

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$- "#)* /60&! "#\$%&' (!)*+&' , (-!. !"/0!23. 2!

Library, archive, and museum (LAM) professionals are idiosyncratic demographics with a diverse need to perform complex tasks. Their tasks are becoming more complex as a result of collaborations that lead to overlaps in information science and cultural heritage concentrations due to organizational changes and technological advances (Edwards, 2003). The merging of skills and resources allows professionals to transcend the traditional boundaries of well-established library and information science (LIS) concentrations to allow forward thinking application of collaborative models. This collaboration extends access to a more diverse group of users than in the traditional sense (Falls, 2009).

As noted above, libraries, archives, and museums are three distinctive cultures; nonetheless, the boundaries between them are being slowly blurred due to the use of integrated access systems. Because of their divergent cultures, LAM collaborations must be aware of varying levels of technology that hold the potential to enhance user experience when implemented across disciplines.

Each institution offers a unique experience to a defined set of users; however, a collaborative effort on the part of the LAM will provide open access to a wider range of records. It is because of this that the traditional OPAC may fail to fulfill the needs of a LAM collaboration wishing to offer greater exposure to library materials, refined access, and simpler discovery methods. This is where integrated access systems and specialized interfaces have the potential to come into play (Deng, 2010).

Collaboration makes it possible for institutions to take advantage of profit 0.2 (o c) 0.2 ionio

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-./0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$-"#)*60&!"#\$%&' (!)*!+&' , (-!.!"/0!23. 2!

populations of libraries, archives, and museums to improve their chances of learning their associated community's languages and practices, establish common interests, and serve a greater good to the community.

Zorich, Waibel and Erway (2008) discuss the inevitability of the convergence of LAM collaborations due to their organizational commonalities. The authors offer an interesting view into the collaborative environment, which allows the viewer to deduce that collaborative efforts serve as a catalyst which will allow long-term projects of greater importance to be developed and released to a more diverse audience (p. 18). Recent studies reveal that the overwhelming goal of collaborative activity is preservation. This goal is followed by joint storage of holdings, coordinated and joint exhibition, exchange of holdings, processing materials and other activities that when performed in a collaborative environment between LAM professionals and organizations might make them idyllic cohorts in joint ventures (Tanackoviæ & Badurina, 2008, p. 565). It is also important in these collaborations that libraries incorporate museum and archival pieces into their collections and/or exhibits to create a more customer-centric experience. Dilevko and Gottlieb (2011) suggest that museum-library partnerships allow libraries to include museum objects into library collections thus allowing them to offer their patrons an interdisciplinary learnirson

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$- "#)* /60&! "#\$%&' (!)*+&' , (-!. !"/01!23. 2!

disciplines. In keeping with this theme, Timms (2009) makes an argument for integrated access systems that will allow for the unification of traditional and electronic media while maintaining

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-./0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$-"#)*60&!"#%&' (!)*+&' , (-!.!"/01!23. 2!

copyright, and fair user as well as access and service of different formats. While librarians and archivists may be sensitive to these issues because of experienc

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$-"#)*60!"!#\$%&' (!)*!+&' , (-!.!"!/01!23. 2!

	Education Research Recreation			

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$-''#)*60&!''#\$%&' (!)*!+&' , (-!.!!/01!23. 2!

ways, the NLG program promotes collaboration through research on partnership activities and needs.

Moving forward, LAMs should continually work to seek opportunities to collaborate and cultivate relationships to enhance patron experience. Rodger, Jorgensen, and D'Elia (2011) offer statistical information regarding the driving forces and impact of partnerships and collaboration on the lifelong learning of patrons and to build upon their collective strengths to improve

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$- "#)* /60&! "#\$%&' (!)*+&' , (-!. !"/01!23. 2!

Allen, S. M. (2002). Nobody knows you're a dog (or library, or museum, or archive) on the Internet: The convergence of three cultures. *68th IFLA Council and General Conference*, 1-6.

Cedar-Face, M., & Hollens, D. (2004). A digital library to serve a region: The Bioregion and

!"#\$%&'()*+&,\$-."/0\$1%+&)2&3)4&56&.'7\$-''#)*60&!''#\$%&' (!)*!+&' , (-!.!'!/01!23. 2!

McInnes, S. (1998). Electronic records: The new archival frontier? *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 19(2), 211-220. doi:10.1080/00379819809514439

Raab, C. M., & Roth, E. J. (2001). Documenting New Paltz history: A case study in library-museum cooperation. *College and Undergraduate Libraries*, 8(2), 103-112. doi:10.1300/J106v08n02

Rinehart, R. (3AD). MOAC: A report on integrating museum and archive access in the Online Archive of California. *D-Lib Magazine*2, 9(1).

Rodger, E., Jorgensen, C., & D'Elia, G. (2011). Partnerships and collaboration among public libraries, public broadcast media , and museums: current context and future press stable. *The Library Quarterly*, 75(1), 42-66.

Tanackoviæ, S. F., & Badurina, B. (2008). Collaboration as a wave of future: exploring experiences from Croatian archives.