Keepin' it Inclusive
Inclusive Cataloging Scholarship of the 1990s

Tiffany Henry and Alyssa Nance

Inclusive cataloging has gained more attention within the discipline of library and information science (LIS) within recent years. While the term coined for this concept is newer, the underlying ideas are not new and have been part of the professional and scholarly conversation within cataloging for decades. To trace these ideas, the authors conducted a literature review of scholarship on cataloging, diversity, and vocabulary written in the 1990s to discuss the evolution of inclusive cataloging. The review of the literature from this decade shows the intellectual progression of this topic and how it lays the groundwork for current scholarship.

Inclusive cataloging has risen to the forefront of scholarly discourse in library and information science (LIS) within the past few years as a way to examine and integrate equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) concepts into cataloging and metadata practices. Although the words used to describe this concept are recently minted, it is not a new concept to the profession.

We cite Perera's definition of inclusive cataloging based on research conducted with LIS practitioners. Based on keywords generated by study participants, Perera develops a definition of inclusive cataloging as "resource description that elevates traditionally marginalized voices, removes or contextualizes language that is harmful or offensive, recognizes description as an iterative process, centers empathy, and encourages the use of language that is intentional, person-centered, non-neutral, mindful of diversity, and focus on the humanity of those described."[1] While the popular terms for this concept have shifted, we have observed that the core concept, critical examination of the status quo in the hopes of making the work of cataloging more inclusive, is not new at all. Scholarly conversations that would be considered under the umbrella of inclusive cataloging date back as early as the 1930s with Dorothy Porter and her work enhancing subject access for the Black Studies collection at Howard University.[2] These conversations continue through the twentieth century. Another touchstone of scholarship within inclusive cataloging is the work published by Sandy Berman in the late 1960s and early 1970s, namely his book *Prejudices and Antipathies*, first published in 1973, which critiqued Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) specifically.[3]

Professional conversations and scholarship around the concepts of critical, inclusive, and radical cataloging have burgeoned in the past decade, especially within the past five to eight years. In the context of the United States, this increase of attention within LIS can be attributed to the shifts in political climate and emerging cultural conversations, particularly about race. With the profession of librarianship trying to wrestle with its own lack of diversity and how to promote EDI as a core value in practice, these discussions have reached every specialization in the Galleries, Libraries, Archives, and Museums (GLAM) sector, including cataloging and metadata work. Hopefully, scholarship and

Tiffany Henry (tnhenry@uncg.edu), Discovery Cataloger, UNC Greensboro, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9565-6955. **Alyssa Nance** (alyssa.nance@furman.edu), Cataloging and Metadata Librarian, Furman University, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9263-1832.

conversations around inclusive cataloging and EDI topics have become stable and regular, rather than a trendy or segmented aspect of the field.

Some of the most impactful and relevant work on the topic of inclusive cataloging is recent scholarship, produced within the past fifteen or so years. Reasons for this include shifts in technology that are relevant to the landscape in the present day, changes in cataloging standards and policies, and increased discussion of theoretical and conceptual underpinnings to build on, such as critical theory and social justice scholarship. Although the indefatigable work of Berman is often cited, the work of scholars and advocates in the 1980s and 1990s in criticizing cataloging practices and structures is less often examined in current literature.

Scope

We survey the inclusive cataloging work published in the 1990s and years immediately surrounding that decade to contextualize the scholarship and activism within the constraints on cataloging at the time. For this project, we reviewed LIS journal articles and books written in English, with a focus on works published between 1990 and 1999, while citing relevant scholarship that goes beyond the designated time frame. To note, we did not look at early listservs or message boards from that era, although we acknowledge that this also could have been another venue for professional conversations to flourish. This could be a future direction for further research.

We did not utilize a highly structured search methodology after initial searches revealed that scholarship addressing inclusive cataloging did not necessarily use a shared lexicon or common terminology, particularly in indexed fields. Instead, we primarily used iterative methods, mining likely citations from relevant scholarship.

We selected this particular decade for investigation for a few reasons. First, the discourse around inclusive cataloging has evolved within the past three decades, rapidly so within the past ten years. With so much recent growth about this topic in the LIS scholarship, the 1990s appears to be a neglected decade within existing literature reviews. After Berman's *Prejudices and Antipathies*, there appears to be a noticeable drop in written scholarship during both the 1980s and 1990s relating to inclusive cataloging. Our aim with this project is to track the intellectual evolution of this concept over time, including one of these gap decades. Second, the 1990s marks a turning point within modern technology and a pivotal one within librarianship. The 1990s saw the widespread adoption of internet usage by the general public as libraries transitioned from print card catalogs and LAN-connected terminals to OPACs (Online Public Access Catalogs), the precursors to Web 2.0 online catalogs and the discovery layers of the present day. The third and final reason for selecting the 1990s is that it is an optimal time range in terms of it being a decade that is still within living memory of a majority of LIS workers and information professionals active today given the demographics of the profession. Throughout this literature review, we will use the vocabulary as presented in the written works regarding identity groups and other concepts. The authors recognize that language shifts over time and terminology that was in

use when the works were originally written may not reflect the most current, inclusive, or respectful usage.

Literature Review

Subject headings

Discussions in the 1990s related to inclusive description were focused heavily on LCSH. In 1981, Monika Kirtland and Pauline Cochrane published a comprehensive bibliography of the literature from 1945 to 1979 addressing issues in LCSH.[4] Cochrane and Kirtland's work was widely cited throughout the 1980s and spurred Shubert's 1992 follow-up bibliographic essay covering literature published 1980–1989, as well as Fischer's third installment in 2005, covering literature published 1990–2001.[5] Although the present article is concerned with the inclusive cataloging landscape of the 1990s as a whole, we emphasize literature addressing LCSH due to its outsize frequency of appearance in publication.

A frequent complaint about LCSH, particularly in the early part of the decade, concerned its stagnancy and resistance to change. In a chapter tracing historical changes to LCSH describing gay and lesbian topics, Ellen Greenblatt discusses problems presented by the bias and static quality of LCSH and notes that the Library of Congress (LC) was slow to make any changes to LCSH.[6] Some of this she attributes to the "manual environment" of cataloging—the need to make changes to physical card catalogs—as well as LC's policy of creating or changing headings only with literary warrant, waiting for publications to reflect changes in the common usage of language and terminology. Greenblatt notes a particular long-standing reluctance to change headings related to gay and lesbian people, however, with changes coming long after literary warrant.

Greenblatt considers that LC may not collect many books on gay and lesbian topics (and thus not considered as literary warrant for LCSH) as they were often published by small publishers, but upon analysis concludes that most of the titles identified as a "core collection" had been cataloged by LC, indicating that this may not be a persuasive theory. Greenblatt also remarks on the marginalization by LC of other oppressed communities, naming "the black community, women's community, ethnic groups, non-mainstream religious groups, and age groups," and notes that the prejudicial terminology of LCSH compromises its very function in providing access to resources.[7] "Until LC departs from its ethnocentric, heterosexist, WASPish, and middle class approach, the Library of Congress subject headings will never provide adequate access to the rich cultural diversity of information concerning groups existing outside mainstream American culture."[8] Greenblatt concludes by offering specific suggestions for additions and changes to gay and lesbian LCSH, much in the vein of Berman's *Prejudices and Antipathies*.

The slowness to change LCSH is also remarked upon by Bethel, who describes ways that delayed changes impact searching and discovery.[9] The awkward, unfamiliar structure of LCSH makes it difficult for searchers to use in many fields, but Bethel's concern as a reference librarian is with instructing scholars on searching for materials in Black Studies. A brief case study reports on the rifts between the terminology used in resources, keywords supplied by students to describe those resources, and the

actual LCSH assigned in the records for them. The lack of adequate description, aligned with searcher usage, may impede discovery, per Bethel. Echoing Greenblatt's complaints of bias creating impediments to access, Bethel states, "Simply put, American and European classification schemes are not expansive enough to cover Black Studies materials. There is a colonial orientation in Western Classification schemes. Most African and Caribbean history schedules reflect the European presence and activities on the continent and not the culture and deeds of African peoples themselves."[10] The Western, American-European colonialist orientation and bias of the predominant systems of organization and description cause them to be inadequate to fully and accurately support the materials of Black Studies collections. Although not a cataloger, Bethel's centering of the user reiterates the impact of controlled vocabularies on search results and makes her critique of and call for change to LCSH all the more forceful.

Moorcroft is also concerned with the impact of LC's ethnocentrism in the use of LCSH; Moorcroft's perspective is as an Australian librarian concerned with the description of Aboriginal people, cultures, and concerns both in LCSH and in library materials.[11] Moorcroft demonstrates problems with an international reliance on LCSH, a controlled vocabulary that was never intended to be universal. The article identifies specific problems with the misapplication or lack of appropriate application of LCSH, resulting in obscuring the actual content of a resource or even making it undiscoverable in the catalog.

Nuckolls also reviews problematic trends and specific issues within LCSH, but through a historical lens similar to Greenblatt's, tracing changes, lack of changes, and impediments to change over the preceding twenty years in a review of literature addressing issues in inclusive description.[12] One major problem Nuckolls identifies is the "piecemeal" approach to the correction and change within LC, as well as the lack of involvement or solicitation of input from librarians outside of LC. The noncomprehensive strategy of updates to racial and ethnic identity headings, for example, resulted in inconsistencies in the construction and application of headings. Citing the 1979 Harris/Clack study findings on LCSH,[13] and noting the lack of sufficient changes to headings describing identity, Nuckolls offers the still-relevant recommendation to allow groups to determine for themselves the best words to describe their identity. Nuckolls also relates in this article some of her own contemporary work on discoverability and usefulness within the Skidmore College library catalog. Some of the issues identified include outdated subject headings and authority records related to changes, but also include problems presented by specific technological limitations of the institution's OPAC.

Cornog takes a broad view of issues impacting access to and description of materials related to sexuality, including classification, subject headings, and flyer-bibliographies.[14] With regard to subject headings, Cornog recommended that librarians not rely on those assigned by LC and instead review them for completeness and accuracy. Cornog also advocates for transcribing contents notes as an additional method of communicating the aboutness of materials, articulating how this may sometimes be more useful than using subject headings from a controlled vocabulary (CV).

Some LIS scholars of the 90s, including Cornog, recommend supplementing LCSH with other vocabularies and thesauri. In addition to Sears, Cornog suggests consulting the *Hennepin County Authority File, Sexual Nomenclature: A Thesaurus, Gay Studies Thesaurus*, and *Lesbian Periodicals*

Index.[15] Moorcroft also offers alternatives, mentioning McKinlay's List of Australian Subject Headings and ASCIS Subject Headings List as possibilities for describing Aboriginal people and related subjects, but did not endorse either as being complete, rigorous, or unbiased enough so as to be sufficient.[16] Moorcroft did, however, issue a verdict on LCSH: "They should not continue to be used."[17] Nuckolls, on the other hand, does not advocate for the use of an alternative CV, but urges for a concerted effort to push LC for changes, modeling work after the Canadian approach to altering the Canadian Subject Headings (CSH).[18] The CSH might very well be considered an alternative CV, but Nuckolls' American perspective does not treat it as such.

Classification

As with LIS literature of the 1970s and 1980s, there appear to be fewer scholarly works focused on the ways library classification impacts inclusive cataloging than on other areas. Scholarship often discusses classification alongside subject headings or focuses solely on the issues with subject access and the headings used. There are a few noteworthy articles from the 1990s that expand upon the conversation about classification and its impact on inclusive cataloging.

As noted above, Cornog addresses issues surrounding access to resources about sex and human sexuality.[19] In addition to discussing issues around physical access, the author addresses intellectual access through both subject access and classification. Classification plays a unique role in access and discoverability since the where materials are classed and placed in a collection will impact how users find resources. Cornog gives the example of how Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) treats sexuality within its classification schema by showing a clear division and moral judgment based on where it is classed. In the edition of DDC in use when the article was written, 306.7 is labeled "institutions pertaining to relation of the sexes," which deals with the sociological aspects of sexuality. Meanwhile, the other location in DDC where works about sex or sexuality are either classed or placed adjacent to is labeled "problems and controversies related to public morals and customs" at 363.4. This creates a very clear division between which titles or topics about sexuality are judged as acceptable or problematic. Within Library of Congress Classification (LCC), the author notes less of an overt moral judgment based on labeling and positioning but notes how the topic is treated within the HQ classification schedule and how much or little space is allocated for specific topics like homosexuality, prostitution, and erotica. Regardless of which classification system, catalogers have to face a decision of where to place works in a collection and must contend with the dispersal of works on sexuality either due to the classification system itself or their predecessor's judgment of the work.

Another work by Hope Olson also addresses classification in this era.[20] The article is more theoretical in nature, but Olson's discussion of marginalized knowledge domains and the non-neutrality of library classification makes it fit within our analysis of inclusive cataloging. Building off the idea that classification is a social construct that was introduced by Foskett in 1971,[21] Olson takes this idea another step further by creating a metaphor between cartography/map making and classification. Map making requires illustrating and plotting out spatial boundaries of a geographic area while classification achieves a similar effect with the organization of knowledge. To illustrate this, Olsen uses an alternative

CV focused on feminism called *A Women's Thesaurus* to see how the terms within it could be mapped onto DDC. With the shortcomings and biases of DDC already being discussed elsewhere in the LIS literature, the challenge was to see if the terms within a feminist CV could fit within and where conceptual friction would occur.

Bethel's article is another example of recognizing some of the systemic biases found within cataloging classification.[22] In addition to discussing the slowness of LCSH, it also touches on the impact of cataloging and knowledge organization on library instruction, collections, and user research. Bethel notes the Eurocentric bias in North American cataloging standards and knowledge organization systems prevalent during the 1990s. With such a strong and clear bias, centering other regions and people is difficult, if not impossible. Using a Eurocentric knowledge organization system has a negative impact on collecting scholarship on and aiding researchers focusing on Black Studies or the African Diaspora. Bethel suggests developing and using a knowledge organization system with an Afrocentric perspective to better organize Black Studies scholarship in collections. Unfortunately, similar critiques within the literature remain and continue to the present day within LIS literature.

On Neutrality

Many scholars of the 1990s, including Bethel, criticized the bias evident in the systems and standards of cataloging and classification, but others approached the problem in a different way, with criticism of the concept of cataloger neutrality. The prevailing paradigm, at that time and into the present day, is that neutrality and impartiality within cataloging is desirable. Both are regarded as measures against individual bias possibly introduced by catalogers while doing tasks like classification or resource description. What we see in the literature of this era are pieces of scholarship untangling and critiquing the standards and presumptions about the role of neutrality and impartiality within cataloging work. The works published in the 1990s are a throughline in the present scholarly conversation about the role of neutrality.

Anderson delves into how the descriptive cataloging standards of the time are not actually neutral in practice while the predominant standard in cataloging was to maintain objective.[23] The author notes and raises examples of the ways that descriptive cataloging standards of the time, while proclaiming that they allow for objectivity and demand neutrality, carry specific biases. This article engages only with cataloging standards and practice without delving into the idea of harm minimization or mitigation for library catalog users. According to Anderson, descriptive cataloging rules and standards reflect the era in which they are produced and will have certain oversights contained within. One example of this bias or oversight includes descriptive cataloging rules that permits access points for Classical Greek or Roman literature to be in either Greek or Latin within English catalog records while instructing catalogers to omit similar access points for other languages not using Romanized script. Anderson also notes a desire for universality within cataloging that further perpetuates specific biases within cataloging practices and standards. This universality will discourage catalogers from customizing records to serve their specific libraries and its users. The same issue would apply for custom work done to enhance authority records with a growing preference to adhere to what was set forth by LC instead of

what might be better at a local level. While some of the solutions Anderson proposes in the article have now come to pass with shifts in technology and changes in standards, others are ideas that will remain in the scholarly conversation with inclusive cataloging, radical cataloging, and discourse on user-centered cataloging in the future.

In another article, Radford delves into the philosophical underpinning of the concept of knowledge being objective and how its classification should reflect that for library users.[24] Radford ties this idea to the philosophical idea of positivism dating back to the earlier part of the twentieth century and how it has shaped the perception and function of libraries. Within the article, positivism is defined as a "view [that] holds that knowledge, as contained in texts, constitutes an independent object that can be stored, classified, and arranged in an objective manner."[25] Therefore, information contained within library resources must too be organized and classified in a similar manner, which is where discussions of neutrality enter with the positivist viewpoint of libraries. If the goal is to enable user access to information, then providing that access needs to be as objective as possible, just like the scientific method. The author goes on to critique this viewpoint and approach that upholds neutrality at the expense of a more user-centered approach to classification and facilitating access.

Other articles demonstrate librarians encountering the shortcomings of neutrality within their work. Moorcroft discusses the intentional and unintentional silences within cataloging, namely within subject access, regarding the legacy of racism and settler colonialism in Australia.[26] While not specifically naming neutrality in the article, Moorcroft describes the harm and negative impact this paradigm and value has on users of Australian libraries when catalogers adhere to the concept of neutrality. Similarly, the case study in Herlihy and Cocks about their work with the Luiseño Culture Bank shows a critique of neutrality in action.[27] At the beginning of the article, the author describes their experience coming to understand the systemic biases of LCC, Dewey Decimal, and other popular systems. Impartiality in cataloging cannot be upheld when what is presumed to be universal holds a specific viewpoint and biases. When the authors began to work on the Luiseño Culture Bank project, they learned firsthand that the prevalent knowledge organization systems common in most libraries were inadequate to meet the needs of organizing and classifying a collection of Native American artifacts and sacred works.

Emerging Themes—Discussion

A few topical themes within inclusive cataloging emerged from our review of literature: problems with controlled vocabularies, particularly LCSH, problems with classification schema, and problems with the concept of cataloger neutrality. Many of the overarching issues remain in some form today, but advances in technology and changes to standards and practices have somewhat modified the landscape of inclusive cataloging.

Technology

The 1990s was a decade of rapid technological growth, bringing personal computing and advanced telecommunication devices more widely into homes, hands, and offices. The advent and growth of

the World Wide Web to connect to the internet spurred on this change and facilitated developments in information processing, storage, and access, in libraries as elsewhere. Still, perhaps emblematic of libraries' resistance to change, these advances were slow to be utilized effectively in library environments. Although libraries and library systems still, for many reasons, struggle to implement changes that take full advantage of the possibilities offered by advances, many of the issues confronting catalogers attempting to create inclusive description have been transformed since the 1990s because of changes in technology.

Modern catalogs and discovery layers certainly continue to generate complaints surrounding functionality and interface, but much of the clunkiness created by data storage, indexing, and display limitations of the mid-90s has been eliminated by advances in technology. In 1996, Christine L. Borgman describes the limitations of OPACs, including the reasons they are difficult to use.[28] Borgman's deconstruction of the designs of early OPACs sometimes echoes the complaints of others, namely issues with their mimicry of physical card catalogs and the conflict between actual information-seeking behavior and the requirements for successful catalog searching. Searchers, Borgman notes, must understand both what and how (have both "conceptual" and "semantic" knowledge) they are searching in the online catalog, a complicated combination for most people, who Borgman describes as "perpetual novices." Librarians of the period were aware of the potential for technology to help assuage the limitations created by unwieldy vocabularies; Bethel notes in 1994, "If one is fortunate enough to work in an institution with an online catalog, with keyword and Boolean operators, this dilemma of poor subject access may not pose such a drastic problem."[29] On the other hand, only two years later Borgman enumerated problems with the very underlying construction of OPACs; Borgman's article implies that the indexing and searchability of contents or notes fields was not yet widely available, omitting any discussion of the possibility of keyword searching outside the access points of title, author, subject heading, or shelf list.

The proliferation of electronic resources has also contributed to improvements in keyword searching. Born-digital articles and books with full-text indexing, more sophisticated keyword searching using HTML ,and OCR-processed PDF documents improve user results in ways that could not otherwise be achieved. By bypassing the complexities and limitations of controlled vocabularies, as well as the fallibility and bias of those who assign them, users are afforded the ability to connect directly with the language of a resource—a boon to access, and therefore to inclusive cataloging. On the other hand, those improved search results may be limited to the databases where those documents are stored, depending on what data is indexed and searchable by a particular discovery layer for a particular database or material type.

Beyond the expansion of keyword searching and related improvements in indexing, the development of discovery layers has changed the ways users are able to and expect to interact with library catalogs. Modern catalogs and discovery layers appear and function more like commercial online search engines than the OPACs of even the late '90s, allowing users to perform more useful searches and to interact with catalogs in a more intuitive way, lowering the threshold to entry. Improved keyword searching allows catalogers to utilize inclusive terminology that better reflects the content and/or the way users

are likely to search for the topic by including it in fields like contents notes and summaries. Ranking algorithms provide users with more relevant results first, helping "perpetual novices" search the catalog more productively using terminology that reflects precise and current language use. Alternative vocabularies can be utilized as indexed and search-linked headings in records even when they are not controlled. It remains true that "the power to name generates the power to control,"[30] but the option to wield keyword searching helps to alleviate the access-inhibiting restrictions of LCSH, as noted by Bethel. Traditional controlled vocabularies continue to be useful and sometimes crucial, but catalog users are less restricted in the ways and terminology that they can use to search for resources and information. The discovery layers and ILSs of today are very different systems than the OPACs of the '90s, although the hope for substantive, functional transformation of OPACs from electronic versions of the card catalog into semantically insightful platforms is yet to be fully realized.

Changes in Standards and Practice: LCSH

In her discussion of LC's sluggishness to make changes to LCSH, while noting the decreasing need to make manual changes to a physical card catalog, Greenblatt hoped that "with the advent of increasingly sophisticated online systems, . . . the changes will be more easily accomplished and the Library of Congress . . . will perhaps be able to direct its energies toward creating subject headings that reflect contemporary usage and toward changing headings which are obsolete or prejudicial."[31] This can probably be considered to have come to fruition to some degree, but the proliferation of changes to LCSH since the 1990s may more rightly be attributed to the development of and widespread participation in the Subject Authority Cooperative (SACO) program.

The formal establishment of the SACO program in the early 1990s was a major shift in the cataloging landscape that enabled inclusive cataloging to progress during the decade. For context and a better understanding of the shifts in cataloging standards created by the creation of SACO, Colby provides a historical overview.[32] LCSH was initially created by LC in the late 1890s for exclusive use for their own collections. A precursor to the modern SACO program emerged in 1983 as the Cooperative Subject Cataloging Projects (CSCP) as a way for larger institutions to have input in LCSH. Only four large academic institutions and one national library participated in CSCP in 1983, however. The successor of CSCP was the creation of the National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP) in 1986 and it built off the model of non-LC institutions contributing to LCSH. In 1993, a collaboration between NCCP and the Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) program led to the creation of the SACO program as we know it today.

LCSH serves as the primary controlled vocabulary to aid in subject description for the materials of GLAM institutions in North America and beyond. The pervasiveness of LCSH in the 1990s is illustrated by the literature from the era; many articles from this decade discuss either the lack of terms that would adequately serve their communities or focus on how slowly LCSH could change. LCSH is often used in tandem with other controlled vocabularies rather than being supplanted by other CVs then and in the present. As a result of its continued prominence, LCSH is often the focus of scholarship around remediation and improvements for equity and inclusion. The coordination of participants in

topical SACO funnels such as the African American Subject Funnel, the Latin American and Indigenous Peoples of the Americas (LAIPA) Funnel, and the Gender and Sexuality Funnel, among others, now helps LCSH to move forward with addressing outdated, inaccurate, and offensive terminology in the vocabulary, as well as keeping up with needed additions.

Cataloging Principles and Ethics

Another emerging theme that appeared in the literature was discussion of cataloging principles and professional ethics in inclusive cataloging practice. Critiques on the value of neutrality and challenging implicit systemic biases appear in the literature of the 1990s.

Discussions around neutrality, especially with regard to library cataloging, continued throughout the decade and we can see similarities between scholarly arguments made then and now. Again, articles by Anderson and Radford directly delve into the discussions of neutrality in cataloging standards and classification respectively.[33] Other works of scholarship take this understanding that neutrality is not guaranteed or universal and brings this critique to other areas of cataloging work. Cornog and Olson offer critiques of DDC with an underpinning that the classification schema is far from universal and neutral on specific subjects or domains of knowledge.[34] Works that engage with what the lack of neutrality means for cataloging include those of Moorcroft as well as Herlihy and Cocks, who write about their experiences engaging with systems like LCSH and LCC and finding out that these systems fall short to adequately describe other cultural contexts and domains of knowledge.[35] What we see in these articles is an intellectual outgrowth from earlier critical works like those of Foskett that lead to newer works that evolve the scholarly conversation.[36] Recommendations from scholars like Nuckolls and Moorcroft, for example, to create and use terminology that is accurate, respectful, and reflective of a group's or individual's self-description, are finding their way into best practices documentation.[37]

Conclusion

From this literature review, we have learned that concepts that seem novel and new for metadata and cataloging—as well as librarianship as a whole—are in fact not new at all. What would be called "inclusive cataloging" today is an outgrowth of a scholarly discourse and praxis that was decades in the making. By selecting a point in time not often examined in the literature and not too far into the past, we can see that thirty years ago scholars were calling for more respectful and culturally relevant subject terms, questioning the neutrality of cataloging standards, and more. In the 1990s, scholars followed those that preceded them in the literature and added their works, which shape the inclusive cataloging scholarship of the present.

Notes

1. Treshani Perera, "Description Specialists and Inclusive Description Work and/or Initiatives—An Exploratory Study," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 60, no. 5 (July 4, 2022): 370, https://doi.org/10.1080/01639 374.2022.2093301.

2. Laura E. Helton, "On Decimals, Catalogs, and Racial Imaginaries of Reading," *PMLA/Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 134, no. 1 (January 2019): 99–120, https://doi.org/10.1632 /pmla.2019.134.1.99.

3. Sanford Berman, *Prejudices and Antipathies: A Tract on the LC Subject Heads Concerning People* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1971).

4. Monika Kirtland and Pauline Cochrane, "Critical Views of LCSH—Library of Congress Subject Headings A Bibliographic and Bibliometric Essay," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 1, no. 2–3 (April 13, 1982): 71–94, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v01n02_04.

5. Steven Blake Shubert, "Critical Views of LCSH- Ten Years Later," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 15, no. 2 (November 11, 1992): 37–97, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v15n02_04; Karen S. Fischer, "Critical Views of LCSH, 1990–2001: The Third Bibliographic Essay," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (October 2005): 63–109, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v41n01_05.

6. Ellen Greenblatt, "Homosexuality: The Evolution of a Concept in the Library of Congress Subject Headings," in *Gay and Lesbian Library Service*, eds. Cal Gough and Ellen Greenblatt (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1990), 75–101.

7. Greenblatt, "Homosexuality," 96.

8. Greenblatt, 96.

9. Kathleen E. Bethel, "Culture Keepers: Cataloging the Afrocentric Way," *The Reference Librarian* 21, no. 45–46 (July 12, 1994): 221–40, https://doi.org/10.1300/J120v21n45_21.

10. Bethel, "Culture Keepers," 229–30.

11. Heather Moorcroft, "Ethnocentrism in Subject Headings," *The Australian Library Journal* 41, no. 1 (February 1, 1992): 40–45.

12. Karen A. Nuckolls, "Subject Access to Diversity Materials: The Library of Congress Subject Heading Shortfall," *The Reference Librarian* 21, no. 45–46 (July 12, 1994): 241–51, https://doi.org/10.1300 /J120v21n45_22.

13. Jessica L. Milstead Harris and Doris H. Clack, "Treatment of People and Peoples in Subject Analysis," *Library Resources and Technical Services* 23, no. 4 (1979): 374–90.

14. Martha Cornog, "Providing Access to Materials on Sexuality," in *Libraries, Erotica, Pornography* (Phoenix: Oryx, 1991), 166–87.

15. Cornog, "Providing Access to Materials on Sexuality."

16. Moorcroft, "Ethnocentrism in Subject Headings."

17. Moorcroft, 44.

18. Nuckolls, "Subject Access to Diversity Materials."

19. Cornog, "Providing Access to Materials on Sexuality."

20. Hope A. Olson, "Mapping beyond Dewey's Boundaries: Constructing Classificatory Space for Marginalized Knowledge Domains," *Library Trends* 47, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 233–54.

21. A. C. Foskett, "Misogynists All; a Study in Critical Classification," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 15, no. 2 (January 1971): 117–21.

22. Bethel, "Culture Keepers."

23. Norman Elliott Anderson, "The Non-Neutrality of Descriptive Cataloging," in *Cataloging Heresy: Challenging the Standard Bibliographic Product: Proceedings of the Congress for Librarians*, February 18, 1991, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York, with Additional Contributed Papers, ed. Bella Hass Weinberg (Learned Information, 1992), 15–28.

24. Gary P. Radford, "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library: Conceptions of Knowledge and the Modern Library Experience," *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community, Policy* 62, no. 4 (1992): 408–24, https://www.jstor.org/stable/4308741.

25. Radford, "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library," 410.

26. Heather Moorcroft, "The Construction of Silence," *The Australian Library Journal* 42, no. 1 (February 1, 1993): 27–32.

27. Catherine S. Herlihy and Fraser Cocks, "The Luiseñio Culture Bank: Expanding the Canon," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20, no. 1 (August 4, 1995): 61–81, https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v20n01_05.

28. Christine L. Borgman, "Why Are Online Catalogs Still Hard to Use?," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 47, no. 7 (July 1996): 493–503, https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097 -4571(199607)47:7<493::AID-ASI3>3.0.CO;2-P.

29. Bethel, "Culture Keepers," 233.

30. Greenblatt, "Homosexuality," 96.

31. Greenblatt, 76.

32. Michael Colby, "SACO: Past, Present, and Future," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 58, no. 3–4 (May 18, 2020): 285–93, https://doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2019.1706679.

33. Anderson, "The Non-Neutrality of Descriptive Cataloging"; Radford, "Positivism, Foucault, and the Fantasia of the Library."

34. Cornog, "Providing Access to Materials on Sexuality"; Olson, "Mapping beyond Dewey's Boundaries."

35. Moorcroft, "Ethnocentrism in Subject Headings"; Herlihy and Cocks, "The Luiseñio Culture Bank."

36. Foskett, "Misogynists All; a Study in Critical Classification."

37. Nuckolls, "Subject Access to Diversity Materials"; Moorcroft, "Ethnocentrism in Subject Headings"; Trans Metadata Collective et al., "Metadata Best Practices for Trans and Gender Diverse Resources" (Zenodo, June 22, 2022), https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.6686841; "L 400—Ethics and Demographic Group Terms," in *Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms Manual* (Library of Congress, 2022), https://www.loc.gov /aba/publications/FreeLCDGT/L400.pdf.

Appendix. Additional Resources

Berman, Sanford. *The Joy of Cataloging: Essays, Letters, Reviews, and Other Explosions*. Phoenix: Oryx, 1981.

Carlyle, Allyson. "Matching LCSH and User Vocabulary in the Library Catalog." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 10, no. 1–2 (December 13, 1989): 37–63. https://doi.org/10.1300 /J104v10n01_04.

Carmichael, James Vinson, eds. *Daring to Find Our Names: The Search for Lesbigay Library History*. Beta Phi Mu Monograph Series, no. 5. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1998.

Clack, Doris Hargrett. "Subject Access to African American Studies Resources in Online Catalogs: Issues and Answers." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19, no. 2 (February 14, 1995): 49–66. https:// doi.org/10.1300/J104v19n02_04.

Curry, Deborah A., Susan Griswold Blandy, and Lynne M. Martin, eds. *Racial and Ethnic Diversity in Academic Libraries: Multicultural Issues*. New York: Haworth, 1994.

Dick, A. L., and M. Burger. "Transforming Subject Access: Some Critical Issues for South African Information Professionals." *South African Journal of Library & Information Science* 63, no. 2 (June 1995): 65.

Gomez, Louis M., Carol C. Lochbaum, and Thomas Landauer. "All the Right Words: Finding What You Want as a Function of Richness of Indexing Vocabulary." *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 41 (December 1990): 547–59. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097 -4571(199012)41:8<547::AID-ASI1>3.0.CO;2-P.

Heiner-Freiling, Magda. "Survey on Subject Heading Languages Used in National Libraries and Bibliographies." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 29, no. 1–2 (June 1, 2000): 189–98. https://doi.org/10.1300/J104v29n01_13.

Huber, Jeffrey T., and Mary L. Gillaspy. "Social Constructs and Disease: Implications for a Controlled Vocabulary for HIV/AIDS." *Library Trends* 47, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 190–208.

Olson, Hope A. "Mapping beyond Dewey's Boundaries: Constructing Classificatory Space for Marginalized Knowledge Domains." *Library Trends* 47, no. 2 (Fall 1998): 233–54.

———. *The Power to Name: Locating the Limits of Subject Representation in Libraries*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands ; Boston: Kluwer, 2002.

———. "Sameness and Difference: A Cultural Foundation of Classification." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 45, no. 3 (July 2001): 115–22. https://doi.org/10.5860/lrts.45n3.115

———. "The Power to Name: Representation in Library Catalogs." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* 26, no. 3 (Spring 2001): 639. https://doi.org/10.1086/495624.

———. "Thinking Professionals." *Technical Services Quarterly* 15, no. 1–2 (September 18, 1997): 51–66. https://doi.org/10.1300/J124v15n01_06.

Olson, Hope A., and Rose Schlegl. "Bias in Subject Access Standards: A Content Analysis of the Critical Literature." *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of CAIS / Actes Du Congrès Annuel de l'ACSI*, 1999. https://doi.org/10.29173/cais460.

Olson, Hope A., and Dennis B. Ward. "Ghettoes and Diaspora in Classification: Communicating Across the Limits." *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of CAIS / Actes Du Congrès Annuel de l'ACSI*, 1997. https://doi.org/10.29173/cais45.

Rogers, Margaret N. "Are We on Equal Terms Yet? Subject Headings Concerning Women in LCSH, 1975–1991." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 37 (April 1993): 181–96.

Weinberg, Bella Hass, ed. *Cataloging Heresy: Challenging the Standard Bibliographic Product: Proceedings of the Congress for Librarians*, February 18, 1991, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York, with Additional Contributed Papers. Medford, NJ: Learned Information, 1992.

West, Celeste, and Elizabeth Katz, eds. *Revolting Librarians*. San Francisco: Booklegger, 1972. https://archive.org/details/revoltinglibrari0000west_z0o8/mode/2up.