

A Study on the Differences in Archive Numbering Between Chinese and American Universities

Jing Xu

Wuhan Technical College of Communication, Wuhan, Hubei, China

Abstract: Archive numbering is a core identification system for the management of academic resources in universities, which directly affects the efficiency of resource retrieval, shelving and utilization. Due to differences in knowledge classification logic, management systems and technological application backgrounds, Chinese and American universities have formed distinctly different archive numbering rules. Taking China's Library Classification for Chinese Libraries (LCCL), archive numbering rules and America's Library of Congress Classification (LCC), university archive numbering systems as the research objects, this paper compares and analyzes their differences from four dimensions: compilation principles, structural systems, coding rules and application characteristics, explores the cultural, institutional and technological drivers behind these differences, and puts forward optimization ideas of integration and reference. It aims to provide a reference for the standardization and internationalization of university archive numbering systems.

Keywords: Universities; Archive Numbering; LCCL; LCC; Differences.

1. Introduction

As important resources for academic research and talent cultivation, university archives have standardized management as the core work of university libraries and archives. The numbering system, as the "identity mark" of libraries and archives, is the foundation for realizing orderly shelving, accurate retrieval and efficient utilization of resources. Its compilation logic and rule design directly reflect the concept of academic resource management of universities in a country. Rooted in the demand for unified and standardized management, China's university archive numbering system has formed a normative system centered on the LCCL and national archive numbering rules; based on the principles of individuation and practicality, American universities have formed a numbering mode with both unity and flexibility on the basis of the LCC[1].

With the acceleration of the internationalization of higher education, the exchange of academic resources between Chinese and American universities has become increasingly frequent, and the differences in numbering systems have become an important obstacle to resource sharing and cross-database retrieval. At present, there are many single studies on library classification or archive numbering rules in the academic circle, but systematic comparative studies on the archive numbering systems of Chinese and American universities are still relatively scarce. Based on this, by sorting out the core rules of archive numbering in Chinese and American universities, this paper compares and analyzes the essential differences and their formation reasons, and provides theoretical reference and practical ideas for improving China's university archive numbering system and enhancing the adaptability of international resource exchange.

2. Differences in Compilation Principles of University Archive Numbering Between China and America

Compilation principles are the core guidelines for the

design of numbering systems, which determine the structural logic and application direction of numbering. Both Chinese and American university archive numbering principles follow the basic requirements of uniqueness and scalability, but there are significant differences in core orientation and practical adaptability, forming a sharp contrast between "standardization and unification" and "flexibility and practicality".

2.1. Chinese Universities: Standardization First, with Hierarchy and Universality Considered

The archive numbering of Chinese universities strictly abides by the national unified standards and norms, with standardization and hierarchy as the core principles, and at the same time takes into account the universality of different universities and different types of resources.

Standardization principle: Library numbering takes the Library Classification for Chinese Libraries (5th Edition) as the sole core basis, and archive numbering strictly implements the Rules for Compilation of Archive Numbers (DA/T 13-2014). Universities across the country uniformly follow the same compilation norms without the right of independent adjustment, ensuring the consistency of resource identification across universities and regions[2].

Hierarchy principle: The numbering structure is highly matched with knowledge classification and archive management levels. Library numbering is subdivided layer by layer according to "major category - minor category - subheading", and archive numbering is developed step by step according to "fonds number - category code - class number - file number - item number". Each level of numbering corresponds to a clear management category, forming a clear hierarchical logic.

Universality principle: The numbering rules are adapted to various archive resources such as Chinese, Western, multi-volume and different carriers. The full coverage of special resources is realized through additional numbers (volume number, edition number, carrier code), ensuring that the same rules can be applied to the management of all academic

resources in universities.

2.2. American Universities: Practicality First, with Flexibility and Individualization Considered

The archive numbering of American universities takes practicality and flexibility as the core principles, with the basic framework. Universities can make personalized adjustments according to their own collection characteristics and management needs, forming a compilation mode of "unified framework + independent optimization".

Practicality principle: The numbering design directly serves the efficiency of collection shelving and retrieval. The category division and number length of the LCC are based on the actual collection distribution, avoiding number redundancy caused by excessive subdivision[3]. The core of archive numbering is "facilitating rapid access", simplifying the number identification of non-core management levels.

Flexibility principle: Universities can independently adjust the subdivision of subheadings and number length on the basis of the LCC. For example, the Stanford University LCC numbers with subject tags to achieve accurate identification of characteristic collections; archive numbering can increase or decrease levels independently according to the scale of the university and the type of archives, and small universities can simplify it to "class number - file number - item number".

Individualization principle: The numbering system is adapted to the disciplinary characteristics of universities. For example, science and engineering universities can refine the numbering of categories such as engineering technology and computer in the LCC, and liberal arts universities can strengthen the numbering distinction of history and literature categories. Archive numbering can design exclusive codes for the school's characteristic archives (such as school history archives and scientific research archives).

3. Core Differences in University Numbering Systems Between China and America

Numbering is the foundation of university resource management. Based on the LCCL and LCC respectively, Chinese and American universities have formed all-round differences from classification framework to coding rules, which are concentrated in three aspects: classification system, coding structure and shelving rules.

3.1. Classification System: Differences Between Knowledge Logic Orientation and Disciplinary Practicality Orientation

Chinese university classification takes the logic of knowledge system as the core, while American universities take the practical needs of disciplines as the core. The different underlying logics of category division lead to the fundamental differences in numbering systems.

China's LCCL: Five-level knowledge system with highly unified categories

The LCCL adopts a five-level knowledge classification system of "5 major divisions + 22 basic major categories". The 5 major divisions are Marxism-Leninism-Mao Zedong Thought, Philosophy, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Comprehensive Books. The 22 basic major categories are identified by Pinyin letters (A-Z). Each major category is

subdivided layer by layer according to "major category - minor category - subheading - detailed heading - subheading", forming a rigorous knowledge logic system. The category division is unified nationwide, and all universities have no right of independent adjustment, ensuring the consistency of knowledge classification. For example, the "Education" category is uniformly classified as Category G, and the "Literature" category as Category I[4].

America's LCC: 21 practical major categories with flexible category adjustment

Abandoning the strict division of knowledge systems, the LCC sets 21 basic major categories (identified by English letters A-Z, with I, O, W, X, Y unused) according to the collection and teaching research needs of North American universities. The category division is centered on "disciplinary practicality", and the same academic field can be set across major categories. For example, the history category is divided into C (Auxiliary Historical Sciences), D (World History), E-F (American History), and the social science category into J (Political Science), K (Law), L (Education). Universities can flexibly adjust the categories according to their own disciplinary characteristics. For example, science and engineering universities can refine the subheadings of Category T (Engineering Technology), and liberal arts universities can strengthen the division of Category P (Linguistics and Literature).

3.2. Coding Structure: Differences Between Fixed "Letter + Number" Structure and Flexible Combined Structure

Both Chinese and American university numbering adopt the mixed coding mode of "letter + number", but there are significant differences in structural composition, coding rules and additional number design, reflecting different ideas of "fixed norms" and "flexible adaptation".

Chinese Universities: Fixed three-stage structure with unified coding rules

The book call number of Chinese universities is a fixed three-stage structure of classification number + book sequence number + additional number. All types of books follow the same coding rules without the right of independent adjustment.

Classification number: Adopting the "Pinyin letter + Arabic numeral decimal system", the letter identifies the major category, and the number subdivides the minor category according to the decimal system. For example, the classification number of Marketing is F713.50, where F is the economic major category, 713 is the trade economy subheading, and 50 is the marketing detailed heading;

Book sequence number: A two-choice mode, either the author number of the author's Pinyin initials plus 3 digits, or the book order number arranged according to the accession order, used to distinguish different books in the same category;

Additional number: Added as needed, the volume number is marked with "V. number" and the edition number with "(number)". The additional number of the multi-volume General History of China is V.1-V.10.

Although the author number compilation of Western books refers to the Cutter Sanborn Three-figure Author Table, the overall structure still follows the three-stage norm, and the classification number is still compiled according to the LCCL. For example, the classification number of Microeconomics is F016.

American Universities: Flexible multi-stage structure with

adaptive coding rules

The book call number of American universities is a flexible multi-stage structure of subject classification number + author identification number + publication information number. Universities can adjust the structure and number length according to the book type. The core classification number follows the LCC rules, and the auxiliary number is designed independently.

Subject classification number: Adopting the "English letter + Arabic numeral arithmetic system", the letter identifies the major category/subheading, and the number progresses according to the arithmetic system, which can be subdivided with a decimal point. For example, the classification number of Study Methods for University Students is LB2395, where L is the education major category and B2395 is the subheading of learning methods in higher education;

Author identification number: Adopting the Cutter number of the author's last name initial plus numbers, such as the identification number of the author Coman is .C65, used to distinguish different authors in the same subject category;

Publication information number: Added as needed, usually the publication year, such as 1991. Some universities can add edition numbers and volume numbers to flexibly adapt to different book types.

This structure can adjust the number length according to the book thickness and collection importance. Core books can add subdivided numbers, and ordinary books can simplify the coding.

3.3. Shelving Rules: Differences Between Fixed Order with Classification Number Priority and Flexible Order with Subject Priority

Shelving rules are the direct application of the numbering system. Due to different coding structures, Chinese and American universities have formed different shelving logics, which directly affect the efficiency of book access.

Chinese Universities: Fixed shelving order of letters first then decimal system

Shelving takes the classification number as the core, arranging major categories in Pinyin alphabetical order first, then arranging numbers in the decimal system within the same major category. If the classification numbers are the same, the book sequence number and additional number are arranged in turn. For example, I565.44/50 (The Hunchback of Notre-Dame) is placed before I565.44/51, and V.1 before V.2 under the same book sequence number. The shelving order is unified nationwide, and librarians of any university can locate books quickly.

American Universities: Flexible shelving order of subject first then author

Shelving takes the subject classification number as the core, arranging major categories/subheadings in English alphabetical order first, then arranging author identification numbers under the same subject. If the author identification numbers are the same, the publication years are arranged. For example, LB2395.C65 1991 is placed before LB2395.C66 1992. Universities can adjust the shelving priority for characteristic collections. For example, rare books can take the publication year as the priority shelving basis, and out-of-print books can add exclusive identification numbers and be shelved separately.

3.4. Coding Consistency: Absolute National Unification vs Relative Regional Unification

China's university library numbering follows national unified standards, achieving absolute consistency nationwide. The classification number and call number of the same book are exactly the same in different universities, and no adaptation is needed for cross-school retrieval; American university library numbering takes the LCC as the basic framework, achieving relative unification in North America. The core subject classification number of the same book is consistent, but the author identification number and publication information number can be designed independently by universities, and adaptation to the additional coding rules of each university is required for cross-school retrieval.

4. Core Differences in University Archive Numbering Systems Between China and America

Archive numbering is the core identification for the physical management and digital retrieval of university archives. Based on national unified archive number rules and independent university compilation rules respectively, Chinese and American universities have formed significant differences from numbering framework to coding logic, which are concentrated in three aspects: numbering levels, coding rules and carrier adaptation.

4.1. Numbering Levels: National Unified Seven-level Framework vs University Independent Flexible Framework

China's university archive numbering follows the national unified seven-level hierarchical framework, while American universities adopt an independently designed flexible hierarchical framework. The differences in hierarchical division reflect different orientations of "full-element management" and "core-element management".

Chinese Universities: Seven-level full-element hierarchy with national unified norms

According to the Rules for Compilation of Archive Numbers (DA/T 13-2014), the archive number of Chinese universities is a seven-level framework of fonds number - category code - secondary class number - tertiary class number - year - retention period code - file number/item number. Some universities can simplify it according to the archive type, but the core levels (fonds number - category code - file number/item number) cannot be missing.

Fonds number: A unique code assigned by the archive to the archival unit, adopting letters plus 4 digits, such as J019, which is the core identification of university archives;

Category code: Identifying the major archive categories with 2 letters, such as WS for documentary archives, KJ for scientific and technological archives, RS for personnel archives;

Subsequent levels: Subdivided step by step according to "class - year - retention period - file - item". Each archive has a unique seven-level number. For example, J019-KU·01·2017-001-001 is the 1st item of the 1st volume of accounting voucher archives in 2017.

The seven-level framework covers all elements of archive management, ensuring that the source, type, time and

retention status of each archive can be directly identified through the number.

American Universities: Flexible core hierarchy with independent university expansion

There is no national unified archive number standard in American universities. Taking source classification number - subject code - file/item number as the core hierarchy, each university can independently expand or simplify it according to the archive scale and type. The core principle is "facilitating rapid access and traceability".

Source classification number: Centered on the internal department code/archive forming institution code of the university, such as AD for the President's Office and AC for the Academic Affairs Office, directly identifying the archive source;

Subject code: Added as needed, identifying the archive subject with English letters/numbers, such as ED for educational management and RS for scientific research projects, without unified norms;

File/item number: Arabic numbers arranged according to the archive forming order, which is the only mandatory level to ensure the uniqueness of archives.

Small universities can simplify it to "source classification number + item number", such as AD001 for the 1st item of archives of the President's Office; large universities can expand it to "source classification number - subject code - year - file number - item number" to adapt to the management of massive archives.

4.2. Coding Rules: Letter and Number Combined Coding with Different Identification Logics

Both Chinese and American university archive numbering adopt the core coding mode of "letter + number", but there are significant differences in the identification logic and combination mode of letters and numbers, reflecting different ideas of "standardized identification" and "personalized identification".

Chinese Universities: Fixed code identification with unified combination rules

The letter and number codes of China's university archive numbering all have fixed meanings stipulated by the state, and the combination mode follows the unified rule of "hierarchical separator + code". Separators such as "-" and "." are used to distinguish different levels without the space for independent design.

Letter codes: All are fixed-meaning category/class codes, such as WS=documentary archives, KJ=scientific and technological archives, JC=tax inspection. The same letter code has the same meaning in any university;

Number codes: Fonds number, file number and item number are sequential numbers, the year is a 4-digit Gregorian number, and the retention period code is "D + number" (D30=30 years);

Combination rules: The fonds number is connected with the category code by "-", the category code with the secondary class number by ".", and all subsequent levels by "-", such as C015-WY·TZGG·2019·D10-00001.

American Universities: Independent code identification with flexible combination rules

The letter and number codes of American university archive numbering have no national unified meanings and are defined independently by universities. There are no fixed norms for the combination mode, and separators can be used

or not according to management needs, reflecting a high degree of flexibility.

Letter codes: Mostly English abbreviations of the university's internal departments/subjects, such as AO=Administration Office, RS=Research Project. The same letter code can have different meanings in different universities;

Number codes: All are sequential numbers arranged according to the forming order. The year and retention period are added as needed without fixed coding rules;

Combination rules: Levels can be separated by "-" or "/", or combined directly. For example, AO-RS-001-2023 is the 1st item of scientific research project archives of the President's Office in 2023, or it can be simplified to AORS0012023.

4.3. Carrier Adaptation: Differences Between Unified Additional Code Adaptation and Independent Exclusive Number Adaptation

With the increase of new carrier archives such as electronic archives, audio-visual archives and physical archives, both Chinese and American universities have formed corresponding numbering adaptation schemes, but the adaptation ideas are different between "unified additional" and "independent exclusive".

Chinese Universities: Unified additional carrier codes integrated into the original framework

Chinese universities adopt the adaptation scheme of "basic number + carrier additional code" for new carrier archives. The carrier codes are uniformly stipulated by the state and directly integrated into the seven-level basic number framework without the need to design an independent numbering structure.

Audio-visual archives: Add exclusive category codes to the basic number, such as LY for audio archives and ZP for photo archives, with the number J019-LY·2019·Y-001;

Electronic archives: Add the electronic code "DZ" after the item number, such as C038-001-002-DZ;

Physical archives: Exclusive category code SW, with the number B168-SW·2015·Y-001.

The numbering structure and core rules of all carrier archives remain consistent, and only the carrier types are distinguished by additional codes, facilitating unified management and retrieval.

American Universities: Independently designed exclusive numbers independent of the paper framework

American universities adopt the scheme of independently designing exclusive numbering systems for new carrier archives, which are independent of the paper archive numbering framework. The numbering structure and coding rules are independently designed according to the carrier characteristics with stronger adaptability.

Electronic archives: Mostly adopt "electronic identification + source code + serial number", such as E-AO-001, where E is the electronic archive identification and AO is the President's Office;

Audio-visual archives: Numbered separately according to the carrier type, such as V-001 (video archives) and A-001 (audio archives), with subject codes added as needed;

Rare physical archives: Design exclusive collection numbers, such as R-001 (collection archives), which are shelved and managed separately.

This scheme can design targeted numbering according to

the management needs of different carriers, avoiding the restriction of the paper archive numbering framework on new carriers, but cross-carrier retrieval needs to adapt to different numbering systems.

5. Forming Drivers of Differences in University Archive Numbering Between China and America

The differences in the archive numbering systems of Chinese and American universities are not accidental, but the result of the joint action of multiple factors such as knowledge classification concepts, administrative management systems, technological application backgrounds and higher education development needs, and the concrete embodiment of the concepts of academic resource management under different cultural and institutional backgrounds.

5.1. Knowledge Classification Concepts: Differences Between Holistic Systematic Thinking and Individual Practical Thinking

China's knowledge classification concept is rooted in holistic systematic thinking, emphasizing the integrity, logic and unity of the knowledge system. It is believed that archive numbering should be a concrete identification of the knowledge system. Therefore, both the LCCL and archive numbering rules take the rigorous knowledge hierarchy and management hierarchy as the core, and the numbering structure is highly consistent with knowledge classification and archive management, ensuring the systematicness of the numbering system.

America's knowledge classification concept is rooted in individual practical thinking, emphasizing the applicability and individuation of knowledge. It is believed that the core value of archive numbering is to serve practical utilization rather than simply reflect the knowledge system. Therefore, both the LCC and American university archive numbering rules take collection needs and retrieval efficiency as the core. The category division and numbering structure abandon excessive systematic norms and focus on flexible adaptation and personalized adjustment.

5.2. Administrative Management Systems: Differences Between Centralized Management and Decentralized Management

China implements a centralized administrative management system for education and culture. The National Library of China and the National Archives Administration of China uniformly formulate national standards for library classification and archive numbering. As executive units, universities have no right of independent adjustment, ensuring national standard unification and facilitating the integration and sharing of resources across regions and universities.

America implements a decentralized administrative management system for education. The federal government has no unified management standards for education and culture. The LCC is only a reference framework for North American universities, and there are no national norms for archive numbering. Universities have sufficient independent management rights and can design numbering systems

according to their own needs, reflecting the management characteristics of "local autonomy and university self-governance" [5].

5.3. Technological Application Background: Differences Between Unified Digital Platforms and Decentralized Personalized Platforms

The digitalization process of university archive management in China is led by the state, forming a national unified digital management platform and data interface standard. The standardization of the numbering system is the foundation for realizing national data sharing. Therefore, fixed and unified numbering rules have become an inevitable requirement for technological application.

The digitalization process of university archive management in America is promoted independently by universities. Each university adopts different personalized digital management platforms without a unified data interface standard. The flexibility of the numbering system is the foundation for adapting to different platforms. Therefore, flexible and independent numbering rules are more in line with technological application needs. For example, the subject tag numbering of the Stanford University Library can be directly adapted to its independently developed "Stanford University Catalog" system.

5.4. Higher Education Development Needs: Differences Between Unified Talent Cultivation and Individualized Disciplinary Construction

China's higher education takes unified talent cultivation as the core. The disciplinary settings and curriculum systems of universities across the country are highly consistent. The standardization of archive numbering adapts to the unified teaching and research needs, ensuring that teachers and students of different universities can quickly adapt to cross-school resource utilization.

America's higher education takes individualized disciplinary construction as the core. There are significant differences in the disciplinary characteristics and research directions of each university. Ivy League universities focus on liberal arts and basic disciplines, while state universities focus on science, engineering and applied disciplines. The flexibility of the numbering system adapts to the needs of individualized disciplinary construction. Universities can improve the efficiency of resource management and utilization by refining the numbering of characteristic disciplines and simplifying the numbering of non-core disciplines.

6. Integration, Reference and Optimization Ideas of University Archive Numbering Systems Between China and America

The archive numbering systems of Chinese and American universities have their own advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of China's system lie in high standardization, strong cross-school sharing and unified management norms, and the disadvantages are insufficient flexibility and weak adaptability to characteristic collections; the advantages of America's system lie in strong practicality, high flexibility

and good adaptability to personalized needs, and the disadvantages are low standardization, weak cross-school sharing and disunified management norms. Under the background of the internationalization of higher education and the digitalization of academic resources, the integration and reference of the two are an inevitable trend for the optimization of university archive numbering systems. Combined with the actual needs of Chinese universities, the following optimization ideas are put forward:

6.1. Adhere to the Core of Standardization and Appropriately Increase the Flexibility of Rules

Taking national unified standards as the core, retain the basic framework and core coding of the LCCL and archive numbering rules to ensure national standardization and sharing; at the same time, appropriately delegate the adjustment right, allowing universities to make independent adjustments in non-core links such as subheading subdivision, additional number design and book sequence number compilation. For example, allow science and engineering universities to refine the numbering of subheadings such as Category T (Engineering Technology) and Category TP (Computer Technology) in the LCCL, and allow liberal arts universities to optimize the compilation method of book sequence numbers in Category I (Literature) and Category K (History) to adapt to the disciplinary characteristics of universities.

6.2. Optimize the Coding Structure to Adapt to New Resources and Carriers

On the basis of retaining the fixed core structure, optimize the flexible adaptability of the coding structure. For new resources and carriers such as e-books, audio-visual archives, physical archives and characteristic collections, design a unified optional expansion level instead of a single additional code. For example, add an optional "characteristic collection code" level to the book call number to identify school history rare books and donated books; add an optional "carrier type code" level to the archive number to distinguish different carriers such as electronic, audio-visual and physical, which not only maintains the unity of core rules but also improves the adaptability to new resources.

6.3. Integrate the LCC Classification Ideas and Improve the Disciplinary Practical Categories

Drawing on the "disciplinary practicality orientation" idea of the LCC, optimize the category division of the LCCL to make up for its deficiency of overemphasizing knowledge logic and ignoring disciplinary practical needs. For example, add exclusive subheadings for emerging interdisciplinary disciplines (such as digital economy and artificial intelligence education) in the LCCL to avoid the dispersion of interdisciplinary books in different major categories; simplify the numbering levels of non-core categories for the high-frequency needs of university teaching and research, shorten the coding length, and improve the efficiency of retrieval and shelving.

6.4. Construct a Cross-system Adaptation Mechanism to Enhance the Ability of International Resource Exchange

Establish a comparative conversion mechanism between the LCCL and the LCC, compile a unified comparative conversion table to realize the two-way rapid conversion of library classification numbers between Chinese and American universities; for archive numbering, design international core metadata identification, adapt the core numbers such as fonds number, category code and file number to the source classification number, subject code and item number of American universities, and break the international barriers of numbering systems. At the same time, embed the comparative conversion function in the digital management platform to realize one-click retrieval and utilization of cross-system resources.

6.5. Combine Technological Development to Promote the Digital Upgrading of Numbering Systems

Relying on big data, artificial intelligence and other technologies, promote the digital upgrading of the archive numbering system to realize the intelligent compilation, automatic adaptation and dynamic adjustment of coding. For example, develop an intelligent classification and coding system to automatically match classification numbers and numbers according to the content, subject and carrier of libraries and archives, reduce errors in manual compilation; establish a dynamic update mechanism of the numbering system to automatically add subheadings and coding for emerging disciplines and new resources without manual revision of standards, improving the timeliness and adaptability of the numbering system.

7. Conclusion

Due to differences in knowledge classification concepts, administrative management systems, technological application backgrounds and higher education development needs, the archive numbering systems of Chinese and American universities have formed a sharp contrast between "standardization, hierarchization and unification" and "practicality, flexibility and individuation". Centered on national unified standards, China's universities have formed a standardized and rigorous numbering system, which adapts to the national unified resource management and sharing needs; centered on independent practicality, American universities have formed a flexible and elastic numbering system, which adapts to the individualized disciplinary construction and collection management needs of each university.

The differences between the two are not a distinction between superiority and inferiority, but the concrete embodiment of the concepts of academic resource management under different backgrounds. Under the background of the internationalization of higher education and the digitalization of academic resources, the optimization of China's university archive numbering system should adhere to the principle of "taking standardization as the core, flexibility as the supplement, practicality as the orientation and digitalization as the support". On the basis of retaining the advantages of national unified standards, appropriately learn from the flexible adaptation ideas of the American system. Through increasing the flexibility of rules, optimizing

the coding structure, integrating practical classification ideas, constructing a cross-system adaptation mechanism and promoting digital upgrading, realize the balance between standardization and individuation, and the unification of standardization and practicality. Improve the international adaptability and resource management efficiency of the archive numbering system, and provide better support for university teaching, scientific research and international resource exchange.

Although this study systematically compares and analyzes the core differences and forming drivers of archive numbering between Chinese and American universities, there are still certain limitations, such as the lack of empirical research on the numbering systems of specific universities. In the follow-up, case empirical analysis can be carried out on different types of Chinese and American universities to further verify the application effect and optimization ideas of the numbering system, and provide more specific practical references for the improvement of university archive numbering systems.

References

- [1] National Archives Administration of the People's Republic of China. Rules for Compilation of Archive Numbers (DA/T 13-2014) [S]. Beijing: China Standards Press, 2014.
- [2] Editorial Board of Library Classification for Chinese Libraries. Library Classification for Chinese Libraries (5th Edition) [M]. Beijing: National Library of China Press, 2010.
- [3] Du J N. A Comparative Study on Library Classification for Chinese Libraries and Library of Congress Classification[J]. Library Work and Study, 2023(07):45-52.
- [4] Research on the Refined Physical Classification and Numbering Strategy of University Archives[J]. Archives Science Research, 2025(04):89-96.
- [5] Subrahmanyam B. Library of Congress Classification Numbers: Issues of Consistency and Their Implications for Union Catalogs[J]. Library Resources & Technical Services, 2020 (02): 112-120.