CONTENTS

New Editor Announced. Connie Dunlap

Measuring Reader Failure at the Catalogue. Carol A. Seymour and J. L. Schofield

Why Not Both? Leslie R. Morris

The U.C.L.A. Library Catalog Supplement. Roberta Nixon and Ray Bell

An Expansion of Library of Congress Classes PT2600-2688. Gerda Annemarie Jones and Elizabeth H. Weeks

A Prediction Equation Providing Some Objective Criteria for the Acquisition of Technical Reports by the College or University Library, Joan Ash, James Aldrich, and Bernard Hanes

Acquisitions of Out-of-Print Materials. Ernest R. Perez

Media Designations. Virginia Taylor

“Early Warning” Generic Medium Designations in Multimedia Catalogues. Peter R. Lewis

LC Card Order Experiment Conducted at University of Utah Marriott Library. E. Dale Cluff and Karen Anderson

Serials Cataloging: Successive Entry. Judith Proctor Cannan


Descriptive Cataloging Committee Report, July 1970/June 1972. Elizabeth L. Tate

RTSD Nominees—1973 Election

In the Mail

Reviews

ERIC/CLIS Abstracts
New Editor Announced

The first issue of *Library Resources & Technical Services* appeared in the winter of 1957, the new journal of the newly-formed Resources and Technical Services Division. Although a merger of two specialized publications, *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* and *Serial Slants*, *LRTS*, from the beginning, was intended to serve the Division as a whole by publishing papers on topics of interest to all of its sections. It serves as a forum for those of like interests and presents an opportunity for the exchange of ideas for those of related interests. For the first ten years of its existence *LRTS* was under the expert guidance of the beloved late Esther J. Piery.

Under Miss Piery's direction, *LRTS* became an outstanding professional journal. After her untimely death in 1967, Paul Dunkin became the chief editor and maintained the high standards of excellence. With Dr. Dunkin's retirement in 1971, editorship of the journal fell to the capable hands of Robert Wedgeworth briefly until he became ALA Executive Director. Each of the editors brought a special strength and a special expertise to *LRTS* but each retained the same high level of quality in the journal.

To find an editor to carry on in this tradition of excellence and to further the development of *LRTS* was the principal concern of the RTSD Board of Directors. A search committee was appointed and the name of Wesley Simonton was presented to the board at the Midwinter Meeting in Washington, D.C. Unanimous and enthusiastic approval was received.

Dr. Simonton is a professor at the Library School, University of Minnesota. He has long been active in Division affairs and has served both as chairman, Cataloging and Classification Section and as president of the Division for two terms. The board looks forward to the continued success of *LRTS* under his able direction.

A new assistant to the editor has also been appointed. She is Miss Helen Schmierer of the University of Chicago.

---
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Measuring Reader Failure at the Catalogue

CAROL A. SEYMOUR
and
J. L. SCOFIELD
Library Management Research Unit
Cambridge University
Cambridge, England

In an effort to develop a simple method for librarians to employ to measure and evaluate author catalogue use, the Library Management Research Unit tested a survey design in four varying libraries. The reader was asked to note details of items not found in the catalogue, the source of the reference, and his status. The items were then checked by library staff to discover the cause of "failure." Library staff interviewed samples of catalogue users to determine the overall rate of "failure," the cooperation (with "Catalogue Query Slips") rate, and the action readers proposed to take in order to obtain the item(s) not found in the catalogue.

Introduction

PART OF THE BRIEF of the Library Management Research Unit (LMRU) has been to study users' problems and ways in which knowledge of these problems can be transmitted to the librarian.* One problem is the nonavailability of known items, both at the shelf and in the catalogue, when a reader comes to look for them. We have termed this nonavailability "failure"—failure by the reader to obtain the item desired. This does not by any means imply that the reader is always at fault, that he "failed" because he did not look in the right place on the shelf or because he did not use his intelligence or his energy in searching the catalogue (although these faults are sometimes present). There are many other possible reasons for failure, or nonavailability, such as the book being on loan or at the bindery, the reader having been given an inaccurate reference, the library not owning the book, etc.

Many surveys have shown that the reader's approach to finding a desired book more often than not consists of looking on the shelf first,

* The unit is supported by a grant from the Office for Scientific and Technical Information, Department of Education and Science.

Manuscript received Sept. 1972; manuscript accepted for publication Dec. 1, 1972.
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then, sometimes, consulting the catalogue. This pattern emerged in the survey of undergraduate library use carried out by the LMRU in twenty-one university libraries (unpublished).

In known-book searches, an average of 39 percent consulted the catalogue first, while 50 percent went straight to the shelves. (Two of the universities proved exceptions to this pattern, with 81 percent and 88 percent consulting the catalogue first, and 9 percent and 12 percent, respectively, going to the shelves.) Another survey, at Southampton University Library, showed that, in known-book searches, 87 percent looked in the author catalogue first, while 52 percent used it only if they "could not find the book easily elsewhere." A Birmingham University Library survey found that, of 128 failures to find specific books, 16 percent of the readers had looked in the catalogue, and 78 percent had looked only on the shelves. With these figures in mind it is evident that while the proportions of those failing in shelf failure and in catalogue failure surveys may be similar (as they were in the Cambridge University Library: 27 percent and 25 percent respectively), the actual numbers of readers experiencing catalogue failure will generally be much smaller than those experiencing failure at the shelves. The unit has studied the problems of failure at the shelf and failure at the catalogue separately. The results of our studies on shelf failure can be found elsewhere. We concentrate here on our investigations of failure at the catalogue.

Among the many studies of catalogue use, few have concentrated on failure at the catalogue. Most research has centred on how often the reader uses the catalogue, with what information he approaches it, and what characteristics he remembers most about a book when he is attempting to find it again; these studies are carried out with a view of improving the catalogue. In the Birmingham survey already mentioned, readers were asked, in addition to the questions above, what action they intended to take after failing to find the item they had been looking for.

The Catalog Use Committee of the American Library Association’s Reference Services Division also carried out some studies, in twelve university and eleven public libraries. Reference librarians were asked to fill in a form for any catalogue query they dealt with over a three-month period, checking off the “Type of Difficulty” and “Probable Cause.” Difficulties encountered by patrons included lack of entry (for a book which was, nevertheless, in the library) (5.2 percent), lack of cross references (15.4 percent), and confusion about filing arrangements (15.2 percent); probable causes cited, included Library of Congress cataloguing (14.9 percent), local policy (20.7 percent), and clerical errors (10.4 percent).

A recent catalogue use study at Yale University was undertaken as part of a project on computerizing the catalogue. The researchers wanted information on how readers used the catalogue, in order to determine “how to design the computerized catalog to do its job most efficiently.”
Figure I
Catalogue Query Slip

Recto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalogue Query Slip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please fill in this slip if you cannot find what you are looking for in the Catalogue. Use a SEPARATE slip for each item not found in the Catalogue. Underline all names and words which you checked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR or other person or organisation responsible (if known):</th>
<th>TITLE, date, other information about the book, periodical, etc. (if known):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE(S) of this reference:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/Periodical article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague/Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity media/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookshops/etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOUR STATUS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third/fourth year undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and Research Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-resident MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If this query originated in the Supplementary Catalogue please tick here:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verso

FOR LIBRARY USE ONLY

- Main Catalogue
- Supplementary Catalogue
- Bibliography
- Not yet catalogued
- On order
- Not on order
- Author's name
- Surname
- Forename
- Corporate body
- Form heading
- Edition
- Insufficient information
- Not in Catalogue
- Other

Note—"Other" at the bottom of the right-hand column (verso) was divided at the time of analysis into various specific categories such as "Title," "Series," "Wrong catalogue," "No apparent problem." On subsequent versions of the slip "Title" was listed separately.
They therefore carried out interviews—before and after a catalogue search—with over 2,000 catalogue users. Although some data gathered were on similar topics to those we were interested in, the method used—interviewing—would obviously be impractical for a librarian to employ himself.

Method

Our object in the survey (which covered Author/Name catalogues only) was two-fold.* First, we wanted to discover the size of the "catalogue failure" problem and the various reasons for it; second, we were attempting to develop a simple system for conveying this information to the librarian which would not be inordinately time-consuming for the staff. The survey designed comprised two parts. One part was the "Catalogue Query Slips" (Figure 1) which were distributed around the catalogue area, to be completed by the reader upon his failure to find a required known item in the catalogue. The sections "Source of reference" and "Status of reader" were modified to suit the various libraries in which the survey took place.

The "Catalogue Query Slips" were collected daily, counted, and checked, first of all in the catalogue to see if the items noted had been overlooked by the readers. If not found there, the items were checked in national and subject bibliographies to establish positive identification. When a bibliographical record found was substantially different from the notation on the query slip (e.g. a major variation in the title) the item was rechecked in the catalogue. The final checks were in records of books on order and books received but not yet fully processed.

Brief interviews with a sample of users of the catalogue formed the second part of the survey. A member of the LMRU or a member of the library's staff carried out the interviews for two 30-minute periods per day. Observations of catalogue use prior to the start of the survey established times of peak use from which were chosen periods for interviewing (in order to make the best use of the interviewer's time). The purpose of the interviews was to provide a basis on which to judge the number and scope of the completed query slips received—e.g. What proportion of total failure recorded in the interviews did they represent? Were the proportions of each type of reader who filled in query slips similar to the proportions found by interviews to be failing? The interviews also gave a basic idea of how big the failure problem was, and provided information on what action was planned by those who had failed which might be of use in planning library services. Those interviewed were readers leaving the catalogue area who had been observed using the catalogue. (Whether or not they had been seen filling in a query slip was immaterial.) The following questions were asked:

* In England, most "Subject catalogues" are classified. In the "Author catalogues" along with the authors and some titles are included books about people and places, called "Names." There are not to be confused with entries in the "Subject catalogue."

—Ed.
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1. Did you find all the items you were looking for in the catalogue?
2. How many items were you looking for?
   [If yes in Question 1, go on to Question 6]
3. How many did you find?
4. Did you fill in a query slip at the catalogue for each item not found?
5. What further steps, if any, do you plan to take to obtain the item(s) you could not find?
6. What is your status in the university?

The survey was carried out in four libraries: Cambridge University Library, Leicester University Library, London University Institute of Education Library, and Bradford University Social Sciences Library. Cambridge University Library, a large copyright deposit library, is considered to be chiefly for research, although it is heavily used by undergraduates as well; there are many departmental and college libraries within the university, however, whose main function is to serve the needs of course work. The University of Leicester Library is medium-sized and caters for both course work and research. It is virtually the only library within the university. The Institute of Education Library, London University, although small, is the main research library in the field within the university. It is situated about ten minutes' walk from the main London University Library, Senate House. Bradford University Social Sciences Library is a small library catering to course work and limited research. The Bradford City Library, nearby, is fairly large and well-stocked.

The period of the survey was five weeks during the autumn term in Cambridge and Leicester University libraries, and seven weeks during the spring term in the Institute of Education Library, London, and Bradford Social Sciences Library.

Results

The response from readers (in terms of query slips returned) in the Institute of Education and Bradford Social Sciences Libraries was only 7 percent and 6 percent respectively of the total number of query slips (648) collected from all four libraries. Although admittedly these two libraries are smaller than the others, the interviews show that only 7 percent and 10 percent, respectively, of the readers who reported failing in those libraries were cooperating in the survey. Cooperation rates derived from interview data in the other libraries were 28 percent (Cambridge) and 16 percent (Leicester).

These cooperation figures may seem quite low. And, in fact they are much lower than cooperation rates recorded in our shelf failure surveys, e.g. 67 percent at Cambridge. There may be several reasons for this. As far as the difference between the two surveys is concerned the reason may be degree of expectation, or conversely, level of frustration. Going to the catalogue in the first instance, a reader does not know for certain that the book he wants is in the library. His expectations have no cause to be great, therefore his frustration at not finding the book cannot be
very great (irritation, maybe, but not frustration). But when a reader
goes to the shelf, he usually has prior knowledge that the book is in the
library and he can reasonably expect it to be on the shelf. He is conse-
quently more likely to experience frustration and disappointment when
it is not. To express this frustration—and perhaps to relieve it—he fills
in a “failure slip.”

Another reason we have postulated for the low cooperation rates on
the query slips is that if a reader has high expectations of finding his book
elsewhere immediately (e.g., at the Institute of Education, with the
main London University Library so close) or if he does not feel that the
book not found is vital to his work, he may not feel moved to partici-
pate in the survey. Often we found readers who felt that by filling in
a query slip they were asking the library staff for the book (even though
no names were requested and notices publicising the survey clearly stated
that it was merely a survey); so if the book was not important to them
they did not bother to fill in a query slip. Equally, of course, there
would be the readers who, because it was just a survey and not a guaran-
tee that the book would be produced for them, also did not bother to
fill in slips.

**Interviews**

Between one-quarter and one-third of the readers interviewed were
unable to find *everything* they had looked for (although they may have
found some of the items). Table 1 contains an outline of the responses
of readers in each of the four libraries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile of responses</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
<th>Inst. of Educ.</th>
<th>Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readers interviewed</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers not fully satisfied</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader failure rate</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readers filling in query slips</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader cooperation rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual items looked for</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual items not found</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item failure rate</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Query slips reported filled in</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item cooperation rate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated full item failure</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “reader failure rate” and “reader cooperation rate” describe the
extent of the survey in each library—what proportion of those using
the catalogues (“readers interviewed”) would have been eligible to take
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part in the survey ("readers not fully satisfied"), and then what proportion of the latter actually did participate. The "item failure rate" indicates the extent of failure at the Author Catalogue—how many of all the books looked for by all those interviewed were not found by them. The total number of items not found during the period of the survey, by all readers ("estimated full item failure") can be estimated by using the proportion of items not found for which interviewees reported filling in query slips ("item cooperation rate") and the actual number of query slips collected. (The latter figures appear in Tables 5a and 5b for Cambridge and Leicester Universities respectively, and in Table A, Appendix, for the other two libraries.)

The difference in numbers, noted in the Introduction, between "failures" at the shelf and "failures" at the catalogue can be illustrated here. The bottom line of Table 1 shows 2,085 estimated catalogue failures at Cambridge over the 5-week survey (which included one week of the vacation period). The shelf failure survey conducted a year earlier produced an estimate of 5,000 failures over the ten-week survey period (of which four weeks were vacation). Somewhat similar figures can be shown for Bradford, although the shelf failure survey was conducted in the Science Library (whereas the catalogue failure survey was carried out in the Social Sciences Library). Estimated item failures were over 15,000 at the shelf and 557 at the catalogue (over ten- and seven-week survey periods respectively).

Table 2 shows the varying proportions of failure by those in different status groups.

**TABLE 2**

INTerviews—Failure Rates of Some Different Types of Readers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status group of reader</th>
<th>Average failure rates of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates (all years)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-grad. course and research students</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that undergraduates seemed to experience a smaller proportion of failure than others is probably due not to any greater skill in using the catalogue, but rather to the types of books they looked for, which were more likely to be in the library. (Analysis of items noted on query slips showed that about half of the overall failure was due to the books *not* being in the library. See Tables 6a and 6b following, and Table A, Appendix.)

In Table 3 one can see what further steps readers planned in order to obtain the item(s) they needed. Percentages will not always total 100 percent because some readers mentioned several possible steps.
TABLE 3
INTERVIEWS—ACTION PLANNED AFTER FAILURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action planned after failure</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
<th>Inst. of Educ.</th>
<th>Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of readers failing</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recheck reference</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look on shelf</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%†</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask library staff</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask supervisor/colleague</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look in bibliography</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempt to purchase</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try another library</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try interlibrary loan</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended to library</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try to find substitute</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forget it</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Includes 13% who said they would look on the shelves of unprocessed books within each subject area.
* Includes 13% who said they would “reserve it.” In this library this means filling in a card for a book not found, whether in the catalogue or on the shelf.

The physical situation of the library surveyed is reflected by some of the answers to this question. In the Institute of Education Library (near the main university library), almost 40 percent of those failing said they would try to find their book in another library. Leicester University Library, with almost no departmental libraries in the system, had the lowest proportion of those who would try another library; and it also had the greatest proportion of those who would try to get the book through interlibrary loan. Not a large percentage of those who failed in three of the libraries were planning to buy the book. Readers in the Institute of Education Library seemed more anxious than the others to obtain the books they could not find in the library: 10 percent intended to try to buy them, 35 percent were going to ask the staff, and only 11 percent were able to “forget” them.

In analysing readers’ intended actions to obtain desired items, the librarian will note areas of service which deserve scrutiny. For instance, at Cambridge the librarian may wonder why the interlibrary loan service was not considered more often. The Bradford Social Sciences librarian might investigate why none of the interviewees (who were predominantly undergraduates) intended to buy any of the books not found in the catalogue; perhaps it was because they expected to find them at another library. In all the libraries the possibilities of substitutability might be explored with the teaching staff. And the reasons why so many were prepared to look no further for the items not found would also prove in-
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teresting. (Was it because they really did not need the book but were just looking “in case?” Was it because it would not be useful if they could not have it at that moment? Or were they unaware of other possible sources?)

Query Slips

The first thing one wants to know about the query slips to be analysed is whether or not they are representative of all catalogue users. Table 4 is a comparison of proportions of the various “status,” or type-of-reader, groups participating in the survey, comparing those who were interviewed with those who filled in query slips. In most cases the proportions are similar, leading one to assume that, given a reasonable number of completed query slips, they will be representative of the total population of catalogue users (of which the interviewing was intended to produce a representative sample). A very small number of query slips, however, could not be relied on to be representative. For example, both the London University Institute of Education Library and the Bradford Social Sciences Library returned small numbers of slips; but while in the former, the status group proportions in interviews and query slips were quite similar, in the latter they were not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status groups of readers</th>
<th>Percentages of participation at each university</th>
<th>Cambridge</th>
<th>Leicester</th>
<th>Institute of Education</th>
<th>Bradford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-grad. course and research</td>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>446</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of query slips</td>
<td>as a proportion of number of interviews</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many correlations which could be made from the information presented by analysis of the query slips filled in by readers. Such questions as the following are answered by the tables presented:

- Where did different sorts of readers get their references?
- Where were the titles from the various sources of reference located (by subsequent staff searches)?
- Of the titles found to be in the catalogue, what were the readers’ appar-
ent problems in finding them, and where did the references they used come from?

- Was one type of reader more prone than others to a certain type of “failure?”
- What were the dates and places of publication of titles not found by readers?
- How much staff time was involved in identifying and locating titles given on query slips?

Since the total numbers of query slips returned in both the Institute of Education, London, and the Bradford Social Sciences Libraries were small, it is improbable that results of analyses would be significant. Therefore we have concentrated in the following tables on the results from Cambridge and Leicester University libraries. Tables A and B

### Table 5a

**Query Slips—Status of Reader/Source of Reference**

**Cambridge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Lecturer/Supervisor</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
<th>Book/Periodical</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Separate Bibliography</th>
<th>Colleague/Friend</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
<th>Publicity/Bookshops</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Totals of Slips</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year undergraduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year undergraduate</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/4th year undergraduate</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated student*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'B.A.' (chiefly research students)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'M.A.' (chiefly academic staff)*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N.B. In some cases a reader indicated that his reference came from not one but two or three sources. Each source has been counted separately in the "source of reference" columns, but only once in the totals of the "status of reader" rows, so as not to distort these totals. For example, in the second row, the raw total is 82; but since 5 of the second year undergraduates gave two sources of reference for one item and two gave three sources, the total of 82 is 9 (5 × 1 extras + 2 × 2 extras) more than the actual number of second year undergraduates filling in slips, which was, as given, 73.*

* At Cambridge, "affiliated students" are those originally from other universities who are reading for undergraduate degrees, and "M.A.'s" are, for the purposes of the library, graduate members of the university over twenty-five years of age. These include some research students and all academic staff.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tutor/Supervisor</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
<th>Book/Periodical Article</th>
<th>Separate Bibliography</th>
<th>Colleague/Friend</th>
<th>Reviews/Bookshops</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(2 sources given)</th>
<th>(3 sources given)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st year undergrad.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year undergrad.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd/4th yr. undergrad.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-grad. dipl. stud.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External reader</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff/Research fellow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

showing the two main subjects of analysis—"sources of reference," and "results of the subsequent searches by staff members"—are given for both of the smaller libraries in the Appendix. In all cases, percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

The greatest proportion of overall reader failure was on references from lecturers or supervisors. This is an area in which the librarian could possibly initiate some improvement, such as by persuading lecturers to be more careful when giving references—both more accurate and more certain that the books are in the library. With the next most common source of reference—book or periodical article—(these would be references copied by the reader) a different approach, perhaps educating the readers about citations, would be necessary. Not surprisingly it is evident that undergraduates had received most of their references from lecturers/supervisors, while research students and teaching staff relied chiefly on books/periodical articles and other bibliographies.

At Leicester University Library references received from lecturers and supervisors totalled a smaller proportion than those garnered from books and periodicals—this in spite of the fact that the proportion of undergraduates among respondents was much higher in this library than in Cambridge. Altogether 54 percent of the references were directly or indirectly the responsibility of the academic staff; again, the librarian would be able to point this out to them when requesting cooperation, especially, here, in making sure the book is in the library before assigning it. (Table 6b will show that about one-half of the titles attributed to references from academic staff were not in the Leicester University Library.)

- 16 -
**TABLE 6a**

**QUERY SLIPS—RESULTS OF STAFF SEARCH/SOURCE OF REFERENCE**

**CAMBRIDGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Lecturer/Supervisor</th>
<th>Supervisor List</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
<th>Book/Per. Article</th>
<th>Separate Bibliography</th>
<th>Colleague/Reviews</th>
<th>Publicity/Bookshops</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(p sources given)</th>
<th>(s sources given)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Staff Search</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In catalogue</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Identified</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Not Identified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_N.B. “Remainder” includes all titles not held by the library._

In Cambridge over 40 percent of the books not found in the catalogue by readers were found by checkers to be in the library at the time, 26 percent being in the catalogue, and 16 percent in process. (Incidentally, of the 106 items which were in the catalogue at the time of failure, 46 were found easily by the staff members, but the rest required some

**TABLE 6b**

**QUERY SLIPS—RESULTS OF STAFF SEARCH/SOURCE OF REFERENCE**

**LEICESTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Tutor/Supervisor</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
<th>Book/Per. Article</th>
<th>Separate Bibliography</th>
<th>Colleague/Reviews</th>
<th>Publicity/Bookshops</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(p sources given)</th>
<th>(s sources given)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Results of Staff Search</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In catalogue</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process</td>
<td>(being recat.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(being recat.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On “Unprocessed” shelf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Identified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Not Identified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERCENT</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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detective work because of obscurities on the part of, variously, readers and catalogue. Apparent reader problems in finding these books are shown later, in Table 7a.) Only about one-third of the titles queried by readers which had been recommended by lecturers/supervisors, either personally or on reading lists, were in the catalogue.

Books which are awaiting cataloguing at Leicester University Library are placed on shelves marked “Unprocessed” within each subject area, so that they will be more readily available to the readers. Thirteen percent of the items queried during the survey were on these shelves.* However

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Lecturer/Supervisor</th>
<th>Reading List</th>
<th>Book/Periodical</th>
<th>Separate Bibliography</th>
<th>College/Institutional</th>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Bookshop</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>(3 sources given)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author’s surname</td>
<td>17 4 2 2 1 1 4 (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s forename(s)</td>
<td>4 1 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>8 1 2 1 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate body</td>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form heading</td>
<td>3 1 2 1 1 3 (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>4 2 1 1 (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9 4 7 2 1 4 2 (3) (1)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No apparent problem</td>
<td>10 4 4 1 1 3 2 3 (3)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>57 17 19 6 6 6 7 14 (10)</td>
<td>120*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>54 16 18 6 6 6 7 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This total is more than the 106 items found in the catalogue (Table 6a) because several query slips showed evidence of more than one point of confusion or misinformation on the part of the reader. Percentages given, however, are based on the actual total of items (106) rather than on the augmented total (120).

Readers in Leicester seemed to have less trouble with books which were in the library than with books which were not—nearly 70 percent of the titles they looked for were not in the library. Of these, almost half (47 out of 107) had been recommended by the academic staff.

In both libraries, authors’ surnames provided the biggest identifiable problem for readers looking in the catalogue (Tables 7a and 7b). Generally, the name was misspelled on the query slip, which meant that the reader had looked in the wrong place and had not tried any alternatives.

* This figure, and the proportion of only 13 percent, shown in Table 3, of interviewees who were planning to look on the “Unprocessed” shelves after failing to find a book in the catalogue, has led to a review of procedures for unprocessed books at Leicester.
(We asked readers to underline the words or names which they used in their catalogue searches. Not many did this, however, so we cannot be certain what approaches were used.) Errors on such names as Thompson/Thomson and Clarke/Clark were common. A large proportion of failure in each library on titles which were actually in the catalogue seemed due to lack of energy, because there was no other cause apparent; the title was in the catalogue where it should have been according to information given on the query slip. This was true of 24 percent of such titles in Cambridge and 40 percent in Leicester (6 percent and 2 percent, respectively, of the total failure recorded in each library).

“Other” problems (25 percent) include chiefly having looked in the wrong catalogue (the main catalogue at Cambridge does not contain entries for all items in the library), confusion with series; and failure to realise that an item was only a part of a journal or monograph rather than the whole of it.

**TABLE 7b**

**QUERY SLIPS—READER PROBLEMS/SOURCE OF REFERENCE**

*(BOOK IN CATALOGUE)*

**LEICESTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Reference</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Reader Problem in Finding Book in Catalogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Tutor/Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s surname</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author’s forename(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form heading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No apparent problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PERCENT             | 24        | 16              | 44           | 20                 | 4                   |                 |        |                    |       |                        |                      | 4      | 100 |

We carried out some further analyses of the slips from Cambridge University Library alone. First, we wanted to know whether any one group had a particular problem (e.g., whether more undergraduates than other types of reader could not find items in the catalogue, or were looking for books which, on the whole, were not in the library).

There was, in fact, little difference among the various types of readers in the proportions of queried items located in the catalogue, in process, etc. The breakdown of a particular group’s queried items averaged out to the following proportions: 30 percent were in the catalogue, 15 percent were in process, 2 percent were on order; of the 53 percent remaining, 46 percent were identified and 7 percent were not. Only two
notable exceptions to this pattern occurred among the individual groups. The first was among first year undergraduates, where the proportion of 50 percent of their failures found to be actually in the catalogue was much larger than the 30 percent average. This could have been due to inexperience in using the catalogue (or to the fact that the total number of first year undergraduates in the group was quite a lot smaller than the numbers in the other groups and therefore possibly not sufficient to be representative).

The second variation was among B.A.'s (research students) of whose queried titles only 15 percent were in the catalogue, while 72 percent of the items they were looking for were not in the library at all (the average was 53 percent), 59 percent having been positively identified. Since it has been shown (Table 5a) that this group gathered two-thirds of their references from published sources—books, periodical articles, or separate bibliographies—this preponderance of items not in the library may be due to the specialised nature of their needs.

We also analysed the Cambridge slips to see whether any particular type of reader made a particular mistake in using the catalogue (causing him to miss titles which were actually there). The results are shown in Table 8.

**Table 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Slips—Reader Problem/Status of Reader (Book in Catalogue)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMBRIDGE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Reader</th>
<th>1st year undergrad.</th>
<th>2nd year undergrad.</th>
<th>3rd/4th year undergrad.</th>
<th>Affiliated student</th>
<th>B.A. (Research stu.)</th>
<th>M.A. (Acad. stu.)</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author's surname</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author's forename(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate body</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form heading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient information</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No apparent problem</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 problems evident)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF OVERALL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF SLIPS (407)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The biggest problem for undergraduates appears to have been surnames; the only notable difficulty among research students or academic staff was that about one-third of the sixteen research students had trouble with titles. "Other" problems, again, were chiefly looking in the wrong catalogue and not realising the nature of the item desired.

Table 9 is given as an example of additional information which can be drawn from the query slips. We have analysed the dates of publication and countries of origin of titles not found by readers, in Cambridge University Library only.

**TABLE 9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of publication</th>
<th>Place of publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In catalogue</td>
<td>6 16 34 36 8 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process</td>
<td>70 20 8 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On order</td>
<td>50 13 13 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Identified</td>
<td>10 18 29 36 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Not Identified</td>
<td>23 3 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENT OF TOTAL</td>
<td>20 16 25 28 6 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NUMBER</td>
<td>81 66 100 112 24 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By checking this information the librarian may find areas in which the collection might be strengthened; for example, here books from North America accounted for 53 percent of the identified titles not held by the library. (Eighty-seven percent altogether were of foreign origin.) Bottlenecks in processing procedures might emerge as well, if, for instance, English and foreign language books were processed by different departments. Individual titles in demand would, of course, also be evident from the slips, as would general subject areas in demand.

The staff who checked the Leicester University Library query slips recorded the time they spent on (most of) the individual slips. Unfortunately no time was recorded for unsuccessful searches; however, one must assume that more time would be taken for an unsuccessful search than for the longest successful search (in this case, 3 minutes on average). Table 10 gives a general idea of how much staff time was involved in checking the query slips in a library of about 400,000 volumes. On an average of 2.6 minutes per slip, checking the 154 Leicester slips probably took about 6¼ hours.
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TABLE 10

QUERY SLIPS—TIME SPENT SEARCHING (MINUTES)

LEICESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of Search</th>
<th>Total Number of Slips</th>
<th>Slips with Time recorded</th>
<th>Total Time recorded</th>
<th>Average time spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In catalogue</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On “Unprocessed” shelf</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On order</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Identified</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>180.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Not identified</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(66.5) *</td>
<td>(3.5) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>340.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates, based on the recorded longest average search. Additional time, twenty-five hours, was spent in interviewing by the library staff, and the LMRU spent about three weeks analysing all of the results.

Conclusion

We believe that we have developed a simple system for conveying valuable information on reader behaviour and needs to the librarian. By asking direct questions in brief interviews, he collects data on the numbers and different types of readers who are not finding in the Author Catalogue the titles they require. He also learns the proportion of titles not found of all those looked for, which helps to put the failure into its proper context. And he records the planned future action of those failing. Such information shows him the extent of the reader’s exploitation of the library’s services and staff.

By analysing query slips filled in by readers failing, the librarian learns the categories of readers (among those who trouble to fill in the slips) having the least success at the catalogue. This information complements the data given by the interviews. The reasons for their failure, the sources of their references (which can sometimes be linked to reasons for failure), and the individual titles not found also become apparent. The librarian can, as well, discover gaps in the library’s collection from analysis of dates of publication and especially countries of origin of titles in demand.

Could the same type and quantity of information be gained from analyses of enquiries at the readers’ service desk and of readers’ book recommendation cards? Undoubtedly some of it could. Book recommendation cards already in use could be modified to provide the additional information asked for on a query slip. Conversely, query slips could be
used for recommendations, with the addition of a box to be ticked if
the reader wished the library to purchase the item in question and a
space for his name if he wished to be notified. But an analysis of en-
quiries at a services or reference desk requires that they must first be re-
corded, and reference/readers' service librarians are often too hard-
pressed to welcome such an additional burden. With the query slips, the
reader does the initial work. Also, of course, not everyone likes to ask
for help from a member of the library staff; some people would prefer
the anonymity of putting a slip in a box, right at the point of failure
(or, nonsatisfaction). The quantity of data gathered at the interviews
would not be expected from analysis of merely those queries which
reached an enquiry desk; nor would such analysis give any indication of
the numbers of catalogue users who were not failing, nor of those
queries which did not reach the enquiry desk.

Although the query-slip response from readers in the two smaller li-
braries was disappointing (in view of the fact that their failure rates
were no lower than those of the two larger libraries), we do not consider
that the survey itself was a failure. Certainly there were enough slips
collected from the two larger libraries to establish the usefulness of the
format as a vehicle for collecting worthwhile data in those libraries.
Possibly the existence of readily-available alternative sources of books
to the smaller libraries (in the one case the Senate House Library, Uni-
versity of London, and in the other, the Bradford City Library) less-
ened people's motivation for participating in the survey. In the case of
interviews, staff members in all four libraries were diligent in carrying
out their interviews, so we have been able to build up a reasonably re-
liable picture of catalogue use and failure at the catalogue from the in-
formation they provided.
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APPENDIX

TABLE A

QUERY SLIPS—SOURCES OF REFERENCE

LONDON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION LIBRARY
BRADFORD UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCES LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Reference</th>
<th>Institute of Education Library</th>
<th>Bradford Social Sciences Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number*</td>
<td>Percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Tutor/Supervisor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading list</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/Periodical article</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate bibliography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleague/Friend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity/Bookshops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Television/Radio</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58 (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* On some query slips more than one source of reference was given. The actual total of slips returned was 48.

TABLE B

QUERY SLIPS—RESULTS OF SEARCHERS BY STAFF

LONDON UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION LIBRARY
BRADFORD UNIVERSITY SOCIAL SCIENCES LIBRARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of Search</th>
<th>Institute of Education Library</th>
<th>Bradford Social Sciences Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In catalogue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On order</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Identified</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder-Note identified</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SLIPS</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In this library temporary cards are put into the catalogue for titles which are on order or in process.
Why Not Both?

Leslie R. Morris
Technical Services
Reed Library
State University of New York
Fredonia, New York

A semi-humorous article suggesting that libraries should have both a
dictionary catalog and a divided catalog. The author also suggests ad-
ditional card catalogs, such as a people catalog and a place catalog.

After reading a number of articles on the merits of
the divided card catalog versus the dictionary card catalog, I have
stumbled onto the supreme answer—why not both? In fact, why only
both? Why not offer the patron any number of access points including
the following: a dictionary catalog, a title catalog, an author catalog, a
subject catalog, a people catalog, a places catalog, and (for librarians
only) a corporate author catalog?

The Dictionary Catalog
All librarians are familiar with the advantages of the dictionary cat-
alog, including serendipity, so there is no reason to enumerate them. The
dictionary catalog has served us well for many years, ergo, every library
should have one.

The Title Catalog
Many libraries have an author-title catalog, but very few have the
simplest of all, the title catalog. Yours could be the first library with a
title catalog on your block. The title catalog is the one patrons really
want. In a project submitted to NSF (National Silly Foundation), we
were going to prove that the title catalog was the most used by the pa-
tron. Since the project was never funded (which proves that they are not
so silly), we did not bother.

The Author Catalog
The author catalog is useful to the patron. He thinks he knows the
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author, so why not let him try to find his book that way. We can laugh when he fails. “Keep the corporate authors out of the author catalog” is a slogan akin to “Keep the Arabs out of Israel.”

The Divided Catalog

On what mountain was the “Law of Author-Title Catalog, Subject Catalog Division” handed down? What is the relationship of authors to titles?

The Subject Catalog

The subject catalog is for subjects. Patrons do not understand how a person can be a subject, and neither do I. In one college library, which actually exists, the librarian despaired of teaching undergraduates that to write a paper on Walt Whitman they must search both the author-title catalog and the subject catalog. He therefore put the personal name subjects into the author-title catalog. Result: author-title-personal name-subject catalog and a subject catalog.

The People Catalog

Now we are getting to the good part. Another catalog that the patrons need is the people's name catalog. Patrons do not ask for a book about Roosevelt, Theodore, or a book by Roosevelt, Theodore, but a book on Roosevelt, Theodore. Therefore, we should have a catalog of people's names. Let the patron choose his own poison. (The patron does not usually ask for Roosevelt, Theodore either, but for T.R., Teddy Roosevelt, the Bull Mooser, Eleanor Roosevelt's cousin by marriage, etc., but that is a subject for another paper.)

The Places Catalog

“Write 500 words on Washington, D.C.” is a typical teacher's assignment. The student comes to the library, and he does not care whether the material is by Washington, D.C. as a corporate author, or is about Washington, D.C. as a subject. Give the patron what he needs.

The Corporate Author Catalog

The corporate author catalog should be kept in technical services away from the unwary patron. The patron should not be allowed to use this one without guidance.

The Thing Catalog

We have people and places so we need a thing catalog, but I have not figured out what goes into it.

Conclusion

The multiplicity of catalogs may seem like overkill, but the patron really is confused by the card catalog. The multiple access approach would either confuse him more, or give him better service. The multiple
access card catalog is expensive, but becomes less frightening if the card catalog is computer-based. The expense, in a computer-based catalog, is in getting the entries into the computer, not getting them out. The cumulative issues of a computer-based catalog would become expensive, but in an on-line system, multiplicity of access points costs almost nothing. A little extra coding, and the patron can have almost any access point which librarians are imaginative enough to offer.

The chart indicates which cards go where. A ☐ means that all cards of one kind are in both catalogs, e.g., all title cards are in the dictionary catalog. An X means that some cards may be in the other catalog, e.g., subject cards may be in the place catalog, but not necessarily. A blank means those cards are not in that catalog, e.g., title cards cannot be in the subject catalog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dictionary</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Places</th>
<th>Corporate Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Author</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an effort to speed materials to the user while allowing a maturation period in order to take full advantage of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, many libraries are making their newly-acquired materials available in a public area for circulation before cataloging. The U.C.L.A. library's scheme employs the use of an in-house IBM 360/20 computer to produce a weekly updated author and title listing of these materials; books are shelved and circulated by accession number until cataloging copy arrives.

Nearly all large research libraries are holding much of their current acquisitions by some method in order to maximize their return on national shared cataloging (N.P.A.C.). Member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (A.R.L.) have found that a maturation period of twelve to eighteen months will yield as high as 90 percent Library of Congress copy. The problem has been how to provide library users with access to newly-acquired material during the waiting period.

Since April 1969 the library at the University of California, Los Angeles (U.C.L.A.) has experimented with a computer-based system for covering this maturation period for current material. The books are physically available in an open stack area by accession number. A machine-produced campuswide record is issued on a weekly basis.

After three years the maturation collection has reached some 40,000 volumes with the main research library and eleven of twenty-two branch libraries participating. Books are added and withdrawn weekly. Material withdrawn from the older end of the collection is cataloged with or without Library of Congress copy, but up to 90 percent yield of LC copy is found. The books with computer-produced labels and machine-readable book cards are identified by an accession number preceded by...
an "X," and are circulated through the standard automated system used to circulate all material from the research library collection. The books are shelved in a public area. Two complete computer-produced author and title lists are made weekly for the central public catalog area, and one complete list is located near the collection. Superseded lists are distributed to other main points on the campus and to the libraries of other University of California campuses.

The books included are those for which LC cards can reasonably be expected, based on known Library of Congress cataloging priorities. Excluded from the collection are books published before 1966, added editions, government documents, books with doubtful entries or with unusual format. Unbound material goes into the collection with the exception of very flimsy pamphlets which are "pam-bound" within the library before inclusion.

The material for inclusion is screened through the Bibliographic Control Section of the Technical Services Department. Order slips accompanying books from the receiving point are compared with the books for correct and complete information. The slips are revised as necessary, languages determined, and a consecutive accession number assigned. Information keyed into the record includes accession number (which serves as call number), location, LC card number, International Standard Book Number, author, title, place, publisher, date, edition, series, volume number, and language.

Edited copy that is to be added to the "Catalog Supplement" is keyed on a CRT terminal which is on-line to the U.C.L.A. Campus Computing Network IBM 360 Model 91. This method of input offers several advantages over punched-card input: keying is done more rapidly as 400 characters can be keyed in one block; editing is easier because the entire record is displayed on the screen; the keyboard has upper-lower case characters; and corrections are greatly simplified. Once the data has been keyed and edited, a tape is produced from a disc where the data is stored for subsequent processing.

With the exception of the input procedures all processing is done on the U.C.L.A. library computer. This is a dedicated machine for processing located in the library's Systems Department. The computer is an IBM 360 Model 20 with a 600 line per minute printer, 4 tape drives, and 12k storage. All updating, format conversion, sorting, and printing of the "Catalog Supplement" are done on this machine.

The first step in processing the weekly input is a MARC format conversion program. The data is keyed free form using one-character codes to designate the field type. The format conversion program organizes this input and converts it to a University of California MARC II format. The U.C. MARC II format is merely an augmentation of the Library of Congress MARC II format and not an alteration of it. For example, the blanks in the leader contain such data as a campus code and record ID number. Any program used in processing the "Catalog Supplement"
ment" will operate on an LC MARC II record. The MARC II format was chosen for this project because it is being accepted as a national standard, eliminates the problems of fixed fields, and provides the capability of developing programs which will process our own data, as well as that received from the Library of Congress.

The data base is maintained in three separate files; a shelflist file, author file, and title file. The size of the file together with the large amount of time necessary to sort on a computer with low speed tape drives make it necessary to maintain three files and merge in the additions.

Sorting of the author and title files is accomplished by generating a sort key at the front of the record. This sort key is then utilized by a standard sort utility. The sort key is generated in such a way that some filing difficulties are resolved, although it is certainly not an approximation of library filing rules. All punctuation is removed in the sort key, all lower-case letters are translated to upper case, and initial articles are removed. These features of the sort key program have eliminated some of the most obvious filing problems, but many remain.

The original print format of the "Catalog Supplement" was a single column which was printed on 8½" x 11" paper. This made a more manageable size for the user. However, as the number of entries increased, the list became too large to handle easily. To overcome this problem the format was changed to double columnar which cut the number of pages by half. The resultant 14" x 11" print out is reduced on a Xerox Computer Forms Printer to 8½" x 11", which eliminates bursting, deleaving, and the problem of bad carbon copies. The lists are given a simple "therma-bind" binding and distributed from the library.

There are variations in processing procedures for the branch libraries. Self-cataloging branch libraries send only the record for keying. The books are shelved in the individual library. Book cards and labels are not required for all branches, but all do receive a separate weekly listing.

Books are only temporarily listed in the "Catalog Supplement," and are pulled from the shelves for full cataloging in the order they were originally received. Routine bibliographic searching is done, and LC or NUC copy is used if available. Once the books are cataloged, the call number replaces the accession number in the "Catalog Supplement"; the listing is deleted only when the catalog cards have been filed in the main card catalog.

User response has been good though gradual in coming. Some users scan the latest additions for material in their particular subject area as the books are added to the end of the collection each week. Initial staff reaction to the project was highly critical but constructive. Meetings among personnel from the Technical Services, Public Services, and Systems Departments have led to improvements in the project which have resulted in staff acceptance.
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The project, as it has from its inception, continues to be expanded or modified almost weekly. Participation of additional branch libraries, expansion of the project coverage to include all incoming acquisitions and a variety of products such as listing on 3” x 5” cards, as well as language and subject listings are possible.

This experiment has required the cooperation of the Technical Services, Circulation and Systems Departments supported by a special Technical Services Task Force. Great flexibility and particularly imaginative and successful programming efforts have contributed to the development of the project. The most important objective, providing users with records for and access to newly-acquired material, has been realized. In addition, the staff has been provided experience with machine-readable data bases and the library with the capability to participate in statewide University of California and national mechanization programs.

**SOUTH AFRICAN UNION CATALOG TO BE PUBLISHED ON MICROFICHE**

The State Library at Pretoria (South Africa) announces publication of the first national joint catalog based on ISBNs (International Standard Book Number) on microfiche, called Unicat.

The South African Joint Catalogue of Monographs commenced in 1941 and by 1971 had 151 member libraries that contributed an average of 26,000 catalog cards to represent new acquisitions per month. The catalog currently contains approximately 2½-million cards. Because the maintenance of such a large catalog is difficult and expensive and the information it contains is also only readily obtainable at one central point, the State Library decided to close the existing Joint Catalogue and starts a new printed catalog.

Member libraries supply ISBNs of new acquisitions or withdrawals. The code number of libraries and 5 ISBNs are fed into the computer. A cumulative microfiche catalog will be published quarterly in the form of a numerical list of ISBNs with the codes of holding libraries. Each fiche will contain 11,799 entries, and a reduction factor of 42x will be used. The last image on each fiche is an index of that fiche; from the fiche it can be learned which library holds a book required. It is anticipated that, as soon as the number of fiches becomes awkward to handle, a cumulation on microfilm will be compiled and a new series started on microfiche.

According to the State Library, the advantages of the published Unicat are that: differences in cataloging in individual libraries are eliminated, the unique book number identifies the book, the joint catalog with additions and withdrawals is always up-to-date, and information is cumulated quarterly and available to all libraries at a low cost.
An Expansion of Library of Congress Classes PT2600-2688

Gerda Annemarie Jones
German Section
Monographs Department
General Library
University of California
Riverside, California

Elizabeth H. Weeks
Monographs Department
General Library
University of California
Riverside, California

A brief description of the reasons for and methods employed in arriving at an expansion of the Library of Congress classes PT2600-2688.

Introduction

Riverside is one of the newer of the nine campuses of the University of California. It opened its doors for undergraduate instruction in letters and science in 1954, and its General Library's collection was started primarily as an undergraduate collection. In 1960, the regents of the university made the decision to expand Riverside to a general campus offering graduate work. Graduate instruction in German, beginning then, was extended to the doctoral level in 1967.

In support of this teaching and research program, the library surveyed its collection in German literature during the summer of 1968. There was evidence that the collection was not well rounded and not representative. (There seemed to be an especially serious gap in the field of medieval German literature.) This survey was accomplished by making a detailed analysis of the library's shelflist. As a result, an ambitious program of building a collection of German language and literature with special emphasis on the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries has been pursued.
The General Library had adopted the classification of the Library of Congress and was committed to accepting Library of Congress call numbers on a "no conflict" basis. It did not order cards from the Library of Congress Card Division. In classifying material falling in the PT 2600 and following classes, the need for an expansion of the Cutter numbers for authors was evident. The Library of Congress does not include these in its publication *L. C. Classification Additions and Changes*. For this reason, it was necessary to search either the Library of Congress author catalogs or the subject catalogs under such headings as "German drama," "German fiction," "German literature," and "German poetry" in order to determine the specific Cutter number used for a specific author.

In answer to this lack within the Library of Congress schedules, greatly expanded schedules were developed.* They cover German literature from 1860 to the present. This note is a brief description of the methods employed in arriving at the expansion of both PT2600-2659 (individual authors 1860/70-1960), and PT2660-2688 (individual authors 1961-- ) and a description of the auxiliary table used.

**Expansions**

The PT2600-2653 schedule was expanded by incorporating the names and dates of approximately 350 authors who were represented in our collection. Cutter numbers used by the Library of Congress were adopted. When no Cutter numbers were available for authors, they were established and recorded. The complete schedule was then retyped. Since August 1968 it has been necessary to add only approximately 140 new names or cross references to this section. We therefore feel that it is virtually complete for our purposes.

The PT2660-2688 schedule includes most post-World War II authors—approximately 1,360. In expanding this, we have applied the Library of Congress criteria of placing an author in the period of his maximum productivity, as expressed by his publication dates. Several authors were discovered who should have been classified here but had been placed in PT2600-2658, prior to the Library of Congress expansion as given in the *Additions and Changes to 1966* section of the 1966 reprint of the PT schedule. These we have covered with a reference from this expansion back to the place in the PT2660-2688 sequence. This eliminated the hazard of a split file. Numbers have been assigned for all German

---

* Since several classifiers who are acquainted with these expansions of the PT schedules have urged that we share them with others, and have expressed an interest in securing copies, we have written this note and offer copies of the schedules on a cost plus postage basis. The approximately 2,700 names and dates included could also serve as a selection and collection building tool. Address: German Section, Monographs Department, General Library, University of California, Riverside, CA 92507, P. O. Box 5900. $5.50 postpaid. Kindly prepay, making checks payable to "Regents of the University of California."
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authors whether or not they were represented in our collection, which explains the very large number of authors in this section. Room was left for expansion; and, as we find numbers assigned to new authors by the Library of Congress, our schedule is examined and annotated. If we have not included the author, he is fitted into the schedule.

**Auxiliary Table**

Within these German literature schedules, Gerhart Hauptmann and Hermann Sudermann are the only authors with individual classification numbers. Other voluminous authors—Brecht, Kafka, Mann, Rilke, etc.—are represented by two Cutter numbers. The first stands for the name of the author (example: 165 for Rilke). The second Cutter number is assigned A-Z, according to the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTED WORKS IN GERMAN (date mandatory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.xdate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLLECTED TRANSLATED WORKS (date optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.xA2-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA3-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA5-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xA7-Z4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xZ41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xZ42-Z47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xZ48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xZ49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.xZ5-99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is an adaption of Table IXa as outlined in the “Tables of Subdivisions for Individual Authors” in the Library of Congress PT schedule. The primary difference between the two tables is in the Z41-49 sequence. We consider manuscripts, letters, diaries, and autobiographies worthy of separate treatment. As such, these forms are not inserted into the Z5-Z99 range. They can be expanded decimally—Z42, Z421, Z423, etc.—or by adding the publication date to the call number. We do not use this expanded table for other literatures.

---
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A Prediction Equation Providing Some Objective Criteria for the Acquisition of Technical Reports by the College or University Library
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Regression techniques are used to define a method determining when and to what extent technical reports should be collected by college or university libraries. Data gathered from a questionnaire sent to ninety-four such libraries and from published sources was analyzed. The result was a formula which can be used to predict the number of technical reports a library should have at each point in its development.

Problem

THE OBJECT OF THIS STUDY is the formulation of a method by which a college or university librarian can objectively determine when and to what extent technical reports (TR's) should be collected. Data was gathered from a questionnaire and a number of published statistical sources for the purpose of finding answers to the following questions: Is library size alone a factor in the extent of technical report collecting? Is the college curriculum a factor? Is engineering enrollment a factor? What are other possible factors?

Background

Tables 1 through 5 describe some of the characteristics of the sixty libraries returning questionnaires. Volume and staff size were obtained from Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities and American Colleges and Universities.1 2 Table 1 includes data on volume size for libraries which did not answer as well as those that did. As may be seen
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the two groups of libraries roughly corresponded in size. The median size, above and below which fifty of the cases fall, is 459-thousand volumes. Staff size is reported in Table 2.

**TABLE 1**

**Size of Libraries Queried. Volumes Are Given in Thousands.**

A Total of Ninety-Four Libraries Were Queried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Answering</th>
<th>% of Total Libraries Answering</th>
<th>Not Answering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>950-1000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850-900</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750-800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650-700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550-600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350-400</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250-300</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

**Size of Professional Staff at Libraries Which Returned Questionnaires. Data Not Available in All Cases.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42-45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>99%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tables 3 through 5 describe curricula at the colleges and universities served by the libraries returning data. Table 3 shows how many have schools or departments of engineering, or science courses only. Table 4 gives the number of engineering graduate students and Table 5 shows the number of faculty engaged in separately budgeted research. These three particular measures of curricula were chosen mainly because very current data was available in *Engineering Education.* Most of the institutions (58 percent) have schools or "colleges" of engineering. The median number of graduate students at the masters level is ninety-eight and at the doctoral level forty-two. The median number of faculty investigators with extramural funding is ninety-six.

**Results**

A technical report was defined as a "near-print research or development report in science or technology which is not encumbered by securi-

### TABLE 3
**ENGINEERING CURRICULA AT SCHOOLS RETURNING QUESTIONNAIRES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricula</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Schools Answering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School or College of Engineering</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Engineering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Engineering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Depts.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
**ENGINEERING GRADUATE STUDENTS AT SCHOOLS QUERIED. DATA IS NOT GIVEN FOR ALL SIXTY SCHOOLS BECAUSE ONLY THIRTY-FOUR HAVE GRADUATE PROGRAMS. TWO OF THESE HAVE MASTERS BUT NO DOCTORAL PROGRAMS.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Masters Candidates</th>
<th>Doctoral Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Schools</td>
<td>% of Masters Candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-350</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ty restrictions." The questionnaire asked for the total number of reports held by the library which fit the definition and were published by any of the following: the U.S. Superintendent of Documents (GPO); States; Government agencies (i.e. AEC); Private firms (i.e. Rand); and College and university laboratories or research institutes. If a library noted that it acquired technical reports only at the request of a student or faculty member, the number was rarely indicated and the questionnaire therefore disregarded. Of the sixty returned questionnaires, twenty-three, or approximately 40 percent, were used in the actual analysis. Incomplete data was received from the others.

Table 6 (columns 2-13) tabulates information gathered from sources 1, 2, 3, and 4, about each of the twenty-three libraries. The twelve independent variables indicated in the column headings were chosen because these variables were thought to have some influence on the number of technical reports the library had collected. The category "number of researchers in engineering" indicates the number of persons, whether they be faculty or not, involved in research funded by sources from outside the college. Column 1 gives the number of TR's in each collection. (See Table 6.)

The data in Table 6 was analyzed to see whether or not a suitable regression formula could be devised. Four of the twelve variables turned out to be the best combination to predict the number of technical reports. These four variables were: the number of volumes in the library, the number of FTE engineering faculty, the number of doctoral candidates in engineering, and the number of engineering researchers. The pertinent multiple regression statistics are noted in Table 7. The multiple correlation coefficient was .77, indicating that a prediction from these four variables is sufficiently accurate to make decisions with since approximately 60 percent of the variance is explained. (See Table 7.)

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Researchers</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>% of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-550</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-350</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-250</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Number, 1973</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib. No. TR's</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Library Op.</td>
<td>527,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expend. on Mats.</td>
<td>157,000</td>
<td>475,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TABLE 6*

**Data Gathered From Questionnaire and Published Sources About Each of the Twenty-Three Institutions Whose Libraries Returned Questionnaires With Complete Information**

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{m} = \frac{\sum m_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{n} = \frac{\sum n_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{o} = \frac{\sum o_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{m} = \frac{\sum m_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{n} = \frac{\sum n_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{o} = \frac{\sum o_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{m} = \frac{\sum m_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{n} = \frac{\sum n_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{o} = \frac{\sum o_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum x_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{y} = \frac{\sum y_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{m} = \frac{\sum m_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{n} = \frac{\sum n_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{o} = \frac{\sum o_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{p} = \frac{\sum p_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{q} = \frac{\sum q_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{r} = \frac{\sum r_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{s} = \frac{\sum s_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{t} = \frac{\sum t_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{u} = \frac{\sum u_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{v} = \frac{\sum v_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{w} = \frac{\sum w_i}{n} \]

\[ \bar{z} = \frac{\sum z_i}{n} \]
TABLE 7
MULTIPLE REGRESSION WITH FOUR INDEPENDENT VARIABLES
(INDICATED IN COLUMN 1)

Variable 1 (Volume) is transformed by dividing each case by 1,000 and converting to logarithms. Variables 2 thru 4 are logarithmic transformations while technical report figures are obtained by dividing each case by 100 and then taking the square root of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (Independent)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Correlation X,Y</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard of Reg. Coef.</th>
<th>Computed t-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>2.813</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td>6.834</td>
<td>3.864</td>
<td>-1.768*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Engin. Faculty</td>
<td>1.874</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>-.146</td>
<td>12.278</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>-4.273**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engin. Researchers</td>
<td>2.104</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>3.864</td>
<td>1.642</td>
<td>2.379**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dependent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>12.153</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at P < .10; evaluated at 22 degrees of freedom
** significant at P < .05; evaluated at 22 degrees of freedom

Conclusions

An investigation of criteria used for the acquisition of technical reports by libraries shows that the four factors of volume size, number of FTE engineering faculty, number of doctoral candidates (in engineering), and number of engineering researchers can be used for prediction purposes. The eight factors which were examined but found not to improve upon the prediction equation were the number of: professional librarians, nonprofessional staff, graduate FTE engineering students, master’s degree candidates in engineering, master’s degrees granted in engineering, doctoral degrees granted, total library operating expense, and miscellaneous library operating expense.

Results of analysis indicate that there is a predictive relationship between the four selected variables and the number of technical reports a college should obtain. The prediction equation in two parts is:*  

* A logarithmic and square root transformation of the data yielded distributions which appeared more normal in form.

Library Resources & Technical Services
1) \[ y = -6.83 \log \left( \frac{\text{number of volumes}}{1000} \right) + (-12.28) \log \left( \frac{\text{number of FTE eng. faculty}}{\text{number of volumes}} \right) \]

\[ + 5.05 \log \left( \frac{\text{number of Ph.D. cand. in eng.}}{\text{number of volumes}} \right) + 3.86 \log \left( \frac{\text{number of researchers in eng.}}{\text{number of volumes}} \right) + 37.29 \]

2) number of technical reports = \((y)^2\) (100).

The actual application of this equation is illustrated by the following example: A library has 461,000 volumes, 32 FTE engineering faculty, 15 doctoral candidates, and 49 researchers in engineering. When these figures are converted to common logarithms, the following data result.

\[ \log \left( \frac{\text{volumes}}{1000} \right) = \log \left( \frac{461,000}{1000} \right) = 2.6637 \]

\[ \log \text{FTE Faculty Eng.} = \log 32 = 1.5051 \]

\[ \log \text{Ph.D. Cand. Eng.} = \log 15 = 1.1761 \]

\[ \log \text{Researchers Eng.} = \log 49 = 1.6902 \]

These figures are then plugged into the two-part prediction equation.

1) \[ y = \left[ (-6.83) \times 2.6637 \right] + \left[ (-12.28) \times 1.5051 \right] + \left[ (5.05) \times 1.176 \right] + \left[ (3.86) \times 1.6902 \right] + 37.29 \]

\[ = (-18.19) + (-18.47) + 5.94 + 6.52 + 37.29 \]

\[ = 13.09 \]

2) number of technical reports = \((13.09)^2\) X 100

\[ = 17,135 \]

The simplicity of the processes necessary for the use of this equation obviate the need for expensive equipment and computer time. With the aid of a log table and a desk calculator any librarian can use this equation to help in decisions concerning the acquisition of technical reports.
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Acquisitions of Out-of-Print Materials

Ernest R. Perez
Houston Chronicle

A survey of various methods of obtaining out-of-print materials for library collection-building, this paper looks briefly at various methods such as reprints, microtexts, exchange, etc. Emphasis is placed on avenues of access to the o.p. book market, as reported in library literature. An effort is also made to look at the antiquarian book trade's own booksearching methods, and findings of a survey of o.p. book dealers are presented as an indication to current practice.

Aside from the continuing effort to reflect the current output of publishing, there is a necessity for libraries of all types to venture into the out-of-print (o.p.) book realm. For public or school libraries, this may involve generally useful reference works that are recently or currently o.p., or o.p. items that are valuable to local history. The reasons might be as pressing as a needed single issue of a periodical for binding, or a single volume of a periodical set. For the academic library, o.p. needs may be for duplication of heavily-used titles, books needed for course reserve, material needed for faculty or student research purposes, or replacement of important or necessary missing items.

Because of this continuing need for books that are no longer available through normal channels of the current book market, it is important that library acquisitions units have a good idea of the alternate sources and resources to use for o.p. acquisitions. This paper will list major sources very briefly, but will devote chief attention to methods useful for library acquisitions from the antiquarian book trade.

Nonmarket Sources

A listing of possible o.p. sources includes description of several possible routes, as well as physically distinct media. An obvious starting point for acquisition of older literature is through the currently-offered reprint market, new reprintings of old volumes for which reprint publishers feel there is sufficient demand to assure a profitable reprint edition. Reprints vary in production method and degree of physical resemblance to the original text. Technically, reprinted works are no longer out-of-print. Good general guides to current offerings on
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the reprint market do exist; such sources are *Reprints in Print* and *Guide to Reprints*. Current publishers' announcements and advertisements are also valuable sources for information on new reprints.

A second source of o.p. materials is the various types of microforms and their related photocopy offspring. O.P. materials are to be found in the physically distinct forms of microtext produced as microfilm (35 and 16 mm.), microfiche transparency, microcard, and microprint. There are, of course, a few major corporations in the field such as University Microfilms and Readex Microprint which produce a great proportion of the currently available material from o.p. texts in microtext form, but acquisitions departments should be aware of smaller companies that may have specialized subject offerings of interest. Examples of this are the regional and source materials available from Lost Cause Press.

One method that should not be overlooked when considering microform copies of o.p. materials is the copying of another institution's films or the production of a single copy of microfilm from an original text. The *Union List of Microfilms* and its supplements locate copies of existing films; it is possible to have copies made from a master at a relatively low cost. Acquisitions librarians should also not overlook the possibility of training a subprofessional in the library to copy film in the parent institution's or municipality's other facilities. The process is not difficult, and Kodak microfilm runs about $3.50 per 100 foot roll when bought from an Eastman Kodak distributor.

Production of one copy of a film from an original copy of an o.p. work can be requested from University Microfilms, who will then add the master negative to their stock of o.p. books available “on demand.” University Microfilms must locate the original copy and arrange permission for filming it, a process which can take a long time. However, obtaining o.p. material on film from University Microfilms is a costly procedure, especially for items in photocopy form, produced by using the Xerox Copyflo process to make photocopy from the microfilm. As Agatha Leonard phrased it, acquisition of o.p. material on microfilm from University Microfilms, is “a last resort” because of its expense.2

A more economical method of getting o.p. material on microfilm would be to locate and borrow a copy, get permission to copy it, check for copyright status, and have a microfilm of the item made locally. There are companies throughout the country that do microfilming, and these can be sources of comparatively inexpensive, one-copy “editions.” An even less costly method would be to have another branch of the parent institution or municipality do the microfilming in its own facilities. For example, microfilm cameras and processing are often routinely used in university or municipal business offices for storage filming of financial documents, records, personnel data, etc. A bit of liaison work in this area might be a profitable investment for future o.p. microfilming purposes.

Another source for o.p. acquisitions is exchange. This may be by
an agreement with other single libraries or groups whereby parties can exchange duplicate or withdrawn o.p. titles and receive in return items from another library which may be on the first library's own desiderata list. Or exchange can be through a formal organization such as the United States Book Exchange (USBE) or the Duplicates Exchange Union. USBE, for example, is a nonprofit organization which in 1970 had a stock of three and a half million items. In 1968 USBE distributed about 600,000 items to its 1,739 members, of which 1,510 are American and Canadian libraries. Member libraries pay a membership fee and a handling fee per item bought (exchanged). USBE circulates book lists, periodical lists, and special lists to its members, who then check their own desiderata lists against them. USBE will also check requests against its own stock.

Before investigating various routes and methods to use for acquisitions from the antiquarian book market, note must be made of exactly what items are wanted and of how libraries may systematically record their wants. The most common means is the desiderata list or file (a file has the advantage of a built-in update procedure). This type of file may vary enormously in location, responsibility for maintenance, and authority for addition or deletion. Reichmann reports size variations from 150 titles to 40,000, with a median size of 5,000 titles in the libraries he investigated. Part of the reason for huge files is, of course, the size of research libraries and their needs. But a file which grows huge with no justification usually owes its size to one or more reasons: lack of review to see if items are still wanted or needed; lack of maintenance in that items in the file are not removed as they are acquired; or authority for designation of desiderata too loosely controlled. Emerson Jacob points out that not all requested library material found to be o.p. should be considered desiderata. He reasons that if the burden of decision to search is placed on the requester, “the lists are usually kept manageable.” Hala Piekarski also notes that in an academic library the decision to search should be made by an experienced librarian or the requesting instructor. “Returning the o.p. requests to the faculty for a final decision . . . results in considerable weeding of the file.”

In short, all acquisitions search units should have some positive program designed for placing authority for search designation, periodic review of desiderata, and updating maintenance responsibility.

*The O.P. Market*

The acquisition of o.p. material on the antiquarian market offers a great challenge to modern librarians, who, existing only on its fringes, have not that familiarity with it which book dealers labor so hard and long to acquire. Hala Piekarski observes, “Librarians generally seem to lack the imagination and resourcefulness needed in the ‘twilight zone’ of out-of-print titles.” But, using the same reasoning, one could similarly assert that antiquarian book dealers generally lack the
“imagination and resourcefulness” to provide systematic author, title, and multiple subject access to their wares.

In addition to its lack of experience in the o.p. market, the library profession seems to have almost deliberately gone to extremes to avoid learning enough about it to use it in an active manner. This reluctance or refusal to learn about the o.p. market exists, although libraries do have frequent peripheral contact with it. As an indication of this, Carter and Bonk’s Building Library Collections sees two aspects of acquisitions of o.p. material: “the search by the library for a specific title which it wishes to acquire. The other aspect involves searching catalogs sent to the library by the various o.p. dealers to see if anything is being offered which the library would like to buy.” Even this relatively authoritative source puts the passive searching of dealer catalog offerings on the same level as the active search for desiderata. Carter and Bonk notwithstanding, is there pragmatically any justification for a library to search for anything other than “a specific title which it wishes to acquire”?

It is hard to avoid a scathing judgment of library practices in the o.p. acquisitions field when one reads such revelations as those written by George MacManus, himself an o.p. dealer. MacManus reports that a colleague of his had surveyed 200 American college libraries and found that 89 percent of them claimed to have never purchased o.p. materials.

Even if this survey was not accurate, one can imagine the impression such findings as this must present to the o.p. book trade. And sadly, these findings are probably more true than not. As Shirley G. Heppell notes in discussing an o.p. acquisitions survey which covered ninety-two libraries of colleges with 2,000–3,500 students, “Many librarians showed vagueness about the nature and extent of their OP purchasing and a lack of knowledge about common practices which could enrich their holdings. Where certain techniques for getting OP titles were used, they continued to be used regardless of results.”

One of the reasons for this lack of knowledge about o.p. acquisitions is the remarkable paucity of literature on the subject. Despite the fabled overabundance of library literature, there is not much to be found on this important subject. A January 1970 article by Felix Reichmann in Library Trends includes an excellent bibliography covering reference sources on pricing o.p. material, history of the book trade, directories of dealers, as well as library literature on suggested procedures, surveys of practice, administration of o.p. acquisitions, etc. The library literature section of his bibliography contains some twenty-three citations, and it is a very complete record of the materials on this subject since the late 1940s. This scarcity of literature exists, despite the avowed library value placed on creation and maintenance of a retrospective collection, and the fact that a recent study places median library budget allocation to o.p. acquisitions at 20–25 percent of book budget funds!
Dealers

The first and most obvious access to the o.p. market are the various types of o.p. or “antiquarian” dealers. Reichmann classifies these into six broad categories: (1) large-scale general o.p. dealers—not generally limited to one special subject area, with a large stock, good market connections, and real library service potential; (2) top-level rare book dealers—dealing almost exclusively in extremely choice and rare items, usually high-priced, but able to supply very scarce and valuable items; (3) specialist book dealers—usually quite knowledgeable and thorough in coverage of their subject area, often a small shop or home operation; (4) book scouts—dealers who charge on a commission basis, searching out materials which they then provide to dealers, collectors, and libraries;* (5) dealers in publisher’s remainders; and (6) junk dealers, who often carry books among their other wares.

Although librarians often complain bitterly about what they feel to be excessive profit for o.p. dealers, who work on a normal basis of 100-200 percent markup, they must remember that this represents gross profit, from which must be subtracted overhead, search expense, labor cost, advertising expense, postage, capital tieup in nonmoving stock, etc. An analogy to the dealer’s situation is found in reports compiled from records at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) of the relative labor costs to the library of buying desiderata through a dealer catalog search method in comparison to using a search service. The library found that the labor cost per order for the catalog search method was six times the total labor cost per order for search service orders. This held true “even when the entire search service routine of listing wants, evaluating quotations, and writing orders was included.”13 Aside from the labor performed for the library by the search service in locating specific wants, some observers feel that prices in the o.p. market represent preatomic age capitalism. “... Of all businesses in the world, it (the booktrade) seems to follow those simple laws of supply and demand laid down in the dismal theoretical economic treatises of the nineteenth century. ... A conference of scholars, booksellers, and librarians today is a conference of comparatively free men, such as Adam Smith would have approved.”14 The “free man” allusion is apt, since the decision for acceptance of the item at the quoted price is entirely the buyer’s decision. As the bookdealer sees it, the “right” price of a book is what someone will pay for it.

* Book scouts generally have only a small personal stock of their own. This category of Reichmann’s can be expanded to include what are usually called search services—larger scale dealers who locate copies of specific wants for customers, quote prices on them, and purchase and resell the items if their quotes are accepted. A few search services have a fairly large stock of o.p. material which they have judged from experience to be in demand, and of which they are assured a fairly quick turnover, enabling them to avoid tying up capital in slow-moving stock.
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Advertising

Another example of active workings in the o.p. marketplace is the use of advertising journals for the booktrade. There exist in the U.S., and in most other major countries, antiquarian booktrade and collector's magazines which run advertisements for wanted items. Readers of the advertisements then check their own stock and send price quotes on wants to the advertiser by mail (typically, a postcard). An advertiser waits long enough to get representative bids from different parts of the country, then chooses the item or items offered at the lowest prices in a condition acceptable to him. In effect, advertising for o.p. wants is equivalent to a published call for competitive bids. Depending on the publication chosen, the market reached may be large and general, or specialized as to subject or geographical area.

The principal American journal for want list advertising is AB Bookman's Weekly (also referred to by the trade as AB or Antiquarian Bookman). It is the largest advertising organ of the o.p. market in the U.S., with a circulation of 5,900, of which 3,400 are dealer subscribers, the rest libraries and collectors.\(^\text{15}\) \(AB\) gives discount rates on advertising to dealer and library subscribers. In 1971 the rate was twenty-five cents per thirty-eight character line for want listing. An even more library budget-oriented advertising resource is The Library Bookseller, at times called The American Antiquarian Bookseller's Weekly. This publication, familiarly known by the acronym TAAB, publishes library want list advertisements at no charge. The expense for the publication is borne completely through subscription sales to antiquarian dealers, who in 1971 paid a fee of $40 per year to provide themselves with prospective customers. Library subscription rate is $20 per year, but free want list publication is offered to any library. One hundred twenty-five dealers were reported as subscribers in a 1956 article about TAAB use.\(^\text{16}\)

Well-known advertising journals for the o.p. trade exist in other countries. Examples are England's The Clique (with a circulation of 2,000), the Spanish Elenchus, the French Bulletin de la Librairie Ancienne et Moderne, and the German Boersenblatt.

Auction Buying

Another o.p. trade source for libraries is the book auction. Such auction firms as Sotheby, Parke-Bernet, and Hotel Drouot handle book sales and issue catalogs well in advance of scheduled sales. Although many of the top houses handle only high-priced rare or scarce items that can be of interest only to large academic or endowed libraries, there are a number of houses that handle less expensive material for the general trade, and these could be of use to library o.p. acquisitions programs.
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Buying Trips

A method somewhat akin to auction buying is the practice of library staff or institutional faculty going on buying trips for o.p. material. These trips may be for the sole purpose of o.p. buying, or they may be combined with other reasons for trips that happen to locate a prospective buyer for the library in an area where known wants or dealers with generally good stocks are located.

Local Dealer Use

Another dealer visit-connected method is the use of visits and want list submission to local dealers. Few libraries report doing this, and unless a library is located near large, well-stocked o.p. dealers, they tend to regard local dealer use as a waste of time. However, ALA's 1951 Out-of-Print Books Committee felt this to be a potentially valuable, if neglected, source:

It would seem that in some localities, it would be a gracious and in many cases a rewarding thing to do, if order librarians would turn over their want lists to their local dealers before sending them out of town. It is a great asset to any community, no matter how small, to have one or more good second hand book stores. The only way in which these stores can thrive and grow, is to have good local support. They also offer a good market for discards and duplicates and can serve the library in many other ways. . . . Such a connection can be a personal one, in contradistinction to an impersonal one with a dealer or dealers in a distant city.17

Collection Buying

A final o.p. market access route, often combined with auction buying or buying trips, is library purchase of book collections. These are usually former private collections, occasionally dealer-created collections of related materials. One difficulty in this method is that although a collection may contain several hard-to-get o.p. items, a library, especially a large academic or research library, may find that most of the collection material duplicates holdings already possessed. A Purdue survey reports that about 45 percent of the libraries surveyed never use collection-buying for o.p. acquisitions.18

Evaluation of Methods

Dealer Catalogs

The primary method almost all order librarians list as the top source for most of their o.p. wants is checking of dealer catalogs by library staff or by institutional departmental faculty, who also receive these catalogs. All of the surveys examined gave this source as the most used and most highly regarded. The Out-of-Print Books Committee Survey found that 81 percent of their sixty-four responding libraries did use dealer catalogs as important o.p. acquisitions tools.
fact, 84 percent of these respondents answered that one important method of o.p. selection was by checking dealer catalogs against desiderata files and/or the official catalog. The Purdue survey reported by Cook, covering 307 usable library responses also listed dealer catalog use for o.p. acquisitions as the most popular and most used method (about 60 percent of the Purdue respondents used this method), as did the State University of New York at Cortland survey, written up by Heppell.

This almost universal popularity and use exists despite several obvious drawbacks to such a method: (1) o.p. material choice is restricted to what the dealers choose as likely saleable items; (2) the labor requirement of this method is enormous, as shown in the Eldred Smith UCB study (cited earlier) which showed that six times more library labor cost was needed to locate and acquire desiderata using this method instead of dealer search; (3) the typically used subject arrangement and the incomplete or incorrect entries often given in these catalogs are not suited to efficient checking of typical library desiderata files or official catalog records; and, (4) the element of competition with all other prospective buyers who have received the same catalog reduces the probability of obtaining the item wanted.

In regard to the Purdue survey finding that dealer catalog checking is the most popular o.p. acquisition method used by American libraries, Hala Piekarski observes:

. . . the conclusions presented by S. A. Cook that "circulating and checking dealers' catalogues is at least for the present the most frequently used and perhaps the best method" invites a comment that although the first statement might well be true, the second is not necessarily the case. The checking of dealers' catalogues is the most obvious, least imaginative, and most time-consuming, as well as the most expensive method. This is supported by the o.p. buying statistics compiled by the Search Division, University of California, Berkeley. [E. Smith].

One other commonly-held notion about ordering from dealer catalogs is that speed is of the utmost importance, that no means must be overlooked to get faculty or selecting librarians to make selection and submission from catalogs as quickly as possible, and then have acquisitions departments process the order on a rush basis, so the order may get to the dealer before anyone else can order wanted items. The most common suggestion in the literature is to get the order on its way (airmail, of course) within a week of catalog receipt; certainly no more than two weeks should elapse between catalog receipt and order transmission. Some advocate regular use of long distance phone call or telegram for utmost speed of order transmission, and one writer advocated airmail return of a catalog marked to indicate wants, to be followed later by an official order form, or confirmation order processing.

All this effort to be able to compete with other libraries seems faint-
ly ridiculous, especially when one considers data such as Eldred Smith’s report that there was 70 percent cancellation of UCB dealer catalog orders. This finding induced UCB to abandon this method as a system of o.p. acquisitions. Piekariski reported from her own bookshop experience that it takes up to two months for a dealer to sell the bulk of listed items in a catalog, but it is certain that scarce and desirable items do go quickly, and all the rush does not change the reality that dozens of other buyers may be trying for the same single copy of an item. The unbelievably high order cancellation rate does nothing but add to labor charges to figure into a per purchase unit cost.

Certainly, order departments should get out catalog orders quickly to accommodate faculty or bibliographers who have selected on this basis, but a time limit from date of receipt should be set to avoid submission of very late requests. A factual, objective evaluation should show that dealer catalog searching is not acceptable for use as a normal acquisitions routine or system.

**Want Lists**

A second major library access to the o.p. market is the use of want lists, or lists of material which a library is currently searching for, and willing to buy at the right price. These lists are compiled from whatever variation of desiderata list or file a library may maintain. These lists are then submitted to o.p. dealers for quotes by any one of several means.

A common library practice is to make up a desiderata list, prepare multiple copies, and then circulate the list to several dealers for simultaneous search. This practice is looked upon with much disfavor by the book trade, for several reasons, with two most commonly heard: (1) dealers feel that multiple circulation of a library want list results in several dealers searching for items or advertising for them simultaneously, creating a false impression of scarcity which results in an artificially inflated price; and (2) lack of specific direction or a simple quote from stock may result in the dealer searching for the item, creating investment expense through labor cost, postage, advertising expense, and possibly capital outlay if he does buy the item for his stock. The dealer then quotes the found or bought item to the library, only to discover that it is no longer wanted, having been acquired (probably from another dealer) in the interim since the want list was received.

In the light of dealer reaction to the practice of multiple submission of want lists, it would be advisable for libraries to make certain points definite to the dealers if they do choose to use this method. Libraries should make it clear that the list is only for quoting from the dealer’s stock, not for search. Direction for quotation before filing the list on an “order” basis should also be explicit. It is probably advisable to inform the dealer that it is a duplicated want list. This is honest and will let the dealer know his exact status. This may result in the dealer ignoring, or spending little effort on checking a list, since he
might consider the chances of a possible sale versus the effort and correspondence required to be unfavorable. So, it may actually not be worth the extra labor and expense required to get more want list exposure by using this method as the list might get little serious attention. Although she seems to have meant it as a negative comment, Shirley Heppell noted in her article that 75 percent of the libraries surveyed did not use a "competitive bid system" (her view of multiple-submission wantlists). Restated, this could be taken to mean that only 25 percent of the libraries covered in her survey found this method profitable enough to use. Hala Piekarski gives a more realistic picture of this method and its possible pitfalls when she cautions that this type of list should indicate clearly "quote from stock only" and indicates that a correct choice of dealers based on past performance is important.

A logical extension of using want lists submitted to many dealers, who may give them less than full attention, is the submission of a want list to a single dealer on an exclusive basis, for simple quote from stock, or for search. Knowledge that his quotes are exclusive, or that he has an exclusive search privilege should result in better dealer response, since he will be aware of the increased opportunity for definite sales. In order to prevent unquoted or unfound items from falling into the limbo of the dealer's own backfile of desiderata, a time limit may be set for rights to exclusive search on a list. UCB records showed that 90 percent of a sample of 746 o.p. purchases made during 1963/64 were made from quotes offered within six months of their listing with an o.p. dealer. A majority of the purchases had also been quoted within 2½ months of their listing, but from the 90 percent figure, UCB decided to give exclusive search privilege for six month periods. At the end of the six months, unfilled items are relisted with another dealer for the same six-month exclusive search.

Another practice which offers additional incentive to dealers is some sort of an automatic shipment agreement. This practice should be limited to dealers who have proven themselves trustworthy and reliable in the past. Under an automatic shipment agreement, the dealer is permitted to ship and invoice any titles on the want list that fall within a certain preset price maximum: for instance $10 for a domestic title, and $15 for a foreign one. Any sort of price limit rule may be set by the library, and any number of subclasses such as domestic, twentieth century, Texana, etc. The dealer should be allowed some freedom in price range, and definite advice on the limits of acceptable physical condition should be given by the library. If the dealer does find items that will exceed the limits of the agreement, he may quote on those items. Such an automatic shipment agreement is beneficial in several respects: (1) correspondence is cut down for both library and dealer; (2) the dealer has the incentive of concrete orders for wants; (3) library labor cost for quote evaluation is nil; and (4) wise choice of price limit will not increase average unit cost of o.p. items. In fact,
unit cost from recent records may give a good basis for setting the limit. Of course, such an arrangement with a dealer should be periodically reevaluated as to performance and cost factors, and comment should be solicited from the dealer on his satisfaction with the arrangement.

A first step in getting any sort of an exclusive want list assignment routine for o.p. dealers is to make a list of acceptable dealers in general and in special subject areas. Both types of dealer have their respective advantages: the wide-subject coverage in the stock of the large general dealer, and the access to more scarce or hard-to-find titles through use of the subject specialist dealer.

Besides recommendations from other acquisitions operations and their experience, it is a fairly easy matter to find subject and geographical listings of antiquarian dealers. A good current list is the annual listing of subscribers by specialty put out by AB. This list is currently Part Two of the AB Bookman's Yearbook. For geographical listing, the American Booktrade Directory and the Antiquarian Booksellers Association of America (ABAA) membership list do this alphabetically by state and then by city. Both of these sources also list dealer specialties. The American Booktrade Directory is a standard reference continuation, and the ABAA list is free on request. London's Sheppard Press publishes irregularly updated editions of their Bookdealers in North America and A Directory of Dealers in Secondhand and Antiquarian Books in the British Isles, both of which list detailed information on stock size, services, specialties, etc.

Other quite obvious sources for o.p. dealer information are advertisements in library and book trade journals and, of course, the steady flow of o.p. dealer catalogs that filter into any library. Use of all dealers for repeat or exclusive want list business should be reevaluated periodically after transactions are voluminous enough to form a continuing, objective judgment of service and cost factors.

Excellent examples of procedures for this type of evaluation are presented in the two recent articles by Smith and Mitchell (see bibliography) from their experiences respectively at UCB and California State University, Northridge. Mitchell reports on a system initiated in a new, developing library which made exclusive search assignment of 17,689 o.p. titles. Using their o.p. acquisitions routine, they were able to purchase 27 percent of the wants in one year at an average unit cost of $10.18 (compared to unit cost of $9.19 for inprint books during the same period). In a brief but detailed description, Mitchell explains her library's procedure for: (1) setting up a beginning dealer/subject file; (2) designing the form and establishing a system for a dealer performance record for costs, percent of wants supplied, and want supply over time span (indicating continuation of active search); and (3) evaluating performance and choice of dealer. The California State University, Northridge system used a dealer agreed upon one year exclusive search limit and an automatic shipment without quote if the item did not exceed $35.00.25
Smith's article is not so detailed as to procedure, but has an amazing amount of statistical information on the factors that prompted the Search Division at Berkeley to make certain major policy decisions. With a desiderata backfile of some 30,000 items, Smith reports that UCB was able to purchase 15 percent of the wants that were listed with dealers during 1966-67. Because of the huge file size and the impossibility of frequent review, they proceeded on the idea of multiple assignment in order to decide on several dealers during one review. Because of the quote return percentages mentioned earlier in this paper, UCB decided on six-month exclusive search listings, and forwarding to follow-up dealers at the end of that time:

Each day, all new wants and a portion of older wants from the desiderata file are examined. Three dealers are assigned for each and three request slips are photographed, but only the first slip is mailed. The others are post-dated by six months and one year and they are filed under that date. . . . Each day, the slips filed under that date are removed, added to slips which have just been photographed, and mailed to dealers. The assigned dealers were noted on the post-dated slips before they were filed. . . . When a quotation is received . . . , the back of the bibliographical card is checked before the order is placed [to check that it is current and exclusive dealer] and any post-dated slips requesting a quotation on that book still in the files are removed and destroyed [the bibliographic card is filed by main entry and has post-dated locations noted on its verso].

Like Mitchell, Smith emphasizes periodic review of dealer service and unit cost performance, in UCB's case semiannually, comparing and rating for selection, dealers who are similar in subject, language, or geographic coverage.

Both of these reported systems have chosen the assignment of want lists for exclusive search during a definite time limit as the "best" system. In Piekarski's terms: "The only valuable yardstick for the o.p. operation, regardless of the size of desiderata or the amount of funds available is a ratio of titles obtained by a given method over those sought."

Advertising

Both of these reports, and other sources, concede that library use of book trade advertising media is useful in certain cases, but is not generally useful for extremely large desiderata lists. George MacManus rightly notes that AB use is actually cheaper than the cost of duplicating want lists and mailing them out to several dealers for in stock quotes. Certainly it is also more effective to pay twenty-five cents to let 3,400 dealers see your wants, instead of two, when the twenty-five cents is applied to postage. Even so, libraries are probably more likely to use the free listing service of TAAB rather than one of the commercial trade lists, despite its smaller circulation. But use of any of these want list publications has some definite favorable points: (1) It is a good cheap route to getting your wants known by many dealers; (2)
use of this method gets fast response, usually within about two or three weeks of publication for a domestic list; (3) the market reached can be general, as in use of TAAB or AB, or a specialized one such as in Clique (English), Elenchus (Spanish), or American Book Collector (firsts and rare items); and, (4) it has the advantage of calling for competitive bids, resulting in the most reasonable price possible.

However, UCB and California State University, Northridge probably found the disadvantages of a large desiderata file too great to overcome. First of all, the search, although quick, is very short-lived, usually only until the next issue. The unquoted or unbought items must either be relisted with labor and advertising costs thus increasing, or they must be farmed out for search by a dealer. There is also the problem of the size of desiderata lists, which both Smith and Mitchell mention. Both comment on the labor involved in advertising listing, and then that of "... receiving, tallying, and responding to thousands of quotes." Large numbers of wants must be spread into smaller lists, and this in itself requires much labor, besides the added duty of keeping track of what is not bought and must be relisted or dropped.

Advertising is used only for very selective o.p. purchase at UCB. Smith notes his present guidelines for TAAB or AB use: material urgently needed for course reserve, because of the quick response from listing and items regular dealers are not supplying. For instance, UCB could not get o.p. anthropology books easily and by using AB were able to get their wants, plus discover new specialist dealers in this field. Smith concedes that although UCB's use is very selective, advertising could be extremely useful to a library with a small desiderata file.

O.P. Dealer Survey

In an effort to help the strategy of library o.p. acquisitions, a survey of o.p. dealers was undertaken to see what common dealer practices and preferences might be considered in library o.p. buying. It would be valuable to be able to make conclusions on buying practices, dealer relations, and pricing practices based on information learned from the antiquarian dealer's viewpoint, instead of relying only on information from the librarian's experience. A questionnaire consisting of some twenty items was constructed which emphasized buying, pricing, selling, and searching practices. The questionnaire was not pretested, rather it was taken to a local antiquarian dealer and discussed and adapted in accordance with the suggestions of the firm's rare books division head. After revision, it was sent to fifty-four antiquarian dealers selected from advertisements in the 1970 AB Bookman's Yearbook.

Selection of respondents was based on positive indications by the advertiser that the firm would accept want lists for quote from stock and/or searching. Often the advertiser specified a willingness to accept library business specifically. Questionnaires were sent with a cover letter explaining that the purpose of the survey was research for a paper
in library science study, with a self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed for return.

Twenty-two or 40.7 percent of the questionnaires were returned. This was a good return when compared to a short, two-question survey described in the *Report of the Out-of-Print Book Survey* in 1951 in which twenty-six of eighty-three dealers contacted answered.³¹

However, the answers given in reply to the questionnaire were quite spotty and incomplete, with many dealers leaving large areas of the questionnaire unanswered. Most of these dealers would not give answers relating to pricing and profit ratios, perhaps in itself a verification of Stanley Pargellis' "Adam Smith—Free Man" allusion. Unfortunately, the spottiness of the answering renders invalid any attempt at concrete conclusion or correlation of the various factors. However, the returns do bear some explanation and elaboration.

Thirteen of the twenty-two respondents reported a bookstock of less than 25,000 volumes. (However, nearly 30 percent reported a stock of 50,000 volumes or more.) But these findings do appear to bear out the belief that dealers who advertise search service tend to have a small, selective stock. This small stock is partially explained by the fact that many dealers offering search services or want list quotes were highly specialized dealers in such subjects as music, medicine, or twentieth century literature.

Somewhat predictably, 73 percent of the respondents said they used a combination of subject division subdivided by author arrangement for stock shelving and display. The only notable exceptions were two dealers reporting an alphabetical author or main-entry type of card file with references to a fixed location shelving based on size and order of purchase. One company using this type of retrieval also mentioned IBM punch card record use for computer-based multiple-facet access to their stock. The most popular method reported for searching requested items was systematic search of a stock shelflist. The next most used method was reliance on staff or owner memory of definite stock possessions.

As for pricing guides, by far the most frequently mentioned basis for price assignment was book trade experience with nineteen of twenty-two dealers claiming to use this. Next in order were two “current” pricing indicators, *Bookman's Price Index* and *American Book Prices Current*. The only retrospective or “dated” guide mentioned by the dealers as used to a good extent was Wright Howes' *U.S. iana*, with 50 percent reporting its use. Several dealers also mentioned use of other dealer's current catalogs and the “Books for sale” ads in *AB* as to determine current price guides.

For systematically-arranged access for use in library evaluation of offers, it would seem that *BPI* and *ABPC* would be most useful, as they are the guides most frequently reported used by the responding dealers. The prices given in these sources are updated annually, but are really more a historical guide than actual representation of current prices.
They are valuable guides to recent price trends. BPI, it must be remembered, gives dealer catalog price listings, while ABPC gives auction or “wholesale” prices.

Only about a third of the respondents would answer questions about percentage of desired profit markup. Most of the dealers who did answer claimed to try for an average 100 percent markup, although four dealers mentioned a 50 percent markup goal in sales to other dealers while four dealers gave the 50 percent markup to libraries. Apparently half of the eight dealers who did answer a question about markups considered libraries eligible for “trade discount.” One enterprising capitalistic dealer, however, reported a 500-800 percent markup on his library and dealer sales.

To questions about sales income sources and dealer sales practices, responses differed. When asked about various percentages of sales income from catalog sales, want list quotes, specific title requests, and on-premises sales, the response was good. Weighting for the value of income percentage reported from these various sales methods showed that most dealers claimed most sales from catalogs, followed by want list quote income. Using the weighted scale to show the emphasis placed by the dealers on the position value of the various types of sales, the four methods come out with the following scores:

- Catalog sales 30
- Want list sales 27
- Specific title requests 21
- On-premises sales 16

It is evident that for these dealers at least, mail orders account for most of their business. The closeness of the catalog and want list business is reflected in answers to questions on the effort devoted to each and on the opinion as to which category of effort gave the best reward. Of sixteen responses, eight reported devoting major effort to want list quoting, and eight reported major effort on catalog production and sales. Predictably, the value judgments on best reward for effort put forth reflected this split—eight for catalog sales, eight for want list quoting.

Fifteen dealers indicated a favorable response return rate on want list quotes which averaged to 53 percent. Twelve dealers reported an average sale of 58 percent of the items listed in a catalog. In regard to speed of catalog ordering, only one dealer suggested ordering items within two or three days of catalog receipt, and two of the dealers suggested orders within a week of receipt. Five advised ordering within two weeks, and four seemed to think a month’s delay was acceptable. These answers were in response to a question regarding the maximum time an order could be delayed past catalog receipt with a prospective purchaser able to “still expect to have a good chance of getting the desired item.” Only the recommendations of the twelve dealers reporting catalog issue were counted in response to this question, although most
had some opinion on this. (Of the twelve who did issue catalogs, only five reported dating their catalogs.)

Response to a question on the rate of catalog sales came from only five dealers. These data are from too small a sample to be representative, but do indicate that catalog items as a total group do not sell very fast. Average sales reported within respective dates from catalog mailings were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date from issue</th>
<th>% of items sold (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One week</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two weeks</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One month</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although sales are not very rapid, it seems logical to assume that the most desirable items are the first to go. Practice should follow this assumption if catalog ordering is to be used.

Questions relating to searching procedure were more consistently answered. Sixteen of the dealers reported searching outside their own stock for wants. Only five, or 3.8 percent, of the twenty-two dealer respondents confined search for want list items to their own stock. Nineteen of twenty-two reported using AB for want advertising, and five also said they used The Clique. Eighteen dealers reported scanning AB for quoting on others' wants, while only four, or 18.2 percent, subscribe to or scan TAAB. Several respondents commented that TAAB was too expensive to justify subscription to it ($40 per year in 1971). Of the four dealers who did use TAAB, two felt that favorable response on quotes to TAAB want lists was significantly better than response on quotes to AB wants. Of the remaining two, one felt AB response was better, and the other thought there was no significant difference.

In regard to limited time exclusive searches, only one dealer indicated he would not accept a search on this basis. Responses on this matter were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum acceptable exclusive search time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not accept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 responses to questions

Apparently this practice is quite acceptable to dealers. Almost all would agree to Betty Mitchell's reported one year limit, and over half (68.5 percent) to Eldred Smith’s six month limit.

Responses to an open-ended search method question could be summarized as follows: (1) search of own stock; (2) want advertising in AB; and (3) issuing of own want list to regular suppliers and/or
specialist dealers. Significantly, not one dealer mentioned survey of other dealers’ catalogs, lists, stock, etc., as any sort of a regular routine for active want search. These methods, plus buying trips, auction buying, and collection buying were cited for use in stock buildup, but not as methods for search for definite wants. Librarians should note that antiquarian dealers seem to use only advertising and want listing for their own searching. This is quite a contrast to all the surveys proving catalog surveillance as the “most popular and most effective” method used in library o.p. buying.

An open-ended question on unfavorable dealer/library experiences yielded several major dealer complaints. The most commonly voiced dissatisfaction was impatience resulting from the slowness of library payment. It is understandable that dealers would resent this as a standard process because most o.p. market trade is “cwo,” or “cash/check with order.” This means the dealer has already made the capital investment and must wait for the library to effect payment for their capital return. The next most commonly voiced complaint was the paperwork and excess invoice copy requirements set by many libraries. This may be avoided to some extent by special prepayment processing or confirmation order handling. A main source of dealer irritation is library use of the multiple want list, often resulting in notification by the library that the item is no longer needed after dealer search, location, and quoting. Another dealer criticism of library practice is a library’s insistence on purchasing o.p. (second hand) material in excellent or fine condition. From the dealer’s point of view, all a library should want or need, except for rare items, is a good “reading copy.”

To conclude on a bright note, however, one California dealer ended his negative comments with the statement, “Frankly, we prefer doing business . . . with libraries as opposed to private customers because libraries always pay and generally are more understanding about the value of books and services.”
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SERIES ON TECHNICAL PROBLEMS IN MUSIC LIBRARIES ANNOUNCED

Technical Information Reports for Music-Media Specialists (TIRMMS) is the title of a new Music Library Association publication series. Publications within the series will be devoted to technical problems encountered in the music library. This will include statistical studies, bibliographical studies of technical subjects, studies of technology, management and administrative techniques, buildings and equipment, standards and standardization. Contributions are solicited from librarians or others who have met and/or conquered technical problems of any sort which are pertinent to music libraries or collections. The series is designed to meet the requests of M.L.A. members for practical information about such problems. Manuscripts should be submitted to: Troy Brazell, editor, TIRMMS, University Library, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197.
Media Designations

With the introduction of nonprint materials into all types of libraries, the question of the need for the use of media designations has risen. This paper discusses some of the pros and cons of the question. It concludes that a generic term should be used after the title of a work as a medium designation and that a more specific designation may be used to introduce the collation if it is needed.

The problem of media designations revolves around four questions: First, should designations be used to differentiate print and nonprint materials? Second, if so, what should they be? Third, should they be specific or generic terms or both? Fourth, where should they be placed if they are used?

First to be considered is the function of a medium designation. The literature on the subject and discussions with librarians and media specialists indicate that it is to notify the user briefly and immediately what type of format is being cataloged. Patrons who are interested in the format of the nonprint of the work listed and have access to the equipment needed to read it, if any is required, will read further on the card for more detail. However, one who wants a book or who does not have access to the needed equipment where he wishes to use the material will move on to the next listing.

Many librarians point to the fact that no medium designation is used for microforms, which are described in a note on the card for the original work, as shown on the catalog card (Example 1):

Revised text of address delivered at the program meeting held on June 29, 1972 by the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division, in conjunction with the annual conference of the American Library Association. Manuscript received and accepted, July 1972.
This practice resulted from a study made at the request of the Association of Research Libraries. Joseph Z. Nitecki, in his discussion of cataloging microforms in the library of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, states the principle on which this practice is based: “a consideration of each photoreproduction (microfilm, microcard, or microprint) as a copy of the corresponding work in printed form, i.e., the original work, its facsimile or reprint edition.” Since the microform version of a work is not cataloged separately, a patron can very easily read through the title and even the collation on a catalog card and not discover the library has only the microfilm or the microfiche copy. How disappointed he can be when he gets the item and discovers it is not in book format, which he can take from the library! This situation illustrates again the need for warning the catalog user early of the format of the nonprint item.

The practice of cataloging microforms as notes on the cards for the original works also points up the discrepancy in the use of media designations for some nonprint reproductions and not for others. For example, why are filmstrips that are reproductions of pages in books not also considered exceptions to the need for media designations and separate cataloging like microforms? In this category are the “Picture Book Parade” books made into filmstrips by Weston Woods by photographing the pages of the books.

The decision to use or not to use media designations rests upon their value to the library patron. Since the maturity and purpose of the user will vary with types of libraries, will this affect the general principle of using early designations? The mature user of the library will consider his time valuable enough to warrant the use of these warning devices,
and the young user will definitely need them to identify formats of materials.

The use of early media designations is also valuable in omni-media indexes, bibliographies, or catalogs as an organizational device. In the field of music, for example, scores will be separated from phonodiscs and from phonotapes of the same title. Also, in the field of literature, phonodiscs and phonotapes of plays will be separated from the books of the same titles.

What terms should be used as media designations to describe non-print materials? Many groups have been working on the problem of identifying and standardizing terminology. As an example, in 1970 the authors of Non-Book Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collections, identified twenty-nine terms.4 The Association for Educational Communications and Technology, in its third edition of Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials, published in 1972, included twenty-three terms.5 The Joint Audio Visual Education Association of California and California Association of School Libraries Ad Hoc Committee in 1971 included twenty-two in its list.6 The 1972 list from the Library Association of Great Britain included forty-three. Many of the terms included in the lists show standardization already appearing. On some of the terms like “kit,” “pack,” “phonodisc,” “sound disc,” and “audiocassette” there is still disagreement. The authors of Non-Book Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collections, who are preparing a revision of this book, have grouped these terms into the following list of generic terms: Audiorecord (includes sound recordings of all types—disc, tape, wire, roll); Chart (includes flip chart, wall chart); Diorama; Filmstrip (includes filmslip); Flash card; Game; Globe; Kit (two or more media which are not fully interdependent and, therefore, may be used separately); Machine-readable data file (includes computer data-cell, disc, drum, magnetic tape, punched card); Map (includes relief map); Microform (includes aperture card, microfilm, microfiche, micropaque); Microscope slide; Model (includes mock-up); Motion picture (includes motion picture loop); Picture (includes photograph, art original, art print, art reproduction, post card, study print); Realia (consists of specimen, sample, etc.); Slide (includes stereoscope slide); Transparency; and Videorecord (includes videotape, videocassette, videodisc, electronic video recording). Any list of generic designations must be as comprehensive as possible but also open-ended, since new media are being developed and terminology is still developing.

The next question that arises concerns the location of the medium designation. Choice of generic or specific terms depends to some extent upon the location of the media designations. For example, if the designation follows the title, it should be generic, as the specific physical description will be included in the collation. The use of the generic term after the title of the work with a more specific designation, if needed, to begin the collation is more useful to the patron than the use of only specific designations to begin the collation. The card shown was developed...
oped by the Library of Congress as a result of problems in cataloging the Sony Superscope Keyboard Immortal Series and illustrates the need for generic terms if a designation is to be used after the title of the work (see example 2):

**Keyboard immortal Sergei Rachmaninoff plays again, in stereo.** Phonorecord. Sun Valley, Calif., Superscope 1970. (The Keyboard immortal series, 1)
- disc A001. 2 x 12 in. 33 1/3 rpm. stereophonic.
- cartridge 2-A001. 8-track. stereophonic.
- cassette 1-A001. 2 1/2 x 4 in. stereophonic.
- reel 3-A001-8. 7 in. 32 ips. stereophonic, quadriphonic.

Recorded by the Welte reproducing piano from piano rolls. Program notes on slipcase of disc and on reel container.

Example 2.

The item is produced as a stereophonic or quadriphonic disc, cartridge, cassette, or reel.

The card also illustrates the value of the generic term following the title. This practice will eliminate proliferation of media designations which may develop if specific designations are used. The term can be broad enough to include as many format variations as will make economical centrally produced catalog records. For example, “Phonorecord,” as used on the LC card, or “Audiorecord,” as recommended by others, includes disc, cartridge, cassette, and reel tape.

Some librarians and media specialists, on the other hand, believe that the more specific the designation even after the title, the more useful it will be to the catalog user. Thus “Tape Cassette” will mean more than “Audiorecord” to the patron who has a record player but not a tape recorder or whose tape recorder plays only reel-to-reel tapes.

Other arguments for the use of the medium designation after the title of the work have been presented in the earlier discussion on the need for an early warning designation for nonprint materials. First, the designation has organizational value. For example, if after the title of a phonodisc, the term will prevent confusion of scores and phonorecords. Next, since nonbook media will often be included in omnimedia or union catalogs or in multimedia bibliographies, identification of the media after the title of the work in the cataloging of music, in the cataloging of both hard copy and machine-readable copies of the
same text, and in the cataloging of microform copies of macroform
texts is useful to the patron.

Some nonbook materials, like photographs, art reproductions, and
study prints, do not require special equipment for their utilization, and
one, the laboratory kit, includes its equipment. They need early warning
designations, however, to assist the patron in finding quickly the art re-
production or art print or the laboratory kit for which he is searching.

Some librarians and media specialists point out that placing the me-
dium designation after the title results in mixing elements on the cata-
log card, because the term is part of the physical description, not bibli-
ographic description. Since the physical description is ordinarily in the
collation, these professionals question the use of the term after the title
of the work. They believe that the use of special typography for the
collation can give sufficient warning to the catalog user. Others, however,
do not believe this is true. A few librarians point to the fact, too, that
the omission of the medium designation after the title of the work
makes possible the printing of one set of cards without collation for a
visual presentation in several different formats. The missing collation
can be supplied by the central cataloging or individual media center.

There is one more problem to consider. Placing the early media des-
ignations after the titles of works can lead to misinterpretation. This can
best be illustrated by the title of a filmstrip with the designation written
in three ways:

Adventures of Tom Sawyer, by Mark Twain (Filmstrip)
Adventures of Tom Sawyer (Filmstrip), by Mark Twain.
Adventures of Tom Sawyer (Filmstrip) [based on the novel] by
Mark Twain.

Such confusion or misinterpretation can be avoided if authorship or
primary intellectual responsibility for the original work is given in a
note on the catalog card.

From this discussion, one may conclude that the generic term after
the title of the work is useful to the patron, for it provides him with an
early warning as to the format of the work and the possible need for
equipment to use it. The medium designation also serves to differentiate
formats in bibliographies, indexes, and catalogs. It is also important to
standardize the terms used so that they will eliminate proliferation of
media designations, yet be broad enough and open-ended to include new
media as they develop. The many problems in cataloging nonprint ma-
terials indicate the value of the generic term after the title with the
more specific term used in the collation if it is needed.
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"Early Warning" Generic Medium Designations in Multimedia Catalogues

PETER R. LEWIS
University of Sussex Library
Brighton, England

The much-favoured "early warning" generic medium designation is discriminatory, functionally inefficient, and out of line with the national and international acceptance of AACR. A specific designation, placed with the collation, is preferable on all these grounds; and there are better ways of giving an "early warning."

WE HAVE HAD FROM VIRGINIA TAYLOR a wide-ranging survey of the various ways in which the question of medium designations has been, or could be, approached; given with a dispassionate impartiality that suggests this is still an open question. However, as chairman of the British (Library Association) Non-Book Media Cataloguing Rules Committee, I have been pretty continuously in discussion with committees and individuals in the United States and Canada on this question (among others) over the last twelve months, and during this present conference itself I have had ample opportunity to sample the prevailing consensus. And from all this, I have formed the opinion that it is not an open question at all. The majority of you appear to have made up your minds in favour of a particular form of medium designation—that is, of a statement occurring as the second element in the body of the entry, immediately following the title statement, and being a general rather than specific indication of the medium being catalogued. Its function and its form have led to its being labelled an "early warning generic medium designation."

In view of this, and recognising that I am probably engaged in a lost cause, I shall abandon any pretence of impartiality and dispassion and...
attempt the advocacy of another point of view which we on the British side have come to prefer after long study both of the problem in general and of the "early warning generic" designation in particular.

**What Are Medium Designations For?**

Let me begin with a piece of "non-book media liberation." The usual reason given for medium designations is that they alert the catalogue user to the nature of the item described in the catalogue, so that he can reject without further examination of the entry any item in a medium unsuited to his purpose. Now, in an integrated multimedia catalogue containing entries for books as well as nonprint items, this must surely mean that designations are given to all the media represented, including the books and other printed publications. Otherwise, the nonprint media are being discriminated against: the medium designation is in effect saying "Look out! This is not a book!," as if the book were a minimum standard below which nonprint media fall. There should, in equity, be no discrimination in respect of medium in a multimedia library, any more than of colour or creed in a multiracial society. But, when the British Committee, recognising the importance of this principle, came up with suggested early warning designations for print (they were, as a matter of fact, "book," "periodical" and "printed text"), these were received without any shred of interest or enthusiasm, and do not figure in any list of medium designations known to me.

What everybody seems to have forgotten is that the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules already provide for medium designations for printed materials. They are contained in Chapter 6, and they are the rules governing the collation in which are prescribed the abbreviations for the terms "pages," "volumes" and so on. The points to notice about these are that they are very specific designations indeed, and that they are not placed in the "early warning" position, but occur toward the end of the formal description. One way to eliminate discrimination is to adopt for the newer media the conventions of what is still the senior, if not now always the supreme, medium in our cataloguing.

**Generic or Specific?**

For books, the collation serves two purposes very precisely and economically: it states the medium and indicates the extent of the item (i.e., number of pages, size of document). With most of the nonprint media, we additionally want to know whether, and what kind of, equipment is needed to enable us to use the item, since this is a very important factor in our decision to select the item for a particular purpose.

After much study of the situation in different types of library, the British Committee concluded that, in a nondiscriminatory multimedia catalogue, this indication of equipment requirements is the most important function of the medium designation; and from this conclusion two consequences flow.

First, the medium designation should be specific, not generic, since
there is so much hardware incompatibility within each genus of media that a general statement is not helpful enough. For example, the generic term "sound recording" (British usage, cf. American "phonorecord," "audiorecord") does not immediately tell the user whether his ownership of a phonograph will enable him to use the item, or whether he must lay hands on a tape recorder—and if the latter, whether with cassette, cartridge, or reel-to-reel facility. He must go to the collation to find out. Why not tell him immediately with some such specific designation as "sound tape cassette?"

Notice the economy with which this designation both selects the hardware and indicates the medium of communication. Logically, the specific points to the generic, but the converse is not always true. If I announced my subject as "beagles," I should also be saying that I was going to talk about dogs; but the poodle-lovers and the German shepherd fanciers would know enough to leave the room if they wanted to. But if I advertised my subject as "dogs" and still talked only of beagles, some of my audience might justly feel that I had promised more than I performed.

In this field of rapidly developing technology and unstandardised terminology, there is also a particular difficulty in grouping the media generically, and it often happens that there is no adequate generic term in existence to embrace species of media which have similar characteristics in use. For example, art reproductions, study prints, wall charts, and posters all need vertical surfaces and communicate their contents in the same way, but under what generic designation can we usefully gather them? So, even when generic terms are agreed upon in principle, the lists of medium designations which emerge are always a mixture of generic and specific terms, and the principle is lost right away. And certainly, from the user's point of view there is no merit in striving to preserve it by the invention of our own classifications of media, as some cataloguers have advocated in the past.

Placing the Designation

The second consequence of emphasising the equipment indicating function of the medium designation is that it should be placed in juxtaposition with the other physical and technical specifications which are the nonprint equivalent of collation. In fact, the collation should immediately follow it. Both are concerned with the physical characteristics of the item, and the one only extends further the information given by the other. To split this information by placing one part after the title and the other after the imprint (neither of these elements having anything to do with physical characteristics) is both illogical and confusing.

Besides, as we have seen, the collation is itself in part a medium designation, needing a specific term to explain the measurement of the item more often than not. Even if you used the generic "microform" as a designation, you would still have to introduce the term "microfilm" in
the collation to make clear the statement of the gauge measurement; and such unnecessary near-duplication is wasteful and extravagant.

So, if you settle on the second element in the body of the entry as the place for the medium designation, both logic and common sense demand that the collation should be the third element. But this is so radical a departure from the order of elements in established cataloguing formats (not least in the International Standard Bibliographical Description, with which both AACR and MARC are rapidly coming into line) that it would have serious and damaging effects on the standardisation of multimedia practice across two continents and more, and would hardly find acceptance.

The only place left for the medium designation is as first term in the collation, after the imprint, where anyone familiar with library catalogues would have expected to find it all along.

How to Give an Early Warning

But, I hear the cry go up, what about the early warning function? This is still one of the purposes of the medium designation, even if we agree that it is not the principal one.

I have already tried to suggest that an early warning is not necessarily important in many types of libraries. In those in which it is thought to be important (and nearly everyone says that these are the school libraries, though not all the school librarians agree, and it must be remembered that AACR is not primarily intended for school libraries), it seems to me that the position of second element in the body of the entry is not early enough anyway—why whet your user's appetite with an interesting title and only then warn him (perhaps in the second or third line of the entry) that he probably can't use it for the purpose he had in mind?

If you want your warning early, then the earlier the better: the medium ought to be the first thing to catch your user's attention when he looks at the catalogue entry. There are various ways of doing this without disturbing the logical progression of descriptive cataloguing. You can achieve it within the formal description, by capitalising the designation, by indentation, by underlining, or all three together. Or you can leave the description alone and repeat the necessary information in a conspicuous place around the entry: as an addition to the class number, or call number (with both of which it has a logical relationship in most libraries), or as a form heading, and so on.

All of these are, in my submission, more effective and more useful than a vague generic term, waiting in its second-element user trap to spring out on your unwary and dismayed patrons.
Between the months of October 1971 and March 1972 the University of Utah Marriott Library conducted an experiment to test the turnaround time of card orders sent to the Library of Congress. This article is a brief report of that experiment.

IN OCTOBER OF 1971, the University of Utah libraries carried out a study to determine actual return time of Library of Congress card sets. The Library of Congress had provided information stating that turnaround time from receipt of order to shipment on 7-series number sets would average seven working days and that titles in the reprinting and copyflo procedures would average three to four weeks. There were other priorities but the first two were of interest to the University of Utah because of the time factor.

A total of 523 orders submitted on Library of Congress machine-readable forms were sent at various intervals from October 1 through October 20. All orders which would have been processed in-house by a Xerox-4 camera duplication method were sent to the Library of Congress Card Division, providing what we felt was a valid random sample. Table 1 shows card sets ordered by imprint date, language, and subject field.

In order to monitor return time, working days were counted from the day each order was sent. Return time for each order was kept indi-
TABLE 1
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE
OF LC CARD ORDERS BY CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number Sent</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post 1968</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1968</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individually, then compiled on a detailed master chart. Table 2 shows the average return time on the 523 orders.

We found no significant difference in return by date of publication, language, or subject. This result is pertinent because Library of Congress had “guaranteed” a quick return on newer items regardless of language or subject. Note the 43.4 percent average return of orders by twenty-five working days and 53.9 percent average return by thirty working days. In-house card processing turnaround time is ten working days. It is interesting that there was no return from Library of Congress in

TABLE 2
AVERAGE RETURN TIME
OF CARD ORDERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orders Returned By</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 working days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 (2 months)</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 (4 months)</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals at end of five months</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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the same time. However, we were pleased to receive over 90 percent of our orders within a five-month time limit.

At the conclusion of the experiment we felt that we should continue in-house card processing. A two-week turnaround time for card processing is essential for our card section to fulfill its commitment of complete processing of all materials in as short a time as possible.
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1. Dale Cluff received a letter dated August 31, 1971 from Robert R. Holmes, assistant director for processing services, Library of Congress explaining the improvement in return time.
Serials Cataloging: Successive Entry

JUDITH PROCTOR CANNAN
Serials Department
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

This paper outlines why, in June 1971, the Library of Congress decided to adopt successive entry cataloging for serials, a reversal of its earlier decision made prior to 1967 in connection with the publication of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. The Cornell University libraries provide an example of why a library decided to follow LC's decision and how. Confusion arising from the ambiguous wording of Anglo-American Cataloging Rule 167G, dealing with successive entry, is discussed and illustrated. Despite some pessimistic predictions concerning the change-over, the future is assessed as bright, especially in the area of bibliographic control.

FOR YEARS LIBRARIANS have argued which of the three possible ways of cataloging a serial—earliest, successive, or latest title—is the most efficient, informative, and economical. To my knowledge no one has arrived at a definitive answer. In June 1971 the Library of Congress changed from latest to successive entry cataloging for serials.* Of those libraries faced with the decision whether or not to follow suit, some found it easy, for others it was more difficult, and a few are still undecided.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the three forms of entry were discussed at great length because of Seymour Lubetzky's recommendation that successive title cataloging be adopted for serials. This recommendation was made in an earlier version of his 1960 Code of Cataloging Rules, but in the 1960 draft he allowed the individual library to choose

* The term "successive entry" applies throughout this paper to changes in name of both title and corporate body entries. Prior to 1967 these two types of changes were treated separately; the narrower term "successive title" applied only to serials entered under title. The term "successive entry" came into use as a consequence of the adoption of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Rule 68, which replaced the ALA Cataloging Code rule 91A1, provides that a new heading is established for a publication appearing with a corporate body name change. The old rule provided that all publications be entered under the latest name of a corporate body.
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whichever form of entry it preferred for a current serial, while recommending latest title for a publication that has ceased. The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules were printed in 1967 and most of Lubetzky's efforts to rationalize cataloging rules were incorporated into the final draft of the AACR, including his original proposal to catalog serials under successive titles, described in rule 167G. Briefly, it states that whenever a serial changes title or is entered under a corporate body that changes its name, a separate entry will be made for each different title or author. The Library of Congress, however, did not follow rule 167G; a footnote to this rule describes LC's procedure for entering serials under the latest title or name of the corporate body.

The Library of Congress retained its practice of latest entry cataloging for serials at the request of the Cataloging Code Revision Committee which cited the need for the bibliographic information provided by the LC cards when a serial is cataloged as one entry under its latest title or corporate author. At the time this seemed like a perfectly legitimate request, for no one foresaw the enormous burden it would place on the Library of Congress or the continual increase in the publication of new serial titles, which are subject to constant change. As a result of this decision many libraries in the United States followed suit; consequently nationwide adoption of successive entry cataloging for serials was hampered.

About eighteen months after the publication of the AACR it became apparent that the Library of Congress could no longer keep pace with cataloging under latest entry for serials. This necessitated some major changes to increase serial cataloging output and the availability of LC card copy. The announcement of these changes appeared in the September 1968 issue of LC's Cataloging Service. Formerly LC had cataloged most serials from the first bound volume but now cataloging from the first issue in hand would be extended to all serials. On the other hand, recataloging and reprinting of cards to reflect changes in serials would be discontinued, unless time permitted the recataloging of dead titles; but even so, any changes that occur would continue to be announced in the “Changes in Serials” section of New Serial Titles. Interim entries covering changes in serials would be used in LC's catalog, but would not be published because they might not meet the requirements of the cataloging rules and consequently LC's standards for publication. Kathryn Henderson concluded that “the interim entries seem in essence to amount to successive title cataloging but these entries will of course be reflected only in LC's card catalogs.”

Not quite three years elapsed before these measures too proved insufficient to combat the ever increasing flow of new serial titles. Hence the Library of Congress, after another re-examination of its practices and procedures, finally adopted successive entry. In April 1971, LC reported its intention “to abandon its long standing practice of cataloging all issues of serials under the latest title and name of the corporate author and to follow the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules as printed.”
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Along with this announcement came the information that *New Serial Titles* and the *National Union Catalog* would adopt the same policy.

Obviously the Library of Congress must be facing serious economic problems; otherwise it would not have abandoned latest entry instead of hiring additional staff to cope with the backlog. Successive entry was probably adopted as a practical solution to the extremely expensive operation of recataloging under the latest entry. Since the announcement gave no details regarding LC's procedures, the Cornell University libraries sent a letter of inquiry seeking further information. In a reply dated November 9, 1971, the chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division explained that "the basic reason for changing our policy and procedures is that we were losing the serial battle at LC and something had to be done. . . . Successive entry cataloging allows us to work from the piece in hand and to limit the amount of bibliographic searching done since we no longer need the complete history of a particular title." It remains to be seen whether LC can win the serial battle with this latest measure. At least it has increased its serial cataloging output.

What are the crucial factors behind a library's decision to adopt successive entry cataloging for serials? At the Cornell University libraries, LC's basic reason for changing to successive entry carried no weight because we were confronted with only a minimal arrearage. Moreover, we were not willing to comply with LC's practices of cataloging from the issue in hand and of limiting its bibliographic searching. Unquestionably the change to successive entry is an economical as well as a time-saving measure for LC, yet it need not be so for other libraries. The benefits to be gained depend on how tasks are distributed among the staff, and in this regard every library varies. Of course LC's serials cataloging is streamlined and professional time is not wasted on clerical work, but regrettably this is not so in many libraries. Any economic and time-saving benefits accruing to LC from the changeover, it soon became clear, would not be immediately forthcoming at the Cornell University libraries.

We changed because most librarians felt we were committed to follow LC's cataloging practices and procedures whenever possible—especially since they are reflected in the principal bibliographic tools, the *NUC* and *NST*. Also, some considered it unwise for Cornell to remain one of the last strongholds of latest entry, which could prove a weakness when joining computerized serial programs and data banks. Finally, no conclusive evidence has yet surfaced proving that latest entry cataloging for serials is superior to successive entry.

To coordinate the changeover in the total library system, a detailed statement was drawn up concerning the starting date of the application of successive entry for serials. It reads:

The use of successive title entry is to be applied only to publications where a title or corporate entry change and/or a combination of both occurs. Serial publications covering 1972 and any part of that year or after will be entered under
successive entry. This means that serials currently being received, as well as retrospec-
tive purchases regardless of format (e.g. reprints, microforms, facsimiles, etc.) reflecting title changes or corporate entry changes and/or a combination of both for the given title with a date on the issue or issues covering the years up to and including 1971 are to be done under latest title entry, even if a 1972 or later printing date also appears on the publication.

It is hoped that uniformity will be achieved with the assistance of these guidelines, so that an identical title held in two or more libraries will not be cataloged under latest entry in one and under successive entry in the other. In time the likelihood of such an occurrence will lessen.

How should successive entry be implemented? A review of the literature on earliest, latest, and successive titles is assuredly profitable. Among the informative material on this subject, Paul S. Dunkin’s explanatory commentary on Lubetzky’s Code of Cataloging Rules makes a suitable starting place. Dunkin defends successive title cataloging for serials on several grounds: it may be cheaper, neither recataloging nor movement of books is necessary, and time is not wasted establishing a serial’s history. These arguments plus many more are taken up by F. Bernice Field in her excellent working paper with its detailed and informative analysis for and against the three forms of entry. Finally Kathryn Henderson’s “Serial Cataloging Revisited” furnishes a neat summary of the major arguments with examples.

Besides comparing the favorable and unfavorable aspects of latest and successive entry, the Cornell University libraries gave consideration to the Library of Congress’ Processing Department’s procedures as outlined in its Department Memorandum no. 111. Two sections in the memorandum’s “Procedures for First Issue Cataloging” have items of general interest. One contains information for the descriptive cataloger:

1. Catalogs issue(s) in hand. Issues under other corporate bodies or titles are not to be examined unless essential to resolve an entry or heading problem.
2. Bibliographical searches, apart from establishing headings, will be limited to the official catalog, unless a conflict arises there, and to the NST files. Information from the NST files, subject to evaluation, will be used for the printed card.

The other addresses the Subject Cataloging Division:

1. If numbering continues and there has been no major change in the subject content of the serial, the call number will be continued. Subject headings will be reviewed.
2. If numbering continues and there has been a major change in subject content, or if the numbering does not continue, new call numbers and subject headings will be assigned.

After a lengthy discussion, it was decided at Cornell to leave the call number unchanged. Several factors influenced our decision not to follow LC’s practice of altering it. Perhaps the most important was that our stacks are open, if not to all, at least to the majority of our patrons,
some of whom have memorized the locations of journals. Furthermore, retaining the call number for a serial guarantees, at least in the shelflist, that the entire history of the publication is together. It also means that a bibliographical volume, subject to a title change in midstream, can be bound in a single physical volume.

As to reviewing subject headings, whether to alter or add them has always been left to the discretion of the cataloger, who usually retains the former subject headings if they were originally correct.

The “continues” note provides another example of how we adapted LC’s practices—and in this instance, the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules as well—to suit our needs. The alteration amounts to placing the volumes and dates, whenever known, after the “continues” note in order to indicate to the public services personnel where to search in NST when we lack the previous title.

Even these modifications of LC’s practices and the AACR were insufficient to meet our needs. Consequently an additional referral system was designed to supplement the “continues” and “continued by” notes. This system can only be applied in libraries where holdings cards are used to indicate to the patrons volumes held. The additional referral system is based on the use of three stamps, “SEE LATER TITLE,” “SEE EARLIER TITLE,” and “CEASED,” which are placed on the Serials Catalog holdings card either immediately before or after the appropriate holding entry. To take a hypothetical example, when the serial publication Studies in Journalism changes entry with v. 3, 1978, “SEE LATER TITLE” is stamped below this holding on the holdings card; and on the new holdings card, under the title Journal of Journalism “SEE EARLIER TITLE” is stamped immediately above the holding v. 4, 1979. “CEASED” is used on those publications that are no longer being published in order to avoid confusion between them and entry changes. Before “SEE LATER TITLE” is stamped on the Serials Catalog holdings card, the holdings are updated. This means the cataloger usually has at hand the previous title if needed. We will not be relying as the Library of Congress does, solely on the new title, NST, NUC, and our union catalog for bibliographic information; thorough searching is considered essential. In designing this additional referral system our principal concern was the presence of both latest and successive entry in our catalogs. In our opinion, therefore, anything assisting as well as alerting the patron in his search for a desired entry seemed expedient.

The above outline includes only the basic procedures approved unanimously at the Cornell University libraries, and hence adopted.

There remains an unsolved problem stemming from AACR 167G which states:

A serial that appears under a different title or different name of corporate author, but continues the numbering of its predecessor is considered to “continue” that publication; if the numbering has not been continued, however, it “supersedes” it.\(^{11}\)

This rule leaves the choice of a “continues” or “supersedes” note for
an entry change to the cataloger's interpretation of the word "numbering." Logically this rule should apply to any form of serial enumeration, including dates, but literally it applies only to serials with numerals indicating volumes, numbers, or editions. Catalogers seem to have few problems with periodical title changes and use the "continues" note even when dates are the sole form of enumeration. However, corporate body changes are more difficult, so the application of the rule is far from uniform in this area, as indicated by the following examples where the rule has been applied literally. This results in one entry having a "supersedes" note, the other a "continues."

**National Ocean Survey.**

United States coast pilot 3: Atlantic Coast. Sandy Hook to Cape Henry. 9th ed.; 1971-
Washington.

v. Illus., maps. 27 cm. annual.
Continues a publication of same title issued by the U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

1. Pilot guides—Atlantic coast (U. S.)—Periodicals. 1. Title.

VK981.A3135 623.89°29'75 71-612538

Library of Congress 71 21

**National Ocean Survey.**

Tide tables, west coast, North and South America (including the Hawaiian Island). 1972-
Rockville, Md.

v. Illus. 26 cm. annual.
Supersedes a publication of same title issued the by U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.

1. Tides—Pacific coast—Yearbooks. 2. Tides—Hawaiian Islands—Yearbooks. 3. Tides—Tables—Yearbooks. 1. Title.

VK741.U62 623.89'49°00'1642 73-613155

Library of Congress 71 21
A corporate body either changes its name, or is completely reorganized and as a result a new corporate body comes into being. In the first case the "continues" note should be used for all publications regardless of whether or not numbering or dates appear on the publication, unless of course the numbering is not continuous. On the other hand when the second case is true, the "supersedes" note should be used for all publications; if the volume numbering is continued, the phrase "and continues the numbering" is added. As the rule currently stands, a combination of both "supersedes" and "continues" notes may appear on the entries of a corporate body that has either changed its name or been restructured to form a new organization. This situation is confusing to the user of the catalog, and it could be remedied if the choice of notes depended not on the continuity of numbering but on whether the corporate body had merely undergone a name change or been restructured. Another way to avoid this problem would be to enter under a distinctive title whenever possible, rather than a corporate body.

These "supersedes" and "continues" notes are in turn reflected in New Serial Titles, which complies with the AACR 167G, though the introduction still states that the serial entries comply with the ALA Cataloging Rules. The "continued by" note only appears in NST when a title has undergone a name or corporate body change prior to being cataloged. An example of this occurs in the April/June 1972 issue where there is an entry as follows:

Gewerkschaft Holz.

with a "continued by" note stating that the same title was issued by the union under its later name, Gewerkschaft Holz und Kunststoff. There is also an entry as follows:

Gewerkschaft Holz und Kunststoff.
Ordentlicher Gerwerkschaftstag. v.8- 1969-

with a "continues" note. The "Changes in Serials" section of NST has retained the same format, so in actual fact the only major difference under successive entry is the replacement of the "title varies" note by the "continues" note. As in the catalog, the user will now have to look under each title to locate the necessary bibliographic information. This inconvenience will be negligible provided the data in NST is adequate and accurate, which is not always the case at present.

Both technical and public service personnel fear that successive entry will result in loss of bibliographic control if the connecting links between titles are lacking or incorrect. Libraries with broken holdings often rely on the National Union Catalog or New Serial Titles for their bibliographic information; therefore the reliability of these tools is of the utmost importance. Although LC card copy is more readily available
under successive entry, it is less accurate; these errors are perpetuated in NST and subsequently in the catalogs of many libraries.

On the other hand, in fairness, the Library of Congress is making every effort to surmount the overwhelming task confronting it. With regard to NST, the patron frequently overestimates its role. In his article "The Consumer Survey of New Serial Titles," Kuhlman reminds users, when evaluating bibliographic entries in NST, that "NST is compiled on a current basis to serve three purposes: (1) to supply information about new serials promptly as an aid to acquisitions; (2) to supply information on locations of serials to expedite interlibrary loans and (3) to supply useful cataloging entries as promptly as possible."14

In the foreseeable future librarians can anticipate an improvement rather than a deterioration in bibliographic control of serials. This prediction stems from a description of Phase III of the National Serials Data Program, which began on April 17, 1972.15 During Phase III a base record of serial titles will be provided to which the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) can be permanently added. In addition, the establishment of an automated bibliographic resource will facilitate the supply of serial cataloging information to libraries, the interchange of serial data among libraries, and the building of serial processing systems.

If the Library of Congress had made its decision to adopt successive entry only with a mind to the international standards that are being discussed and adopted to improve bibliographic control, that would have been sufficient reason. For with LC's acceptance of the AACR as printed, successive entry overnight became internationally the most widely-accepted form of entry for serials. It was inevitable that most libraries adhering to the practices and procedures of the Library of Congress would follow the same policy for the sake of economy and expediency, especially as it is difficult to prove that latest entry is significantly better than successive entry. Yet, each library when adopting successive entry cataloging for serials should give due consideration to the requirements of its system as well as its patrons, while complying basically, but not rigidly, with either AACR 167G or the practices of the Library of Congress. At the same time, this flexibility should in no way interfere with the provision of accurate and dependable bibliographic data.
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State Secrets Made Public:
The Albany Plan

JACQUELYN GAVRYCK
Downtown Campus Branch Library
and
SARA KNAPP
Reference Department—Library
State University of New York at Albany

This article describes a simplified scheme for cataloging and classifying state and municipal documents. The plan, now in use at the State University of New York at Albany, employs a system of double Cutter numbers to designate the documents by state and then by agency. The use of a consistent scheme for subject and state Cuttering makes possible both a subject and an agency approach.

TONGUE-IN-CHEEK? Of course, since no library which acquires state documents is deliberately keeping this material hidden from its public. The fact is, alas, this material is so poorly documented and indexed, the secret keeps itself. Unless the library fully catalogs all such documents (a vain hope considering the quantity of material involved and the lack of LC cataloging for much of it) some alternative classification plan or special location indicator has to be devised.

A small college library could conceivably put all its documents in files by subject, but as the educational institution broadens its fields and deepens its research needs, documents come into their own as excellent, and inexpensive, primary and secondary source material. If the library becomes a federal depository, and seeks yet other document sources, the avalanche descends, often before practical solutions have been found for classification and storage.

The library of the State University of New York at Albany, an institution which has grown from a small teachers college to a major university center in less then ten years, found itself facing just such a problem. A number of major policy decisions have been made recently, with the assistance and approval of Dr. Jonathan R. Ashton, former director of libraries, which are at last moving these materials from storage to the shelves.
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The library is now classifying all United States government documents under one LC number plus the Superintendent of Documents classification number. Library department heads were unanimously agreed that as a New York State educational institution we should fully catalog New York State documents, another large part of the processing backlog. Of the three major areas left (United Nations, foreign countries, states) the first two are still under study. The most original and creative solution to date is the one which is solving classification for, and access to, the publications of state governments other than our own.

We began by examining features of the Oregon Plan, adoption of which had been promulgated by a documents committee working under the library's previous administrator. In our opinion, the major disadvantage to this plan is that the holdings are available only in chronological order on the catalog cards filed under the name of the agency. Thus, the holdings cards must continually be removed from the catalog for revision; and the patron has to have a sophisticated awareness of the names of state agencies which are likely to produce the type of materials he needs, since there is no subject approach to the contents of the state documents collection.

We felt that any system which required the removal of cards from the catalog as part of the processing routine was, in a large library, time consuming, cumbersome, and self-defeating. But, the last disadvantage was the most alarming. Everyone of the staff with whom we talked (we solicited reactions from catalogers and reference librarians frequently) asked the same question, "How does the patron know that the most recent (or most valuable) information on this topic is probably in the form of a document?" Informal observation in this library indicates that the subject approach is the one used most frequently. This is particularly true of undergraduate students.

The downtown campus branch of the university library had, several years ago, succeeded in organizing their document collection by a scheme which borrowed from the Oregon Plan the clever idea of assigning a number to the governmental agency which produced the document. That branch, which serves master and doctoral candidates, had devised a system based on this premise which produced a unique number and a title card for each document. By comparison, the number of items handled at the main library precluded this kind of in-depth processing, but the experience had proven that an agency number was workable.

We took a giant step in our thinking when Miss Marion P. Munzer, at that time head of technical services, suggested that the agencies, of all states, which are empowered to administer in a similar subject area, e.g., departments of education, departments of motor vehicles, etc., be given the same number with a differentiation by state.

The library had just implemented a new policy by assigning one classification number (J85) to all U.S. government documents. Adhering to this policy, the cataloging department assigned J86.2 as the classification...
number for use in the Albany Plan, and we began building the scheme. The LC schedule gave us a Cutter number for each state (see Table 1) and there we stopped—struggling to incorporate a standard number for an agency’s field with a subject approach to the agency’s publications. Dr.

### TABLE 1

**CUTTER NUMBERS ASSIGNED TO STATES AND OTHER JURISDICTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Cutter Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>.A2 Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>.A4 Nebraska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Samoa</td>
<td>.A5 Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>.A6 New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>.A8 New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>.C2 New Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>.C6 New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>.C8 North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Territory</td>
<td>.D2 North Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>.D3 Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>.D6 Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>.F6 Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>.G4 Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>.G8 Puerto Rico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>.H3 Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>.I2 South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>.I3 South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Territory</td>
<td>.I4 Tennessee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>.I6 Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>.I8 Trust Territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>.K2 of the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>.K4 Utah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>.L8 Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>.M2 Virgin Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>.M3 Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>.M4 Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>.M5 West Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>.M6 Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>.M7 Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>.M8 Regional or interstate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ashton eliminated both problems with one brilliant stroke when he suggested that we double Cutter, first by state and then by subject. However, we soon learned that the problem of tying standard LC subject headings to the work of a governmental agency requires cataloging experience, a knowledge of governmental structure, patience, and imagination; at times, a crystal ball would have been helpful. (See Table 2.)

The documents section composed a form letter which was sent to every state, possession, and protectorate requesting some kind of agency list, be it blue book, manual, or organizational chart. Of much help in
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TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Names</th>
<th>LC Subject Headings Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration (Departments of . . .)</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>AERONAUTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>AGING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Pollution</td>
<td>AIR—POLLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholic Beverage Control</td>
<td>LIQUOR LAWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>ART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy &amp; Nuclear Boards</td>
<td>ATOMIC ENERGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banking</td>
<td>BANKS &amp; BANKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind &amp; Deaf</td>
<td>BLIND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Commission</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY—PRODUCTION STANDARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare &amp; Family Services</td>
<td>CHILD WELFARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>CIVIL DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defense SEE ALSO</td>
<td>DISASTER RELIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>CIVIL RIGHTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>CIVIL SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service SEE ALSO</td>
<td>STATE GOVERNMENTS—OFFICIALS &amp; EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce &amp; Trade</td>
<td>COMMERCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation &amp; Ecology</td>
<td>ECOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>CONSTITUTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Protection</td>
<td>CONSUMER PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>COURTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development SEE ALSO</td>
<td>ECOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education SEE ALSO</td>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services and Disaster Relief</td>
<td>DISASTER RELIEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services and Disaster Relief SEE ALSO</td>
<td>CIVIL DEFENSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Security</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>FINANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish &amp; Game</td>
<td>HUNTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>FORESTS &amp; FORESTRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Geological Surveys</td>
<td>GEOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>STATE GOVERNMENTS—OFFICIALS &amp; EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>HANDICAPPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways &amp; Roads</td>
<td>ROADS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights &amp; Human Relations</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Affairs</td>
<td>INDIANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Names (Cont.)</th>
<th>LC Subject Headings Assigned (Cont.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>TOURIST TRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>INSURANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Cooperation</td>
<td>INTERSTATE AGREEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Uniform State Laws</td>
<td>LABOR &amp; LABORING CLASSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Employment</td>
<td>EMPLOYMENT STABILIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor &amp; Employment SEE ALSO</td>
<td>LAND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>LEGISLATIVE BODIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislature</td>
<td>HISTORICAL SOCIETIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>LICENSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing &amp; Regulation</td>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government &amp; Problems</td>
<td>MILITARY ART &amp; SCIENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>MINES &amp; MINERAL RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Affairs (or Adjutant General)</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines &amp; Minerals</td>
<td>NARCOTICS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics</td>
<td>NATURAL RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotics SEE ALSO</td>
<td>ECOLOGY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>RECREATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources SEE ALSO</td>
<td>PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>PLANNING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>POLICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>PRISONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>HYGIENE, PUBLIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons</td>
<td>TRAFFIC SAFETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>CONSUMER PROTECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>PUBLIC UTILITIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety SEE ALSO</td>
<td>SOCIAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service—Public</td>
<td>PUBLIC WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Institutions</td>
<td>REHABILITATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Welfare &amp; Social Services</td>
<td>REVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>STATE GOVERNMENTS—OFFICIALS &amp; EMPLOYEES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>TAXATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue &amp; Treasury</td>
<td>REVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Conservation</td>
<td>URBAN RENEWAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Commission &amp; Equalization</td>
<td>VETERANS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>WATER—POLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>WATER RESOURCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Renewal</td>
<td>DEVELOPMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans’ Affairs</td>
<td>WOMEN—RIGHTS OF WOMEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Pollution</td>
<td>YOUTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this task was *State Manuals, Blue Books, and Election Results* by Charles Press. In some instances, when no reply was forthcoming, we sent a second form letter to the head reference librarian of the state library, or state university library, appealing for help with the project. In no case did we fail to receive an answer, often in the form of a bulky package of otherwise unobtainable and very useful materials.

From these tools we selected agencies likely to publish, typed a three by five inch card for each, using an entry consisting of state and department, filed each behind tabs representing probable subject areas, and began, with the help of the cataloging department, to select true LC subject headings which would best match the output of the agency. These subjects were then Cuttered, and the scheme was complete. (See Table 3.)

We believe the true worth of this plan to be in its extreme flexibility and growth potential. For instance, governmental agencies have characteristics of a living entity: they are born, they alter, they die. New agencies are generated to control, or coordinate, the work which is created by identification of problems. The plan allows for the insertion of any number of new cards for new agencies. If it is a new area of endeavor, identify the subject, Cutter it, and add it to the subject list in the plan. Agencies alter, change their focus, merge with others, etc. In these instances, the library can establish its own policy, either to change the entry or to use cross-references. Should an agency be eliminated, it is probable that some other will be created to carry out its work, or the work will be assigned to one already in existence. Seldom is a subject area entirely eliminated from human experience, the buggy whip notwithstanding.

Our objectives in devising the plan were to obtain simplicity and speed of processing without sacrificing comprehensiveness or precision. A simplified scheme can not be a "perfect fit."

Time is obviously saved in the elimination of searching for LC entry and in eliminating the updating of holdings on main entry cards. Time is also saved by making the holdings file serve as the "on order" file and the "check-in" or "received" record. Multiple slips for material on order are filed in the same file by state and agency Cutter number. The multiple is removed when the material is received. The holdings card is the record of receipt. This single file management works especially well when the library is organized by form, i.e., when there is a documents room in which all document functions are performed.

In order to keep the plan simple, the number of subject headings and Cutter numbers used has been deliberately limited.

The fewer subject headings used, the less possibility there would be of inadvertently assigning the same agency to more than one subject when there was an overlap of functions, and the fewer places to look in retrieving an agency's publications. On the other hand, the fewer subject headings used, the less specific the categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Agencies</th>
<th>A33 License System</th>
<th>L56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeronautics</td>
<td>A47 Liquor Laws</td>
<td>L56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging</td>
<td>A55 Local Government</td>
<td>L62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>A57 Maternal and Infant Welfare</td>
<td>C45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air—Pollution</td>
<td>E262 Mental Hygiene</td>
<td>M45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>A78 Military Art and Science</td>
<td>M54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy</td>
<td>A85 Mines and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>N383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks and Banking</td>
<td>B35 Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>M68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blind</td>
<td>B45 Narcotics</td>
<td>N37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Welfare</td>
<td>C45 Natural Resources</td>
<td>N38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Defense</td>
<td>C53 Hunting</td>
<td>N381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>C57 Fishing</td>
<td>N381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>C64 Geology</td>
<td>N382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>U72 Mines and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>N383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Protection</td>
<td>C66 Land</td>
<td>N384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>C69 Forests and Forestry</td>
<td>N385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf</td>
<td>B45 Water Resources Development</td>
<td>N386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Relief</td>
<td>E43 Parks</td>
<td>P37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>E26 Personnel Management</td>
<td>P47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollution</td>
<td>E261 Planning</td>
<td>P43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air—Pollution</td>
<td>E262 Police</td>
<td>P66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil—Pollution</td>
<td>E263 Pollution (General)</td>
<td>E261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water—Pollution</td>
<td>E264 Port Authorities</td>
<td>C64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>E36 Prisons</td>
<td>P83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>E38 Public Utilities</td>
<td>P88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>E43 Public Welfare</td>
<td>P94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Stabilization</td>
<td>E46 Public Works</td>
<td>P96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>C45 Recreation</td>
<td>P37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Allowances</td>
<td>C45 Rehabilitation</td>
<td>R44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>F55 Revenue</td>
<td>R48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>N381 Roads</td>
<td>R62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests and Forestry</td>
<td>N385 Social Welfare</td>
<td>P94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>N382 Social Services</td>
<td>P94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>H35 Soil Pollution</td>
<td>E263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Societies</td>
<td>L52 State Governments—Officials</td>
<td>S72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>H68 and Employees</td>
<td>S72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>N381 Taxation</td>
<td>T39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene, Public</td>
<td>H83 Tourist Trade</td>
<td>C64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>I53 Trade Regulation</td>
<td>C64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>I54 Traffic Safety</td>
<td>T73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>I58 Transportation</td>
<td>T75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>G57 Urban Renewal</td>
<td>U72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate Agreements</td>
<td>I83 Veterans</td>
<td>V48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor and Laboring Classes</td>
<td>L32 Water—Pollution</td>
<td>E264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>N384 Water Resources Developement</td>
<td>N386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Bodies</td>
<td>L43 Waterways</td>
<td>T75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>L52 Women—Rights of Women</td>
<td>W64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licenses</td>
<td>L53 Youth</td>
<td>C45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further complication arose from the combinations of functions of various state agencies. By assigning several overlapping, or similar, subject headings to the same Cutter number, the necessity of looking in several places for an agency is reduced. Of course, this makes it necessary to look at all the cards filed under a single Cutter number.

For example, child welfare, family, youth, and family allowances are all Cuttered C45. There is a possibility of overlap between these agencies and those under P94, public welfare, social problems, welfare, and social services. Other combinations used are libraries and historical societies under L52, liquor laws and license systems under L56, commerce, port districts, tourists trade and trade regulation under C64 and the combination of blind and deaf under B45, while handicapped is separate under H35. The degree of specificity depends on the nature of the state agencies, but also on the types of material a library expects to acquire.

After reviewing our material in the areas of ecology and natural resources, we decided to group all the subject headings covered into these two main areas. We had previously assigned an "A" Cutter number to air-pollution, an "E" to ecology, an "S" to soil pollution, and a "W" to water-pollution, etc., while hunting and fishing had been given an "H" number, forests and forestry an "F" and so on.

Then we discovered that, for example, Kentucky has a Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources; Indiana has Land, Forests, and Wildlife Resources Advisory Council, Arkansas has a Soil and Water Conservation Commission; Florida has a Department of Air and Water Pollution Control; Missouri has a Division of Geological Survey and Water Resources; Maine has both a Department of Inland Fisheries and a Department of Sea and Shore Fisheries; Nebraska has an Oil and Gas Conservation Commission. The problems, the emphasis, and thus the organization may vary considerably from state to state.

We tried to cope with this problem by grouping these materials together, and using the Cutter number for the general headings for agencies which combine several functions (see Table 1).

The natural resources headings tend to emphasize the development of resources, while the ecology headings emphasize conservation.

Another problem lies in how far to subdivide a state agency. An agency which functions separately in some states may in other states be subsumed under another broader agency. There is no final answer to this kind of question; it really depends on the subject headings chosen and the nature of the material a library will collect. Cross-references within the holdings file can also prevent confusion.

Until material is received it is often hard to tell whether agencies are comparable. For instance, should Wyoming's Board of Charities and Reform have the same Cutter number as Michigan's Department of Health and Social Services?

Although we began using the plan only for state documents, it soon became evident that the scheme was also applicable to interstate agency,
commonwealth, territorial, county and municipal documents with only slight modifications. It could probably be modified for application to documents of some foreign national governments, although we have not attempted it.

Since the shelflist is filed by Cutter number, that is, by state subdivided by agency Cutter number, the question has been raised concerning an alphabetical approach to the file. This is provided by the agency card, for each agency activated, which is filed in the author-title catalog. It is not generally necessary to use this, however, since the charts usually provide direct access to the subject of the agency.

Once an agency's form of entry, subject heading, and Cutter number are established, the check-in and processing can be done by a clerk.

It is not a flawless scheme. It has to be applied with judgment, but we believe it can make these government documents more accessible to students. Perhaps our efforts may aid other libraries, which feel the need to acquire these "secret" publications, to cope with the problem of making them more readily available.

Records

Three sets of cards are used to organize and provide access to documents classified by this plan: an agency card for the author-title catalog (see Example 1), a holdings card which is filed by call number in the documents room (see Example 2), and a subject card for each subject heading assigned the work of the agency (see Example 3).

Example 1. Agency card for state agency

| J 86.2 P4 C57 | Pennsylvania, Human Relations Commission. Publications issued by this agency are listed by title in documents section holding file. Consult reference staff for assistance in locating the materials. |

The name of the agency doing any particular type of work may vary greatly from state to state. Whenever possible, the agency's name is used in the form given in the state's organization manual. If that is not available, the form used is that given on the actual document, or on LC proof slips if one accompanies the document.
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Example 2. Handwritten holdings card

The call number for an agency card includes the prefix J86.2 plus the Cutter number for the state and the Cutter number for the subject of the agency. The holdings cards also include the year of publication, and the documents are labeled with the call number, double Cutter, and the year.

Only one subject card is made for all the agencies classified under that subject. Only one agency card is made for all the documents published by that agency. A holdings card is made for each agency for each year of publication for which documents are to be recorded.

County and Municipal Documents—The same charts and types of cards used for state documents apply to county and municipal documents, except that the Cuttering is further refined.

Example 3. Subject card

Volume 17, Number 1, Winter 1973
A "2" is added to the state number to indicate counties and a "3" to indicate cities. This is followed by the first three letters of the name of the county or city, then followed by agency subject, number, and year. (Names beginning with "New" are abbreviated to N plus the first two letters of the second word.)

For example, a 1970 publication of the Office of the Mayor of Chicago would have the number J

86.2
I33 (Illinois plus "3")
CHI
S72
1970

**Interstate Agency Documents**—This category includes regional or other joint agencies, such as the Mississippi River Commission. It does not cover agencies of a single state whose function is to work toward interstate cooperation or uniform state laws.

Regional interstate agencies are given the Cutter number X5, rather than a state Cutter number. This places them after all the state agencies. They are further Cuttered by subject and then by agency name. This puts them in alphabetical order by agency name within a subject classification.

**REFERENCES**

Committee Reorganization

During 1969/70 it became increasingly apparent that the substitution of “Anglo-American” for “ALA” in the title of the cataloging code signified not merely a change of title but also a change of milieu in which code development and rule revision must henceforth take place. The previous chairman, Paul Berrisford, had recognized the significance of the change and called the matter to the attention of the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) Executive Committee. The salutary discussions that followed prompted the Descriptive Cataloging Committee (DCC) to look closely at its organization and procedures and to recommend to the CCS Executive Committee certain changes. The changes regarding selection of the chairman and the membership terms, recommended by DCC and the Executive Committee were not authorized by the Resources and Technical Services Division, but approval was given to the suggestion that CCS replace any DCC member failing to attend more than one meeting or to respond to more than three mail ballots by the stipulated deadline for reasons other than an extraordinary personal or professional emergency. DCC decided to meet regularly in executive sessions as well as with the representatives of the other authors of the code, quintupled the number of meetings, and instituted other practices to facilitate communication. The committee also secured agreement to a policy of deferring certain proposed rule revisions as editorial changes, and in response to a specific question from a cataloger, concluded that its function excludes rule interpretation.

Code Development and Emendation

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee, in concert with the Canadian Library Association Committee on Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the Library Association Cataloguing Rules Committee, the Library Association Media Cataloguing Rules Committee, and the Library of Congress, devoted its attention primarily to the development of rules for cataloging nonbook materials. To expedite the preparation of the rules for cataloging audiovisual materials, it was decided to take advantage of the work being done by the LA Media Cataloguing Rules Committee and by the authors of Non-Book Materials, a manual being
revised under the aegis of the Canadian Library Association. This decision obliged the group to seek agreement on three troublesome issues: (1) the applicability of the principle of author main entry to media cataloging, (2) the media to be included in this corpus of rules, and (3) media designations. The group also reviewed the specific rules drafted by the LA Media Cataloguing Rules Committee. At the same time the DCC Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files was investigating the premises on which to base rules for cataloging computer records. This subcommittee completed two position papers, forwarded by DCC for the consideration of the other authors of the code.

During this reporting period, further code development came in the form of additional transliteration tables. One revised and three new transliteration tables were prepared by the Library of Congress staff and approved by the CLA and ALA committees: Amharic and the revision of the table for Greek, Sindhi in Arabic script, and Georgian.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee is responsible not only for filling the lacunae in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR), but also for revising the rules that have been found inadequate in the day-to-day application of the code. The most important of the rule changes adopted for the “North American Text” was the deletion of rules 98 and 99 which provided for the entry of certain corporate bodies under place. This change eliminated one of the major differences between the “British Text” and the “North American Text” and brought the latter into harmony with the “Paris Principles.” Complete revisions of the rule for Indonesian names (AACR 57) and the rule for Thai names (AACR 58) also were approved. Numerous other proposed rule revisions were considered and several were authorized for publication in Cataloging Service.

Editions and Translations of the AACR

The cataloging code as a publication has been a matter of concern to DCC during the past two years. The Committee’s responsibilities to ALA were explored with the executive editor, ALA Publishing Services. The request for authorization to incorporate revisions into the text of the French-Canadian translation required a recommendation from the authors of the code, and brought up the question of copyright protection for revisions and amendments. Plans were made for the publication of a supplement to make the revised rules of description quickly available. There was considerable interest in the report from the LA Cataloguing Rules Committee concerning their project of preparing an abridged edition.

The prospect of substantial additions and revisions in the near future brought the authors face to face with the need for a second edition of the AACR and a Subcommittee was proposed to consider the many problems.
International Standards

The application of computer technology to problems of bibliographical control is accelerating the metamorphosis of descriptive cataloging rules into international standards. Two important standards have been referred to the Committee this year. The International Standard Bibliographic Description for Single Volume and Multi-volume Monographic Publications was approved in principle by DCC. Its incorporation into the rules for description of monographs in the AACR was begun at the Library of Congress and at the British Library. The International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials also was discussed especially with regard to its relationship to the UNISIST International Serials Data System.

Work in Progress

Since the protean quality of library collections makes cataloging code development forever a work in progress, the DCC agenda are crowded. Immediate attention must be given to the resolution of certain problems of corporate authorship to permit the urgently needed revision of rules 1A and 17. Rule 78 with its thorny problems of entry for government agencies and rule 43 the provisions of which have precipitated extensive recataloging also require attention. Other major projects before DCC have been suggested in this report—prompt review and publication of AACR, chapter 6, revised to accord with the ISBD; preparation of the rules for cataloging nonbook materials; the formulation of rules for cataloging machine-readable data files; and planning for the second edition of a code that its authors hope will someday be not just “Anglo-American” but international.
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Member-at-Large (1973–76):
Margaret E. Cockshutt, Faculty of Library Science, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.
Mrs. Elizabeth L. Tate, National Bureau of Standards Library, Gaithersburg, Maryland.
(Nominating Committee, CCS: Thomas E. Sullivan, Chairman; Rowland Bennett, Raymond H. Deutsch, Mrs. Esther S. Greenberg, Richard R. Hammond.)

Reproduction of Library Materials Section

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1973–75):
Charles W. Evans, College of Library Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.
William C. Roselle, University of Wisconsin Library, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Secretary (1973–76):
Robert Lynch, University of Massachusetts Library, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Paul C. Sheldon, Jr., Catalog Maintenance and Preservation Department, University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder, Colorado.
(Nominating Committee, RLMS: Robert C. Sullivan, Chairman; Robert C. Farris, Robert A. Jones.)

Serials Section

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1973–75):
Mrs. Dorothy Glasby, Cataloging Section, Serial Record Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.
Elizabeth Pan, Graduate School of Library Science, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Secretary (1973–74):
Judith Nientimp, Serial and Binding Division, University of Rochester Library, Rochester, New York.
(Nominating Committee, SS: Mrs. Josephine S. Pulsifer, Chairman; William Henderson, Ms. Helen Schmierer.)
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IN THE MAIL: DOCUMENTS CONTROL

I was pleased to see "The Plain 'J'" by Mina Pease in the last number of LRTS (16:315-25) which seems to be the first step towards positive handling of the problem of a growing and active documents collection. The complications are rapidly beginning to go beyond the capacity of conventional cataloging and classification processes. It would be extremely desirable if some way could be found for Mina Pease to concentrate on further extension. Having completed some months ago a long article (170 typed sheets) "Government Publications (Documents)" for volume X of the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science as well as having wrestled with the problem for nearly fifty years, I would feel that such would mark a most considerable forward step in attempting to meet a situation of increasing importance and complexity—James Bennett Childs, Washington, D.C.

IN THE MAIL: MORE ON SUBJECT ENTRY SEARCHES

In volume 16 no. 2 (Spring 1972) page 267 of LRTS, Sidney L. Jackson refers to filing of subject cards by publication date. During the summer of 1971, the catalog department of the Wilbur Cross Library began an experiment in filing selected headings in our subject catalog by inverse chronological order by publication date.

In May 1971 lengthy discussions were held between the catalog department staff; the reference department staff; and David Kapp, administrative assistant for public services, who initiated the request for this type of filing. The request was made on the basis of suggestions and recommendations cited in Ben-Ami Lipetz's User Requirements in Identifying Desired Works in a Large Library. It was finally decided to experiment with inverse chronological filing. Sixty subjects were selected by the reference department using the criterion of headings with large files where currency of information is considered important.

The cards for each selected subject were filed by date of publication with the most recent date first, and alphabetical by main entry when there was more than one card for a year. Pink instruction cards were filed at the front of each subject stating.

Example:

BANKS AND BANKING

Cards under BANKS AND BANKING are filed chronologically by publication date with newer books first. Annual reviews, on-going sets, etc. are filed in a separate section in front.

A pink guide card headed CURRENT was filed directly behind the open entry material to indicate the beginning of the chronological sequence. Date indication guide cards (pink) were filed at reasonable space intervals.

In March 1972 a committee evaluated the filing experiment. Although there were very few comments from the users, the Reference Department staff considered the arrangement very helpful. It was agreed, therefore, to refile all cards in
the subject catalog chronologically by publication date except for those headings beginning with a geographical name and those which are divided into chronological periods. We estimate that about 50 percent of the subject catalog will be filed by inverse chronological order by date of publication.

We are now in the process of refiling the subject catalog. Although we have no formal plans for evaluating user reaction, we will probably consider some method of evaluation in a year or so.—Mary Balmer, Wilbur Cross Library, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

IN THE MAIL: CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION

*LRTS* is the outstanding journal in our branch of the profession. Fine. The editors decide to publish a lead article on Cataloging-in-Publication (Henry W. Wingate, “Cataloging-in-Publication: Problems and Prospects,” *LRTS* 16:423-32 [Fall 1972]), a program of great interest to the cataloging world. Fine. The author writes well and reasons logically. Fine. The writer draws his conclusions from serious misapprehensions about the nature of the present Cataloging-in-Publication program. Not so good. Though the program has been well described in the literature, the editors of *LRTS* do not perceive the writer’s misapprehensions. Not so good. Reasoning logically from these misapprehensions the writer comes to very pessimistic conclusions concerning the possibility of success for the program. Not so good. Though the writer correctly says, “The single largest problem . . . is that of gaining the cooperation of individual publishers,” any publisher reading his article and not knowing its factual flaws would pretty certainly be quickly turned off from the program. Not good at all.

What are the misapprehensions that led the writer to his pessimistic conclusions? First, and I quote: “To relieve pressure on the cataloging staff the new program will operate under a ten-day time limit rather than the previous 24-hour limit. This will no doubt relieve some of the tension for the catalogers, but a week-long delay may prove to be unacceptable to a majority of publishers.” The problem of time pressure, on the publishers’ schedules or on the catalogers’ nerves, has been solved by operating from galley proofs instead of page proofs, as in the earlier Cataloging-in-Source experiment. The difference is not merely one of days or weeks but of many months. We have cataloged some 12,500 titles and about the only problems in this regard were a few cases where the publisher’s office forgot to send the material to us until the last minute. Even then we got the CIP data back very quickly by phone. We have a file of letters from publishers expressing their delight with our fast service. Catalogers do CIP cataloging at their standard cataloging pace. They just catalog the CIP galleys before any non-CIP books.

Second, and I quote: “The Library of Congress . . . must set up a department to rush catalog the titles submitted by publishers.” Actually the Library of Congress has not found this to be necessary at all. However, it was necessary to set up a special office to manage the project—to handle the incoming galleys, etc., mail out the completed CIP data, maintain liaison with the publishers, keep control records, and the like. Titles are cataloged by the regular cataloging divisions and moved from station to station by the CIP office staff. Our initial estimates of extra cataloging staff required to handle titles in the CIP mode turned out to be much too high.
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Third, and I quote: “The Library of Congress... must, to all intents and purposes, catalog every book in the CIP program twice.” Actually the cataloger catalogs the galley proof completely, except for collation, although only selected elements of the cataloging are sent back to the publishers for printing as CIP. Only in rare instances does the cataloger see the published book when it arrives. A trained library technician compares the book and the full cataloging copy, corrects any discrepancy (a rare event), adds the collation, and sends the card to the printer.

Fourth, and I quote: “The rate of discrepancy between the entries and the books will necessitate careful examination of every CIP entry [by a cataloger in any library using CIP data]... It will probably be necessary for a cataloger to prepare the entire card.” The discrepancy rate in CIP data should not be perceptibly different from the discrepancy rate on LC cards for books cataloged after publication. If changes are made during production, these are reported to the CIP Office to update the CIP data printed in the book. In other libraries the need for a cataloger to handle a CIP book is the same as the need for a cataloger to handle a set of LC cards. A call number has to be established and if headings are checked against the catalog by a cataloger as standard routine, this will be required also for CIP titles. The point is, there is no difference. But the preparation of the card copy can be done by trained technicians.

Based on these and other misapprehensions Mr. Wingate comes to the conclusion: “For a number of reasons, the optimism with which CIP has been approached does not appear to be warranted.”

Now the facts are that Cataloging-in-Publication is alive and well! Since the CIP program began July 1, 1971, approximately 12,500 titles have been processed, although only 4,400 have actually appeared on the market to date. Over 350 publishers are enthusiastically cooperating in submitting all their titles. Most of the publishers who began participating in the program prior to June 1972, have CIP data in 100 percent of their spring titles. Current receipts for processing projected on an annual basis show that we are operating at the rate of 14,000 to 15,000 titles per annum or about 50 percent of the United States trade book output. When several large firms who have recently joined the program get into full gear, this figure will jump much higher. A sign of the interest and impact the program is generating in the publishing industry is evident in the number of publishers who are now writing to ask how they may join rather than waiting to be contacted by the CIP office. A cooperative effort with the National Library of Medicine for biomedical titles is also proving successful. Over 70 percent of the major medical book publishers have joined the program. The CIP cooperative cataloging effort, begun with NLM in May 1972, has now seen over 400 titles processed to include the alternate NLM subject headings and class numbers for biomedical titles.

Publishers are indicating an enthusiastic response from librarians, in some cases reporting an increase in their prepublication ordering.

A survey of D.C. area public library systems and select U.S. university libraries shows they are regularly using CIP data to speed the books to their readers. Public librarians unanimously requested that every effort be made to increase as rapidly as possible the coverage of U.S. books in the program. Current CIP titles represent about 15 to 30 percent of these libraries’ total receipts of new books.

University libraries report that 85 to 95 percent of CIP books have LC
printed cards waiting in depository card sets when the books arrive at their libraries. Getting an advance copy of the book from CIP publishers insures in most cases that an LC printed card is available on or before the date of publication.

No doubt the sharp contrast between these reports and Mr. Wingate’s great reservations about the possibility of success for CIP can be traced to the fact that his article was written before the CIP program had gotten underway and was issued originally in 1971 as an ERIC/CLIS document (ED 053 752). Republication of this article in January 1973 with no mention whatever of its earlier issuance strikes us as being a disservice to both the author and his readers.—C. Sumner Spalding and William A. Gosling, Library of Congress.

METHODS OF CARD REPRODUCTION TO BE REPORTED

The ALA/RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section announces that it is now assembling reports on methods of catalog card reproduction used by libraries. The project aims to provide a collection of informal papers, prepared by the librarians most directly involved in the card production operation in their libraries, which describe and evaluate the techniques and costs of various systems.

Mr. Joseph Z. Nitecki, current chairman of RLMS, who is compiling the reports, has arranged for the microfilming and distribution of the collection in cooperation with the Library of Congress Photoduplication Service. Detailed information about the price and ordering procedure for the document, which is expected to be available in May, will appear in the LC Information Bulletin. Although he is especially interested in techniques employed by small libraries, he would welcome information concerning any method, from stencil to computer-assisted production. Reports received after March 15, if sufficient in number, may result in a follow-up volume.

RLMS is also preparing a two-hour meeting to be held at the ALA Annual Conference at Las Vegas in June, during which a panel comprising those who have contributed to the collection will review card reproduction systems and answer questions about them. It is suggested that anyone planning to attend this meeting purchase and read the reports in advance.

For further information concerning the project or meeting, write to: Joseph Z. Nitecki, Assistant Director of Technical Services Division, Paley Library, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122.

Disdaining, or perhaps simply being blissfully unaware of, its pejorative connotation Mr. Scilken undauntedly proclaims his journal to have originally been called "How I Run My Library Good." The first four issues certainly have been just that! Designed as an informal non-scholarly letter for the exchange of useful ideas among librarians, The Unabashed Librarian to date has been essentially a one-man, one-library publication telling the world how the Orange, New Jersey Public Library does things. With a little more of the leavening from other libraries that has appeared in the most recent issues, and the use of Dui’s simplified spelling, it could well be mistaken for the Library Journal of 1876.

This is a technical journal of potential interest to all readers of LRTS. The contents of the first four issues include: a list of high loss books; publishers’ discount tables; magazine expiration codes; magazine circulation figures; numerous pseudo-classification schemes; complaints about the too scholarly nature of LC cataloging; relevant subject headings; bibliographies on popular topics; samples of forms; descriptions of a variety of home-made systems; etc.; etc.; and even one or two intentionally not so practical or even serious articles. To characterize its contents as bold or innovative is an exaggeration for there is little described that is really new or different and much that is impractical and unsound. What is most lacking in this publication is any sense of editorial judgment or evaluation. Clearly oriented toward small public libraries, The Unabashed Librarian might well meet their need for practical advice if there were stronger editorial control and if there were not so many unabashed librarians ready to foist their notions on an unwitting world. —Norman Stevens, University of Connecticut Library, Storrs, Connecticut.

Library of Congress Classification (filmstrip and cassette). Wichita, Kans.: Library Filmstrip Center, 1971. 57 frames. color. 35 mm. 18 min. $23.00.

It should be noted at the outset that of the fifty-seven announced frames the first twenty-two—after three devoted to focus, imprint, and title—deal with the history and description of the Library of Congress and its collection, with one exception where the six classes of an early scheme are enumerated. The twenty-seven frames that actually treat of the subject announced in the title are well presented, the photography is excellent, and the schedules shown are clearly explained in the accompanying recording. But it seemed appalling to the reviewer that only about half of the filmstrip is devoted to the subject of the title, as the Library of Congress classification scheme presents a number of difficulties to the beginner, especially in its tables, none of which are given even honorable mention in this work. Certainly those twenty-two wasted frames could have been efficiently utilized to explain the operation of certain tables which could provide the key to the use of similar tables throughout the schedules. The reviewer, in his own courses, has found that the tables of the B (authors in philosophy), H (geographical tables), L (Table I), and P (especially VIII, IX, XI) schedules
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provide the essential types of difficulties and their solution can be applied analogically to most of the others. In fact, the reviewer would strongly recommend that the publisher produce a separate filmstrip on the history and description of the Library of Congress and revise this one so that it honestly represents its title.

No teacher who is serious about presenting students with the intricacies of LC classification wants to waste class time with showing portraits of Jefferson, Putnam, the Juilliard String Quartet, and pictures of the Gutenberg Bible, etc. The historical aspects can better be handled in a lecture. It is certainly unfortunate that the producers of educational films and filmstrips so often seem to follow the pattern of the old military training film which presupposes the intellectual ability and attention span of a fifth-grader.

Returning to the work at hand, the last three frames contain a view of the dome from the inside, credits, and a very sketchy bibliography which includes only the authors' surnames (Wynar is misspelled), brief titles, and no edition or imprint information. Finally, although advertisements and labels announce fifty-seven frames, the reviewer could find only fifty-five in his copy, and these, of course, included a focusing frame and the usual credits, title, etc. In other words the reviewer strongly suggests that Immroth's book is still far better and at less than half the price.

—Francis J. Witty, Department of Library Science, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.


The proceedings of the Documentation Research and Training Centre, established in Bangalore in 1962, provide up-to-date knowledge of the Colon classification, specifically, and information on cataloging and classification, generally. The twenty-nine papers—by documentalists, librarians, professors, and research and subject specialists—which comprise the eighth annual seminar are divided into four major groupings. S. R. Ranganathan introduces sections A, B, and C with the papers, "Conflict of Canons of Cataloguing," "Formation of Basic Subjects and Isolates in Social Sciences," and "Documentation Service to Top Management."

One fourth of the book is devoted to Part A: "Library Cataloguing, Rendering of Names of Corporate Bodies." The discussion in Part A is based on the Canon of Recall Value, "the principle that in the multiworded name of a person, or a corporate body, or an organ of a corporate body, or a series, or a work . . . the entry element is to consist of the word or word group with the highest Recall Value." The implications of the Canon of Recall Value are explored in papers on corporate bodies, titles, series, and multiple purview (a word or group of words expressed in terms relating to two or more entities). The same general pattern is followed in each: scope, suggestions, examples, and distribution of recall value.

The second section deals with subject analysis in the social sciences. The two papers on new basic subjects and compound isolates are particularly interesting. As knowledge expands, classification must somehow accommodate new knowledge, and of course the question is inevitable, "Is this a new subject or a part or isolate
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of an existing subject?" The rate of growth of new basic subjects (Editions 6 and 7 of Colon Classification) in social science is compared with development in natural sciences. The total number of main basic subjects in social sciences in Edition 7 is 16, representing an increase of eight new subjects compared to forty-five in natural sciences, an increase of thirteen new subjects.

The largest number of papers (fifteen) is on "Documentation Systems for Industry." These are mostly short essays, some of which are case studies. Although some of the reports in this section deal with specific industries such as textiles, mining, glass, ceramics, and food, the informational needs, requirements, and services may be applied to other technical libraries.

The final section consists of three technical papers on classification, cataloging, and computer-aided document finding systems from the DRTC Research Cell.

In general there are bibliographical references at the end of each paper; the papers are well-organized and easy to read. There is a table of contents but no index, a feature which would be helpful in a work of this length. All of the papers are based on the assumption that the reader is familiar with Ranganathan and his five laws of library science, and this book is therefore of particular interest to cataloging teachers and classification specialists.—Geraldine O. Matthews, School of Library Science, North Carolina Central University, Durham.


That IFLA's International Conference on Cataloguing Principles at Paris in 1961 (ICCP) adopted a Statement of Principles was a major achievement. Over the years that Statement has continued to dominate catalog code writing in individual countries and to stimulate creative thinking about cataloging itself. Eva Verona's commentary gives a clear and concise account of the Statement's effects in both areas. It draws heavily on (1) the "provisional" annotated edition of the Statement by A. H. Chaplin and Dorothy Anderson (1966) and (2) the International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts at Copenhagen in 1969 (IMCE). But the Verona commentary and its helpful examples are much more elaborate than in Chaplin-Anderson, and the account of how post-Paris codes have dealt with individual principles in the Statement is entirely new.

Problems not solved by the original Statement continue to plague both code makers and code theorists. Of these problems perhaps the most serious is the failure of the Statement to define "author." During the Paris meeting in 1961 the sectional group on terminology did agree on the definition of "author" as the "person or corporate body who created a work or is responsible for its intellectual content, arrangement or form" (ICCP Report p. 118). Such a definition has dominated Anglo-American cataloging since Cutter. But this definition carried only the authority of the group on terminology, not of the Paris conference.

In post-Paris codes, differences resulting from different definitions of "author" have resulted in different rules for entry (1) under personal
authors and/or corporate bodies, (2) for works done under editorial direction, and (3) for collections (See Verona p. 24, 45-46, 85-87 and elsewhere). The problem, of course, lies in accepting one word: "responsible." Even in our own Anglo-American code (AACR) we do not always require that a heading meets our definition—e.g., AACR rule 22A1 which produces "Australia. Constitution." a heading representing neither authorship nor responsibility. The popular notion is that the ICCP Statement reconciled the long-standing Anglo-American and Germanic differences about corporate bodies as authors. But the Verona analysis reveals clearly "the disappointing fact that in the field of corporate entries we are still very far from international uniformity" (p. 73) .

A second major problem of the Statement is "international uniformity" itself. AACR, for instance, provides (44A3a and 44B1c) for headings such as "Horace" and "Homer" rather than the formerly used "Horatius Flaccus, Quintus" and "Homerus." The Verona analysis, however, endorses the "definite trend of the IMCE recommendations towards international uniformity and towards the use of original forms whenever possible" (p. 33), and suggests that "the English form of name as heading" on LC cards "considerably impairs the value of those cards as international means of bibliographic information and renders their use in libraries in non-English speaking countries less convenient" (p. 32). It may, however, be possible that in non-European countries Latin is no longer (if it ever was) an international language.

To many catalogers the main thrust of the Statement is toward international standardization of choice of entry rather than form of entry. Indeed, what purpose would international standardization of form of entry serve unless we have some kind of international Cataloging in Publication (CIP)? But "for alphabetical catalogues using a non-roman script the IMCE agreed that a uniform phonetic transcription might be used for each name written in characters different from those used in the catalogue, if no exact transliteration system exists" (p. 34). This concession seems to admit that international CIP is impossible because the cards with such transliterated headings would (like the cards with English headings) not be equally useful in all countries and particularly in the countries using the language which has been transliterated.

Eva Verona and her colleagues have written a stimulating and informative book; it is unfortunate that there are no specific citations of rule numbers in the various post-Paris codes discussed and that there is no index.—Paul S. Dunkin, Bloomington, Indiana.


The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules has been the subject of a considerable number of publications since its appearance in 1967, as well as many prepublication discussions, interpretations, conferences, and analyses; personal and official interpretations of what AACR is or should have been are available in the literature. Most of these publications, however, have been written for, or from the point of view of, experienced catalogers, thoroughly familiar with the basic purposes of cataloging.
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and with previous cataloging codes. Such background provided many catalogers with an advantage in the changeover to the new code. But, frequently forgotten in much of the discussion is the beginner—the student who must not only absorb the purpose of AACR, but become knowledgeable in its use. Aids for the beginning cataloger have appeared sporadically during the past five years, however, and the book under consideration here is such a work.

Designed to be used in conjunction with AACR, this work interprets some of the technical language and meaning of the rules and illustrates many of them with sample cards (some are LC cards, others are typewritten). This guide, as the title indicates, covers only the rules for author and title entry—but in doing so includes both headings and choice of entry. Not all of the rules are included: special rules for religious and legal publications, for example, as well as others which the author determined to be self-explanatory have been disregarded. The arrangement of the book does not parallel AACR, but begins with the rules for headings for personal names; then rules for choice of entry; uniform titles; sacred works; conferences, corporate author headings; headings for government bodies and officials; and a chapter on rules 98 and 99 (both virtually eliminated recently by ALA and LC—a decision supported by the author).

In the preface, Lehnus states that "the principal objective of this manual is to explain these new rules for the novice cataloger." One of the major aids to the "novice cataloger" that is not included in this work is the title page. The interpretations of the rules and the sample cards are helpful; but beginning catalogers start with some work in hand, identify the "problem" and then go to the rules. Many of the sample cards included here would be much more enlightening if used to illustrate how the title page information was translated into a catalog entry with the title page next to the card—particularly for the rules on choice of entry.

The author also states that he will demonstrate the differences between ALA and AACR, which he does to a certain extent in his explanations, but this is not extended to the samples themselves. The first sample card in the book, illustrating AACR 42 (Pseudonyms), shows a main entry under "Twain, Mark, 1835–1910." While this author would be entered as such under AACR, it may prove to be very confusing for students who find that the entry is under "Clemens, . . ." in most catalogs. An explanation of differences and of the principle of superimposition here would certainly be an aid to interpretation.

The lack of title pages is a handicap in this work. But, there is also a problem in that some of the sample cards do not illustrate the rules which they are supposed to cover, while others require exhaustive examination to make the connection between the card and the rule. Two examples: For AACR 3B1 (principal author indicated and no more than three named) there are four sample cards, but one is a case of joint editorship. And, for AACR 6 (serials), one of the examples is an LC card for a title main entry on which has been typed a corporate name to make the card into an author main entry, but which looks like—and in any other context would be assumed to be—an author added entry.

From the title and from the preface of this work, the reader is given the impression that this is a "how to" manual for the use of the AACR, but the author gets side-tracked into criti-
icism of the rules or the format of AACR. In a guide for the "novice cataloger" such criticism is unnecessary and out of place. The *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* is an established fact, and despite revisions, this is the code now in use. A guide to the *AACR* should be just that, not a critical analysis. Another point in this area of discussion is the author's apparent conviction that the British text is superior to the North American text. Again, this kind of personal bias has no place in this publication. Students must learn to use whatever tools are available, and while they should do so with a critical eye, extrapolations such as may be found in this work are beyond the author's stated intentions.—*Judith Ganson, School of Library Science, North Carolina Central University, Durham.*


This collection of approximately 500 catalog cards illustrating the *AACR* has been arranged by rule number. Most of those included are LC cards, but a few are typed. Many of the LC cards have been adjusted to conform with the *AACR*, rather than with current LC cataloging. Still, there are cards which are erroneous, e.g., those illustrating rules 1B, 8E2, and 78A type 2. The examples are principally of works found in theological libraries, but this in no way diminishes the volume's usefulness for other types of libraries.

Each card is accompanied by extracts from *AACR* text and, occasionally by a comment from the compilers. It must be noted that there has been no attempt to interpret or clarify *AACR* statements, only to illustrate them by using actual catalog cards. The coverage of the cataloging code as a whole is quite good, and commendation is due the compilers for including so many examples which illustrate the *AACR*'s Part III on nonbook materials. Due to the emphasis on theological materials, exemplary cards for legal publications (rules 20-26) and for names in certain languages (rules 54-59) have been omitted. For most libraries this is not nearly as serious as the paucity of examples for nonreligious corporate bodies, and the fact that apart from the section on nonbook materials no example whatsoever is given for interposed uniform titles.

There is an alphabetical index, but arrangement by rule number is more important. This makes it quite a useful tool for the cataloger needing an example which illustrates a specific rule. Even though this guide offers little help in the interpretation of the rules, the examples offer some assistance. It might well be that the publication of such guides, containing full catalog cards, will point out the need for exemplary cards to be included in a forthcoming edition of the *AACR*.—*Donald J. Lehnus, School of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.*


This report of a conference held five years ago in Florence contains, happily for English-only readers, two basic communications in English; one is by John Finzi of the Library of
Congress and the other by Joseph Becker of EDUCOM. The purpose of the conference was to study the possibility of "rationalizing" or applying to certain fundamental services of the National Central Library of Florence more modern efficient methods, using the most advanced techniques available. Both Finzi's and Becker's communications addressed themselves directly to this problem. Comments by the distinguished delegates from Europe and Canada were largely limited to encouragement and reports of their own automation efforts with minor criticisms of the basic documents. The outcome of the conference was the adoption of twelve resolutions and the formation of a committee to implement them.

Unfortunately the most advanced techniques are probably not available to the Italians. Among the persistent themes of the meeting was the realization of the limitation of funds and especially of trained personnel. It is greatly to the credit of the administration of the Nazionale that they proposed to take the lead in modernization and automation in Italy soon after the disastrous flood of 1966. But the resources at their disposal are restricted. It is also to Finzi's and Becker's credit that they were fully cognizant of these limitations and proposed only small steps as a beginning to automation. Finzi, for instance, suggests a study of the internal organization of the library along systems analysis lines to establish functions of the various administrative sections and to set up channels of internal communication. His recommendations are confined to automating the accessioning and registration of incoming materials as the first link in securing bibliographic information in machine-readable form which would ultimately facilitate the work of the cataloging and national bibliography sections.

Both Maltese and Becker discuss and usefully summarize the experience of the Nazionale in mechanizing aspects of its work associated with production of the Bibliografia Nazionale Italiana (BNI). The MARC format has been adapted, in coordination with LC. Becker recognized the following serious constraints: cost, availability of trained staff, and access to a high-quality photo-composition machine and to a computer service bureau. Neither the library nor IBM, the consultant, were willing to sacrifice printing quality and typography in the BNI, and IBM expressed its willingness to cooperate in solving this problem.

The matter which seemed to generate the most discussion was Finzi's recommendation that the library review its policy of collecting ephemera (postcards, leaflets, advertising matter, wedding announcements, etc.) which come to the library under the depository laws. T. Tombor of the Hungarian National Library in Budapest and J. Lethève of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris both objected to any suggestion to eliminate these items. As Tombor said: "the history of a people is not written only in its government documents, international treaties, parliamentary acts." Nevertheless, these items are bulky to store and time-consuming to process. At the moment we have no really good guidelines for establishing the point beyond which even a national library should not collect. Perhaps Tombor is right, for we cannot know now what uses the future will make of present artifacts. And yet "universal" collection places an extremely severe strain on systems already overloaded. The problem remains and begs for consideration.

At this point in time the conference has primarily an historical inter-
est, although Finzi's and Becker's methods of analysis might provide a useful model for other libraries wishing to undertake a similar modernization. In addition, a certain amount of detailed information on accessioning and acquisitions procedures is presented—of doubtful value except as a curiosity. It would be more interesting to know what progress has been made along the lines of the conference, and for this we must turn to the periodical literature.—Sally Gibson, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.


In 1968, responding to a request by a group of university librarians, the National Library of Canada undertook a survey of the library collections of universities offering graduate studies in humanities and social sciences. The result of this endeavor is beginning to appear in the form of a series of volumes, each dealing with the resources of libraries located in a province or a group of provinces. This is the first in the series; it is devoted to the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta.

In the Introduction, the National Librarian assures the reader that the information (which in some cases is out-of-date) presented in the volume will be kept up-to-date and will be augmented by surveys of federal government libraries, special libraries, large public libraries, and by the inclusion in future surveys of science and other collections.

The handsomely-designed book comprises two parts. The first gives a historical sketch for each university, enrollment figures, the number of degrees conferred, the composition and duties of the graduate faculty, the fields of graduate studies with some curriculum notes, and brief comments on some library collections worthy of note. The second part consists of a series of subject tables arranged by LC classification giving figures for monographs and periodical holdings. The tabular form of reporting the findings is good in that it is simple; but the simplicity hides some thorny problems of interpretation regarding government documents, special collections, audiovisual materials, and microforms, depending on whether or not a particular library classified the material or not. A three-line note on page 7 provides a reminder that nothing is ever quite as simple as titles of books indicate: "Undergraduate and graduate collections are not separated in the Prairie Provinces with the result that the statistics are of the integrated collection."

This survey of research collections in Canadian libraries is an important step in the direction of coordination and cooperation among libraries. The financial constraints already with us, and likely to remain for some time, render rationalization of library collections imperative. This volume and its companions will be a useful complement to the report of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada's Committee on the Rationalization of Research in Canada. The true worth of the publication will be determined by the uses made of figures which are available.

Large research libraries and American institutions particularly interested in the Canadian library scene should find this surprisingly and refreshingly inexpensive book a worthwhile addition to their collections.—Laurent-G. Denis, Faculty of Library
The papers presented here are the proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School, August 2-4, 1971. The purpose of the conference was to introduce librarians to some of the contributions that operations research (OR) has made to libraries. As stated in the introduction by Abraham Bookstein and Don R. Swanson, the conference did not "presume to define the limits of Operations Research in the field of librarianship" and that "an attempt was made in organizing this conference to select representative and important lines of substantive work and to invite those who have carried out this work to prepare papers. . . ."

Generally, the contributors are well-respected scholars. As a group, they are predominantly OR practitioners. Only four of the seventeen contributors are directly connected with either libraries or library schools.

The papers can generally be divided into two groups. The first group emphasizes the philosophical aspects of OR; included is an introductory paper by C. West Churchman. The philosophical discussion is continued by Ferdinand F. Leimkuhler who explores in some detail what libraries could expect to gain from operations research and also what operation research could expect to gain from libraries. He states that "libraries have been more useful to OR than has OR been useful to libraries." However, he attributes this, at least in part, to the lack of "... more permanent in-house OR teams which can concentrate on model implementation as well as model development." Abraham Bookstein concludes the philosophical discussion by considering the implications which OR has for library education.

The second group of papers concentrates on the mathematical modeling of specific library or information transfer problems, covering a wide range of library applications. Philip M. Morse discusses several measures of library effectiveness. Michael K. Buckland proposes a specific measure of effectiveness, "satisfaction level," which he defines as "the chances that a reader would find a copy of a book on the shelves when he wanted it." He presents a model which relates the effects of "variable” loan and duplication policies to the "satisfaction level." Buckland reports that the application of this model at the University of Lancaster contributed to a 200 percent increase in borrowing over two years. Morris Hamburg, Leonard G. Ramist, and Michael R. W. Bommer develop a different performance measure called "document exposure." They report that a "useful conceptualization of library objectives is to maximize document exposure per dollar..."

Ben-Ami Lipetz reports on a very detailed study of card catalog use at Yale University. Fred Glover and Darwin Klingman present a mathematical programming model for the selection of journals. Their model, despite its mathematical elegance, does not seem to be a reasonable representation of the journal selection process. Even if the information required for the model could be obtained, which
would be difficult if not impossible, it is questionable that the model would produce results as good as those achieved by a competent librarian using normal selection procedures.

Two papers deal with information transfer. Robert R. Korfhage, U. Narayan Bhat, and Richard E. Nance present a communications model for information networks. Manfred Kochen reports on a model for the design of directories for information networks and referral centers. To some extent, the implications of Kochen's model should apply to reference service in general.

As a group, the models seem to give a fair reflection of the present state of operations research in libraries. However, these models should not be viewed as "final solutions" to the particular problems with which they deal, but rather they need to be viewed as products of early attempts to apply OR to libraries. Most of the models presented could be expected to yield satisfactory results if and when they are implemented. However, it would be expected that some of these models will undergo significant modification as the data required to test them become available. Morse recognized that "we need more data, both to extend the present models and to test out proposed ones."

Generally the book does a commendable job of trying to present a very difficult topic. Very few librarians will want to read the entire book, although a majority of papers would probably be of interest. Most of the authors have done an admirable job of keeping the mathematics to a minimum, but several papers will be difficult reading for the average librarian. The result is an excellent book for either librarians who are interested in operations research or professional OR practitioners who have an interest in libraries. It is not, however, recommended as an introductory text on library OR. The reader is forced to integrate the various concepts presented in order to achieve an overview of the implications of operations research for libraries, and the differences in terminology and notation tend to make this a difficult process.

—Edward T. O'Neill, School of Information and Library Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo.
The following abstracts are based on those prepared by the Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC/CLIS).

Documents with an ED number are available in the format specified—microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC)—from:

ERIC Document Reproduction Service
LEACSO Information Products, Inc.
P.O. Drawer O
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $10.00. Book rate or library rate postage is included in the quoted price. Order blanks containing further information may be obtained from LEACSO Information Products.

11p. ED 060 905. MF $0.65, HC $3.29.

The purpose of Cataloging in Publication (CIP) is to provide professional cataloging data to publishers so that the data will be printed in the book. Since CIP will reduce cataloging costs and speed the delivery of books to readers, it should be beneficial to both the library world and the publishing industry. The number of participating publishers has grown from 27 in July 1971 to 157. The goal of CIP is to provide Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data at an annual rate of 30,000 titles by July 1973. The publishing houses and their divisions who are actively participating in the CIP program, or who plan to participate in the future, are listed. The selected bibliography contains references to the articles and announcements concerning CIP that have appeared in the library and trade press.

Cataloging Non-Print at NMAC; a Guide for the Medical Librarian. Match 1972. 36p. ED 061 985. MF $0.65, HC $3.29.
Institution: National Library of Medicine, National Medical Audiovisual Center, Atlanta, Georgia.
Sponsor: National Library of Medicine (DHEW), Bethesda, Maryland.

Cataloging audiovisual materials consists of compiling depictive information which best describes the content and substance of the audiovisual. Since the physical nature of AV's makes it necessary to limit access to them, the catalog entry should contain information which will reduce to a minimum the occasions when the handling of the AV is necessary. The rules for cataloging nonprint media take account of certain attributes of the materials and of the conditions under which they are generally catalogued and used. These rules are designed for the treatment of nontheatrical AV's of the most common kinds. This guide follows the standard library cataloging practices as far as they are applicable to the cataloging of AV's. The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules have been expanded and modified when necessary in order to include all elements required for thorough cataloging of nonbook materials. These rules can be adapted for cataloging special types of AV's and aggregations of AV's assembled for special purposes.

Creation of Machine Readable Catalog Entries; An Adaptation of the “Data
Institution: Ohio College Library Center, Columbus.

Sponsor: Office of Education (DHEW) —Washington, D.C.

This manual specifies the additional steps required in the data collection process to prepare bibliographic data for conversion into machine-readable form. It is designed to aid catalogers in preparing catalog entries in machine-readable form for the on-line cataloging system of the Ohio College Library Center. The rules for data preparation for compatibility with an on-line system are presented, and are based upon "Data Preparation Manual: MARC Editors" (MARC Manual, Vol. 2).


Institution: Stanford University, California. Libraries.

Sponsor: Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE) , Washington, D.C.

The main objectives of Project BALLOTS (Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations Using a Time-Sharing System) are: to control rising technical processing costs and, at the same time, to provide improved levels of service. This report on BALLOTS Phase II is concerned with the development and implementation of the production library automation system—the system that will support the day-to-day operations of the library. The report is divided into four parts. Chapter I gives some background for the report and summarizes the nature of the BALLOTS system, as well as its status at the end of the reporting period (June 1971). Chapter 2 describes development progress in two different areas: the bibliographic services and system design as seen by the user; and the software and hardware design to support these services (including video terminal selection and screen design). Chapter 3 describes the major standards and analytic studies completed during the design. Each of these standards or studies became a part of the design, or had a substantial effect on the user or the design described in Chapter 2. Chapter 4 describes the activities currently under way and future plans.


There is a fairly large body of literature on the 1967 Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR). Much of the adverse criticism which this literature contains is concerned with comparatively unimportant shortcomings of the code. This paper discusses what the author considers to be some of the more serious defects. Several suggestions are made for improving the code: (1) to avoid ambiguity, the rules in a catalog code must be based on a carefully controlled vocabulary; (2) a code should be based on stated principles; (3) rules for the selection of main entry headings should be more strictly adhered to; (4) inconsistency in rules determining the structure of main entries must be eliminated; and (5) a cataloging code should be as brief as possible. The overall effectiveness of a code depends to a large extent on the effectiveness of its arrangement. The fact that the scope of some rules is not clear makes it difficult to assess the comprehensiveness of the AACR, but it is probably the most comprehensive code for author/title cataloging in existence.
Programs for the training of library technical assistants exist in more than 31 states of the United States and six provinces of Canada. A total of 134 programs have been identified, 118 in the U.S. and 16 in Canada. This directory is arranged in two alphabetical groups—by state for the U.S. and by province for Canada. Within each state or province, entries are arranged alphabetically by institution. Each includes the name, address, and telephone number of the institution; name and title of the person in charge of the program; the title of the program; the year it began; course numbers; titles; and credit.

Sponsor: Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

This report identifies steps that might be taken by organizations, individual libraries, and libraries acting collectively to work towards resolution of the many problems that have been brought on by the physical deterioration of books and journals. An attempt is made to clarify the nature of the preservation problem and to assess progress made in recent years. A number of specific recommendations for action are made. A method of generating broader participation is suggested in the area of research into the causes of paper deterioration and remedial techniques. An analytical investigation of the merits of alternate methods of text preservation is also proposed. Additional needs in the area of education and training are identified, and the importance of specific preservation activities by individual libraries is underscored. The fundamental requirement is affirmed that preservation of library materials be seen as an inseparable part of the broader objective of extending access to recorded information. Approaches to developing a capability for collective action are advanced, and measures to be taken in such areas as storage standards, identification and recording of preservation copies, and preservation priorities are suggested.


The National Serials Pilot Project, Phase II of the National Serials Data Program, is described. Utilizing the MARC format for processing serials, the objectives were: (1) to create a machine-readable file containing live serials in the fields of science and technology; (2) to produce a number of preliminary listings; and (3) to produce one or more written reports covering procedures, problems, and results. Data were input via an administrative terminal system to a 360/40 computer; processing of data was done on a 360/50 computer. Among the conclusions and recommendations are: (1) a national serials data bank in machine-readable form is both technically and economically feasible; (2) such a data bank should have its own machine-readable authority file for corporate names; (3) input and output in upper case only would be more satisfactory from both the systems viewpoint and the cost viewpoint, but probably would not be accepted by the library community; and (4) serious con-
sideration should be given to the question of applicability of existing cataloging rules in the determination of main entry in a machine-readable file.

Lakhanpal, S. K. *A Manual for Recording Serial Publications in Kardex, Revised Edition*. 1971. 44p. ED 060 887. MF $0.65, HC $2.00 (Murray Memorial Library, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada).

Institution: Saskatchewan University, Saskatoon. Murray Memorial Library.

The recording of serials is an important function of a serials department. It helps in controlling the in-coming serials, claiming the not-received and missing issues, and answering inquiries regarding the current holdings of the library. This manual briefly describes the 3" x 5" file card system of recording serials, defines the various types of serial publications, and then provides a complete discussion on the use of the Kardex method. The various Kardex processes and notations discussed here are: date stamp, call number, plastic indicators, missing issue slips, duplicates, titles on display, removal from the reading area, reprints, separately cataloged items, titles not in the Kardex, invoicing, withdrawal of cards, filing, back issues, damaged journals, errata and information sheets, and notes. Included are several examples of sample forms used in the process of recording serials.


The alphanumeric code is a system put forward with the hope that it will bring uniformity in methods of inventory-taking and describing all sorts of audiovisual material which can be used in either French or English. The alphanumeric code classifies audiovisual materials in such a way as to indicate the exact nature of the media, the format, the year the document was edited, and the color if any. The classification systems actually in use regroup all documents by subjects. The alphanumeric code can be added by combining it with either of the following: (1) key words assembled on cards in alphabetical order in the same manner as subject-headings are traditionally classified; (2) key words assembled on periodical and cumulative lists with the help of a computer; and (3) traditional classification systems such as Dewey Decimal, Library of Congress, and the Universal Decimal Classification. The code can also be easily combined with the Uniterm Indexing System.


The purpose of the study was to define a world-wide machinery registering the essential characteristics of scientific periodicals and making them available to all interested individuals or organizations. The study is a combined feasibility study and preliminary system design. No provision was made to identify individual organizations which might participate at the international or local levels; nor for the maintenance of the data base; nor for the production of publications and services. Chapters 2 to 10 of the report constitute a detailed study of the proposed International Serials Data System. In particular, Chapters 4 and 7 are concerned with the content of the computer data base, and with detailed procedures for capturing and recording information for the system. Chapter 11 summarizes the authors' conclusions and recommendations. Supporting information is presented in a series of appendixes including a brief survey of existing serials data systems.

Volume 17, Number 1, Winter 1973
Proceedings of the International Symposium: “UDC in Relation to Other Indexing Languages” (Herceg Novi, Yugoslavia, June 28-July 1 1971). 1971. 422p. ED 062 995. MF $0.65, HC $6.00 (Jugoslovenski Centar za tehnicu i Naucnu Dokumentaciju, P.O. Box 724 Belgrade, Yugoslavia).

Institution: Yugoslav Center for Technical and Scientific Documentation, Belgrade (Yugoslavia).


The stress of this symposium was on the role of the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) and other indexing languages, especially in multilingual and multidisciplinary information systems, rather than on their potential uses in mechanized retrieval systems. The consensus of the symposium was: (1) that, without major structural changes, a system like the UDC cannot continue to serve as an internationally accepted ordering system for the rapidly proliferating new subject-fields, which have to be handled in modern information retrieval systems; (2) UDC improvement should be based on better methodology and clearer guidelines for those working to revise specific fields; and (3) that the International Federation for Documentation (FID) should aim at preparing, publishing, and maintaining a Standard Reference (SR) scheme consisting of a “roof classification schedule” of not more than three or four hierarchic levels as the unifying/switching language, with suitably indicated points and symbol devices for coupling to specific classifications, thesauri, etc., leaving the responsibility for full editions with national members, and for special-subject editions with the specialized interests concerned. A list of symposium participants is appended.


Institution: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.


Heavy emphasis was placed on experiments, and interpretation of experimental results. A set of experiments was designed to yield quantitative information on how the experimental subjects used the full-text-access system, why they used it and how effective it was. A detailed report of work on this topic to date is presented. The in-depth analysis of the Intrex system of bibliographic storage and retrieval is continued. The economic studies of information systems were extended along lines that refined the system models being used for study and that included consideration of networks of information systems. Two Project Intrex-designed display terminals are now in operation and both can engage the Intrex system simultaneously. The terminal has been newly named BRISC (Buffered Remote Interactive Search Console). Users prefer BRISC to other available terminals because of its large-size characters, bright display, and the save-page feature of the terminals. Refinements in the full-text-access system have been made to overcome occasional difficulties experienced in centering text on the cathode-ray-tube screen.


Institution: Bath University of Technology (England). University Library.

A discussion of one of the main activities of the DISISS (Design of Information Systems in the Social Sciences) project is presented in this working paper. A comprehensive Check List of Social Science Serials (CLOSSS) is being prepared as a basis
for bibliometric studies of the primary and secondary literature of the social sciences. The CLOSSS data base will be made machine readable so that a wide range of bibliometric studies can be undertaken using statistical and mathematical techniques. Section 2 of this paper deals with requirements for bibliometric studies. Problems associated with the construction of a machine-readable data base are discussed in section 3. Detailed design features and problems of CLOSSS are set down in section 4. Section 5 takes a wider view and looks at CLOSSS in a number of contexts in which a serials data base can make a contribution. Section 6 concludes the discussion, giving some general issues which must be resolved before the future development of CLOSSS can be estimated.

Universal Copyright Convention, as Revised, with Protocols; Message from the President of the United States Transmitting the Universal Copyright Convention as Revised at Paris on July 24, 1971, Together with Two Related Protocols. 1972. 67p. ED 060 869. MF $0.65, HC $3.29.


The basic purpose behind the Paris Conference was to satisfy the practical needs of developing countries for ready access to educational, scientific, and technical works, without weakening the structure and scope of copyright protection offered by developed countries under both the Universal Copyright convention and the Berne Convention. This document is a copy of the one sent to the Senate for ratification.

Statement of Ownership and Management

LRTS is published quarterly by the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Ill. 60611. American Library Association, owner; Robert Wedgeworth, editor. Fourth class postage paid at Fulton, Missouri. Printed in U.S.A. As a nonprofit organization authorized to mail at special rates (Section 132.121, Postal Manual), the purposes, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during the preceding twelve months.

Extent and Nature of Circulation

(“Average” figures denote the number of copies printed each issue during the preceding twelve months; “Actual” figures denote number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing date—the Fall 1972 issue.) Total number of copies printed: Average 12,575; Actual, 12,500. Paid circulation: not applicable (i.e., no sales through dealers, carriers, street vendors and counter sales). Mail subscriptions: Average 10,605; Actual 10,253. Free Distribution: Average 647; Actual 647; Total Distribution: Average 11,312; Actual 10,880. Office use, leftover, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: Average 1,263; Actual 1,620. Total (sum previous two entries): Average 12,575; Actual 12,500.
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Immediate access to our collections of Early English Books is better than a sabbatical in Great Britain—although perhaps not as much fun. Students and faculty alike will enjoy the benefits of doing research from primary sources when they are in your library.

Our collections include almost all the titles listed by Pollard and Redgrave in their “Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1475-1640” (STC I), and by Donald Wing in his “Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700” (STC II).

Through the cooperation of libraries in Great Britain and the United States, we are photographing the titles from these two authoritative bibliographies, and making them available to the academic community on 35mm roll microfilm and as bound, xerographic copies. Included with the microfilm are guides listing the collections’ contents by reels, and cumulative cross indexes by STC number.

These primary sources for the study of Tudor and Stuart times are issued serially as additional titles are photographed. They are a very economical way for your library to increase its holdings dramatically—without the need for elaborate storage facilities or an increased budget.

Further information about these collections can be obtained from the Series Product Manager, Xerox University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Xerox University Microfilms

XEROX

XEROX® is a trademark of XEROX CORPORATION.
Introducing Two New Important BIBLIOGRAPHIC TOOLS

LC/TITLE REGISTER lists alphabetically the full title entry of all library materials catalogued by the Library of Congress since January 1970.

Under each title entry data also shown includes:
- beginning January 1970 plus beginning January 1973
- LC card order number
- Authoritative LC Main Entry
- MARC/CIP Indicator Flags
- ISBN where assigned
- Uniform Title
- Series Added Entries

LC/ENGLISH TITLE REGISTER is identical to the full LC Title Register above, except it contains only the English language entries. All foreign language materials have been removed for the convenience of libraries not interested in these titles.

TITEL REGISTER USES abound for all libraries; academic and public, research and special, large and small:
- order catalog cards from LC by number and save 40¢ per title search
- verify individual purchase requisitions by title for correct identification
- when title is known, search current materials contents of catalog files arranged by authoritative LC Main Entry, e.g.,

☑ National Union Catalog ☑ Regional Union Catalogs
☑ Proofslip Files ☑ Author Catalogs
☑ Official Catalogs ☑ Depository Card Files
- Use as title index to MARC tapes and other MARC based files

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscriptions</th>
<th>LC/Title Register</th>
<th>LC/English Title Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Update &amp; Bi-Monthly Running Cumulations</td>
<td>$2,240</td>
<td>$1,150/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-Monthly Update &amp; Cumulation</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$385/Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merged Register for 1970, '71, and '72</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special discounts available for multiple year subscriptions and quantity orders for library consortia and network groups. ORDER FROM:

INFORMATION DYNAMICS CORPORATION, Dept. T — 2000
80 Main Street, Reading, Massachusetts 01867
Documents of American Theater History

Vols. 1 and 2: Famous American Playhouses

William C. Young

Presenting a unique compilation of primary and secondary sources illuminating the history of American playhouses, from 1716 to 1971. Letters, diaries, journals and newspaper reports of participants and observers show how the American playhouse evolved architecturally from crude colonial structures to elaborate complexes, how theater companies were organized and financed, how audiences responded to the plays presented and how religious and cultural values affected the theatrical enterprise. Arranged chronologically. Lavishly illustrated, completely indexed for use as a reference book. All sources reproduced have complete bibliographic citations.

Volumes 1 and 2, $50. ISBN 0-8389-0136-0 (1973)

Volume 1, 1716-1899
Volume 2, 1900-1971

Volumes 3, 4 and 5, Famous Actors and Actresses of the American Stage are in preparation.

American Library Association
50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Illinois 60611
A social sciences reference tool that's easy to use, highly current, and multidisciplinary too!

Beginning in 1973 it will be a lot easier to search the social sciences journal literature if your library has the new Social Sciences Citation Index™ (SSCI™).

SSCI will offer an integrated search system designed to overcome the ambiguous terminology and wide scatter of related articles that used to make social science searches so difficult. It will take advantage of two powerful retrieval methods:

Citation Indexing—which utilizes the fact that an article's reference citations to earlier publications are excellent indicators of the subject of the article, and

Permuterm® Indexing—a natural language system that pairs every significant word in an article's title with every other word in that title to produce extremely specific, two-level indexing entries.

With SSCI, all you'll need to start a search on any subject is the name of a key author in the field of interest or any English word that is descriptive of the subject. There's no need to master specialized search vocabularies or complex classification schemes.

With SSCI you won't have to use a half-dozen discipline-oriented indexes to assure comprehensive searches. A single look-up lets you search the entire output of over 1,000 journals from all the fields relevant to the social sciences including anthropology, community health, demography, economics, educational research, ethnic group studies, geography, history, law, linguistics, management, marketing, political science, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, statistics, and urban planning and development.

And because SSCI will be computer-produced, it will be the most current index of its size. That means you'll find new articles while they're still new.

Send the coupon for more information.
because you pay less when you are a Baker & Taylor customer. Any type of book or edition, it doesn’t matter—you get the most competitive discounts in the industry. So the money you save can be used to buy extra books—very important in these days of higher prices and tighter budgets.

Would you like proof of the savings we offer?

Just send us a copy of a recent order filled by another source. Mask out the prices if you like, and ask us to give you a computer print-out of our prices, book by book. Then you’ll see how many more books you can get for the same dollars—at Baker & Taylor.

No obligation, of course. Address your nearest Baker & Taylor division.

The Baker & Taylor Co.
SINGLE SOURCE
SINGULAR SERVICE

ALL desired titles, periodicals and irregulars, foreign or domestic, available from
one source . . . simplifies your work. Regional offices assure exceptional, de-
centralized service. Next time, give us a call . . . we'd like to be of service.
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YOU WILL HAVE—
"CONFIDENCE"

In Our Complete
Periodicals Service—
All American and Foreign Titles
Promptness is a Traditional part
of McGregor Service . . . as well as:

• EXPERIENCE
• TRAINED PERSONNEL
• FINANCIAL STABILITY
• AMPLE FACILITIES
• RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT

An attractive brochure is
available for the asking.

SUBSCRIBE TO
McGREGOR PERIODICALS
BULLETIN
OBER EGER.

MAGAZINE AGENCY
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

OVER 5,000
NOW
NEARLY 7,000
CORE COLLECTION
REPRINT TITLES
PLUS:

• original trade books
• tape cassettes
• large print editions
• microfiche

All this and no gimmicks... just good service from the
library-oriented publisher.

BOOKS FOR LIBRARIES, INC
30 Liberty Avenue, Freeport, New York 11520
(516) 379-9270
For Catalogs, Write or Call Collect
You Can Now Purchase the Library of Congress/National Union Catalogs on 4x6 positive or negative microfiche. NCR/Microcard Editions offers an exact reprint of this massive compilation in a form that is compact, easy to use, and moderately priced. The years 1898-1970 are available at a total price of $2409.00; current subscriptions cost $175.00 for 1971 and $260.00 for 1972. Buy the complete series and get a new NCR38X microfiche reader free.
How much can a subscription agency save your library?

Consider how long it takes to order one subscription, how much it costs to process one invoice for payment and send one check. Estimates run from $10.00 to $18.00 for each order. Multiply by the number of subscriptions your library orders, and see how much you'll save by sending one order and one check for all your periodicals to F. W. Faxon Co.

Send for our free descriptive brochure and annual Librarians' Guide listing more than 50,000 domestic and foreign periodicals.

Library business is our only business—since 1868.

F.W. FAXON CO., INC.
15 Southwest Park
Westwood, Mass. 02090
Telephone: (800) 225-7094 (Toll Free)

Library Binding is a special kind of binding developed primarily for libraries, and includes the initial hardcover binding of periodicals, the rebinding of used books and the pre-binding of new books—all in accordance with the LBI Standard.

By specifying low cost library binding for all your binding requirements, you can save thousands of dollars in your budget (amount dependent upon size of original budget) because each volume will withstand 100 or more circulations, over four times the number provided by a publisher's library edition. This new-found money can then be used to purchase new titles, thereby increasing the size of your collection without substantially increasing the budget.

Write today for our free brochures and the name of your nearest Certified Library Binder.

Library Binding Institute
50 Congress Street, Boston, Mass. 02109

SERIALS: Acquisition & Maintenance
by Clara D. Brown

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 76:189654

Mrs. Brown has authored this book during retirement after 30 years service as librarian at Washington State and Louisiana State Universities. Librarians who have reviewed the volume find it “down to earth and extremely clear” . . . “outlines with wit and perception all of the difficulties with which serials people must contend and suggests solutions.”

Order Now at $4.95 from
EBSCO Industries, Inc.
Book Dept.
P.O. Box 1943 • Birmingham, Ala. 35201

Why Library Binding?

Available Now! A New Library Tool.

SERIALS: Acquisition & Maintenance
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when you bought that microform reader did you?

consider consult

THE MANUFACTURER'S CLAIMS:

The [reader] has no complicated controls or touchy adjustments; maximum ease of operation is built into the reader. Just insert the fiche in the precision holding and transporting mechanism, flip the switch, adjust focus, and scan.

LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS:

The design of the reader does not provide for a page indicator grid. The platen moves awkwardly and binds, especially when moving from side to side.

The user must reach to the left side of the reader and move a short arm back and forth to focus the image.

None of the controls are labeled. The user must experiment with the various levers and handles to learn how to use the reader.

The bracket holding the platen handle allows the film to catch between the bracket and glass, which can tear the film if the user is not careful.

Quoted from the manufacturer's literature.

From an evaluation of the same machine in the July, 1972 LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS.
Matched sets:

Computer-produced by
Richard Abel to match your card format.

We'd like to introduce you to a very versatile and comprehensive computer cataloging system designed just for you. This system complements your staff with a complete, professional cataloging and processing team. Available when you need them—without sacrificing an iota of format uniformity.

No. 1 in computer cataloging.

We've spent over 6 years developing and perfecting a computer system entirely adaptable to your cataloging system. We added Richard Abel's extensive records of over 500,000 active titles—considered one of the largest data bases in use in the world—to handle as, large a load as you might require, at any time. These and many other flexible advantages—just to do it your way!

Whole or part of your program.

Our staff is working for you all the time, whether you need them right now or not. Ready to take care of your backlogs, for instance, and getting them down to a reasonable level. Or, ready to handle your entire cataloging function under your direction. The cost is only 45¢ a 4SAT card set (by LC card number request), with no special set-up fees or inconveniences.

Your man at Richard Abel.

A Richard Abel specialist is located near you for prompt, personal service. He will help you fit our system to your format, as well as be on hand if further modifications may be required at a later time. He is on hand right now to provide further details and a complete explanation of this time and money-saving service which we think is the very finest available.

- Formats tailor-made to your specifications
- Over 500,000 active titles
- Catalog card sets, processing kits, full book processing, machine-readable records

Write or call collect for further information:
503-645-3511, extension 244

RICHARD ABEL & COMPANY, INC.
POST OFFICE BOX 4245 • PORTLAND, OREGON 97208
BRANCH OFFICES: ARLINGTON, TEX. • ATLANTA, GA. • BLACKWOOD, N.J. • DENVER, COLO. • GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA • MARION, OHIO • WALTHAM, MASS. • MILL VALLEY, CALIFORNIA • ZION, ILL. • TORONTO, CANADA • OVERSEAS OFFICES: AMSTERDAM • LONDON • SYDNEY
From the publishers who are identified with major bibliography*

ASIAN STUDIES
Cambridge South Asian Archive:
Records of the British period in South Asia relating to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Nepal and Afghanistan held in the Centre of South Asian Studies, University of Cambridge. Edited by Mary Thatcher
£6.00 0 7201 03649 March

Union Catalogue of Asian Publications 1971 Supplement
Edited by D. E. Hall
Adds recent acquisitions to the list of major Asian holdings in British libraries.
Price to be announced. 0 7201 03029 May

Union Catalogue of the Serial Publications of the Indian Government 1858-1947 held in libraries in Britain
Edited by T. Macdonald
The fourth volume in the paperbound series: South Asian Government Bibliographies.
£6.50 0 7201 03630 February

SOCIAL SCIENCES
Seven new volumes of the London School of Economics card catalogue.
£98.00 the set. 0 7201 02979 May

LIBRARY SCIENCE
Published Library Catalogues
Edited by Robert Collison
A handbook to major English language library catalogues in book form.
Price to be announced. 0 7201 03693 April

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS
Sale Catalogues of Libraries of Eminent Persons
General Editor: A. N. L. Munby
This series, published with Sotheby Park-Bernet Publications, reproduces in facsimile a selection of historic sale catalogues. The first six volumes are still available.
Price to be announced. 0 7201 03665 April
Volume 8, Political Thinkers, edited by Seamus Deane: the sales of Burke, Godwin, Hastings, Holli, O'Connell, Wilkes.
Price to be announced. 0 7201 03673 April

Vaughan Williams Memorial Library Catalogue
The listings include published and unpublished material representing the holdings of the English Folk Dance and Song Society.
Price to be announced. 0 7201 03681 Spring

Mansell
3 Bloomsbury Place London WC1A 2QA England

*Librarians have coined our National Union Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints ‘The Mansell’
BIBNET was designed especially for library applications.

BIBNET was designed by library system experts.

BIBNET is installed and used right in the library.

BIBNET lets you specify your own automated library system.

BIBNET gives highest yield from bibliographic searches.

BIBNET includes MARC and all LC cataloging since 1953.

BIBNET uses interactive on-line mini-computers.

BIBNET can operate in batch or on-line mode.

BIBNET makes ready-to-file catalog card sets in minutes.

BIBNET individually prints 200 finished cards per hour.

BIBNET can communicate on-line to other libraries.

BIBNET can communicate on-line to centralized computers.

BIBNET lets you hook-on to other library networks.

BIBNET lets you keep your autonomy when you do.

BIBNET servicing is done by the people who build it.

BIBNET IS NOW AND TOMORROW!
NEW EDITIONS OF FOUR POPULAR GALE TITLES

NATIONAL FACULTY DIRECTORY—1973, THIRD EDITION. The National Faculty Directory 1973 is a mammoth alphabetical name-and-address list of faculty personnel, probably the only source need to consult in order to learn "who's where" in the academic world. The listings in the new, Third Edition have been carefully confirmed or revised on the basis of recent catalogs and faculty lists. Covered are 413 faculty members at United States and selected Canadian junior colleges, colleges, and universities. Each entry includes the individual's name, institution name, departmental designation, street address if necessary, city, state, and zip. Two volumes. (In Print) $69.50.

"Clearly, this compilation is one of the most important reference works now available to the higher education community ... It is a unique and invaluable resource to a multiplicity of users... An essential acquisition for all academic libraries." —Choice. "The durency of information in the present edition is considerably better than are most mailing lists distributed by some publishers and special mailing houses." —Bohdan S. Wynn, American Reference Books Annual.

SOMETHING ABOUT THE AUTHOR, VOLUME 3—The first two volumes in this innovative series I been enthusiastically accepted and successfully used by teachers and librarians who deal with yo readers—and, by the youngsters themselves, for "Something About The Author" offers a worthwhile reading incentive and a source of genuine satisfaction to the youthful user. This new volume furnishes full career personal data, bibliographies, and criticism on 200 authors and illustrators of juvenile and young adult fic nonfiction, poetry, and drama. In the sidelights section of each sketch the author or illustrator tells of writings, hobbies, and other related topics. With informal portraits and animal illustrations from the works. Volumes 1, 2, and 3, covering over 600 juvenile authors and cumulatively indexed, are in print. $15.00 each.

"The quality of this new biographical series both editorially and graphically is superior to other directories this field ... The book is profusely illustrated not only with photos of the writers but with well-chosen illusirations." —American Reference Books Annual. "More than a Who's Who type of reference ... Duplicates some of the biographies in other reference sources... and in its parent, Contemporary Authors, (but the up-to-dateness and unique features in volume 1 make it useful. Recommended." —Booklist.
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