material that is being "treated archivally."

In order to do this we must have analyzed not only the rules embodied in *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed. (*AACR 2*) and the special manuals, but also the reasons repositories currently choose one set of descriptive rules over another. This could be related to their decisions concerning which USMARC format to use, their assumptions concerning the principal research use of their holdings, their decisions concerning collection management and depth of description, and—most arbitrary and compelling of determinants—the constraints of the catalog system(s) they use.

We need to define what constitutes "archival description" and how it may or may not be applied to different types of "archival" material, and we need to investigate and summarize the potential conflicts among the rules or interpretations given in the special manuals, paying particular attention to *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts, Graphic Materials* (*GIHC*), and *Archival Moving Image Materials* (*AMIM*)—not forgetting *AACR 2*, itself.[1]

The largest part of this study concerns the problems, issues, or conflicts that surfaced when the cataloging rules in *AACR 2* and the special manuals were compared— to each other and to the 5XX fields (the "containers" available for notes) in the USMARC format.[2] The recently published *MARC for Archival Visual Materials: A Compendium of Practice*[3] was useful as supporting documentation, especially the report of the 1988 Conference on the Use of USMARC Records for Archival Visual Materials, which summarized the major issues discussed at the conference and highlighted problems that this study also addresses.

There are other special manuals covering description of cartographic materials, sound recordings, newspapers, music, nonbook materials in general, and audiovisual materials in general, but they will not be considered in this study.

The description of electronic records, while of growing importance to archivists, is an elusive problem, since it changes as fast as the technology. In the first place, what is to be cataloged? Early rules, embodied in the original *AACR 2* (1978) and in Sue Dodd's *Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files* (1982), focused on social science statistical data files. The introduction of microcomputer software and files required a different orientation, reflected in a series of publications: the ALA/CC:*DA Guidelines for Using AACR 2, Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software*;

---

[1] *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (*AACR 2*), 2nd ed., 1988 revision (Chicago: American Library Association, 1988); Wendy White-Hensen, comp., *Archival Moving Image Materials: A Cataloging Manual* (*AMIM*), (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1984); Steven Hensen, comp., *Archives, Personal Papers, and Manuscripts: A Cataloging Manual for Archival Repositories, Historical Societies, and Manuscript Libraries* (*APPM*), 2nd ed. (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1989); Elisabeth W. Betz, comp., *Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing*

Original Items and Historical Collections (*GIHC*), (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1982). *APPM, GIHC*, and *AMIM*, besides being useful abbreviations, are also the codes authorized by the Library of Congress for use in USMARC field 040 (cataloging source).

[2] A rule-by-rule comparison of *AACR 2, APPM, GIHC*, and *AMIM*, along with annotations concerning the USMARC fields, was prepared by the author as background for this paper (available from the author).

[3] Linda Evans and Maureen O'Brien Will, *MARC for Archival Visual Materials: A Compendium of Practice* (Chicago: Chicago Historical Society, 1988).

the Dodd and Sandberg-Fox manual, *Cataloging Microcomputer Files: A Manual of Interpretation for AACR 2* (1985); the *AACR 2* Chapter 9, Computer Files, draft revision (1987); and finally the new chapter 9 in *AACR 2* Rev. (1988).[4] But archivists may need to document or represent software-dependent computer applications *systems* (rather than either computer *files* or computer *software*), both for appraisal and for access. Documentation of such systems goes beyond those traditional elements of archival arrangement and description practice concerned with documenting organizational structure and recordkeeping systems. And it certainly poses problems for the ISBD/*AACR 2* approach to describing in a catalog record the physical manifestation of a work.[5] In fact, it would be difficult to identify systems as either "works" or "physical manifestations" of works in the traditional senses.

It is difficult to identify conflicts when the rules change frequently, and when few general archives have done much computer file cataloging. Lacunae in rules, and conflicts between rules, are likely to be seen more clearly in the light of practical application, making a likely subject for further study in the near future.

The *AACR 2* Family: Generalists and Specialists

The special media manuals in the *AACR 2* family were never intended to stand alone,

apart from *AACR 2*, although *APPM* originally was intended to replace chapter 4 of *AACR 2* for those cataloging agencies that wanted it replaced, the most influential of which was the Library of Congress Manuscript Division.[6] In the Working Group's classification of technical standards, conventions, and guidelines, the manuals that "interpret" or supplement *AACR 2* might be considered guidelines, while manuals that replace parts of *AACR 2* might be more aptly termed conventions. *APPM, AMIM,* and *Bibliographic Description of Rare Books* (*BDRB*) would thus be classed as conventions, while *GIHC* would be classed as a guideline. The recently published *Notes in the Catalog Record* treats *APPM* rules as if they were Library of Congress (LC) rule interpretations. It refers to the existence of *AMIM* and *GIHC*, but "they have not been quoted as direct LC policy." Had the book covered areas other than notes, it might well have treated some parts of *GIHC*, and especially *AMIM*, as it does *APPM*.[7]

The special manuals were compiled and published to serve the needs of "specialist and archival libraries" which *AACR 2*, alone, could not satisfy (*AACR 2* rule 0.1, p. 1).[8] So *AACR 2* was not intended to stand alone, either, but under the same rule "such libraries are recommended to use the rules as the basis of their cataloging and to augment their provisions as necessary."[9]

---

[4]Until there has been time for new auxiliary manuals to be published to "interpret" and give examples for the new chapter 9, Ann Sandberg-Fox suggests that catalogers follow the rules in the new chapter 9, using the Dodd and Dodd/Sandberg-Fox manuals for background information (telephone conversation, 27 April 1989).

[5]Lenore Coral, "Problems in the Cataloguing of the Products of Rapidly Changing Technologies: with Special Reference to Machine-Readable Files," *International Cataloguing* 13 (April 1984):18-19. Coral analyzes the problems, especially relating to edition and physical description, but arising in other areas as well, caused just by trying to follow ISBD to describe the machine-readable files of as *long* ago as 1983.

[6]Steven Hensen, "Squaring the Circle: The Reformation of Archival Description in AACR 2," *Library Trends* 36 (Winter 1988):539-52. Hensen discusses the circumstances that led to *APPM*.

[7]Jerry D. Saye, *Notes in the Catalog Record: Based on AACR 2 and LC Rule Interpretations* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1989), xxviii. For the Working Group's definitions of technical standards, conventions, and guidelines, see "Report of the Working Group on Standards for Archival Description," *American Archivist* 52 (Winter 1989): 452-53.

[8]The special manuals all refer to *AACR 2* chapters 22-24 for creating headings. *AACR 2* must also be used for its list of standard abbreviations and its rules concerning capitalization, as well as when the specialist cataloger may have occasion to catalog materials outside the specialty.

[9]In "The Newspaper Cataloging Manual and AACR

Each of the special manuals meets a need that no other single manual (or *AACR 2*) could meet adequately. The relationships between the manuals might be envisioned as a set of overlapping concentric circles. At the center of each is the kind of material or the kind of repository for which the manual was written.

APPM majors in collective description of textual archives or multi-format archives, with a minor in description of individual items in textual archives. Moving out from the center, it also provides a framework for collective description of materials in any single medium, but in those cases could (and probably should) be supplemented by information given in the media-specific manuals, particularly for physical description, notes, and choice of access points. In such cases, cataloging would still follow *APPM*, augmenting it only in areas where it is not specific enough.

The *GIHC* core contains historical graphic items, published or unpublished, held by graphics archives; the next layer contains focused collections of such materials (e.g., the works of a single artist or photographer); the outer layer, which contains collections of graphic materials held by general archives, overlaps with the *APPM* outer layer. But even *GIHC* does not cover all types of graphic materials in detail. It emphasizes pictorial works (i.e., photographs, prints, paintings), which are quite different from technical drawings, charts, and the like.

AMIM is best at handling formally titled, once commercially produced moving image material now considered historical, along with related unedited material in special moving image archives.[10] At the periphery

of its circle are informal productions like home movies or videotapes of governor's speeches, or material distinguished by large volume and primarily documentary value (e.g., local news footage), all of which overlap with the *APPM* outer layer.

No matter which rules we follow for particular materials, if we are concerned with the use or exchange of bibliographic records outside the narrow domain of a local, single-purpose, single-medium catalog, then all the rules should be complementary. Bibliographic records created under any medium-specific extension or interpretation of the *AACR 2* rules should be compatible with records created under any other. They should be able to coexist in the same catalog, should be understandable alone or in the context of other records, should support the identifying and collocating functions of the catalog, and should not confuse the user. Catalogers will need guidance concerning when to use different rules, even though ultimately it should be a local option based on local needs.

Choice among rules. How do catalogers choose which rules to use and when? Must they choose only one? *AACR 2*, rule 0.23 (p. 7-8) states:

> Where types of material demand specific treatment of a certain element, the general chapter contains only brief guidance and the user of the rules will find specific guidance in the appropriate specific chapter. . . . Use the chapters in part I alone or in combination as the specific problem demands. For example, a difficult problem in describing a serial sound recording might lead the user to consult chapters 1, 6, and 12.

In chapter 4, rule 4.0A1 advises ''For manuscript cartographic items, see also chapter 3. For manuscript music, see also chapter 5.''

2,'' *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 6 (Summer 1986):59-67, author J.E. Cole argues that Harriman's *Newspaper Cataloging Manual* (1984) and *AACR 2* together constitute a national standard for newspaper cataloging; one cannot do proper cataloging without either one.

[10]As evidenced by the primary definition of title as

''original release title in the country of origin,'' *AMIM*, 24.

While those rules apply only to choices within *AACR 2*, one could use the same relationship model in conjunction with rule 0.1 (mentioned above), to apply to *AACR 2* and one of the special manuals, or even to two of the special manuals. A difficult problem in describing a collection of archival sound recordings might require *APPM* and *AACR 2* or a special manual on sound recordings. A difficult problem in describing a collection of archival graphic materials might require *GIHC* and *APPM* (and *AACR 2*).

Catalogers might choose one set of rules over another for reasons that have already been mentioned, but there may be different ways of expressing similar reasons—the nature of materials, the degree of integration of different physical formats in the organization of a collection, the mission of the cataloging institution.[11]

The report of the 1988 Conference on the Use of USMARC Records for Archival Visual Materials (in *MARC for Archival Visual Materials*, appendix C) states that for visual materials catalogers, the selection of cataloging rules and the selection of USMARC format (VM vs. AMC) are closely linked. The AMC catalogers use *APPM*; the VM catalogers use *AACR 2*, *GIHC*, or *AMIM*.[12] But since some visual materials catalogers do use *APPM*, the nature of the materials cataloged is not the only factor influencing choice of rules. Statements (and cataloging examples) given by participants illustrate the range of factors.

The cataloging system affects some choices at both the Chicago Historical Society and the Hallmark Historical Collection, which use *AACR 2* and *GIHC* for description, but use a USMARC AMC implementation to format the description, necessitating some adjustments.[13]

The Getty Archives of the History of Art chooses to catalog visual materials using *APPM* in the AMC format, possibly because "materials are acquired primarily to document art history and not necessarily for their aesthetic value," in other words, because of assumptions concerning management and research use of the collections.[14]

The Minnesota Historical Society (MHS) bases visual materials descriptions on *AACR 2* and *GIHC*, while *AMIM* "may be used if a more detailed description is needed."[15] But MHS has also made an internal decision not to bracket supplied titles because "approximately 90% of our collection requires supplied titles and the brackets confused the patrons." Its plans to use subfields $f and $g of field 245, if available through format integration, indicate a preference for the title rules as set out in *APPM*.[16]

The UCLA Film and Television Archive uses title transcription rules and uniform title rules from *AACR 2* but follows *AMIM* for supplied titles and other elements of description.[17]

The decisions made by UCLA and MHS lead one to ask what it means to "follow the rules." *AACR 2* permits the use of special rules, and nothing in it or in any of the special manuals precludes use of whatever special rules seem helpful. Within the two major bibliographic utilities, RLIN and OCLC, cataloging based on one of the approved *AACR 2*-based manuals is considered as valid as that based solely on *AACR 2*.

But what if cataloging were to be based on *two* special manuals? Here, the USMARC format presents a problem. According to the documentation for USMARC

---

[11]Barbara Orbach to Steve Hensen, 5 January 1989, concerning *APPM*; photocopy in possession of the author.

[12]*MARC for Archival Visual Materials*, 406.

[13]Ibid., 358, 370.
[14]Ibid., 365.
[15]Ibid., 390.
[16]Ibid., 171.
[17]Ibid., 171, 161, 114.

field 040, use of subfield $e (description conventions) is optional, but some implementations (like RLIN) require it when one of the special manuals is used. So, on a practical level, if an institution uses rules from different sources, how does it declare itself in subfield $e (not repeatable) of US-MARC field 040?

If there is no logical reason why catalogers should not use more than one manual when appropriate,[18] then SAA's Committee on Archival Information Exchange (CAIE) should work with the bibliographic utilities and MARBI to recommend appropriate use of USMARC field 040 $e. Should $e be repeatable? Should $e represent only the rules used to derive the title, statement of responsibility, and main entry (as opposed to manuals used for guidance in creating the physical description or notes)?

Archival Description, Archival Control. The characteristics of a catalogable entity that make archival description or archival control desirable or necessary are:

1. **Uniqueness.** If we talk about archival *material*, this is often what we envision—unique, unpublished (i.e., not commercially available) textual matter. It is a distinction that makes sense only when applied to items, however. Collections, unless reproduced in another format, are always unique aggregations, even if they contain published material. The distinction made here—based on history of production or distribution—has long been accepted by archivists, but David Bearman has suggested that such a distinction is not only unproduc-

tive but potentially harmful.[19] And the distinction is often not applicable to visual materials that may exist in multiple copies without having been published.

2. **Collectivity.** An aggregation (collection, record group, series) is described or cataloged as a unit, although it contains many entities that could be described or cataloged separately.

We could make a distinction between the "organic" nature of an archival collection generated in the natural course of personal or organizational activity, and the arbitrary nature of, for example, a collection of pamphlets described as a collection for reasons of economy.

OCLC makes another kind of distinction in its guidelines for choosing between the USMARC AMC format and other formats: "If the collection consists of materials which, if cataloged separately, would require the use of more than one format" then the cataloger should use the AMC format.[20]

3. **Requirement for "life-cycle management."** According to the OCLC manual, "If the intent is to use the archival control fields (e.g., 541, 583, 584)," then the cataloger should use the AMC format.[21] An archival collection retains

---

[18]As noted above, in *AACR 2*, chapter 4 (manuscripts), catalogers are directed to *see also* chapter 3 (cartographic materials) and chapter 5 (music) when cataloging manuscript maps or music (rule 4.01). Following this precedent, users of *APPM* could *see also* the appropriate *AACR 2* chapter or special manual when cataloging archival materials whose form also happens to be "cartographic" or "music" or "videorecording," etc.

[19]Bearman has suggested that archivists beware the implications of too strong an identification with this characteristic: "The disappearance of archives as organizational entities during our professional careers is extremely likely if we continue to define archives as repositories of non-published materials, in part because published and unpublished are disappearing distinctions and the cultural institutions which have been most responsible for the former are perfectly capable of servicing the latter." *Towards National Information Systems for Archives and Manuscript Repositories: The National Information Systems Task Force (NISTF) Papers, 1981-1984* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1987), 92. Further, he states, "National archival policy should make possible the integration of information concerning cultural records without regard to the history of their production or distribution" (p. 95).

[20]*OCLC AMC Format Manual*, Introduction p. 1.

[21]Fields for notes on immediate source of acquisition (541), actions (583), and accumulation and fre-

its intellectual identity (which is derived from its provenance) even if it has been subject to weeding, sampling, reproduction, or other actions that change its physical extent or format. The description must provide for a record of actions and their results and a means of identifying the underlying entity through various changes.

4. **Documentary value**. An item or collection may be regarded as primary historical documentation or as evidence of organizational activity. Thus, archivists may wish to describe an "archival copy" of a published annual report (or a collection of published annual reports) using rules for archival description, even though under most circumstances the *AACR 2* rules for serials would be used.

We usually assume that at least one of these four characteristics must be present for an entity to be considered amenable to archival description, but it does not seem to be necessary that all be present. *APPM* concentrates on collective description of archives, characterized generally as unique historical source material under archival control. For *GIHC* and *AMIM*, the focus is on historical material since both may be used for materials existing in multiple copies, including commercially produced material. Original or noncommercial graphic works "are considered to be unique, though they frequently exist in multiple copies. Even if published, they lack much of the explicit information characterizing books and book-like materials" (*GIHC*, 4). *GIHC* provides rules for collective description. *AMIM* rules are based on the concept of the moving image *title* as the catalogable unit, which could represent anything between a single physical item and a collection, reflecting the need for a conflation in one record

of data covering several physical pieces, perhaps bearing different identifying indicia but belonging to the same moving image title. . . . The moving image archive may have several manifestations of a work, each incomplete, but which when taken together approximate a single whole item. It may also hold in separate physical items various manifestations that are dependent, e.g., a separate sound track. (*AMIM*, 2)

Further consideration of the four characteristics reveals that: (1) collective description might be used for any kind of material (beyond archival graphic or moving image material) in any setting where item level cataloging was not possible or desirable; (2) none of the four characteristics related to choice of "archival" description is *completely* identifiable with any type of material (textual, graphic, moving image, computer files, etc.); and (3) none of our existing rules adequately cover description of life-cycle management or "archival control" elements (USMARC fields 541, 583, 584) other than the date and method of acquisition.

In the absence of any useful rules in *AACR 2* for collective description, *APPM*, because of its generic framework, could become the basis for collective description of any materials (other than graphics, at least). On the other hand, since *APPM* does not really address all of the "archival control" elements of archival description, desire to use these elements does not require use of *APPM*. And since any type of material might be amenable to archival control or archival description, while also requiring medium-specific description, it is difficult to regard *APPM*, alone, as sufficient for all archival description. If *AACR 2* is any indication, it is impossible for *APPM* to provide rules for all types of material that might be treated archivally. *AACR 2* tried to be all things to all catalogers, but only at a very general level. Perhaps *APPM* is the *AACR 2* of ar-

---

quency of use (584). *OCLC AMC Format Manual*, Introduction p. 1.

chival description, giving generic rules that must be expanded and interpreted for specialist archives.

So, what about rules for the archival control elements not covered in *APPM*? Is there enough common practice even to begin codifying in rules? Rules for description created without regard for common practice will not be accepted, as experience with *AACR 2*, chapter 4 illustrated. The RLIN Government Records Project has begun to develop rules and a structure for dealing with appraisal information, but it is just a beginning. What information about management actions must be recorded in order to document the integrity of records as legal and evidential sources? How standard must it be? What is "public" and what is "private" information for a repository's internal use only? Who needs to know about management actions? Might the answers be more important for the future of archival description than the conflicts among the existing special manuals? Archivists need to focus attention on development of description related to archival management actions.

Problems, Issues, and Conflicts

This paper could not possibly cover all the potential implications of all the variations in all the rules in *AACR 2*, *APPM*, *GIHC*, and *AMIM* (not to mention the other special manuals!), so there is ample room for further discussion.[22] The following selected issues are set out in *AACR 2* order, for lack of another organizing principle, with general issues at the end.

Bibliographic identity. There are really two issues here: (1) what shall constitute a catalogable unit? and (2) what is the min-imum amount or type of data needed to uniquely identify the catalogable unit, to distinguish it from others, and to provide useful citations?

The *AACR 2* rules assume that the catalogable unit is a physical manifestation of a "work." Thus the single work *Hamlet* is represented by many catalog records, each for a different physical manifestation that may involve different publishers or different editors, for example. The different versions and physical manifestations will be collocated under the uniform title, *Hamlet*, in conjunction with the main entry for William Shakespeare. Together they form a heading by which the work can be cited or indexed (e.g., as a subject heading). In general, such citation headings are created by joining the main entry heading with the title proper.[23]

AACR 2 looks at citations in another way in the chapter on analysis, where the "In" citation consists of name and/or uniform title if appropriate, title proper, statement of responsibility when necessary for identification, edition statement, and numeric or other designation of a serial or publication details of a monographic item (*AACR 2*, rule 13.5, 301).

As *AACR 2* descriptions are generally formulated, they can stand alone; they contain all the information necessary to identify the item, although to be used as catalog entries they require the addition of headings acting as access points (main entry, added entries, subject headings, etc.).[24] In fact, the title and statement of responsibility frequently can stand alone, and sometimes this combination is used as a citation

---

[22]Barbara Orbach has already analyzed the implications of rules for corporate main entry in "Integrating Concepts: Corporate Main Entry and Graphic Materials," *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 8:2 (1987/1988): 71-89.

[23]The *title proper* is (according to the glossary in *AACR 2*) "the chief name of an item, including any alternative title but excluding parallel titles and other title information."

[24]Note that according to *AACR 2*, the description does not *include* the main entry heading; rather, the description is *entered under* a heading or headings, one of which is chosen as the *main* entry heading.

form, rather than the main entry/title combination.[25]

On the subject of what constitutes a catalogable unit, *AMIM* takes a different approach from *AACR 2*, defining the *work* as the catalogable unit (which may include more than one physical manifestation), at least for cataloging done within a single repository. A repository might have the work *Nosferatu, Phantom der Nacht* (or portions of it) in several physical manifestations, including dubbed or subtitled versions, etc., all covered by a single record for the original work. A major revision or a complete remake of the story is considered a different work. Since moving image material is almost universally entered under title (specifically, original release title in country of origin), without a personal or corporate main entry, the uniform heading for a work would be the title. Even though *AMIM* eschews the concept of uniform title in the bibliographic description of moving image material (there is no need for a uniform title when in a sense all titles are uniform titles), it acknowledges that it is useful when a citation or a subject heading for the work is required (*AMIM*, 7).

In the cataloging of unique archival items or collections (as would happen under *APPM* or *GIHC*), the "work" has been, in fact, the same as its physical manifestation. The existence of microfilm of entire collections challenges that assumption, and the proliferation of various electronic reproductions is likely to weaken it further. As mentioned earlier, it becomes even more difficult to define the "work" with respect to computer files and electronic record systems.

When it comes to the integrity of descriptions, *APPM* differs from *AACR 2* in that, unless the item/collection is entered under title alone or unless the option to in-

clude the name element in the title is exercised, the description (or at least the title) often cannot stand alone without its main entry, because the main entry establishes the collection's provenance, a crucial element in its identification.[26] (Actually, the same thing could happen for certain items cataloged according to *AACR 2*, chapter 4.) The following examples come from *APPM*, 2nd ed.

- **Collection with a main entry, showing title options:**

main entry:	Bollingen Foundation
title:	Records, 1939-1973
or, optionally title with name	
element:	Bollingen Foundation records, 1939-1973

- **Collection entered under title alone:**

title:	California travel diaries, 1849-1851

An *APPM*-based record does not have a statement of responsibility unless the record represents a literary manuscript or other item that has a title page from which such a statement can be transcribed.[27]

- **Item with formal title and statement of responsibility:**

main entry:	Daly, Augustin
title:	Divorce : holograph, [187-?]
statement of responsibility:	by Augustin Daly

The dependence on main entry for identification in *APPM*-based records might not be a problem except when those records are included in a catalog system that uses the title/statement of responsibility combina-

---

[25]See *AACR 2*, rule 1.7A4 concerning citations to other works.

[26]*APPM*, 1989 revision, rule 1.1B3 covers the name element in titles. Rule 2.1 covers the relationship between main entry and provenance.

[27]According to the *AACR 2* glossary, the statement of responsibility is "a statement, transcribed from the item being described, relating to persons responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the item, to corporate bodies from which the content emanates, or to persons or corporate bodies responsible for the performance of the content of the item."

tion rather than the main entry/title combination as a citation form,[28] as demonstrated below.

- **Main entry/title citation form:**
  Bollingen Foundation. Records, 1939-1973.

  Bollingen Foundation. Bollingen Foundation records, 1939-1973.

  California travel diaries, 1849-1851.

  Daly, Augustin. Divorce : holograph, [187-?].

- **Title/statement of responsibility citation form:**
  Records, 1939-1973

  Bollingen Foundation records, 1939-1973

  California travel diaries, 1849-1851

  Divorce : holograph, [187-?] / by Augustin Daly

The citation to *Records, 1939-1973*, by itself, is not particularly informative to users, compared with *Bollingen Foundation records, 1939-1973*. Archival catalogers should be alert to potential system constraints so that they can evaluate the usefulness of *APPM*'s name element option for titles.

Finally, while *APPM* rules cover the situation,[29] there may not be solid agreement among other catalogers on how a uniform heading or citation form (title or name-title heading) for archival material is formed. That is the representation of an archival collection ("work") used when it is necessary to create an added entry or subject heading for it. Existing headings sometimes comprise main entry and title, sometimes main entry, title, and inclusive dates (the latter, according to *APPM*). Since in *GIHC* and *AMIM* the inclusive dates of production normally are not considered part of a title, the name-title uniform headings created for archival materials by *GIHC* or *AMIM* catalogers would not include dates.[30] Here, then, we have potential for different headings representing the same work.

Archivists should further investigate the implications of the main entry/title/statement of responsibility relationship in archival description compared to that relationship for other materials. Also, they should evaluate the impact on this relationship of catalog system constraints (e.g., systems that display title and statement of responsibility rather than main entry and title). Is this a real problem? If so, where should we make changes—in descriptive practice or in catalog systems?

An added problem concerning citation headings arises from the fact that the dates—perhaps even the title—of an archival collection could conceivably change as a result of archival management actions (receipt of accretions, weeding, reprocessing and recataloging, etc.). If, as noted above, an archival "work" is identical with its physical representation, then it would seem that a change in the physical representation implies a change in the work, perhaps even the existence of a new work—except that we have also said that by its nature, archival material subject to archival control (or life-cycle management) retains its identity even if archival management changes its physical form. How can we provide for change and continuity? Is it reasonable to try to create uniform headings for mutable descriptions? This is completely alien to anything in *AACR 2* and we haven't adequately provided for it in any rules.

Archivists must begin to investigate how change as the result of archival management actions affects the integrity of a bibliographic record, citation forms, and headings based on a description prior to change.

---

[28]A citation form may be displayed when multiple records satisfy an online search, for example, as well as in bibliographies.

[29]*APPM*, 1989 revision, rules 2.3F, 2.3G; introduction to chapter 6 (uniform titles).

[30]In both *GIHC* and *AMIM*, dates *may* be included in titles; see *GIHC* rule 1A3 and 1C2, *AMIM* rule 1F2.3.

Title brackets. *APPM* does not require that supplied titles be enclosed in brackets, reserving brackets for conjectural data only. *AACR 2* does require brackets with supplied titles, as does *AMIM*, and *GIHC* for single items. *GIHC* does not require brackets with supplied titles for collections. As stated in *MARC for Visual Materials*, the Minnesota Historical Society, while generally following *AACR 2* and *GIHC*, does not bracket supplied titles at all.

Will it be important in the long run to distinguish between titles given by "authors" or commercial producers (i.e., formal titles) and titles constructed by catalogers? Since the AMC format is used to catalog materials along a continuum from a single item with a formal title (such as an unpublished literary manuscript), to collections of materials in multiple formats, possibly including published items, we cannot always say that (1) use of the AMC format, or (2) intent to apply "archival control" will tell you whether or not to expect transcribed titles or cataloger-supplied titles. Is this an important distinction except for entities existing in multiple copies and likely to be cataloged in several places? Of course, we can't always know in advance that an archival item or collection will never be *reproduced* and the reproduction then "published" in multiple copies.

When the *AACR 2* definition of the chief source of information is enlarged to include things other than explicit title pages (especially secondary reference sources), the significance of brackets, which are supposed to enclose anything *not transcribed* from the chief source of information, is reduced. A statement of responsibility may be created by piecing together data appearing in different places in the chief source of information. What is, and is not, given as transcription from chief sources of information according to *GIHC* and *AMIM* (but also, to a certain extent, according to *AACR 2* in many chapters) can vary depending on the cataloger's use of secondary reference sources.

If you look at a record created according to *GIHC*, you will not know whether you are dealing with transcribed or supplied titles until you first determine whether you are seeing an item or collection description. The rules for bracketing vary depending on whether you are dealing with an item or a collection. Obviously, brackets make sense only to catalogers. Is it really important, even to them? According to some contributors to *MARC for Visual Materials*, it is,[31] although no reason is given for why it is useful to distinguish quickly between original title and cataloger-supplied title. As one might expect, the issue arises more often for visual materials catalogers who deal with materials bearing explicit title information.

If brackets were used only for conjectural data, the cataloger could always make a note concerning the source of the title when there is no title page or close equivalent.

Original release title for moving images. *AMIM* declares that the title proper for any moving image work (commercially produced work, at least) is the original release title in the country of origin. This applies even if the only manifestation of that work held by the archives is the work as released in another country under another title; the title on the work in hand would be given as an added entry. Catalogers holding the same physical manifestation but following *AACR 2* would transcribe the title from the work in hand and probably record the original release title as a uniform title.[32] If records cataloged under these two methods were merged in a single catalog, the records for the same physical manifestation would be different, although they would collocate because of the use of the uniform title.

---

[31]*MARC for Visual Materials*, 411.
[32]Telephone conversation with Martha Yee, [?] April 1989.

Construction of supplied titles. *GIHC* (p. 21) instructs the cataloger to strive for distinctiveness in supplied titles; *APPM* does not. *APPM* stresses form of material; *GIHC* stresses subject depicted (for single items), provenance (e.g., donor, sponsoring body), and subject for collections. *AMIM* stresses use of supplied title as a classification and access device (although it does not say that explicitly). Instructions call for grouping certain types of materials:

- "group thematically related footage by a descriptor such as a collection name" (*AMIM*, 42), e.g.,

  [Unidentified Tusler. A Writer's dream]

- "if the use of a collection name is not appropriate, use descriptors that are, such as the production company and/or a genre term or simply a number" (*AMIM*, 41)

  [Unidentified travelog. Greenland expedition]

  [Unidentified Mack Sennet comedy. No. 1]

- "if a collection name is not appropriate, use the production company name to modify and group the unidentified works" (*AMIM*, 41)

  [Unidentified Kleine. Assorted scenes]

- "when a single individual is identified as the subject of the footage, bracket the name, last name first" (*AMIM*, 42)

  [Roosevelt, Theodore—inaugural ceremony, 1905]

- "to supply a title for a home movie, invert the name of the person who is the subject of the material or its focal point followed by a dash (—) and the phrase "home movies" (*AMIM*, 46)

  [Taft, Robert A., Sr.—home movies]

- "when describing commercials and announcements, etc.... supply a title ... consisting of the words *Television commercial*, *Public service announcement*, ... or other appropriate descriptor, a dash (—), the name of the product, service, etc." (*AMIM*, 47)

  [Television commercial—Ajax cleanser]

[Television commercial—Miller beer].
  Billy Martin

Such titles are quite different in style from titles likely to be created using *GIHC* or *APPM* rules. There is great support in the international film archives community for making the title do more of the work of providing access points than would be true for libraries and other archives. Apparently, the current draft of international film cataloging rules leans even more in this direction.[33]

AMIM also redefines "parallel title" for use in moving image cataloging. *AACR 2* defines it as "the title proper in another language and/or script recorded in the title and statement of responsibility area," assumed also to be a title transcribed from the item.[34] *AMIM* defines parallel title also to include "the title, other than the original release title, by which the moving image work *in hand* is well known to users and researchers, e.g., the American release title of a British work, when the archive holds the American release copy" (*AMIM*, 34). The same information could be included in a note and would certainly be included among the added entries. This particular redefinition may have come as a result of declaring the original release title to be the title proper, even in records where the item in hand has a different title (as in the section quoted above).

It is worth noting that not all moving image archives follow *AMIM* in the title area; UCLA, for one, does not.[35]

Statements of responsibility. *APPM* directs the cataloger not to use statements of responsibility for collections, or for signers

---

[33]Telephone conversation with Harriet Harrison, 5 May 1989. It is my own unsupported contention that the more "classified" a title looks (i.e., the farther it is from natural language order), the less understandable it is to users other than catalogers.

[34]*AACR 2*, 1988 rev., Appendix D, Glossary, 620.

[35]Statements made in *MARC for Visual Materials*; and telephone conversation with Martha Yee, [?] April 1989.

of letters or other documents; it is permissible only for items bearing formal titles and statements of responsibility. *AACR 2* chapter 4 gives examples that imply that a signature on a letter or document is to be considered a statement of responsibility, but it says nothing about statements of responsibility for collections. Rule 4.1F3 (p. 127) states "If a manuscript lacks a signature or statement of responsibility, supply the name(s) of the person(s) responsible for it, if known." This conflicts directly with the general rule in *AACR 2* (1.1F2, p. 24) which states "If no statement of responsibility appears prominently in the item, neither construct one nor extract one from the content of the item. Give the relevant information in a note." *APPM* rules conform to the general rule in *AACR 2*. Archival collections bear neither titles nor statements of responsibility as they are commonly understood; the same applies to many, but not all, items within collections. Signed letters and manuscripts might be considered a gray area.

GIHC gives rules for statements of responsibility for collections (p. 26) and for attributions (p. 27, similar to *AACR 2*'s rule 4.1F3 quoted above). However, in current practice the Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division now gives attributions only in notes and would recommend cancellation of rule 1G6 (p. 27) regarding attributions. In other words, they do not "create," but only transcribe, statements of responsibility, which means that they seldom have statements of responsibility for collections.[36] This all makes *GIHC* somewhat closer to *APPM*, at least for collections.

AMIM employs a combination of transcription and construction of statements of responsibility ("transcribed from the ma-

terial being described, accompanying material, or from secondary sources," *AMIM*, 48), and the production company is given first. "Statements of responsibility should be recorded whether or not they appear on the item in hand. Sources for statements of responsibility which do not appear on the item in hand should be recorded in the note area" (*AMIM*, 49). *AMIM*'s broad definition of chief source of information (to include accompanying material and secondary sources) could result in catalog records differing from those created according to *AACR 2*. From the point of view of the film cataloging community, this is necessary because, first, cataloging reflects the "work" and attempts to make the catalog record "authoritative" about the work; second, the title (now in conjunction with statement of responsibility) is required to do much of the work of providing access points; and third, it is considered desirable to reduce the number of areas in the catalog record where credit function information is placed.

In all areas where *AMIM* departs from *AACR 2*, it generally does so because it is strongly influenced by the international film archives community, which has been working with rules for description since well before the publication of *AMIM*. The International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF) has recently circulated a new draft for review.[37]

Inclusive dates. According to *APPM*, the date of an item or the inclusive dates of a collection are considered part of the title, not part of the "Date Area" of *AACR 2* chapter 4, or of the "Publication, Distribution, etc. Area" of the rest of *AACR 2*, *AMIM*, and *GIHC*. Often it is an element necessary to make titles unique and adequately expressive of content.

There are cases in *GIHC* and *AMIM* when dates may be included in supplied titles,

---

[36]Telephone conversation with Barbara Orbach, 18 April 1989; photocopy of pages from LC's internal "master" copy of *GIHC*, provided by Orbach.

[37]Telephone conversation with Harriet Harrison, 5 May 1989.

as, for example, when an event depicted in a graphic item is different from the production date given in the publication area. Otherwise, *GIHC* and *AMIM* direct the cataloger to record dates, whether for items or collections, in the publication area; *AACR 2* chapter 4 does the same but calls this the date area.

In any case, the information is there. Does it really matter where it is recorded? Yes, if one is trying to construct unique titles; yes, perhaps, if one is trying to refer to a collection by a unique title;[38] yes, perhaps, if catalog system displays are structured to favor one or the other method.

It would be very difficult to convince *APPM* users to abandon the recording of dates in titles, particularly inclusive dates for collections.

Statements of extent for collections containing multiple formats, multiple types of containers, etc. The problem is not really in the rules, but in their stylistic relationship to USMARC field 300 and its more detailed content designation in subfields. It is possible to use a single field displayed as a single line or paragraph, or multiple fields displayed as multiple lines or paragraphs. *GIHC* provides a rule (3F, p. 55) and both *GIHC* and *AMIM* provide *examples* of multiple (mutually exclusive) statements of extent. The 1989 revision of *APPM* also provides examples of multiple statements of extent. Catalogers will want direction, even if it is only an explicitly stated option to do it one way or the other.

Approach to analytics. Archival catalogers don't typically use the term *analysis* the way *AACR 2* does, for "the process of preparing a bibliographic record that describes a part or parts of an item for which a comprehensive entry has been made" (*AACR 2* rule 13.1, 299). In fact, however,

archival catalogers do considerable "analysis" in scope and content notes that describe the parts of a collection, and in separate catalog records for subunits or items within collections. But the separate options are not stated explicitly in *APPM*, except in rule 1.7B1, "linking entry complexity," which relates to only one kind of analysis, the "In" analytic (in *AACR 2* terms). Consulting the *AACR 2* chapter on analysis could be useful to catalogers who need help deciding how to handle parts of their collections. At present, such guidelines for archival description are mostly in the heads of archivists who have well-developed institutional policies. It would be helpful to integrate the concept and its terminology into the archival description vocabulary, because it makes it easier to talk about how we do it.

The USMARC subfield 3, "materials specified," illustrates a form of analysis on an individual field basis; again, archival catalogers haven't had much guidance in applying this kind of analysis.

In *GIHC* rule 1B2.2 (p. 21) elements of a graphics "series" may be cataloged collectively under the series title.

It might be useful to explore further the construction of various levels of "In" analytics as described in *AACR 2* (involving bibliographic series, items, and parts of items) with the same kinds of relationships in archival description (groups, series, items, etc.).[39] It could be that monographic series and archival series have something in common in this context!

Choice of entry. One substantial issue concerns corporate main entry, although there also may be questions about entering a collection under the person responsible for assembling it, in equating the activity of collecting with personal authorship.[40]

AACR 2 is very strict in limiting the use

---

[38]The discussion, under "bibliographic identity," of the possibility of changes in inclusive dates resulting from archival management actions is relevant here.

[39]See particularly, *AACR 2*, rule 13.5B, 301-302.
[40]Orbach, "Integrating Concepts."

of corporate main entry to specific relationships between the work cataloged and a corporate body. *APPM* takes a simpler and broader view, stating "Enter the records of a corporate body under the appropriate heading for that body. Records consist of any documentation created in the course of fulfilling the purposes and functions of the corporate body."[41] In other words, provenance (rather broadly defined) is the determining element, as opposed to the more specific list of categories to which a work must belong in order to be eligible for corporate main entry according to *AACR 2*.[42]

The question is whether "it matters if main entry for groups is determined on different principles and the resulting catalog records are then mixed in a single file."[43] The answer can only be determined by further research concerning the use of such a mixed catalog.

Cataloging rule decisions based on system capabilities. The separation of different types of material into different "files"—as is characteristic of RLIN, for example—affects choice of USMARC format as well as choice of rules for description. If one repository dependent on a bibliographic utility for access wants all its materials to file together, or wants them to be accessible in a single search, the catalogers must choose one USMARC format (AMC or VM, for example) and probably match the cataloging rules to it.

Trying to "get around" system constraints leads primarily to creative (i.e., nonstandard) interpretations of the USMARC format, but also to manipulation of rules for description. For example, institutions have stretched the definition of uniform title in order to force individual items from the same collection to file together.

Some of the *AMIM* rules probably were developed in order to create records that could provide the best access in a manual catalog in which the title entry card might be the only entry for a work. Hence the concentration on original release titles and on supplied titles that also classify works.

Catalogers sometimes create unusual records, not from lack of standards or from insufficient incentive to follow them, but because of the conflict between local needs and catalog system implementations with insufficient flexibility to support them in conformance with standards.

Notes. Because few notes are prescribed and none are really prohibited, there are no substantial conflicts concerning notes. The primary differences among the manuals concern which notes are *emphasized*, which notes relate specifically to the information needs of users of different types of material, the order of notes, and whether certain types of information are in separate notes or combined in a single note. There are, however, conflicts that arise in the content designation of notes in the USMARC format, at least before format integration, since not all note fields are available in all formats. And there are some USMARC fields for which there are no rules beyond those given in the format documentation itself.[44]

Finally, many catalog system implementations make it impossible to follow *AACR 2* (or anybody else) when it comes to the order of notes. The 1989 revision of *APPM* has taken the position that the order of notes is a matter where local preference should govern, especially since, if records are held in automated systems and if the notes bear

---

[41]*APPM*, 1989 revision, rule 2.1B2.

[42]*AACR 2*, rule 21.1B2, 313.

[43]Orbach to Steve Hensen, 5 January 1989, 3.

[44]In the AMC format, these fields include: 544 (location of associated materials note), which is frequently misunderstood; 565 (case file characteristics note); 583 (action note), although the need for notes concerning actions might be inferred from some rules; and 584 (accumulation and frequency of use note). In the VM format, an example is field 585 (exhibitions note), covered indirectly in *GIHC* rule 5.B20 (publications and other uses of the material), but without examples from exhibitions.

content designation (i.e., they have been recorded in separate fields), they can (theoretically) be made to appear in any order that suits anybody for any purpose.

Seriousness of conflicts. Is there any difference between conflicts that affect the amount of information recorded and conflicts that result in different information being recorded—or being recorded in a different way (or in a different USMARC field)? Can the results of conflicts be ameliorated in ways that don't require rule changes?

AMIM/AACR 2 conflict concerning original release title may result in catalog records with different data in the title and statement of responsibility area. However, appropriate use of uniform titles and added entries lessens the potential negative impact of this conflict on collocation.

Most of the conflicts between rules probably should not trouble catalogers as much as they seem to, especially where they do not affect the choice or form of access points (i.e., indexing). Because archival materials are so often unique, we are spared many difficulties faced by other catalogers as they try to prepare consistent descriptions for items existing in multiple copies (whether published or not).

However, that is not sufficient reason for dismissing conflicts. It would be desirable to be able to cite research concerning the real effects on catalog use of variant approaches to choice of entry, construction of supplied titles, brackets, placement of dates, and physical description. Such research should consider the degree to which the issues, problems, and conflicts listed above affect the integration of records in a catalog. If the rules for description function properly, the records created under them should be able to "file" in the same catalog, should be understandable standing alone or in the context of other records, should support the identifying and collocating functions of the catalog, and should not confuse the user. How is it possible to judge

such effects when bibliographic records represent unique bibliographic entities? Do we have any truly integrated catalogs to study?

Can researchers find a record they are looking for? Can they recognize what it is that a catalog record is describing, and can they discover related material? How well or ill do the cataloging rules support catalog functions? There is simply a need for more study of catalog use in order to determine the effect of cataloging by different rules.

Recommendations

In addition to the need for continuing research on the nature and use of archival catalogs, in order to inform the development of cataloging rules, there are other, even more specific actions that the profession, or individual archivist-catalogers, can take.

Archival catalogers must become familiar with the range of cataloging tools available. Such awareness promotes better cataloging practice by making catalogers sensitive to the qualities to be brought out with respect to different types of material.[45] It could also promote a larger common interest in making rules work together. But awareness is not enough; institutions must acquire the appropriate tools, and catalogers must learn to use them.

Archival catalogers need regular forums in which to discuss cataloging problems and potential solutions. Cataloging

---

[45]In a paper titled "So That Others May See: Tools for Picture Cataloging," given at the Mid-Atlantic Regional Archives Conference, 5 November 1988, Barbara Orbach describes the characteristics of still pictures (primarily photographs) that catalogers will want to communicate: captions; visual content and impact; cumulative information value; significance of creators, physical processes, and presentation formats; and possibility of multiple copies. *GIHC* contains rules dealing specifically with these characteristics; except for its emphasis on the significance of creators, *APPM* does not.

rules can't possibly cover all cases neatly; there will always be questions of application and interpretation. Question-and-answer forums could be held as regular conference program sessions and the proceedings could be published, perhaps in the SAA Description Section newsletter, perhaps in regional association newsletters.

Some mechanism must be developed for continued review of the special cataloging manuals for archival materials, and for issuing revisions and "rule interpretations." Library of Congress divisions have begun to accumulate internal interpretations or suggestions for revision of both *AMIM* and *GIHC*, but they remain internal documents. Could they become "real" Library of Congress Rule Interpretations? An *APPM* revision will be published this year, but what happens then? Who owns the rules? Who is authorized to accept suggestions for change and to issue "official" revisions or interpretations? How best can they be distributed? What gives them force? The bibliographic utilities seem to have provided the best incentives for rule-following: they require adherence to rules as a contractual condition of membership.

Within SAA, the Committee on Archival Information Exchange (CAIE), the Description Section, and the Visual Materials Section probably all have primary interests in rule maintenance. What is lacking is rule-making authority.

Archivists must look outside their own community to monitor the activities of a variety of organizations that may act in the area of special materials cataloging. This might be the responsibility of the Description Section of SAA and/or CAIE, or any other group, provided that the information it acquires be disseminated beyond its own membership. These organizations include (a suggestive rather than exhaustive list):

American Library Association (ALA):
    Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL):

    Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS)
Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS):
    Catalog Form and Function Committee
    Cataloging Committee: Description and Access (CC:DA)
    Computer Files Discussion Group
    Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI)
    Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
Art Libraries Society (ARLIS)
Association for Recorded Sound Collections (ARSC)
Council of National Library and Information Associations (CNLIA), Joint Committee on Specialized Cataloging (This is the organization that pursued the NEH grant to produce the original versions of *AMIM*, *GIHC*, and *APPM*.)
International Federation of Film Archives (FIAF)
Music Library Association
National Moving Image Database (NAMID) Standards Committee
Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)
Research Libraries Group (RLG):
    Archives, Manuscripts, and Special Collections Committee (AMSC)
    Art and Architecture Program Committee (AAPC)
    Bibtech Committee, Descriptive Standards Subcommittee
Visual Resources Association (VRA)

Conclusion

After investigation of the characteristics of archival description and comparison of the rules in *AACR 2*, *APPM*, *GIHC*, and *AMIM*, it appears that *APPM* provides a good framework for collective description of archival materials in general repositories. However, as *AACR 2* is not always sufficient for description in specialist li-

braries, so *APPM* is not sufficient for description in specialist archives, and no set of existing rules adequately covers that part of archival description dealing with archival management actions. Further, no set of existing rules for archival description adequately covers analysis, "the process of preparing a bibliographic record that describes a part or parts of an item for which a comprehensive entry has been made" as does *AACR 2*.

New research concerning catalog function is required in order to determine whether records created according to different rules are usable and understandable in the context of a mixed catalog. Additional experimentation with the description of archival management actions and the use of analytics is required before rules can even be drafted for those aspects of description.

The most important work to be done immediately, however, is first, to encourage widespread familiarity with and adherence to the rules that already exist; and second, to provide for continuing maintenance of those rules, so that they serve evolving needs.