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Developing a National Foreign Newspaper Microfilming Program

JOHN Y. COLE
Coordinator, Foreign Newspaper Microfilming
Reference Department
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

In recent years, American research libraries have devoted an increasing amount of attention to the acquisition and microfilming of foreign newspapers. In addition to the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, large-scale microfilming programs have developed at the Library of Congress and several other research institutions. In 1972, in accordance with the recommendations of the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee, the Library of Congress expanded its foreign newspaper activities and assumed responsibility for coordinating a national foreign newspaper microfilming program. The author reviews cooperative endeavors in foreign newspaper microfilming from 1938 to the present and discusses the current efforts of the Library of Congress toward the development of a national program.

SINCE WORLD WAR II, the microfilming of foreign newspapers has been a subject of growing importance to American research libraries. Increased interest in international affairs and new area studies programs have made access to a comprehensive selection of foreign newspapers a necessity for scholars and government officials alike. Taking advantage of the convenience and permanency of newspapers in microfilm format and recognizing the cost-saving benefits of joint endeavors, research libraries have attempted to meet this need through a variety of cooperative foreign newspaper microfilming projects. The most successful single enterprise has been the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) since 1956. The project is administered for the ARL by the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. By 1968, however, the number of foreign newspaper titles and separate microfilming projects had proliferated so rapidly that the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee, which oversees the
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ARL project, began seeking an expanded national approach to the problem. After a research study, the committee recommended a coordinated national effort to insure efficient and comprehensive coverage of foreign newspapers among research libraries. In accordance with the committee's recommendations, in 1972 the Library of Congress (LC) expanded its foreign newspaper activities and assumed responsibility for coordinating a national foreign newspaper microfilming program. The purpose of this article is twofold: (1) to outline the cooperative efforts in foreign newspaper microfilming between 1938 and the present that prepared the way for developing a national program, and (2) to describe the current efforts of the Library of Congress, and particularly those of the newly established office of coordinator of foreign newspaper microfilming, toward making that program a reality.

Foreign Newspaper Microfilming, 1938–1968

The first major cooperative project was established in 1938 when Harvard University received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for the “reproduction on microfilm of current files of foreign newspapers.” Thirty-seven important titles were selected for microfilming and positive microfilm copies were offered to other libraries on a subscription basis. The price, which included the full cost of the positive microfilm and a pro rata share of the negative, depended on the number of subscribers. The newspapers filmed at Harvard were included in the earliest listing of newspapers being microfilmed in the United States, the “Preliminary Checklist of Newspapers on Microfilm” by George A. Schwegmann, chief of the Union Catalog Division of the Library of Congress.1 The Harvard project proceeded satisfactorily during the World War II years, but it was recognized by all as only a limited step in meeting the needs of research libraries.

The total problem of “research materials on microfilm” was faced in a 20 December 1946 letter from Librarian of Congress Luther Evans to Paul North Rice, ARL executive secretary. Evans’ suggestion for a nationally coordinated and cooperative plan for the “microfilming of extensive runs of library materials” had a great impact on newspaper microfilming. Among other proposals, Evans urged the establishment of a microfilming information clearinghouse; he also asked that an ARL committee be formed to assume responsibility for the “planning, distribution, publicity, standards, and pooling” of library resources for microfilming. As a result of Evans’ letter and subsequent discussions, the ARL Committee on Microfilming Cooperation was formed.2

The committee, under the chairmanship of Vernon Tate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, decided to limit its activities to newspapers “since the need appeared most urgent in this field.” Attention was devoted immediately to the drafting of bibliographic and technical standards for microfilming, the establishment of an information center, and the compilation of a union list of newspapers already microfilmed. The Union Catalog Division of the Library of Congress assumed re-
sponsibility for preparing the union list, which was published in 1948 as *Newspapers on Microfilm: A Union Check List*. At the request of the committee, on 5 July 1949 the Library of Congress established a Microfilming Clearing House to serve as a central source of information about “extensive microfilming projects involving newspapers, serials, and manuscript collections either contemplated, underway, or completed at various institutions.”

The committee concentrated on the preservation of nationally known domestic newspapers because it believed that, at least for the present, foreign newspapers received enough attention “through the efforts of Mr. Keyes Metcalf of Harvard University, the Pan American Union, and individual libraries.” This focus on American newspapers was shared by the Cooperative Microfilm Projects Committee of the American Library Association (ALA), which included several librarians who also served on the ARL committee. The 1953 publication *Selected List of United States Newspapers Recommended for Preservation by the ALA Committee on Cooperative Microfilm Projects*, like *Newspapers on Microfilm*, was edited by the Union Catalog Division. The preface to the *Selected List* contains a “Statement of Principles to Guide Large Scale Acquisition and Preservation of Library Materials on Microfilm,” which is still of value. The preface urged that libraries concentrate funds for filming in copying original materials instead of investing cooperatively in positive film copies of materials for which negatives have already been made.

This was to be a guiding principle in the formulation of the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project three years later. The second edition of *Newspapers on Microfilm* was issued as a companion volume to the *Selected List*.

After the publication of the *Selected List*, the interest of large research libraries began to shift back to the problem of foreign newspaper coverage. One reason was that the relatively new position of the United States as a world power required detailed knowledge of areas of the world that previously had been little known to Americans. The new emphasis also reflected a growing consensus that domestic newspapers could be left to local and state libraries which “should be responsible for building up files from their own geographic areas.” Moreover, by virtue of their relative scarcity, foreign newspapers offered better opportunities for cooperative acquisition and microfilming activities.

In 1952 the Library of Congress, on behalf of the ARL Committee on National Needs, gathered holdings information about foreign newspapers from 120 American libraries for inclusion in a union list which would “serve as the basis for the planning of a cooperative acquisitions program in the field of current foreign newspapers.” In the preface to the publication that resulted, *Postwar Foreign Newspapers*, the wish was expressed that the list will focus the attention of librarians on the need for an adequate
national coverage of the foreign press, that it will stimulate a cooperative program which will ensure such coverage, and that it will form the basis for a planned microfilming program which will best utilize the national resources available for this purpose.5

The listing excluded Latin American newspapers because they were reported in the Pan American Union's Union List of Latin American Newspapers in the United States, also published in 1953.6

At the same time, possible changes in the Harvard foreign newspaper project were being discussed. Interest in the Harvard project was increasing, as demonstrated by the acquisition of its microfilm by more than forty institutions in 1953-54. Early in 1953 the program's administrators began considering ways to make it "more economical to subscribers." One possibility, discussed at length at an ARL meeting of 1 February 1953, was the reshaping of the program into one in which subscribers contributed to a single fund to be used for the microfilming of a wider range of newspapers than hitherto filmed; positive microfilm would be available for free loan to subscribers but normally would not be furnished to institutions for retention. The idea of this type of a cooperative project met with favor, and the possibility of using the successful Harvard experience as the foundation for a new, national microfilming program was considered seriously. Two possible locations for such a national project were considered: the Center for Research Libraries, then the Mid-West Interlibrary Center (MILC), and the Library of Congress. However, Librarian of Congress Evans felt that, because the Library of Congress was already the center of many activities, it would be preferable to locate the project elsewhere. Moreover, it was pointed out that the MILC had already developed a small-scale cooperative pool of foreign and domestic newspapers, subscribing to a number of titles from Harvard and acquiring additional ones from other sources.

In 1954 ARL created a committee, chaired by Herman H. Fussler of the University of Chicago, to explore and develop a national plan for cooperative library access to current foreign newspapers. Discussion centered on the concept approved by the committee in earlier meetings, namely, "initiating a national pool of current foreign newspapers in microfilm form to be available by loan to subscribing institutions." The plan devised by the committee and approved by ARL provided for the acquisition of approximately 100 current foreign newspapers on microfilm beginning in January of 1956. The newly formed ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project would be administered for ARL by MILC, which seemed "to be the best situated in the United States to make fast nation-wide loans and handle the other necessary arrangements of the project." By paying an annual subscription fee ranging from $150 to $500, participating institutions could borrow positive microfilm of any title held by the project, which would film some titles and purchase others from outside sources. Furthermore, positive film of titles microfilmed by the project would be available to the subscribers at cost. This form
of cooperative arrangement, in the opinion of the committee, was advantageous for several reasons: it enabled libraries to avoid the high cost of individually microfilming needed titles, while giving those libraries access to a wider range of foreign newspapers; it permitted the microfilming of a greater number of titles, particularly from areas of the world "of unusual interest"; and finally, it utilized previous experience by recognizing that "many titles, while of clear strategic importance, were likely to be subjected to long periods of little or no use." A new ARL standing committee, the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee, was established to administer the project, which began in January 1956 with forty-six institutions subscribing and a first year budget of $14,000.7

Many institutions helped the project's start. The Harvard program was absorbed, and the Harvard University library transferred a working capital fund from its original Rockefeller Foundation grant. Harvard also contributed approximately 640,000 feet of negative microfilm for the titles it had been filming since 1938, making positive prints available to subscribers at cost. The MILC newspaper pool was also integrated into the project. The Pan American Union donated 818 reels of negatives of Latin American newspapers for varying periods between 1938 and 1950. The 100 titles originally selected for acquisition were picked by a national committee of librarians, which in turn worked from the extensive list, Current Foreign Newspapers Recommended for Cooperative Microfilming, prepared by area specialists at the Library of Congress.8 From the original 100 titles, the project grew with the result that by 1959 its fifty-four subscribers had access to 146 newspapers published in ninety countries.

It had become apparent, however, that 146 titles were not adequate to meet the needs of scholarship and research. New microfilming programs at other United States research institutions, particularly the Library of Congress, the Hoover Institution, the New York Public Library, and the University of Florida, attempted to meet these needs, as did several commercial micropublishers. The largest microfilming program for current foreign newspapers developed at the Library of Congress. In 1957 the library announced the availability of thirty-one vernacular titles in Oriental languages. The African Studies Association and the library began a cooperative microfilming project for fifteen current African newspapers in 1960. The next year Congress authorized the establishment, under Public Law 480, of a Library of Congress office in New Delhi, a development that soon made possible a large-scale microfilming program for current Indian newspapers. Finally, in 1968 the library announced that it had undertaken a comprehensive program to microfilm approximately 500 current foreign newspapers in lieu of binding. The library was careful to microfilm "in substantially all instances" only newspapers not available on microfilm from the ARL project or from other sources.
As area studies programs expanded, the interest of research libraries in foreign newspapers grew accordingly. Nor was interest confined to current newspapers. While the ARL project was limited to current titles, many other institutions began microfilming retrospective files of foreign newspapers. Once again, the most active program was at the Library of Congress. For example, as early as 1953 the library, with aid from the Rockefeller Foundation, produced *Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian Newspapers, 1917–1953; A Union List*, a publication intended to stimulate interest in the preservation of Russian newspapers through cooperative retrospective microfilming. The Photoduplication Service soon undertook such a project for seven important Russian titles. The fourth edition of *Newspapers on Microfilm*, published in 1961, contained entries for 2,580 foreign newspapers published in 106 countries; the sixth edition in 1967 contained entries for 4,640 newspapers from 136 countries.

In 1968 the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee, chaired by John G. Lorenz of the Library of Congress, recognized this widespread interest in foreign newspapers as well as the rapid growth of separate acquisition and microfilming programs when it expanded its scope beyond that of overseeing the ARL project to include the development of a truly national foreign newspaper microfilming program. The proposed undertaking was to include a minimum of 2,000 foreign newspaper titles and would utilize the resources of the ARL project, the Library of Congress, and other interested research institutions. In 1969, through a grant from the Council on Library Resources, the committee sponsored a feasibility study that resulted in a series of recommendations concerning the development of such a national program. The study, conducted by Norman J. Shaffer, now assistant chief for bibliographic services of the Photoduplication Service of the Library of Congress, was completed in 1970.

*The Shaffer Report*  

The object of the feasibility study was threefold: (1) to determine the breadth of coverage of foreign newspapers required to serve the needs of the scholarly community; (2) to identify institutions wishing to participate in a national foreign newspaper program by microfilming or having commercial firms microfilm newspapers for their collections; and (3) to make recommendations concerning the functions and organization of a proposed coordinating office for a national foreign newspaper microfilming program.

Adequacy of foreign newspaper coverage was gauged through examining the holdings reports accumulated at LC for the next edition of *Newspapers on Microfilm*, tabulating the results of a questionnaire sent to all members of ARL, and discussions with area and language specialists at LC. Although over 800 new foreign newspaper titles had been reported to *Newspapers on Microfilm* since the publication of the 1967 edition, Shaffer found general agreement that even wider coverage, es-
especially for Africa and Asia, was needed. For example, he discovered that more than a dozen United Nations members were not represented by a newspaper file on microfilm anywhere in the United States. As a first step in remedying this situation, he recommended the expansion of the number of titles made available through the ARL project. An appendix to the report listed 749 titles, representing 132 countries, specifically recommended by subject specialists for microfilming. The survey also identified forty-three research institutions in the United States with "a real and often enthusiastic interest" in a national microfilming program.

Shaffer found a definite need for the creation of a national coordinating office "to facilitate institutional cooperative filming or acquisitions and to facilitate accessibility through interlibrary loan and other means." He recommended that this office include among its major functions (1) coordinating the selection and microfilming of foreign newspapers, with priority given to current titles; (2) soliciting information from and about commercial sources of microfilm, both in the United States and abroad, to include keeping those sources aware of American scholarly needs and microfilming programs sponsored by research institutions; (3) serving as a central reference point for information about the acquisition and microfilming of foreign newspapers; and (4) publishing a newsletter that would feature announcements, "intention to microfilm" statements, and other information concerning foreign newspapers. The report also recommended the division of Newspapers on Microfilm into two separate publications, one listing domestic titles, the other foreign. The Library of Congress was suggested as the site for the new coordinating office because of its large foreign newspaper microfilming program, the location of Newspapers on Microfilm and its extensive files at the library, the staff of knowledgeable foreign area specialists, the institution's widespread network of overseas offices and contacts, and because the library already was performing similar national services.

Coordinating a National Program

As previously mentioned, the Shaffer report, endorsed by the ARL Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee, led directly to the expansion of LC's foreign newspaper activities; included was the establishment in 1972 of the position of coordinator of foreign newspaper microfilming, a post presently held by the author. The Shaffer report also clearly indicated why a centralized, national approach to foreign newspaper microfilming is necessary: the multiplicity of microfilming programs, combined with increased interest in acquiring foreign newspapers, frequently results in confusion among research libraries and inefficiencies in the production, distribution, and utilization of foreign newspapers on microfilm. There are six large-scale foreign newspaper microfilming programs sponsored by the research community: the ARL project and programs supported by the Library of Congress, the Hoover Institution,
Cornell University, the University of Florida, and the University of California at Berkeley. While duplication of microfilming efforts among these major programs appears to be minimal, it is a problem among other libraries which microfilm titles on a more limited scale. In addition, there exist approximately a dozen commercial producers of foreign newspapers on microfilm in the United States and nearly thirty foreign producers and distributors.

Certain steps can be taken immediately to reduce duplication. The Library of Congress, with the cooperation of other institutions, recently has made progress in furnishing updated holdings data about foreign newspapers on microfilm and current information about microfilming programs and technical standards in newspaper microfilming. After careful study, both the ARL project and the Library of Congress have increased the number of current titles being microfilmed. Other steps, however, can only be taken more slowly, particularly those that concern relations between research institutions and commercial micropublishers, the microfilming of long retrospective files of important titles, and the general improvement of researcher access to foreign newspapers on microfilm. Aside from the shortage of funds available for microfilming projects, the major problems in foreign newspaper microfilming appear to have resulted from a lack of current and accurate information and a lack of coordination among various acquisitions and microfilming endeavors. The efficient utilization of foreign newspapers on microfilm as a national research resource does not require a major revision or redistribution of existing programs. What is needed is more effective coordination, increased communication, and, above all, a sense of direction. The Library of Congress is committed to the development of an efficient and comprehensive national microfilming program. Recent efforts along these lines are detailed in the remainder of this paper.

Bibliographic Control. Since 1948 Newspapers on Microfilm has been the basic research tool for microfilmed newspapers. Including both bibliographic data and holdings information for each title, it serves, in effect, as a national bibliography of newspapers, and as such it is the key element in the development of a national microfilming program.

Because the necessary bibliographic apparatus has not yet been developed in many areas of the world, foreign newspapers present a more difficult bibliographic problem than newspapers published in the United States. Moreover, while there is less over-all demand for information about foreign newspapers, that demand is usually of a different and more specialized nature. These considerations and the recommendations of the Shaffer report persuaded the Library of Congress to separate Newspapers on Microfilm into two volumes, one for newspapers published in the United States, the other for foreign titles. The new format provides the library with greater flexibility in issuing supplements or later editions, and enables the purchaser to select the volume or volumes suited to his needs. The title has been changed to Newspapers in
Microform, recognizing the increased use of microfiche and micro-opaque techniques in the microphotographic reproduction of newspapers. The volume Newspapers in Microform: United States, 1948–1972 contains information about 34,289 titles as reported by 843 libraries and 48 commercial firms, and the volume Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries, 1948–1972 contains information about 8,620 foreign newspaper titles as reported by 524 libraries and 40 commercial firms.\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^2\) (Holdings reports for newspapers in microform should be addressed to: Library of Congress, Catalog Publication Division, Editor, Newspapers in Microform, Washington, DC 20540. Printed form cards and postage-free, preaddressed labels are available upon request.)

The Need for Current Information. In addition to the expansion and more frequent updating of Newspapers in Microform, the library, through the office of coordinator of foreign newspaper microfilming, has begun publishing Foreign Newspaper Report.\(^1\) This newsletter, issued three times a year, provides research institutions and commercial publishers with current information about various foreign newspaper acquisition and microfilming programs, announcements of newly available titles and cooperative microfilming projects, information about technical standards in newspaper microfilming, and other news concerning foreign newspapers (e.g., newspapers that have changed titles or ceased publication). It also carries “intention to microfilm” statements. The Report is now distributed to more than 800 libraries, research institutions, area studies associations, and commercial micropublishers throughout the world.

Foreign Newspaper Report is a crucial part of the clearinghouse function of the office of foreign newspaper microfilming coordinator. The office also provides information and advice about specific titles or microfilming projects and related matters. (Correspondence should be directed to: Library of Congress, Reference Department, Coordinator, Foreign Newspaper Microfilming, Washington, DC 20540.)

Technical and Archival Standards. As the number of research institutions and commercial firms producing newspapers on microfilm increases, the need for enforcement of uniform, high-quality technical standards becomes even more important than before. The office of foreign newspaper microfilming coordinator takes an active interest in standards, particularly in encouraging compliance with specifications considered acceptable by the research community; information about technical standards is available from the office. In addition, in 1972 the library published Specifications for the Microfilming of Newspapers in the Library of Congress.\(^1\)\(^4\) This publication has eight major sections: preparation of the files, technical guide, filming procedures, processing the exposed film, inspection of the film, intermediate copies, reference use copies (which includes the criteria employed in evaluating microfilms being considered for addition to the library's collections), and
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storage. It also includes a glossary of thirty-one terms and a selected list of references.

Commercial Publishers. Many librarians are reluctant to purchase microfilm from commercial micropublishers. There are two principal reasons for this hesitation: (1) the technical quality of the microfilm may not be satisfactory, and (2) librarians prefer to encourage microfilming by a library or research institution. Since 1970 the problem has become more severe as several commercial firms, particularly the Microfilming Corporation of America (MCA), have been obtaining exclusive microfilming and distribution rights to foreign newspapers previously microfilmed by research institutions. Further complications recently have arisen as MCA, after announcing the availability of certain titles, has decided not to microfilm them, and the institutions previously microfilming them have, after delays of from one to three years, resumed the filming. This kind of unfortunate situation is of prime interest to the office of foreign newspaper microfilming coordinator. One obvious need is for better communication between research institutions and commercial micropublishers, a need now being met at least in part by Foreign Newspaper Report. Libraries must be kept up-to-date on the offerings and the activities of commercial micropublishers, who in turn should be kept informed about the scholarly needs of the research community and the cooperative efforts already taking place among research libraries to satisfy those needs.

Extending Current Coverage. Using the data gathered during the Shaffer study as a base, the coordinating office is maintaining a detailed list of foreign newspapers recommended for microfilming by area specialists and a list of important titles apparently not now in the collections of research libraries. The number of current foreign newspapers being microfilmed has been increased substantially during the past two years, however, and most of the newly added titles are from Africa and Asia.

As agreed in a special vote of the membership in 1972, the ARL project is adding approximately 20 titles to its holdings. The new titles were selected by the coordinator of foreign newspaper microfilming and the ARL project staff and approved by the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Committee in January 1973. This addition brings the total number of important current foreign newspapers available to ARL project subscribers on loan to 195. Subscribers may also purchase positive microfilm of titles filmed by the project at cost; nonsubscribers may buy the same titles for cost plus one-third of the cost of the negative. There are now eighty institutions subscribing to the ARL project. (Membership information may be obtained from: Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project, The Center for Research Libraries, 5721 Cottage Grove Ave., Chicago, IL 60637.)

The Library of Congress receives and permanently retains 950 current foreign newspapers on microfilm. Approximately 65 percent of
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these titles are microfilmed at the library; the remainder are acquired from other research institutions and commercial sources. The library does not microfilm any titles microfilmed by the ARL project. The current foreign newspapers in the library's collections are listed in Newspapers Currently Received in the Library of Congress. Positive microfilm copies of most of the titles filmed by the library may also be purchased (information is available from: Library of Congress, Photoduplication Service Dept. C, Washington, DC 20540).

Expansion of Retrospective Coverage. Thus far, the greatest emphasis in foreign newspaper microfilming has been on getting microfilming of current titles underway. Retrospective files, however, cannot be ignored, and eventually a coordinated effort in the microfilming of early files of foreign newspapers must be part of the national program. Furthermore, the deteriorating condition of many early newspaper files now in the possession of research libraries and newspaper publishers lends some urgency to this gigantic undertaking. Currently, the Library of Congress supports the largest retrospective preservation-microfilming program for foreign titles; the ARL project also plans to begin acquiring and microfilming earlier runs of titles that it makes available. Many foreign newspaper publishers sell microfilm copies of earlier issues of their newspapers and additional microfilming of retrospective files takes place at several universities that have strong area studies programs. Finally, additional titles are being acquired or microfilmed for area studies consortia such as the Cooperative Africana Microform Project, the South Asia Microform Project, and the Southeast Asia Microform Project. Information concerning titles filmed by these projects will be carried in Foreign Newspaper Report.

A need also exists for additional union lists of retrospective foreign newspaper holdings. Compilations such as Latin American Newspapers in United States Libraries: A Union List not only are valuable bibliographic and reference tools but they also provide a means of locating files to be microfilmed.

Improved Access and the Sharing of Resources. Efficient reader access to a greater number of foreign newspapers is, of course, a major goal of the national foreign newspaper microfilming program. To a considerable degree, improved access depends on factors previously mentioned, such as enhanced bibliographic control, widespread dissemination of current information about microfilming activities, achievement of suitable technical quality in microfilming, and the expansion of both current and retrospective coverage. In addition, a compilation of directed, such as enhanced bibliographic control, widespread dissemination and that project is being pursued as time permits. A more important consideration relates to interlibrary loan, a principal means of access to these items. Loan policies for newspapers on microfilm are not uniform among research libraries, and information about these policies frequently is not widely known. This is especially true for foreign libraries and
research institutions. Information is also needed on the use of foreign newspapers.

Increased sharing of foreign newspapers on microfilm must be a fundamental goal of the national program. As recognized in the deliberations during the 1950s that led to the establishment of the ARL project, the most efficient means of making a greater number of titles available is to concentrate resources on the microfilming of titles never before filmed, rather than on producing duplicate positive copies for a number of institutions. A few positive copies, shared as needed through interlibrary loan or a similar system, is, of course, the ideal. To be sure, many libraries, not content with the knowledge that they have access to newspapers on microfilm, prefer to purchase positive copies for their collections. While questionable, the desire to purchase is also understandable. The efficient sharing of newspapers on microfilm is not possible without improvements in the bibliographic apparatus that will make the identification and location of individual titles relatively easy, or without more convenient physical access to those titles. However, while the principle of local self-sufficiency in foreign newspaper microfilm collections can never be eliminated wholly, much can be done to minimize it. In this sense, foreign newspapers on microfilm present research libraries with a unique opportunity for nationally planned resource development.
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Cataloger's Camera Chaos

ROBERT C. FARRIS
Catalog Department
Purdue University Libraries
Lafayette, Indiana

A "cataloger's camera" to facilitate the reproduction of catalog card sets has been sought actively by librarians for more than two decades. The Council on Library Resources ascribed a high priority to research and development for such a device immediately after the establishment of the council in 1956. Many variations of equipment and procedures have been tried but never with complete success. Several of the latest library and commercial developments in the continuing quest for this elusive device are described briefly.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF "A 'CATALOGER'S CAMERA' or other card-duplicating device for producing complete catalog card sets (main entry plus filing entries) at one action" is not much further advanced today than when Verner Clapp expressed the need in 1964. Many libraries have tackled the problem individually and some have devised partially satisfactory solutions. As of this date, however, no major manufacturer seems convinced that the library market is large enough or standardized enough to return a profit from the substantial investment needed to perfect the necessary sophisticated equipment.

The following list of developments in this area represents only reports in library literature and activities which have been brought to this writer's attention. Costs quoted were provided by the libraries involved and may not be valid currently. The quality of reproduction achieved varies from cards which more resemble ransom notes to those which can hardly be distinguished from the original Library of Congress cards.

Xerox Model 4 Camera

The forerunner of all so-called "cataloger's cameras" is the Xerox Model 4, which has been used at Yale and the University of Colorado, among others. It is capable of enlarging National Union Catalog (NUC) entries to catalog card size, and unwanted information may be erased before the image is fused. The Model 4 transfers an image onto
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almost any solid material, thereby permitting its use in conjunction with a variety of reproducing equipment. The camera's greatest disadvantage is its size. At least a ten-by-four-foot table is required and copy, therefore, must be carried to it. Its use is economically feasible only when used by an experienced operator for batched processing at annual volumes of over 2,500 titles.

The Polaroid CU-5 Close-up Land Camera

The only major camera manufacturer even to flirt with the library market has been Polaroid, and this involvement has been more coincidental than intentional inasmuch as the CU-5 camera was designed originally for close-up dental work. The camera's outstanding feature is that it can develop a print in fifteen seconds. The CU-5 weighs ten pounds, requires little space, and operates simply, allowing almost anyone (with a minimum of experience) to achieve successful results. Its disadvantages are many: the size of the print, $3\frac{3}{8}$ inches by $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches, makes impossible the reproduction of sets of catalog cards without the annoyance of trimming the print and pasting it onto a standard sized card; the prints are not very sharp and, because they deteriorate rapidly, must be used soon after their development or be coated for preservation; the film price is excessively high. The current price of the camera is a little above $400. Comprehensive reports on the performance and practical use of this camera are available.5,6

Indiana University Library Camera

In 1965, Indiana University Library reported on its experiment with a camera designed by Hugh Hazelrigg.7 At that time, the prints were not used to reproduce sets of cards, and the total cost per print was stated to be $.216. Since then, a second camera has been developed by Hazelrigg and is being used to produce master copies from which sets of cards are Xeroxed after the call number has been added. The enlargement is $1.7x$ and the print quality is very satisfactory. The total cost per print is stated now to be $.195. One disadvantage is the size of the finished print which must be trimmed from four inches by five inches to standard card dimensions.

35-mm Variations

Many libraries have devised their own equipment for photographing entries from catalogs. The basic equipment usually consists of a 35-mm camera, an enlarging lens, a frame to which the camera is attached, a device to mask out undesired information, and adequate lighting. Commercial cameras and lenses are used, but the remainder of the equipment is improvised.

The material used in the frames varies from aluminum used by the UKAEA Reactor Group at Risley, England, to square steel tubing at Arizona State.8,9 Frames have also been fashioned out of wood at Volume 18, Number 1, Winter 1974 • 19 •
Modesto Junior College and from stainless steel at the University of Colorado, which was forced to establish a back-up system because the Xerox Model 4 camera could not produce at the rate required during peak periods of demand. The ideal frame is light enough to allow the entire camera assembly to be lifted without difficulty, yet sturdy enough to prevent the assembly's moving when the picture is snapped. The height of the frame depends upon the lens used for enlarging the image.

A masking device, a rectangular opening, is placed at the bottom of the frame. The borders of the masking device should be of a color which will not contrast too sharply with the color of the NUC page so shadow lines will not appear. The opening should be wide enough to include an entire NUC entry—2½ inches in height will accommodate most entries. Because the entry length varies, a movable masking device is needed to screen out unwanted overlapping entries framed in the opening. These masking devices range from something as simple as a clean catalog card to a sliding device, such as Polaroid utilizes, built into the frame.

If a library desires to photograph wider entries such as those found in the British Museum catalogs, a separate frame with a corresponding larger rectangular opening should be constructed.

A variety of methods of lighting ranging from combinations of flood lamps to electronic flashes have been employed. The most effective combination appears to be an electronic ringflash attached around the barrel of the macro lens used in conjunction with a camera and frame fitted with a pistol grip which includes a trigger capable of exposing the film and setting off the flash simultaneously. This combination is simple enough to allow almost any employee to position the camera over the desired information, mask out what is not wanted with one hand, and snap the picture with the other.

Taking the picture is only the first step. The problem of developing a usable print remains. Not every library is as fortunate as Indiana University, which has its own darkroom. Most make arrangements with commercial firms, and satisfaction varies with the quality of services rendered. The most obvious disadvantage is the time delay inherent in any such outside service. The print size is also important. Although some libraries, such as Arizona State, produce a print which approximates 7.5 centimeters by 12.5 centimeters, most prints are oversize and need to be trimmed. If the prints have a glossy finish, call numbers must be typed first on a pressure label before being applied.

**Copy Cat Library Cataloger's Camera**

Even though the major commercial firms generally have ignored this pressing library need, one library specialist has marketed a system which, by combining a camera and a darkroom in one unit, enables one person to perform the complete process. This is Copy Cat, Inc., which offers
its Copy Cat Library Cataloger’s Camera for lease at $75 per month.10
The cost per print is reported to be less than $.07. The camera is a mod-
ification of the one developed for Indiana University and produces a
three-by-five-inch print on matte or glossy finish paper. The unit is two-
tiered, with the camera beneath and a developing unit above. The back
of the camera extends up into a darkbox which has sleeved holes on the
front enabling the operator to remove the print and run it through a de-
veloping process without danger of exposure. The print is clear and
sharp, and call numbers can be typed directly onto the matte finish.

Minolta Copier

Some libraries, bothered by the costs and frustrations involved in
normal photographic processes, have devised other solutions. At the Uni-
versity of Denver, the reduction device on a Minolta Copier was re-
placed with one which enlarged the image 1.3 times.11 These images are
cut out, grouped into fours, and then rerun producing an image with a
1.75 enlargement. The group of four is again cut and presumably used
as master copies for further reproduction. The cost per final print is
quoted as $.079, which obviously excludes the labor involved in the trim-
ming operations.

Xerox System 1.2.3.

A similar method known as the Xerox System 1.2.3, is in operation at
several institutions including Drexel University and Oregon State.12 The
basic machine is either a 720 Xerox or a 914 Xerox copier with special
apparatus added. Instead of one print button, there is an enlarge but-
tton and a copy button, each with its own print button. The desired NUC
try is laid upon the glass, the enlarge button is pushed, followed by
its print button. The result is an 8½-by-11-inch sheet of paper with the
entry enlarged 1.67 times.13 This image is trimmed, pasted, batched, and
rerun on the same machine using the copy and print buttons which pro-
duce copies on regular card stock. The cost for the enlarged image is
less than $.05 if the time for cutting and pasting is excluded.

CATA-CAM

The CATA-CAM photocopying device consists of a microfilm cam-
era mounted in an internally lighted case described by the manufacturer
as being “about the size of a small Kleenex box.”14 It is capable of re-
cording 800 NUC entries on roll film which is developed and then repro-
duced on card stock by the Xerox Copyflo process. The device weighs
only three and one-half pounds. Because it produces cards directly from
film it has two disadvantages: the image cannot be revised, and the call
number cannot be added before the cards are duplicated.

Photographing Directly from Card Drawers

Two other developments seem to have been inspired by the same
idea, namely the need to reproduce catalog cards without removing the
cards from the drawers. The first was designed by Gérard Mercure and Jean Thibault at the University of Quebec at Rimouski, and the second by Developtron Inc.¹⁵,¹⁶ The essential feature of each is the framework design. Each has a wedge shaped projection which slides into the drawer and photographs the desired card by means of reflecting mirrors. The Quebec camera is quite compact. One of the prototypes using a camera with a 38-mm lens and 1.8 focus weighs only five pounds. The light source is a battery-operated Polaroid Wink-Light. The developers have also experimented with a 16-mm camera and various illuminating devices including one recently invented by Zoltan Vital of the Lumina firm. The Developtron Librographer’s camera features a self-contained illuminator head consisting of a 600 watt, 117 V.A.C. fan-cooled illuminator. Unusually powerful illumination is achieved using a 500 watt quartz-iodine bulb which makes short exposure time possible. The camera and illuminating head are grouped as an integral unit and counterbalanced at the end of a lever which is part of a stand. The catalog drawer is placed on the stand and the unit is positioned in the drawer with a minimum of effort.

Although either device can be adapted for other purposes, each is best suited for its original intent, which was to allow researchers to compile bibliographies by photographing catalog cards without removing them from drawers. Another use would be for reproducing and replacing worn out cards. Sixteen-millimeter microfilm cameras would be ideal for either of these projects because of the large number of exposures possible and because cards could be reproduced easily by Copyflo.

Microform Reproduction

It would be an oversight to exclude the services which offer NUC reproductions in microform inasmuch as they achieve the same results as the cataloger’s cameras.

NCR Microcard Editions offers the complete NUC file, from the original catalog, published 1942–46 to date, in the same cumulations as are available in book form.¹⁷ These are available on either four-by-six-inch positive or negative microfiche as well as on micro-opaque cards. They are arranged by main entry, as are the original catalogs.

Information Design, Inc., features a service known as CARDSET which consists of a collection of 16-mm microfilm cartridges containing all MARC II records.¹⁸ These are not reproductions of LC cards, but rather complete sets of cards computer-generated from MARC tapes with LC call numbers and added entry headings overtyped plus extra cards for shelflist use. The current year’s records are updated and cumulated twice monthly. Included is a microfilm index, cumulated twice monthly, of the entire MARC output. The index is arranged by LC card number and by title, including cross references from series entries traced by LC. The subscription includes the use of a microfilm reader with a motorized film transport. Cards are reproduced on a Xerox Microprinter.
Information Design complements the CARDSET with their N.U. Cardset, a 35-mm microfilm of *NUC* from 1953 through the current catalog in the same cumulations. The retrospective volumes are filmed one volume to a cartridge, so access remains analogous to that for the printed books. The N.U. Cardset, however, reproduces only a unit card, not complete sets like the MARC CARDSET. Information Design also offers a 1958-1967 decennial LC card number index either on film or fiche. The 1968 card number index is in hard cover, and from 1969 to the present the card number indices in soft cover are monthly, cumulated quarterly.

Information Dynamics Corporation (IDC) Micrographic Catalog Retrieval Systems (MCRS) utilizes four-by-six-inch negative microfiche containing *NUC* from 1953 to the present. For the period from 1953 through 1962, quinquennial cumulations like the original are available; for the period since 1963, annual cumulations are provided. The contents of the years prior to 1970 were filmed from the *NUC*. From 1970 on MCRS contains reproductions of the Title II depository cards (cumulated weekly) plus all non-LC contributed *NUC* entries (updated monthly, quarterly, and annually, consistent with the *NUC* pattern of publication). Entries are accessible by main entry, by an LC card number index cumulated year to date and annually, and by a title index which is available in various cumulations at varying prices. Since January 1973, the title index has included series added entries. Subscribers may order this comprehensive coverage or only English-language entries. One negative aspect of MCRS is that Information Dynamics Corporation prefers to lease the majority of its services. Libraries subscribing to the complete system do not own the fiche and indices outright, but are obligated to return everything to the lessor upon cancellation of the subscription. For potential subscribers who prefer another arrangement, IDC offers a perpetual license option which as of May 1971 required the payment of an additional $3,000 for the four years preceding the current subscription year, plus an additional $200 per year for any prior or subsequent years. IDC recently has demonstrated the BIBNET system, which includes a cathode ray tube (CRT) display unit with a keyboard and a separate hard-copy printer. The CRT keyboard unit has two slots which accommodate tape cassettes. One of the tapes contains programs. Cataloging information is typed onto the other, which has a capacity of approximately 250 separate entries. This tape can then be run through the hard-copy printer to produce completed catalog card sets. It is asserted that the mini-computer used by the system can be programmed for other library purposes and can be connected to other existing networks.

Last but not least, the capabilities of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) should be mentioned. Using CRT terminals, libraries belonging to this consortium can query the OCLC bibliographic data base by LC card number, by author-title or title search codes, or by OCLC
REFERENCES

14. Detailed information may be obtained from CATA-CAM Research, P.O. Box 856, Riverdale, MD 20840.
15. Detailed information may be obtained from Gérard Mercure, Université du Québec, 300 ave des Ursulines, Rimouski, Que., Canada.
16. Detailed information may be obtained from Ivan Kadar, Developtron Inc., 60 Häpburg Place, Hempstead, L.I., NY 11550.
17. Detailed information may be obtained from Microcard Editions, 901 Twenty-Sixth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.
18. Detailed information may be obtained from Information Design, Inc., 3247 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025.
19. Detailed information may be obtained from Information Dynamics Corporation, 80 Main Street, Reading, MA 01867.
Standards Update: ANSI Committee Z39
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This article describes the organization, sponsorship, scope, and procedures of American National Standards Institute, Inc. (ANSI), Committee Z39 on Library Work, Documentation, and Related Publishing Practices. This is done within the context of the activities of ANSI and of the other ANSI committees relevant to the library community. The article includes a list of Z39 subcommittees, with their fields of specialization and chairmen, a priced list of standards in print, a status report on standards in progress, and a list of the fifty-three member organizations of Z39.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS INSTITUTE, INC. (ANSI) is the United States clearinghouse and coordinating body for standards activity on a national level. It is a federation of professional, technical, trade, and consumer associations. In addition to these member organizations, some 1,000 companies are affiliated with ANSI as company members.

ANSI is the U.S. member of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO), as well as other specialized international and regional standards organizations, such as the International Electrochemical Commission and the Pan American Standards Commission.

There are a number of ANSI Committees whose work is relevant to the library community, among them PH5 (Photographic Reproduction of Documents, whose scope is "standards for photographic materials, apparatus, and processes pertaining to the production, use, storage, and presentation of document reproduction"), PH7 (Photographic Audiovisual Standards), X3 (Computers and Information Processing), Z85 (Standardization of Library Supplies and Equipment), and Z39 (Standardization in the Field of Library Work, Documentation, and Related Publishing Practices). This paper is limited to a brief review of the current state of Z39 activities.

Manuscript received and accepted for publication June 1973; updated February 1974. Prepared while author was at The Catholic University of America libraries, Washington, D.C.
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Committee Z39 is sponsored by the Council of National Library Associations (CNLA) and supported by grants from the Council on Library Resources and the National Science Foundation. Its chairman, Jerrold Orne, has been cited repeatedly for his contributions to standardization. At its November 1971 meeting in Denver, the American Society for Information Science presented him with its Award of Merit for outstanding contributions in the area of standardization of library and information work. At the American Library Association’s June 1972 convention, he was named recipient of the Melvil Dewey Award in recognition of his efforts in guiding the work of Z39, his leadership at ISO meetings, and his many other contributions to the field. Linda Schneider, secretary-treasurer (Standards Committee Z39, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514) is the source for the committee’s quarterly newsletter, News About Z39, and for other information about the committee’s activities.

There are now fifty-three member organizations in Committee Z39, including several library associations and the three national libraries (see the Appendix). Each member organization is entitled to a representative and an alternate representative to Z39. At present the ALA representative is Fred Blum and the alternate is Ann F. Painter. A list of member organizations and their representatives is always available from the secretary-treasurer of Z39.

The scope of the committee’s work, as stated on the masthead of its newsletter, is “to develop standards for concepts, definitions, terminology, letters and signs, practices, and methods in the fields of library work, in the preparation and utilization of documents, and in those aspects of publishing that affect library methods and use.”

The actual work on standards is done in subcommittees, which are comprised of experts in the specific areas covered by the respective standards. Subcommittee members are not limited to individuals representing member organizations on the parent Committee Z39. The following complete list of the subcommittees and their chairmen indicates the range of Z39 interests (committees marked with an asterisk are inactive, having completed their work):

1 Program (Harold Oatfield)
2 Machine Input Records (Herniette D. Avram)
*3 Periodical Title Abbreviations (James L. Wood)
4 Bibliographic References (Ellis Mount)
5 Transliteration (Jerrold Orne)
*6 Abstracts (Ben H. Weil)
7 Library Statistics (Frank L. Schick)
8 Proof Corrections (Bruce C. Young)
9 Terminology (Ben H. Weil)
10 Periodical Format and Arrangement (Anne J. Richter)
12 Indexing (John Rothman)
13 Trade Catalogs and Directories (Karl A. Baer)
16 Binding (Matt Roberts)
17 International Standard Book Number (Emory Koltay and Robert W. Frase, co-chairmen)
18 Book Publishing Statistics (Carol Nemeyer)

*26*

Library Resources & Technical Services
Subcommittees 11, 14, 15, 23, and 28 were disbanded for various reasons and these numbers are not used. Quarterly reports of the subcommittees are included in News About Z39.

Draft standards prepared by the subcommittees are circulated widely, affording all interested parties an opportunity to comment. After comments have been received and taken into account by the relevant subcommittee, the proposed standard is sent to the representatives of the fifty-three member organizations for vote. In accordance with the procedures of the member organizations, the representatives may consult with appropriate committees and/or experts prior to voting. Z39 attempts to resolve any negative votes before forwarding proposed standards to CNLA and ANSI for final review and publication.

Conformity with the standards is voluntary, but because they represent the consensus of interested parties, the standards are implemented widely. ANSI publicity states:

Each standard represents general agreement among maker, seller, and user groups as to the best current practice with regard to some specific problem. Thus the completed standards cut across the whole fabric of production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. American National Standards, by reason of Institute procedures, reflect a national consensus of manufacturers, consumers, and scientific, technical, and professional organizations, and governmental agencies. The completed standards are used widely by industry and commerce and often by municipal, state, and federal governments.

ISO Technical Committee 46 on Documentation, the equivalent ISO committee in the field of library work, often brings Z39 standards forward for consideration as international standards. Z39 is usually well represented at the plenary meetings of TC 46. Highlights of relevant TC 46 activities are frequently noted in News About Z39.
ANSI has issued over 4,000 standards in a wide range of fields; a complete list of all American National Standards is available from the institute. The following Z39 standards are currently available from the American National Standards Institute, Inc., 1430 Broadway, New York, NY 10018:

Z39.1-1967 Periodicals—Format and Arrangement $2.75
Z39.2-1971 Bibliographic Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape 5.00
Z39.4-1968 Basic Criteria for Indexes 2.75
Z39.5-1969 Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals 2.75
Z39.6-1965 Trade Catalogs 2.50
Z39.7-1968 Library Statistics 4.50
Z39.8-1968 Compiling Book Publishing Statistics 2.25
Z39.9-1971 Identification Number for Serial Publications 2.25
Z39.10-1971 Directories of Libraries and Information Centers 3.00
Z39.11-1972 System for the Romanization of Japanese 3.00
Z39.12-1972 System for the Romanization of Arabic 2.50
Z39.13-1971 Advertising of Books 3.00
Z39.14-1971 Writing Abstracts 3.00
Z39.15-1971 Title Leaves of Books 2.50
Z39.16-1972 Preparation of Scientific Papers for Written or Oral Presentation 3.50
Z39.18-1974 Scientific and Technical Reports—Format and Production 4.00

In addition to Z39 standards already published, the following standards have been approved by Z39 membership and submitted to CNLA and ANSI for final approval and publication:

Z39.17 Recommended Practice for Units in Published Scientific and Technical Work
Z39.19 Guidelines for Thesaurus Structure, Construction and Use (Approved 10 July 1973)

Several other proposed standards have been submitted to the Z39 membership for voting during the first half of 1973:

Z39.6 Trade Catalogs (Reaffirmation of Z39.6-1965)
Z39.20 Criteria for Library Materials Price Indexes
Z39.22 Proof Corrections

Drafts circulated to Z39 membership for comment include:

Romanization of Hebrew
Identification and Coding of Countries, Dependencies and Areas of Special Sovereignty for Information Interchange
Standard Record Number
Bibliographical Information for Microfiche Headers.
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Library Resources & Technical Services
Among the drafts being circulated in subcommittee are national standards for:

- Bibliographic References
- Journal Article Citations

A complete set of the Z39 standards published to date (including a free binder) may be ordered at a discount from the price for the separate standards.

In accordance with procedures, published standards must be resubmitted to the membership for reaffirmation or revision after five years from the date of publication. This assures that they are kept reasonably up-to-date.

Judging from the subcommittee reports and the discussions at the last annual meeting, held at the Library of Congress on 4 May 1973, Z39, under the chairmanship of Dr. Orne, will continue to be a fertile source of standards work in the library field over the ensuing years.

### APPENDIX

Member Organizations in Z39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acoustical Society of America</th>
<th>Engineers Joint Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Law Libraries</td>
<td>Information Industry Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Business Press</td>
<td>Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society</td>
<td>International Business Machines Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Concrete Institute</td>
<td>Library Binding Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Institute of Physics</td>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association</td>
<td>Medical Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Nuclear Society</td>
<td>Music Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Petroleum Institute</td>
<td>National Academy of Sciences/National Academy of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Information Science</td>
<td>National Agricultural Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Testing and Materials</td>
<td>National Association of Home Builders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Indexers</td>
<td>National Bureau of Standards, Institute for Computer Sciences and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society of Mechanical Engineers</td>
<td>National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for Computing Machinery</td>
<td>National Library of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Library Schools</td>
<td>National Security Industrial Association, Technical Information Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Publishers</td>
<td>Printing Industries of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American University Presses</td>
<td>Shoe String Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Jewish Libraries</td>
<td>Society for Technical Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Research Libraries</td>
<td>Special Libraries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Scientific Information</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Centers</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc.</td>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Water Resources Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. R. Bowker Company, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Library Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Biology Editors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of National Library Associations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Library Resources, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Information Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Index, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Societies Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1972 Microfilm Rate Indexes

ROBERT C. SULLIVAN
Order Division
The Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.


Preparation of the microfilm indexes is sponsored by the Library Materials Price Index Committee of the Resources (formerly Acquisitions) Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association. Publication of the microfilm indexes is designed to assist librarians in planning and justifying budgets for an increasingly significant form of library material.

Chart 1, “Index of U.S. Library Microfilm Rates,” compares the 1969 microfilm rate indexes for selected U.S. libraries, for both negative and positive microfilm, with the 1972 microfilm rate indexes. Whereas earlier editions of the Directory distinguished between rates for bound and unbound materials and newspapers, the 1973 Directory lists only a single rate for each institution. Also, as with the indexes for other forms of library materials, the base period of 1957/1959 has been abandoned in favor of the new base period of 1967/1969. For microfilm rate index purposes the rates quoted in the 1969 edition of the Directory have been utilized as the new base period for computing index values. The rates quoted are for 35mm negative microfilm per exposure and 35mm positive microfilm per foot.

Chart 2, “1972 Negative Microfilm Rate Index for Selected U.S. Libraries,” itemizes the institutions and the rates indexed for negative microfilm. The 1969 rates indexed for bound materials were available from forty-nine libraries; the 1972 rates were available from forty-eight libraries. The 1972 rates for thirteen of these libraries were obtained by telephone since they did not quote rates for inclusion in the 1973 Directory.

Chart 3, “1972 Positive Microfilm Rate Index for Selected U.S. Li-
# CHART 1

## INDEX OF U.S. LIBRARY MICROFILM RATES

### Negative Microfilm Rate Index² (35mm per exposure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$.0493</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>$.0621</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive Microfilm Rate Index³ (35mm per foot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
<th>Average Rate</th>
<th>Index Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>$.0960</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>$.0839</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Includes forty-nine selected libraries for 1969 and forty-eight for 1972.


The rates indexed are definitely minimum rates because many libraries add charges for spools and boxes, establish minimum charges per volume, item or order, and/or set additional charges for manuscript, "libraries," itemizes the institutions and the rates indexed for positive microfilm. The 1969 rates indexed were available from twenty-two libraries; the 1972 rates were available from twenty libraries. The 1972 rates for nine of these libraries were obtained by telephone since they did not quote rates for tabulation in the 1973 Directory.

The rates indexed are definitely minimum rates because many libraries add charges for spools and boxes, establish minimum charges per volume, item or order, and/or set additional charges for manuscript.

# CHART 2

## 1972 NEGATIVE MICROFILM RATE INDEX FOR SELECTED U.S. LIBRARIES (35MM PER EXPOSURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1972 Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>$ .09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Henry E. Huntington Library</td>
<td>.10AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. University of Colorado</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Yale University</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Library of Congress</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. National Archives</td>
<td>.10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Chicago</td>
<td>.055AB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1972 Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. University of Illinois</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Iowa State University</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Harvard University</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. University of Michigan</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Wayne State University</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of Missouri</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Princeton University</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cornell University</td>
<td>.055A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Columbia University</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. New York Public Library</td>
<td>.10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. University of North Carolina</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Duke University</td>
<td>.055A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. American Philosophical Society</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Virginia State Library</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. University of Virginia</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. University of Washington</td>
<td>.08B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Wisconsin State Historical Society</td>
<td>.065B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. University of Alabama</td>
<td>.05B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Claremont College</td>
<td>.06AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Stanford University</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>.06B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. University of Florida</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. University of Georgia</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. University of Iowa</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. University of Kentucky</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. University of Maryland</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. University of Minnesota</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. University of New Mexico</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. University of Rochester</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Hebrew Union College</td>
<td>.0775AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. University of Oregon</td>
<td>.15B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Pennsylvania State</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Joint University Libraries</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. University of Texas</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Texas Tech University</td>
<td>.05B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Brigham Young University</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. West Virginia University</td>
<td>.03B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: A Average of rates  
   B Responded to letter or telephone

TOTAL 2.9825  
\[
\frac{2.9825}{48} = 0.0621
\]

Average rate = Index Value of 125.9
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pictorial, rare book and other material requiring special handling, or for nonconsecutive runs, filming double-page material in single-page format, for customer specifications, for scrapbook, map, and similar material, for camera changes required by fold-out charts or variations in material format, etc. As the Directory itself cautions: "Prices indicated are those for a typical small order without complications."

The index value for negative microfilm rates increased 25.9 percent for the four-year period between 1969 and 1972. This is a sharp upsurge since the index value for negative microfilm rates for the previous eleven-year period (1959 through 1969) increased only 22.3 percent. This suggests that the inflationary increases in salaries and the costs of supplies and equipment that library photoduplication services absorbed have been transmitted partially to customers in the form of increased rates. This figure is not shocking when compared with the 34.6 percent increase in the average price of a U.S. periodical between 1967/1969 and 1971, the 24.3 percent increase in the average price of serial services,

**CHART 3**

**1972 Positive Microfilm Rate Index for Selected U.S. Libraries (35mm per Foot)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>1972 Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Library of Congress</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. National Archives</td>
<td>.10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. University of Chicago</td>
<td>.0775A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Harvard University</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. University of Michigan</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. University of Missouri</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cornell University</td>
<td>.12AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Columbia University</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. New York Public Library</td>
<td>.12B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Virginia State Library</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. University of Virginia</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. University of Washington</td>
<td>.05B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Wisconsin State Historical Society</td>
<td>.10B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Louisiana State University</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Hebrew Union College</td>
<td>.12B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. University of Oregon</td>
<td>.06B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Brigham Young University</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>.06B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. West Virginia University</td>
<td>.03B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  
A Average of rates  
B Responded to letter or telephone  

TOTAL 1.6775  
\[ \div 20 = .0839 \]  
Average Rate = Index Value of 87.4
or the 51 percent increase in the average price of U.S. hardcover trade-technical books in the same period.

Surprisingly the index value for positive microfilm rate declined by 12.6 percent between 1969 and 1972. In the 1959–1969 period positive microfilm rates increased 18.6 percent, from an average rate of $.0809 to $.0960; now the rates have settled at an average of $.0839. Obviously some libraries reduced their positive microfilm rates between 1969 and 1972, an encouraging sign. Since the production of positive microfilm is a more mechanized and less laborious process than the preparation of negative microfilm, it is understandable that these rates might not rise as rapidly as the negative rates. That the average rate for positive microfilm actually declined is, nevertheless, a surprise. U.S. library produced microfilm continues to be a comparatively good “buy.”
Interest in and use of approval plans has been very widespread. One interesting factor in the use of such plans is the absence of data demonstrating their effectiveness. This article reviews what librarians have said about approval plans, and reports on a study conducted to develop data with which to determine the effectiveness of approval plans. The findings of the study indicate that there may be a significant difference between the utility of the materials acquired through approval plans and the utility of those acquired by other methods.

Introduction

In order to evaluate various types of acquisition-selection programs, one needs to secure hard data, not opinions. To date little evidence is available with which one may evaluate objectively the effectiveness of any particular selection method. Literature on the subject is limited generally to discussing the success or failure of a particular selection program employed by a particular college or university library, with no solid data presented. Because of the increasing demands to acquire more materials at a faster rate, many libraries are incorporating some type of approval plan into their acquisitions programs. Libraries may implement an approval program without being able to determine properly its usefulness for their needs, because there is no solid evidence by which to weigh the pros and cons.

In a previously reported study of book acquisition and book collec-
tion usage in academic libraries, there was an indication that a statistically significant relationship existed between the methods by which materials were selected and acquired and the subsequent use these materials received in the library. The study was concerned with three methods of selection: by faculty, by librarian, and by jobber (sometimes designated as approval plan acquisition). The purpose of the study was to attempt to learn something about the relationship between a book selector’s knowledge of patron needs and the resulting success attained in building a library book collection. Success was measured in terms of collection usage.

The study was based on the hypothesis that a knowledge of user needs is essential to building a useful library collection. It was suggested that if the librarian was more successful in selecting items that were used within a specified period of time, the success was due to more contact with the users. To test this assumption, the measure of recorded use of the materials was considered to be a partial index of success. The percentage of items acquired by the three selection methods—librarian, faculty, and jobber—and then used (circulated) after being available to library users for a specific period of time represented the measure of success. The position taken was that the librarian would be more successful than either the faculty member or the jobber in selecting titles that would be useful to the library patrons. In the study the time element used was the first twelve months the materials were available to the public.

Random samples of titles acquired by each method of selection were examined to determine their use during the stipulated period of time. The results were tabulated into circulating and noncirculating categories, and the chi-square ($\chi^2$) test was used to determine whether the observed differences in use were greater than might be expected as a result of pure chance. The findings showed that a statistically significant difference in the use of current imprint English language materials did exist. When the samples for each method were grouped together the $\chi^2$ value was 191.95, while the value needed to reject the null hypothesis was 5.99.

Factors other than the method of selection which could influence use were also examined. Results of this study showed in almost every case only a slight possibility of any other factor than method of selection accounting for the observed difference. One basic question remained unanswered. Were the cases studied representative of academic libraries in general? Only four American universities were examined, and clearly there are many other academic institutions to be considered. The limitations imposed by the small number of cases were discussed in the article noted above.

The purpose of the present article is to report the results of a follow-up study and to review current thinking about approval plans. Additional work was made possible with the aid of two grants from the Uni-
versity of California, Los Angeles, Academic Senate Research Committee. A number of libraries in the southern California area cooperated in the second study, and the authors express appreciation for the assistance received. Because of the type of records required to carry out the study, it was not possible to select the case institutions in a random manner and still have meaningful material to report. The libraries included were those with records showing who selected an item and records revealing the circulation history of individual titles.

Review of the Literature

As further background, it is useful to review some methods of book selection and the trends in their development and application as reported in the literature. Recent literature on acquisition programs and policies is marked by general agreement among librarians that selection policies ideally should (a) effectively increase and broaden the depth and scope of the collection, (b) meet new fields of user needs, and (c) supply the kinds of materials needed by the library user.

Traditionally book selection in academic libraries has operated under the strong influence of the teaching faculty. Primarily because of the pressure to acquire ever greater quantities of materials in the academic library at a time when there is an increasing number of titles from which selection must be made, the trend is away from dependence upon faculty and/or title-by-title ordering of books. Also, a larger role in selection is given to librarians as a result of increasing reliance on blanket order or approval order plans for book acquisition. As book assessment has become a full-time job, some libraries (usually in larger universities) have developed a corps of bibliographers, each with one or more subject specialities, who initiate book orders and are responsible for the depth and maintenance of the collection in their respective areas. Not all libraries are able to meet these added demands on their staff effectively. Though increasing, academic library budgets have not been adequate to handle all the demands placed upon them, especially in terms of staffing demands. Without adequate staffing of the acquisition department, approval plans tend to become blanket order plans.

To cope with acquisitions problems, academic libraries have been implementing blanket order and approval plans. Early forms of such plans are the Farmington Plan and later the PL-480 program. Both plans initiated the use of an agent as the primary selector of materials. Another plan used widely in the academic library is sponsored by the Association of American University Presses, which provides academic libraries with books on approval from all member presses.

Wilden-Hart’s recent review of approval programs shows several basic types of plans being offered:

1. Standing order with a publisher for all his publications.
2. Standing order with a publisher for his publications in selected subjects.
3. Standing order with a jobber for all of a publisher's publications.
4. Jobber notification plan, under which selection is made from a jobber's listed offerings.
5. Jobber approval plan, under which selection is made from books sent on approval combined with some form of listing.
6. Jobber approval plan, under which selection is made from books sent on approval.
7. Jobber approval plan by subject, under which jobber sends books according to the library's "profile."  

Dealers, jobbers, wholesalers, and publishers offer various types of programs. For example, area coverage is available in science and technology, and libraries may specify subjects, publishers, series, and levels of study. Some programs are operated through a dealer or jobber-vendor rather than directly through the publisher. Approval plans are being used for gathering materials in area studies of particular foreign countries. Because of increased use, now many plans are directed toward general collection building.

Approval plans have certain procedural operations in common. Most are designed to supply current materials and seldom include nonbook material. To establish an approval program, the library creates a "profile" which delineates the subject interests and limitations on materials the dealer is to supply. Most profiles take the form of a letter to the dealer. Others are designed according to a subject thesaurus by which the library describes interests and desired subject coverage. This approach is helpful in facilitating dealer-library communications, because descriptive terms can be defined to have the same meaning for both participants.

A major concern for the library using an approval plan is review and assessment of incoming materials. Many alternatives have been suggested, including review by the library staff and/or a corps of bibliographers, or an open policy of faculty review. Most approval plan sponsors indicate that a return rate of no more than 5 to 10 percent is acceptable. A higher rate is thought to indicate some misunderstanding of profile stipulations between the library and dealer. In most cases, the library's ability to define its specific collection needs determines the extent of success or failure of the approval plan.

Recent discussions in the literature provide varying opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of the approval plan as a means of selection or acquisition for academic library materials. Considering both positive and negative factors, the discussions are often subjective or provide, at best, estimations concerning time and money factors, but lack supporting evidence.

The following are the most consistently agreed upon advantages of approval plans:

1. Delivery and acquisition of materials is provided soon after publication date. (This is the most often mentioned advantage.)
2. Better evaluation is possible with the book in hand.
3. Most materials are acquired while current, with less danger of their going out of print (especially important for many foreign publications).
4. Materials not having an apparent immediate value, but useful to building a research collection, are obtained.
5. Much broader coverage of selected areas is possible, in contrast to the sometimes sporadic faculty selection practices.
6. The problem of securing coverage in exotic languages or countries with minimal national bibliographies may be solved.
7. There is the added convenience of single billing, fewer invoices, and elimination of individual orders.
8. Most popular books are available before the user wants them.
9. Librarians have greater opportunity and time for antiquarian selections, and for backlist and o.p. ordering.
10. Often discounts are given by dealers, and projected total savings per title are high.
11. More flexibility in library job allocations is possible because the work load has shifted.
12. The comprehensive coverage in current monographs or foreign areas is necessary for an expanding collection.
13. From working with one dealer, the library derives benefits such as special service, discount advantages, and more personal service.

The disadvantages identified in connection with the use of an approval plan or blanket order program are not agreed upon as consistently as the advantages already mentioned, but tend to depend upon varying situations in a particular library. Several of the most commonly mentioned are:

1. Most approval plans fail to supply multiple copies, and so special ordering for additional or replacement copies is required.
2. A special request is difficult to answer because whether particular titles will be received on an approval order is usually not known.
3. Most programs are relatively expensive and beyond the budgetary means of smaller libraries which do not want to devote the entire acquisitions budget to a plan for current materials only.
4. Many publications which are not listed in the major trade journals or for which vendor discounts are not available may be ignored.
5. Quite frequently sizable discount advantages are relinquished in acknowledgment of the dealer's additional efforts to render the required amounts of service.
6. The length of time required to establish a program and the commitment of time and effort in order to develop a smooth operation represent major hidden costs.
7. Many claims of increased speed of acquisition and efficiency of operation may be overemphasized, and frequently an item is re-
ceived long before the patron even knows the item exists. Single copy order and processing procedures would be more than adequate.

8. Evaluation is more difficult and time consuming because books frequently are received before scholarly reviews are available.

9. No net saving for the library may result because savings in the acquisitions department may be countered by an additional cost for personnel involved in review in other departments.

10. For a large library, the collection policy is not likely to change, but in a small library where a large portion of the budget is necessary to support an approval plan, a “standardized” collection may result.

11. A small library depending on a single supplier may become too dependent on the supplier and risk accepting poor or deteriorating service.

12. The quality of the personnel selection for the supplier, especially in the case of foreign materials, may not be as good as it should be.

13. The risk of developing a collection with a wide range of titles but no provision for multiple copies of authoritative titles exists.

14. Materials of marginal value or an ephemeral nature, though clearly not specified in the profile, may be accepted because extra review time is judged to be unavailable.

15. Sometimes duplication is a problem, especially where programs are simultaneously ordering publications from more than one country when the same book is published in different countries under different titles.

16. Unless an approval plan builds on an established collection, an over-supply of current materials may develop.

Vacillating opinions about and differing degrees of experience with approval plans have prompted some common “words of wisdom” concerning the approval plan as a method of selection. Some points more commonly mentioned are:

1. Too many restrictions on the jobber may keep him from supplying enough “marginal” titles, many of which are useful.

2. If the plan is to be effective, it should provide for careful scrutiny of all titles received as a continuing check of the dealer’s selection.

3. Uncritical acceptance of the dealer’s selections should not be extended to the point that the special needs of faculty and students are ignored.

4. It may be fruitless to try to weed out the materials which a majority might consider worthless because of a strong disagreement between individuals and departments on the value of materials.

5. A successful approval plan is based upon having a good agent, a precise library profile, and faculty approval and cooperation.
6. Experience in checking publishers' catalogs and national trade journals confirms that a high proportion of the new publications are of a very marginal value, perhaps even expendable.

Approval plans are becoming more the rule than the exception for selection of materials in larger academic libraries. Although the comments on the ultimate success or failure of such plans vary, there seems to be a definite trend toward recommending some type of librarian or faculty review and evaluation of the incoming materials. Summarizing a report on approval plans in forty-four academic libraries, Dudley reiterates the need for careful review of approval materials received by the library. He indicates that if materials are not reviewed with thought, discrimination, and some measure of professional expertise, if close contact fails to be maintained with the bibliographic sources, and if new orders are not generated, then it is likely that the library will lose its flexibility and fail to meet its responsibility to respond to changes in the academic environment.4

Stanford University library maintains seventeen different blanket order or approval plans, and also hires librarians as subject specialists (usually the competence represented by a master's degree is required as a minimum) to review materials received and to make additional selections for the library collection. The specialists maintain close contact with departments and faculty, and, in addition, review trade bibliographies, such as Publishers' Weekly, marked by dealers with indication of books in the shipment. Stanford's director warns that the "automatic plan" tends to build an uncritical collection if there are no librarians or other persons to monitor the program.6

A review of the opinions on the merits and faults of approval plans does not establish any criteria by which the usefulness or suitability of such a program of acquisitions can be determined. In considering selection objectives, writers place emphasis on supplying the kinds of information required by the library user served. Even with a competent corps of subject bibliographers at Stanford, Grieder states, "There is no doubt that a large part of a research library is seldom if ever used. The problem is to identify accurately the comparatively useless portion."6

Research on Selection Procedures in Academic Libraries

Because of the lack of objective data on the methods of collection development, especially on the approval plan, a series of studies have been planned.

One technique for determining the suitability and utility of a particular collection is the examination of use patterns in order to determine which books are circulated. Use is recognized to be only one element in the evaluation process and is certainly not the only measure. Nevertheless, for all its weakness, use is a reasonably objective, measurable criterion and was chosen, therefore, as the criterion for the study.7 The final objectives of these use studies are (a) to help in the evaluation of
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Librarian Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Librarian Non-Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Faculty Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Faculty Non-Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Approval Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Approval Non-Circulated Titles</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5,593</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
various collection development procedures, and (b) to look for some characteristics to aid the selectors identify the “useless” items before they are added to the collection. Three major steps are required in this process: (1) determine if differences in use of books exist, (2) determine the causes for the differences, given the methods of book selection, and (3) compare those titles consistently used to others never used to determine characteristics which explain these differences.

Findings of the first study conducted in four institutions (A, B, C, and D in Tables 1 and 2) show that statistically significant differences in the pattern of use of current English language monographs did exist. The differences were as predicted: the librarians selected more circulated titles than either the faculty or book jobbers, and the faculty was the second most successful selector. The statistical significance of the differences is analyzed in the group data, showing a $\chi^2$ value of 191.95, where the value needed to reject the null hypothesis is 5.99 (as noted earlier). The same method of selection was checked over a number of years at one institution, but the differences between samples were statistically insignificant. This indicated that factors such as teaching methods, student body composition, research needs, etc., all of which change through time, did not influence book usage significantly. No comparisons were made between institutions, because the institutions were too different in character.

Subsequent research has been conducted in five other academic libraries, three college and two university. This work tends to support the findings of the first study for the universities and large colleges. Some variation between study findings was found, especially in the small college situation. The second study has incorporated two new elements. First, the period during which use was measured was extended to cover the entire period the book was in the library and available to the public up to the time the survey was taken. It was noted whether the book had been used any time during this period. Second, titles were classified by broad discipline or subject areas. Often libraries report using broadly based approval programs for the social sciences and humanities while using more limited programs for science and technical books.

The data were analyzed according to method of selection and by three major disciplines: the social sciences, humanities, and the sciences. Because the recorded book use was noted according to Library of Congress (LC) or Dewey classification, only a very broad grouping was possible. It is recognized that there are a great many problems in using such an approach; however, for this first examination a broad division seems valid. The titles in LC classes A, C-L, and arbitrarily half of the titles in LC class B, and the titles in Dewey classes 300, 900, and arbitrarily half of the titles in Dewey class 100 were considered as social sciences. The titles in LC classes M-P, Z, and half of those in LC class B, and the titles in Dewey classes 000, 200, 400, 700, 800, and half of those in
Dewey class 100 were grouped as humanities. Titles in LC classes Q–V, and Dewey classes 500 and 600 were considered as sciences.

For each institution, several comparisons were made according to discipline and selection methods, but it was determined that differences between institutions precluded the formulation of valid assumptions based on combined statistics. Comparisons of statistics from institutions of similar size, three medium-sized university libraries and two state college libraries, were also made, and, although the statistical differences are smaller, they are consistently too high to indicate anything but institutional differences. The smallest difference was in the approval plan selection ($\chi^2 = 112.32$), and librarian selection showed a moderate value ($\chi^2 = 56.77$). The wide variation between institutions and their selection policies, however, makes it difficult to compare statistics and assume valid results. Clearly, there are different demands on the collections, even among institutions of similar size; these figures by no means indicate that the librarians or faculty at one institution are more qualified as selectors than those at another institution.

Table I presents the percentages of use (recorded circulation) of materials in all institutions considered in both studies, grouped according to method of selection. For each institution, comparisons for three selection methods plus paired combinations of each method were made. In addition, selection by discipline was considered according to the three major areas: social sciences, humanities, and sciences. The $\chi^2$ value differences for paired combinations were also determined according to selection method for each discipline (see Table 2).

As hypothesized, the data indicate the success of the librarian selector as compared with the faculty selector and the jobber as measured by the number of circulating titles. The statistical analysis by discipline also tends to support the confining of approval plans to nonscientific fields. For acquiring science materials, the approval plan was consistently the least successful of the three methods of selection.

For the institutions included in the first study, the hypothesis, as previously stated, was supported by the findings. With the same institutions and selection methods, and with the data grouped according to the three discipline areas indicated, there is generally little significant difference shown between selection methods in the social sciences and humanities, while the sciences indicate a notable degree of difference, which again favors the librarian as the most successful selector.

In institution A, for example (see Table 2), the humanities and social sciences show no statistically significant difference in use for faculty and approval plan materials ($\chi^2 = 0.63$ and $\chi^2 = 0.85$, respectively, where $\chi^2 = 3.84$ is a statistically significant value). The sciences show a significant difference in use ($\chi^2 = 7.34$), with more faculty selections being used.

At institution B significant differences exist in all categories except the social sciences.

Institution C in the first study was also reexamined according to discipline.
cipline and selection methods. In the social sciences, comparing all three selection methods shows a statistically significant difference ($\chi^2 = 13.10$), as do the humanities ($\chi^2 = 25.28$) and the sciences ($\chi^2 = 25.91$). In every case, pairing selection methods by discipline shows a statistically significant difference between librarian selection and approval plan selection. The librarian is favored as selector, the faculty is second, and the approval plan is third.

At institution D, figures for librarian and approval plan selections show no significant differences for the social sciences or the humanities. The sciences indicate a substantial statistical difference.

It is important to remember in connection with the above data that the time of use was confined to the first year of availability. The first study considered circulation figures covering only one year as compared to an extended time span in the second study. As a test of validity of the one-year time span, the use statistics from institution D from the first study were compared to statistics gathered by that institution over a four-year period in a completely unrelated study of the book collection conducted a number of years ago. The research was concerned with identifying little-used books in the collection for the purpose of select-

**TABLE 2**

**CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR SELECTION METHODS OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Method of Selection</th>
<th>Calculated</th>
<th>Required for Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A All Disciplines</td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>6.54*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>7.34*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>112.90*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>48.11*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>12.97*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>20.23*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>49.37*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>48.17*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>12.77*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>10.82*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>41.44*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>50.62*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Approval, ES = Earlier study, F = Faculty, L = Librarian.
* Statistically significant value.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Method of Selectiona</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value Calculated</th>
<th>Required for Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>8.05*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>15.50*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>45.30*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>42.77*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>16.15*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>6.94*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>13.10*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>9.85*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>11.43*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>25.91*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>11.63*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>20.37*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>7.96*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>6.64*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,ES,A</td>
<td>10.79*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,ES</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES,A</td>
<td>6.58*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,ES,A</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,ES</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES,A</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,ES,A</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,ES</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES,A</td>
<td>8.73*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,ES,A</td>
<td>6.93*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,ES</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ES,A</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>127.59*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>73.07*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>103.60*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>65.19*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>32.48*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>52.24*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>60.47*</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>40.28*</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Method of Selection&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Chi-Square Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calculated</td>
<td>Required for significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>37.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>18.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>6.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F,A</td>
<td>17.88*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>7.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>10.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>31.63*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>31.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>4.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>12.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F,A</td>
<td>29.39*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>L,A</td>
<td>16.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>12.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>L,F</td>
<td>11.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Indicates significance at the 0.05 level.
ing items for storage. Circulation statistics were reported by broad discipline areas, indicating the number of titles used and not used during a four-year period. The selection procedures in the institution's earlier study were primarily the same as those employed during the year selected for the author's first study. Using $\chi^2$ as a means of comparing the two sets of statistics in all disciplines shows a statistically significant difference between the librarian, approval, and the institution's earlier study circulation numbers ($\chi^2 = 10.79$). An important point appears when the circulation of titles in all disciplines from the author's first study is compared to the institution's earlier study ($\chi^2 = 0.27$), indicating no statistical difference in the results of the studies in terms of librarian selections.

A second comparison between the approval plan and the institution's earlier study shows a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 6.58$). From the comparison it is suggested that (1) the two samples of librarian selections reflect basically the same use pattern although one sample covers a longer period of use, and (2) both librarian samples when compared to the approval sample show a significant difference indicating perhaps something other than chance factors caused the difference.

Further analysis was made comparing circulation figures according to discipline. As indicated earlier, there is no significant difference in circulation of social science titles reported in the institution's earlier study, titles selected by the librarian, and titles selected by the approval plan ($\chi^2 = 1.11, 0.13, \text{and} 1.09, \text{respectively}$). No significant difference in circulation of humanities titles is found when the three samples are compared, but a comparison of librarian selections and approval selections indicates a significant $\chi^2 = 8.73$.

Support is given to the subhypothesis that the librarian is more successful as a selector of materials in the sciences than the approval plan, as comparing the three sets of data for circulation shows a significant statistical difference ($\chi^2 = 6.98$). Again, circulation figures for the sciences show a statistically significant difference between librarian selections and the approval selections ($\chi^2 = 3.99$, where $\chi^2 = 3.84$ is required for significance).

It is suggested, based upon the above comparisons, that circulation figures gathered over a period of twelve months are as valid as those compiled over an extended period of time. The hypothesis that there is a significant difference in use of materials selected by different methods is supported. Also the posited consistent difference between librarian and approval selection in broad disciplines is supported partially in the sciences and the humanities but not in the social sciences.

For the institutions studied during the second study, the same basic patterns prevail. The selectors who had the greatest direct contact with the library users had the greatest success in selecting materials that are used. The group having the most direct contact with the library patrons did vary, as will be noted.
At institution E several points appear. One, the pattern of the approval plan's being the least effective means of acquiring usable materials is maintained. Two, no significant differences in use are observed between faculty and librarian selections regardless of discipline. There are significant differences in use among faculty, librarian, and approval plan selections in all disciplines.

With one exception, the results from institution F are consistent with other findings. The exception, which was found in the social sciences rather than the sciences, is the difference in use by discipline. To a certain extent this is not too surprising since this institution has perhaps the most active science program, as reflected in student enrollment, of any institution studied. This institution did not use an approval plan, and the observed differences in use indicate librarians are more effective in selecting usable material, especially in the social sciences.

At institution G a mixed pattern is observed. Overall, the same pattern is observed, with librarian, faculty, and approval plans ranking in that order of effectiveness in selecting usable materials. In the breakdown by discipline an extremely varied pattern is found. Significant differences are found in the humanities between the librarian and faculty or approval plan selections, in the social sciences between librarian and approval selections, and in the sciences between faculty and approval selections. How one is to interpret these results is difficult to say, except to note that approval plan selection does not appear to be as selective as the faculty or librarian.

Institution H contributes several new factors. The most notable factor is that librarian selectors do not appear to be more effective in acquiring materials. In comparison with faculty selectors, librarian selectors, regardless of discipline, show a statistically significant difference in performance as measured by titles selected and used. The second interesting point is that there are no significant differences in the science grouping. What is surprising about this result is that the institution does not place a great emphasis on science programs, as did institution F. For the other fields there is the same mixed pattern as observed at institution G.

The final institution, I, is a small college with no graduate program. Each of the other institutions has one or more master's degree programs, and four of them have doctoral programs. Somewhat surprisingly, even in the small college situation the librarians have a better percentage of used selections. One might have expected the faculty selectors to have done better since the material acquired would tend to be heavily curriculum oriented rather than research and independent study oriented. Unfortunately, since the data was collected by the library staff of the institution, only the gross results were available for analysis. Because of the lack of information, it was not possible to compare the data on the basis of broad disciplines; the gross data is shown, however, in Table 2.
Summary and Conclusions

The second study validates the results of the first study. The results of both studies were supported further in the case of one institution by the results of a comparison of the data from these studies with data collected for another purpose by the staff of the institution. While the findings are in no way definitive, they do supply some objective data upon which to base a judgment about the employment of an approval plan. There is clear evidence that the approval plan, even when it is carefully monitored, as it is at institutions B, D, and G, still brings into the library significantly more unused material than do other methods.

What now needs to be explored is the cost benefit factor. What method is the least expensive? Is there a significant saving of time with the approval plan? Is there any real saving by acquiring current material now rather than later? What is the life cost of acquiring, processing, and maintaining unused materials? These and other questions need to be answered with evidence rather than testimony before sound decisions can be made about what method of selection should be used.

The basic conclusions of the second study are:

1. Significant differences in use do exist, and they are related to the method of acquisition (the order of differences was librarian selection, faculty selection, and approval plan).
2. The first year of title availability appears to be representative of and predictive of long-term use.
3. Approval plans, even when carefully monitored, do bring in more nonused material than do other methods of acquisition.
4. Approval plans tend to be least satisfactory in the science fields.

Further work in this area is being pursued in an attempt to develop a means of identifying certain types of books as being potentially non-circulating.
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The first problem in using the Library of Congress (LC) classification schedule for Chinese literature is the lack of explanation of the procedures to be followed in classifying. With specific examples from the LC schedule and the National Union Catalog, the writer first discusses the construction of author notations for Chinese authors or works and then the application of special tables for Chinese literature.

There are only two major classification schedules used by American academic libraries in organizing Chinese materials for their East Asian collections. The majority of East Asian collections established before 1958 use A Classification Scheme for Chinese and Japanese Books, by A. K’ai-ming Ch’iu, devised under the inspiration of Sun Hsing-yen and Miao Chuan-sun and based on the general principles and mnemonic devices of Cutter, Dewey, and others. Many of the East Asian collections established after 1958, when the Library of Congress (LC) schedule for Chinese literature was first introduced, have accepted the LC schedule. The acceptance of the LC schedule, despite its weaknesses and inadequacies, has brought about a dual benefit: the ease of accepting both descriptive and subject cataloging of the same system, and the integration of Chinese materials with the Western-language materials in one dictionary catalog.

Whereas Ch’iu’s scheme is based on the traditional concepts of Chinese literary history, the LC schedule is devised according to the structure of its schedules for English or American literature. A Chinese cataloger skilled in the use of LC schedule for either literature mentioned above should have little difficulty in the application of LC schedule for Chinese literature. Unfortunately, the majority of Chinese catalogers...
are language specialists rather than general catalogers. They will need some explanation of the author notations and tables used in the LC schedule for Chinese literature. As early as 1940, Grout pointed out the lack of explanation in the LC schedule, of both terminology and the procedures to be followed in classifying. More recently, Richmond, in a discussion of the general advantages and disadvantages of using the LC schedule, also states that the first disadvantage has been the lack of instruction manuals for its application. Although this paper is written for the benefit of Chinese language specialists inexperienced in the LC schedules in general, it should also be of interest to general catalogers. Certain sections of the schedule apply to translations of Chinese literature from Chinese to Western languages as well as the Western-language criticisms of Chinese literature. Needless to say, translations and criticisms of individual authors or works are to be arranged together with the original works in the vernacular language.

This paper will discuss first the author notations and then the tables provided in the LC schedule for Chinese literature.

Author Notations

Like the author notations for Western-language literatures, LC author notations for Chinese literature are composed of two elements: initial Roman letters and decimal Arabic numbers. In several sections of the PL schedule for Chinese literature, there are specific author numbers for prominent individual authors of a period, arranged in one alphabet. The remaining authors are to be grouped in another alphabet in the same class, arranged from A to Z by their family names. The schedule for the T'ang dynasty illustrates how individual authors are treated:

PL
Chinese literature.
Individual authors and works...

| 2670 | Han, Yü, 768–824. |
| 2671 | Li, Po, 701–762. |
| 2672 | Li, Shang-yin, 813–858. |
| 2673 | Liu, Tsung-yüan, 773–819. |
| 2675 | Tu, Fu, 712–770. |
| 2676 | Wang, Wei, 699–759. |
| 2677 | Other, A–Z. |

In PL2677, LC has constructed a number of author notations by combining the first letter of the Chinese family name with an appropriate decimal number. The following are examples:

.C4 Ch'ên, Tz'u-ang, 661–702.
.H74 Hsü, Hun, chin shih 832.
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The author notations of the schedules for the Chinese literature of Sung dynasty (960–1279), Yuan dynasty (1279–1368), Ming dynasty (1368–1644), and Ch'ing dynasty (1644–1912) are treated in the same manner. However, a new device is introduced to the author notations for the Ch'ing dynasty:

**PL**

Chinese literature.

Individual authors and works . . . .

Ching dynasty, 1644–1912.

2700 A–Chiang.
2701 Ch'ien, Ch'ien-i, 1582–1664.
2702 Ch'ing Kao-tsung, emperor, 1711–1799.
2703 Chu, I-tsun, 1629–1709.
2704 Chu'üan, Tsu-wang, 1705–1755.
2705 Other names beginning with Ch.

In the first section of the LC schedule for Ch'ing dynasty, individual numbers are provided for four prominent authors whose names begin with Ch (PL2701–2704). Preceding these four numbers, one number (PL2700) is provided for all other authors whose names begin with A through Chiang, in such a manner as to arrange them in one alphabet with the four prominent authors. Finally, all other names beginning with Ch and not included in the above mentioned five numbers (PL2700–2704) will be classified in the sixth number (PL2705). The reason for such elaborate provisions for names beginning with Ch is obvious. Since a considerable number of Chinese names begin with Ch, and many more authors or works of modern period are likely to be represented in any East Asian collection, elaborate provisions are needed for the construction of author notations.

For individual authors of the Ch'ing dynasty, there is yet another device in LC for author notations:

**PL**

Chinese literature.

Individual authors and works . . . .

Ching dynasty, 1644–1912.

2710 H–Huang.
2711 Huang, Tsung-hsi, 1610–1695.
2712 Huang–Hz.
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The following are examples of the numbers for individual authors constructed by LC from the above two series of class numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Numbers</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL2710.S825</td>
<td>Hsü, Ch’ing-ch’eng</td>
<td>1844–1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hsü, Nan-ying</td>
<td>1855–1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hu, Lin-i</td>
<td>1812–1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hu, Yü-chin</td>
<td>1859–1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2711</td>
<td>Huang, Tsung-hsi</td>
<td>1610–1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2712.U5</td>
<td>Huang, Shéng</td>
<td>1645–1704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL2715.A5</td>
<td>K’ang, Yu-wei</td>
<td>1858–1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2716</td>
<td>Ku, Yen-wu</td>
<td>1613–1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2717.U25</td>
<td>Ku, Yün-ch’ên</td>
<td>1828–1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K’ung, Shang-jên</td>
<td>1648–1718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kung, Tzü-chên</td>
<td>1792–1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kuo, Sung-t’ao</td>
<td>1818–1892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the author number is derived from the second letter of the name rather than the first in order to maintain alphabetical order.

The construction of correct author numbers involves, first, determination of whether the first or second letter of the name is to be used as the basis of the notation, and, second, a knowledge of LC practice which can only be obtained from experience.

Tables for Chinese Literature

There are four special tables provided for Chinese literature: Tables I and II for the Confucian Canon, or the Chinese Classics, and Tables III and IV for the historical periods. In addition, Table XXIII for Western-language literatures is also to be used for Chinese literature outside China.

Table I is always used in combination with Table IV. Table I provides a numerical designation for each of the comprehensive classics and the individual classics, as shown in the excerpt:

**PL CHINESE LITERATURE TABLES FOR THE CONFUCIAN CANON**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Comprehensive editions and selections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 13, 12, or 9 Classics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wu ching (The 5 Classics).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes I ching, Shu ching, Shih ching, Li chi, and Ch’un ch’iu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ssū shu (The 4 books of philosophy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Includes Lun yü, Ta hsüeh, Chung yung, Mencius.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV provides designations for historical periods, as shown in the excerpt:

**PL**

**CHINESE LITERATURE**

**TABLES OF HISTORICAL PERIODS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.AI-9</td>
<td>Five dynasties, 907–960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.C1-9</td>
<td>Yuan dynasty, 1279–1368.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of numbers from PL2461–2476 is used for printed editions of the Confucian Canon (in Chinese). The number for the individual classic is derived by substituting from Table I in the 4–16 range. Thus, the number for *I Ching* is PL2464; for *Shu ching*, PL2465; and for *Shih ching*, PL2466. To sub-arrange editions of an individual classic, Table IV is used. In the use of this table, a problem relating to date of edition may be encountered. If the edition in hand happens to be a reprint of an earlier edition, the cataloger has two options for the construction of the work number. He can use the letter for the period when the reprint was produced, or the letter for the period when the original edition was published. For example, a 1964 edition of *Shu ching* edited by Tsêng Yün-ch’ien (1884–1945) will be classified in PL2465, with all other editions. However, the work number can be constructed using the letter R since the book was reprinted after 1949, or using the letter Q if it can be verified that the original edition was published sometime between 1912 and 1949.* The second option is obviously more difficult and time-consuming since bibliographies must be searched in order to determine the imprint date of the original edition. In his paper on cataloging pirated Chinese books, the writer has discussed the various problems in

* Editor's note: Information from the Library of Congress indicates that current practice is to use the current date of the edition with no attempt to determine the original date. Practice has varied in the past.

* * *
the descriptive cataloging of these books. Other problems of catalog-
ing pirated Chinese books involve subject cataloging, including classification. The majority of pirated Chinese books have omitted the imprint dates of the original editions, and it will be a formidable task if the cataloger tries to group together all editions of the same Confucian classic originally published during the same period.

It should be emphasized, however, that grouping together all editions originally published during the same period will be of great value to scholars of textual studies. The Library of Congress evidently prefers to use date of publication rather than date of original edition, as shown by the use of work numbers in the R series for two modern editions of the version of Shih ching edited by Chu Hsi in the twelfth century (LC cards C63-1310 and C64-45).

The last part of Table IV is used frequently and is important for the organization of Chinese materials:

- .Z6 Commentaries.
- .Z7 General treatises.
- .Z8 Treatises on special chapters or sections, by number or name.
- .Z9 Special topics, A-Z

As a general rule, Tables VIII and IX of the PN-PR-PS-PZ schedule for notations of individual authors of English or American literature are applicable to the schedule for Chinese literature, provided there are no special provisions. If there are special provisions for Chinese literature, the special provisions take precedence. Thus, all criticisms of Shih ching will be classified in PL2466, where the classic itself is classified. If the book is a commentary, it will take the notation .Z6, followed by the notation for the commentator; if a general treatise, the notation .Z7, followed by the notation for the critic; if a treatise on any chapter or section, the notation .Z8, followed by the notation for the critic; if a treatise on a particular topic as treated in the classic, the notation .Z9, followed by the notation for the topic, e.g.,

PL2466.Z6C55 a work by Chin K'ai-ch'eng (LC card C64–387)
PL2466.Z7K3 a work by Kao Pao-kung (LC card C66–1230)
PL2466.Z9P5 a work by Chiang Chü-ch'ien on phonology in Shih ching (LC card C66–3152).

Table II is identical with Table I, as presented earlier, except for the use of letter symbols rather than whole numbers for comprehensive and individuals classics:

PL

CHINESE LITERATURE
TABLES FOR THE CONFUCIAN CANON

[Table] II

The 13, 12, or 9 Classics.
B1-9 Wu ching (The 5 Classics).
   Includes I ching, Shu ching, Shih ching, Li chi, and Ch’un ch’iu.

C1-9 Ssū shu (The 4 books of philosophy).
   Includes Lun yü, Ta hsūeh, Chung yung, Mencius.

Individual Classics:

D1-9 I Ching (Book of changes).

.E1-9 Shu ching (Book of history).
   For works discussing the Chinese history in the Shu ching prefer DS 741-747.

.F1-9 Shih ching (Book of poetry).

.R1-9 Hsiao ching (Book of filial piety).
   Cf. BJ 117-118.

It is applied to the range of numbers from PL2478 through PL2491, used for translations of Chinese classics. Included in this range are PL2478 for English and PL2488 for Japanese. Thus, an English translation of Shih ching by Legge is classed in PL2478.F5 (LC card C67-30370), and a Japanese translation of Shu ching is classed in PL2488.E5 (LC card J66-942). The different translations of the same classic will be arranged numerically in a way to place the translators’ names in alphabetical order.

Table III provides as many as twenty-four numbers for subdividing by historical period, as shown in the excerpt:

PL

CHINESE LITERATURE

TABLES OF HISTORICAL PERIODS

[Table] III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ancient period. Early to 1122 B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chou dynasty, 1122-221 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confucian Classics, see PL 2450-2491.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Era of the Warring States, 403-221 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medieval period, 221 B.C.-1368 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T’ang dynasty, 618-907.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Modern period, 1368-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1912-1949.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1949-1949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III is applied to such subjects as the history of Chinese literature (PL2280-2303), of Chinese poetry (PL2310-2333), of Chinese drama (PL2370-2393), and of Chinese fiction (PL2420-2443), and to collections of Chinese poetry (PL2520-2543), of Chinese drama (PL2580-2603), and of Chinese fiction (PL2630-2653). Examples include:

PL2280.T8 a work on Chinese inscriptions by Tung Tso-pin (LC card C66-1208)
a work on poetry of the Chou dynasty by Chu Tsü-ch'ing (LC card C59-1538)
a work on Chinese poetry of the T'ang dynasty by Wang Shih-ching (LC card C59-3025)
a work on Chinese literature of the twentieth century by Yao Wén-yüan (LC card C67–231)
a collection of poems of the twentieth century under Hsi-nan wén i (LC card C67–124)
a collection of twentieth-century drama entitled Chü pên hsüan chi (LC card C60–3379).

It should be noted that in certain sections of the schedule for history or collections of Chinese literature only a part of the notation in Table III is applied for dividing by period. For example, the ranges of numbers for the history of and collections of tz'ū are PL2341–2353 and PL 2551–2563, respectively, because the beginning of tz'ū is traceable to the second half of the ninth century at the very earliest.

Table XXIII is provided in the LC schedule for Chinese literature outside China:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Table] XXIII</th>
<th>History.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Periodicals. Societies. Collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General works. Compends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General special. Minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Collected essays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biography. Collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Origins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>To 1800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>20th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Local, see 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Poetry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Collections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>General.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Poetry. A2, Early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Drama.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Local.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individual authors.¹⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chinese literature outside China is classified in PL3033–3208, according to the following schedule:

**PL**

**Chinese literature.**

**Chinese literature outside China.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3033</th>
<th>General.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3038</td>
<td>Special. . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 8038 | Asia. |

* 58 *
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In the entire LC schedule for Chinese literature, only the section between PL3033 and PL3208 is to be arranged by Table XXIII, e.g.,

PL3041.K3 a history of Chinese literature by Japanese authors, by Kanda Kiichiro (LC card J68-2693)
PL3054.A2K3 a history of Chinese poetry by Japanese authors, under Kaifusō (LC card J58-4183)
PL3074.A2Y5 a collection of Chinese poems by Korean authors, by Yi Kyu-yong (LC card K67-19)

The second and third examples illustrate the use of .A2 for early works in Table XXIII.

The author notations and tables used in the LC schedule for Chinese literature are constructed according to the same principles as those used in Western-language literatures. In their application, most problems can be resolved by consulting LC schedules for the Western-language literatures and LC cards for Chinese literature.

REFERENCES
Highlights of RTSD Activities
During the 1974 Midwinter Meeting

Carol R. Kelm
Executive Secretary
Resources and Technical Services Division

At the 1974 Midwinter Meeting the newly-appointed Catalog Code Revision Committee was shifted from the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) to division committee status. John Byrum (Princeton University libraries) has been named chairman of the committee. During the period of the revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) leading to the publication of the second edition, the authority for catalog code revision will be vested in the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee. The CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee (DCC) will continue to handle all matters relating to descriptive cataloging except those pertaining to the second edition of AACR. After publication of the second edition of AACR, the authority for catalog code revision within ALA will revert to CCS DCC.

The CCS DCC Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files continues to make significant progress in its assignment in the area of cataloging machine-readable data files. The subcommittee is revising papers on title transcription, production and distribution, and size of file to remain compatible with recent changes in AACR chapter six.

The RTSD Nonbook Committee, consisting of Carolyn Whitenack, Alma Tillen, Pearce Grove, and Margaret Ayrault (acting chairman), met at Midwinter and identified several major concerns—the need for: (1) standardizing of terminology (entry, media designators, description), classification, and subject headings; (2) establishing liaison or communications channels with producers, the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, university film centers, National Tape Recording Center, museums and archives, National Microfilm Association, National Audiovisual Center, and other groups; (3) identifying the many areas of concern that need attention and assuming responsibility for dealing with these areas in consultation with other groups; (4) monitoring activities relating to AACR for nonprint media.

Volume 18, Number 1, Winter 1974
The RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee (chairman, Paul Berisford) has agreed to maintain a "watchdog" position with regard to the reported acid-free paper problem. Because of a lack of substantial evidence, the committee will not act to confirm or deny the report that acid-free paper will be in short supply.

The RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) continues to work with the Library of Congress (LC) in identifying the committee's role as an advisory committee to LC on MARC.

A new ad hoc Keyboard Committee has been established by RTSD to study the need for and the feasibility of one or more standard library typewriter keyboards. Particular attention is to be given to recent developments such as international standard bibliographic descriptions and computerized bibliography, and to work being done by the various standards organizations, especially the American National Standards Institute Committee Z39 and Committee Z85.

Because of the need for a careful evaluation of the RTSD structure, the RTSD Board of Directors has authorized the establishment of the RTSD Organization Study Committee. Appointments are being made by RTSD president Dorothy Ladd.

The CCS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) discussed several topics related to policy changes regarding subject headings and currently being considered at the Library of Congress. The committee discussed a proposal to revise all subject headings in which place is the final element instead of the first element. The result would be double entry as opposed to one entry and a cross reference. A majority of those present at the SAC meeting did not think that double entry would be desirable. The second possible change discussed was the construction of all geographical entries as indirect entries (e.g., "Maryland—Baltimore—Churches") as opposed to direct entry (e.g., "Baltimore—Churches"). A majority of those present voted against the principle of indirect entry and indicated their preference for direct entry. The Subject Analysis Committee recognizes its important function as a forum for discussion of problems of subject analysis and as an avenue of communication between the profession and the Library of Congress.

For the RTSD Resources Section (RS) Library Materials Price Index Committee, Fred Lynden (Stanford University libraries) is preparing a price index for German books using the figures from the German publishers' association. The committee is discussing the possibility of developing price indexes for French, Japanese, and Mexican books, and for newspapers.

The RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section Standards Committee continues to work with the American National Standards Institute Committee PH5 on standards for microforms. The committee is also exploring ways in which ALA could work with the National
Microfilm Association on the education of librarians in microform technology.

A number of RTSD units are working on guidelines. The RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee has begun work on additional pamphlets in the Acquisitions Guidelines series being published by ALA. A new draft of the guidelines for out-of-print materials will be considered at the New York Conference. A set of microform guidelines is being discussed. The RS Collection Development Committee is discussing the development of guidelines for the allocation of library materials budgets, for the formulation of collection development policies, for the description and evaluation of library collections, and for the development of review programs with a view to coping with space limitations. The RTSD Book Catalogs Committee hopes to complete its guidelines on book catalogs at the New York Conference in July 1974.

RTSD has four officially recognized division discussion groups. Several more are being proposed. These groups provide forums for technical services personnel in different sizes and types of libraries who wish to discuss mutual problems. There are also four other groups for the discussion of matters relating to serials, acquisitions, and the reproduction of library materials. Persons interested in such forums are urged to check the New York Conference schedule under “RTSD Committee Meetings” for meeting times of the various division and section discussion groups.
ALA Dues Structure Change

CAROL R. KELM
Executive Secretary
Resources and Technical Services Division

THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION has been considering a revision of the ALA dues schedule for about four years. The most recent change in the dues schedule was approved in 1969. Immediately after that change, which increased dues, the number of ALA members decreased, but the dues income rose. Since that time, the number of members has increased gradually, but, for a variety of reasons, the financial condition of the association has worsened.

Since 1970 the ALA Membership Committee and the ALA Committee on Program Evaluation and Support (COPES) have proposed a number of dues schedule revisions. Most of these proposals have recommended that the graduated dues schedule for ALA personal membership be replaced by a standard (ungraduated) personal membership fee. The proposals have varied, recommending that membership in no division, one division, two divisions, or all divisions be included in the basic ALA dues. One proposal recommended that a division journal be available only through subscription rather than as a perquisite of division membership.

At the 1974 Midwinter Meeting, COPES and the ALA Membership Committee proposed a change in the ALA dues structure for personal members, and the proposal was approved by the ALA Executive Board and the ALA Council. Instituting this change in the dues structure requires that the ALA Bylaws be changed as indicated below:

ALA BYLAWS CHANGE

Article I. Membership

Sec. 1.
A. Personal Members
1. Regular Members—includes librarians, trustees, friends of libraries and others interested in the work of the Association.
2. Foreign Librarians—librarians who do not hold U.S. Citizenship and who are not employed in the U.S. or its possessions.
3. Student Members—members who are enrolled at least halftime in a program of library and information science in a four-year undergraduate or a graduate school.
4. Non-Salaried Librarians—those who are inactive, retired or unemployed, or who are employed in library service or related activities at a salary of less than $6,000 per annum.

Sec. 2. Dues, Rights, and Privileges. Only personal members of the association shall have the right to vote and hold office, personal insurance privileges, and...
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membership rates at Conferences. Personal members shall receive American Libraries and discounts on AI-A monographs. All personal members shall be eligible for membership in any division upon payment of additional dues of $15 for each division. The divisions shall have the right to impose additional fees upon their members except no additional division fees may be imposed on Honorary, Continuing or Special Members.

The dues to be paid shall be as follows:

1. Regular Members: Dues, $35 annually.
2. Foreign Librarians: Dues, $20 annually.
3. Student Members: Dues, $10 annually. Eligibility is limited to no more than two calendar years.
4. Non-Salaried Librarians: Dues, $10 annually.
5. Honorary Members: No dues or divisional fees.

6. Life Members: No dues; two divisional memberships; Membership Directory upon request. Holders of existing Life Memberships may acquire additional life divisional memberships for $50 each. Designation of divisional memberships may be changed at the end of each membership year.

7. Continuing Members: No dues; divisional memberships, $15 each.

Sec. 4. Upon approval of the Executive Board special one-year promotional membership rates may be made available from time to time.

Article VI. Divisions

Sec. 6 (a). All dues paid by personal members for membership in divisions shall be put to the credit of the division. Additional allotments may be made on the basis of need as determined by the Executive Board upon recommendation of the Committee on Program Evaluation and Support.

Personal members of ALA will have the opportunity to vote on these ALA Bylaws changes. In May 1974, the ALA Bylaws change ballot will be mailed to ALA personal members with the 1974 election ballot for ALA and its units. If the ALA personal membership accepts the ALA Bylaws changes, the new personal membership dues schedule will take effect with the membership year beginning 1 January 1975.

Please compare the proposed ALA Bylaws changes above with the present ALA Bylaws (ALA Handbook of Organization, 1973–74, pp.59–60). Since this personal membership dues change has organization ramifications, every member is urged to consider the matter carefully.

COPES estimates that, based on a projected personal membership of 23,158, the new dues schedule will increase ALA revenues by $279,664. (Personal members of ALA numbered 21,675 in January 1974.) William Chait, COPES chairman, told ALA Council at the 1974 Midwinter Meeting that the new dues schedule was the dues schedule most likely to alleviate the association’s financial problems although it will not meet the current budget deficits.

As of 31 January 1974, RTSD had 9,638 members of which 2,401 were organizational members. The September 1973–August 1974 RTSD budget is $65,484. This figure includes monies for RTSD staff salaries and benefits, for financial support of the division journal, and for all other program lines in the RTSD budget. The figure does not include overhead charges, e.g., space, light, heat, general supplies, use of ALA headquarters library, RTSD’s share of ALA Membership Record Unit
costs. In the 1973/74 RTSD budget the average direct expenditure per RTSD member is estimated to be about $7.20. If an overhead of 15 percent is added to that figure, the average expenditure per member would be $8.28. If RTSD is to maintain the present program under the new dues structure, the division will need approximately 5,000 members ($15 \times 5,000 = $75,000).

If, as proposed in the ALA Bylaws changes, personal membership in a division is not included in the basic ALA dues fee, it is possible that the division will lose members. COPES estimates that under the new dues structure each division will lose 40 percent of its personal members.

The proposal makes no changes in organizational dues. Presumably the division will be expected to continue to send the journal to Honorary Members and Life Members who select RTSD membership, and to the present RTSD organizational members, from whom the division will receive no direct income unless special arrangements are made. Another unknown is how many persons who are presently members of the division will choose to subscribe to the journal at the present subscription rate ($10) rather than pay the division dues.

Under the new dues structure, student members, trustee members, and those members receiving salaries up to $10,000 per annum can expect to pay higher dues in order to be a member of ALA and one or more division. Members receiving salaries above $10,000 per annum can expect to pay less in ALA dues than they pay currently.

The proposal for the ALA personal dues schedule change is not expected to be a panacea for ALA's financial problems, but is seen as a means of broadening the membership base and of giving divisions more direct control of their financial resources.

---

**Statement of Ownership and Management**
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ZRTS is published quarterly by the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. American Library Association, owner; Wesley Simonton, editor. Second 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 1973 issue.) Total number of copies printed: Average 12,375; Actual 13,000. Paid circulation: not applicable (i.e., no sales through dealers, carriers, street vendors, and counter sales). Mail subscriptions: Average 10,849; Actual 11,872. Free Distribution: Average 841; Actual 877. Total Distribution: Average 11,690; Actual 12,509. Office use, leftover, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: Average 685; Actual 491. Total (sum previous two entries): Average 12,375; Actual 13,000.

---

*Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation  
(Published with the United States Post Office Postmaster in Chicago, September 28, 1973)*
RTSD Program Meetings
at the 1974 ALA Conference
in New York City

Current Issues in Commercial Processing Services for Libraries
Wednesday, July 10, 8:30–10:30 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Commercial Processing Services Committee.
Introduction: David Remington (Library of Congress).
Librarians’ Reactions: G. U. Hodowan (assistant professor, Drexel University), Jane Ross Moore (associate librarian for administrative services, Brooklyn College Library), Thomas Tennyson (methods analyst, Brooklyn Public Library).
Summary: Marguerite Soroka (Engineering Societies Library).
Questions and Answers.

The Place of National and Regional Preservation Programs
Tuesday, July 9, 10:00 a.m.–noon
Sponsored jointly by the RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee and the ALA/Society of American Archivists Joint Committee.
Introduction: Frazer Poole (Library of Congress Preservation Office).
Regional Preservation Program:
Other speakers to be announced.

Technical Services Costs: How to Figure Costs and How to Cut Costs
Tuesday, July 9, 8:30–10:30 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee.
Keynote speaker will discuss the need to identify cost or times for technical services activities.
Specific Problems of Identifying Costs or Times: three speakers representing different types of libraries.
Questions and Answers.

ISBD(M): Background and Description
Tuesday, July 9, 2:00–4:00 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section. The meeting will also serve as the membership meeting for RTSD and CCS.
Introduction of Officers.
Bylaws Changes (presentation and vote).
Presentation of Mann Citation.
Announcement of the “Worst Serial Title Change of the Year” by David C. Taylor (Michigan State University, East Lansing, editor of Title Varies).
Implications of Proposed Changes in Rules for Entry of Serials

Tuesday, July 9, 4:00-6:00 p.m. (a continuation of the CCS program above).

Sponsored by the RTSD Serials Section and the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section.

Speaker: Joseph Howard (chief, Serial Record Division, Library of Congress).

Reactors: Judith Cannan (associate serial librarian, Cornell University libraries), Robert Balay (head, Reference Department, Yale University libraries), Philip Greene (Northeastern regional manager, Universal Periodical Service, Rumson, N.J.).

Paperbacks: Acquisition, Distribution and Use

Monday, July 8, 2:00-6:00 p.m.

Sponsored by the RTSD Resources Section Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee and the RTSD/Association of American Publishers Joint Committee.

Introduction: Murray Martin (Pennsylvania State University).
National Paperbacks Survey: Diana L. Spirt (C. W. Post College).
Use of Paperbacks in Schools, Public Libraries, Colleges, and Universities: Nancy Larrick (author, Parents' Guide to Children's Reading), Mary Ann Swanson (Evanston Township High School), William Bunnell (County College of Morris County), Phyllis F. Calese (New York Public Library).

Questions and Answers.

Break.
Panel: The Publisher and the Distributor, moderator, Harold Laskey (Combined Book Exhibit), James Thompson (Baker & Taylor), Aaron Rabinovitz (A & A Distributors), Abbot Friedland (Princeton University Press), Carl Tobey (Dell Publishing), Richard Robinson (Scholastic Book Services), G. Royce Smith (American Booksellers' Association).

Questions and Answers.

Allocation of Funds in Support of Collection Development

Monday, July 8, 10:00 a.m.-noon

Sponsored by the RTSD Resources Section Collection Development Committee.

Speaker: William E. McGrath (University of Southwestern Louisiana).

Reactors: John Burgan (Enoch Pratt Free Library), Jean Boyer (Temple University).

RTSD-sponsored tours:
The Resources Section will sponsor tours of the book trade on Wednesday, July 10. Carol Nemeyer (Association of American Publishers) is in charge of arrangements.
The RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee will sponsor tours of the book restoration workshops of Carolyn Horton & Associates and the Pierpont Morgan Library. Registration for these tours is required and may be made at the Local Tours Desk. The Bindery of the Conservation Division, New York Public Library, Room 60, Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street, has prepared an exhibition of binding tools and methods. Visitors are welcome Monday-Friday, 9:00 a.m.-12:00 noon, 1:00-4:00 p.m., and may tour the bindery operations. See Ralph Savio in Bindery.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Board of Directors</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Council of Regional Groups Workshop</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD LRTS Editorial Board</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Book Catalogs Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Bylaws Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Commercial Processing Services Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Committee on Computer Filing</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Committee on Interlibrary Networks</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Conference Program Committee (San Francisco)</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD New Officer Orientation</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Organization Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Planning Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee</td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 6, Sat</td>
<td>7:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Heads of Preorder and Precatalog Searching in Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Large Public Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Smaller Research Libraries</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>9-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Processing Centers Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS Executive Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee</td>
<td>*July 8, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files</td>
<td>July 6, Sat</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Policy &amp; Research Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>8-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Subject Analysis Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcommitte on Subject Headings for Correctional Materials</td>
<td>July 11, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPRODUCTION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Executive Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Directory of Library Reprographic Services Fund Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Policy &amp; Research Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Standards Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESOURCES SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS Executive Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 10, Wed</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Collection Development Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another meeting to be scheduled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Library Materials Price Index Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Policy &amp; Research Committee</td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Reprinting Committee</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acquisitions Discussion Group</td>
<td>July 7, Sun</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERIALS SECTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS Executive Committee</td>
<td>July 8, Mon</td>
<td>4-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 9, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* closed meeting
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FORTIETH IFLA GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD NOVEMBER 1974 IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

For the first time, the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) will hold a conference in the United States. The fortieth IFLA General Council meeting will take place 16-23 November 1974 in Washington, D.C., at the Washington Hilton Hotel. Speakers at the plenary sessions will include Frederick H. Burkhardt (chairman, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science) and Harry T. Hookway (executive director, British Library, London).

"National and International Planning" is the theme of the meeting. The theme is related to the Unesco International Conference on Planning of National Overall Documentation, Library, and Archives Infrastructures to be scheduled for Paris in late September 1974.

Overall conference chairman is vice-president of IFLA Robert Vosper (professor of library service at the University of California at Los Angeles). John G. Lorenz (Library of Congress) is the chairman of the Local Planning Committee, and Foster Mohrhardt (Council on Library Resources) is its vice-chairman. They anticipate an attendance of approximately 1,000 delegates and observers with representatives from over seventy-five countries.

The following are serving on the Local Planning Committee: Leo Weins (H. W. Wilson Co.), finance chairman; Chris Hoy (American Library Association), accommodations, exhibits, and conference manager; Robert Vosper, program chairman; Elsa Freeman (librarian, Dept. of Housing & Urban Development), registration and printed program chairman; F. Kurt Cylke (Library of Congress), tours and transportation; Lois C. Cole, hospitality chairman; Judith Werdel (National Academy of Sciences), visas and government relations; Frank Schick (Office of Education), translations; Lawrence S. Papier (Office of Education), documentation; Mary Ellis Kahler (Library of Congress), preconference seminar; and Catherine D. Scott (Smithsonian Institution), publicity chairman.
Association representatives on the Local Planning Committee are: Stephen McCarthy (Association of Research Libraries), Robert Wedgeworth (American Library Association), John S. LoSasso (Medical Library Association), Robert Klassen (Special Libraries Association), and Marvin Hogan (American Association of Law Libraries).

_Tours—_Preconference tours beginning from Boston, New York City, and San Francisco are being organized. The tours will be library-oriented with special emphasis on library automation and public and university library systems, and will enable overseas delegates to visit a variety of libraries enroute to Washington. The tours will be scheduled from 11-16 November 1974. Details on preconference travel arrangements and costs will be included in the registration information.

During the conference in Washington, delegates and observers will have the opportunity to visit the Library of Congress; National Library of Medicine; National Agricultural Library; public libraries in Washington, D.C., and nearby Montgomery County; the National Gallery of Art; and the museums of the Smithsonian Institution. Free day tours of public buildings in Washington, D.C., and places of interest in the surrounding states including the homes of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, Arlington National Cemetery, Gettysburg Battlefield, Virginia Shenandoah National Park, and the Pennsylvania Dutch country are also planned. A postconference tour of colonial Virginia and Williamsburg will be offered.

F. Kurt Cylke, chairman of tours and transportation, announced that his committee will provide local transportation to all scheduled events.

_Registration—_Official registration forms with detailed conference information are scheduled for distribution in March 1974. Library associations in each country will select and accredit their delegates and observers. The deadline for registration and receipt of conference papers will be 1 July 1974.


The thesis of this volume is clearly expressed in its Introduction:

Knowledge and scholarship are, after all, universal. And a subject-scheme should, ideally, manage to encompass all the facets of what has been printed and subsequently collected in libraries to the satisfaction of the worldwide reading community. Should, that is. But in the realm of headings that deal with people and cultures—in short, with humanity—the LC list can only “satisfy” parochial, jingoistic Europeans and North Americans, white-hued, at least nominally Christian (and preferably Protestant) in faith, comfortably situated in middle- and higher-income brackets, largely domiciled in suburbia, fundamentally loyal to the Established Order, and heavily imbued with the transcendent, incomparable glory of Western civilization. Further, it reflects a host of untenable—indeed obsolete and arrogant—assumptions with respect to young people and women. And exudes something less than sympathy or even fairness toward organized labor and the sexually unorthodox or “avant garde.” (p.ix-x)

Berman documents his thesis by citing 122 items (an item is a subject heading, or a group of one or more subject headings relating to the same issue) divided among the following chapters: Section I. Races, Nationalities, Faiths, and Ethnic Groups (40 items); Section II. Chauvinism, the “Bwana Syndrome,” and the Third World (18 items); Section III. Politics, Peace, Labor, Law Enforcement, Etc. (23 items); Section IV. Man/Woman/Sex (20 items); Section V. Children, Youth, “Idiots,” and the “Underground” (7 items); and Section VI. Do-It-Yourself (14 items). For each item in each section except the last the offending LC subject heading(s), frequently accompanied by the equivalent from Sears, is cited; the nature of the problem is described, usually with copious notes including bibliographical citations, all of which are interesting but of varying relevance; and then a remedy is suggested. Much of the material will be familiar to regular readers of library literature since the book is an expansion of ideas expressed in the author’s articles of the past few years.

This reviewer does not question the orientation of *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress (LCSH)* toward Western culture and leaves to the reader the decision whether the word “prejudice” should be substituted for “orientation.” Haykin’s *Subject Headings: A Practical Guide* is cited as setting forth the guiding principles for the establishment of headings in *LCSH* (p.xii), but Berman fails to mention Haykin’s introductory statement with reference to choice and change of subject headings, and the problems and principles thereof:

As further experience and objective study show principles and rules of practice to be faulty or inadequate, they will be displaced or modified. Meanwhile, the statements which are embodied in the following chapters represent the most valid current practice as evolved in the Library of Congress and the libraries which voluntarily follow it. The subject headings now in use in the dictionary catalogs of the Library of Congress represent fifty years’ growth. Many of them were valid and well chosen at the time of their adoption. They have remained unchanged because the need for change did not appear urgent or because the cost, in the light of more urgent needs, made change inexpedient. (Haykin, p.5–6)

Although Berman states that “this ‘tract’ has emphatically not been con-
ceived as a deliberate ad hominem attack on the LC editors and staff" (p.xiv), subsequent text often belies this assertion.

The subject headings under discussion are by definition those used in the dictionary catalogs of the Library of Congress. That they have been found useful in libraries throughout the world is to the credit of LC's Subject Cataloging Division. A subject heading list suitable for any library in any part of the world, while certainly desirable, is, this reviewer suggests, probably even more difficult to create because of, among other factors, the constraints of natural language, than is the long sought universal classification system. Certainly LCSH needs improvement, not only for choice of terms but also for consistency and clarification—for American users as well as for those in other countries. This reviewer questions, however, that Berman's remedies, accepted in toto, offer the way to such improvement.

Essentially the items Berman discusses fall into one of four broad categories: (1) subject headings to which the addition of a gloss is urged; (2) subject headings which include the word "as"; (3) subject headings for which the problem is cross references rather than the subject headings themselves; and (4) subject headings which present problems not included in categories one through three.

The category of subject heading for which Berman urges the addition of a gloss or adjectival inversion in the interest of clarification is one in which this reviewer would urge adoption of his remedies. Most items in this category are related to religion and theology. As an example, he recommends adding the gloss "(Christian)" to Angels so that it becomes comparable to the already established Angels (Judaism) and Angels (Mohammedanism), the latter now Angels (Islam). "The unglossed form may be retained to cover material, if any, on Comparative Angelics" (p. 56). A non-theologically-related item in this pattern pertains to six subject headings (Reconstruction; Northwest, Old; etc.) expressing facets of American history. Here again, the suggested remedy of a clarifying gloss, e.g., "Reconstruction (U.S. History)"; "Northwest, Old (U.S.)" seems eminently desirable.

The second category is the use of "as" in phrase headings, a type of phrase heading which Haykin notes is used to serve the purpose of expressing a relationship between concepts or things (Haykin, p.22–3). Berman contends that "the 'as' necessarily implies that the occupation or activity that follows is somehow odd, uncommon, or unfitting . . ." (p.54). Examples of headings of this type that he cites as indicating prejudice include: Negroes as businessmen [consumers, farmers, etc.]; Catholics as scientists; Jews as scientists; Women as accountants [architects, artists, astronauts, soldiers, etc.]; Children as artists; Children as authors; Youth as consumers. His suggested remedies involve the removal of "as"; some of the resulting headings conflict with already established headings or suggest different concepts. This reviewer finds it difficult to follow the logic of Berman's argument about the use of "as," especially when it is considered in relation to subject headings which do not concern people, for example: Eggs as food, Medicine as a profession, Music as recreation, Wood as fuel.

The third category concerns cross references rather than primary subject headings and gathered in the fourth and largest category are those items not covered by the preceding
three. For both categories this reviewer agrees with Berman that some cross references and subject headings need to be changed, and disagrees with him about others. Probably each reader of this book will have similar reactions, but these will vary depending upon which cross references and subject headings cause what reaction. There seems little point in pursuing this further in this review.

There are instances, however, when Berman criticizes subject headings apparently without understanding LC practice, for example, Literature, Immoral. Berman questions, as well he might, “by what authority, pray tell, does LC, or anyone else, determine that an erotic novel or volume of poetry is—purely because of its sex-content—immoral?” (p.191). Berman to the contrary (and as a quick glance at Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects affirms), LC does not use this subject heading for novels or poetry but assigns it to works about pornography and obscenity including collections. Recent examples of titles to which Literature, Immoral has been assigned include The Smut Peddlers, A Report on Denmark’s Legalized Pornography, and Perspectives on Pornography, none of which are novels or poetry.

Another example is found in his discussion of Fascism and its geographical subdivisions. LCSH includes four: Argentine Republic, Brazil, Germany, and Italy. Berman does not question these:

Fair enough. But not complete enough, for Fascist movements have thrived—and continue to flourish—elsewhere, not merely in Axis countries and cacique-prone Latin America. The virus has also infected Great Britain, Finland, America, Spain, France, Portugal, and South Africa. Remedy: Add sub-heads for the above-named states, together with any others indicated by the literature. (p.159)

Fascism may be divided by country or state, and a check of Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects shows that it has been used with many countries, including all but two of those Berman mentions. The four countries included in LCSH are there only because of cross references connected specifically with these countries—in accordance with standard LC practice.

LCSH, with certain stated exceptions, contains subject headings used by the Library of Congress. The list does not represent an overall view of knowledge as such, but subject headings assigned to works represented in LC catalogs. Berman proposes several new subject headings, often to provide a balance to already existing subject headings. The question this reviewer poses in this connection is, “Has LC cataloged works for which the proposed subject headings are appropriate?” Berman does not suggest titles for which such subject headings might be used.

It would have been extremely helpful if Berman had cited actual works and what subject headings LC has assigned to them in relation to what subject headings he thinks should have been chosen, not only in reference to the new headings mentioned in the previous paragraph but also to others. Three such titles and their subject headings are noted in the book (p.35, 159) in relation to the discussion of two different items. This reviewer strongly urges that this be standard practice for each subject heading or at least for each item, should there be another edition of this book.

Another suggestion of a minor nature for another edition is that the use of op. cit. be replaced by the brief author-title form of citation. The bibliographical references are numerous and tracing an op. cit. back to the initial citation is frequently tedious.
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Certainly many of Berman's criticisms and suggested remedies are worthy of serious consideration. That LCSH has changed, however, although hardly speedily, in the areas of Berman's concern is evident to anyone who compares the present edition to earlier ones and to LCSH's predecessors. Happily, for example, "Woman, Diseases See also Hysteria" (American Library Association, List of Subject Headings for Use in Dictionary Catalogs, 2d ed., 1904) has long since been dropped. Finally, to respond to Berman's introductory injunction to "tell it like it is" (p.x), in balance and reflecting both the good and the bad, the present list seems to accomplish this more accurately than a list incorporating his proposed remedies.—J. R. Moore, Library Department, Brooklyn College, City University of New York, Brooklyn.


This report is recommended to the National Librarian of Canada, Dr. Guy Sylvestre, by a committee of distinguished Canadian librarians, formed as a result of the Conference on Cataloguing Standards held at the National Library of Canada in May 1970. It is intended to "provide general direction to the National Library and indicate in which areas the Research and Planning Branch should develop the detailed specifications" for a Canadian MARC format. In preparing the report, the committee intensively considered:

- uses of a Canadian MARC bibliographic record and
- its bi-lingual content,
- other existing MARC formats, such as the UK MARC (BNB), the French Monocle and the Italian version,
- the LC MARC serial format,
- the utility of MARC for information retrieval systems, and
- a MARC format for Canada.

Fundamentally, most of the report is distributed in three large sections. The first two are detailed descriptions of recommended monograph and serials formats in a manner closely paralleled by the familiar Books: A MARC Format and Serials: A MARC Format. The third section consists of two tabular comparisons covering 144 pages. The first of these compares the suggested Canadian MARC for books with LC, UK MARC, Monocle, and Italian MARC. Each tag, indicator, and sub-field is listed in roughly the same order as the one established by LC but with Canadian additions inserted. The table illustrates which of these elements is used in each of the formats compared. The second tabular comparison is that of the serials formats of Canada, LC, and MASS (MARC-based Automated Serials System being developed by The Birmingham Libraries and the University of Technology Library, Loughborough, Leicestershire, U.K.). Following the tables is a comparative summary of the two Canadian formats.

The Canadian effort attempts, among other things, to: (a) reconcile the conflicts implicit in a bi-lingual library system; (b) synthesize and produce an improved format based on existing experiments; and (c) extend what is primarily a bibliographic descriptive format to an information retrieval device.

It is difficult to resist the con-
clusion that Canada's nationalism has not played a role in the provisions made for bi-lingualism. While admitting the necessary dependenceCanadian libraries have on LC and the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the authors still wish to incorporate into MARC a more complex structure of elements to satisfy the needs of bi-lingualism. Marcel Fontane, one of the authors, elevates this linguistic concern to a universal principle, viz.: “The language of the document determines the language of the bibliographic description.” The result of this is the addition of a whole series of “900” tags to enable the establishment of equivalence tables between English and French words.

Most of the other “improvements” on MARC consist of making the record substantially more complex. Added to LC MARC are indicators from BNB and Monocle, some of the filing value relationships from Monocle, a considerable expansion of intellectual level codes, form of reproduction codes, and form of content codes, as well as a number of other tags which MARC lacks. All this adds a certain elegance to the bibliographic format, but many LC MARC users now wonder at its cost. The Canadian additions make the record even more extensive. A simulation study might be in order to test the utility of these added elements, as well as some that now exist in MARC, rather than a meshing of elements combined from different environments like Italy, Britain, France, and the United States.

Finally, the Canadian format explicitly adopts PRECIS, the BNB's Preserved Context Index System, which is the BNB's more sophisticated version of a permuted multiple term subject index. The primary intent of this recommendation seems to be to provide more up-to-date subject headings for Canadiana, as well as an improved information retrieval capacity. The Canadian MARC report is a valuable addition to the literature and an interesting tour de force for those patient enough to examine the detailed tables of which it is largely composed. One wonders, however, if the recommendations ought not to be subjected to an empirical verification of their utility before final adoption of the report.—Richard J. Talbot,
University of Massachusetts Library, Amherst, Massachusetts.
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Sponsor: New York State Library, Albany.

From experimental work performed, and reported upon in this document, it is concluded that converting the New York State Library (NYSL) shelflist sample to machine-readable form and searching this shelflist using a remote access catalog are technically sound concepts though the capital costs of data conversion and system installation will be substantial. The two primary areas of investigation covered in this report are: (1) pilot conversion to machine-readable form of a portion of the NYSL shelflist; the purpose of this conversion process itself being the creation of a file of machine-readable records which can be searched by a computer under the control of a telecommunication computer terminal. The purpose of the pilot conversion test is to determine costs of conversion, and any unusual technical problems; and (2) experimentation with, and use of, the initial product of the pilot conversion in catalog searching. The purpose of the search test is to determine technical feasibility of the search process where a user must formulate a query as a logical combination of alphabetic search words, a process far different than the mental eye-brain scanning of entries on catalog cards.

Cataloguing Standards; The Report of the Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards. 1972. 100p. HC $3.00 (Information Canada, Vanguarde Bldg., 171 Slater Street, Ottawa, Ont.).

Institution: National Library of Canada, Ottawa (Ont.).

Following the recommendations of the National Conference on Cataloguing Standards held at the National Library of Canada in May 1970, a Canadian Task Group on Cataloguing Standards was set up to study and identify present deficiencies in the organizing and processing of Canadian material, and the cataloging problems of Canadian libraries, and to make recommendations for improvement. The areas addressed are: standardization of entry and bibliographic description; classification of
Canadian history, literature, and law; Canadian lists of subject headings; processing of government documents; processing of serials; and a suggested program of implementation of the recommendations made. The recommendations of this task group provide a blueprint for long-term action which calls for a basic overhaul and strengthening of the established structure of Canadian bibliographic services.


The American Library Association's policy on federal legislation is based on its objectives of promoting and improving library service and librarianship. Representing those who use libraries as well as those who operate them, the Association is a source of information on libraries and information services for those concerned with formulating and implementing federal legislation. Legislative action is considered especially pertinent in the following areas: (1) direct support of library services, which includes national library networks, telecommunications, federal aid to education and libraries, school library media centers, career education, public libraries, service to the handicapped and institutionalized, and federal libraries; (2) indirect support of library services including research in information science, postal rates, copyright, and taxation; (3) intellectual freedom; (4) international programs such as Unesco, the Organization of American States, U.S. libraries abroad, international copyright, and international postal policy. Included is a listing of laws affecting librarians, libraries, and their users.


Institution: University of Illinois, Urbana. Graduate School of Library Science.


This dissertation attempts to determine whether the human intellectual process of cataloging bibliographic materials, using the Anglo-American (AA-1967) and American Library Association (ALA-1949) cataloging codes, can be simulated by automatic techniques. The specific cataloging process is that which concerns selection of entry. Automatic techniques used to simulate the entry process are directed tree graphs. It is the basic assumption of the study that the AA rules of entry are more amenable to simulation than the ALA rules of entry. Measurement of amenability was determined in terms of four criterion variables. With the exception of one variable, measurement did not support this assumption. The directed tree graphs for the two sets of entry rules were tested for their accuracy to assign correct main entries, and their ability to accomplish this assignment automatically. Both tests showed the graphs for the two sets of rules to be highly and equally, or almost equally, accurate and automatic. Findings of the study apply to human application of the graphs. The economic or technical feasibility of the graphs is not considered.

*Kadmon, Gedalia. Automated Acquisition of Periodicals.* 1973. 46p. ED 077 525. MF $0.65. HC $2.00 (Israel Society of Special Libraries and Information Centers, POB 20125, Tel Aviv, Israel).

Institution: Israel Society of Special Libraries and Information Centers.

This project describes the software system which creates the data base for the periodical purchasing department of a library and processes it by mechanizing the yearly cycle of activities. The following subjects are discussed: description of activities comprised in the yearly cycle; design of the data base; review of the mechanized processes; organizational and working routines; the forms of input/output; error checks at different stages; and the system analysis and planning for the future. The project.
lays stress on improving the familiarity of the librarian with the entirety of the data and activities involved. Its other purpose is to supply the contact between the librarian and the computer for the convenience of the librarian, who is not expected to be a computer expert.

Kniemeyer, Justin M., and others. _Order Division Automated System_. 1972. 77p. ED 077 516. MF $0.65. HC $3.29.


This publication was prepared by the Order Division Automation Project staff to fulfill the Library of Congress' requirement to document all automation efforts. The report was originally intended for internal use only and not for distribution outside the library. It is now felt that the library community at-large may have an interest in the contents of this report and may find it of value if they are contemplating the automation of their own book ordering procedures. The library is not prepared, however, to make available any other written documentation, computer program, program listing, program documentation, object or source decks or tapes that may have been generated in the course of developing this automated system, even if referred to in this document. Work on the Order Division Automated System has been divided into several tasks. Task 1 was concerned with the input and output of printed bibliographic products, such as purchase slips, order file slips, etc. Task 2 consisted of the development of a file management and control subsystem, which absorbed Task 1. This report describes the automated system as it exists upon completion of Task 2.


Institution: Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, Graduate School.

Cornell University Libraries maintains one central technical processing department which processes all materials for endowed division libraries. It is divided into four functional departments: acquisitions, serials, cataloging, and catalog maintenance. This report is concerned with the latter two functions. The present manual system of cataloging books was analyzed to determine the cost per title. The feasibility and cost effectiveness of installing the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) on-line computer system for cataloging was then analyzed. The authors recommend implementation of the OCLC system by leasing three terminals with a projected cost savings of $5,000 per year.


Institution: National Archives and Records Service (GSA), Washington, D.C.

In an effort to provide the National Archives and Records Service and other archives and research libraries with guidelines to assist them in the selection of microfilm readers suitable for use with microfilm copies of archival or manuscript materials, provide manufacturers with data to improve their product, and provide the Library Technology Program (ALA) and the National Reprographic Center for documentation with information that would serve as a check on their own technical evaluations, eight commercially available models of 35mm roll microfilm readers were tested. As much as possible the most favorable lighting and furniture arrangements were provided for each machine. Readers were cleaned daily and checked regularly to assure proper functioning. Participants were selected at random from the user population and asked to fill out a questionnaire after using each reader. Findings concerning loading, focusing, screen illumination, and other characteristics of machine
use are presented, along with data on comparative performance, specifications of each reader tested, and a sample questionnaire.

Manuscripts: A MARC Format; Specifications for Magnetic Tapes Containing Catalog Records for Single Manuscripts or Manuscript Collections. 1973. 51p. ED 073 791. MF $0.65, HC $0.80 (Supt. of Docs., Govt. Print. Off., Washington, D.C., Stock Number 3000-00063).


One of a series of communications formats for machine-readable cataloging records issued by the Library of Congress is described. It is an implementation of the American National Standard for Bibliographical Information Interchange on Magnetic Tape, Z39.2-1971, which was adopted by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The ANSI format structure was designed to accommodate records for all kinds of materials used by different groups of users, and this format structure has been used for the MARC formats for books, serials, maps, films, and music developed at the Library of Congress. The MARC manuscript format provides specifications and content designators (tags, indicators, and subfield codes to identify data in a machine record) for manuscript collections and single manuscripts. Since the Library of Congress does not have any immediate plans to distribute records of this kind on magnetic tape, the publication of this format is intended for the use of other institutions involved in creating machine-readable records for manuscripts. Map and music manuscripts can be handled by this format in conjunction with the additional data elements or content designators in the MARC formats. The type of record code in the leader would specify the type of materials.


The primary objective of this program is the design and implementation of a national serials information system. The goals of this system are the provision of timely, accurate, and comprehensive information about serial publications within a framework of quantitative efficiency and agreed-upon cost effectiveness. The intent of the program is the creation of a mechanized data base which would encompass all the world's serial literature without regard to subject or disciplinary classification. The data base would contain information relating to the description and location of all serials in order to increase the bibliographical and physical accessibility to serials. The three national libraries accepted the responsibility for implementing the first phase of the Serials Data Program. The Library of Congress was the executive agent for this project, and its Information Systems Office had the responsibility for project direction. The Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials acted in an advisory capacity. This document reports upon Phase I of the project including results of a user survey and alternatives to the proposed system. A related document is ED 063 009.


Institution: University of Illinois, Urbana. Graduate School of Library Science.

In increasing numbers microform publishers are engaged in reproducing valuable and extensive collections of books, documents, and manuscripts that would otherwise be impossible for most libraries to acquire due to their scarcity and cost. The micro-

Volume 18, Number 1, Winter 1974
form collections or series described in this guide reflect the holdings of Milner Library, Illinois State University. However, because these collections are found in many other libraries, this guide can serve a larger audience than those using Milner Library. The series are grouped under the following headings: general, business, education, history, library science, literature, music, psychology, religion, social sciences, technology, and theatre. Not included in this guide are separate, individual monographs, newspapers, or periodicals in microform. At the conclusion of the sections describing the microform series or collections is a bibliography with imprint information which includes an alphabetical listing of the series mentioned in the body of the text. The second list provides, in alphabetical order, an index to all series and collections covered.


Institution: Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Miss. Research Center Library.

Sponsor: Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. Office of the Chief of Engineers.

A review is presented of mechanized equipment, exclusive of the computer, being used for acquisition, processing, use, and maintenance of library material. Brochures were collected from manufacturers; library and office management literature was searched; and a questionnaire was sent to 1,000 selected libraries in the United States asking for information about machinery and techniques in use. There is not a large amount of equipment, other than the typewriter, being used in small- and medium-sized libraries in the U.S. Funds are not readily available for purchase of equipment. Most current studies are on application of the computer to library processes. Much remains to be done before many of the smaller libraries will be able to take advantage of equipment now available.

Perkins, John W., and others. Library of Congress Classification Adapted for Children's Books. 2d ed. 1972. 108p. ED 076 216. MF $0.65, HC $3.50 (Finance Department, City of Inglewood, Number One Manchester, Inglewood, CA 90301).

Institution: Inglewood Public Library, California.

This publication presents a book classification system which is adapted from the Library of Congress classification and is designed especially for children’s books. The classification system was developed to prepare children to use adult materials (employing Library of Congress classification) by means of a gradual transition, provide a system easier for children to understand than the Dewey Decimal classification, and reflect more closely the subject matter of children’s books. The classification system could be easily expanded as required, and its use would cause a mandatory re-evaluation of children’s subject materials. The system retains a close relationship to the original Library of Congress classification system and employs one or two letter subclasses with numbers as required. The classification system is supplemented by a comprehensive list of index headings arranged alphabetically. Index headings are also arranged by classification so as to illustrate subject groupings of each subclass. There is also a section on suggestions and recommendations for spine labels and special collections.

Perkins, John W., and others. Library of Congress Classification Adapted for Children’s Sound Recordings. 1973. 23p. ED 076 217. MF $0.65, HC $2.25 (Finance Department, City of Inglewood, Number One Manchester, Inglewood, CA 90301).

Library Resources & Technical Services
This publication describes how the Library of Congress classification adapted for children's books by the Inglewood Public Library can also be used in the classification of children's sound recordings. One of the major features of the classification system is its applicability to various media, as it provides a method by which the same work can be uniformly classified regardless of the medium in which it appears. The publication also contains material on the revision and expansion of the M (Music) class shown in the Inglewood Public Library's Library of Congress Classification Adapted for Children's Books (2d ed.). The following music subclasses were developed to reflect more closely the subject matter of children's sound recordings: M (Instrumental and vocal music), MC (Songs), ME (Folk music), MG (Popular music), MJ (Films and theater music), ML (Literature of music), and MT (Musical instruction and study). A listing of music index headings and classification (revised from the book classification system) is included, as is a selected list of phonograph records illustrating a wide range of subjects within the classification system.

Perkins, John W., and others. Library Technical Processes Procedures. 2d ed. 1972. 127p. ED 073 788. MF $0.65, HC $4.50 (Finance Department, City of Inglewood, Number One Manchester, Inglewood, CA 90301).

Institution: Inglewood Public Library, California.


The paper reports on a series of programs that have been developed at the Moore School to process data bases, consisting of textual items, and to index and arrange the data items in accordance with an automatically generated classification system. The programs produce the directories and the rearranged data base on microfilm, where it may be searched using a microfilm reader, or magnetic tape for input to an on-line computer system for search and retrieval.

Ranganathan, Shiyali Ramamritam. Impact of Growth in the Universe of Subjects on Classification. 1972. 26p. ED 077 528. MF $0.65.


The development of the removal of rigidity in library classification is traced from the Enumerative Classification of DC (1876) through the Nearly-Faceted Classification of UDC (1896), the rigidly, though fully faceted version of CC (1933), the generalized faceted structure of version 2 of CC (1949) down to the Freely Faceted Classification of version 3 of CC (1970). The separation of the three planes of work


This document contains the results of a survey of ninety-four United States organizations, and thirty-six organizations in other countries that were thought to prepare machine-readable data bases. Of those surveyed, fifty-five organizations (forty in U.S., fifteen in other countries) provided completed camera-ready forms describing eighty-one commercially available, machine-readable data bases that contain bibliographic information about published literature. The following types of data were requested for each data base: name, frequency of issue, and time span covered by the data base; name of organizations and individuals who can provide information on the data base; subject matter and scope of data on the tape; source of information in the data base (journal articles, reports, patents, monographs, etc.); method(s) used for indexing or other types of subject analysis; special data elements; tape specifications (density, tracks, labels, etc.); availability of programs for retrospective searching and selective dissemination of information (SDI); type and cost of search services offered; and availability and charges for data bases. The information provided represents the status of these data bases as of November 1972. Libraries and other information centers will find this document helpful in selecting data bases for providing SDI, retrospective search services, and other bibliographic reference services to their users.


Institution: California State University and Colleges, Los Angeles. Office of the Chancellor.

As a prerequisite for library automation an analysis and cost study of technical processing functions was undertaken in all nineteen libraries of the California State University and Colleges system. The purpose of the study was to provide accurate cost figures for operations as well as a means of comparing costs based on a standardized methodology. The study was to facilitate comparisons among similar functions in several libraries as well as between current manual operations and projected operations in a computerized mode. Four summary sheets are provided for the nineteen libraries: a general summary, a unit cost summary, a production unit summary, and a bibliographic search summary. In addition, an activity detail analysis is provided for the participating libraries. This report represents raw unevaluated data and does not reflect total costs of the technical processing operations in the participating libraries.

of classification—idea, notational, and verbal—and its conscious application is indicated. Mention is made of the advantage of recognizing modes of formation of new subjects and isolates. The concept of compound isolate created by the Law of Parsimony is described. The atomization of subjects in the Universe of Subjects make it obligatory for library classification to be based on a sound dynamic theory of classification in each of the three planes. For documentation search, the replacement of the general purpose computer by a special purpose electronic doc-finder is commended. To make the investment in electronic machinery pay back more than itself and to secure noise-free, leakage-free result of search, a continuous improvement in the theory and in the design of a scheme for classification is an absolute necessity.

Institution: ERIC Clearinghouse on Library and Information Sciences, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Media and Technology, Stanford University, California.


Thirteen important micrographic events have been identified which can be divided into two groups. Nine are of a technological nature and involve micrographic products; the remaining four are basically educational in nature and reflect positive responses from the library community to a changing micrographic technology. The thirteen events discussed within the framework of this report are briefly presented. The author describes the many types of microforms, explains the differences between each type, and discusses the uses, benefits, and drawbacks of the various microforms. Included are a discussion of related technological events of the past decade and a list of microform equipment. Many technical terms are defined such as those describing the reproduction process of the various microform types. Also included is an annotated bibliography of the literature of micrographics.

Stuart-Stubbs, B. *Purchasing and Copying Practices at Canadian University Libraries; Two Studies Performed for the Canadian Association of College and University Libraries Committee on Copyright Legislation.* 1971. 45p. HC $2.00 (Canadian Library Association, 151 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont., Canada).

Institution: Canadian Library Association, Ottawa, Ont.

Extensive studies of expenditures on library materials and the use of photocopy machines in Canadian university libraries were conducted in 1971. The purposes of the study were: (1) to reveal the pattern of library spending as an indication of how collections are being developed, and (2) to determine the effects of direct purchasing from the country of origin which might be available through Canadian agents. This report contains statistical compilations collected about library dealings with new book vendors, periodical publishers and agents, antiquarian dealers, and vendors of materials other than books or periodicals. The duplicating survey sought to discover the dimensions of copying (how many photocopy machines and how many copies made) and the content (what is copied, and for whom). The report results are important since the Canadian government is considering revisions to copyright legislation.


Institution: Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.

The steady growth of the academic libraries reflects a true increase in the body of human knowledge. The average academic library either now has, or will have within the next few years, a severe space problem related to housing of books. The seemingly limitless growth of space needs creates problems compounded by rising costs of buildings and equipment. Effective future planning of academic libraries would be greatly facilitated if there were some theoretical bases which could be used to predict the probable distribution of the future use of library materials in subject matters that have curricular significance on a given campus. This paper proposes to design a method by which small and medium-sized academic libraries can determine the relationship between usage and age of monographic material, and the application of this relationship to consideration of the possible establishment of a less expensive...
secondary access storage facility. Since studies of this magnitude are expensive, a pilot study at the Florida Atlantic University campus is proposed to test for design weaknesses and validity. The results should be useful to other academic libraries in terms of research design and other appropriate applications.


With the aid of a grant from the Council on Library Resources, the New York Public Library's Research Libraries conducted an experiment to determine the acceptability of microfilm as a substitute for the public card catalog, the new book catalog, and the authority file for the new book catalog. Because many of the cards in the heavily-used public catalog are badly deteriorated and in need of replacement, various alternatives, including microfilming and book publication, have been studied. Public use of the Research Libraries' new book catalog on microfilm is reported.

Wetmore, Rosamond B. A Guide to the Organization of Library Collections. rev. ed. 1972. 171p. ED 071 712. MF $0.65, HC $3.00 (Ball State Book Store, Muncie, IN 47306).

Institution: Ball State University, Muncie, Ind.

In response to current developments in library collections, this 1972 revision gives greater coverage of multi-media materials than the 1969 manual.


Institution: Southampton University (England) Library.

Too little is known generally about the cost of the various operations carried out in libraries. At present, new techniques are being devised using computers to store, sort, file and reproduce data formerly dealt with by traditional manual methods. Computer time, however, is expensive, and the computer programs to handle bibliographic data are difficult and costly to write and test. There is a danger that the new techniques may simply be too expensive. This study reports on three cataloging systems employed at the University of Southampton Library—manual, mechanized (using a tape typewriter), and automated (using MARC data)—and the costs incurred by each.
At Baker & Taylor all titles on MARC tape as supplied unedited by the Library of Congress are now available cataloged and processed—and there is no extra charge if LC numbers are not included on your order.

Catalog cards using Library of Congress classification and subject headings and Unabridged Dewey classification with Library of Congress subject headings (LC/LC and Dewey/LC) provide descriptive cataloging, subject analysis and classification exactly as on MARC tape. Processing materials are computer produced and supplied with your books.

Cataloging and processing from MARC tape offers you a wide variety of call number formats at no extra cost. Here are a few examples of Baker & Taylor's low cost LC/LC and Dewey/LC processing options:

- Fully cataloged and processed book, including cards, label, book pocket and book card .................................. 89¢
- Fully cataloged and processed book without Mylar jacket ......................................................... 65¢
- *Unattached processing kit ........................................ 35¢
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  *(Available with book orders only)

Additionally, at your option, titles not accessible from MARC tape are often available from Baker & Taylor's computer file of Dewey/LC and Abridged Dewey/Sears cataloging, prepared by our own professional library staff.

Each order for processed books must be accompanied by a specification sheet. Request the specification sheet for the type of cataloging you prefer. Write to your nearest Baker & Taylor Library Service Center.
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LC SUBJECT HEADINGS
SUPPLEMENTS
1966-1971 CUMULATION

A new tool to cut the time and complexity of subject cataloging.
Produced from the unedited Library of Congress magnetic tape source files of annual supplement data for 1966 through 1971.
(The 1964/65 supplement is not accessible in machine readable form.)
Edited to ensure conformity with the LC Printed Supplements.
Eliminates the need to check six annual supplements to the LC 7th Edition.
Format of the cumulated supplements is similar to standard LC Printed Supplement style. Variations from LC display are explained in full.
Convenient 8½ x 11” size. 793 pages.
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Price. $40.00 ppp.
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BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

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 1886.

F.W. FAXON CO., INC.
15 Southwest Park
Westwood, Mass. 02090
Telephone: (800) 225-7894 (Toll Free)

Announcing the Autumn publication of A London Bibliography of the Social Sciences

Seventh Supplement, 1969-72, Vols. XXII-XXVIII

This new supplement catalogues recent acquisitions of the British Library of Political and Economic Science at the London School of Economics. Almost 110,000 entries include works from all areas of the social sciences. Entries are arranged in conformity with LC subject headings, and then listed alphabetically, by author where possible, within chronological order.

Seven cloth volumes 286 x 225 mm. Total 4283 pp.
£98.00 (U.S. $255.00)
ISBN 0 7201 0297 9

Mansell 3 Bloomsbury Place London WC1A 2QA England
SEBD PUBLICATIONS, INC.
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Acquisition and Provision of Foreign Books by National and University Libraries in the United Kingdom

Edited by B.C. Bloomfield, Librarian, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London

Librarians in charge of major foreign collections share their experience of non-European publishing. Here are the regional facts and figures, indigenous national practices, and practical acquisition techniques discussed at a special symposium held in 1972 by the University, College and Research Section of the Library Association of Great Britain.
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Want to be up-to-date with the everchanging periodicals world? Get timely information on irregular frequencies. Subscribe to Faxon's new Serials Updating Service
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Klean (No Rusting or Tearing)
Klever (Attention Getters)

For packing information and prices please write to:

Baumgartner's Edelweiss Imports
110 A. N. Highland Ave. N.E. • Atlanta, Ga. 30306

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.

SUScriBE To OUR 41st YEAR
MCGR EOR
PERIODICALS BULLETIN
Magazine Agency
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

WATERGATE HEARINGS
NOW AVAILABLE AT EDUCATION DISCOUNT

COMPLETE TRANSCRIPTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PUBLIC HEARINGS TELEvised MAY THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 1973
WATERGATE INVESTIGATION IN 8 VOLUMES

Special Subscription Offer in both Clothbound and Paperbound editions

TO: THE LESLIE PRESS
Dept. LR • 111 Leslie St. • Dallas, Texas 75207

Please send:
CLOTHBOUND
Undelivered
☐ $37.20 net for all 8 vols. @ $4.65 net per vol.
(total $37.20 set)
Check One of the Following:
  - Ship ea. vol. as issued, order direct Leslie Press only.
    (Immediate shipment Vol. 1.)
  - Hold and ship full set when available.

Please send:
PAPERBOUND
Undelivered
☐ $24.00 net for all 8 vols. @ $3.00 net per vol.
(total $24.00 set)
Check One of the Following:
  - Ship ea. vol. as issued, order direct Leslie Press only.
    (Immediate shipment Vol. 1.)
  - Hold and ship full set when available.

Name of organization __________________________ Address __________________________
City __________________________ State __________ Zip ________
Total amount enclosed $ __________________________
(postpaid if payment enclosed. $2 added for postage and handling for each set on charge orders)
Total amount to be billed $ __________________________
No mistake. Dewey System libraries now have access to the world’s largest private collection of authoritative catalog records. That’s because Richard Abel & Company’s entire data base of over 610,000 catalog records is now available with Dewey classification as well as L.C. The records include English language titles, 38,000 foreign records, new and retrospective titles, and titles listed in BCL, BJCL and other important bibliographies. And besides this, we have a continuing program of updating these records with over 2500 new titles each week, from MARC tapes, NUC, and our own original cataloging.

The Richard Abel Dewey Plan now offers libraries opportunities never before available:

- An unprecedented number of authoritative records to select from.
- Your choice of any combination of acquisitions, cataloging and complete book processing services.
- Some quick and easy ways to order cataloging and processing to your specifications.
- The opportunity to save time, money, and reduce your paperwork to an absolute minimum.

We’d like to show you how we’ve made the Dewey System 610,000 times better. And if you are considering changing from Dewey to L.C., we’d like to show you how easily it can be done. Just phone 800-547-3551 toll free, or mail the coupon.

Richard Abel & Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 4245/Portland, Oregon 97208
(503) 645-3511/Telex 36-0458
OFFICES IN: Mill Valley, Ca. • Los Angeles • Denver • Dallas
Kansas City, Mo. • Zion, Ill. • Marion, Oh. • Nashville, Tn.
Atlanta, • Washington, D.C. • Blackwood, N.J. • Newton
Centre, Mo. • Toronto • London • Amsterdam • Melbourne
Sao Paulo.
FACTS ABOUT FACS

Fact 1: FACS stands for Faxon's Automated Claims System

Fact 2: FACS is a new automated system intended to make life a lot easier for you.

Fact 3: To place a claim, all you do is complete and return our claim notice form. We then activate our computer to process the claim to the publisher with complete order and payment information included.

Fact 4: You receive a quarterly report of all your claim request activity.

Fact 5: This is only one reason, among many, why you should choose Faxon, the world's only fully automated library magazine subscription agency. For a full description, write for a copy of our Service Brochure and annual Librarians' Guide to Periodicals. Or call us on our toll-free line: 1-800-225-7894.

Library business is our only business — since 1881.

F.W. FAXON COMPANY INC.
15 SOUTHWEST PARK, WESTWOOD, MASS. 02090
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.

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

Quoted from the manufacturer’s literature.

library technology reports

A Product Testing and Evaluation Service

American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611
With this eighth volume in the *Bookman’s Price Index* series Gale continues to provide a unique, up-to-date reference which *AB Bookman’s Weekly* has called “still the most comprehensive, clearest general price guide of its kind!” The eight volumes in the series contain listings for nearly 350,000 antiquarian books and periodicals selected from the catalogs issued by the world’s leading rare book sellers, specialist dealers, and O.P. bookmen.

*Bookman’s Price Index* serves bookmen in a number of essential ways. First, *BPI* furnishes an accurate guide to recent prices quoted by representative dealers. Second, *BPI* is the only index to the bibliographical data included in dealers’ catalogs, many of which are scholarly works in themselves. Finally, *BPI* constitutes a master finding list of thousands upon thousands of books.

So that the user may quickly and easily determine the approximate value of a book, the offerings of the dealers are arranged in a single alphabet by authors. Each entry gives the following information: author, title, place and date of publication, pagination or collation, condition, dealer’s name, catalog number, item number, year the catalog was issued, and price of the book.

**BOOKMAN’S PRICE INDEX**, $38.50 per volume
Volumes 1 to 8 are in print
...available on 30-day approval.
A STANDING ORDER WILL ASSURE YOU AUTOMATIC DELIVERY.

**GALE RESEARCH COMPANY**

BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICH. 48