

Enhancing Bibliographic Access to Dissertations

*This is an accepted manuscript of an article published online on 12/12/16
by Taylor & Francis in Technical Services Quarterly,
and is available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07317131.2017.1238202>*

Abstract

A study of dissertation cataloging practices of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) academic libraries was conducted to discern how they provide access to subjects as well as to names of academic departments and advisors. An analysis of catalog records revealed that this information is recorded in notes and uncontrolled access points more often than in established access points. Although these local practices reflect a move towards cataloging efficiencies, they must be considered in the context of information retrieval.

KEY WORDS

Academic dissertations
Cataloging

AUTHOR

Catherine Sassen, Principal Catalog Librarian, Cataloging and Metadata Services Department, University of North Texas Libraries, Catherine.Sassen@unt.edu

Enhancing Bibliographic Access to Dissertations

Academic libraries collect theses and dissertations (TDs) not only because they contribute to advances in knowledge, but also because they document the research of their institutions' graduate students. Although librarians agree that TDs are important, they disagree on how to catalog these resources. Author and title access points are accepted as standard elements in TD catalog records, but additional strategies for enhancing access to these materials vary (Hoover & Wolverton, 2003; Wolverton, Hoover, & Fowler, 2011).

Many academic library catalogs provide access to names of TD advisors and committee members, as well as to names of academic departments, colleges, schools or disciplines. However, practices differ because of local policies, staffing constraints, and a lack of guidance from descriptive cataloging rules. Subject cataloging practices also vary because of local policies and staffing limitations. Furthermore, the subject analysis of TDs is challenging because of the difficulty of finding pertinent subject headings "to represent adequately the topics of new, very specialized research projects" (Wolverton et al., 2011, p. 212).

The purpose of this paper is to explore the dissertation cataloging practices of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) academic libraries. The study was guided by the following research questions.

1. How do ARL academic library catalogs provide access to the names of the advisors and committee members of dissertation authors?
2. How do ARL academic library catalogs provide access to the names of academic departments, colleges, schools or disciplines of dissertation authors?
3. How do ARL academic library catalogs provide access to the subject content of dissertations?

This study was restricted to doctoral dissertations because previous research indicated that some libraries provide full cataloging for doctoral dissertations but not master's degree theses (Wolverton et al., 2011, p. 210). This study also was limited to ARL academic libraries because they are recognized as leaders in the library profession. ARL is a membership organization consisting of 124 North American research libraries, 114 of which are academic libraries (Association of Research Libraries, 2016).

Literature Review

The library literature indicates that TD cataloging is a subject of perennial interest. Wolverton, Hoover, Hall, and Fowler (2008b) provided an extensive 41-page annotated bibliography on this topic, covering the literature published from the mid-1970s through 2006. The present literature review will place primary emphasis on publications issued since 2006.

Value of Cataloging Theses and Dissertations

Libraries should catalog TDs because they are an important source of scholarly information, which contribute to the advancement of knowledge (Council of Graduate Schools, 2005, p. 26). Although some libraries provide access to electronic theses and dissertations (ETDs) only through institutional repositories, several authors have argued that this practice limits discovery (McCutcheon, 2011, p. 65; Lubas, 2009, p. 255; Frank & Rowe, 2004, p. 344). “Why must ETDs be archived separately and not with other documents containing scholarly information when it is now widely accepted in library circles that organizing materials by medium in an online environment impedes access to information?” asked Fineman (2003, p. 223).

Libraries may increase access to TDs by adding their catalog records to OCLC WorldCat. Lubas (2009, p. 259) reasoned that cataloging resources in WorldCat is a good way to make a library's collection visible to researchers, "especially as OCLC is making WorldCat.org available in an increasing number of venues." Furthermore, the OCLC WorldCat database provides access to some TDs that are not found in ProQuest's Dissertations and Theses (PQDT) database, as demonstrated in a study by Prociou (2014). Prociou identified three comparable topical subject terms for each database, and then searched the databases with these terms. He limited the results to dissertations in English from U.S. institutions published prior to 2012. He found that "WorldCat consistently had twice as many citations for which ProQuest had no records" (Prociou, 2014, p. 144).

Names of Advisors

Providing access to an advisor's name is helpful to students searching for an example of a thesis or dissertation written under the guidance of a particular advisor, according to Harris and Huffman (1985). These investigators conducted a survey of 92 academic libraries in institutions with doctoral programs, and received responses from 84. Only two of the libraries included the name of the advisor in the catalog record. One institution placed the advisor's name after the institution's name in a corporate name access point. Another institution included the advisor's name in a thesis note and in a personal name access point.

Hoover and Wolverton (2003, p. 24-25, 54-55) also reported on the incidence of access points for advisor's names. They analyzed the responses of 171 institutions designated as Doctoral/Research Universities in the Carnegie Classification. Thirteen percent of the respondents included the name of the advisor in print TD records, and 18% included the name of

the advisor in ETD records in a variety of fields. Fields in which the advisors' names appeared included 500, 502, 590, 599, 690, 700, 790 and 791.

Case studies from libraries indicate a variety of practices in providing access to names of advisors. These names have been recorded in notes in the Kent State University library catalog (Maurer, McCutcheon & Schwing, 2011, p. 310), and in local subject fields at the University of Arkansas library catalog (Middleton, Dean & Gilbertson, 2015, p. 241). Advisors' names also have been provided in local name access points tagged 720 in the University of Iowa library catalog (Averkamp and Lee, 2009), and in local name access points tagged 790 at the University of Northern Colorado (Lowell, 1998, p. 66).

Names of Academic Departments, Colleges, Schools or Disciplines

Catalogers may record the name of an academic department, college, school, or discipline in a TD bibliographic record. Harris and Huffman (1985, p. 10-11) reported on the use of access points for names of academic departments. The option used most often was a corporate name access point for the department, subdivided by "Dissertations". The second most common practice was the use of a local subject heading (tagged 690) including the name of the degree subdivided by the name of the department. Other options included corporate name subject headings, series statements, and added title access points. Harris and Huffman (1985, p. 11) recommended that a cataloging rule should be written for "a uniform access point for a thesis as a thesis. No such rule exists now, and the wide variation in practice by individual libraries indicates a need for it."

Hoover and Wolverton (2003, p. 24, 53-54) also reported that libraries were including the name of the student's academic department in the MARC record. Among libraries cataloging print TDs, 65% included academic department names, while 55% of libraries cataloging ETDs

included department names. Once again, there was wide variation in that practice, with libraries recording department names in 246, 440, 500, 502, 590, 610, 650, 653, 655, 690, 710, 793 and 810 fields.

Hoover and Wolverton (2003, p. 23, 52-53) also asked respondents if they provided “an access point for accessing TDs as a group,” and 62% answered “yes”. Fields used to provide this type of access included 099, 246, 440, 490, 500, 590, 610, 650, 653, 655, 690, 710, 740, 791, 810, and 940.

Case studies from libraries also reflect a variety of practices. Catalogers at the University of Northern Colorado recorded names of academic department in 791 local access points (Lowell, 1998, p. 66). Catalogers at Kent State University included this information in 793 local series fields (Maurer et al., 2011, p. 310). Catalogers at the University of Arkansas placed department names in 690 local subject fields (Middleton et al., 2015, p. 241).

Subject Analysis

A major survey on the subject analysis of TDs was conducted in 2008 by Wolverton, Hoover, and Fowler (2011). The investigators surveyed 280 institutions designated as Doctoral/Research Universities by the Carnegie Classification, and received responses from 205 libraries, constituting a 73% response rate. Although 16% of the respondents replied that they did not assign subject headings to TDs, other respondents indicated that they used one or more subject heading systems. The most commonly used system was Library of Congress subject headings (LCSH), reported by 79% of the respondents. Other options included locally devised subject headings, Medical Subject Headings, the National Agricultural Library Subject Headings, ProQuest/UMI subject terms, Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST), and terms from specialized thesauri.

The practice of assigning LCSH to TDs appears to be declining. Harris and Huffman (1985, p. 6) reported that 89.13% of the libraries in 92 doctorate-granting institutions assigned LCSH to TDs, while Ryans (1991, p. 85) found that 92% of 43 ARL libraries assigned LCSH to TDs. However, Hoover and Wolverton (2003) found that 74% of 167 libraries assigned LCSH to print TDs, and that 63% of 30 libraries assigned LCSH to ETDs.

Keyword access emerged as a topic of perennial interest in a comprehensive review of the literature on TD cataloging (Wolverton et al., 2008b, p. 134). The prevalence of keyword assignment in TD cataloging was studied by Wolverton et al. (2011, p. 206). Sixty-nine (34%) of 200 respondents indicated that keywords were assigned to TDs at their institutions.

The assignment of LC subject headings and keywords to ETD records in different disciplines was investigated by Maurer and Shakeri (2016), who limited their research to the Kent State University Library catalog. They found that more cataloger-assigned LC subject headings and more author-assigned keywords were found in ETD records in the arts and humanities as opposed to ETD records in the sciences, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) disciplines and the social sciences. Authors in the arts and humanities assigned more keywords to their ETDs than did authors from other disciplines. Personal name access points, geographic name access points, and corporate name access points were more likely to appear in LC subject headings assigned to arts and humanities ETD records than in records from other disciplines. The researchers also discussed the challenges of assigning LC subject headings to STEM ETDs, including “topical currency, topical specificity, literary warrant, as well as the lack of development in STEM areas of the LCSH (Maurer & Shakeri, 2016, p. 20).

Controlled Vocabulary versus Keyword Searching

Are controlled vocabulary subject terms preferable to keywords in TD catalog records? Keyword searching is easy to use and is “adequate for straightforward to moderately complex information needs” (McCutcheon 2009, p. 62). However, its deficiencies include “limited precision, unselective recall and lack of connections showing relationships” (McCutcheon, 2009, p. 63). In contrast, controlled vocabularies, such as LCSH, are less intuitive for the user, and may require instruction for effective use (McCutcheon, 2009, p. 64). Nevertheless, controlled vocabularies have the advantages of high precision, high recall, consistency, and context (McCutcheon 2009, p. 63, 67). The process of adding new terms to LCSH takes time because catalogers base the proposal of new subject headings on literary warrant (McCutcheon, 2009 p. 64).

Gross, Taylor, and Joudrey (2015, p. 23) published an extensive literature review on controlled vocabulary versus keyword searching. They concluded, “The preponderance of the literature continues to show that controlled vocabularies are useful, and indeed are necessary in some cases, such as in searching full text. For keyword searching of bibliographic records, including those that have been given tags by users of the systems, most studies show that controlled vocabularies cannot be replaced by keyword searching for in-depth, scholarly work” (Gross et al., 2015, p. 23).

Two studies have been conducted to examine the effectiveness of Library of Congress subject headings (LCSH) versus author-assigned keywords when searching for TD bibliographic records. Strader (2009) conducted a study with a data set of 285 bibliographic records for doctoral dissertations in the Ohio State University Libraries’ catalog. She examined LCSH, author-assigned keywords, and terms in titles and abstracts. She found that LCSH

“demonstrated their potential to provide unique access points for approximately one-third of searches” (Strader, 2009, p. 249). Schwing, McCutcheon, and Maurer (2012) replicated Strader’s methodology in a study of 95 ETD bibliographic records in Kent State University Libraries’ catalog. They found that “about one-third of keyword searches would have failed to discover records in the absence of the LCSH” (Schwing et al., 2012, p. 919).

Prociuous (2014, p. 148) commented on the lack of subject headings in WorldCat records in his study comparing the inclusion of ETD records in WorldCat and PQDT. He noted that this deficiency “forces the user to rely on keyword searching” and “represents a severe limitation to WorldCat’s searching capabilities”.

Semi-Automated Cataloging Workflows and Metadata Extraction

Wolverton et al. (2008b, p. 134) identified semi-automated cataloging and metadata extraction as growing trends in ETD cataloging. One example of a semi-automated cataloging workflow concerns the University of Arkansas Libraries where staff downloaded ProQuest ETD MARC records into their online catalog and then enhanced them to meet local standards (Middleton et al., 2015).

Other semi-automated workflows have involved extracting metadata records from ETD repositories and converting them into the MARC format to populate their catalogs. Staff at Texas A&M University Libraries and Kent State University Libraries used Perl language scripts to extract metadata records from ETD databases and transform them into MARC records (Surrat & Hill, 2004; McCutcheon, Kreyche, Maurer & Nickerson, 2008). University of Iowa Libraries staff transformed ProQuest XML metadata files with bepress schemas to create files for an ETD repository, and then edited the files with MarcEdit to create records for their online catalog (Averkamp & Lee, 2009). MarcEdit also was used at Wichita State University Libraries and

Oregon State University Libraries in the process of harvesting Dublin Core metadata from the DSpace platform and transforming it into MARC records for their online catalogs (Boock & Kunda, 2009; Deng & Reese, 2009).

Author-Generated Metadata

Some of the metadata used to populate ETD records in repositories and online catalogs may originate with the ETD authors. For example, Kent State University ETD authors fill out web-based forms when uploading documents to the OhioLINK ETD Center (McCutcheon et al., 2008). The metadata elements on a completed form include the author's name, title of thesis or dissertation, abstract, keywords, degree name, department name, and advisor's name. The metadata from the OhioLINK ETD Center is harvested and converted into a provisional catalog record. A cataloger reviews each record to correct errors, impose name authority control, assign subject headings and provide other enhancements.

Authority Control

Authors do not always supply standardized forms of metadata elements in their TDs or in web-based submission forms. Authority control of personal names, corporate names, subject headings and series titles is needed to impose consistency among variant forms of access points and facilitate retrieval (Wolverton et al., 2008b, p. 96-97).

Wolverton et al. (2008a) conducted a survey in 2006 to learn more about the authority control of names in TDs. They recruited participants from the Autocat discussion list, and received responses from fifty-one institutions. Sixty-five percent of the respondents stated that they created name authority records for authors, while 57% indicated that they created name authority records for academic departments.

Ideally, a name authority record for a TD author should include a distinctive name authorized access point reflecting the author's preferred form of name. However, a TD title page may not provide enough information to do this. At Mississippi State University, the Library worked with the Registrar's office to develop an Author Contact Form (ACF) (Wolverton et al., 2008a, p. 86-90). The ACF was used to ask each author for contact information as well as for the full form of the name, the preferred form of the name if it differed from the full form, previous names and date of birth. The ACF also included a brief explanation of name authority records and provided contact information for the authority control librarian. The implementation of the ACF was successful because in most cases, the authors provided enough information on the form to allow the catalogers to develop name authority records.

Another approach to securing standardized forms of metadata elements was implemented at Kansas State University. The university enhanced their online ETD submission form to include drop-down menus providing authorized forms of names for departments and advisors (Lubas, 2009, p. 257).

Summary

The literature indicates that libraries use a variety of cataloging practices when providing access to names of TD advisors, departments, colleges, schools, and disciplines. The literature also indicates that subject access through LCSH is declining. The present study was conducted to discern if any of these practices predominate in a selection of recent dissertation catalog records from ARL academic libraries.

Method

The research method employed in this study was content analysis. The researcher analyzed the content of selected bibliographic records for dissertations found in ARL library catalogs to discern practices in the following areas:

- Access to names of advisors and committee members of dissertation authors
- Access to names of departments, colleges, schools or disciplines of dissertation authors
- Access to subjects

The researcher assumed that many institutions apply standards for TD cataloging that are defined locally or by consortia. One example is the *Standards for cataloging electronic TDs*, written by the OhioLINK Database and Standards Committee (2014). This consortium consists of 91 institutions, including Ohio academic libraries as well as the State Library of Ohio.

Another example of a standards document is the *UC Standard Practice for Cataloging UC Theses and Dissertations*, formulated by the University of California Libraries Cataloging and Metadata Common Interest Group. (2008). Several ARL academic libraries are included in each of these consortia.

TD cataloging standards throughout the United States have been revealed by responses to two major surveys. Hoover and Wolverton (2003) conducted a study of TD cataloging practices in 2002, and received responses from 171 institutions from all regions of the United States. Wolverton et al. (2011) conducted a survey about TD subject analysis practices in 2008, and received responses from 205 institutions from all regions of the country.

Data Collection

The study population consisted of bibliographic records for dissertations identified in the online catalogs of ARL academic institutions. The data were collected in mid-2015 using the following procedures.

First, the researcher consulted the ARL website and identified the names of all 114 member academic libraries (Association of Research Libraries, 2016). The names of these institutions then were listed in a spreadsheet designed to record information about each library's dissertation cataloging practices.

Next, the researcher searched *PQDT* (ProQuest CSA, 2016) to find citations for dissertations at each of the 114 ARL academic libraries. This search also was limited to dissertations completed in 2013 to allow sufficient time for cataloging. Since the search results did not sort citations by subject, the researcher selected the first ten citations for each institution for further investigation.

The third step was to search ten dissertation titles from each university in that institution's online library catalog. The researcher examined the bibliographic records, identified the cataloging practices related to the research questions, and recorded the findings in a spreadsheet.

In some cases, dissertations completed in 2013 at certain institutions were not listed in *PQDT*. Not all universities require their students to submit their TDs to ProQuest (Prociuous 2014, p. 145). In each of those exceptional cases, the researcher examined the appropriate library website and determined how dissertations were cataloged. Then the researcher searched the appropriate library's catalog, identified dissertations completed in 2013, and examined a systematic sample of ten bibliographic records from that catalog.

In this study, a bibliographic record was defined as one cataloged according to AACR2 or RDA rules. In many of the catalogs studied, the researcher was able to view the records in the MARC format, sometimes referred to as “staff view,” “librarian view,” or “technical view”.

Bibliographic records for dissertations were found in 76% (n= 87) of the 114 ARL academic library catalogs. The resulting data set consisted of 870 bibliographic records. The remaining ARL academic libraries provided access to dissertations only through institutional repositories and/or *PQDT*.

Data Analysis

The researcher recorded bibliographic data in an Excel spreadsheet for the purposes of categorization, comparison and counting. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the results and generate tables.

Results

Names of Advisors and Committee Members

While 51.72% (n=45) of the catalogs provided access to names of advisors in dissertation records, only 13.79% (n=12) provided access to names of other committee members. Names of advisors and committee members appeared in notes in some catalogs, in personal name access points in other catalogs, and in both notes and access points in still other catalogs. The findings are displayed in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 here.]

Names of Academic Departments, Colleges, Schools or Disciplines

Eighty-six percent (n=75) of the catalogs provided access to names of academic departments, colleges, schools or disciplines through one or more variable fields in the bibliographic records. The most common practice was to record the name of a department,

college, school or discipline in a corporate name access point, but this occurred only in 31.03% (n=27) of the catalogs. Names also appeared in a variety of other access points and notes. Some catalog records included the name of the department, college, school or discipline in more than one field. For example, a catalog record might include the name of the department in a formal dissertation note as well as in a corporate name access point. Table 2 displays the various fields providing this information, as well as examples of the text found in these fields.

[Insert Table 2 here.]

Subjects

Subjects were represented in bibliographic records in 87% (n=76) of the catalogs. The most common means of representing subjects was through note fields, with 75.86% (n=66) of the catalogs providing summary notes, and 2.3% (n=2) of the catalogs providing keywords in note fields. Local or uncontrolled subject access points appeared in 44.83% of the catalogs (n=39), while LC subject headings appeared in 25.29% (n=22) of the catalogs. In some catalogs, subjects were recorded in more than one field of the bibliographic record. For example, a catalog record might include a summary note as well as one or more subject access points. The fields that included subject information are displayed in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 here.]

Discussion

Names of Advisors and Committee Members

Names of advisors appeared in 52% (n=45) of the catalogs, while names of other committee members appeared in only 14% (n=12) of the catalogs. When comparing these findings to previous research, it appears that the practice of including the name of the advisor in the catalog record may be increasing. In the Hoover and Wolverton (2003, p. 24-25) study on

the TD practices of 171 institutions, 13% of the respondents included the name of the advisor in print TD records, and 18% included the name of the advisor in ETD records. Earlier, Harris and Huffman (1985, p. 11) studied the TD cataloging practices of 84 libraries, and found that only 2.38% of the respondents included the name of the advisor in the catalog record. In each of these studies, the names of advisors were found in a variety of notes and access points with no single practice predominating. The variance in practice reflects the lack of guidance in RDA and AACR2 cataloging rules for the treatment of these names.

Names of Academic Departments, Colleges, Schools or Disciplines

Names of academic departments, colleges, schools or disciplines appeared in 86% (n=75) of the catalogs examined in this study. A comparison of this finding with previous research suggests that this practice may be increasing. In the Hoover and Wolverton (2003, p. 24, 53-54) study on the TD practices, department names were included in catalog records of 65% of libraries cataloging print TDs, and in 55% of the libraries cataloging ETDs.

In both of these studies, names appeared in a variety of fields in the bibliographic record, including corporate name access points, subject access points, title access points, series access points, and notes. No single practice was found to be predominant. Once again, this variance in practice reflects the lack of guidance in cataloging rules. Lowell (1998, p. 69-70) wrote, “Utility-specific local use fields are fine for the libraries using each utility, but global information sharing efforts are not enhanced by a proliferation of idiosyncratic fields that do not translate in every system. Would it not be more to the point to make an optional cataloging rule that would allow all libraries to catalog correctly using the standard MARC fields, thus enhancing consistency among networked databases?”

Subjects

Subject terms were recorded in bibliographic records of 87% of the catalogs included in this study. Subject information appeared most often in note fields, with 75.86% (n=66) of the catalogs providing summary notes. Local or uncontrolled subject access points appeared in 44.83% of the catalogs (n=39).

Only 25.29% of the catalogs included LC subject headings in their bibliographic records for dissertations. When comparing this finding with earlier research, it appears that the practice of including LCSH in TD records is decreasing. Wolverton et al. (2011, p. 206) found that 79% of 202 academic libraries assigned LCSH in TD records. Hoover and Wolverton (2003) reported that 74% of 167 libraries assigned LCSH to print TDs, and that 63% of 30 libraries cataloging ETDs included LCSH in these catalog records. Ryans (1991, p. 85) reported that 92% of 43 ARL libraries assigned LCSH to TDs, while Harris and Huffman (1985, p. 6) found that 89.13% of the libraries in 92 academic libraries assigned LCSH to TDs.

Why is the practice of assigning LCSH to TDs decreasing? Why are libraries recording subject information in notes and access points instead of controlled subject headings? The answer may be related to staffing constraints. In the Wolverton et al. (2011, p. 214) study, catalog departments reported that they had “an insufficient number of cataloging staff to devote to this task.” Respondents also identified alternate methods that they use to provide subject access, including “assignment of only very broad LC subject headings, use of the name of the author’s academic department in the bibliographic record, reliance upon keyword search capability of online systems and social tagging” (Wolverton et al., 2011, p. 215).

Limitations

The data examined in this study reflect cataloging practices ranging from 2013 to 2015, depending on when each institution created the bibliographic records that were analyzed. Dissertation cataloging practice may have changed in some of these libraries since these records were created.

As discussed in the methods section, the researcher made the assumption that libraries catalog dissertations by applying standards that are defined locally or by consortia. It is possible that some libraries may have different cataloging standards for dissertations in different disciplines, and that the complete extent of these standards was not discovered in this research.

Conclusion

Many libraries enhanced catalog records for dissertations with information about subjects, advisors, and departments, colleges, schools or disciplines. Notes and uncontrolled access points were used more often than authorized access points to provide this access. Without question, TD cataloging can be completed more quickly and with less professional expertise if notes or uncontrolled access points are used to record names and subjects. However, the efficiency gained through such local cataloging practices must be considered in the context of TD discovery. Although local cataloging practices may enhance discovery in one catalog, the widespread use of local standards may cause problems for library users searching across databases. As Frank and Rowe (2004, p. 351) noted, “The record becomes searchable, but users may need to learn local rules for search strategies in order to retrieve local notes.”

Catalogers should consult with other library staff whenever they make decisions about the content of TD records. They should ask reference librarians and IT staff for their knowledge about patron information seeking behavior. Furthermore, decisions about the content of TD

records must be shared with reference and instruction librarians so that they understand how the coding of these records affects information retrieval. Information about how to find TDs also should be easy to access on library websites, especially in settings where cataloging practices have changed.

References

- Association of Research Libraries. (2016). List of ARL members. Retrieved from <http://www.arl.org/membership/list-of-arl-members>
- Averkamp, S., & Lee, J. (2009). Repurposing ProQuest metadata for batch ingesting ETDs into an institutional repository. *Code4Lib Journal*, 7, 3. Retrieved from <http://journal.code4lib.org/articles/1647>
- Boock, M., & Kunda, S. (2009). Electronic thesis and dissertation metadata workflow at Oregon State University Libraries. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 47(3/4), 297-308.
doi:10.1080/01639370902737323
- Council of Graduate Schools. (2005). *The doctor of philosophy degree: A policy statement*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Graduate Schools, 2005.
- Deng, S., & Reese, T. (2009). Customized mapping and metadata transfer from DSpace to OCLC to improve ETD work flow. *New Library World*, 110 (5/6), 249-264.
doi:10.1108/03074800910954271
- Fineman, Y. (2003). Electronic theses and dissertations. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 3(2), 219-227.

- Frank, I., & Rowe, W. C. (2004). Indexing and accessing electronic theses and dissertations: Some concerns for users. In E. A. Fox, S. Feizabadi, J. M. Moxley & C. R. Weisser (Eds.), *Electronic theses and dissertations: A sourcebook for educators, students, and librarians* (pp. 343-353). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Gross, T., Taylor, A. G. & Joudrey, D. N. (2015) Still a lot to lose: The role of controlled vocabulary in keyword searching. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 53(1), 1-39. doi:10.1080/01639374.2014.917447
- Harris, G. D., & Huffman, R. (1985). Cataloging of theses: A survey. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 5(4), 1-15. doi:10.1300/J104v05n04_01
- Hoover, L., & Wolverton, R. E., Jr. (2003). Cataloging and treatment of theses, dissertations, and ETDs. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 20(4), 3-57. doi:10.1300/J124v20n04_02
- Lowell, K. E. (1998). Added access points in thesis cataloging: Enhancing public service without running athwart input standards. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 26 (2), 57-71. doi:10.1300/J104v26n02_06
- Lubas, R. L. (2009). Defining best practices in electronic thesis and dissertation metadata. *Journal of Library Metadata*, 9(3/4), 252-263. doi:10.1080/19386380903405165
- Maurer, M. B., McCutcheon, S., & Schwing, T. (2011). Who's doing what? Findability and author-supplied ETD metadata in the library catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 49(4), 277-310. doi:10.1080/01639374.2011.573440
- Maurer, M. B. & Shakeri, S. (2016): Disciplinary differences: LCSH and keyword assignment for ETDs from different disciplines. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/01639374.2016.1141133

- McCutcheon, S. (2009). Keyword vs controlled vocabulary searching: The one with the most tools wins. *The Indexer*, 27(2), 62-65.
- McCutcheon, S. (2011). Basic, fuller, fullest: Treatment options for electronic theses and dissertations. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 35(2/3), 64-68. doi:10.1016/j.lcats.2011.03.019
- McCutcheon, S., Kreyche, M., Maurer, M. B., & Nickerson, J. (2008). Morphing metadata: Maximizing access to electronic theses and dissertations. *Library Hi Tech* 26(1), 41-57. doi:10.1108/07378830810857799
- Middleton, C. C., Dean, J. W., & Gilbertson, M. A. (2015). A process for the original cataloging of theses and dissertations. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 53(2), 234-246. doi:10.1080/01639374.2014.971997
- OhioLINK Database and Standards Committee. 2014. Standards for cataloging electronic theses and dissertations. Remote electronic version (non-reproduction). Retrieved from <https://platinum.ohiolink.edu/dms/catstandards/ETD-RDA.pdf>
- Prociou, A. W. (2014). WorldCat, the other ETD database: An exploratory study. *The Reference Librarian*, 55(2), 144-150. doi:10.1080/02763877.2014.880276
- ProQuest (2016). *ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global*.
- Ryans, C. C. (1991). Cataloging theses and dissertations: An update. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 14(1), 83-87. doi:10.1300/J104v14n01_08
- Schwing, T., McCutcheon, S., & Maurer, M. B. (2012). Uniqueness matters: Author-supplied keywords and LCSH in the library catalog. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 50(8), 903-928. doi:10.1080/01639374.2012.703164

Strader, C. R. (2009). Author-assigned keywords versus Library of Congress Subject Headings: Implications for the cataloging of electronic theses and dissertations. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 53(4), 243-250.

Surratt, B. E., & Hill, D. (2004). ETD2MARC: A semiautomated workflow for cataloging electronic theses and dissertations. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 28(2), 205-223. doi:10.1016/j.lcats.2004.02.014

University of California Libraries Cataloging and Metadata Common Interest Group. (2008). UC Standard Practice for Cataloging UC Theses and Dissertations. Retrieved from <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/camcig/docs/ucthesesanddissertations.pdf>

Wolverton, R. E., Jr., Hoover, L., Hall, S. L., & Fowler, R. (2008a). Issues of name authority control in the cataloging of theses and dissertations. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 25(S1), 75-94. doi:10.1080/07317130802127900

Wolverton, R. E., Jr., Hoover, L., Hall, S. L., & Fowler, R. (2008b). Theses/dissertations and ETD cataloging: An annotated bibliography. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 25(S1), 95-135. doi:10.1080/07317130802127934

Wolverton, R. E., Jr., Hoover, L., & Fowler, R. (2011). Subject analysis of theses and dissertations: A survey. *Technical Services Quarterly*, 28(2), 201-222. doi:10.1080/07317131.2011.546276

Table 1. Catalogs Providing Access to Names of Advisors and Committee Members

Means of Access	Advisors		Other Committee Members	
	n	%	n	%
Only in notes	23	26.44%	5	5.75%
Only in personal name access points	12	13.79%	6	6.90%
Both in notes and access points	10	11.49%	1	1.15%
Total	45	51.72%	12	13.79%

Table 2. Catalogs Providing Access to Names of Departments, Colleges, Schools or Disciplines

Means of Access	n	%	Example
Corporate name access points	27	31.03	710 2 Tulane University. \$b Dept. of Anthropology.
General notes	17	19.54	500 Modern Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, Dept. of
Genre/form index terms	17	19.54	655 7 Dissertations, Academic \$z UCSB \$x Chemistry \$2 local
Dissertation notes	17	19.54	502 Thesis (Ph. D.) -- The University at Albany. Department of History, 2013.
Corporate name subject access points	7	8.05	610 20 University of California, Riverside. \$b Department of Physics \$x Dissertations.
Topical subject access points	6	6.9	690 4 Mechanical Engineering \$x Temple University \$x Theses.
Title access points	4	4.6	740 Dissertation--Music (2013)
Series title access points	2	2.3	830 0 Dissertation (Louisiana State University (Baton Rouge, La.)) ; \$v 2013

Table 3. Catalogs Providing Access to Subjects

Means of access	n	%
Summary notes	66	75.86
Local/uncontrolled subject access points	39	44.83
Library of Congress subject headings	22	25.29
Keywords in note fields	2	2.30