

**IMLS National Leadership Grant LG-02-02-0281
"Proposal for IMLS Collection Registry and Metadata Repository"**

This white paper is part of the three-year interim project report for the IMLS Digital Collections & Content Project, summarizing major findings October 2002 through September 2005. Project is hosted at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Project Director is Timothy W. Cole (t-cole@uiuc.edu). Full report is available at <http://imlsdcc.grainger.uiuc.edu>. The material in this report is based upon work supported by the Institute of Museum and Library Services under IMLS National Leadership Grant Award No. LG-02-02-0281. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

**Summary of IMLS NLG Collections
White Paper**

Jenny Benevento

Digital Collections and Content Project
Grainger Engineering Library
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

September 22, 2005

Introduction

The creation of a collection registry for digital collections developed with funding from the IMLS National Leadership Grant (NLG) program from inception to date has provided an opportunity to observe commonalities and differences among and between these collections. Initial analyses of collection characteristics and the different approaches taken by NLG projects to collection definition inform us regarding current practice and have suggested avenues for fruitful research. In this latter regard, a separate project white paper ("Collection Definition in Digital Resource Development") discusses findings so far with regard to our investigations of fundamental questions about the role of "the collection" as a defining or organizing unit in the digital environment.¹

¹ See also: Palmer, C.L. and Knutson, & E.M. (2004). Metadata practices and implications for federated collections. In Proceedings of the 67th Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, Edited by Linda Schamber & Carol L. Barry. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc: 456-462.

By contrast, provided here² is a simple summary of data collected regarding collection characteristics (e.g., range of topics and material types represented, hosting institution type and location, range of spatial and temporal coverage of these collections) and current practice within the IMLS NLG community of digital collections with regard to OAI readiness, use and range of controlled vocabularies and metadata schemas, identification and use of sub-collections. Most of the data reported here were gathered through a survey of NLG projects working with digital content. Thus far we have received 95 surveys solicited from NLG projects that had commenced by or prior to October 2003. We have also had one-to-one phone and email contact with many NLG projects, including four projects which had not completed surveys. Survey questions and information garnered from other contacts focus on many aspects of the digital collection and were largely used to populate our Collection Registry (<http://imlsdcc.granger.uiuc.edu/collections/>).

OAI-Capability

(Note: Data derived both from survey and contact with projects)

A little less than a quarter of the projects we surveyed currently host OAI data provider sites. The majority of projects, about a third, have some OAI implementations that had not yet been extended to their NLG content, but intend to eventually include it. The rest either have the technology, but no plans to enact it, have no item-level metadata, have ended their grant, or have no interest in providing OAI access to their collections.

Category:	Number / % of Respondents:
Group 1 – Projects with OAI data provider sites for NLG content	32 (22.4%)
Group 2 – Projects whose institutions have an OAI implementation (not yet being used for NLG content) and projects that have explicitly expressed plans to add OAI functionality	50 (34.9%)
Group 3 – Projects who meet certain technical criteria – e.g. have item-level metadata and a maintained web site	24 (16.8%)
Group 4 – Projects with no item-level metadata, no interest in providing metadata via OAI, or whose grants were given up	18 (12.6%)
Unknown	19 (13.3%)
Total	143

Table 1: OAI Compatibility

Controlled Vocabularies

² See also Knutson, E., Palmer, C. & Twidale, M. 2003. Tracking Metadata Use for Digital Collections [Poster Extended Abstract]. In DC-2003: Proceedings of the International DCMI Metadata Conference and Workshop p. 243-244. (Preprint attached.)

Seventy-four respondents identified controlled vocabulary in usage in their digital collection. Library of Congress controlled vocabularies are the distinct majority of those used. Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) are used by almost seventy percent of collections in subject fields. In format fields, the Library of Congress Thesaurus for Graphic Materials II (LC TGM II) leads usage with 17% and in type with almost 14%. The LC name Authority File is most popular with personal names as well, being used by almost 70% of those surveyed. Finally, for geographic names, 23% of projects are using LCSH and 24% the LC Name Authority file.

When LC controlled vocabularies are not used, the Art and Architecture Thesaurus (AAT), MIME types, Anglo-American Cataloging Rules 2 (AACR2), and the Getty Thesaurus for Geographic Names are the most mentioned.

Element	Top three used Controlled Vocabulary (% of respondents who identified C.V.)
Subject	LCSH (68.9%); LC TGM I (20.3%); AAT (14.9%)
Format	LC TGM II (17%); MIME types (10.8%); AAT (9.5%); AACR2 (5.4%)
Type	DCMI Type (16.2%); LC TGM II (13.5%); AACR2 (6.8%)
Personal names	LC Name Authority File (63.5%)
Geographic names	LC Name Authority File (24.3%); LCSH (23%); Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (12.2%)

Table 2: Controlled Vocabularies

Sub-collections

Seventy-four percent of respondents told us that they had sub-collections. Over the two years we have been collecting survey responses, sub-collection responses have stayed very consistent. There has been a slight trend toward dividing collections based on fewer criteria; One basis for making sub-collections is the most popular choice. Although responses are pretty evenly divided, most projects seem to subdivide collections on the topic and type of material.

Basis of sub-collection organization:	Number (%) of respondents with sub-collections:
Administrative unit only	9 (12.9%)
Topic only	15 (21.4%)
Type of material only	12 (17.1%)
Other basis only	11 (15.7%)
Based on two factors:	
Administrative unit and Topic	3 (4.3%)
Administrative unit and Type of material	1 (1.4%)
Administrative unit and Other	4 (5.8%)
Topic and Type of material	6 (8.6%)
Topic and Other	2 (2.9%)

Type and Other 1 (1.4%)

Based on three factors:

Topic, Type of material, and 5 (7.1%)

Administrative unit

Admin, Type, Other 1 (1.4%)

Table 3: Subcollections By Type

Almost 93% of the respondents with sub-collections told us how many they had. Some were unclear on how many there would eventually be, but gave us a rough estimate. These have also stayed fairly consistent over the year. The major change has been in the larger number of collections. Twelve percent of respondents two years ago said they have over 31 sub-collections. Currently, the percentage is half that, at six percent of respondents currently saying they have over 31 sub-collections.

Number range of sub-collections	Number (%) of respondents to question
1-5 sub-collections	25 (38.5%)
6-10 sub-collections	16 (24.6%)
11-15 sub-collections	7 (10.8%)
16-20 sub-collections	4 (6.2%)
21-30 sub-collections	2 (3.1%)
31-40 sub-collections	1 (1.4%)
41 or more sub-collections	3 (4.6%)
Other (unknown, not relevant)	7 (10.8%)

Table 4: Subcollections by Number

Metadata

Around 81% of collections surveyed have item-level metadata. The great majority of those, about 65%, are using more than one metadata schema. This number has been increasing since we began surveying. The majority are using Dublin Core and some other schema, usually a locally grown schema. MARC or TEI used with another schema are the closest runners up. Some participants, though few, are using up to four different schemas

Metadata schema:	Number / % of respondents with item level metadata:
Dublin Core (simple or qualified) alone or in combination with other schema(s)	50 (32.25%)
Dublin Core only: 10 (6.5%)	
Dublin Core in combination with other schema(s): 40 (25.8%)	
EAD alone or in combination with other schema(s)	12 (7.75%)
EAD only: 1 (.6%)	
EAD in combination with other schema(s): 11 (7.1%)	

MARC alone or in combination with other schema(s)	28 (18.1%)
MARC only: 4 (2.6%)	
MARC in combination with other schema(s): 24 (15.5%)	
Other metadata standard (METS, MOA2 Museum MARC) alone or in combination with other schema(s)	18 (11.6%)
Other metadata standard only: 4 (2.6%)	
Other metadata standard in combination with other schema(s): 14 (9%)	
TEI alone or in combination with other schema(s):	16 (10.3%)
TEI only: 0	
TEI in combination with other schema(s): 16 (10.3%)	
VRA Core alone or in combination with other schema(s)	2 (1.3%)
VRA Core only: 0	
VRA Core in combination with other schema(s): 2 (1.3%)	
Locally developed schema alone or in combination with other schema(s)	29 (18.7%)
Locally developed schema only: 8 (5.2%)	
Locally developed schema in combination with other schema(s): 21 (13.5%)	

Table 5: Metadata Schema

More information about how item-level metadata is being used by NLG grantees is available in our *Analysis of Item-level Metadata Harvested White Paper*. Historical statistics from our project as well as further analysis is available at our website.

Subject Access

For browsing access in the registry we are using GEM Subject Headings. Collections can choose as many subject heading as they find appropriate for their collection (thus percentages do not equal one-hundred percent). Because collections can add or subtract subject affiliations through our web form at any time, these statistics are only a snapshot of the collections at one point and time. NLG collections overwhelmingly affiliate with the broad subject term Social Studies, with over 80% of projects self-identifying with it. Arts is also very popular with almost 42% of collections identifying as an art-related collection.

Major GEM Subject Divisions	Number of Collections/ (% of all collections)
Social Studies	124 (80.0%)
Arts	65 (41.9%)
Science	22 (14.2%)
Language Arts	12 (7.7%)

Educational Technology	9 (5.8%)
Vocational Education	8 (5.2%)
Health	6 (3.9%)
Religion	6 (3.9%)
Foreign Languages	3 (1.9%)
Mathematics	3 (1.9%)
Physical Education	2 (1.3%)
Philosophy	1 (.6%)

Table 6: Broad GEM Subject Headings

The majority of our collections (66.5%) deal with American History or State history (41.9%). In Social Studies the next more popular category with 18.1% is World History. Visual arts and Photography also rate highly with 21.3% and 18.1% respectively.

GEM Subtopic	Number of Collections/ (% of all collections)
Social Studies—United States history	103 (66.5%)
Social Studies—State history	65 (41.9%)
Arts—Visual arts	33 (21.3%)
Arts—Photography	28 (18.1%)
Social Studies—World history	28 (18.1%)
Social Studies—United States government	21 (13.5%)
Social Studies—Urban studies	17 (11.1%)
Social Studies—Geography	12 (7.7%)
Social Studies—Economics	12 (7.7%)
Science—Ecology	11 (7.1%)
Social Studies—Anthropology	11 (7.1%)
Science—Biology	10 (6.5%)
Arts—Music	9 (5.8%)
Language Arts—Literature	9 (5.8%)
Arts—Architecture	8 (5.2%)
Arts—Popular culture	8 (5.2%)
Social Studies—Civics	8 (5.2%)
Science—Geology	7 (4.5%)
Arts—History of art	6 (3.9%)
Educational Technology—Multimedia education	6 (3.9%)
Science—Biological and life sciences	6 (3.9%)
Science—Botany	6 (3.9%)
Science—General science	6 (3.9%)
Science—Natural history	6 (3.9%)
Social Studies—Current events/issues	6 (3.9%)
Arts—Theater arts	5 (3.2%)
Health—Nutrition	5 (3.2%)
Science—Engineering	5 (3.2%)
Science—History of science	5 (3.2%)
Arts—Drama/dramatics	4 (2.6%)

Science—Agriculture	4 (2.6%)
Science—Physical sciences	4 (2.6%)
Social Studies—Human relations	4 (2.6%)
Vocational Education—History of vocational education	4 (2.6%)
Arts—Computers in art	3 (1.9%)
Arts—Film	3 (1.9%)
Arts—Technology in art	3 (1.9%)
Educational Technology—Educational media	3 (1.9%)
Educational Technology—Informal education in educational technology	3 (1.9%)
Health—Death and dying	3 (1.9%)
Health—Environmental health	3 (1.9%)
Health—Mental/emotional health	3 (1.9%)
Health—Substance abuse prevention	3 (1.9%)
Science—Earth science	3 (1.9%)
Science—Entomology	3 (1.9%)
Science—Informal education in science	3 (1.9%)
Social Studies—Criminology	3 (1.9%)
Social Studies—Informal education in social studies	3 (1.9%)
Social Studies—Social work	3 (1.9%)
Social Studies—Technology and civilization	3 (1.9%)
Vocational Education—Occupational home economics	3 (1.9%)
Arts—Dance	2 (1.3%)
Arts—Informal education in art	2 (1.3%)
Foreign Languages—Linguistics	2 (1.3%)
Health—Aging	2 (1.3%)
Health—Consumer health	2 (1.3%)
Health—History of health	2 (1.3%)
Health—Safety	2 (1.3%)
Health—Smoking	2 (1.3%)
Health—Technology in health	2 (1.3%)
Language Arts—Alphabet	2 (1.3%)
Language Arts—Story telling	2 (1.3%)
Physical Education—History of physical education	2 (1.3%)
Religion—History of religion	2 (1.3%)
Religion—Islam	2 (1.3%)
Science—Oceanography	2 (1.3%)
Science—Physics	2 (1.3%)
Social Studies—Human behavior	2 (1.3%)
Social Studies—Psychology	2 (1.3%)

Social Studies—Sociology	2 (1.3%)
Vocational Education—Agriculture	2 (1.3%)
Educational Technology—Language laboratories	1 (.6%)
Educational Technology—Technology planning	1 (.6%)
Foreign Languages—History of foreign languages	1 (.6%)
Health—Chronic conditions	1 (.6%)
Health—Disease	1 (.6%)
Health—Family life	1 (.6%)
Health—Human sexuality	1 (.6%)
Health—Informal education in health	1 (.6%)
Language Arts—Grammar	1 (.6%)
Language Arts—Listening comprehension	1 (.6%)
Language Arts—Reading	1 (.6%)
Language Arts—Writing (composition)	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Algebra	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Calculus	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Geometry	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Number theory	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Patterns	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Statistics	1 (.6%)
Mathematics—Trigonometry	1 (.6%)
Philosophy—Aesthetics	1 (.6%)
Philosophy—Epistemology	1 (.6%)
Philosophy—Existentialism	1 (.6%)
Philosophy—Marxism	1 (.6%)
Philosophy—Phenomenology	1 (.6%)
Physical Education—Individual sports	1 (.6%)
Physical Education—Informal education in physical education	1 (.6%)
Physical Education—Outdoor education	1 (.6%)
Physical Education—Team sports	1 (.6%)
Religion—Buddhism	1 (.6%)
Religion—Christianity	1 (.6%)
Religion—Confucianism	1 (.6%)
Religion—Informal education in religion	1 (.6%)
Religion—Instructional issues in religion	1 (.6%)
Religion—Judaism	1 (.6%)
Religion—Taoism	1 (.6%)
Science—Chemistry	1 (.6%)
Science—Embryology	1 (.6%)
Science—Histology	1 (.6%)
Science—Paleontology	1 (.6%)
Science—Technology in science	1 (.6%)

Social Studies—United States Constitution	1 (.6%)
Social Studies—Instructional issues in social studies	1 (.6%)
Social Studies—Process skills in social studies	1 (.6%)
Vocational Education—Business	1 (.6%)
Vocational Education—Trade and Industrial	1 (.6%)

Table 7: Narrow GEM Subject Headings

Place

The majority of our collections cover large regions (for example, “Midwest” or “Southern U.S.”) or even entire countries or continents (the United States, Mexico, Asia, or Europe). The state with the highest coverage is California, with 7.7% of collections citing it.

Place	Number of Collections/(% of all collections)
United States (nation)	56 (36.1%)
Southern U.S. (general region)	27 (17.4%)
Midwest U.S. (general region)	25 (16.1%)
Southwest U.S. (general region)	22 (14.2%)
Europe (continent)	20 (12.9%)
Northeastern U.S. (general region)	20 (12.9%)
Asia (continent)	17 (11.1%)
Africa (continent)	14 (9.0%)
Mountain Region U.S. (general region)	14 (9.0%)
California (state)	12 (7.7%)
Pacific Coast U.S. (general region)	12 (7.7%)
Middle Atlantic U.S. (general region)	11 (7.1%)
Mexico (nation)	9 (5.8%)
Illinois (state)	8 (5.2%)
South America (continent)	8 (5.2%)
Pacific Islands (general region)	7 (4.5%)
Canada (nation)	6 (3.9%)
Central America (general region)	6 (3.9%)
Virgin Islands of the United States (dependent state)	5 (3.2%)
Florida (state)	4 (2.6%)
Middle East (general region)	4 (2.6%)
Oceania (continent)	4 (2.6%)
Alabama (state)	3 (1.9%)
Antarctica (continent)	3 (1.9%)
Arkansas (state)	3 (1.9%)

Colorado (state)	3 (1.9%)
New York (state)	3 (1.9%)
New York City, New York	3 (1.9%)
San Francisco, California	3 (1.9%)
Tennessee (state)	3 (1.9%)
Washington (state)	3 (1.9%)
West Indies (archipelago)	3 (1.9%)
Boston, Massachusetts	2 (1.3%)
Brooklyn, New York	2 (1.3%)
England (country)	2 (1.3%)
France (nation)	2 (1.3%)
Georgia (state)	2 (1.3%)
Hawaii (state)	2 (1.3%)
Japan (nation)	2 (1.3%)
Kansas (state)	2 (1.3%)
Kentucky (state)	2 (1.3%)
Louisiana (state)	2 (1.3%)
Minnesota (state)	2 (1.3%)
Mississippi (state)	2 (1.3%)
North Carolina (state)	2 (1.3%)
Oregon (state)	2 (1.3%)
Utah (state)	2 (1.3%)
Virginia (state)	2 (1.3%)
Wyoming (state)	2 (1.3%)
Arizona (state)	1 (.6%)
Chicago, Illinois	1 (.6%)
Chile (nation)	1 (.6%)
China (nation)	1 (.6%)
Cuba (nation)	1 (.6%)
Deerfield, Massachusetts	1 (.6%)
Delaware (state)	1 (.6%)
Detroit, Michigan	1 (.6%)
District of Columbia (National District)	1 (.6%)
Great Britain (island)	1 (.6%)
Great Lakes Region (general region)	1 (.6%)
Idaho (state)	1 (.6%)
India (nation)	1 (.6%)
Indiana (state)	1 (.6%)
Indonesia (nation)	1 (.6%)
Ireland (nation)	1 (.6%)
King (county), Washington	1 (.6%)
Liberia (nation)	1 (.6%)
London, England	1 (.6%)
Los Angeles, California	1 (.6%)
Maine (state)	1 (.6%)
Maryland (state)	1 (.6%)

Massachusetts (state)	1 (.6%)
Michigan (state)	1 (.6%)
Mississippi River (river)	1 (.6%)
Monroe (county), New York	1 (.6%)
Nebraska (state)	1 (.6%)
New Jersey (state)	1 (.6%)
Oklahoma (state)	1 (.6%)
Paris, France	1 (.6%)
Peru (nation)	1 (.6%)
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	1 (.6%)
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	1 (.6%)
Rochester (county), New York	1 (.6%)
Rochester, New York	1 (.6%)
Seattle, Washington	1 (.6%)
Sonora (state)	1 (.6%)
South Carolina (state)	1 (.6%)
Springfield, Massachusetts	1 (.6%)
Tennessee Valley (valley)	1 (.6%)
Territorial Kansas	1 (.6%)
Texas (state)	1 (.6%)
United Kingdom (nation)	1 (.6%)
West Virginia (state)	1 (.6%)

Table 8: Collections by Place

Time

The time period of collections is self-defined and thus time periods reported often overlap. The highest concentration of collections falls between 1900-1929 (37.4%), 1850-1899 (35.5%), 1930-1949 (31.6%), 1800-1849 (24.5%), and 1950-1969 (20.6%). Nine percent of the collections deal with the year 2000 to the present.

Temporal Period	Number of Collections/(% of all collections)
Pre-1400	4 (2.6%)
1400s-1699	10 (6.5%)
1700-1799	20 (12.9%)
1704-1789	1 (.6%)
1730-1842	1 (.6%)
1789-1868	1 (.6%)
1789-1960	1 (.6%)
1796-1850	1 (.6%)
1800-1849	38 (24.5%)

1818-1918	1 (.6%)
1830-1890	1 (.6%)
1837-1901	1 (.6%)
1839-1954	1 (.6%)
1840-1860	1 (.6%)
1841-1902	1 (.6%)
1850-1899	55 (35.5%)
1850-1924	1 (.6%)
1861-1865	2 (1.3%)
1868-1912	1 (.6%)
1870-1954	1 (.6%)
1870-1963	1 (.6%)
1883-1983	1 (.6%)
1900-1929	58 (37.4%)
1929 – 2001	1 (.6%)
1930-1949	49 (31.6%)
1936-1941	1 (.6%)
1938-1969	1 (.6%)
1939-1945	1 (.6%)
1941-1945	1 (.6%)
1942-1945	4 (2.6%)
1950-1969	32 (20.6%)
1955-1984	1 (.6%)
1964	1 (.6%)
1970-1999	27 (17.4%)
2000 to present	14 (9.0%)

Table 9: Collections by Time Period

Object Type

The majority of our collections identify as images (42%) or text (35%) as broad categories..

Object type	Number of Collections/(% of whole)
Image	218 (41.7%)
Text	183 (35.1%)
Physical Objects	61 (11.7%)
Sound	30 (5.7%)
Interactive Resource	14 (2.7%)
Moving Image	11 (2.1%)
Dataset	5 (1.0%)
Unknown	1 (.2%)

Table 10: Collections by Broad Object Type

Although much of the collection is images, there isn't a majority type of images every collection has. Photographs/slides/negatives are the most represented with almost 19%. Books and pamphlets are the second most popular with almost 8% of collections including them. The majority of collections identify with specific object types that aren't widely collected, like engravings or storyteller performances. These statistics speak to a breadth of object type collected.

Object Type	Number of Collections/(% of whole)
Image—Photographs / slides / negatives	99 (18.9%)
Text—Books and pamphlets	40 (7.6%)
Text—Archival finding aids	34 (6.5%)
Physical Object—Physical artifacts	32 (6.1%)
Image—Prints and drawings	28 (5.4%)
Text—Newspapers	17 (3.3%)
Image—Posters and broadsides	14 (2.7%)
Sound—Music (audio files)	13 (2.5%)
Image—Maps	12 (2.3%)
Interactive Resource—Interactive learning objects	11 (2.1%)
Sound—Oral histories (audio files)	11 (2.1%)
Text—Letters	10 (1.9%)
Text—Manuscripts	10 (1.9%)
Image—Paintings	9 (1.7%)
Text—Sheet music and scores	8 (1.5%)
Physical Object—Physical specimens (plants / animals / etc)	6 (1.1%)
Text—Government documents	6 (1.1%)
Text—Periodicals	6 (1.1%)
Image—Caricatures	5 (1.0%)
Image—Postcards	5 (1.0%)
Text—Diaries	5 (1.0%)
Physical Object—Clothing	4 (.8%)
Physical Object—Ephemera	4 (.8%)
Text—Ephemera	4 (.8%)
Image—Cartoons (Commentary)	3 (.6%)
Image—Illustrations	3 (.6%)
Image—Oil paintings	3 (.6%)
Image—Political Cartoons	3 (.6%)
Moving Image—Video	3 (.6%)
Physical Object—Sculpture	3 (.6%)
Text—Government web sites	3 (.6%)
Sound—Sound files	3 (.6%)
Dataset—Field data	2 (.4%)
Image—Digital art piece	2 (.4%)

Image—Etchings	2 (.4%)
Image—Lithographs	2 (.4%)
Image—Mixed Media	2 (.4%)
Image—Scrapbook	2 (.4%)
Moving Image—Video files	2 (.4%)
Physical Object—Scrapbook	2 (.4%)
Text—Documents	2 (.4%)
Text—Field diaries	2 (.4%)
Text—Institutional reports	2 (.4%)
Text—Journals	2 (.4%)
Text—Legal documents	2 (.4%)
Text—Scrapbook	2 (.4%)
Text—Travel narratives	2 (.4%)
Text—Web pages	2 (.4%)
Dataset—Geospatial data	1 (.2%)
Dataset—Statistical documents	1 (.2%)
Dataset—Summarized evaluation data	1 (.2%)
Image—Advertisements	1 (.2%)
Image—Architectural models	1 (.2%)
Image—Bird's eye views	1 (.2%)
Image—Blueprints	1 (.2%)
Image—Christmas Cards	1 (.2%)
Image—Clipper ship cards	1 (.2%)
Image—Concert posters	1 (.2%)
Image—Costume plates	1 (.2%)
Image—Digital representation of New York City skyline	1 (.2%)
Image—Engravings	1 (.2%)
Image—Fiber Arts	1 (.2%)
Image—Illustrated books	1 (.2%)
Image—Intermedia	1 (.2%)
Image—Landscape drawings	1 (.2%)
Image—Lantern slides	1 (.2%)
Image—Mail art	1 (.2%)
Image—Modern art	1 (.2%)
Image—Performance art	1 (.2%)
Image—Periodical illustrations	1 (.2%)
Image—Pictorial envelopes	1 (.2%)
Image—Pictorial lettersheets	1 (.2%)
Image—Stereographs	1 (.2%)
Image—Stereolithographic files	1 (.2%)
Image—Watercolors	1 (.2%)
Interactive Resource—Computer-aided design	1 (.2%)
Interactive Resource—Interactive maps	1 (.2%)
Interactive Resource—Teaching materials	1 (.2%)

Moving Image—Films	1 (.2%)
Moving Image—Interviews (video)	1 (.2%)
Moving Image—Storyteller performances	1 (.2%)
Moving Image—Television news program	1 (.2%)
Moving Image—Video art	1 (.2%)
Moving Image—Video of field researchers	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Bonds (Negotiable instruments)	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Dioramas	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Clothing and accessories	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Currency	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Headdresses	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Ikenga	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Masks	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Tapestry	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Textiles	1 (.2%)
Physical Object—Toys	1 (.2%)
Sound—Audio of field researchers	1 (.2%)
Sound—Sound recordings	1 (.2%)
Sound—Wax cylinders	1 (.2%)
Text—Artist's books	1 (.2%)
Text—Artist's statements	1 (.2%)
Text—Classified ads	1 (.2%)
Text—Concert posters	1 (.2%)
Text—Concrete poetry	1 (.2%)
Text—Court records	1 (.2%)
Text—Directories	1 (.2%)
Text—Directory data	1 (.2%)
Text—Essays	1 (.2%)
Text—Finding aid	1 (.2%)
Text—Finding aids	1 (.2%)
Text—Funeral booklets	1 (.2%)
Text—Land grant documents	1 (.2%)
Text—Legislative documents	1 (.2%)
Text—Manuscripts: Legal documents	1 (.2%)
Text—Notebooks	1 (.2%)
Text—Oral histories	1 (.2%)
Text—Papers	1 (.2%)
Text—Plant profiles	1 (.2%)
Text—Play scripts	1 (.2%)
Text—Proceedings	1 (.2%)
Text—Programs	1 (.2%)
Text—Research reports	1 (.2%)
Text—Treaties	1 (.2%)
Unknown—Documentary films	1 (.2%)

