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PAUL SHANER DUNKIN
28 SEPTEMBER 1905–25 AUGUST 1975: AN APPRECIATION

For those who remember Paul Dunkin’s “year’s work” papers which appeared in *Library Resources & Technical Services* from 1958 through 1966, the year 1975 might be called “The Year of the Great Loss.” The world of cataloging and classification has, through Paul Dunkin’s death, lost contact with one of its most ardent supporters who was, at the same time, one of its most devastating critics. Through his writings he nudged and prodded us by means of gentle humor and sometimes not-so-gentle satire. Witness the titles of his year’s work papers: “1964: Peek into Paradise,” “1961: The Year the Innocents Went Abroad,” and “1960: The Year of the Bug.”

New members of RTSD may recognize “Dunkin” simply as that person who wrote *Cataloging U.S.A.* (1969) and whose name is not spelled “Duncan”! Those of us who had the privilege of becoming active in RTSD during the years in which Paul flourished there may in contrast forget the book which appeared late in his career, while remembering his pithy reviews of new literature and that regularly cited little pamphlet to which we were all referred if we wanted to know “How to Catalog a Rare Book” (1951, in second edition, 1973). We also knew him for his long service to *Library Resources & Technical Services* as the long-time assistant editor for cataloging and classification (1958–66) and as editor (1967–71).

Paul served as RTSD president in 1964–65 and in 1968 he was recognized by the award of the Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification “for his contribution to the development of the philosophy and techniques of organizing recorded human knowledge.”

Many of us, however, missed out on Paul’s earlier “incarnation” as head cataloger and later chief of technical services at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C. Few may remember his days as an assistant in classics (1929–35) or cataloger (1935–37) at the University of Illinois. Few will forget, though, the often painful but always humorous way in which Paul could strip cataloging of its pretensions and raise basic questions about its raison d’etre. It was not always fun being the brunt of his jokes, but more often than not, we learned from his attacks. Even when his wit cut sharply into some of our most cherished assumptions, we could not be annoyed with a man of such basic warmth and friendliness.

When Paul Dunkin retired from his position as professor of library service at Rutgers University, he told some of us that he did not intend to participate further in the activities of the profession or of ALA. Many felt the loss of his presence quite severely because we needed his perspective and his iconoclasm. His view, however, was that the affairs of the association and of the profession were now in the hands of the young, and he was satisfied to let it be so. He seemed unsure about the future of cataloging and classification; nonetheless, he was content to let the optimistic among us put forward our attempts to correct the errors of the past and build our own particular brand of “brave new world.” If it turns out to be a world of the Huxley type, Paul will not be surprised; if it succeeds in becoming a truly effective world, he will undoubtedly be pleased and, no doubt, a bit skeptical. That’s the charm of Paul Shaner Dunkin, the cataloger’s loving critic. *Library Resources & Technical Services* is proud to honor the memory of its onetime editor and longtime friend.—DORALYN J. HICKEY, Director, School of Library Science, University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee.
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Serial Cataloging Problems: Rules of Entry and Definition of Title*

WESLEY SIMONTON
Editor

Alternatives to the present rule for entry of serials in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) are identified and arguments relating to the concept of authorship for serials are summarized. The varying concepts of “title” in AACR, the International Serials Data System, and ISBD (S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials are compared and the next steps relating to code revision and attempts at international agreement are described.

IN RECENT MONTHS librarians concerned with serials records—persons who receive, catalog, and service serial publications and those who work with machine-readable records for such publications have found themselves increasingly concerned with two basic questions relating to a large percentage of the items they handle: (1) What is the title of this serial? (2) Is there an author? What is the name of the author?

It is useful to begin a discussion of these problems with a brief consideration of the concept of “main entry” for serials. Rule 6 of the North American Text of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR), the present rule for main entry of serials for North American librarians, is a difficult rule to explain and apply. It has three parts: the first part (6A) is concerned with a negatively defined class of publications (“not issued by or under the authority of a corporate body and...not of personal authorship”); the second part (6B) consists of a rule and an exception, but in practice the exception has proved to be more widely applicable than the rule; the third part (6C) is concerned with “serials by a personal author,” a class of publications which by definition cannot exist if we apply the criterion of “intended for indefinite publication” which is central to the definition of a serial.

*This summary of the elements of the problem of rules of entry and definition of titles for serials has been occasioned by the editing of the several papers on this question presented in this issue. As I worked with the papers, it became clear that some of the most important documents bearing on the problem are not readily available to many of our readers and that a guide through the often-conflicting theories and proposals might be useful. I am grateful to John Byrum for the provision of recent documents and information.—Ed.
It is, then, perhaps easy to understand why many librarians have come to reject the concept of authorship for serials in favor of blanket entry of all serials under title, ignoring or considering irrelevant the basic principles of authorship set forth in AACR.

Alternatives Proposed

In any event, few defenders can be found for the rule in its present form in the North American text. A number of alternatives have been proposed:

1. No separate rule for serials (Carpenter).1 Extension of this concept leads to applying the authorship principle as far as possible (Spalding and Fasana).2-3
2. Adoption of the British version of the second part of the rule which Cole asserts "has struck an appealing balance between... divergent American and European philosophies."4
3. The entry of all serials under title (Howard).5
4. The entry of all serials under title except those with generic titles (a question discussed by virtually all writers on the subject).

And, most recently, Gorman asserts that the cataloging of serials involves "predictive cataloging," as does the cataloging of an incomplete work in any medium, and suggests the recognition of a dichotomy between complete and incomplete works as crucial in the revision of our rules.6

As we read the several proposals, we find increasingly that we lack agreement on the meaning or interpretation of words like "authorship," "corporate," and "generic," to cite the three terms currently causing the most trouble. We are also reminded how little reliable data we have on which to base judgments and decisions. In the words of one close to the center of the controversy, "No one seems to have gathered statistics on the problem of how the present rule 6 is applied or understood. Perhaps this gathering would not even be possible. . . . I gather that most, if not all, of the arguments are empirical. There seem to have been a fair number of wet fingers held in the wind. The problem with that, of course, is that the wet-finger method is no good unless the holder knows which direction is which in the first place."7

A Summary of the Arguments

The theoretical argument for retaining the concept of authorship for serials is based on two assertions:

1. The concept of corporate authorship is well established—if it is applied to monographs, it must also be applied to serials, unless we are to renounce the basic principles of our rules of entry.
2. For the many serials with generic titles, corporate name represents the best approach because
   a. the corporate name is closely associated with the title;
   b. use of corporate heading creates a large number of small files rather than a small number of large files (under titles such as
c. if exact title is not known, a search under corporate name is much easier.

The theoretical arguments for adopting title main entry for all serials is based on the following assumptions:

1. Title is the most constant element—it is less likely to change than the corporate agency related to the serial.
2. The title is simpler, more easily understood as an access point, and more likely to be remembered (particularly in the case of foreign-language titles).
3. Title is more likely to be the entry point in bibliographies, lists, data banks, abstracting and indexing services, etc.
4. The diffuseness of authorship of serials renders designation of a single author illogical and argues for title entry in keeping with the Paris Principles and AACR.

Certain practical arguments for title main entry are frequently presented: (1) it is more feasible for international cooperation because of the varying concepts of corporate authorship among countries; (2) it is more closely related to the needs and procedures of machine-readable data bases; (3) it is more feasible and efficient for internal library operations—checking in, binding, etc.; (4) experience with Library of Congress proof slip files, arranged by title in many large libraries in recent years, has been encouraging. Against these may be set the cost of the considerable amount of recataloging necessary in all libraries if the present rules are changed.

**What is the Title?**

Turning to the question of What is the title? we find that AACR presents rules which result, for most serials issued by corporate bodies, in an identification of a serial consisting of two inseparable parts—a heading and a title. Neither is complete without the other. In part, perhaps, because of our failure in earlier years to agree on international rules for headings, we have seen in recent years the growth of attempts to devise rules which provide descriptions of serials which are complete in themselves, without the addition of a heading.

To understand the problems, we must begin with definitions—first, of “key title,” a term originally used by and primarily identified with the International Serials Data System (ISDS). The key title of a serial:

—“is derived from the title information appearing in the publication”
—may be “distinctive”
—includes the name of the issuing body if
— that name is the first element of the title
— that name is grammatically inseparable from the rest of the title
— the title information contains a generic word
— may include the place of publication, starting date or any other in-
formation necessary to distinguish between otherwise identical titles (this information being given in parentheses following the main part of the title)
—does not include the subtitle.8

The term “distinctive” in relation to titles appears in the Guidelines for ISDS without definition; in ISBD(S) it is defined as “the chief identifying title of any serial, exclusive of a parallel title, sub-title or any other title.”9

“Title proper” is a term which to date has been applied only to monographs. It is defined in ISBD(M) as “the chief title of a publication.”10 It includes any alternative title but excludes parallel and other titles.

And, finally, “generic”: ISDS defines a generic work as “one which indicates the kind and/or periodicity of a publication”11 and in its guidelines for determining which words or phrases are generic, specifically identifies the following kinds of titles as not generic:
—those with terms indicating subject content or coverage
—those with words other than those indicating periodicity or kind
—those containing or consisting of an acronym or initialism
—those with more than five nonempty words (in most cases)12

The only appearances of the word in the Title and Statement of Authorship Area of ISBD(S) are in section 1.1.1.3. They include the following statement as a kind of definition: “The distinctive title may consist of a generic term (e.g., bulletin, journal, review, acts, reports, technical reports, etc.).”13

As ISDS was put into use, it soon became apparent that ISDS descriptions in many instances would not be compatible with AACR descriptions. ISBD(S) was developed with a conscious attempt to be compatible with ISDS; it introduced the concept of the “distinctive title” and attempted to handle generic titles by creating an entry consisting of the title and the name of the corporate agency, prescribing the form on the piece if the two are grammatically linked or a phrase-type description (in the form: title—author) if the two are not grammatically linked.

Next Steps

ISBD(S) was published in 1974 as the recommendations of a joint working group and has not yet been published in a “first standard edition” (a process which required three years in the case of ISBD(M)). A number of national library and bibliographic organizations are responding to the 1974 version in anticipation of a meeting in Paris in October to review the present draft. Among these responses is one by the ALA/RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, and the Library of Congress—the “North American Response.”14 This document highlights several of the basic problems and presents important suggestions for study and rewording of ISBD(S), including the following.
1. It is proposed that *ISBD(S)* apply the concept of "title proper" to serials and that a generic term be permitted as a title proper. Adoption of this practice would both remove an instance of non-conformity with *ISBD(M)* and make possible complete compatibility between *ISBD(S)* and ISDS. Conformity with *ISBD(M)* would be achieved by changing, for example, from the present "Bulletin—American Physical Society" to "Bulletin/American Physical Society." Compatibility with ISDS would be achieved if ISDS were to specify that in the case of a generic title which is not linguistically linked to the author, the key title is to consist of the generic title proper/statement of authorship or that the statement of authorship be added in parentheses as the qualifier, that is, as "Bulletin/American Physical Society" or "Bulletin (American Physical Society)."

2. In section 1.1.1.2, the following rewording, intended to provide greater editorial clarity and to provide a clear differentiation between linguistic linkage and typographical appearance, is suggested:

   "The distinctive title may include a statement of authorship when this statement is linguistically an integral part of the distinctive title or when the typography of the title-page indicates that the statement of authorship is intended to be a part of the distinctive title."15

   It is suggested that as a practical matter the major bibliographic agencies in each language should frame a policy for all cataloging in the language.

3. In section 1.1.1.3, the need for guidance as to what constitutes a generic term is asserted. The following problems are identified as having not been considered "in a depth sufficient to permit a uniform interpretation of the rule:
   
a. the question of transcription of author statements when hierarchical elements of corporate bodies are involved
   
b. the problem of multiple statements of authorship and how this rule is to be applied in those cases
   
c. the question of initial articles in the statement of authorship."16

   As a result of deliberations in San Francisco, CCRC has adopted a position calling for statements of authorship which record all parts of the hierarchy, beginning with the lowest element, on the assumption that the item of the hierarchy which would dictate a new entry if it changed should be closest to the title and that under this system major changes can be more easily ascertained, and changes to elements other than the lowest would not unduly affect the filing order of the title. It also approved a policy of omitting initial articles in the statement of authorship.

   A number of other suggestions relating directly to matters of descrip-
tive cataloging are proposed in the "North American Response," including (1) a "two-level description pattern," one level "suitable for the description of the single issue . . ." and the other "designed to produce a concise and reasonably stable description of numerous issues of a serial title or of the serial in its entirety," and (2) a proposal for a new "Numerical/Chronological Extent Area," to be placed after the Title and Statement of Authorship Area, including data presently assigned to the Imprint Area.

The Future

The North American delegation to the ISBD(S) Revision Meeting in Paris, 21–22 October 1975 will include representatives of the national agencies involved in code revision: John Byrum (ALA/RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee), Ed Buchinski (Canadian Committee on Cataloguing), and Joseph Howard (Library of Congress). At this meeting, the responses of at least fifteen national library and bibliographic organizations will be reviewed as the basis for a revised version of ISBD(S).

The work of the Catalog Code Revision Committee in assembling input from the profession relating to revision of AACR has been completed and on all matters of substance the committee has adopted positions which will be reviewed by the Joint Steering Committee. In the meantime, the editors are engaged in attempting to reconcile the present two texts on those points on which they are in disagreement. The several Rule Review and Revision Proposal Teams will soon be engaged in studying modifications suggested by other national library and national code revision committees and in reviewing successive drafts of the revised text as the editors issue them. The next opportunity for input by the profession at large will come when revised texts incorporating present decisions have been prepared and are remitted to the national committees for review.
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**BRITISH STANDARD FOR STORING MICROFILM**

A revision of BS 1153 *Recommendations for the Processing and Storage of Silver-Gelatin-Type Microfilm* has recently been published by the British Standards Institution. It supersedes the 1955 version and distinguishes between conditions suitable for the storage of commercial records, which may be needed for about ten years, and those suitable for archival records, which will probably be kept much longer.

The recommendations for storage conditions deal with relative humidity, temperature, chemical contamination, containers, and protection against fire and water. The standard also gives advice about processing microfilm before it is stored, about testing it after it has been processed, and about inspecting it while it is stored. Methods of test are given in appendixes. The recommendations are similar to those in ISO 2803 *Photography—Silver-Gelatin-Type Microfilms— Processing and Storage for Archival Purposes*.

Copies of BS 1153 are available from BSI Sales Department, 101 Pentonville Road, London N1 9ND. Price is £2.70 including postage.
The Current State of Standardization in the Cataloging of Serials*

M. HARRISON
Head, Bibliographic Standards Office
British Library

Current standards for the cataloging of serials, including the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, ISBD (S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials, and the Guidelines of the International Serials Data System, are discussed. The varying needs of bibliographic catalogs and serials lists, the latter serving primarily the functions of finding lists, are described. A distinction between complete and not complete works, regardless of medium, is suggested as an important consideration in the revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.

A DISCUSSION OF STANDARDIZATION in the cataloging of serials may be based on either the "nuts and bolts" of serials cataloging, that is, the day-to-day details involved in the use of standards, or on a survey of the field of standardization which attempts to raise the fundamental questions that underlie our search for standardization and to make some modest proposals as to the directions that we may take in the future. The latter course has been chosen for this paper.

The Nature of Serial Publications

Let us begin with a fundamental question. "What is a serial?" To some the answer is obvious—"A serial is the biggest problem in librarianship." And the reason for that problem is also obvious—"A serial is an item which is subject to change." It is this quantity and rate of change which constitutes the basic question to be considered. In the past it has been the habit of librarians to distinguish between "books" and "non-books"; or, among the more sophisticated, to distinguish between "print" and "nonprint" items. This is a simple conceptual error which, though understandable, has caused a lot of problems and, unless checked, will

---
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cause a lot more. Consider two instances of the trouble that this conceptual error has caused. First, the * Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AAGCR)* are divided into three parts. The parts are labeled “Entry and Heading,” “Description” and “Non-book Materials.” The first part does not in fact deal with all materials; for example, in the context of this paper it is important to note that the rule for headings for serials is included in the section of the code devoted to basic conditions of authorship when in fact, serials constitute a type of publication rather than a condition of authorship. The rules in the second part, which are limited to the description of print materials, collocate monographs and serials as if they were, in terms of description, more alike than, say, books and films. The rules for nonbook materials mingle and confuse problems of headings and description as, for example, in the chapter on maps. All of this, with its theoretical muddle and practical disadvantages, is, at least in part, the result of the conceptual error to which I have referred. Second, there is the case of *ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials* (of which more later) which in attempting to standardize descriptive elements in the manner of *ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographs* has introduced (in section 1.1) an organizational concept—the distinctive title—which has little to do with description as such.  

**Complete and Not Complete Publications**

In place of the dichotomy between print and nonprint material, I propose a different basic division, intended to provide a more satisfactory foundation for the cataloging of library materials. The division is that between complete items, be they books, films, sound recordings, or items in any other medium; and items which are not yet complete and, hence, are subject to change, be they printed serials, microform serials, or continuing publications in any medium (print, sound, visual, etc.). The first class can be cataloged with a reasonable degree of certainty—though change may occur, it does not occur in the vast majority of cases. The second class is subject to what may be termed “predictive cataloging” that is, for current serials at least, one is making predictions about future issues based on current issues. The fact that volume 1, number 1 of any serial is probably the least typical is a melancholy fact of life known to all serials catalogers. If our cataloging rules were to be reorganized on this basis, many of the problems, both of description and of the assignment of headings, would cease to exist.

If this dichotomy were to be reflected in the cataloging rules, it would be possible to devise rules to deal with a class of materials which have certain characteristics of monographs and certain characteristics of serials. This ill-defined and unnamed group does not fit well into our present rules (and is ignored by the Paris Principles). It includes quasi-monographic items of the “Advances in . . .” type; frequently revised items (e.g., “The American engineers pocketbook”); certain government publications; and part works issued in a large number of regular issues.
but with a definite concluding date (for example, part-published encyclopedias). All of these and others in the group would fall into the class of items which are continuing and not yet complete and would be assigned headings and described in the terms applicable to that group of materials (i.e., the incomplete class [of which serials are the major type]).

**Main Entry for Serials**

An important question which will have to be resolved in the near future is that of the main entry for serials. The Paris Principles, treading softly through the minefield of corporate authorship, granted legitimacy to corporate headings for certain materials when certain conditions were met: "The main entry should be made under the name of a corporate body . . . when the wording of the title or the title page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible." This gave rise, in the case of *A.A.C.R* (among others), to the anomalous treatment of serials whereby the basic rule for the main entry of serials (rule 6) occurs in a section that is intended to deal with basic conditions of authorship (single authorship, multiple authorship, anonymum, and edited works or collections). It is immediately evident that serials do not belong in this class of rules. A serial is not a condition of authorship—it is a type of publication. In addition to this anomalous placement, there is the fact that this rule does not prescribe an "author" heading (in the pure sense). The main entry, in the case of the British text of *A.A.C.R*, is based entirely on the title of the serial; in the case of the North American text, the main entry is based on a combination of the type of serial (involving a rather abstruse classification of serials) and the title of the serial. In neither case is the heading an author heading; it is either a title heading or a corporate heading based on association of the corporate body with the serial and dependent principally on the wording of the title page. This heading cannot be judged in principle and therefore must be considered from the point of view of its usefulness. One will have to admit that the heading is not theoretically justifiable and defend it or attack it on purely functional grounds. In discussing the question of main entry for serials in the light of recent developments, Spalding comes down in favor of retaining the corporate main entry in the cases which at present receive such entry. He points out that the pressure for what he calls "arbitrary entry under title" comes from persons who are solely or primarily involved in the bibliographic control of serials, and not from those who catalog general library materials. In addition, Spalding says that in an automated context the question of title or corporate entry is almost irrelevant as retrieval can be by either factor. There is clearly a conflict between the needs of general catalogs and those of serial records and it does not, on the face of it, appear unreasonable to retain corporate main entry in general catalogs and to print purely serial listings by title.
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Filing Problems

Three questions relating to filing arise as we consider entries for serials with generic titles, or with titles which contain the name of the issuing body, in general catalogs and in title main entry catalogs. First, there is the question of the subarrangement of the serial with a title starting with the name of the corporate body Is Library Association Record to be filed:

- **LIBRARY ASSOCIATION**
- **Record**

In a large catalog the decision on this question may affect the filing position by many hundreds of entries. In a catalog in which all serials were entered under title, this particular problem would not arise, as the Library Association Record would file with all the other title entries beginning “Library Association . . .,” separated, of course, from monograph records with Library Association as a heading. The second filing problem is part of a more general problem—that of the filing of initials. Under AACR rule 6 the ALA Bulletin is entered under American Library Association—in a title main entry serial catalog the question of how to file “ALA . . .” would arise. It is a question of which, unfortunately, there is as yet no satisfactory answer. The third filing problem would occur in a title catalog in interfiling the innumerable serials which began with words like “Journal” and “Proceedings.” Are these to be subarranged by the words immediately following the first? If so the arrangement would follow the pattern:

- Journal—American Automobile Association
- Journal and bulletin of the Yugoslav Association
- Journal—Butterfly League
- Journal of librarianship
- Journal of the American Archaeological Association
- Journal of the Boston Athenaeum

Successful retrieval of a title under this pattern requires a precise knowledge of the title as presented on the publication. The alternative is to ignore all nonsubstantive words in the title, thus giving the arrangement:

- Journal (of the) American Archaeological Association
- Journal—American Automobile Association
- Journal (of the) Boston Athenaeum
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This is theoretically a more useful arrangement and one that could easily be achieved in a manual or an automated catalog. It does however smack of the kind of complex filing arrangements which bedevil large and well-established manual catalogs to this day. Whichever solution is chosen, it remains a fundamental question to be tackled by title main entry serial catalogs. The entry of some serials under a corporate heading does avoid one apparent inconsistency which would arise in a catalog with author headings for monographs and title entries for serials. In such a catalog it would require a very knowledgeable catalog user to understand why (for example) the ALA Bulletin is found under “ALA” and the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards is found under “American Library Association.” All of these points, of course, raise the question of whether serials should be represented in a general catalog or listed only in a separate serials record. Of this, more later.

Change of Title

In the history of serial cataloging there has been a perpetual indecision on the question of serials which change their titles. Are they to be consolidated under the earliest title or under the latest title or is each change of title to be regarded as indicating the death of one serial and the birth of another? The size of the practical problem can be gauged from the fact that there is a periodical (Title Varies) devoted entirely to chronicling the seemingly endless and usually apparently arbitrary changes which happen in serial titles. (Parenthetically I must recommend Title Varies to those who do not know it. It is not only a useful source to serials catalogers—who need all the help they can get—but also one of the few amusing publications in the field of library science). Catalogers in libraries both large and small know the extent to which they have to alter their catalog records and call marks for serials which change their titles.

All the practical problems which these changes of title gave rise to in the past are less serious when viewed in the context of an automated system. The MARC format for serials reflects a thorough analysis of the relationships between serials and provides for linkages between related serial titles. The “Reference manual” developed by the International Council of Scientific Unions for the control of scientific literature in monographic, serial, and other forms has provided an even more detailed analysis of such relationships. These developments mean that it will be possible to treat each title as a separate serial while at the same time maintaining linkages between serials which are part of even the most complex network of preceding, succeeding, amalgamated, and split-off titles together with their supplements, special issues, etc. Such systems will contain all the retrieval and housekeeping functions demanded by even the most complex serials collection.
Bibliographic Description of Serials

No attempt will be made here to trace the history and background of ISBD(S). Rather, let us try to place ISBD(S) in its context and use it to see where the idea of international standard bibliographic description (ISBD) is today and where it is going. It must be noted here that the progress of the ISBD idea is due in no small part to the IFLA International Office for UBC (Universal Bibliographic Control) and, prior to its establishment, the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing. It must have seemed to be a logical move to develop a standard description for serials on the basis of the standard description for monographs, but it is suggested here that this is another manifestation of the problem inherent in dividing library materials into print and nonprint materials. In fact, in many important ways serials are less like monographs than any other library materials. The necessity for a standard bibliographic description for serials has yet to be proved. There is undoubtedly a necessity for recording data about serials in a standard manner, but whether this can be described as “bibliographic” or not is a moot point. In many cases bibliographic attitudes and practices get in the way of efficient recording of serials data. Surely the establishing of bibliographic data depends on the existence of a bibliographic unit—something which has certain fixed attributes which can be described with a reasonable degree of certainty, and thus can allow the cataloger to establish a definitive or near definitive record. Serials cataloging, with the exception of the cataloging of completed serials by certain large libraries, is not bibliographic. It consists for the most part of the construction of a practical tool in which the fine points of bibliography are not important and the utility of the finished product is all important. For the cataloging of monographs ISBD(M) performs an important function in distinguishing between the description and its functions and the organizational factors and their functions. This distinction has not been carried over into ISBD(S) with an equivalent degree of clarity. Since the trend in many catalogs is toward listing serials under title and the use of “uniform titles” is virtually unknown, what is the point in maintaining that there is a “description” of serials which is somehow apart from the entry point in the catalog? Indeed, it may be asserted that, for most library purposes, we do not need ISBD(S) as such at all. What we need is an international standard catalog entry for serials which would prescribe the elements that are to be recorded for serials and the order in which they are to be given without reference to the prescriptions of ISBD(M). Volume numbering and edition statements are only two examples of elements which are so totally different in serials description as compared with monograph description that it is difficult to claim that there is some kind of equivalence between them. An international standard catalog entry for serials might consist of the following elements: key title; corporate heading; volume, etc., numbering; publication details; frequency; physical description; related serial notes; other notes (which would be serial
based and hence different in content and order from the notes in ISBD(M); ISSN.

There would be no attempt in such a standard catalog entry to reproduce the wording or the order of any part of the serial, and in this would lie the essential difference between the entry and the ISBDs for various complete item media. At the moment we have an uneasy compromise between the logical necessities of serial records and the attempt to be compatible with a bibliographic description which was designed for a totally different type of library material, one which is different in the most fundamental and important way. This is not in any way to say that international exchange of information about serials is either irrelevant or doomed, nor that standardization of serial records is impossible or unimportant. On the contrary, we must engage in the international exchange of serials data and we can best accomplish this by achieving international standards in serials cataloging. But serials cannot be described in the same terms as books. A clear and objective analysis of the needs of serial catalogs and other lists is needed, not an attempt to make the traditional attributes and structure of bibliographic entries for books into the basis for the description of serials.

There are numerous interesting points of detail about ISBD(S) but the fundamental question of whether ISBD(S) is necessary at all needs to be settled before we concern ourselves with points of detail. Admittedly, it is probably too late to reconsider the standard in such a radical way, and it will certainly be published in something like its present form. The real test will come when acceptance of ISBD(S) is measured. Many libraries will no doubt retain their present cataloging practices when faced with a standard that does not seem entirely relevant to their needs.

One of the most distressing aspects of modern library science is the exponential growth in the number of initialisms. In the area we are speaking of there is the additional hazard that the acronyms are similar in appearance and sound. There is a widespread confusion in the profession about the meaning of and interconnections between ISBD(S), ISDS (International Serials Data System), and ISSN (International Standard Serial Number). The first of these has become involved in most minds with the second. The details of ISDS are set out in the UNISIST Newsletter. The ISDS Guidelines contain a framework for recording data about serials for the purposes of international exchange. Though this is not a cataloging system as such, it does point the way for serials catalogers and serials catalogs in that it consists of a series of "pigeonholes" for data (key title, publisher, date of first issue, frequency, etc.) which could be recorded without reference to bibliographic niceties and used either for retrieval by any factor (or combination of factors) or for reassembly of data to create catalog entries. It represents a genuine attempt to come to terms with the realities of the role of the computer in the maintenance and exchange of catalog records, and the realities of the day-to-day task of recording information about serials.
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It has been a striking and regrettable feature of the interaction of automation and library practices that, far too often, no opportunity is taken to reconsider traditional practices. Too often the resulting system is simply an automated version of what already exists. Automation can offer us far more and the most important benefit is the opportunity to reappraise what we are trying to achieve in a completely objective manner. In examining the ISDS Guidelines, one finds exactly this kind of reappraisal, which has led to a structure which cannot but further the aims of international cooperation and exchange.

An important aspect of the work of ISDS is the furtherance of the ISSN system and the establishing of the “key title” which identifies each serial. Numbering systems are far more important and extensive in their impact than they might at first appear. The International Standard Book Number (ISBN) scheme has aided librarians and the book world generally to a very great extent and there seems to be little doubt that ISSNs will be equally useful. The ISSN identifies a title—it does not identify a particular issue or volume of a journal, nor does it identify a complete serial issued under various titles. To return to an earlier topic, in cataloging terms the ISSN does not attempt to consolidate all the manifestations of one serial. This is a practical and realistic viewpoint. A great many English and American serials now carry ISSNs—even those produced by relatively small companies and associations. This must mean that, for the purposes of those concerned with maintaining serials records, many of the problems of identifying serials for the purposes of maintaining current records will be overcome. Numbers have the attraction of neutrality and objectivity unlike any other factor such as titles and “author” headings. The work of the serials librarian will no doubt be made substantially easier and more efficient by the use of ISSNs, especially when these are used in an automated system with the capability of automatic linking to preceding, succeeding, and other related titles. In the world of national and international exchange of information, there are obvious advantages in the availability of a standard method of identifying and linking serial titles. Union catalogs of serials in the future will only need to contain the ISSN and location symbols, together, of course, with a “key title” and ISSN index. The key title, though in one sense just an adjunct to the ISSN, is also an important development in itself. The provision of a unique title for every serial is a giant step forward in providing standardization of citations to titles. Presumably the National Serials Data Centers set up within the ISDS framework will provide printed lists of key titles which can be used by anyone who has need to refer to serials in verbal (rather than numeric) terms. It is to be hoped that library associations and the publishing trade can come to an agreement that all serials should be referred to by their key titles as published. The gain in clarity of bibliographic citations would be considerable.

The Revision of AACR

The important role of AACR in the international context was recog-
nized at the 1974 IFLA Conference in Washington, AACR is a halfway house between national codes of cataloging rules and international codes because of its wide use both within and without the English-speaking world, and because it represents perhaps the most fully developed published code which is based on the principles of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles held in Paris in 1961. With all its imperfections, AACR can justly be viewed as a code which takes account of international developments. Following Lubetzky’s epoch making work and the Paris Conference, the AACR was in a unique position to develop as a truly international code. Already it has incorporated ISBD(M) and has, at least in principle, a commitment to future developments of ISBD. The current revision of AACR is scheduled to be completed by the end of 1976. In other words, while it will be possible for AACR to incorporate any fully developed standards presently in existence, it may well be that standards will be set by IFLA and others after the work of AACR revision is completed. I have the honor of being the associate editor of the second edition of AACR and I know how important it is that we produce something that is, as near as can be in this imperfect world, a definitive code of rules. We cannot go on year after year changing rules and changing the structure of the rules. At the same time it must be recognized that the world of cataloging has changed substantially since the mid 1960s and that the movement toward automation and toward internationalism has changed from a pious hope to a developed reality. The committee for the revision of AACR is considering a proposal that AACR contain a section on the standard description of all library materials, that this section should be based as closely as possible on the prescriptions of ISBD(M) and that subsequent chapters should develop the basic structure as it applies to the various media. With the cooperation of the UBC office, it is reasonable to hope that this may be the structure of the descriptive section of AACR. Speaking personally, I would like to see another development—the reorganization of AACR into two sections; one dealing with headings, their choice and form, and the other dealing with the description of library materials. The second section would open with a standard framework for description. This standard framework would be expanded in two basic areas—complete items and serial items. These two areas would have certain fundamental differences because of the fundamental differences between types of material. Within these two areas the description of specific forms of documents would be further elaborated. In outline this section would be something like this:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of library materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Microform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not complete items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printed Microform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

I must emphasize that this is only a personal view and it will almost cer-
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ertainly not be the final form of the second edition of AACR. One reason why we may not achieve this, to my mind, logical structure is that we lack the equivalent of the Paris Principles in the world of description. We have ISBD(M) and ISBD(S) and projected ISBDs for all kinds of materials—but we have not a single basic ISBD upon which all these others can be developed. In serials cataloging, as with all cataloging, we are faced with the very delicate, and sometimes seemingly impossible task of fitting together the demand for consistency across all types of publication and the inherent differences between the several types. I hope that AACR will be able to arrive at a correct analysis of the problems of description of serials and get away from the kind of thinking that describes part II of AACR (which includes the chapter on the description of serials) as concerned with “books and book-like materials.” Serials are not even “book-like” (whatever that means) any more. Consider the new literary periodicals being published only as tape sound recordings. Which rules in the present AACR apply? Or to take another example: How does one catalog a film serial? By the chapter on films or the chapter on serials? If AACR is to realize its true international potential it must be the first code of rules to sort out this confusion between medium (film, sound recording, print, etc.) and type of publication (complete item or serial). At present the rules are organized as a result of what a classificationist would call “an incomplete application of characteristics of division”—and that as we all know leads to cross-classification or, to use plainer English, muddle.

General Catalogs and Serials Lists

In referring to Spalding’s excellent article, mention was made of differing needs of the general catalog and the serials list. The first has various bibliographic functions to fulfill; the second is concerned mainly with housekeeping functions and acting as a specific item finding list. It is most likely to be in the integrated bibliographic catalog that ISBD(S) and whatever serials rules there are in the second edition of AACR will have the most impact. When interfileing entries for books, serials, and other materials, it is very important to maintain consistent sets of information consistently presented. This is especially important when dealing with the quasi serials referred to earlier. It would be intolerable if different standards of description and headings were to apply in the same catalog—and even more intolerable if such distinctions applied to materials which were superficially the same. The sort of nit-picking discussion which used to go on about societies and institutions would be as nothing as to the potential horrors of deciding that a “Five years work in . . .” was to be cataloged in one way, and a biennial “Advances in . . .” in another.

The needs of a serials list, especially one which performs a series of housekeeping functions, are very different from those of the bibliographic catalog. Almost all searches in serials lists are for specific items or linkage searches (What was the predecessor of this serial? for exam-
ple). It seems to me that traditional cataloging standards have at most a limited role to play in this type of list. The specific item search can best be achieved by the use of numeric linkages in a mechanized system and the constant updating of records is a very practical problem with little or no relation to bibliographic canons.

Perhaps the time has come to recognize the diverse aims of the two types of list and to recognize the fact that no one standard or set of standards can hope to accomplish both sets of purposes, at least as far as the printed form of the entry is concerned. With automation, of course, one has the possibility of setting up a record with the maximum amount of information from which one can derive various different types of entry. It does not seem unreasonable to recognize that there are different standards for different purposes, and for our codes to prescribe one entry for integration in a general catalog and another for use as the basic entry in a serials list. There is no doubt that, if our codes prescribe a type of entry which is only suitable for one purpose, many libraries will simply ignore the rules and create records which are not consistent with other listings and hence cannot easily be used as the basis for the exchange of information.

**Multivolume Works and Monographic Serials**

An ex-colleague of mine, a man with a great deal of experience in cataloging, once told me that the most difficult common problem in cataloging was distinguishing between multivolume works, monographic series, and serial publications. There is no doubt that many publications start out in one category and become members of another as time goes by. Cataloging rules give no help to the cataloger in making this distinction—they merely tell the cataloger what to do when the primary distinction is made. It would be well if these categories were more clearly defined so that the cataloger could, for example, catalog a set of volumes either collectively or independently with a reasonable degree of certainty that the same set was being cataloged in the same manner elsewhere. Our present rules (or the lack of them) on monographic series, multivolume works, and serials, give rise to inconsistent cataloging which is a tremendous barrier to the exchange of information and to the efficient retrieval of items. The lumping together of serials and monographic series in *AACR* is not helpful. In many ways a serial and a monographic series are similar, in other ways they are not. How is the cataloger to treat (for example) a twelve-volume series of independent monographs, each with its own author and title? Since it is in a finite number of volumes, it cannot be a serial—but is it a multivolume work? Surely not. There has been a lot of work in the IFLA Committee on Content Designators on the question of "bibliographic levels." These levels recognize that a document may exist as an entity and as part of a collection, and may itself have discrete parts. At each of these levels there may exist factors which are valuable in retrieval (title of series, title of book, title of part, etc.). Without regard to the automation as-
pect of this matter, we may observe that these concepts are important to cataloging theory and practice and that our standards and codes should take account of them.

Citations to Serial Articles

Probably the most widespread listing of periodical materials is also the least standardized. I am referring to bibliographic citations relating to articles in serials, whether published as part of another document or in serial indexing and abstracting publications. The main movement towards standardization in the serials area has been concerned with the listing of whole serials, yet, intellectually speaking, these are of much less significance than the articles which they contain. Anyone who has used serial indexes extensively or has had the unenviable task of trying to trace articles from information supplied in citations will know that this is an area which needs standardization and needs it very badly. The problem seems to be not that we lack standards but that there are too many standards and that very few persons and publications observe them. Most national standards agencies have publications which deal with citations, but none of them seem to carry much weight. This area of “microthought” (to use Ranganathan’s term) is of primary importance in the exchange of information and in achieving the aims of UBC. Machine formats have been devised to hold citations to periodical articles, but in the absence of effective standardization these will obviously differ in the information held and the way in which it is held. It would seem to be a very worthy and practical objective to decide what should be in a citation and to construct a standard method of presenting that information. The part of the citation which refers to the serial could be a subset of the total description of the serial, and the part referring to the article itself could have a heading based on the Paris Principles (which surely apply to any work no matter how small) and a “description” presented in a standard form. This is a very urgent question and one which is integral to our progress toward internationalism, UBC, and the free exchange of information.

Conclusion

In conclusion, let me reiterate that we have muddled up the idea of the serial with the idea of the various media of communication. A serial publication exemplifies a condition which is independent of medium—it is clear that we will have serials in ever-increasing numbers in non-print and mixed media forms over the next few years. The cultivated few who invented the scientific journal in the eighteenth century can have had no idea of the many-headed monster they were creating, nor of the burden that they were going to impose on catalogers in the late twentieth century. The document explosion is at its most dramatic in the area of serials, and if we are going to control it, locally, nationally, and universally, we need a clear-eyed appraisal of what we are trying to
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achieve, followed by the construction of tools which will enable us to fulfill our goals.
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Two changes are proposed in the North American text of rule 6 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR): the adoption of the British text of 6B and the deletion of 6C. Both of these changes are intended to simplify the entry of serials. With the deletion of 6C, serials would be entered only under title or corporate author. The adoption of the British text of 6B would in turn greatly simplify the remaining choice between title or corporate author.

The year 1974 has seen the publication of the long-awaited International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials (ISBD(S)) by the International Federation of Library Associations. The impact of this publication has already been felt in American libraries: in April 1974, the Library of Congress announced the deletion of rule 162B of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) with the result that when the name of a corporate body is included in the title of a serial, it will be transcribed as such in the body of the entry. For example, a title like University of London Historical Studies will no longer be recorded as “Historical studies” but as “University of London historical studies.” Shortly thereafter, in May 1974, the Library of Congress announced that it had adopted the following practice:

If the title of a serial consists solely of a generic term, that term is followed by the author statement. The two elements are separated by a space-hyphen-space ( - ). The author statement is transcribed as it appears on the publication, except that, if the statement includes a corporate hierarchy, those parts of the hierarchy which are not necessary for the identification of the author are omitted. The parts of the hierarchy which are recorded are separated by commas.

While these two changes in no way directly affect the catalog entry of
serials, their potential to influence the choice of entry cannot be overlooked. Late in 1973 the Ad Hoc Discussion Group on Serial Data Bases, which had been established at the 1973 ALA Conference in Las Vegas, proposed that consideration be given to using the title, as transcribed according to these two changes, for the main entry for all serials.\(^8\)

Such a change in our cataloging principles departs not only from all cataloging tradition in this country, but also from the Paris Principles, which call for the entry of serials “whose titles consist of a generic term (Bulletin, Transactions, etc.) preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body” under the heading for the body.\(^4\)

The weight of tradition in relation to corporate main entry may be seen in the June 1972 edition of *Serial Publications in the University of Iowa Libraries*, which contains over 1,900 corporate main entries under the letter \(A\) alone. Many of these serials lack an added entry or even a reference from the title in the card catalog, since the transcribed title consists merely of a generic term. Such a drastic change as title main entry for all serials would perhaps simplify the work of the programmer and the operations of the computer, but it would place an excessive burden on our card catalogs, which are already strained to the breaking point by “superimposition.”

Even though we may rule out the principle of title main entry for all serials, it may still be good to reconsider rule 6 of the North American text of *AACR* in the hope of simplifying it and standardizing the treatment of all types of serials. A basic question confronts us: When should a serial be entered under a corporate or personal author?

Although rule 5C of the *A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries of 1949* (AL\(A\) Rules) states that “a periodical issued by a society, institution or government body is ordinarily to be entered under its title (especially if this is distinctive in character) with added entry for the issuing body,” the restrictive definition of a periodical and the lack of attention to other serials in the rules strengthened the long-established tradition in the United States of using corporate main entries for official publications of governments, proceedings of societies, and reports of societies, institutions, and other corporate bodies.\(^5\)

Since “distinctive in character” is a vague concept, a great many periodicals and monographic series which could have been entered under title have been entered under a corporate entry. An example of such past practice is *Studies in Bibliography: Papers of the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia*, which is entered under the heading for the society in the *Union List of Serials*.

This American tradition is exemplified by rule 6B of the present North American text of *AACR*, which is somewhat more liberal than were the AL\(A\) Rules in the use of title main entry for serials, although 6B still favors the use of corporate main entry. The rule states:

1. Enter a periodical, monographic series, or a serially published bibliogra-
phy, index, directory, biographical dictionary, almanac, or yearbook, issued by or under the authority of a corporate body, under its title with an added entry under the corporate body.

Exception: If the title (exclusive of the subtitle) includes the name or the abbreviation of the name of the corporate body, or consists solely of a generic term that requires the name of the body for adequate identification of the serial, enter it under the name of the body.

2. Enter any other serial issued by or under the authority of a corporate body under the body. In case of doubt that the serial is covered by 1 above, enter under the body.6

In many European countries, on the other hand, there is an equally strong tradition for the entry of serial publications under title. For example, rule 62 of the Prussian Instructions calls for the entry of all periodicals under title.7 Rule 6B of the British text of AACR has struck an appealing balance between these divergent American and European philosophies. The British rule reads as follows:

Enter a serial issued by or under the authority of a corporate body (other than one acting, in relation to the serial, solely as a commercial publisher) under the name of the body if the title of the serial (exclusive of any subtitle) 1) includes the name or an abbreviation of the name of the body, or the title of an appropriate official, or 2) consists solely of a generic term or phrase which does not adequately identify the serial except when taken in conjunction with the name of the body. If the name included in the title of the serial, whether in full or in an abbreviated form, is that of a superior body to which the body responsible for issuing the serial is subordinate, enter under the name of the superior body, with an added entry under the subordinate body.

Make an added entry or reference under the title of the serial unless this begins with the name of the corporate body in the form used as heading for the main entry.8

Thus a great number of serials entered under title in British libraries are entered under a corporate body in America. One such example is Precipitation in Tennessee River Basin, issued by the Hydraulic Data Branch of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The North American text cites this as an example of a serial to be entered under issuing body; in the British text it is used to illustrate a serial to be entered under title. Because of the ambiguities in the North American text, the rule is subject to varying interpretations, with a resulting difference in the entry chosen for a given serial. The adoption of rule 6B of the British text would remedy this situation.

The British version of 6B should not be construed as an abrogation of the principle of corporate authorship; rather it is a recognition of the fact that serial publications are generally cited by title. For instance, several world lists of serials, prominent among which are the World List of Scientific Periodicals Published in the Years 1900–1960 and the British Union-Catalogue of Periodicals. New Periodical Titles and Gesamtverzeichnis ausländischer Zeitschriften und Serien list serials under title. Biological Abstracts, Geo Abstracts, and New Testament Abstracts, among others, cite journals by title, as do Index Medicus, L’Année Philo-
logique, the International Bibliography of the History of Religions, and the International Bibliography of Political Science. It is especially interesting that the “List of Journals Indexed” of the Cumulated Index Medicus, published by the National Library of Medicine, lists journals under title with no reference from the issuing body, even if the title consists solely of a generic term or if the name of the body is included in the title. Because serials are cited under title, the title, unless generic, is of primary importance, and the corporate author, unless included in the title, is of secondary importance. Corporate authorship can be acknowledged as well through an added entry as through a main entry.

Several important problems exist in the interpretation of the North American text of 6B. Among them is the distinction between serials covered by 6B1 and those covered by 6B2. One does not encounter this problem in the British rule, since it provides for uniform treatment of all serials. The decision of how to enter a serial issued by a subordinate body, if only the name of the superior body is included in the title, is also complicated by the North American version. Because the British version allows more serials to be entered under title, it facilitates the compilation and use of serial lists and does not “scatter” as many serials throughout the catalog because of changes in corporate author.

Section 1 of rule 6B (North American text) is interesting in that it contains a list of types of serials. The inclusion within this list is itself open to interpretation. Is one at liberty to extrapolate from the list other types of serials which, by analogy, should be entered under title? Osborn apparently thinks not, stating merely that title main entry is authorized for these types of serials if they do not fall into the “exception” which 6B1 includes.9 Henderson believes otherwise, saying that “the types are named only to give direction to the cataloger who may not see the principle which is illustrated.”10 Dunkin states that the list is not intended to be complete.11

To answer this question correctly, one must perhaps look at the ALA Rules, which we may assume had a strong influence upon those who drafted the present code. Sections C-F of rule 5 of the ALA Rules deal with specific types of serials (periodicals and newspapers; almanacs, yearbooks, etc.; directories; and series) and in general provide for their entry under title. Section 1 of rule 6 of AACR (North American text) can be considered a consolidation of, and expansion upon, these sections of the ALA Rules. When read in this light, it leaves no room for other categories of serials to be entered under title. There is a conspicuous absence of an “etc.” at the end of the list. Thus the entry of serials under corporate author or title is unfortunately and unnecessarily complicated by an arbitrary classification of serials by type. The British rule greatly simplifies the choice of entry by not distinguishing between types of serials.

What kinds of serials does 6B2 (North American text) then cover? An obvious example is a serial whose title includes the title of an appropriate official of the issuing body, e.g., Annual Report of the Librarian
of Congress, which one should enter under the heading for the library; another type of serial to be entered under issuing body which this title brings to mind is the annual report of a corporate body. The following limitation of the term “yearbook”—one which excludes the annual report—is found in footnote 8 to 6B1:

The term “yearbook” is to be understood to exclude a work the content of which is necessarily the expression of the corporate thought or activity of the body, such as a report of its management or a record of the results of its operation.12

As Dunkin explains, “the user may expect (if he has been around catalogs much) to find the formal reports of the business of a corporate body under the name of the body, even though they may appear at intervals as regular as those of the Atlantic Monthly.”13 This leads one to conclude that the term “periodical” may also have the same implicit qualification.

Government publications create a special problem for the cataloger because of 6B2. Of the four examples given to illustrate the application of the rule, three are government publications. The fourth is the Proceedings of the Liverpool Geological Society, which one would expect to find under the issuing body since it is named in the title. The first example, a document, is the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, which, as discussed previously, would necessarily be entered under the heading for the library. The remaining two examples create a good deal of confusion. Precipitation in Tennessee River Basin, issued by the Hydraulic Data Branch of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), is a monthly publication. Thus it is a “serial appearing or intended to appear indefinitely at regular or stated intervals, generally more frequently than annually” and as such meets the primary criterion in the AACR (North American text) definition of a periodical.14 Carload Waybill Statistics . . . Mileage Block Distribution . . ., issued by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC), and the final example of the application of this rule, is an annual—one hesitates to use the term “yearbook,” since apparently the term for some reason did not apply. Perhaps the TVA and ICC publications could be considered “records of results” of the issuing bodies. But then the Scottish Abstract of Statistics, a yearbook issued by the Scottish Office of Great Britain, could perhaps be considered a “record of results” of that office, although the Library of Congress cataloged the abstract under its title.

Because of the choice of examples used to illustrate 6B2 and the vagueness of the phrase “in case of doubt,” one finds inconsistency in the entry of serial publications whose titles are nongeneric and do not include the name of the issuing body or the title of an appropriate official. For example, the Library of Congress cataloged Document Retrieval Index, a quarterly bibliography issued by the National Criminal Justice Reference Service, under its title; but it cataloged the Quarterly Re-
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port on Job Vacancies, issued by the Job Vacancy Survey Section of Statistics Canada, under the heading for the section. In the 1971 cumulation of New Serial Titles, a total of 203 serials with nongeneric titles which could be entered under title are found under "United States." If the title alone were the decisive factor in determining whether a serial should be entered under corporate body, as it is in the British version, the inconsistency in entry would be avoided.

In footnote 10 to the "exception" to 6B1, the North American text explains what is meant by the name of the issuing body or the abbreviation thereof being included in the title of a serial. In the footnote one finds the following:

Construe the presence in the title of the full name of a larger body, of which the responsible issuing body is a part and under which it would be entered as a subheading, as sufficient reason for not entering the serial under its title, e.g., University of Detroit Law Journal, issued by the Department of Law of the University of Detroit.\(^{15}\)

Osborn states that the journal must be entered under the heading for the department because the name of the university is given in full. But wouldn't an entry under the heading for the university be more appropriate, with an added entry for the department? Examples can be cited to illustrate both sides of the argument, although the bulk of them support Osborn's conclusion. However, the Library of Congress has entered the Statisticheskii ezhegodnik stran-chlenov Soveta ekonomicheskoi vzaimopomoshchi (the statistical yearbook of the member-countries of COMECON, issued by COMECON's Sekretariat) under the heading for COMECON (Sovet ekonomicheskoi vzaimopomoshchi) with an added entry for the Sekretariat.

The complexity of choice of entry for serials with names of corporate authors included in the title may be seen in the case of the several titles published by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), as cataloged by the Library of Congress and as entered in New Serial Titles, both of which supposedly follow the ALA Rules or AACR, as appropriate at the time of cataloging. In the 1956-1967 cumulation of the National Union Catalog may be found LC cards for some thirty titles in the form "IEEE transactions on. . . ." Two recent LC cards indicate two different treatments of comparable titles. IEEE Transactions on Plasma Science is entered under IEEE Nuclear Plasma Sciences Society, but the IEEE Transactions on Professional Communications, issued by the IEEE Professional Communications Group, is entered under Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.

Practice in New Serial Titles for these transactions also varies. In the 1971-72 cumulation are found four entries, including that for the "professional communications," under Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers; three entries under title (IEEE transactions on . . . .); two entries under subordinate bodies, in two different forms: (1) Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Systems, Man, and Cybernetics

---
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Group and (2) IEEE Communications Society. The “plasma” title is entered under title (July–Sept. 1978).

Since all of these works are periodicals by definition (although they contain “transactions” in their titles), and since the corporate names of the issuing bodies are similar, one may reasonably expect these works to have similar main entries—either under the institute, the responsible subordinate bodies, or under title. Cataloging these serials under the heading for the responsible subordinate bodies “buries” the main entries in the catalog to a great extent and entry under title violates the principle of entering a work under the issuing body if named in the title, since the institute does publish the works. Thus, entry according to the British version of rule 6B—under the superior body named in the title, with an added entry for the responsible subordinate body—seems the wisest choice.

Lubetzky states that “in a situation where the name of a corporate body, or the initials which stand for that name, is a part of the title of a serial, then that corporate body is already associated with the title; it is not subject to change. The moment that the serial is taken over by another corporate body, as it may well be, then it will no longer be called, for example, ALA Bulletin. It will have to have another title and you will have to enter it under that title.” This is also the case with works such as the University of Detroit Law Journal and the IEEE Transactions. The university and the institute are already associated with the title; but the subordinate issuing bodies can change their names, or the responsibility can be shifted to another subordinate body, both without affecting the title of the serial. It is this basic principle that is reflected in the British rule.

The choice of main entry is always of crucial importance. It is especially so today with the prevalence of union lists, both regional and national, and local lists of serials. For reasons of space and finance some lists include only main entries for serials, as determined by the cataloging rules or an interpretation of them. It can be argued that any serial with a nongeneric title is likely to be cited under title, and so perhaps requested under title. Therefore, for these lists to be of maximum use, two entries are needed for any serial entered under issuing body—a main entry and a reference from the title. Thus a great deal of time and expense could be saved if the British text of AACR were followed. Also, a great deal of the user’s time could be saved, since he would not encounter so many references.

Anyone who has worked with serials is familiar with their frequent changes of title and of issuing body. This leads to constant recataloging and quite often to establishing new entries. When a serial with a nongeneric title not including the name of its issuing body is entered under title, it is less probable that the entry for the serial will need to be changed, since one of the variables, the corporate author, has been removed from the entry. As Osborn points out, added entries under variant names of corporate bodies can be multiplied freely without chang-
ing the entry of such a serial. It is far less costly when recataloging to add a note about a variation in issuing body than to establish a new entry, since the latter also involves changing various receiving and payment records, the binding record, and if the title is not classified, the shelf label. At the same time, it is less likely that such a serial, if entered under title, will come to be scattered in the catalog under various entries, a situation which constantly hinders the patron who is searching for a list of the library’s holdings of a bibliographical entity.

Since, as the examples to rule 6B2 of the North American text indicate, the rule is frequently applied to official government publications, and since it may be taken to be a basic premise of library work that government bodies are by far the most likely to change—either by being renamed or abolished—the adoption of the British text would greatly simplify the work of the cataloger. Even though it is still accepted practice in this country to enter a majority of government publications under issuing body, in certain instances when the changes in corporate author are extremely frequent, it becomes less feasible to continue this, and some publications are of necessity recataloged under title. The industry reports of the Department of Commerce are an excellent example of this (cf. Pulp, paper and board, issued over the years by the following units of the Department of Commerce: Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Office of Domestic Commerce, National Production Authority, Business and Defense Services Administration, Bureau of Domestic Commerce, Bureau of Competitive Assessment and Business Policy). It is more than somewhat quixotic here to follow the North American text; and by following it only partially, one is perhaps adding to the confusion of the patron who is trying to use the catalog.

The following examples are presented to illustrate the similarities and differences of the two texts of AACR 6B. The first and second examples are works cataloged identically according to the two texts, the former work under title and the latter under corporate author. The third and fourth examples are of works entered under title in accordance with the British version, but under issuing body in keeping with the North American. Note in particular in the fourth example that fewer sets of cards are generated by the use of title entry. The next example illustrates the “superior-subordinate issuing body” problem, with entry under the superior body according to the British text, but under the subordinate body according to the North American text. The last example illustrates the British use of either an added entry or a cross-reference from a title that normally would not be traced in this country.

I. Identical entries under the two versions of AACR
   A. Title main entry

   Geologie. Jahrg.1-
   März 1952-
   Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.
   v. illus. 24cm.
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(added entries for the issuing bodies)

B. Corporate author main entry

Chemical Society.
Chemical Society reviews. v. 1-
1972.
London.
  v. illus. 22cm. quarterly.
  Supersedes Quarterly reviews, and RIC reviews.

II. Varying practices
A. Main entry under corporate body or under title

British text

Electricity.
  v. 25cm. annual.
  "Report of the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry."
(added entry for the Dept. of Trade and Industry)

North American text

Great Britain. Dept. of Trade and Industry.
Electricity: report of the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry.
  v. 25cm. annual.
(added entry for title)

British text

Washington.
  v. 26cm.
  Supersedes in part the World trade information service of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.
(added entries for the issuing bodies)

North American text

a)
United States. Bureau of International Commerce.
Washington.
11v. 26cm.
  Supersedes in part the World trade information service of the Bureau of Foreign Commerce.
  Continued by a publication of the same title, issued by the Domestic and International Business Administration.
(added entry for title)
Serials of Personal Authorship.

The North American text of AACR 6C states, "Enter a serial by a personal author under his name." (The British version uses different wording but accomplishes essentially the same result.) The serial by a personal author has not long been recognized on the American library scene and rule 6C constitutes its first formal recognition. This is in accordance with the general principles underlying the AACR rules for entry. The first of these principles is especially relevant in this case: "Entry should be under author or principal author when one can be determined." 19

It would seem wise in the case of serials to follow the example of
the new German Regeln für die alphabetische Katalogisierung, which in accordance with paragraph 11.14 of the Principles treats serials as "anonymous" works, that is, as works for which no personal author can be ascertained or which have more than three personal authors, none of whom has primary responsibility for the work. In this way a serial would be cataloged under title or corporate author, with a personal author receiving an added entry.


If rule 6C of AACR (North American text) were deleted, there would be no need to interpret what is meant by “author”; also, inconsistencies in the treatment of personal and corporate authors would be avoided. The ordering and receiving of serials by personal authors would be somewhat facilitated; and these serials would be cataloged as they are listed in the Union List of Serials.

The interpretation of “author” in 6C apparently was open to question at one time. In November 1970, the Library of Congress stated that “author” was to be taken literally, and that for a person to be considered author of a serial, he must be represented as such on the title page or in another prominent position. Thus a serial should not be entered under editor. Lubetzky states that although the entry of a serial under editor would be consistent with the general principles, it is nevertheless the title, and not the editor, that is the unifying factor in a serial, since editorship is subject to constant change. If a work is so totally dependent upon an individual that he is considered its author and becomes its main catalog entry, perhaps it should not be considered a serial: since its author is a mortal, it can no longer be a question of how long the work will continue, but rather of how soon it will cease publication. If it is believed that the work will continue after its “author’s” demise, then a strong case exists for treating the work as a serial with potentially changing authorship and according the “author” not the main entry, but rather an added entry.

How should one handle the compiler of a serial bibliography, if he is named as such on the title page? To most reference librarians and patrons, and also to most catalogers, the compiler of a bibliography is indeed the author. If the compiler is treated as author and thus becomes the main entry, an inconsistency in the treatment of corporate and personal authors immediately presents itself. For instance, Schriftum zur Geschichte und geschichtlichen Landeskunde von Hessen, compiled by Winfried Leist, can be entered under Leist according to 6C; but
Deutsches Bücherverzeichnis, compiled by the Deutsche Bücherei, must be entered under title in accordance with 6B. One could avoid this problem by eliminating the entry of serials under personal author.

The serial by a personal author is not the rule, but the exception. Thus such a work inevitably will require more time and effort for the ordering and receiving sections if it is cataloged under personal author and an adequate system of references (especially from the title) is not provided in the library’s check-in record for serials.

AACR 6C breaks with longstanding tradition in this country and abroad. The *ALA Rules* made no provision for a serial to be cataloged under a personal main entry. Thus in pre-1967 printed catalogs, and also in many catalogs listing serials published before that year, this type of serial is entered under title or issuing body. For example, *Antike und Christentum*, by Franz Joseph Dölger (an example under 6C) has its main entry under title in the *National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 Imprints* (although originally cataloged by the Library of Congress under Dölger in 1985). It is also listed in the *Union List of Serials* under title, with no reference from Dölger.

Only when the name of the personal author is as well known as the title of the serial should the librarian feel that a main entry under author is not greatly hindering the patron. If one is looking for the *Spectator*, he will undoubtedly search under Addison or Steele. However, since most patrons do not discern between main and added entries, an added entry for the author can effectively be used to indicate authorship. The following example illustrates the difference in cataloging which would accompany the elimination of *AACR 6C*:

A. *Entry according to AACR 6C.*

Boe, John Oliver.  
The television sponsors directory.  
v. 28cm. quarterly.  
(added entry for title)

B. *Entry if AACR 6C were deleted.*

The Television sponsors directory.  
v. 28cm. quarterly.  
By John Oliver Boe.  
(added entry for Boe)

In this paper two changes have been proposed in the North American text of *AACR 6*: the deletion of 6C and the adoption of 6B of the British text. Both changes would simplify the entry of serials and thus benefit the patron and the librarian. With the deletion of 6C, serials would be entered only under title or corporate author, returning to an old tradition in this country. The adoption of the British text of 6B would in turn greatly simplify the remaining choice between title and
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corporate author. Serious consideration should be given to these two changes in the North American text.
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One of the objectives of a library catalog is to enable one to determine what books or publications by an author are in the library. Establishment of special rules of entry for serial publications which preclude attribution of authorship defeats this objective. The present rule 6 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and the Paris Principles are criticized in this regard. In the course of this criticism, it is shown that the presence of a generic title, the presence of the name of a corporate body within the title, or the presence of an account of the activities of a corporate body within the serial publication are not valid criteria for determining authorship of a serial publication. Furthermore, using the form of publication produces unpredictable entries for serials. Therefore, it is proposed that special rules for entry of serials be abolished, that a serial be treated like any other work of corporate or personal authorship, including compilations and works produced under editorial direction. This will have the added benefit of allowing consistent treatment of instances of corporate and personal authorship.

THE THESIS PRESENTED HERE is that there should be no special rules for the entry of serials. Theoretically sound and consistent reasons can be adduced for this proposal.

It is usually agreed that the three objectives of an alphabetical catalog are (1) to provide sufficient information to permit the ready identification of a bibliographical entity in the library, (2) to enable one to determine what books or publications by a given author are in the library, and finally, (3) to tell one what editions of a given work are to be found in the library. The first of these objectives, the unambiguous description of a bibliographical entity, is complicated by the continuing publication pattern of serials, and is closely related to what has been
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called the benchmark problem. The number of pieces of a serial held under a particular entry is the subject of discussions that have led to first title entry, latest title entry, successive title entry, key title entry, and variations upon them. These policies of description have no logical relevance to the problem of main entry for serials, and will be left aside for the rest of this paper. Rather let us concentrate on the second objective of the alphabetical catalog, the identification of the works of an author. Let us begin with an analysis of rule 6 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) and the treatment of serials in the Paris Principles.

It seems safe to say that there is widespread agreement that AACR 6 in its present form is far from satisfactory. As is stated in the introduction to AACR the framers of that code thought that the presence of the name of a corporate body in the title of a serial was “too powerful a criterion” to ignore “when in unusual cases” there is “no account of the activities of the body in the publication.”1 This departure from the Paris Principles, by prescribing entry under the name of the body in all cases when the body is identified in the title of a serial, represents a first regrettable step away from international standardization of cataloging. But the Paris Principles contain the further restriction that the title must not only have name of the body in it, and the serial contain some account of the activities of the body, but also that the title be generic. As Verona’s commentary on the Paris Principles points out, those present at the 1969 International Meeting of Cataloguing Experts had difficulty with these provisions.2 An examination of these difficulties is also pertinent to some of the provisions of AACR 6.

Problems Relating to the Structure of Titles

How can one be sure, for example, that a generic title is indeed generic? There is no definitive list of such titles available, and a glance at the list of possible titles of publications of German corporate authorship presented by Cutter makes one humble about his own ability to capture all generic titles in such a listing.3 And this is to speak only of the obvious ones. Many candidate generic titles like “Educational series” or “Scientific studies” may be considered generic by one cataloger or user and not by another. It is not at all clear that well-defined criteria, obvious to any user of a catalog, can, even in principle, be generated.4 Let us examine one of the reasons generic titles are not wanted in a catalog. It is thought to be difficult to locate a particular serial in drawers full of entries beginning “Journal of.” To find the correct title, you have to know the name of the corporate body anyway. For this reason, it is claimed, entries under generic title are redundant, especially in any printed display of the catalog. So, if main entry is not under the generic title, there should be no added entry under that generic title. Confusion over what constitutes a generic title could thereby cut off an important approach to the catalog.

In addition to problems with generic titles, there are the two other
requirements for corporate entry of serials in the Paris Principles that require examination. One is the requirement that the name of the body be found in the title. It seems obvious that the presence of a corporate body's name in the title does not in itself constitute proof of authorship. In this connection, it should be remembered that historically the foundation for rule 6 was not authorship. But one requirement for entry of serials under corporate body found in the Paris Principles, a requirement discarded around 1964 in the discussion of drafts for AACR, was the presence of an account of the activities of the body in the serial. Even Verona's commentary seems to treat this as evidence of corporate authorship. Unfortunately, the presence of such an account is no more than evidence for the fact that the body is a subject of the publication.

Returning to AACR 6 again, we find that only the section dealing with entry for personal serials is concerned with authorship. This represents an inconsistency of treatment between publications of personal authorship and publications of corporate authorship that pervades all of AACR. This problem will be considered later and the inconsistency shown to be based on a faulty analysis of authorship.

Problems Relating to Form of Publication

The second major criticism of AACR 6 is that many of the provisions are based on the form of the material. As has often been pointed out, this is risky with respect to serials, and indeed, the criticism may be extended to any type of publication. For instance, there is no absolutely clear division between serials and monographs. Setting aside the obvious case of pseudserials, in which monographs appearing in many successive editions are conveniently, if not consistently, cataloged as serials rather than monographs, there are still publications which make neither good serials nor good monographs for cataloging purposes. Some examples are reprinted issues of Sears catalogs, quinquennial statistical reviews, and the publication entitled Time Capsule. Since decisions about these publications are made on a case-by-case basis, uniformity of cataloging is not promoted, finding entries for them in union catalogs becomes unpredictable, and international standardization of bibliographical control takes a step backwards. Therefore, it appears to be a mistake to use a criterion that cannot always be applied easily as the basis for cataloging rules.

Let us now explore some of the effects of abolishing separate rules for the entry of serials. To do this, we must first analyze some of the complexities of corporate authorship as applied to serials and then discuss the results of the proposal in the light of the recent revision of rules 4 and 5. The new version of rule 4 (in which rule 5 has been merged) states that both works produced under editorial direction and compilations having a collective title are to be entered under title, with an added entry for compiler or editor where appropriate.
The Nature of Corporate Authorship

Any discussion of serials cataloging must include a discussion of corporate authorship, since a great number of serials are associated with corporate bodies. Although in many ways it is quite different from personal authorship, corporate authorship is much more than a fiction devised to permit the ordering of publications in a file. To see how this is true, we must begin by noting that there are two nonexclusive bases on which authorship can be ascribed. The first, and this is the paradigm case of authorship, occurs when someone actually performs the work connected with originating a publication. Let us call this theory the origination theory. As far as serials are concerned it appears that the portion of rule 6 dealing with personal serials was composed with this theory of authorship in mind. The origination theory of authorship is not limited to work of single authorship. One can imagine a committee of equals in a “brainstorming” session trying to write something. Anything forming part of the work they were composing would get in only by unanimous agreement. Surely this would be a work of corporate authorship, even under the paradigm, origination theory.

As an extension of the origination theory, it is convenient to claim that one can perform authorial work without actually having to perform authorial tasks. An example of this is the ghostwritten work. Let us call this theory the assumption theory, and note, without an exhaustive analysis of the myriad of ways in which one can assume responsibility for a work, that the authorship of the majority of works of corporate authorship is ascribed on the basis of the assumption theory. One important assumption will be made here: evidence for authorship on the assumption theory is readily available in a greater proportion of instances than evidence for authorship on the origination theory. The names of the people writing material for annual reports are rarely known, but the body claiming credit for the report generally has proclaimed its name on the title page. It is far better for a library catalog to stick with the assumption theory entirely than to make a futile attempt to be a local substitute for Halkett and Laing.

Among authorial tasks are originating ideas, writing, adapting, revising, compiling, and editing. All of these, it will be noted, are complexes of tasks. Unfortunately, after a long analysis, it turns out that no one of these, or any set pattern of them, is in all circumstances a sufficient condition to make us call the person performing them the author. On the other hand, we can describe family resemblances among many cases. We appear to have what may be called executive mastery of the concept of authorship; that is, we can recognize instances of it very well, but we can’t so easily describe or analyze it. It is much like walking. We can do it, but we find it hard to describe.

With respect to corporate authorship, let us start with the obvious. A person always puts corporate ideas into words. Before publishing the results a corporate body has to assume responsibility for the writing up...
of its ideas. Its ideas, in turn, are something which come from persons. Yet the body assumes responsibility for them through some procedure enunciated in its constitution. For example, because the head of the organization sets forth the ideas under certain circumstances, they become the ideas of the organization. The organization is now their author.

The Authorship of Serials

The above analysis can be applied mutatis mutandis to the editing of serials containing separate identifiable contributions from various writers. Indeed, editing in the sense of selecting previously written material is an authorial task.

However, whether editing or compiling material is sufficiently "authorial" to require main entry under the heading for an editor or compiler is open to question. With respect to monographic publicationsAACR has not considered corporate bodies compilers or editors. This is an inconsistency, only partly and badly remedied with respect to serial publications by the present text of AACR 6. More fundamental is the nature of the problem as perceived in the international cataloging community. Paragraph 10.3 of the Paris Principles, dealing with collections, bears a minority text. The majority view, not followed by the United States delegation to the conference, favors, with exceptions, entry under title. That the majority was not unshakable is revealed in subparagraph 10.34, where we are told that main entry may be under the heading for the compiler if his name appears prominently (whatever that is) on the title page. We should criticize this weakness in the majority text on the grounds that ascription of authorship on the basis of subjective considerations of typography is nothing more than the blind following of nonprobative evidence.

Consonant with the majority view of paragraph 10.3 (excluding 10.34) the recent revision of AACR 4 and 5 will result in main entry of all compilations and works produced under editorial direction under their titles. As in the earlier versions of AACR 4 and 5, serials, works of corporate authorship, and proceedings of conferences are excluded. To make the proposal presented here work, the first two of these exceptions will have to be removed. In that case, entry of many serials will be under title. Certainly, the vast majority of periodicals, monographic series, yearbooks, and the like will now be entered under title. By the same token, it appears that theater programs, auction catalogs, corporate annual reports, and the like will continue to be entered under the names of their authors. Added entries rather than main entries will be given for the names of bodies appearing in the titles, bodies assuming editorial responsibility, and the like. But corporate annual reports will continue to be entered under the headings for corporate bodies—now as authors, not as names derived from their titles.

The Advantages of Abolition of Special Rules for Entry of Serials

Since the revision of rule 4, the use of a generic title as main entry
for monographs is becoming more frequent. Many compilations have titles beginning “Studies in,” “Introduction to,” “Papers on,” etc. Hence the presence of even more filing elements beginning with generic titles will no longer constitute a block to the adoption of this proposal for serials entry.

Abolition of special rules for entry of serials would cause many problems in the cataloging of pseudoserials to disappear, for they would receive the same kind of main entry that they would if they were considered monographs. Ad hoc decisions concerning entry of such publications as court reports (for which there is no conclusive treatment in the North American text of AACR) would no longer be necessary. Case-by-case decisions, resulting perhaps from pressure from libraries outside LC for entering publications of doubtful form either as serials or monographs, would be required much less frequently. Finally, there would be eliminated one more rule starting “In case of doubt . . .” when there is no criterion for what constitutes sufficient doubt.

It is often said that the main entry for a serial in a library catalog should be identical with that found in the serial record. There is no good reason why this should be so as long as two conditions obtain: (1) the number of pieces controlled by both entries is identical, and (2) each entry must be readily accessible from the other—that is, there must be references if the entries vary.

Finally, the abolition of special rules for serials entry would permit the description of a serial prepared under a new system to be filed under its initial element in the catalog without interfering with the integrity of an author catalog.
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AACR, ISBD(S) and ISSN: A Comment

By DEFINITION, a code is a system of principles, rules, or regulations relating to one subject. In relation to cataloging, the more important principles that obtain, and which are reflected to varying degrees in each cataloging code since Cutter, can be summarized or paraphrased as follows:

1. Assertion and definition of authorship responsibility;
2. Consistent procedures for bibliographic identification and control;
3. The application of rules and regulations in a consistent manner irrespective of type or form of material; and
4. The preparation of a product which will be useful to users.

Tracing the treatment of serials in the cataloging codes developed within the United States since Cutter is a task of considerable difficulty. Though the idea and definition of a serial publication is clearly set forth in Cutter, his rules, and those of all subsequent codes until AACR, immediately and confusingly establish separate and often contradictory additional conditions and/or rules for the treatment of such forms as periodicals, continuations, and newspapers. The ambiguity is...
bewildering to the novice and frustrating to experienced serials catalogers. In a sense, one can characterize this seeming inconsistency or ambiguity as the result of an attempt on the part of code makers to be consistent with established or recognized principles, arranged by priority. The problem, however, is which of the several principles are being considered, in what order they are being applied, and whether this represents the best ordering of principles. In essence, it is similar to the process of constructing a classification schedule in which a choice must be made concerning which aspect or characteristic is to be applied in defining a subclass.

The Achievement of AACR

The problem in the codes which preceded AACR is not that their authors did not appreciate the practical problems involved in serials control nor that the principles were invalid or inadequate, but rather that the authors chose the wrong order of priority in attempting to develop rules to handle serials material. The solution is simple: reexamine principles and their priority and revise the rules for serials according to this revised ordering of principles.

In a very real sense, the authors of AACR attempted to do exactly this and they are to be commended for attempting to develop a single, integrated rule that treats all materials sharing the essential characteristics of a serial—that of being issued in parts and intended to continue indefinitely—consistently. The attempt was less than completely successful, however, and it is regrettable that the principle of usefulness or practicality (as reflected in rule 5 of ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries or Paris Principle rule 9.12) was not applied, instead of the concept of authorship responsibility. If it had been, the problem that exists today would not exist or would be far less critical. Admitting the difficulty in achieving a complete consensus on what is practical or useful, there is nonetheless fairly wide agreement that the 1949 ALA rules provide a definition of practicality which is useful: distinctive as opposed to nondistinctive or generic.

It follows, then, that AACR rule 6 should not be abandoned. The concept of “serial” as a generic term which subsumes all materials sharing an essential characteristic is an important advance over previous codes; it conforms with the intent of the Paris Principles; it is valid relative to the basic principles of cataloging theory. The rule should be revised, however, to provide that if a title is distinctive, entry under title is preferred; if it is not, entry under author is preferred. There are problems in defining “distinctive,” but these problems are far less complex and confusing than the conditional judgments required of a serials cataloger by the present rule 6. Guidelines for determining the distinctiveness of titles have been developed which are reasonable and sound. Ironically, perhaps, these guidelines have been developed and are being used by the National Serials Data Program and International Standard Data System (ISDS) centers throughout the world. These guidelines
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should be studied carefully and considered in revising AACR rule 6.

Proposed Changes in AACR

Let us now consider the currently recommended replacement for AACR rule 6. The issue is confusing in that there are in fact two separate standards involved: the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), which requires the assignment of both a number and a corresponding "key-title"; and ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials, which attempts to incorporate and/or accommodate the concept of "key-title." This incorporation or accommodation is less than perfect in the present draft of ISBD(S).

It should be noted at the outset that these are standards rather than codes. Their self-proclaimed scope or objective is to develop specifications for the physical description of serials currently published. Neither professes to be concerned with the basic concept of cataloging. ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications clearly and repeatedly states that it is concerned with bibliographic description only and not with choice or form of entry, as does ISBD(S). Both standards clearly state their objectives and repeatedly identify their limitations.

If one persists in refusing to acknowledge these factors and attempts to use a standard in a way in which it is not intended to be used, confusion and complexity will be the inevitable result.

For the purpose of illustration, let us assume that it would be possible and/or desirable to superimpose these two standards on AACR and examine the possible results. In this hypothetical context, what would be the impact on (1) retrospective records and catalogs, (2) the method of accessing serials files, and (3) the cataloging activity? What kinds of problems may we expect? What is the relative importance of these problems?

Retrospective Catalogs

Though the treatment of serials has varied from one code to another, the changes have been relatively minor and, more importantly, the changes have been made in an evolutionary manner, allowing catalogers to build a mechanism to incorporate and accommodate these changes while preserving the integrity and continuity of card catalogs and library collections. Not that the results are ideal with respect to the card catalog. Catalogs today are patched and often makeshift. To what degree this patching has undermined the effectiveness and efficiency of the catalog is impossible to calculate.

The ISBD(S) conventions, on the other hand, relative to past code changes, are radical in a variety of ways. Most importantly, they abrogate at least two of the basic principles of cataloging: authorship responsibility and respect for form of material. Catalog records produced using ISBD(S) would be far more difficult to integrate into retrospective card catalogs than has been the case under previous code changes.
The effect of such an integration on retrospective catalogs would be negative and pervasive and would destroy eventually the hallmark of catalogs in the United States—integrated files containing records independent of type or form of material. With information being packaged in ever-differing formats, the need to produce a tool to control, access, and display information becomes increasingly critical. Catalogs in the United States today, including records of many media and based on cataloging rules which are independent of form of material, have achieved a level of excellence and usefulness rarely equalled and never excelled. Destroying these qualities simply to accommodate the requirements of largely untested standards would be irresponsible.

Mode of Operation

ISBD and ISSN were developed largely within the context of satisfying computer requirements, an environment wherein the options provided by rapid and mechanical searching and matching operations compensate, supposedly, for the traditional control provided by cross-references and multiple entries or cards. The files and catalogs into which serials catalog cards are filed, however, vary widely. A card catalog, for example, can compensate in part for the limitation of slowness of access in a manual environment through secondary entries, but a serials check-in file, which usually is a single-entry file, cannot.

The point is that the virtue of ISBD and ISSN is also a limitation, and a serious one, when the environment or context of use is changed. Library automation is developing rapidly and in many areas. It is lagging, however, in the area of serials control. Even the most optimistic computer technician admits that it will be some time before a fully integrated serials control system will be achieved, and even longer before such systems will be widely used.

Stated in a slightly different manner, computer processing for searching, manipulating, updating, and displaying serial data in an on-line mode is still in the future (perhaps the distant future) for the majority of libraries in the United States today. For many years to come libraries will have to depend on and use manual files and catalogs, a great number of which will be single-entry files. How effective are these standards if viewed in this context?

The Cataloging Activity

In serials cataloging, the basic intent is to describe the bibliographic unit, not the physical piece. Therefore, conventions and rules attempt either to accommodate or to disregard minor variations and changes. Both ISBD(S) and ISSN, by contrast, stress the physical description of an item as taken from a single piece at one point in time. As the elements of this description change, especially with respect to title, a new record must be created.
What kinds of problems will this requirement present if imposed on a practical cataloging environment? It is difficult to say with precision, but some sense of their magnitude may be realized by considering the recent decision to abandon AACR rule 162 B dealing with the fullness of title to be recorded in the title paragraph. The rules for assigning a key-title are dependent upon the exact wording as it appears on a specific piece, as shown by the fact that the National Serials Data Program (NSDP) requires that a surrogate (i.e., photocopy) of the title page used as the source of cataloging be submitted before an ISSN or a key-title is assigned. Even minor variations in the title proper may require that a new ISSN and a new key-title be assigned.

What impact will minor variations in wording within the title proper have in such a system? Consider the variations that can and do occur with great regularity in government serials, where on one piece the title may read "Report of the . . .," on the next simply "Report," and so on. Each of these will require new cataloging and the assignment of a new ISSN and new key-title according to the current ISBD and ISSN rules and conventions.

Conclusion

A recent sample of the New York Public Library Research Libraries’ Central Serial Record, a file of approximately 90,000 currently received serials, revealed that 54 percent, or approximately 48,600 titles, are entered under author and that 95 percent of the authors are corporate authors. Of the 48,600 titles entered under author, 50–55 percent (25,000–27,000) have generic titles such as "report," "proceedings," etc., a fact which argues against arbitrary title entry. It is clear that not only will a massive quantity of material be affected, but that over half of the titles affected will be generic titles, the kind which is most difficult to accommodate within the key-title convention.

The recommendation to abandon AACR 6 should be rejected because of the adverse impact it will have on the quality, integrity, and continuity of existing library catalogs and library collections. Rather, the rule should be revised to preserve the significant advances that AACR 6 reflects over previous codes: an inclusive definition of serial and a single integrated rule. In addition, consideration should be given to applying the simpler, pragmatic condition of whether a title is distinctive or not in deciding whether to enter under author or title.

ISBD and ISSN are important emerging standards that promise to have considerable effect on the bibliographic control of serial materials. Their advantages must be carefully studied and wherever possible accommodated by cataloging codes and integrated into catalog records. However, these standards and their conventions should not be considered as a replacement for cataloging rules or codes. To do so would be to create confusion. The objectives of these standards are decidedly different from the objectives of a cataloging code.
Discrepancies between descriptions of serials as provided in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules and recent international standards are discussed. Increasing compatibility is identified. The major goal of the ISDS is stated to be the provision of a formal identification structure for representing a serial.

Much of the current impetus for a revision of the rules for entry of serials stems from a concern that the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) be compatible with emerging international standards. The ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials addresses itself to matters of description and visual display of the bibliographic elements associated with serials—not to choice of entry per se. However, the International Serials Data System (ISDS) network with its guidelines for determining the entry to which an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) is assigned does have greater implications for choice of entry for serials.

In order to regulate the allocation of ISSN, it was internationally agreed that a citation acceptable to all ISDS participants would be used for serials to which ISSN are assigned. In the absence of any standardized international cataloging code for serials, the concept of the key title as a control citation was incorporated as the “handle” to which the ISSN is assigned in any given ISDS bibliographic record. A new ISSN is assigned and a new bibliographic record is generated only when the key title undergoes what has been defined in the Guidelines for ISDS as a “major change.”

According to these Guidelines, each key title is “inseparably associated with its ISSN” as a control mechanism within the ISDS network. As the citation to which the ISSN is assigned, the key title thus becomes a kind of “main entry” in ISDS files. Effective use of the ISSN by li-
braries, abstracting/indexing services, and subscription agencies is obviously facilitated if the key title concept is incorporated in the files of these various communities. However, it is not a mandatory requirement for successful utilization of the ISSN. One of the prime benefits to be gained from the ISSN system is its ability to provide a universally applicable, brief, and unambiguous code by which serial publications can be identified, regardless of the type or form of citation used: author/title entry, title entry, journal title abbreviation, key title, etc. The number serves as a common denominator which can bridge or link the varying identification conventions of libraries, abstracting/indexing services, subscription agents, and publishers or distributors. This universality of the ISSN constitutes the major value of the system, rather than any value inherent in the key title concept, which should be viewed in the perspective of a necessary internal device within the ISDS network to control ISSN registration.

What is essential for successful use of the ISSN, however, is that the bibliographic entity created according to any given set of cataloging rules or conventions be compatible with the bibliographic entity created by a key title in the ISDS system. This can be done without abandoning the AACR concept of authorship and without adopting a title-main-entry approach for all serials. Howard's discussion of some of the current discrepancies between AACR and the key title concept of ISDS presents two equally viable approaches to a resolution of these differences. The first suggests title main entry for all serials which, as previously indicated, would obviously achieve successful compatibility between the two systems. His second alternative, however, would also provide a sound basis for an equally satisfying solution. In this proposal it is suggested that AACR be amended to require title main entry for all serials except those titles which consist of a generic term or which begin with a generic term followed only by the name of the issuing body, in which case the serial is entered under the name of the corporate agency. This ideally provides for a direct correspondence between an AACR bibliographic record and an ISDS record, since a change in an AACR main entry would also be considered a change in the key title.

Additional specifications for resolving the differences between what constitutes major and minor changes according to AACR and ISDS are still required in order to assure a more complete compatibility between the two systems. The Guidelines for ISDS provides explicit criteria for determining when a change is of sufficient importance to warrant the creation of a new record and when it is of such minor significance that it is simply noted in the existing record. Although AACR is not as exact in its specifications, there appears to be general agreement between the two systems on what constitutes a major change. However, in characterizing minor changes, there are some rather important discrepancies between the two approaches. This stems largely from the lack of consideration given by ISDS to the effect a change will have on the location of
a given title in an alphabetical file. Thus what would be a minor change in the ISDS system may indeed be considered a major change according to the guidelines provided in AACR.

Other problems also remain in the rules for transcription of title between AACR, the Guidelines for ISDS, and ISBD(S) which can affect the compatibility of bibliographic entities. Several of these have been identified and proposals designed to achieve compatibility presented in the “North American Response” to ISBD(S). These conflicts in major/minor change characteristics and the transcription of title should not be minimized, for they can greatly affect how a title is handled in any given system. However, their resolution is not an unrealistic expectation, and the problems are being addressed by the appropriate national as well as international committees and cataloging agencies.

To support the ISSN and key title in an ISDS bibliographic record, additional data elements, considered essential to the identification of any given serial, are also included in the ISDS files. These bibliographic requirements of the ISDS are not as full nor as detailed in their specifications as are those of the AACR, since the ISDS network intends to provide a basic bibliographic record which meets the general needs of an international community. Each national center, or national cataloging agency, however, is permitted and encouraged to augment the basic ISDS record in its own files with the necessary data elements required to meet the needs of national users. Thus an ISDS record serves as the basis for documenting ISSN registration and also provides an internationally acceptable “building block” upon which national cataloging agencies and others can base a complete bibliographic record suitable to the needs and requirements of their constituencies.

To summarize, the function of the ISDS, if applied in the manner for which it is intended, is not to impose a strict “key title” approach (or even a title approach) to serials by the various users of the system. Indeed, such a requirement could jeopardize potential use of the ISSN by institutions whose existing files would not be well served by such a drastic change. The requirements of ISSN and of the ISDS network do not dictate a title main entry approach for all serials. The primary goal of the ISDS is to provide a formal identification structure (the ISSN) which can effectively represent a serial, regardless of the form of citation, as long as the bibliographic entities are compatible.
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In the planning of the CONSER (CONversion of SERials) Project a number of decisions had to be made with regard to the bibliographic conventions to be used. To understand these decisions, a review of the history of serials cataloging conventions used in North America and a discussion of the existing and proposed international standards as they affect the collection of bibliographic data on serials are highlighted. The major functional differences among these codes and practices are discussed briefly. The major bibliographic compromises and their rationale within the CONSER Project are given.

Introduction

THE NEED for a relatively comprehensive machine-readable bibliographic data base of records of serial publications is generally recognized, particularly by those who have some responsibility for maintaining a serials file. Because of the many problems to be solved and the decisions to be made, possible approaches to the establishment of such a data base—one capable of being used by a number of institutions—generate considerable discussion and even controversy.

Assuming that the political and organizational considerations involved in constructing a project of this kind can be resolved, there remains yet another layer of decisions to be addressed—those having to do with technical considerations. This stratum of decisions can have subtle and profound effects on the utility of the product to be generated. Generally there are two classes of technical considerations; the first deals with the mechanics of the project and the second with the attributes of the product. Although the former should not determine the latter, the fact is that in many projects the mechanics often influence the characteristics of the product. When the product is a machine-readable bibliographic file, its attributes fall into three basic areas: (1) the format,
which includes the structure of the record and its constant designation, 
(2) the required data element depth or encoding level, and (3) the rules 
for the construction of the data or content of the record.

The project under consideration here is CONSER (CONversion of 
SERials), and the technical aspects under consideration are those deal-
ing with the content of the CONSER record (item three above). For the 
most part these considerations are applicable to any cooperative project 
dealing with bibliographic records, whether automated or manual. Other 
aspects of the project and the attributes of the product have been dis-
cussed recently.\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}}

In brief, the CONSER Project is an attempt to establish, in a two-to-
three-year period and with the cooperation of a number of institutions, 
a machine-readable data base containing records of 200,000 to 300,000 
serial titles. CONSER is not intended to become or to replace a national 
or international system; it is essentially a file-building exercise, with the 
resulting product to be available to the library community through the 
tape distribution services of the Library of Congress (LC) and the Na-
tional Library of Canada (NLC). It is hoped that this data base will 
serve as a source file of bibliographic information on serials in the gen-
eration of local catalogs of serials and union lists of serials on the re-
gional, national, and international levels. It is hoped also that the base 
will assist the International Serials Data System (ISDS) in expanding its 
registry of serials. CONSER is managed by the Council on Library Re-
sources (CLR) and uses the on-line facilities of the Ohio College Li-
brary Center (OCLC) system.

At the start, twelve institutions will share in building the file: the Li-
brary of Congress, the National Library of Canada, the National Li-
brary of Medicine, the National Agricultural Library, the State Univer-
sity of New York together with the New York State Library, Boston 
Theological Institute, the University of California, the University of 
Minnesota, University of Florida (Gainesville), Yale University, and 
Cornell University. Two national centers of the ISDS will also partici-
pate—the National Serials Data Program in the Library of Congress and 
the ISDS/Canada in the National Library of Canada.

It will perhaps be easier for the reader to comprehend the decisions 
that have been made for CONSER with respect to the bibliographic con-
ventions (rules for the construction of the data) to be used if we briefly 
review first, the history of the major cataloging codes, international 
agreements, and standards that have affected or are affecting serials cata-
loging practices in North America, and, second, the major attributes of 
and differences among these with respect to serials.

\textit{A Brief Chronology}

The bibliographic treatment of serials in the library catalogs in 
North America differs with the type, size, and age of the library. Small-
er, more specialized libraries have tended to simplify the treatment of 
serials, often not even integrating them into their general catalogs. In 
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large research libraries the rules for the treatment of serials are more often embedded in a general cataloging code. In North America for the better part of half a century, those codes were Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries (1908) and A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries (1949) (ALA).2,8

In 1961 a significant international conference in Paris produced a document popularly known as the “Paris Principles.”4 In 1967 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR), based for the most part on the Paris Principles, was published.6

In 1972 Unesco announced the creation of the International Centre of the International Serials Data System. Guidelines for ISDS,6 although not a cataloging code, does have an effect upon the existing codes.

The International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) in 1974 produced the final draft of ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials,7 which deals with the descriptive aspects of serials cataloging in the same way that ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications8 does for monographs.

AACR chapter 6 has been revised to accommodate ISBD(M), and present plans are to complete the revision of the entire code and include the consideration of a revised ISBD(S) proposal and the ISDS practices.

**Major Attributes of Catalog Codes**

The following five basic aspects must be considered when analyzing and comparing the various codes and standards.

1. **Corporate Authorship.** The role of corporate authors in the cataloging codes in North America has been very important. In order to gather together the publications of a corporate body under one heading and to deal with the hierarchical relationships within organizations, rules have been developed within many cataloging codes (such as ALA and AACR) for the creation of a structured form of a name heading. These rules vary among the codes. Another difference in the treatment of corporate authors among the various codes is the extent to which and under what conditions the corporate body is given credit for the authorship.

2. **Choice of Entry.** Assuming the concept of authorship, the choice remains between using the author or the title as the primary point of access. With today’s technology providing convenient and economically justifiable means of establishing multiple entries or access points, the distinction between the main entry and added entries may seem academic, but with regard to serials there remains utility in making this distinction. First, it is desirable to place the location and holding statement data under one entry. Second, choice of entry (main entry) affects another aspect of the bibliographic control of serials, namely, the decision relating to when to create a new record (discussed below).

3. **Entry Changes.** Organizations have a propensity to change the
names of the serials they issue, to split them into multiple serials, or to merge them with other serials. They have an equally troublesome practice of changing their own names, of merging with other organizations, or even of splitting into several organizations. It is therefore necessary to establish procedures in the control of serials in order to convey information on entry changes to the patron. Two basic approaches have been used. The first is the latest-title convention, in which the old record is modified with the new information, including the establishment of references from the older information. The net result is one updated record. The second approach is to close the old record and create a new record, establishing the appropriate linkages between the records. The net result is multiple records. As mentioned above, the choice of the main entry affects the implementation of both of these practices, particularly with regard to the action taken when there is a change in the name of the corporate author.

4. Title Construction. The rules for the transcription of the title vary among codes in two ways. First, there are the rules for the interpretation of the typography—the relative position and emphasis of words, and the grammatical linkages or lack of linkages between the generic terms and the statements of authorship—from which the title is being transcribed. The second deals with the code's requirements for uniqueness versus its concern with brevity.

5. Description. Most of the codes deal with the presentation of the data once it is ascertained. This refers to the sequence of the data elements plus the punctuation and indentation used in the display of the record.

The following is a summary of the above-mentioned considerations or concepts with respect to the codes, principles, and standards mentioned in the chronology. A further summary is given in Table 1.

*ALA* utilizes the concept of corporate authorship and provides rules for the structuring of the author heading. It often uses this heading as the main entry. The code uses the latest-title convention and abbreviates the title statement when the main entry is the author and the title contains a generic term. It prescribes a format for the description.

*AACR* is basically similar to *ALA* in its recognition of the possibility of corporate authorship for serials and in the rules for form of name for corporate agencies. However, *AACR* uses corporate author as main entry more frequently than *ALA* or the Paris Principles and there is some variation in form of entry between the two codes. (The American Library Association's Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) voted on 1 July 1975 in favor of the title entry approach. This issue has to be discussed and approved by the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of *AACR* before it can be included in the revised *AACR*, but its prospect is much brighter now. CCRC is also reconsidering the definition of corporate author and the related concept of issuing body.) *AACR* uses the successive-title convention and until recently did not provide for including the name of a corporate author in the author state-
ment for serials with generic titles entered under corporate author. 

AACR also prescribes a format for the presentation.

As the term implies, the Paris Principles are not a cataloging code but a set of principles on which cataloging codes might be based. The principles subscribe to the concept of corporate authorship as a main entry, but not to the extent that AACR does for serials. The principles advocate the use of the successive-title convention and do not deal with title construction nor with the descriptive aspects of cataloging.

As stated before, Guidelines for ISDS is not a cataloging code but rather rules used in the establishment of an international registry of serials. The Guidelines are not concerned with the concept of authorship and deal only with the descriptive aspects of the presentation of the title. They are essentially concerned with the establishment of a unique title (the key title) and its associated unique number (the International Standard Serials Number (ISSN)). In order to make this title unique, it is sometimes necessary to qualify the title with additional data such as dates or places of publication. Only the National Centers, or in lieu of a National Center, the International Centres can assign the ISSN and establish the official key title.

ISBD (S) is concerned with the descriptive aspects of serials cataloging, that is, the sequence and punctuation of a prescribed set of data elements. There is to be an ISBD(S) revision meeting in October 1975 in Paris to work on the existing draft and the responses from the various library communities. The Library of Congress, the Catalog Code Revision Committee of ALA, and the Canadian Committee on Cataloging have already submitted a joint response.

Present Cataloging Practices

AACR has been the officially adopted standard for cataloging in North America since 1967, but there is some evidence that few libraries adhere completely to its rules. The National Library of Canada is one of the few institutions that subscribe to it in full. But the Library of Congress and most other large research libraries, which depend in part on the cataloging of LC, have made exceptions to the rules. LC's current policy of "superimposition," which calls for continuing to use headings already established by LC under ALA in that form rather than the form suggested by AACR, is currently being reviewed and may be abandoned, resulting in a policy of "desuperimposition." The second major deviation which was dropped in 1971, was the use of the latest-title convention for serials entered under title. LC now uses the successive-title convention.

Since the policy of superimposition at LC is based on its cataloged collection, which, of course, differs from that of other institutions, there exist differences between the LC form of headings and the local form of headings at other libraries. The mixture of latest-title and successive-title cataloging and the use of different rules for the form of heading create an internal inconsistency for any one catalog. Much more critical
are the major problems created by the inconsistencies for compilers of union lists, since the differing local practices must be reconciled. These problems are not just CONSER's problems, for they exist with or without CONSER. They have come to the fore now because of CONSER's projected size and visibility. Since it is CONSER's aim to produce a data base which will be both authoritative and comprehensive, the solutions to these problems are a major concern of the project.

Compromises in the CONSER Project

CONSER is not a union list project, for it will not be collecting the holding statements of the participating institutions, although some will be inputting this data of their own accord. CONSER does share the bibliographic problems of most union list efforts, since it will be collecting data for use by union list projects as well as in local catalogs. The records in the CONSER data base will be converted from the records in the files of the participants. The Centers of Responsibility (LC and NLC) will authenticate certain elements of these records to ensure some degree of consistency. Three basic areas of concern are (1) form of name heading, (2) choice of entry, and (3) the successive- and latest-title conventions.

The Centers of Responsibility will authenticate the form of the name heading according to AACR. NLC will work on the Canadian headings and LC will work on all others. The degree to which LC will be able to do this will depend in part on whether or not it decides to desuperimpose. If LC does not desuperimpose, the authentication of those records that might be affected will be deferred. If it does desuperimpose, its timing and strategy in doing so will affect the speed of authentication.

For the most part, the decision of the inputting library about the choice of entry will be accepted. However, the Centers of Responsibility will reserve the right to modify it. The reasons for this decision were that:

1. This cataloging decision is based on an interpretation of the existing rules, which in some areas are not as precise as could be desired, and it is dependent on the information available at the time of cataloging.
2. AACR is currently under revision and the present rules will probably be modified. Any concerted effort to authenticate this aspect of the record could result in wasted effort.
3. Under the current rules as revised, no truncation of the title is allowed. (The term "truncation" is used here to refer to the prac-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Structured Use of Corporate Authorship</th>
<th>Use of Author as Main Heading Convention</th>
<th>Latest or Successive Title Convention</th>
<th>Title Truncated or as on the Piece</th>
<th>Descriptive Convention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA Paris Principles</td>
<td>Yes* Frequent</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Latest</td>
<td>Truncated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACR</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Greatest</td>
<td>Successive</td>
<td>Truncated before May 1974; as on piece since then</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISDS</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
<td>Successive</td>
<td>As on the piece, plus qualifiers if necessary to make it unique</td>
<td>For title only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBD (S)</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
<td>n.a.†</td>
<td>As on the piece</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSER</td>
<td>Accepts ALA or AACR; will authenticate on AACR entries</td>
<td>Accepts all entries, prefers AACR entries</td>
<td>Duplicate records permitted</td>
<td>Both as AACR and ISDS</td>
<td>Yes (AACR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Conventions not identical.
† Not applicable.

The most significant compromise which has been made relates to latest-title versus successive-title convention. Both forms of cataloging will be allowed. This will result in some duplication of records where the same serial is entered by both the latest-title and successive-title conventions. This decision was made for several reasons: (1) the amount of recataloging required at either the participating institution or at the Centers of Responsibility will be reduced; (2) the outcome of the revision of AACR in this area is uncertain; (3) if title main entry concept is accepted and if the project should require the participants to break up the records based on the current rules, those records that were split.
because of the change in the author's name would have to be corrected.

A negative aspect of this decision is that it will require more work at the ISDS centers, since they can assign key titles and ISSN only to successive-title records. However, the most current latest-title entry corresponds closely to the successive-title record version of the same title. Some fields will have to be modified, but not many.

Another policy that has been established, not directly related to the bibliographic conventions but of some interest, is that in the initial stages of the project all the participants will concentrate on current imprints—that is, open entries or titles that are still being published. The rationale behind this decision is that this subset of the serials universe is the most heavily used; therefore it is most important to provide access to it as soon as possible.

Conclusion

Many of the decisions made for CONSER with regard to the bibliographic conventions are compromises. The factors that influenced these policies included cost considerations; the state of the existing files; the influence of past, present, and proposed standards and cataloging codes; and the goal of creating a comprehensive yet authoritative data base. These decisions were not made in a vacuum, but were made by the CONSER Advisory Group, which includes representatives of many of the major library organizations and indexing and abstracting services. The decisions were pragmatic and were made with the realization that CONSER is not the final solution but a step toward that solution.
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Library networks are seen to have five basic components: resources, directories, communications, users, and management. Network success is dependent on perception of mutual benefit by participants. The relationship between technology and network operations is explored. The open nature of the environment and the crucial staff skill requirements for cooperation are briefly presented.

Introduction

Library resource sharing experiments and library consortia have mushroomed in recent years as libraries entered a time of fluctuating economic support. Budget restrictions and changes in the pattern of federal support for libraries have resulted in substantial shifts in library perceptions of the potential benefits of resource sharing organizations.

Library cooperatives and consortia are widespread enough, and sufficient experience has accumulated to support some general observations on the nature of the library resource sharing interaction.

Library Resource Sharing

Library resource sharing may accurately be described as a network interaction with five network components. The interaction takes place in...
an open rather than in a closed environment, requires special skills, and may stand or fall on the basis of organizational behavior factors. The level of activity on the network is interdependent with the technology in use.

The Components of Library Resource Sharing

Library resource sharing as a network interaction has the same five components as any other network: resources, directories, communications, users, and management.

Depending on the nature of the resource sharing activity, the resources component may be existing collections of books, journals, special collections, and nonbook materials held by participating libraries, or it may be the power to purchase such resources in coordinated fashion. In other cases the resource may be a large, accessible bibliographical data base (e.g., the Ohio College Library Center), a shareable computerized information system or any other holding or service useful to other libraries.

The directories component consists of the index or detailed listing of the resource component for library network users. The range of forms the directories take is wide: from the card catalogs of participating research libraries to a union catalog of public libraries, from microform catalogs to on-line indexes to computerized bibliographical data bases. The elements of this component in a typical library network not only include the collection access tools and their equivalents but also the circulation files which contain information on what is, or is not, available for circulation to network or consortium users.

The communications component consists of the link among the participating libraries as nodes in the network. In its most glamorous (and expensive) form, the communications link may be a microwave hookup transmitting video and computer data. It can also be as prosaic and prac-
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tical as a station wagon delivery service or as slow as the postman.

The users of a library network vary according to the nature of the resource sharing activity. In a configuration of libraries sharing the use of book collections, the network users are that subset of library users who cannot find the item or subject they need in their home library and request that it be located for them. In shared use of a large bibliographical data base, the users may be catalogers or library staff performing bibliographical searches, or interlibrary loan librarians searching for locations of requested materials.

Network management, the fifth component, will be provided by an administrative arrangement at some point on a continuum from part-time staff assignments to a director and support staff employed to operate a separately incorporated agency.

Whatever the administrative configuration, the management component will carry out four basic functions. Management will provide an overview and day-to-day operational control of network activities, especially the communications function with its configuration, protocols, and operational state. Management functions to manage the suppliers of network services in a sharing mode without interfering with the autonomy of the node providing the service. Management will assist users in utilizing available network services. Management will also function as a service broker, bringing potential users and potential suppliers together, and aiding in the negotiation of arrangements for the exchange of services over the network.

In this context it should be noted that the network is a potential marketplace where service suppliers and users enter into exchanges to their mutual benefit through specialization of work efforts, aggregation of demand for services, wider distribution or increased product and service diversity, and lower overall costs.

Mutual Benefit

The concept of mutual benefit is crucial to success in library resource sharing. The dynamics of cooperation contrast sharply with the dynamics of competition. Cooperation occurs successfully only in a win/win situation where each participant library receives a benefit that advances library towards its individual goals and objectives. The situation is one the experts term a non-zero-sum power relationship. Each library, both as giver and as receiver, is strengthened by the interaction. This occurs at the opposite end of the spectrum from a competitive situation where each library gains something only at the expense of the others. If the benefit is not mutual, cooperation will not succeed, will, in fact, die a quite early death, whether recognized or not.

Technology and Resource Sharing

The nature of the technology utilized by a library resource sharing network is determined by the level of transaction activity. And it should be noted that the level of activity is far more likely to be a function of
policy than a function of demand. Ordinary supply and demand factors are usually almost completely inoperative in any direct way in a library network.

Traditional library technology will support a relatively low volume of activity. Card catalogs, telephone and mail queries for holdings information, entries in the National Union Catalog or in a state union catalog as directories, the use of the postal service for interlibrary communications and delivery, and management of the interaction by interlibrary loan staff can reach only so far, serving those users whose requests can survive a time frame extending over several weeks.

When policy determinations indicate that additional user categories can be served by the network, there will almost inevitably be a change in technology. Mail queries will have to be replaced by teletype or extensive telephone use. The card catalogs that functioned as directories will have to be converted into a more shareable form (possibly microform or machine-readable data) that can be distributed to users located at the other nodes in the network. The delays encountered in the use of the postal service will have to be circumvented by use of commercial delivery services or a delivery service operated by network management. Technological change will impact most heavily on the directories and communications components of the network.

The Environment Is Open

Systems analysts from the turn of the century development of scientific management have made the tacit assumption that the systems they dealt with were determinate or closed systems. The closed system viewpoint may be effective to some extent inside the parameters of a single library, but it is demonstrably unfit for viewing the complexities of interlibrary interactions.

The environment in which a library cooperative or network functions is definitely open. In any library resource sharing venture it is obvious to participants that the variables and relationships are far too numerous and complex ever to be perfectly known, the goals are far from perfectly defined, and the variables are more than a little uncontrollable and unpredictable. Think of a public library with twenty branches combined in a multichannel cooperative with a university library that has a dozen branches.

Cooperation and Skill Requirements

Library cooperation appears deceptively simple on the surface, and libraries are so convinced that they have been cooperating with each other for years, as they have, that they often have no warning of the cascade of problems that arises in the development of a more complex network. As the volume of activity rises above that which can be comfortably accommodated by the postal service, not only does the technology change, but so do the skill requirements.

At first glance the skills required for the operation of a library net-
work appear to be those required to manage the logistics of the interaction—which are complex enough. Even brief experience, however, quickly proves that there is an undercurrent here that tends to drag down the unwary network. Problem analysis reveals difficulties related to the boundary spanning nature of network transactions. Any transaction in a network is likely to cross several boundaries, all of which are as real and psychologically formidable as they are invisible.

In a university library consortium, for example, a staff member calling a counterpart librarian in another member library must cross four boundaries: home library, home campus, other member campus, and other member library. For public libraries substitute the appropriate jurisdiction for campus, and the effect is the same.

When counterpart librarians discuss a consortium matter, the four boundaries are in place and operating. Staff members on both sides tend to think in terms of the practices of their own library and inadvertently make assumptions about the other library that do not quite fit. When the almost inevitable problems arise, the staff seldom suspects their own transparent assumptions, quite naturally tending to shift the blame to the opposite side. Soon a number of communication channels begin to shut down without fanfare. When library departments get grouchy with each other and staff become reluctant to talk across boundaries, the network can count on serious problems, including notification of users that the other library is already not cooperating.

Fortunately for librarians involved in networks facing such problems and interested in solutions, there is a set of techniques known to university schools of management and certain consultant firms as “Organization Development” or “OD.” A good OD practitioner can help a library cooperative help itself by working out communications problems and constructing effective interlibrary working teams that can maintain forward motion.

But the need for specialized skills is not limited simply to those required for library-to-library network operation. As the volume of network transactions increases (and it will when the teams begin to function if not before), there will be a need to change the technology employed by the network. The need for certain specialized skills will be highest when the library attempts to utilize computers, but will exist to some degree with any technology, be it microform, telefacsimile, or interlibrary bus.

To effectively change the technology, the library must successfully bridge the chasm between the book-oriented world of the library and the high pressure marketing world of the vendor of the devices of technology. To do this successfully requires a different type of boundary spanning skills than that needed for network operation. The library will need a staff member or team who can uncover the functional specifications of the system, utilizing the technology due for change. The team will have to uncover the specifications in the undocumented stream of library procedures, work up detailed general specifications, write detailed accept-
ance test specifications, get both sets into the contract that the library and the vendor sign, keep track of the vendor's progress, and do the necessary translation until the vendor fulfills the contract. And this will be as difficult and complex as it sounds.

Sociological Models

Given the complexities just outlined, there is a natural tendency to seek outside help, and a certain amount of help is available in the form of two sociological models.

Sloan has developed an exchange model of library cooperation which casts considerable light on the factors that influence the formation of library networks.\(^2\) Thompson has developed a much more complex but equally applicable organization action model that can be used to describe operations of a library network like any other complex organization in an open environment.\(^3\)

Briefly, then, a library cooperative can be viewed as a network with
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five components functioning interdependently in an open environment where uncertainty is to be expected. Operation of a library network requires boundary spanning skills not only between libraries but also between libraries and vendors of advanced technology.
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BIBLIOGRAPHY OF REFERENCES TO MAPS

A new British standard makes recommendations for the presentation of information in bibliographical references to maps in accessions lists. BSI was asked to prepare a standard by map librarians and map curators, who have found that the description of a map in one catalog can be so different from a description of the same map in another catalog that they may be misled into thinking that two different maps are being described and ordering a copy of a map which they later find is already in their collection. The title is BS 5195 *Recommendations for Bibliographical References to Maps and Charts, Part 1 References in Accessions Lists*.

The standard applies to single-sheet maps, multisheet maps, maps in series, and maps in atlases. It lists the essential elements required to describe modern printed maps, modern manuscript maps, early printed maps, and early manuscript maps, and the supplementary elements which may be necessary for a full description. It recommends the order in which the descriptive elements should be presented. Examples of references which conform to the standard are given in an appendix. Part 2 of the standard will deal with references in books and articles.

Copies of BS 5195 Part 1 are available from BSI Sales Department, 101 Pentonville Rd., London N1 9ND England. The price is £2.10 including postage.
A pragmatic book allocation formula for academic and public libraries with a test for its effectiveness*

William E. McGrath
Director of Libraries
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana

A simple and pragmatic empirical book fund allocation procedure which can be used either in academic or public libraries is described. The procedure uses (1) library circulation data, literally interpreting it as demand, and (2) average price of books in subject categories. For academic libraries, the subject categories can be either those related directly to academic departments, which are the usual recipients of allocations, or the divisions of the Dewey Decimal or Library of Congress classifications. For public libraries, the Dewey divisions suffice. A simple test for the effectiveness of allocation is to correlate current buying, or the distribution of books in the shelflist, with the distribution of circulation, using any nonparametric correlation statistic, such as Spearman's rank order statistic. If the correlations are high, the allocations are satisfactory. If low, the procedure should be reexamined.

Equitable and logical allocation of book buying funds continues to be a paramount problem in libraries. In small libraries the problem has always been acute. And now the large libraries, especially those which in the last twenty to twenty-five years have built budgets which went far in meeting their needs, now must look for additional means to stretch their shrinking dollars.

Whereas in previous years many allocation formulas were contrived to appease faculties, library committees, or boards, now these formulas must make sense. They must be based on sound theory backed up by empirical data. The difficulty is that no such theory has yet been presented.

Until such a theory is developed, we may have to satisfy ourselves
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with unexplained empirical applications. One such empirical approach, using library circulation data, will be described here. It is a pragmatic method for allocating to subject categories. The reasoning behind it and a statistical procedure for evaluating the collection and current buying will also be described but with no attempt to "prove" or verify the procedure. With a slight adaptation it can be used for public or academic libraries. It does not consider allocations for periodicals, a necessarily separate procedure.

Empirical Justification

Two fundamentally different philosophies of acquisitions commonly espoused are (1) critical and (2) demand. Both philosophies have strong arguments and many adherents. Under the first, only books which meet some criteria of excellence are bought and no quantitative methods, however efficient, are permitted to override sound critical judgment when selecting books. The second permits only empirical evidence of demand to determine what a library should buy, and asserts that a book's quality is subordinate to its subject matter. This paper is not concerned with the arguments and will not attempt to arbitrate the two positions, other than by stating that a reconciliation is probably achieved by asserting critical judgment when selecting books in subject areas for which the empirical evidence indicates demand, or by reserving a portion of the budget for critical selection. Possession of critical expertise is assumed and will not be discussed. Instead, a pragmatic quantitative procedure for meeting demand will be described.

The word empirical is used here simply to indicate that hard data is collected from the real world of libraries, fitted to a theoretical model, and that a judgment or decision is made according to the quantitative features of the data. The model is simply, or simplistically: circulation equals demand. The model is simplistic because it does not include variables which should be included for a more complete theory, and thus the model is unverified. Obviously, there is a demand for some books which the library cannot fill because it does not own the books. In actuality, circulation reflects only that part of demand which the library is capable of filling. That part of demand which the library does not fill is much more difficult to measure. Since unsatisfied demand is not measured in this paper, we must limp along with the assumption that unsatisfied demand is proportional to satisfied demand. This untested assumption may result in less accurate prediction, but it is the purpose of this paper to offer a procedure that any librarian may easily apply without the necessity of elaborate and complex data collection. If the procedure is followed for several years, the library's collection should exhibit increasingly greater capability for filling all requests. Thus, though circulation may at present equal total requests minus unfilled requests, we can assume that the difference is small and will become smaller as the procedure is followed—if there is a nucleus of books on a given subject to begin with.
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The procedure suggested here has been used since 1969 at the University of Southwestern Louisiana and data are presented from the academic year 1972/73 to illustrate its application.

Other Work

Since this paper is not intended as a definitive study on the subject, no comprehensive review of the literature is included. A few related studies will be mentioned, however.

There is no magic minimum number of books a library must obtain to achieve excellence in a collection. Attempts to establish such standards, useful though they may have been in their time, have resulted in arbitrary minimums which have no empirical foundation. The well-known Clapp-Jordan formula is one such. Rather than adopt arbitrary formulas, a library must assure that its collection reflects the institution's stated purpose. A university's collection should reflect its curriculum. A public library's collection should reflect the community needs and programs. If the librarian is successful, the collection will be "well balanced," not just in the sense that all the traditional and classic subjects and titles are represented, but in the sense that books are owned in each subject in proportion to the volume of demand or need. Conceivably, a small library whose collection is balanced in this sense could serve its clientele more successfully than a large library whose collection is not so balanced and, therefore, size of library becomes meaningless as a measure of excellence.

An underlying assumption in this paper is that users are interested in the subject content of libraries. Therefore a thoughtful collection-building policy will consider user interests carefully. Kraft argues convincingly that

the overemphasis on authorship in our bibliographical apparatus obscures both the fact that libraries are essentially institutions for the preservation of thought processes and the fact that the value of these thought processes is independent from the form in which they appear and from the individuals who create them.

She reminds us that "the essential reason for the preservation of a graphic record is its contents." These thought processes are embodied in subjects. Bonn states that

the sole purpose of any library is to serve the needs of its authorized users, often called the library's community, and that any library survey must include a comprehensive study of the library's community, their interests, and their needs and of the actual use they make of the library.

A university's curriculum or a community's subject profile, when carefully described, are good frameworks for building library collections.

In an earlier article, the author tried to determine which of many possible indicators of library use (such as circulation, interlibrary loans, the number of people who used the library, the number of courses being taught, the number of credit hours, and so on) should have the
strongest weight among the several factors derived from the several variables. These factors in turn were used in a linear allocation formula. Experience with that formula and subsequent thinking showed more and more convincingly, though not conclusively, that, of the several variables studied, out-of-library use was the best indicator of demand for library books—at least in a circulating library. The large number of variables needed to derive the earlier formula made routine data collection and analysis unnecessarily complex. A simple formula with few variables was desired, one which would require little effort for data collection. Yet the variables had to be good indicators of demand.

Basically, the procedure is founded on the idea that demand should determine what the library buys; demand, in turn, is determined by use of the library. What is used is what people want. More accurately, what is used in one period (say, a year) determines what is bought in the following period. This is so because nothing can be bought, if we are to use this method, until after a sampling from the given period is taken. Rationale for this is provided by Fussler and Simon, and some of the author’s unpublished work showing a high linear correlation between usage in any two adjacent periods. Correlation was also suggested by Ranganathan, who remarks that “the scatter of subjects in book selection may be guided by their scatter in use.”

Large changes in adjacent periods would lessen justification for linear correlation as a basis for allocation. Over a long period large changes may well occur. Experience in the author’s library shows relatively small proportionate changes from one year to the next. Ideally, usage should be measured as currently as possible. More realistically, usage data will always be out of date by several months at least.

Reservations that out-of-library circulation does not accurately measure the true use of the library can be taken into account by adding in-library use to out-of-library use. The author has previously reported a high correlation between the subjects of books used in and taken out of the library. The data suggested that “circulation totals, when grouped into self-delineating spans, can be reliable indicators of the subjects being used within as well as out of the library,” and that if high accuracy is not required, only out-of-library circulation need be used. In a 1972 paper the author found that if a book matches academic subject interests, as defined and delineated by Dewey or Library of Congress (LC) classification number profiles for each department, then it is more likely to be charged out of the library. Overall, therefore, a book charged out probably indicates a more solid or lingering interest than in-library use. The findings of these two papers do not contradict each other. Even though out-of-library circulation and in-library circulation correlate highly with each other and with academic interests, out-of-library correlates more highly with academic interests than does in-library.

If library circulation were the sole variable chosen to determine dollar allocations to each category, however, the results would be biased because the average price for a book is obviously different in each of the
TABLE 1
USE-COST PERCENTAGE ALLOCATION*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Use</th>
<th>Average Cost</th>
<th>Cost-Use</th>
<th>Percent Cost-Use</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Arts</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>$27.92</td>
<td>$39,339</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>$3,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>42,142</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>3,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>13,431</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>13,894</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>52,907</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>3,771</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>24,007</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3,555</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>21,828</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>27,048</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>21,563</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>251,209</td>
<td>51.04</td>
<td>20,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$492,209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data in this table is specific to the University of Southwestern Louisiana. Only eleven of sixty-three subject (department) allocations are listed. Totals are rounded.

† All percentages, including miscellaneous, would be much smaller if all departments were included in the table.

many subject categories and should therefore be computed and used in any formula.

Selection of these two variables does not suggest that others might not be of equal or greater utility. Much research needs to be done on this general subject.

Allocation Procedure

The procedure for allocating funds based on the two variables of book use and book prices is as follows. Examples are given in Table 1.

1. Profiles. For academic libraries, describe the subject scope of each department (column 1) by classifying the courses of each department in the college catalog, using either the LC or Dewey Decimal classification. This technique has been described by McGrath and Durand. Some academic libraries will prefer the method suggested for public libraries—allocation by the major divisions of the Dewey or LC classification, a simpler procedure.

2. Circulation. Tabulate total annual circulation figures of books in each subject field—i.e., within each academic department (column 2), or by divisions of the Dewey or LC schedules. If circulation is automated, tabulation is readily done by computer. If circulation is a manual system, then random sampling will save time.

3. Average Cost. Compute the average cost for books within each subject field (column 3). Published price indexes are difficult to apply to local subject interests. Three alternative methods are suggested:
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A. Method A. Compute the average price of books in a given subject by sampling individual prices in the classified American Book Publishing Record;
B. Method B. Compute the average cost from prices actually paid for books purchased or ordered by the library on the request of each academic department, regardless of the book’s classification and regardless of the subject scope of the department; or,
C. Method C. Compute the average cost from prices actually paid for books purchased or ordered within subjects defined as in 1, above. The results using this method are more valid than those of method A or B because (1) subject categories for both cost and use are identically defined, and (2) the library’s own cost data is used.

4. Cost-Use. Multiply the average cost (column 3) by the circulation (column 2) to obtain cost-use (column 4) for each department or category.

5. Total Cost-Use. Compute the total cost-use over all departments by adding the several departmental cost-use figures.

6. Percent Cost-Use. Divide each department’s cost-use by the total cost-use. The resulting figure is percent cost-use, shown in column 5.

7. Allocation. Multiply percent cost-use for each department by the total dollar amount to be allocated for all departments. The result is the dollar allocation for that department.

Since there are a number of sources of error entering into each allocation, no accuracy is lost by rounding it off. In fact, some arbitrary, last minute, minor juggling in data is justified, if not done severely, because random error or discrepancies in data usually prevent complete accuracy.

General Considerations

The effect of this type of formula on collection building is to add books in given subject areas proportionate to the number that are used in those areas. Just as it is difficult to justify purchase of an expensive electronic microscope for which the university has no program or faculty or need, it is difficult to justify purchase of a large number of books on electronic microscopy with little prospect of their being used.

A substantial part of circulation may not fall into the categories designated as academic departments by the classification numbers. Such books can be regarded as “miscellaneous” or “general,” providing an empirical basis for a general allocation. Most libraries will certainly want to purchase some low-demand books for their intrinsic worth. The general fund can be used for this, or for “speculative selection”—i.e., adding books simply to test their demand. Into this category will also go general reference works and works whose subjects match those of two or more departments in the curriculum or subjects in the community program. Circulating books at the University of Southwestern Louisiana whose subjects fall into this miscellaneous category typically comprise
about 20 percent of the total circulation.

If the library has no books in a particular area for which there is latent demand, that area will show no use and will be slighted by the formula. Means for identifying these areas must be sought. This can be done either by soliciting patrons or departments for suggestions, as is usually done in college libraries; or by traditional critical methods of book selection; or through an approval plan which relates books received directly to the curriculum or program without regard to circulation.

Some librarians may want to adjust their allocations to account for high-circulating titles. Since many titles circulate more than once in a given period, a decision must be made whether to count total titles or total loans. This decision will affect the procedure for handling the allocation and determining the amount to be spent on multiple copies. The simplest tack is to ignore high-circulating titles but to assume that there are many and to use the total circulation counts within each category. This procedure permits flexibility in decisions to buy single or multiple copies. If a library owns few titles in a category, and demand is high, these titles will circulate over and over again, thus raising the circulation count for that category, giving justification for buying multiple copies with the allocation for that category.

The procedure can be readily built into approval plans with book jobbers. Books received through such plans should thus match faculty, student, or public needs more effectively than those received through standing or blanket order plans.

The procedure can be used for all or part of the library's book-buying program. Some libraries may have "area studies" programs—e.g., Asian, African, or Slavic—which must be cost justified on a different basis. The administration may prefer a separate allocation breakdown for subjects within these programs.

Some subjects which are likely to receive large allocations—e.g., history and English literature—are broad enough to warrant more detailed, within-subject allocations.

A word of caution: librarians should not allow themselves to become "locked in" to any such procedure as presented here. Flexibility should be built in, with the librarian firmly in control. Policy, not procedure, should be the determinant. Profiles should be updated at least annually.

Test for Effectiveness

The library may be interested in knowing how well its overall buying program agrees with demand. If agreement is very high, then rigid application of a formula may not be necessary. If it is low, then more diligent application may be necessary.

A quick and simple method for testing the overall effectiveness of a book-buying program is to use rank correlation of circulation, shelflist holdings, and current buying. The method is easily applied to both public and academic and both small and medium-sized libraries.

If a library's circulation is distributed among subjects in the same
general proportion as the library's holdings, or as the library's current buying, then the buying program can be said to be matching demand, and the correlation should be high. "High" can be any arbitrarily chosen value, depending on the library's goals, of the usual correlation range of minus 1.0 to plus 1.0 (-1.0 to +1.0). Minus 1.0 (-1.0) would be an inverse correlation, and zero value would indicate no correlation at all. A high correlation might be 0.8 or 0.9, say, while a low correlation would be 0.0 to 0.4. If a low correlation is first found, we might be justified in boosting it to a 0.7 by judicious buying.

The evaluator should first define the categories within which he or she wishes to count books. Again, academic departments or divisions of Dewey or LC are the counting categories. The question of how many categories to establish requires a decision. The larger the number of categories, the more accurate the correlations, at least when dealing with a large circulation. However, the 100 divisions of Dewey (000, 010, 020, . . . , etc.) and the divisions represented by one or two letters in LC (205 in all) are too many for rapid computation, unless done by computer. Furthermore, if a large number is used, the data thins out and the counts in each category will be too small, causing statistical difficulties. So, some combination of categories is preferable. Thirty to sixty categories are sufficient for statistical confidence and can be selected from the total, depending on what the library wishes to correlate.

Several methods of correlation are available. One of the oldest, best known, and perhaps most accurate is Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient. But compared to other techniques it is somewhat tedious to apply, and the type of data dealt with here may not meet certain statistical requirements, such as normality and homogeneity of variance desirable in the product-moment formula. A nonparametric method might be more appropriate. One of the simplest is Spearman's rank order correlation statistic, though it is less accurate. Most elementary statistical books offer a short and simple discussion of this procedure. One suggested here is Roscoe.10

An illustration will demonstrate its utility. Suppose that the library's circulation, shelflist holdings, and current buying are distributed as in Table 2. The correlation of any two columns (variables)—for example, circulation (X) and shelflist holdings (Y)—may be expressed by the Spearman rank correlation statistic (*r*),

\[
\rho = 1 - \frac{\sum d^2}{N^3 - N}
\]

where *N* is the total number of categories. \(\sum d^2\) is the sum of squares of the differences between all the ranks for the two variables to be correlated, or,

\[
\sum d^2 = \text{sum} \ [\text{Rank} (X) - \text{Rank} (Y)]^2,
\]

where Rank (X) is the rank of each circulation category and Rank (Y) is the rank of each shelflist category. Computations for the correlation between the ranks of circulation and the ranks of shelflist categories are
as follows:

$$\Sigma d^2 = (6 - 8)^2 + (3 - 2)^2 + (8 - 5)^2 + (7 - 4)^2 + (1 - 3)^2 + (10 - 10)^2 + (9 - 9)^2 + (5 - 6)^2 + (2 - 1)^2 + (4 - 7)^2$$

$$= 4 + 1 + 9 + 9 + 4 + 0 + 0 + 1 + 1 + 9$$

$$= 38.$$  

Thus:

$$r = 1 - \frac{6 \times 38}{1000 - 10}$$

$$= 0.77.$$  

The rank correlation coefficient of 0.77 indicates a fairly high rate of agreement between the ranks of circulation and shelflist holdings. The rank correlation between circulation and current acquisitions, 0.92, is higher, as it should be. If it were not, then current buying would be seriously inconsistent with current needs.

A fourth variable may be considered—the number of books being published in each field. But this variable may be unnecessary for three reasons: (1) many large libraries, by policy, collect most of the output of domestic publishers, and since publishers produce what sells, circulation in those libraries probably correlates highly with that output; (2) small academic libraries, whose subject scope is more sharply limited to that of the number of departments in the institution, are unaffected by the volume of output in fields not covered by the institution because there will be little circulation in those fields; (3) similarly, in small public libraries, there is little likelihood that small acquisitions programs can accurately reflect the very wide diversity of national output. These statements, of course, represent assumptions and need empirical support.

If a library is interested in collecting in depth without regard to departments, the distribution of holdings or current acquisitions in the Library of Congress can be used as a model. Statistics of holdings and acquisitions within the LC classification are published in the Annual Report of the Library of Congress. This technique was applied by Kebabian, who found an “extremely high correlation” between the distribution of holdings of the University of Florida and the Library of Congress.11

**Implications for Academic Libraries**

Except when new courses, new departments, or new programs are added, circulation of books across subjects should be consistent from year to year, and therefore correlations between successive years should be high. Over the years, of course, circulation patterns will fluctuate more, and correlations between years more widely separated will be lower.

What would a low correlation between circulation and current buying mean in numerical terms? To take some typical high- and low-use subjects, suppose books were being used and purchased as in Table 3. We see in two departments, biology and history, that the library holds a substantial number of books to draw upon, where holdings exceed cir-
TABLE 2

**Number* and Rank of Books: Circulation, Shelflist, Acquisitions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Circulation Volumes</th>
<th>Shelflist† Volumes</th>
<th>Acquisitions‡ Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Arts</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>2,282</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>4,605</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,194</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3,555</td>
<td>8,816</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Numbers are volume counts in each case.
† Total nonserial volumes for each subject.
‡ Total annual acquisitions for each subject.

The higher the ratio of shelflist to circulation, the richer the holdings. If circulation in some area is not substantial, someone will very likely claim that it is the result of insufficient holdings. This may be true to some extent, but if demand is high, the count will be increased by high-circulating titles. In the example for computer science, circulation exceeds holdings, as shown by the low ratio of 0.7, suggesting a high demand and a greater need for books in that area. In Latin, the holdings are not impressive, but are adequate to meet demand. If the library has a vigorous and energetic teacher of Latin who demands and gets a large allocation, as supposed above, whereas the teachers in biology, computer science, and history are not so vigorous, the result is an unbalanced buying program. Yet this is what happens in many libraries, and the persons most penalized are students, who, because there are more of them, make far greater use of the library than faculty.

The effect of an allocation procedure based on actual and real use

TABLE 3

**Fictitious Data on Use and Purchase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ratio Shelflist to Circulation Rank</th>
<th>Shelflist Rank</th>
<th>Volumes Purchased Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>10,781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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of the library is to neutralize the uneven vocal demands of faculty and to distribute the book budget more equitably. Occasionally, a scholar will discover that a department which he feels represents a non-book-oriented or nonscholarly subject receives a higher allocation than his, and promptly labels the practice as "deplorable." The librarian will be very unwise to judge that one subject is more important than another or to base an allocation on such a judgment, especially if the statistics show that the "non-book-oriented" subject is circulating many books.

What happens when it occurs to a faculty member that he can increase his department's book budget merely by taking a large number of books out of the library? The author knows of only one rumor about a faculty member who instructed his students to charge armloads of books out and to return them immediately to the book drop. If this actually happened, the students apparently lost interest after a few trips, no doubt discovering little immediate payoff. And no unusual change in circulation was noticed. Had it happened, the library administration would not have been overly disturbed at this special, though misguided, interest in the library. Most such contrivances diminish after a short time.

Some libraries may want to consider giving different weights to the different levels of degree programs—reasoning, for example, that Ph.D. programs necessarily must have more resources than undergraduate programs. Supposing that one wished to give arbitrary weights of 1, 2, 3, and 4 to undergraduate programs with no degree, undergraduate programs with degree, master's programs, and Ph.D. programs, respectively, the results might be as shown in Table 4. Use of arbitrary weights may be politically satisfying, but it is statistically unsound because it abandons the empirical approach of using real data. Preferably, weights should be derived from analysis of differences in amount of use by graduate and undergraduate students. Analysis may well show no difference, in which case weights should not be used. There is some evidence that book circulation (not periodical use) of master's and Ph.D. students may be more closely tied to course content than that of undergrad-

| TABLE 4  |
|---|---|---|
| Weighting Degree Programs |
| Empirical Allocation | Weight | Weighted Allocation |
| Undergraduate Program with no Degree | $300 | 1 | $300 |
| Undergraduate Program with Degree | $200 | 2 | $400 |
| Master's Program | $400 | 3 | $1,200 |
| Ph.D. Program | $400 | 4 | $1,600 |
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uate students, suggesting that book circulation may be no less valid as an indicator of demand at the upper levels than it is at the lower levels.\textsuperscript{12}

**Implications for Public Libraries**

Public libraries are well able to assess demand for a relatively small number of perennially popular subjects and specific titles. Probably few public libraries do not respond in some degree to this demand. Small libraries can do very little else than spend most of their funds on specific and narrow demand, but in larger communities where a subject may have small demand relative to another, a sufficient number of patrons may still want books on that subject to warrant a sizeable allocation. What is needed is a general framework for assessing demand in all subjects.

In theory, general classification schemes such as Dewey reflect the broad interests of society. The Dewey schedule, which most public libraries use, provides a framework for collecting data which is just as valid, if broken down specifically, as the framework we described for academic libraries.

Most of the implications for academic libraries should hold for public libraries as well—the principal difference being that public librarians select most of their books, whereas in academic libraries, faculty has a strong voice in selection. Therefore, public libraries should be in a very good position to guarantee close agreement between their buying and what the public wants. Again, there is no reason not to exercise critical evaluation of books prior to purchase when the librarian has a choice between several books in a subject. If no new books are published where there is demand, the choice is simple—buy more copies of books already owned in that subject. Librarians should remember that if they are to cater to subject demand they will need, on occasion, to choose a mediocre but needed book instead of a fine book not needed.

What about the public librarian’s time-honored role in helping to educate the public by buying only the finest books? Obviously, the librarian must strike a balance, attempting both to meet demand and to educate the public. The librarian should retain a portion of the budget for critical buying, regardless of demand. That portion will be arbitrary, but it should be the smaller. If one thinks of it as the portion used for educating the public, the other portion—for meeting demand—is that used by the public for educating the librarian.

**Summary**

Administrative decisions such as allocating a budget to the subjects in an academic curriculum, or to subjects in demand by the public, should be done on the basis of empirical evidence—i.e., the hard evidence of data collected from real use of the library. This evidence will be independent of the librarian’s personal preferences.

A procedure is described for allocating based on (1) the premise that a library’s collection should reflect the purpose of the institution,
whether academic or public, and (2) the demand of the users as indicated by the number of books used and average cost of a book in given categories.

For academic libraries, the subjects represented by departments provide a good framework for data collection. The subjects, as described by the departments themselves in the university bulletin, can in turn be described by Dewey or LC classification numbers.

For public libraries, or for academic libraries not wishing to allocate to academic departments, the divisions of the Dewey or LC classifications are sufficient.

Two variables, the number of books circulated and the average cost of books in each category, are the essential ingredients of the allocation formula. The number of books circulated is multiplied by the average cost, and the product converted to a percentage of the overall cost-use. This percentage is the basic allocation value for the particular category, and is multiplied by the total dollar amount available for all categories.

The procedure need not eliminate critical selection of books, but does provide a means for selecting within a framework, or for determining what portion of a budget can be used for critical selection.

A test for evaluating effectiveness of buying, using Spearman's rank correlation statistic, is also described. The effectiveness test, though not as accurate as others, is simple to apply. The test allows the librarian to visualize how well the distribution of books in the shelflist, or books currently bought, agrees with the distribution of books used within academic subject categories or within Dewey or LC divisions.

REFERENCES


• 368 •

Library Resources & Technical Services
NATIONAL INVENTORY OF LIBRARY NEEDS TO BE UPDATED

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) has announced a study to update the National Inventory of Library Needs, which was last produced in 1965 by the American Library Association. Boyd Ladd will be the principal investigator.

The study calls for examination of existing standards and the development of a draft NCLIS Inventory Statistical Measure for each of three types of library (public, academic, and school). These will serve as yardsticks against which the inventory results can be compared. Separate national inventories for each type of library will be followed by similar inventories of several states for which sufficiently current data is available. Much of the raw data for the update will be supplied through the cooperation of National Center for Education Statistics from its previous and current in-process Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) efforts.

As NCLIS moves toward implementing its recently published national program, "Toward A National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action" (available from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20405; Stock Number 052-003-00086-5; price, $1.45), it has encountered an urgent need for quantitative assessments of available library services and the degree to which they meet or fall short of needs. The current study is intended to provide these assessments, at least in part, as a basis for making decisions, establishing priorities, and directing the commission's efforts for maximum effect.

The requirement for developing statistical measures is made necessary by the fact that existing standards have been prepared at different times, by different organizations, and for different purposes, without full reflection of the whole library/information environment. Further, some of them were prepared before the advent of the computer as a library tool and before the recent explosive growth of nonbook media such as audio and video recordings, filmstrips, and microreproductions. The draft NCLIS Inventory Statistical Measure is expected to incorporate appropriate provisions of current national and international standards, be reviewed by national library associations, and be submitted to the American National Standards Institute Committee Z39 (Standardization in the Field of Library Work, Documentation, and Related Publishing Practices) as a starting point for a national standard.

As assistant director for statistical development at the National Center for Education Statistics for six years, Mr. Ladd was responsible for statistical standards and personally participated in the development of the Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS), from which the raw data for the National Inventory will be obtained.
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Detailed subject analysis of book output and cost statistics can be useful in planning and guiding the development of academic library resources in the pure sciences and in determining budget requirements. Currently available statistics are criticized for not being specific enough for these purposes. A method for producing the needed statistics is outlined. Provisional statistics are presented and some examples of the use of these statistics are given.

ASSMAN AND PATTERSON HAVE POINTED OUT both the need for and the lack of specific cost data for determining library book budgets. They have devised a technique for determining the cost of a minimum current book purchase program for undergraduate academic library collections based on favorable reviews of books of importance to these collections. They classified books located in the reviews into subject categories, and for each category they listed the number of titles found in their survey and the cost of purchasing all books in that category. This is a worthwhile, imaginative effort which is valuable for determining minimum undergraduate collection needs. But additional data are needed to help determine book needs for graduate students and faculty.

The basic idea of determining the number of books of interest in a specific subject and then calculating their cost to arrive at specific budget figures has great merit. It is proposed here, however, that book output and cost figures represent a more immediately available and equally valid measure, as compared to favorable reviews. Such figures can be used to help gauge book needs not only for undergraduate students, but for graduate students and faculty as well, and thus provide a more pre-
cise basis for academic library collection development and budget planning. This paper represents an attempt to apply this approach to collection development and budget planning for books of interest to the academic community in mathematics and the physical and biological sciences which are listed in the American Book Publishing Record. BPR Cumulative (BPR).

Massman and Patterson point out quite correctly that:

An academic library's holdings can be determined only by the quantity and range of the materials being published which are relevant to the academic programs it is supporting, not by the traditional number-of-students criterion.2

Book output statistics can provide a very important indication of "the quantity and range of the materials being published" in a subject. The number of volumes published on a given subject in a year will provide a figure which represents exhaustive coverage of that subject. Using the figures for exhaustive coverage as yardsticks, bibliographers and others can then decide what percentage of the total number of volumes in each subject should be in a particular collection. In this way, the development of the collection can be quantitatively controlled, subject-by-subject, in meaningful relation to the number of books published in each subject. Once the desired number of volumes is decided upon for each subject, it is possible to calculate how much it will cost to purchase them. Book output and cost figures thus provide a basis for deciding on the number of units—books—needed in each subject of interest and for determining the average cost per unit. The subject emphasis which has perhaps already been decided upon in the book selection policy can at this point be modified to take book output in each subject into consideration and then be given explicit quantitative expression.

Information Needed for Preparing Selection Policies

The book output and cost figures which appear annually in Publishers' Weekly (PW), valuable as they are for certain purposes, are not specific enough to provide a satisfactory quantitative basis upon which to base academic library book selection policies or the determination of budget needs. The PW statistics show the number of books published, classified under twenty-three broad subjects such as agriculture, art, and business, and including science, and the average cost of a hardcover book in each main class. It is not sufficient, however, to know that 2,586 books were published in this country in 1972 on science, or that 2,187 hardcover science volumes with an average cost of $16.95 were published in that year.8 We at least need to know how many books were published in a year in smaller subjects, such as mathematics, and the average cost per hardcover volume for each of these subjects as well.

For the sciences, moreover, it would help considerably if book output and cost statistics for each smaller subject were divided into categories based on level or intended audience. For academic library purposes, the
following categories, as defined, seem most useful for book output in
the pure sciences:

1. Nonspecialist or popular science books: books written for the
   layman.

2. Introductory texts: includes introductory texts, laboratory man-
   uals, subject outlines, and study guides from high school through
   undergraduate college levels.

   sets, which are excluded.

4. Specialist books: books for advanced undergraduates, graduate stu-
   dents, and professional scientists, including advanced texts, refer-
   ence works, and specialist books in monographic series.

Juvenile books should, of course, be excluded. With these definitions,
the category for each science book listed in PW and BPR could be indi-
ated by the use of a symbol. The symbol could be assigned by the pub-
lisher and provided by him with the other bibliographic information re-
quired for listing a book in PW. The symbol might be a number from
one to four to stand for the level or intended audience as defined above.
In order to get publishers to provide a symbol with book information,
this proposal could be made to the Technical, Scientific, and Medical
Division of the Association of American Publishers. The symbols could
then be used in tabulation of annual book output and cost statistics by
category for each subject.

If we know the number of books which are published in a year on a
given subject in each of these categories and the average cost per volume
in each category, then we will have a more definite idea of the number
of books of potential interest to us, and their cost, than we would have
with book output statistics broken down only by subjects. Books of pop-
ular science and introductory undergraduate texts, for example, are two
categories of books which many science librarians in academic institu-
tions would purchase only on a highly selective basis. Since this is so, the
introductory text category need be used only to separate out that part of
the textbook output of limited academic library interest, perhaps includ-
ing high school level books (though they could also be excluded). In
this connection, it should be noted that the Advisory Council on College
Chemistry generally excluded introductory texts from its list of suggest-
ed undergraduate chemistry books. In the specialist and serial cate-
gories, on the other hand, it may be desirable to purchase 50 percent or
more of the titles on specific subjects.

Method of Study

The method described here for measuring annual American scientific
book output by subject is based on the method used by Gardner in her
work on the reviewing of American books in the physical sciences. She
counted the number of books listed in the 1961 and 1962 issues of the
American Book Publishing Record in each of the physical sciences and
mathematics, but did not divide the books into categories based on level,
as suggested here. In the present study, all science books listed in class 500–599, pure sciences, in the 1967 and 1972 volumes of the *American Book Publishing Record. BPR Cumulative* were assigned to one of the four categories defined above, with two exceptions: in the 525–529 range only works on astronomy were considered, and in the 570–578 range works on anthropology were not included. The earth sciences include the subjects in the range 549–569, mineralogy, earth sciences, and paleontology; the biological sciences include the subjects in the range 570–599, anthropological and biological, botanical, and zoological sciences (except as noted). The number of volumes rather than the number of titles was counted throughout even though this differs in part from *PW* practice. While *PW* reports book output by title (to conform to international requirements for reporting book publishing statistics), it reports the average annual cost of hardcover books by volume in its subject index of prices. In order to make cost comparisons between the data developed here and the figures reported by *PW*, it was necessary to use the same unit of counting as that used by *PW*—the volume. The results of the tabulations presenting science book output by subject and by category are presented in Tables 1 and 2.

It is recognized that the validity and usefulness of the present tabulations may be questioned on at least three points. First, the assignment to level is primarily a subjective action. In the 1967 *BPR*, however, there are many annotations which were of great value in assigning levels. It will be noted that the 1972 percentage figures, computed first and from a volume without annotations, do not diverge markedly from those for 1967, giving some reason to assume that the 1972 tabulations are reasonably accurate. Second, certain major kinds of scientific works are, of necessity, omitted or covered incompletely in *PW* and *BPR*, including foreign books, government publications, and publications of learned societies. Even so, the science books listed in *PW* and *BPR* probably include a substantial majority of the important monographic scientific books published or distributed in the United States. Third, the number of serials listed in *BPR* may not be taken as a good measure of the number of serials likely to be considered for purchase in any given year because of the substantial number of irregular serials published in the sciences. A separate study of serial production over a period of three to five years, providing a better measure of irregular serials, would be required to secure the necessary output and cost statistics for serials.

**Analysis of Data**

The major finding of the study relates to the dominance of specialist books. In each subject, as shown in the last column in Tables 1 and 2, there were more specialist books published, usually a majority of the total, than any other kind of book. It is likely that most science books purchased by academic libraries with science programs of any scope will be specialist books, with nonspecialist books and introductory texts being purchased only sparingly. By determining how many specialist volumes
### TABLE 1
**Output of Science Books as Recorded in American Book Publishing Record 1967**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Serials</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Nonspecialist</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Specialist Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
**Output of Science Books as Recorded in American Book Publishing Record 1972**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Serials</th>
<th>Texts</th>
<th>Nonspecialist</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Specialist Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
are published in a year in a subject, and how much these will cost, and by adding a factor for other books in other categories (which will vary from institution to institution), a maximum number of volumes of potential interest and a maximum book budget can be calculated for each subject. With this information as a yardstick, bibliographers and others can then decide what percentage of the total they need and can afford. As noted above, the role of serials, which are really a subcategory of specialist books, cannot be assessed on the basis of the present data.

As an example of the use which can be made of these statistics, specialist book output and cost figures in one subject, chemistry, were selected for detailed analysis. The number of specialist titles in chemistry listed in BPR in 1967 and 1972 is 200 and 224, respectively, an increase of 12 percent over the period. The 1972 increase over 1967 may or may not be significant. Statistics reflecting a longer period of time and greater frequency are needed to detect any long-term trends. It is important to note, however, the difference between the average cost of all hardcover science books, as given in PW, and the cost of hardcover specialist books in chemistry. In 1967 the respective figures were $12.95 and $17.14; in 1972, $16.05 and $24.79. Thus in 1967, specialist books in chemistry cost 32 percent more than the average for all science books, and in 1972 they cost 54 percent more. Between 1967 and 1972, while the average cost of all science books rose 24 percent that of specialist chemistry books rose 45 percent. Since specialist books dominate scientific book output and are of greatest interest to academic libraries, it is apparent that the average price per science book as shown in PW is far too low a figure upon which to base an accurate science book budget estimate for an academic library. Translating these averages into budgetary figures yields the following data: In 1967, 200 science books cost $2,590 and 200 specialist chemistry books cost $3,428, a difference of $838; in 1972, the respective figures were $3,210 and $4,958, with a difference of $1,530.

Science librarians are aware, of course, that specialist books are much more expensive than the PW figures for the average cost of hardcover science books indicate. The value of the present figures is in confirming the fact and showing the extent of the increased cost of specialist books over the PW figures. It is absolutely essential to have the kind of cost information presented here and to have it annually if we are to be able to base our budget planning on actual costs rather than on the deflated averages represented by the PW figures, which do not take our special needs into account. Cost figures as they appear in PW are grossly misleading if applied to specialist books of academic interest in chemistry, and probably for specialist books in most other sciences as well.

Table 3 presents the number of specialist volumes listed in BPR in 1967 and 1972 in each of the major subjects of the 500–599 class. If a substantially greater percentage of the total specialist book output is published in subject A rather than in subject B, it will probably be necessary to purchase a proportionately greater percentage of books in subject A to cover it adequately. For example, a selection policy which al-
TABLE 3
OUTPUT OF SPECIALIST BOOKS IN SCIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1967 Volumes</th>
<th>1972 Volumes</th>
<th>1967 Percent</th>
<th>1972 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Works</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Sciences</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,192</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,429</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

allowed for purchase of 100 books in each science in 1972 would provide 86 to 100 percent coverage of the specialist books listed in BPR in general science, astronomy, and earth sciences, but would provide less than 50 percent coverage of mathematics, physics, chemistry, and the biological sciences (here the coverage would be less than 25 percent). To achieve balance in collection development, then, specialist books on a subject should be selected in rough proportion to the percentage of specialist book output for that subject—depending, of course, on the subject emphasis expressed in the book selection policy.

Evaluation of Acquisitions Programs and Approval Plans

Detailed book output and cost statistics by subject are thus seen to be useful in planning and controlling collection development and in determining budget requirements. Further, such statistics can also be used to show the extent to which a subject is being covered by a current acquisitions program, leading in turn to an evaluation of approval plan performance. In addition, these statistics can be used to gauge existing strengths and weaknesses in a collection. An example from our experience will illustrate these points.

Table 2 shows that 116 specialist books in the earth sciences were listed in BPR in 1972. From January to mid-May 1972, the Hunter College Library received twelve earth sciences books on approval, one of which was rejected. Since there was nothing in our earth sciences approval profile to account for such poor performance, we alerted the approval dealer. In the next twelve-month period, the situation improved. From 1 June 1972 through 31 May 1973 we received sixty-nine earth sciences books on approval, of which fifty-eight were retained and eleven rejected. Fifty-four books were ordered in addition to the books received on approval. For this twelve-month period, therefore, we received on approval or ordered 112 earth sciences books. Exact figures are not available, but it is safe to assume that close to 100 percent of these 112 books were specialist books. This is because of the predominance of
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specialist books in the sciences, the exclusion of undergraduate texts from our approval profile at that time, and the fact that we order few introductory texts and nonspecialist science books in addition to approval books. This means that we probably acquired close to 100 percent of the earth sciences books of potential interest to us listed in BPR in 1972. Exact comparisons are impossible because our internal acquisition statistics are not kept on a calendar year basis, as are the book output statistics. But such exact comparisons are not necessary. Until now, we did not know to what extent we were covering earth sciences books. Now that we know, the question arises as to whether or not we really need nearly 100 percent of the earth sciences specialist books listed in BPR. Maybe we do. On the other hand, perhaps we ought to be more selective in our coverage of this subject. Are there other subjects we are covering too intensively? Are there subjects we are not covering well enough? By comparing book output figures in a subject with internal acquisitions statistics we can secure better answers to questions such as these and perhaps change our book selection emphasis accordingly.

In 1968 our library changed from the Dewey Decimal Classification to the Library of Congress Classification (LC). Since comparatively few science books have been reclassified, the LC section of the shelflist is composed chiefly of books added to the collection since 1968. In September 1972 a shelflist survey identified approximately 275 earth sciences books in the LC section, most of which were added to the collection between 1968 and 1972. This seemed to be a substandard number of books for the subject, especially when compared with the number of books in other subjects, such as mathematics, where the shelflist estimate was 1,925 books. The low number of earth sciences books in comparison with the much higher numbers of books for most other subjects was the major reason for the increased emphasis on earth sciences acquisitions, which led to our nearly 100 percent 1972/73 coverage of the subject. When the data of the present study were analyzed in late 1973, it became clear that our evaluation of our earth sciences acquisitions was incorrect. Seventy-six specialist earth sciences books were listed in BPR in 1967 and 116 in 1972, as shown in Tables 1 and 2. Assuming an increase of five volumes a year between 1968 and 1971 yields a total of 470 books published during the same five-year period covered by the shelflist survey, 1968–1972. Our shelflist estimate of 275 books represents 58.5 percent of the estimated specialist earth sciences books listed in BPR between 1968 and 1972. We see now that we have been covering earth sciences books adequately rather than poorly, since we purchased nearly 60 percent of the estimated earth sciences books listed in BPR between 1968 and 1972. We bought fewer books in the earth sciences than in other subjects because fewer books were published, not because we were seriously neglecting the subject in our acquisitions program.

Other Work

As noted earlier, the method described in this paper for measuring
American scientific book output and costs using BPR is based on work done by Gardner. McGrath has also used the American Book Publishing Record to measure book output and costs—but for each department in a particular academic institution, rather than by subject. This was done by classifying courses in a college catalog according to the Dewey Decimal Classification, producing tabulations of book output and costs from BPR for the course classifications, and then arranging the data by department. This approach may be useful in situations where it is necessary to narrowly restrict acquisitions to explicit curricular needs since it permits correlation of book output and costs with the curriculum of a particular institution. But it has serious shortcomings. Librarians at other institutions must classify their courses and do their tabulations individually. There is, moreover, no analysis of book output and costs by category, which is of critical importance in the sciences, and may be critical for other subjects as well. As McGrath acknowledges, furthermore, data based on the college catalog may not apply to faculty research interests, which are not necessarily represented by course listings in the catalog. Wherever this is the case, faculty research interests must also be classified and matched with tabulations of book output and costs if they are to be reflected in the budgetary estimate of book needs, which is the desired objective. Finally, essential acquisitions may frequently require coverage of important aspects of many subjects which represent neither explicit curricular needs nor faculty research interests. In sum, McGrath’s approach, laudable and imaginative as it is, requires time-consuming working-up of extensive data to fit each special case in each particular institution, lacks breakdown of book output and costs by category, and is of limited value in arriving at book output and cost statistics which go beyond minimum curricular needs. If the statistics proposed in the present paper were published annually, on the other hand, the necessary book output and cost data by subject and category would be generally available for each library to adapt to its own needs in the ways suggested—at least for the sciences. The data could also be produced for other subjects.

Detailed book output and cost statistics by subject cannot help us to make judgments of pertinence and quality. We must still decide if individual books fall within the scope of our selection policy, and if they do, whether or not they are worthwhile. What these statistics can do is provide a quantitative basis to help plan and control collection development, subject-by-subject, for books of academic interest in the sciences. They can tell us by comparison how much or how little of the book output in a particular category in a subject we do acquire and how much more may be of potential interest to us and how much it will cost to acquire a given number of books on a specific subject. The cost information can be used as a persuasive argument to justify a book budget. This is particularly true for specialist books in science, which are so much
more expensive than the *PW* average price for hardcover science books. These statistics can also be used to measure approval plan performance and to gauge existing strengths and weaknesses in a collection. For these reasons, it is to be hoped that *Publishers' Weekly*, or some other publication, or perhaps even a large approval plan dealer with an adequate computer data base will provide such statistics on an annual basis in the near future. The statistics need not be limited to science books, of course, but ought to include other subjects as well, though different categories may be required for other subjects.
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Selective Dissemination of Information to Congress: The Congressional Research Service SDI Service
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Drawing upon the resources of the Library of Congress and adapting its procedures for descriptive and subject control, the Congressional Research Service has developed a system of bibliographic control for public policy literature to meet the needs of Congress. A mechanized current awareness service based on an in-house created bibliographic data base which is provided to the Congress and to researchers at the Library of Congress is described.

The Library of Congress (LC) was created in 1800 to assist the legislative branch in performing its constitutional role of policymaking. In the 1970s, it is primarily the Congressional Research Service (CRS), a department of the library, which performs this function. CRS provides reference, research, analysis, and other information services to the Congress in response to a wide variety of inquiries and requests for assistance from members and committees in almost every field of public affairs. Among the information services provided to the Congress is a mechanized selective dissemination of information (SDI) service. This current awareness service is specifically designed to meet the information needs of a known clientele, the Congress. Information relevant to the public policymaking process is rapidly identified, processed, and delivered to each subscriber weekly.

Manuscript received April 1974; accepted for publication June 1974.
The present pilot project supplies the SDI service to over 130 members of Congress and congressional staff as well as to 300 CRS researchers and a limited number of researchers at the U.S. General Accounting Office. The users of the CRS SDI service are quite diverse in terms of their information needs and interests and in terms of their functions in the legislative process. They include members of Congress, congressional committee staff, staff in the members' offices, and subject specialists who perform research for the Congress. The usefulness of the service to Congress is indicated by the results of a questionnaire circulated to congressional recipients early in 1973. The response was almost unanimously hearty approval and most recipients indicated that the effectiveness of their legislative activities would be significantly reduced if the service were discontinued.

Background

Bibliographic information was supplied to Congress long before computers were available and before the Legislative Reference Service became the Congressional Research Service in 1970. For decades bibliographers in the CRS Subject Specialization Section with subject backgrounds and library degrees selected material, prepared citations, and matched CRS researchers' interests with manually prepared citations on three-by-five-inch cards. Because of the limitations of the manual system, only six congressional subscribers received direct bibliographic support under special arrangements.

While the system worked, the manual maintenance of the central card catalog of these citations, a relatively minor aspect, was a continuing problem. The inability to keep up with the filing of the cards began to reduce the effectiveness of the whole operation. In addition, as the number of users increased and the extent of their information needs expanded, it became desirable to exploit the availability of the library's growing mechanized data processing capability. The new MARC format provided a vehicle for a new direction in providing bibliographic information to Congress.

In January 1969, two CRS research divisions, the Economics Division and the Education and Public Welfare Division, were chosen for the test phase. To guard against loss of bibliographic support to these divisions in the event this test of the mechanized SDI was not successful, the mechanized system was established parallel with the manual operation. The bibliographers working with the two divisions provided information concerning researchers' needs and the type of bibliographic information the system would have to process. The library's Information Systems Office provided the equipment and, working closely with the Subject Specialization Section head, Janet Mathews Biggs, made the necessary modifications in the software developed for general use. In addition, CRS began construction of a vocabulary specifically designed to meet the needs of the new system. Near the end of the test phase, a sur-
vey of the research staff members involved in the project was undertaken to ascertain user reaction to the automated system. On the basis of the experience gained, it was decided to extend the system in June 1969 to all CRS research divisions and to the few congressional subscribers receiving cards under the manual operation. Now CRS had a mechanized SDI.

Creating the SDI Citation

The Congressional Research Service as a department in the Library of Congress has access to the vast riches of LC’s collections. Since its establishment, however, the service has supplemented these collections by acquiring other materials relevant to public policy formulation. These acquisitions, often in multiple copies, must be processed rapidly. The material which flows through the Subject Specialization Section and which may be selected by bibliographers for the SDI service includes journals, periodicals, international organization publications, federal, state, and local government documents, private and university-related research organization publications, pamphlets, and a few monographs. The more important and informative articles and documents are selected on the basis of the bibliographers’ subject knowledge, awareness of what is happening in Congress and in public policymaking generally, and the research being undertaken in CRS. In addition to this wealth of acquired material, the SDI service also includes citations to selected reports prepared by the CRS staff.

The selection of appropriate material is only the first step in the creation of the service. This first step, and, in fact, the entire process depends upon the qualifications of the bibliographers. The typical bibliographer is a librarian with a relevant undergraduate degree and often graduate work in his subject area. The mechanized system began with six bibliographers; now twelve budgeted positions are dedicated to the entire range of bibliographic support services. This growth reflects in part the expanding range of information sources included in the SDI as well as the increasing number of subscribers and their information needs. Collectively, the bibliographers have subject expertise in such subjects as economics, political science, science, international relations, education, and health, as well as expertise in bibliographic methods. The knowledge which the bibliographer brings to his position is then supplemented by extensive training in the section’s bibliographic procedures and reference services.

The bibliographer is ultimately responsible for the information support in his subject area. He must review, select, and cite the material in order to provide the substance for the service. He works under the pressures of a continuing flow of material and the deadlines of a weekly publication schedule. All of this is in addition to the other services which he must provide to the CRS researchers and indirectly, and at times directly, to Congress.
Once an item is selected for inclusion in the SDI, the bibliographer prepares a citation based on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules as applied by the Library of Congress and on the needs of the CRS bibliographic data base. Bibliographic exactitude, compatibility, and consistency are important, but their importance must be weighed against the pressures for rapid handling of information. For example, only limited searching is performed to establish a new corporate author. The primary concern is the provision of bibliographic control within the context of the data base, available time and resources, and the users’ needs.

The SDI citation contains three levels of subject control:

1. **Classification.** The bibliographer assigns a classification number to the citations of those items which enter the main reference files of CRS. The classification scheme is based on the Library of Congress classification, adapted to meet the needs of the users of the files and the types of material processed.

2. **“Bucket terms.”** A 189-term vocabulary is used for the creation of the SDI profiles. The bucket terms group references by categories to assure that information will be directed to interested subscribers. For example, the bucket term “Congress” is assigned to citations on any of the following topics relating to Congress: committees, delegations, employees, investigations, leadership, party organization, powers, seniority, voting, terms of office, and related areas. Because of their function, the scope of bucket terms varies; a bucket term can be as narrow as “Electoral College” or as broad as “Education.” Changing information needs are reflected by the addition of new terms, such as the recently added “Technology assessment” and by continuing redefinition of existing terms. The full list of 189 terms is given in the Appendix.

3. **Topical descriptors.** The bibliographers index the material, using descriptors from the Legislative Indexing Vocabulary (LIV) developed and maintained within CRS by Frederick John Rosenthal. This vocabulary is 70 percent compatible with the library’s subject headings but its primary aim is to provide control over the information which is relevant to legislative concerns. This vocabulary of 5,532 terms is constantly being revised and updated with weekly additions being made to the computer file. Six complete printouts of the file have been prepared to serve as internal working documents. In addition to the topical descriptors assigned from LIV, personal, corporate, and geographic names may be used. While these descriptors do appear within the SDI citation, they have no direct function in the formulation of the SDI profile. This level of subject control is primarily used for other forms of retrieval from the CRS bibliographic data bases, such as on-line subject searches via cathode ray tube (CRT) terminals.

The last major component of the SDI citation is an annotation, which is intended to tell the recipient what the material covers and what
types of information it contains. The annotation may be written by the bibliographer, or it may be a partial contents note or a succinct quotation from the item. Whatever the source, the annotation must be brief, objective, and informative.

Example 1 presents a sample citation, showing the bucket term “Presidents [U.S.],” the topical descriptors “Executive privilege (Government information),” “Watergate affair” and “United States v. Nixon,” the classification “JK 516 F” and identification of the bibliographer (GHW), of cataloger (CJN), and control number (LRS74-24976).

Presidents [U.S.]
Cox, Archibald.
Former Watergate Special Prosecutor surveys historic and constitutional developments pertaining to executive privilege, including Watergaterelated aspects.

Example 1

Processing the SDI Citation

Working from data sheets prepared by the bibliographers and utilizing a program with a text manipulation capability which permits immediate corrections and additions to the citation, cataloging technicians input the citations on-line via typewriter terminals connected directly to the library's Computer Service Center. A proof copy of a given set of citations is pulled from the terminal and returned to the bibliographer for review. After review, any necessary corrections and changes are made to the citations by the cataloging technicians. These citations are then added to the master tape containing the current bibliographic file. A diagnostic printout of the previous day’s input to the master file is examined by the supervisor of the Cataloging Unit. This examination of the diagnostic printout is one of several checks performed to maintain the accuracy and quality of the data base.

Each weekend the citations input through the preceding Friday morning are matched with the current subscriber profile table. The resulting tape containing an individualized listing for each subscriber is used to print the listing in upper and lower case mode which, while expensive in terms of time, is considered necessary for an acceptable level of readability for users.

The final step in this sequence of information transfer is the distribution of the individualized listings on Monday. As this is being done, work on next week’s edition is already in progress.

The User's Perspective

Few of the details of the system—selection of materials, descriptive
cataloging, subject control, and computer processing—are apparent to
the subscriber. What is important to him is that he receives a personal-
ized weekly list of references, averaging approximately 600 items, in a
fairly standard bibliographic format representing a dependable source
of useful information.

The user's only contact with the intricacies of the system comes at an
early time, when he meets with a member of the bibliographic staff and,
working from an annotated list of the bucket terms which outlines sub-
jects which each term encompasses, establishes a list of the bucket terms
representing his interest profile. At this time the user is given informa-
tion concerning the types of material included in the service, the format
of the citation, the procedure for changing his interest profile (which
may be done at any time) and related information services.

The majority of the questions from users relating to regular opera-
tion of the service are handled immediately by the bibliographers with
whom the CRS researchers work closely day to day. For non-CRS re-
searchers, a single staff member of CRS is identified as a source of infor-
mation, and this centralization of responses to questions from congress-
ional recipients in particular has helped the users to obtain prompt ac-
tion on any problem and has given CRS a better sense of questions and
problems concerning the service.

Among the variety of uses to which the service has been put by its di-
verse recipients, two traditional services may be identified. Some users use
the weekly printout as a kind of weekly specialized bibliographic news-
letter or alerting service. In this way they are kept informed of who is
writing what in their fields of interest. The other use takes advantage of
the physical format of the service to create a current, expanding bibli-
ography. The citations are printed on three-by-five-inch cards, arranged
in alphabetical order by the bucket terms and subarranged alphabetically
by main entry. The recipient selects the most relevant citations and
files the cards by bucket term or any other appropriate system. As a result
he has immediately at hand citations to the literature on a specific sub-
ject, such as consumer protection or health facilities.

Whatever the user's purpose may be, he often needs to examine the
items represented by the citations. At the present time, CRS researchers
are responsible themselves for obtaining the items which have been
cited. A special unit has been established in the Subject Specialization
Section which provides a hard copy service for members of Congress and
congressional staff, who need only return any appropriate cards to CRS
together with the address card supplied with the printout. The Master
File Unit maintains a collection of photocopies arranged by citation
number of all cited items except congressional publications, items with
copyright restrictions, and items over fifty pages in length. Presently an
average of 1,700 items, totaling over 20,000 pages of photocopies, are re-
turned to the members of Congress and congressional staff from this
master file. In addition, approximately 100 items not in the master file
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are sent to congressional users each month. Loan copies are provided if CRS does not have permission to reproduce a requested copyrighted item or if the item is over fifty pages. Congressional publications are not provided since they can be readily acquired through established channels in the House and the Senate.

Related Information Services

The SDI service is one of the major products of the CRS bibliographic data base which now contains over 132,000 citations and is growing at the rate of approximately 2,500 citations per month. Other products, such as author and subject book catalogs, are produced monthly and cumulated quarterly. Work is now under way to develop annual catalogs since the present quarterly catalogs are not cumulative. These book catalogs replace the earlier manually maintained card catalogs and have the advantage of providing multiple copies which may be located in the research divisions of CRS for greater accessibility.

In addition to providing a current awareness service, the bibliographic data base is being used to generate retrospective on-demand bibliographies. Search strategies are constructed utilizing the three levels of subject control (topical descriptors, bucket terms, and classification) as well as other data elements in the citation. In fiscal year 1974, 514 on-demand bibliographies were prepared, ranging from 5 to 4,347, with an average of 300 entries.

Citations from 1972 to the present may now be displayed via CRT terminals. The terminals are installed in most CRS divisions and a few congressional locations. An on-line retrieval language, the Subject Content-Oriented Retriever for Processing Information On-line (SCORPIO), developed by ISO permits Boolean logic searches utilizing two levels of subject control (descriptors and bucket terms) as well as by personal and corporate authors. Even in this early stage, CRT display has proven to be a useful complement to other modes of access to the bibliographic data base.

To supplement the CRS SDI service, which focuses primarily on current serial and government publications, the Subject Specialization Section is developing a biweekly service using the Library of Congress MARC data base. This new service will supply to CRS subscribers computer-produced citations to relevant monographic materials being added to the collections of the library.

Future of the SDI Service

The day-to-day problems and the future of the CRS SDI service are direct outgrowths of its purpose: the rapid identification, processing, and distribution of relevant information. The pressures of time and the need for expertise are constant concerns in the management and development of the SDI system.

The service does not exist apart from its users and their needs. The public policy environment and the need to know create pressures for
constant improvement and development, and with each advance the
users' expectations and demands increase. The present SDI service is far
removed from the manual system of aniline mats and will continue to
change. Among developments under investigation are: the extension of
the service to all members of Congress, the use of microforms, expanded
utilization of the CRTs, coordination of the bibliographic data base
with other CRS produced data bases, and an increase in staff resources
to meet the increasing depth and diversity of the users' information
needs. While it is expected that the format of the product and the over-
all characteristics of the system will change, the service orientation that
existed in the manual system and exists now will be maintained and
strengthened.

APPENDIX

Bucket Terms for the SDI Service

Aeronautics
Aerospace industries
Africa
Agriculture
Air pollution
Alcoholism
Anti-poverty program
Antitrust law
Arms control
Asia
Astronautics
Astronomy
Atomic energy
Birth control
Business and society
Campaign funds
Canada
CBW
Census
Chemicals
Child welfare
Church and state
Civil liberties
Coastal areas
Communism
Computers
Congress
Congressional districts
Constitution [U.S.]
Consumer credit
Consumer protection
Corporate finance
Crimes and offenses
Criminal procedure
Defense economics
Developing countries
District of Columbia
Drug abuse
Drugs
Earth sciences
Eastern Europe

Economic conditions
Economic policy
Education
Election law
Electoral college
Electronics
Elementary and secondary education
Environment
Environmental economics
Environmental health
Environmental law
Equal employment opportunity
Executive departments
Executive reorganization
Families
Federal advisory bodies
Federal aid to education
Fisheries
Food
Food relief
Foreign economic relations
Foreign economics
Foreign relations
Forests and forestry
Future
Government employees
Government information
Guaranteed annual income
Handicapped
Health facilities
Health insurance
Health insurance for the aged
Higher education
Highways
History [U.S.]
Housing
Housing finance
Immigration
Indians
Industrial organization
Industrial technology
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Intelligeuce activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental fiscal relations</td>
<td>Intergovernmental relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal security</td>
<td>International agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International corporations</td>
<td>International corporations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International economic relations</td>
<td>International economic relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International environmental affairs</td>
<td>International environmental affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International finance</td>
<td>International finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International law</td>
<td>International law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations</td>
<td>International relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International science affairs</td>
<td>International science affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judiciary</td>
<td>Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile delinquency</td>
<td>Juvenile delinquency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local finance</td>
<td>Local finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local taxation</td>
<td>Local taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manpower training programs</td>
<td>Manpower training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine transportation</td>
<td>Marine transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials management</td>
<td>Materials management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assistance programs</td>
<td>Medical assistance programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical economics</td>
<td>Medical economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical personnel</td>
<td>Medical personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>Mental health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military assistance</td>
<td>Military assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military justice</td>
<td>Military justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military manpower</td>
<td>Military manpower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mines and mineral resources</td>
<td>Mines and mineral resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities</td>
<td>Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money and banking</td>
<td>Money and banking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National defense</td>
<td>National defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National priorities</td>
<td>National priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters</td>
<td>Natural disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural resources</td>
<td>Natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negroes</td>
<td>Negroes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational health and safety</td>
<td>Occupational health and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceanography</td>
<td>Oceanography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor recreation</td>
<td>Outdoor recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific area</td>
<td>Pacific area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents and inventions</td>
<td>Patents and inventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensions</td>
<td>Pensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticides</td>
<td>Pesticides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar regions</td>
<td>Polar regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ethics</td>
<td>Political ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>Political science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pornography</td>
<td>Pornography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal service</td>
<td>Postal service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power resources</td>
<td>Power resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical politics</td>
<td>Practical politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents [U.S.]</td>
<td>Presidents [U.S.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press</td>
<td>Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons</td>
<td>Prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>Public administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public finance</td>
<td>Public finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health</td>
<td>Public health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lands</td>
<td>Public lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public opinion polls</td>
<td>Public opinion polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public welfare</td>
<td>Public welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional development</td>
<td>Regional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and development</td>
<td>Research and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of privacy</td>
<td>Right of privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline waters</td>
<td>Saline waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science manpower</td>
<td>Science manpower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science policy</td>
<td>Science policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small business</td>
<td>Small business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>Social security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid wastes</td>
<td>Solid wastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State governments</td>
<td>State governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic aircraft</td>
<td>Supersonic aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems analysis</td>
<td>Systems analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxation</td>
<td>Taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and civilization</td>
<td>Technology and civilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology assessment</td>
<td>Technology assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
<td>Telecommunication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territories</td>
<td>Territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban areas</td>
<td>Urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban development</td>
<td>Urban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>Vocational education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War and peace</td>
<td>War and peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water pollution</td>
<td>Water pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water resources development</td>
<td>Water resources development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterways</td>
<td>Waterways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>Western Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife conservation</td>
<td>Wildlife conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workmen's compensation</td>
<td>Workmen's compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth in politics</td>
<td>Youth in politics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Seeking to document the extent to which libraries of four-year colleges and universities have adopted the Library of Congress Classification system, this study surveys the classification systems used by the libraries of 1,160 accredited four-year colleges and universities. The LC system is presently being used by more than half of these libraries; however, throughout 1968–71 the “trend to LC” clearly lost momentum. Data are provided on the extent to which the Library of Congress and the Dewey Decimal Classification systems were used in 1967 and 1971 by libraries of various sizes and categories.

On the question of classification systems, American college and university libraries remain divided. While many have switched from the Dewey Decimal Classification (DC) to the Library of Congress Classification (LC) during the past decade, many others have resisted this trend and have continued to use DC. The literature contains many discussions of the pros and cons of adopting LC, but few statements on the extent to which academic libraries have switched to LC—or have retained DC.

Striving to close this information gap, this study identifies the classification systems that were being used in 1967 and 1971 by a population of American college and university libraries. Brief analyses will be made of the extent to which these classification systems were being used by academic libraries of various sizes and categories. Data will also be presented on the number of libraries within this population that switched to LC during each of the years within the time span 1968–71.
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Defining the Population

The starting point for this study was provided by Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities: Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1967 (LSCU67), the most recent comprehensive survey of academic libraries to identify the classification systems being used by individual American college and university libraries.1 LSCU67 provides data on the libraries of 2,167 institutions, including the libraries of general four-year colleges and universities, specialized four-year institutions, and two-year institutions. We eliminated the two-year institutions and most of the specialized four-year institutions from our survey population by limiting that population to the institutions which not only appeared in LSCU67 but also merited “institutional exhibits” in a second reference tool, the tenth edition of American Universities and Colleges.2 Only senior institutions which were accredited by one of the six regional accrediting associations or which were integral parts of accredited institutions as of January 1968 received such institutional exhibits. The 1,175 institutions which not only were given such institutional exhibits but also were listed in LSCU67 constitute 95.2 percent of the colleges and universities given institutional exhibits in this edition of American Universities and Colleges.

Fifteen of these 1,175 institutions either closed their doors or merged with other institutions during 1968–71. These fifteen were dropped from our survey population, which was thereby reduced to 1,160 institutions. This is the population upon which this study was based.

Classification Systems Used

During fall 1967 each of these 1,160 institutions was asked by the Office of Education to identify the classification scheme being used by its library as “LC,” “DC,” or “other.” As recorded in LSCU67, 306 indicated “LC,” 762 “DC,” and 90 “other.” Two institutions failed to answer this question.

During January 1972 we focused our attention upon the 762 institutions which indicated they were using DC. To determine whether their libraries had retained DC or had switched to LC since 1967, we forwarded them copies of the letter and questionnaire reproduced in Appendix I. Usable replies obtained from 684 (a response rate of 89.8 percent) revealed that 417 had retained DC, 155 had switched from DC to LC during 1968–71, 111 had adopted LC by 1967, and one had used another system throughout 1968–71.

That 111 of these libraries had adopted LC by 1967 represents a major surprise. Why had these libraries been identified by LSCU67 as DC users? The director of one of these libraries explained that he had checked the answer “DC” on the LSCU67 questionnaire to indicate that most of his collection was then still classified by DC—even though he was then classifying all newly acquired monographs by LC. As he aptly commented, “I involuntarily perjure myself every time I fill in a questionnaire!” Whatever the explanation of the other misleading refer-
ences to DC, it is clear that these 111 libraries had adopted LC by the close of 1967.

Can it be assumed that the 306 libraries that were identified by LC as LC users were actually using LC in 1967? To test the trustworthiness of this claim, we addressed inquiries to a random sample of 100 of these libraries. Responses from 96 showed that all but 3 had been classifying most or all of their new acquisitions by LC since at least December 1967. The remaining 3 had used DC throughout 1967-71. On the basis of these results, it is reasonable to assume that the vast majority of these 306 libraries were using LC in 1967.

The three libraries that identified themselves as DC users will naturally be included in the totals for DC users throughout the balance of this study. The remaining 306 will be treated as though all were LC users. This procedure may slightly bias the data in favor of the LC users, but it will greatly facilitate the analyses that will be made below.

Ninety libraries in the population selected the answer “other” when identifying for LC as the classification scheme they were using in 1967. Seeking information concerning the classification schemes these libraries were using, we forwarded them copies of the letter and questionnaire reproduced in Appendix II. In certain cases additional information was obtained through follow-up inquiries. Usable responses received from eighty-six of these ninety libraries revealed that only a handful were actually classifying the majority of their new acquisitions by a system other than LC or DC. Many of these libraries had been reclassifying from DC to LC in 1967 and had selected the answer “other” because they had felt that neither of the other choices provided by the Office of Education questionnaire adequately described their situation. Various other libraries had selected the answer “other” because they had been using a combination of schemes such as LC and the National Library of Medicine scheme or DC and Lynn-Peterson. The majority of these libraries had been classifying most of their new acquisitions by either LC or DC.

Of the eighty-six libraries which provided information, fifty-seven were classifying most of their new acquisitions by LC at the close of 1967 while thirteen were classifying most of their new acquisitions by DC. By the close of 1971, the LC total had risen to sixty-four while the DC total had dropped to nine. The remaining libraries, sixteen in 1967 and thirteen in 1971, were using a variety of systems.

As noted above, two of the institutions within the population failed to inform the Office of Education concerning the classification scheme they were using in 1967. Both responded to our inquiries by indicating that they had adopted LC by the close of 1967. One of these institutions is the City College of the City University of New York, once the most prominent American user of the Bliss Bibliographic Classification.

Tables 1 and 2 summarize our findings. Of the 1,160 institutions in the population, 478 were classifying most or all new acquisitions by LC at the close of 1967 while 588 were classifying most or all new acquisitions by DC. By the close of 1971, the number of LC users had swelled.
TABLE 1  
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED IN 1967  
BY THE LIBRARIES OF 1,160 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification System Used in 1967 as Reported in LSCU67</th>
<th>Classification System Used in 1967 as Reported in This Study</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2  
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED IN 1967 AND 1971  
BY THE LIBRARIES OF 1,160 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification System</th>
<th>1967</th>
<th>1971</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to 635 while the number of DC users had shrunk to 429. Only a handful of libraries were classifying the majority of their new acquisitions by another system in either year.

As noted by Table 1, eighty-two institutions whose classification schemes were identified by LSCU67 as “DC” or “other” failed to return our questionnaires. What can be said concerning these nonrespondents? Forty-five were privately controlled undergraduate colleges, and fifty-seven owned fewer than 100,000 volumes in 1971. As will be shown later, the majority of institutions possessing such characteristics used DC in both 1967 and 1971. It could therefore be argued that the majority of these nonrespondents were probably DC users.

Practices in Different Types of Institutions

Each of the 1,160 institutions in the population was assigned by LSCU67 to one of the following six categories: “PUB-U,” “PRI-U,” “PUB-FG,” “PRI-FG,” “PUB-FN,” or “PRI-FN.” The prefixes “PUB” and “PRI” stand for “publicly controlled” and “privately controlled,” respectively, while the suffixes “U,” “FG,” and “FN” signify “university,” “four-year institution with graduate program,” and “four-year institution, no graduate program,” respectively.
The difference between the suffixes “U” and “FG” requires additional explanation. LSCU67 identifies institutions as universities (identified by the suffix “U”) if they give considerable stress to graduate instruction, confer advanced degrees as well as bachelor's degrees in a variety of liberal arts fields, and have at least two professional schools that are not exclusively technological. The suffix “FG” is reserved for institutions which possess graduate programs but lack sufficient graduate strength or diversity to be categorized as universities.

Findings relating to the frequency of use of the different classification schemes in the different kinds of institutions are summarized in Table 3 (as of 1967) and Table 4 (as of 1971). (For the sake of simplicity, we shall speak, from this point on, of institutions which “used” or “were using” various classification systems when we actually mean that these institutions were classifying most or all of their new acquisitions by these systems.) Between 1967 and 1971 the percentage of institutions which were using LC increased in every category, with the largest increase, 22.4 percent, being registered by the “Public four-year with graduate program” institutions. In 1967 DC users outnumbered LC users in three categories, but in 1971 they outnumbered LC users in only one category, “Private four-year, no graduate program.”

Practices in Libraries of Various Sizes

Findings relating to the frequency of use of the different classification schemes in the different sizes of libraries are summarized in Table 5 (as of 1967) and Table 6 (as of 1971). Table 5 shows that more than 60 percent of the libraries in each of the size-ranges above 199,999 vol-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSCU67 Categories</th>
<th>Classification System</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Using LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public four-year with graduate</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year with graduate</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public four-year no graduate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year no graduate</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED BY THE LIBRARIES OF SIX CATEGORIES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN 1967
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TABLE 4
Classification Systems Used by the Libraries
of Six Categories of Colleges and Universities in 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSCU67 Categories</th>
<th>Classification System</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent Using LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public university</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private university</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public four-year</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public four-year</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Volumes Held and Classification Systems Used in 1967
by the Libraries of 1,160 Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes Held in 1967*</th>
<th>Classification System Used in 1967</th>
<th>Percent Using LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million or More</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-999,999</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000-499,999</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000-299,999</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-199,999</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-99,999</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Source: Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities: Data for Individual Institutions, Fall 1967.

This study has identified 162 college and university libraries which adopted LC during 1968-71. All but three of these libraries formerly used DC. As shown in Table 7, the number of converts declined from a high of 70 in 1968 to a low of 20 in 1971.
TABLE 6
VOLUMES HELD AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS USED IN 1971
BY THE LIBRARIES OF 1,160 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes Held in 1971*</th>
<th>Classification System Used in 1971</th>
<th>Percent Using LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Million or More</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000–999,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000–499,999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000–299,999</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000–199,999</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000–99,999</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 50,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 7
ADOPTION OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CLASSIFICATION DURING 1968–1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Libraries Not Using LC as the Year Opened</th>
<th>Libraries that Adopted LC</th>
<th>Percent that Adopted LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>535*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>495*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>466*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Including the three libraries which adopted LC at an unspecified date within 1968–71.

The final column of Table 7 reports the percentages of the "potential converts" which switched to LC in a given year. At the beginning of 1968, at least 605 of the institutions in the population were using a system other than LC. The 70 which adopted LC in 1968 represented 11.6 percent of these institutions. By the beginning of 1971 the number of potential converts had shrunk to 466. The 20 libraries which switched to LC during 1971 represented only 4.3 percent of this total.

The 429 institutions that were using DC at the close of 1971 were asked, "Is it your present intention to remain with Dewey throughout the foreseeable future?" Of the 419 that answered this question, 363 (86.6 percent) indicated they would retain DC, 12 (2.9 percent) said they would abandon DC, and 44 (10.5 percent) expressed uncertainty.

Each respondent was invited to comment upon his intended course of action, and most did. The comments made by those persons who in...
tended to retain DC for the foreseeable future revealed varying attitudes toward DC. While many of these persons preferred LC but felt they could not justify the costs and disruption associated with a switch, many others enthusiastically praised DC and lauded its utility in academic libraries.

While the majority of the 1,160 libraries in the population were using LC by the end of 1971, a large number of libraries were continuing to use DC and were planning to retain DC for the foreseeable future. On the question of classification systems, academic librarians clearly remained divided.
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4. The libraries which failed to return our questionnaires were not included in this total.

APPENDIX I

Cover letter and questionnaire sent to the 762 institutions identified by LSCU67 as users of the Dewey Decimal Classification:

According to the 1967 edition of Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, the Dewey Decimal Classification system was the principal classification system being used by your library. Are you still classifying most new acquisitions by Dewey?

Seeking to determine whether the so-called “trend” to the Library of Congress Classification is maintaining its momentum or slowing down, I would like to inquire:

If you have remained with Dewey, how firmly committed to Dewey are you?
If you have adopted LC, how recently have you done so?

Your assistance in completing the enclosed brief form will be appreciated.

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Name of the institution)
1. We classify most new acquisitions by

   Dewey  LC

DEWEY USERS—if you classify most new acquisitions by Dewey:

2. Is it your present intention to remain with Dewey throughout the foreseeable future?

   Yes  No  Uncertain

3. Why does this course of action seem best for your library?

LC USERS—if you classify most new acquisitions by LC:

2. LC was adopted in 19_.

3. Is it your present intention to reclassify most of the Dewey materials?
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APPENDIX II

Cover letter and questionnaire sent to the ninety institutions identified by LSCU/67 as users of a classification scheme other than Dewey or Library of Congress:

The Fall 1967 compilation of Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities listed the classification system used by each reporting institution. Whereas most institutions reported using either the Library of Congress or Dewey Decimal Classification systems, your institution reported "Other." What does this answer mean?

It would appear that some librarians answered "Other" because their libraries are using both LC and DDC, while other librarians answered "Other" because their libraries are truly using another classification system.

To help me understand the classification system used in your library, I would appreciate your completing and returning the accompanying short questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance.

QUESTIONNAIRE

(Name of the institution)

Our answer "Other" means that:

1. We use both LC and Dewey:
   Yes No
   LC used for____________________________________
   Dewey used for_________________________________

2. We use another classification system,
   Yes No
   namely,__________________________________________

Are LC or Dewey used at all?____________________________________

Additional explanatory comments:

BOOK MARKETING AND SELECTION DATA

A program meeting on "Book Marketing and Selection: A Publishing/Library Forum" was sponsored by the American Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Resources Section and the RTSD/Association of American Publishers Joint Committee on 1 July 1975 at the ALA Annual Conference. In preparation for the program, questionnaires were sent to a group of wholesalers, publishers, and librarians, and the results of the survey were discussed by program speakers. A summary of the numerical results of the three survey questionnaires is available from the RTSD Office, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. Requests should be accompanied by a check or money order for $1.00 each. Checks should be made payable to the American Library Association.
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Margaret Mann Citation, 1975:
Margaret Webster Ayrault

The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1975 to Margaret Webster Ayrault in recognition of her strength of leadership in cataloging and classification as acknowledged by her colleagues in professional organizations, in libraries, and in library education.

Margaret Webster Ayrault

Sarah K. Vann
Graduate School of Library Studies
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, Hawaii

Margaret W. Ayrault, recipient of the 1975 Margaret Mann Citation, has long represented cataloging interests dynamically and effectively. In many ways her career parallels that of Margaret Mann, for, like Miss Mann, Miss Ayrault acquired an enviable reputation as a librarian and, again like Miss Mann, shared her practical wisdom with library school students.

Miss Ayrault was born in Tonawanda, New York, on 11 September 1911, and was granted degrees from the following institutions: Oberlin College, A.B., 1933; Drexel Library School, B.S.L.S., 1934; and School of Library Service, Columbia University, M.S.L.S. 1940. She is a member of the American Association of University Women, Beta Phi Mu, Delta Kappa Gamma, and Phi Beta Kappa.

Miss Ayrault was nominated for and awarded the Citation on the basis of two criteria: (1) outstanding contribution to the activities of professional cataloging associations, and (2) outstanding contribution to the area of teaching cataloging and classification. Unusual circumstances, notably a career-long involvement, insure that her contributions occurred not only just within the last five years, as the criteria suggest, but throughout many years.

Since 1941, for thirty-four years, Miss Ayrault has been involved with the action and activities of the American Library Association, beginning with membership in the Junior Members Round Table, for which she was secretary in 1942–43. From there she moved quickly to the area of her special interest: cataloging and classification. Miss Ayrault
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gave unstintingly of her time to the development of the Division of Cataloging and Classification (DDC); both her recognition of the need of a purposeful division and her forceful personality compelled its success. She served the division first as elected executive secretary for three years without remuneration, later as a member of the Board of Directors, and, finally, as president. Among the accomplishments during that time were (1) creating the Board of Cataloging Policy and Research, (2) envisioning and designing the Margaret Mann Citation, and (3) transforming the Newsletter into the Journal of Cataloging and Classification. Miss Ayrault participated also in the negotiations which led to the assumption by the Library of Congress of the editorial responsibility for the Dewey Decimal Classification.

In 1956 when the American Library Association was undergoing reorganization, Miss Ayrault, then president of DCC, while feeling regret over the loss of divisional status, endorsed publicly the creation of the Resources and Technical Services Division in which the former DCC became the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS). During the transitional period Miss Ayrault served also as the first chairman of CCS.

She has continued her support of and involvement with RTSD and CCS; among the committees with which she has been associated are these: member and chairman of Cataloging Policy and Research Committee (CPRC); chairman of Margaret Mann Citation Committee.
chairman of Esther J. Piercy Award Jury; member of RTSD Committee on Nonbook Materials (1973/74-1974/75). Miss Ayrault served also as a member of ALA Council representing RTSD and as chairman of the Melvil Dewey Award Committee.

She was among those who recognized the advantages and inadequacies of the new historic Cataloging-in-Source (CIS) project; she offered astute, critical, and effective comments as a multiyear ex-officio member of the Catalog Code Revision Committee which was responsible for the text of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.

Miss Ayrault has participated also in state professional activities. While in Michigan she served as chairman of the Michigan Regional Group of Catalogers; in Hawaii she helped organize and served as first chairman of the newly formed College and Research Libraries Section of the Hawaii Library Association (1970) and, 1974/75, she was president of the association. Miss Ayrault's career evidences a progressive development from her early days as a cataloger at Enoch Pratt Free Library (1934–1938) through the following positions: chief, Processing Section, U.S. Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D.C., 1943–1950; head, Bibliographic Control Section, U.S. Naval Ordinance Test Station, China Lake Inyokern, California, 1950–1951; assistant librarian, U.S. Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D.C., 1952–54; head, Catalog Department, University Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1954–65.

Ten years ago, in 1965, Miss Ayrault accepted the challenge to help establish a Graduate School of Library Studies at the University of Hawaii, which within a period of two years was accredited by the American Library Association. Among the courses which added significantly to the program of the school were those in cataloging and classification, experimentally designed by Miss Ayrault. Her reputation has added prestige to the school, for all who know her throughout the country have confidence in the readiness of her students to assume responsibilities in the profession.

The following tribute paid to Miss Ayrault by one of her former students reflects the message she conveyed in class:

Miss Ayrault . . . brought to her students a lively appreciation of the practicalities of cataloging as well as the theory. Her zeal for accuracy and her passion for "seeing with your mind, not just your eyes" inspire in her students a respect for cataloging . . . Students leaving Margaret Ayrault's classes . . . know that cataloging is not a mechanical process of putting the required elements into a stylized format, but an intellectual activity, describing the physical piece, reciting its history and classifying its contents, in order that the library's public may be served.

A signal honor was bestowed upon her when the House of Representatives, Hawaii State Legislature, passed a resolution on 9 April 1975 (H.R. No. 791) stating that "it does hereby commend Miss Margaret
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Ayrault for her distinguished teaching career and her many contributions in the field of library studies.” All who know her share with the House of Representatives their accompanying resolution “that it does hereby extend to Miss Ayrault aloha and best wishes upon her retirement and wish her many happy and productive years in her retirement.”

Miss Ayrault will continue to reside in Hawaii.

NOMINATIONS FOR 1976 MARGARET MANN CITATION

Nominations for the 1976 Margaret Mann Citation are invited and should be submitted by 15 December 1975 to: Eldon Tamblyn, Apt. #501, 2020 S. W. Main Street, Portland, OR 97205.

The Margaret Mann Citation is awarded annually for outstanding achievement in cataloging or classification through (1) publication of significant professional literature, (2) contributions to activities of professional cataloging organizations, (3) technical improvements and/or introduction of new techniques of recognized importance, or (4) distinguished work in the area of teaching.

Names of persons previously nominated but not chosen may be re-submitted, and letters of nomination should include a résumé of the nominee’s achievement.

The citation has been awarded annually since 1951 by the Cataloging and Classification Section, Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, and its predecessors, in honor of Margaret Mann. Miss Mann served as head of the catalog departments of the Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh, the Engineering Societies Library in New York, and the University of Illinois, and also from 1926 to 1938 in the University of Michigan School of Library Science. Her Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books is a classic in the field.
Esther J. Piercy Award, 1975:

John D. Byrum, Jr.

The Esther J. Piercy Award is presented in 1975 to John D. Byrum, Jr., in recognition of his contributions to technical services. John D. Byrum, Jr., has a remarkable talent for understanding and developing rules for cataloging. His committee work and publications have contributed to the development of cataloging rules for machine-readable data files. As chairman of the ALA/RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee he is directing the revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules with calm leadership and vision. His appreciation that cataloging rules need to be readily comprehensible to all catalogers meets the high standards Esther J. Piercy set for herself and shared with others.

John Byrum

Robert Wedgeworth
Executive Director
American Library Association

John Byrum has distinguished himself both in his academic pursuits and his professional contributions. Following graduation in 1958 from Wenatchee High School, Wenatchee, Washington, he continued his studies at Harvard College; John received a bachelor's degree in history in 1962 and was graduated magnae cum laude. In addition to his academic distinction, he was awarded a Harvard College Honorary Scholarship.

After receiving the baccalaureate, John pursued graduate studies at the University of Washington and Stanford before entering the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers University. At Rutgers he achieved an outstanding record; among his honors was election to Beta Phi Mu and first ranking in his class when he was graduated in 1966.

John's first professional position was as the assistant serials librarian at the University of Washington Library, Seattle. After a year he returned to the East and to the Ivy League and, in 1967, was appointed to the Catalogue Division of the Princeton University Library. John's unusual talents were quickly recognized and, within two years, he was named head cataloger. John has participated actively in both national and local professional associations, but in addition to his professional

interests, has also served on various committees at Princeton University. At this time, John is a member of the Princeton University Equal Employment Opportunity Committee, and is also a member of the committee studying the reclassification of library positions. In the past he has served as both vice-president and president of the University Library Staff Association. In addition to these extracurricular activities, John has certainly left his mark on the Princeton University Catalogue Division. Combining a modish style with high personal standards, he has helped to make the Catalogue Division a team of highly skilled and dedicated librarians, who share his insistence on getting the job done well. John has worked to streamline the procedures in order to make the department a smoothly running, technically expert operation.

As a member of the American Library Association, John has been an energetic member of the Resources and Technical Services Division. Since 1966 he has held numerous committee appointments and chairmanships within the division. For three years he was a member of the Interdivisional Committee on Bibliographical Representation in Machine-Readable Form; from 1970-74 John was chairman of the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section Descriptive Cataloging Committee, Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files. In addition to committee work, he served with distinction for two years as assistant to the editor of *Library Resources & Technical Services*.

As a cataloger, one of John's main interests has been the development of cataloging rules that are understandable and logical. This sensi-
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tivity, combined with an understanding of the complexities of cataloging, have made John an outstanding chairman of the Catalog Code Revision Committee and made him an obvious choice as the association's representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. As the award citation reads, John has directed the task of revising the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules "with calm leadership and vision." And, as is typical of John's inquiring intellect, he has extended his interests and done more than his "fair share." In 1974 John was selected as a Council on Library Resources Fellow to undertake a study to determine the current application of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules by general research libraries and to gather suggestions from catalogers on how the code could be improved. The data he will gather from this research project and the conclusions he will reach will undoubtedly have a profound effect on the revised Anglo-American Code.

John's contributions to the profession, his abilities, his dedication, and his good spirit make him eminently worthy of the Esther J. Piercy Award. William Dix, librarian emeritus of Princeton University, shares our pleasure on John's recognition. Said Mr. Dix,

Not for fifty or seventy-five years has there been such a challenge and such an opportunity for catalogers—with the immediate prospect of networks covering the country and worldwide bibliographic control no longer a dream, this then may be the age of the cataloger. Given these challenges, the times demand catalogers like John Byrum—a library professional with a firm intellectual grasp of theory and insistence upon high standards, and a recognition of the opportunities offered by new attitudes and new technology.

I could not agree more wholeheartedly with Mr. Dix, and I have great optimism and confidence about the future of librarianship, knowing that persons such as John are members of the profession.

NOMINATIONS FOR 1976 ESTHER J. PIERCY AWARD

Nominations for the 1976 Esther J. Piercy Award are invited and should be submitted by 15 December 1975 to: Phyllis A. Richmond, School of Library Science, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, OH 44106.

The Esther J. Piercy Award has been given since 1969 by the American Library Association's Resources and Technical Services Division. The purpose of the award is to recognize contribution to librarianship in the field of technical services by a younger librarian who has not more than ten years of professional experience and who has shown outstanding promise for continuing contributions and leadership. The award may be granted for leadership in professional associations at local, state, regional, or national level; contributions to the development, application, or utilization of new or improved methods, techniques, and rou-
tines; a significant contribution to professional literature; or conduct of studies or research in the technical services.

Renominations of nonrecipients are acceptable; letters of nomination should include a résumé of the nominee's achievements.

The recipients of the Piercy Award to date are:
1969 Richard M. Dougherty
1970 John B. Corbin
1971 John Phillip Immroth
1972 Carol A. Nemeyer
1973 Glen A. Zimmerman
1974 (no award presented)
1975 John Byrum

Esther J. Piercy, in whose honor this award is given, was active in ALA and several of its divisions. The author of *Commonsense Cataloging* and numerous articles in the field of librarianship, Miss Piercy was from 1950 until her death the editor of the divisional journal, *Journal of Cataloging and Classification*, and its successor for Resources and Technical Services Division, *Library Resources & Technical Services*.

**ACQUISITIONS SCHOLARSHIP AWARD**

The Acquisitions Scholarship Award of the American Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Resources Section has been established to honor the author or authors of a monograph, published article, or original paper on acquisitions pertaining to college and university libraries. The donor of the $800 scholarship is Arnold V. Santos of Makely's Inc. The scholarship money will be donated to the U.S. or Canadian library school of the winning author's choice. That library school will select a library science student concentrating in the area of acquisitions or collection development to receive the scholarship money.

The ALA RTSD Resources Section Policy and Research Committee has been charged with identifying the best publication. Recommendations for the most significant resources article or book for 1974 should be submitted to Deanna Marcum, Chairperson of the Committee at the Joint University Libraries, Nashville, TN 37203, before 1 December 1975. Announcement of the name of the author receiving the award will be made on 1 April 1976 and the award will be presented at the RTSD Resources Section membership meeting during the 1976 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago, Illinois.
THE DIVISION AND ITS SECTIONS sponsored programs on a variety of technical services subjects at the 1975 ALA Annual Conference, and committees of the division and sections worked on many projects of importance to the division and the profession.

The division sponsored a coffee hour preceding its business and program meeting as an informal means for officers and committee chairmen to discuss with other RTSD members and potential members the work of the division.

The RTSD Nonbook Committee's name was changed at its request to the RTSD Audiovisual Committee during the San Francisco Conference. The committee decided that a proposed American National Standards Institute (ANSI) Z39 Committee standard for coding audiovisual materials would most properly be assigned to the new ISAD Audiovisual Section. The committee continues to feel the need for a revision of the A.L.A. Glossary of Library Terms which should be coordinated with the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) second edition glossary. The committee also discussed the lack of bibliographic control of microforms and the need for shared cataloging or some method of avoiding duplication. The RTSD representative to the Joint Advisory Committee on Nonbook Materials indicated that the joint committee would be the avenue of input to the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) development of an international standard bibliographic description for nonbook materials.

The RTSD Commercial Processing Services Committee continued at the San Francisco Conference to prepare a manual for commercial processing services. The manual will be directed toward the college or public librarian who needs assistance in selecting the right processor and
will contain a model contract, information about costs, etc.

The RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee discussed at San Francisco its plans to sponsor a four-hour, limited registration workshop on costs at the 1976 Annual Conference.

The RTSD Keyboard Committee reported at San Francisco that it had consulted manufacturers of typewriters; sought opinions from librarians about typewriter keyboards; studied tables of diacritical marks and appropriate ANSI standards; and considered the requirements of the international standard bibliographic descriptions and other developments related to keyboards. A recommendation for a forty-four-key typewriter keyboard has been drafted by the committee as a revision of the 1966 "standard library keyboard."

The RTSD Preservation Committee discussed the possibility of initiating the preparation and publication of a short, illustrated handbook on book repair techniques, to provide libraries with authoritative guidance through the maze of often conflicting instructions now available from several commercial sources. The committee will consider at the 1976 Midwinter Meeting a draft policy statement advising libraries to request/require the use of permanent-durable paper in all materials acquired for their permanent collections. The committee considered a means of fulfilling its role as a clearinghouse for preservation information. At the 1976 Annual Conference the Committee plans to sponsor a program on the administration of preservation programs.

The RTSD Planning Committee reviewed at the San Francisco Conference the recently revised "ALA Goals and Objectives" in relation to the "RTSD Goals for Action."

The RTSD Organization Committee met in San Francisco with division and section discussion group leaders. Ten discussion groups are officially affiliated with RTSD, and two more are forming. All groups indicate that their informal discussion forums are thriving. It was suggested that the popularity of discussion group meetings should indicate to division conference program planners the need for more programs to cover high-interest topics in small workshop format.

After considering other possible division structures, the RTSD Organization Study Committee stated in its final report that the present structure of RTSD is adequate. Organization by form rather than by function would present as many or more problems. The existing overlaps between areas were recognized. They foster and stimulate exchanges of ideas and are even desirable to obtain mutual goals, according to the report. The committee strongly and emphatically recommended that steps be taken to improve, require, and demand communication between sections and committees. It also recommended that the Organization Committee or other appropriate committee reexamine the liaison between committees and sections within RTSD and liaison with units outside RTSD, and to reexamine the function statements of the various sections and committees of RTSD to reaffirm, restate, or change as necessary.
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Many units of RTSD have expressed the desire for better communication in the form of a division newsletter. The RTSD Board of Directors approved at San Francisco the establishment of a newsletter to be published four times per year between the issues of Library Resources & Technical Services. The newsletter would be designed to improve communication with division members concerning the activities of various RTSD units including the RTSD Council of Regional Groups.

The RTSD Board affirmed the continued policy of not copyrighting Library Resources & Technical Services. It also passed a motion stating that, effective with the 1977 ALA Annual Conference, all units of the division desiring to have program meetings at Annual Conferences must submit requests in writing to the Board of Directors one year in advance of the meeting date for approval or rejection of anticipated time slots; that the board prohibit the overlapping of scheduled committee program meetings with program meetings of the sections and/or division; and that duplicate substantive programs be avoided at all times.

Units of the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) gave special attention to subject headings during the San Francisco Conference. A program meeting on the arrangement of elements in geographic subject headings was sponsored by CCS at the conference.

The CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee discussed the advisability of publishing a new subject heading list for children's materials but unanimously voted that such a list should not be published by ALA, particularly in view of the recommended adoption of the Library of Congress cataloging as the standard. The committee recommended that CCS consider a survey regarding the use of and discrepancies between the Sears and Library of Congress subject headings relative to children's materials. It also suggested that the Sears List of Subject Headings is no longer satisfactory and recommended that it would be valuable to have all Library of Congress subject headings used for children's materials published as a standard list.

The CCS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) discussed the final report of its ad hoc Subcommittee on Correctional Materials. Possible methods of publishing of the "Selected Annotated List of Special Subject Headings Lists & Other Sources of Information in the Subject Area of Correctional Material . . .," which was appended to the subcommittee's final report, were discussed.

The Subject Analysis Committee also discussed subject headings for ethnic groups and passed the following resolution:

That the Subject Analysis Committee go on record as recommending that the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division begin to change subject headings containing the words, "Negro" and "Negroes" to use "Afro-American" to refer to "Negroes in the U.S." and "Black" to refer to racial origin (e.g. Black race for Negro race) as recommended by the Black Caucus.

The committee also discussed a position paper, "Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples," written by
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Joan Marshall and Elizabeth Dickinson. The paper contained the following four principles:

1. The authentic name of ethnic, national, religious, social, or sexual groups should be established if such a name is determinable.
2. In establishing subdivisions for use with the names of people or peoples consider the connotation, in addition to the denotation, of the wording and structure of the subdivision.
3. The wording and structure of headings for minority or other groups should not differ in wording or structure from headings for the majority.
4. Do not use subsuming terminology.

After discussion of the paper it was decided that:

The Subject Analysis Committee go on record as recommending that the four principles in the paper entitled “Principles for Establishing Subject Headings Relating to People and Peoples” be accepted by the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division and other libraries.

At the 1976 Midwinter Meeting, the Subject Analysis Committee will consider a suggestion that it undertake studies leading to recommendations to the Library of Congress on the subject analysis which would be desirable in any overall revision of the LC subject catalog structure.

The SAC ad hoc Subcommittee on the Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials met for the first time at the San Francisco Conference. The subcommittee is:

...to investigate and to identify any differences in the subject analysis and control requirements of nonbook materials and books. This investigation is to include consultation with public service librarians and media specialists as well as subject catalogers.

The subcommittee expects to present an interim report in 1976 and a final report no later than the Detroit Conference in 1977. Persons wishing to submit comments to the subcommittee should contact Lizbeth Bishoff (652 North Ave., Antioch, IL 60002).

Catalog code revision received major attention at the San Francisco Conference. The division sponsored a program meeting on past and future of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules.

The RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) met for more than thirty-five hours during the San Francisco Conference. For an account of their major decisions, see “Catalog Code Revision” elsewhere in this issue.

The RTSD CCRC Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files forwarded to CCRC a working paper on main and added entry. It approved with editorial changes a working paper on size of file area. The subcommittee’s working papers on notes and uniform titles will be further revised. A fall 1975 meeting of the subcommittee has been scheduled to continue its work.

The RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) discussed its
position vis-à-vis the draft MARC International Format developed by the International Federation of Library Associations' Working Group on Content Designators; reviewed the draft, "Authorities: A MARC Format"; and discussed proposed MARC format changes concerning a new field for expanded title, a new subfield code for collation, and new fields for variant names. The committee discussed a number of matters referred to it by CCRC. The MARBI Committee had no comment on AACR chapter 14. It endorsed in principle the development of standard medium designators and media codes and the extension of the concept to printed material, but recommended that these be consistent with developments at the international level (i.e., not bound to a particular language), and once developed, be submitted to MARBI for consideration as part of the MARC format. It also noted that CCRC might want to deal with the issue of linking cataloging records across media. The committee observed that the hierarchical approach to the entry of corporate bodies lends itself to greater retrieval capability, i.e., the machine can manipulate, and retrieve only what is there. The committee also pointed out that fullness of personal names in entries is important in the international setting.

At the request of CCRC, the RTSD Computer Filing Committee discussed AACR provisions which should be considered for modification, abandonment, or addition in order to take into account the developments in the machine processing of bibliographic records. At the San Francisco Conference the committee identified the following areas: names with prefixes; numbers in certain corporate headings, e.g., U.S. Congress and military units; numbers in certain personal headings; titles of honor and address; uniform titles; numbers in titles; distinction and subarrangement of corporate headings having identical organizational names.

During the San Francisco Conference the CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee discussed the possibility of an abridged edition of AACR. The consensus was that an abridged edition would not be necessary if the second edition of AACR included an expanded index, a glossary, and was in a format which would facilitate use.

The CCS Policy and Research Committee continued its discussion of the issues and problems concerning the current AACR revision. The committee expressed concern that the revision efforts are being conducted in a fragmentary manner. While it is too late to attempt to do any basic research for the present code revision effort, the committee felt that planning should begin now to insure that future code revisions can be based upon and reflect the results of objective research. The committee strongly urged the CCS Executive Committee to take action to foster and encourage research and where possible to identify funding sources focusing on the following topics: catalog use and user preferences; the form of catalog entries including headings and tracings; the structure and style of catalog records including card catalogs, book catalogs, and computer catalogs; the relationship between manual and ma-
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chine bibliographic records; and the relationship between form and/or type of material, cataloging treatment, and patterns of use.

The CCS Policy and Research Committee continued its discussion of means for encouraging cooperation from various library school faculty members and their students in undertaking research in areas identified and submitted for consideration by the committee.

During the 1975 Annual Conference CCS sponsored an institute on international cataloging standards. At the 1976 Annual Conference the division and the CCS will cosponsor a centennial program on the Dewey Decimal Classification.

The Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS) sponsored a program meeting on criteria for the procurement and use of microforms and related equipment. In 1976 the section plans to sponsor a program on the state of the art of microforms and on computer output microfilm.

The RLMS Telefacsimile Committee has contacted all U.S. state libraries concerning telefacsimile operations in their states. Questionnaires have been sent to libraries using telefacsimile. The information collected will assist the committee in constructing a successful model. The model will include costs, modes of operation, staffing, and forms for transmitting bibliographic information.

The RLMS Standards Committee and the Resources Section (RS) Micropublishing Projects Committee jointly recommended at the San Francisco Conference that libraries buy for their permanent collections only microforms (such as silver halide film) for which standards for archival permanence have been established by recognized standards organizations. It was reported to the RS Micropublishing Projects Committee that the National Reprographic Center has received a grant to devise methods of testing nonsilver film for effects of light, humidity, and temperature. The committee made plans to systematically review advertisements for micropublications in the light of the new ANSI standard for advertising micropublications.

The Council of Regional Groups will sponsor a program on standards related to technical services for its members at the 1976 Annual Conference.

At the San Francisco Conference the Resources Section (RS) cosponsored an all-day librarians/publishers forum on selection of library materials and a program on west coast publishing. For 1976 the section will sponsor a conference program on the international flow of books.

The RS Collection Development Committee sponsored in San Francisco a series of small-group discussions about selection of particular kinds of materials, e.g., American Indian material. At the 1976 Annual Conference, the committee plans to sponsor similar discussions of selection of material from specific geographic areas. The Collection Development Committee also discussed formula budgeting and allocation at its San Francisco meeting. Topics such as the following were discussed: Why allocate? Who should do it? How does the allocation formula re-
late to collection development policy? and How does one fund collection development policies? The committee also discussed guidelines which it is developing on the formulation of collection development policy statements. A new draft of the guidelines will be prepared and discussed at the 1976 Midwinter Meeting.

The RS Library Materials Price Index Committee discussed the need for additional foreign price indexes and decided to initiate correspondence with the appropriate IFLA Committee chairman and interested persons in other countries, e.g., Australia.

The RS Reprinting Committee discussed the possibility of serving as a clearinghouse for suggestions for reprints from librarians and complaints from librarians about reprinting. The committee's Subcommittee on Reprint Review Media reported that 100 questionnaires concerning review media were mailed in May 1975. Information about the responses will be relayed to the committee at its fall 1975 meeting.

At the San Francisco Conference, the Serials Section (SS) cosponsored a program on CONSER (CONversion of SERials Project) and during the 1976 Annual Conference the section plans to sponsor a program on possible uses of the products of the CONSER Project.

The SS Committee to Study Manually Maintained Serials Records discussed at San Francisco the initial tabulation of the responses of eighty-eight libraries to its questionnaire. Consideration was given to ways of making the tabulation and the questionnaires available to a wider audience.

The SS Policy and Research Committee recommended at the San Francisco Conference that the Serials Section establish a mechanism to study, report, and recommend on developing a standardized claim form for serials. The committee also discussed the need for definition, standards, and guidelines for serials holdings statements.

The SS Executive Committee decided that a statement should be prepared to reflect the position that libraries should be given the option of ordering serials directly from publishers or through vendors and that the statement should be distributed to vendors and publishers. The committee expressed continuing concern about the quality and quantity of serials courses in library school curricula, and it voted to establish an ad hoc committee to recommend action appropriate for promoting serials education.

The SS Regional Serials Workshop Committee reported on serials workshops held in Texas in June 1975 on "Serials: National Trends, Local Implications"; in California in May 1975 on "Title Main Entry for Serials: Pro and Con"; and of a conference planned for New York City in October 1975. From experience gathered from participating in planning these workshops, the committee expects to develop a manual on serials workshops.

The ALA SS representative to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials reported that the committee sees its role as one of seeking
funding and the establishment of a Union List of Serials Information Clearinghouse; of determining standards for location symbols if funds can be found; and of preparing a future study of the CONSER data base to determine what major subjects are not being covered adequately, e.g., law, music, theater, etc., and of recommending solutions on how to fill any such gap.

The San Francisco ALA Conference was a busy and productive one for RTSD units and members. Plans being made for the 1976 ALA Centennial Conference indicate a continued vigor in RTSD activities, programs, and membership.

NON-SILVER MICROFILM

Two committees of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association have adopted a joint recommendation intended for the guidance of libraries faced with decisions on whether to purchase microforms published on non-silver film or fiche. The number of such publications offered for sale has been rapidly increasing, and many librarians have voiced concern about the lack of standards for permanence and durability of such materials. The Standards Committee of the Reproduction of Library Materials Section and the Micropublishing Committee of the Resources Section, at a joint session at the Annual Conference of the association in July 1975, unanimously adopted the following:

RECOMMENDATION: that libraries buy for their permanent collections only microforms (such as silver halide film) for which standards for archival permanence have been established by recognized standards organizations.
## RTSD 1976 MIDWINTER MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Board of Directors</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 21, Wed</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 22, Thurs</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Luncheon</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD LRTS Editorial Board</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD/AAP Joint Committee</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Bylaws Committee</td>
<td>Jan 15, Thurs</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 16, Fri</td>
<td>9 a.m.-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 17, Sat</td>
<td>9 a.m.-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>6:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 21, Wed</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Committee on Education for Resources and Technical Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Commercial Processing Services Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Conference Program Committee (Detroit, 1977)</td>
<td>*Jan 22, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Keyboard Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 22, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD MARBI Committee</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 22, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Organization Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD ESTHER J. PIECY AWARD JURY</td>
<td>*Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee</td>
<td>Jan 17, Sat</td>
<td>7-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 21, Wed</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>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Service Administrators of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Small Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>9-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>1-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Processing Centers Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 22, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION SECTION

| CCS Executive Committee                                              | Jan 19, Mon | 8:30-10:30 p.m. |
|                                                                     | Jan 20, Tues | 2-4 p.m.        |
|                                                                      | Jan 21, Wed  | 8-9:30 a.m.     |
| CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee                                | Jan 19, Mon | 8-9:30 a.m.     |
|                                                                      | Jan 20, Tues | 8-9:30 a.m.     |

* Closed meeting.
† Open to all RTSD members; tickets on sale at Midwinter ALA Registration Desk.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCS Margaret Manning Station Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Policy and Research Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>9-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS Subject Analysis Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS SAC Subcommittee on Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPRODUCTION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS SECTION</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Publication Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Standards Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Telefacsimile Committee</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLMS Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES SECTION</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Collection Development Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Conference Program Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chicago, 1976—Western Europe)</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Bookdealer–Library Relations Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Library Materials Price Index Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Micropublishing Projects Committee</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Reprinting Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries</td>
<td>Jan 18, Sun</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIALS SECTION</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Executive Committee</td>
<td>Jan 21, Wed</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS AACR Revision Study Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Committee to Study Manually Maintained Serials Records</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Duplicates Exchange Union Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Policy and Research Committee</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Regional Serials Workshop Committee</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Jan 20, Tues</td>
<td>10-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>Jan 19, Mon</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Closed meeting.
‡ Joint meeting with RS Micropublishing Projects Committee.
§ Joint meeting with RLMS Standards Committee.
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Progress on Code Revision

The following account of recent activity of the Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) relating to revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) is based on two sources: (1) a summary of the minutes of the meetings of the committee in April 1975 prepared by Frances Hinton of the Free Library of Philadelphia and (2) a summary of the highlights of the meetings in San Francisco in June–July 1975 prepared by John Byrum. The most recent earlier account appeared in the summer 1975 issue of this journal.

Decisions on Content in April

A third draft of chapter 12 “Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials” was approved by CCRC and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. It will include an introduction, appendixes, and an index. The text, reproduced from typescript, should be considerably easier to use because of special attention to typographic and layout considerations.

Proposals for revision of chapter 14 were deferred to allow the Music Library Association to consider and comment on them.

In the light of concerns expressed by the MARC Development Office of the Library of Congress, implementation of the proposal to use U.S. Postal Service abbreviations for the states of the United States and the provinces of Canada has been postponed pending further discussion in preparation for the second edition of AACR.

The proposed supplementary list for Chinese romanization was authorized for publication subject to consideration of further proposals suggested by E. Chen of the Gest Oriental Library at Princeton.

The committee reviewed the editor’s proposals for deletion or retention of those rules which appear in either the British or the North American text but not in both. In most cases, the committee approved the editor’s recommendation, but for some rules or groups of rules deferred the proposals pending resolution of substantive differences between the two texts or receipt of proposed revisions of rules that are considered unsatisfactory.

Decisions on Procedures in April

The committee decided that the June deadline for submitting proposals for changes in AACR made it impracticable to assimilate any more new representatives into the Rule Revision Proposal Teams, recognizing that the meetings of the committee are open and anyone is welcome to attend and participate in the discussions. Organizations not interested in proposing changes may be interested in attending later meetings that will deal with the revised texts submitted by the editor.
Although the chairman of the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) will not present a formal document describing the principles upon which the second edition of *AACR* will be based, the JSC did make decisions on specific points that had given concern. The Catalog Code Revision Committee is free to consider any proposal, decide whether it accords with the Paris Principles, and whether, if not, it still merits consideration.

Teams 10, 11, and 12 were merged so that rules for corporate bodies, geographical names, and government bodies may be considered by a single group. A new team was established to consider requests for special treatment for particular types of publications.

*Other Action in April*

Preliminary reports were presented by teams 1–9, only one of which called for action. After considering this report, the committee declined to participate in a project to compile an accepted list of generic terms and agreed instead to work toward development of a definition of a "generic title." Furthermore it was decided that CCRC should actively consider, in addition to the current options for entry of serials, the possibility of entering all serials under title. The vote on this question was six to three, with one abstention.

Representatives of the Library of Congress, the Canadian Committee on Cataloging and the Catalog Code Revision Committee have submitted to the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) a joint position paper on *ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials* that goes somewhat beyond the requested textual criticism but that does not include a North American position on treatment of corporate authors in cases of serials with generic titles. Each of the three organizations has been invited to send a delegate to the October meeting in Paris at which a revised version of *ISBD(S)* will be prepared.

The committee endorsed a broadly based user study, especially concerned with the impact of international standard bibliographic descriptions, to include all types and sizes of libraries and to include staff as well as patrons. The endorsement was transmitted to the Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section.

*San Francisco Actions*

Meeting at several times during the period 26 June to 1 July in San Francisco, CCRC approved for transmittal to the Joint Steering Committee amendments which impinge on all chapters of *AACR*, except for chapter 10 ("Manuscripts"), which was not reviewed for lack of expertise. Appendixes and index as well as the style and format of the text of the second edition were also reviewed. Substantive items include: a proposal to clarify and possibly restrict conditions of corporate authorship; a proposal that title main entry be uniformly required for all serial publications; a recommendation that rules for entry of works with authorship of mixed character be recast into a single, general rule il-
Illustrated with examples of the most frequently encountered combinations of functions; a proposal to limit authorship with regard to artists to their original works and therefore to exclude them from entry consideration for publications which comprise reproductions unless they were involved in the creation of such works; a recommendation that the criteria relating to treatment of headings for corporate bodies involving subordination or other relationship be reconciled in a single rule and that the resulting headings be more complete in terms of elements of hierarchy included; and a suggestion that problems regarding transcription of authorship statements, publication dates, and collations which include leaves of plates be given special attention.

In addition, CCRC considered matters of liaison and communication with other groups concerned with code revision, especially the Computer Filing Committee and the RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI). The committee studied and endorsed the editor's view that there should be a single standard for bibliographic description, based on ISBD(M), in the second edition. The committee also dealt with certain developments on the international front, especially with regard to ISBD(S); it reviewed the Library of Congress amplifications of the North American position on revision of this standard and agreed with the Library and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to extend collaboration in this effort to include determination of a common position on amendments submitted by other national agencies.

CCRC has requested the RTSD Board of Directors to establish an ad hoc committee to conduct an overview of the implications of automation for AACR. The proposed project should involve a long-range, broad assessment of the present rules and possible future code developments in relation to machine potentialities. Any findings available prior to completion of work on the second edition could be referred to the Joint Steering Committee for possible consideration for inclusion in the new edition.
**Corporate Authorship**

I am pleased to notice the article by Ake I. Koel: "Can the Problems of Corporate Authorship Be Solved?" (LRTS, Fall 1974), for while I don't agree with his conclusion, at least so far as government publications are concerned, I do feel that it is high time that some of the Paris Principles are called into question, for that number 9 is not the only one needing to be called into question. In a short address I was asked to make by Madame Suzanne Honore, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, just recently in Washington, before the first of the sessions of the IFLA Commission on Official Publications of which she is chairman, under the title "Government Organization; Key to Government Publications," touching particularly the work in progress by Dr. Eva Verona, whom I met and talked with many years ago when I was in Zagreb, I touched upon that point, and would feel that some other principles besides number 9 might well be reconsidered, as the conference was held now almost fifteen years ago. Too little attention is paid to the user or the reference point of view in the principles and they do not reflect the many pitfalls presented by government organization and by government publications. My point of view may be partially glimpsed from my recent articles in the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science on "Government Publications (Documents)" (vol. 10, p.36-140), on A. S. Hasse (vol. 10, p.373-77), and on "Institute" (as an agency of government) (vol. 12, p.79-83). One thing needed now is a second international conference and thorough-going reconsideration of AACR 67. Some that have had long reference experience particularly in helping readers to locate needed references to government publications in library catalogs, I believe also feel the same way.

The above remarks are intended as no criticism of the personal or professional integrity of anyone—simply that some have not understood the long-range, world-wide over-all ramifications of government publications and of certain other special groups of materials now seriously coming within the collecting scope and use of many of our larger libraries, not only here but world-wide.—James Bennett Childs.

**Foreign Currency Exchange**

I read with interest Michael Moran's article "Foreign Currency Exchange Problems Relating to the Book Trade" [Summer 1973], and I would like to comment on some of his statements.

He says, giving an example, that "since the dealer's invoices were in terms of dollars (with the marks noted on the invoices also), and since the library purchase orders were presumably also in terms of dollars this dealer had no legal right to issue supplementary invoices and the libraries were not obliged to honor them." Wow! First of all, contrary to the opinion of many, it is still an undecided issue as to when a transaction like an order-library-vendor relationship becomes an air-tight contract (in the case of firm orders, or, in other words, single-title orders). Secondly, the vendor is on the same level in his relationship with the library: the currency of each is legal tender in his own country and can be used in an international transaction (if currency regulations about exchange,
import, and export of currency do not forbid it). In other words, the German dealer is no more obliged to invoice in dollars than the American library is obliged to quote a German price on its order, and vice-versa also.

When you send an order, the price quoted on it is only indicative: it is used by the library to calculate its committed funds and is not a binding quote on the vendor. A library order (except in some states of the U.S. where you have that system for state and public libraries) is not an advertisement for bids; it would be if you sent it to many dealers, I suppose. If, between the time that, for example, a German price was printed in VLB and the time that the invoice was issued, the German publisher changed the list price and that affected the selling price, well, it's too bad but you have to pay the new price. The fact that it may or may not be in dollars or marks is irrelevant. It may be unfortunate that libraries have to pay more because of the crazy system of exchange rates we have, but American librarians should realize that: (1) other countries have currencies too, and why should the American dollar have precedence; and (2) the American government bears a lot of the responsibility for the present state of fluctuations in rate, devaluations, and so on by refusing to recognize for a long time that the dollar was not the currency anymore.

The writer of the article, while being on the whole a bearer of good information, is still unconsciously influenced by a very well-known American trait of character (well known outside the U.S., that is): the conviction that the American currency and/or the American financial system is the best, and the standard one. For any one who, in the 1970s, is outside the U.S. and, like me, has lived in Europe for many years, the idea is absurd.

Our university library has its problems with currencies, but we try to be fair to the foreign dealers ("foreign," here, means American too). So, it's a give and take proposition by two equal partners.

May I share another thought? The university has a bank account in Paris (in francs), in London (in pounds), and in New York (in U.S. dollars). Since we buy a lot of American books but also a lot of French books (this being a French-language university), our accounts are very useful.

To take the example of the Paris account: if the university sells something in France, it is being paid in francs in that account; but that doesn't happen often, so when the rates are good, we instruct our Paris banker (the Paris branch of one of Canada's federally chartered banks: Banque Canadienne Nationale) to buy francs for us which we deposit in the account. We pay the francs in Canadian dollars, and pay all our French dealers in francs except when the invoice is made out in Canadian dollars or U.S. dollars. Wouldn't it be a good idea for big university libraries in the U.S. to do the same?—Michel Thériault, Head of Acquisitions, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada.

Michael Moran replies: My article was addressed to American libraries, as reading it will show. Further, it was written from a practical, not a theoretical, point of view. Now in theory, American libraries could maintain accounts in all currencies of all the countries with which they transact business. As a practical matter, however, this is not going to happen in the near future. Mr. Thériault would only have to attempt to obtain a commitment from an American university accounts payable office to pay invoices in non-American currencies and he would realize that what may be easy in Canada is difficult, if not impossible, in America. And even in Canada would the Université de Montréal be willing to
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maintain an account in, for example, the South African Rand? I doubt it! So, in buying books from South Africa which currency will be used? Francs? The Rand? Dollars? True, there is no obligation on either side to deal in any particular currency. But the buyer and seller must come to an agreement. That was the main point of my article. In addition, I gave some practical suggestions to American libraries on working with vendors in getting them to agree to use American currency, not because it has precedence or because it is better, but simply because it is what American libraries use.

Cataloging of Phonorecords

Mr. Robert Miles in his otherwise commendable article, “The Cataloging and Classification of Music on Phonorecords—Some Considerations,” [Summer, 1974] makes a commonplace but regrettable error. He evidently confounds title main entry with title unit entry. I have never recommended the use of title main entry, as he asserts on page 217. While I do suggest the use of title unit entry for reasons beyond those cited, in which cost of cataloging is a primary factor, I would not recommend title main entry anywhere.

The error, as I note above, is commonplace, and perhaps another explanation may help clear away the confusion. A main entry system implies that only one entry includes full description of the material; all other entries include something less than the full description found under the main entry. A unit entry implies that all the entries contain full description, hence any point of access will yield full details about the work cataloged. Because the unit entry card is the same whether for title or for author (or author equivalent, such as composer, performer, etc.), there is no reason to select a main entry as all of the entries are of equal value. A main entry system, however, should be arranged on the basis of probable search patterns on the part of querents of the catalog. Main entry under composer for serious music where one or two works are included on a phonorecord, entry under performer, or under label title as dictated by the presence of works by several composers on a phonorecord but with one performer or several works performed by different individuals is about the simplest way to arrange such a catalog and also reflect the probabilities of search patterns.

Since a unit entry card will include entries under composer and performer, there is very little need for the animadversions that Mr. Miles seems to find decisive. The net effect of a unit card system, along with the simplification of subject entries, is to make the cataloging rules easier to follow and such that a trained technical assistant can apply them without difficulty to all but the non-descript materials that no rules can adequately regiment.—Jay E. Daily, Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh.
This title is another in the Bowker series Problem-Centered Approaches to Librarianship, but these are case studies with a difference. Instead of the identity of the libraries being concealed, each library is fully identified even to the point of credit being given to the members of the library staff who developed the system and also to those who cooperated with the author in describing it for the publication in hand.

The author believes that progress in the use of the computer in libraries has been hampered by the reluctance of librarians to learn to cope with the technical aspects of automation. The aim of his book is to provide a state-of-the-art review of the current use of computers in libraries, and he hopes that it will prove useful to a "wide range of librarians, administrators and library school students."

Examples of computer applications have been selected from school, public, college, university, and special libraries. The cases are grouped by library function: circulation, serials, acquisitions. Cataloging, which does not appear as a separate subsystem, is included occasionally as an extension of acquisitions. The same pattern has been used for reporting all twenty cases, the headings being: "Environment," "Objectives," "The Computer," "The System," "Costs," and "Observations." Due to a lack of documentation for some systems (a problem that is identified by the author), not all the accounts are equally full or detailed. Well-formulated and specific statements of goals and objectives were available from some libraries, but by no means from all. The make of computer, the peripheral devices employed, and the language used in programming the system have been indicated in nearly all the cases. It was not the author's intent to provide documentation to the depth required by systems analysts or programmers. Additional technical information has been provided for some systems, however, and occasionally, as is always a danger when technical information is simplified for the non-expert, erroneous or misleading information has resulted. Thus in one case the statement is made that "the library does not store its information in the central core storage memory, but utilizes magnetic tapes," implying that the former was a viable alternative.

A knowledge of library procedures, but no expertise in data processing, is required to understand the descriptions of how the various systems operate. The language is non-technical, but there is considerable variation in the amount of detail included; in some reports, for example, specifications for record formats are supplied. Too much detail makes it difficult to grasp the overall operation of the system. The author's purpose, however, was to provide an accurate description, and the variation no doubt reflects variation in the type of documentation provided by the libraries.

One of the major criticisms leveled at descriptions of library automation projects published to date is that they usually reveal little or nothing about costs. A good reason for this is that accurate costing of a system is extremely difficult, and further, rapidly changing costs date information quickly. The author has made a praiseworthy effort not to be
guilty of this omission. He admits in his preface that "cost figures . . . are . . . less uniformly based than the author would like, but they are the best that could be established at this time . . . Some of these cost figures include overhead, fringe benefits, etc. and some do not. They should therefore not be compared directly." In view of this caveat it is odd that in the last chapter the information is presented in such a way as to invite a comparison of costs.

In the final section of each case, under the heading "Observations," an attempt has been made to identify noteworthy features of the system, good and bad, and to give some indication of the level of success achieved, in terms of the library's own stated objectives. The author's problem in evaluating some of the systems lay in the failure of the libraries to provide the necessary data on their performance, and statements like the following are the result: "It appears more than likely that the automated serials system has improved the library's serials service to patrons."

This book contains a considerable amount of information on a wide variety of computer applications. Because the author has intentionally excluded technical information, it will probably be of more use to librarians interested in gaining some understanding of the various ways in which a computer can be used to carry out library housekeeping procedures than to library educators. The use of the case study for this purpose is of interest in itself. A similar study with fewer cases, selected for comparability rather than variety, and with technical detail included could produce a very valuable teaching tool for the profession.—Katherine H. Packer, Faculty of Library Science, University of Toronto.
INDEX
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General Procedures Used in Compiling the Index

(1) The following types of entries are included:
   a. authors—of articles, of letters, of reviews, and books reviewed (the latter
two categories identified by "(r)" following the name)
   b. subjects of articles and of books reviewed (the latter identified by "(r)";
subject entries for individuals and corporate agencies are provided sparingly
and are identified by "(about)"
   c. titles of articles and of books reviewed (the latter identified by "(t)"
(2) Corporate names have been indexed under the common form of the name as it normally appears in print (not in inverted form). Acronyms and initialisms are recorded as such, and they are filed as words, whether they are so pronounced or not.
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Filing proofs? Searching NUC? Waiting for cards? Buying CARDSET or MCRS? Doing original cataloging?

Discover MARCFICHE!

LC & contributed cataloging of books in English since 1967 grows by 2,200 titles each week. Cumulatively indexed weekly by ME, Title, ISBN, Card & Call Number.

$375 per week delivered airmail.

MARC APPLIED RESEARCH COMPANY
Post Office Box 40035, Washington, D.C. 20016
Clip with class.
Plastiklips.
Mark, flag, tag. Classify, identify, codify. Fantastic Plastiklips won't rust, mar, tear or scar important papers. So, Plastiklip! At fine stores across the nation. Or order direct, sample box of 630, assorted sizes, colors, $3. Send check with order. Write for information about other sizes, colors.

Baumgarten's
1190-A N. Highland Avenue, NE • Atlanta, Georgia 30306

Machine Readable Data

Faxon, the world's only fully automated library magazine subscription agency, offers serials control information in machine readable format. If your library has data processing support, or if you plan to make use of automation, Faxon will supply this service for your library.

For more information, write:

E.W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
or call: (800) 225-7894 (toll-free)
(617) 329-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada only)

YOU WILL HAVE—
"CONFIDENCE"
In Our Complete Periodicals Service—
All American and Foreign Titles
Promptness is a Traditional part of McGregor Service . . . as well as:
• EXPERIENCE
• TRAINED PERSONNEL
• FINANCIAL STABILITY
• AMPLE FACILITIES
• RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT
An attractive brochure is available for the asking.

SUBSCRIBE TO
MCGREGOR PERIODICALS BULLETIN
OUR 43rd YEAR
MCGREGOR
Magazine Agency
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

Because publishers are not imprints to us—you benefit

Our close, personal contact with publishers in the U.S. and all over the world gives you many advantages. Our library experts on-the-spot in New York, London, Paris and Stuttgart...our world-wide network of agents talk the local publishers' language. They know the markets intimately and avoid problems by anticipating them. Stechert Macmillan's person-to-person contact means better service for your library. Contact us today. Ask for our International Acquisition Services brochure or a representative. You'll be surprised at how helpful we can be.

Let's talk!

STECHERT MACMILLAN, INC.
INTERNATIONAL ACQUISITION SERVICES
Serving Libraries Since 1872
866 Third Avenue • New York, N.Y. 10022
(212) 935-4251
NEW YORK • LONDON • PARIS • STUTTGART
ATTENTION CATALOGER!

We take this opportunity to introduce you to our new Enlarger III. This remarkable unit will enlarge your desired N.U.C. entry to catalog card size in seconds. All you have to do is place the catalog on the exposure glass and push a button! In 7 seconds out comes a sharp, clear enlargement for your catalog card production. You may even want to place a completed card on the exposure glass and enlarge that. Great for Computer entry, Search purposes, Inventory or Instructional material. Imagine all of the possibilities!

We would really appreciate it if you drop us a line so that we might send you some sample copies and additional information on the Enlarger III. The more catalogers we talk to, the more we can improve on our unit to be of better service to you.

Hope we see you at the ALA meetings!

vend-a-copy, inc.

405 SOUTH BOULEVARD • OAK PARK, ILLINOIS 60302
Three timely reports on library systems from "the authority"

Automated Circulation Control Systems: An Overview of Commercially Vended Systems
An extensive discussion by Barbara Evans Markuson of the characteristics of five circulation control systems, including CLSI, Checkpoint/Plessey, and Check-A-Book. In the July & September 1975 issues of LTR. **$3.50.**

Microform Catalog Data Retrieval Systems
A comparison of Information Design, Information Dynamics, and Library Processing Systems. In the May 1975 issue of LTR. **$2.00.**

Theft Detection Systems for Libraries
A revealing and valuable 98-page survey of manufacturers and users. In the May 1974 issue of LTR. **$2.00.**

Library Technology Reports (LTR) is a unique bimonthly publication of the American Library Association that provides critical evaluations of products used in libraries, media centers, schools, and other educational institutions. Its purpose is twofold: to enable librarians and educators to make economical purchase decisions and to alert manufacturers of library needs and standards of performance expected.

To order any of the above individual issues or for additional information on the complete subscription service, write to:

LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Library Technical Assistant's Handbook

MILDRED Y. BORKOWSKI
An instructional handbook designed to enrich the LTA's practical knowledge of library science. Emphasis is on audio-visual materials, acquisitions, cataloging, bibliographies, circulation procedures, storytelling, mending books and shelving.

$12.95 — library discount, 20%
DORRANCE & COMPANY
1617 JFK Blvd., Phila., Pa. 19103

EVERYTHING FOR YOUR AUDIO TAPE LIBRARY

- The new Pentagon Super C-1 Copier and other cassette duplicating systems
- Bulk duplicating cassettes for A/V use
- Premium packaged cassettes
- Cassette tape recorders and players
- Cassette storage units:
  - Carola Tape Wheel (for desk or table top use)
  - Space Saver (wall or floor models)
- Reel-to-reel recording tape, all types
- Blank cassette labels, 12 per sheet
- Cassette editing and repair kit

Contact us for information on these and other related products.

B & L SALES & MARKETING
4632 MAGNOLIA BLVD.
BURBANK, CA 91505
(213) 985-1792
More than 75% of all WEEKLY RECORD users are librarians!

Are you among them? If not, you’re missing the convenience of complete, week-by-week information on who is publishing what—with authors, titles, publishers, prices, cataloging and selection data.

WEEKLY RECORD is comprehensive ... accurate. It saves you valuable hours every week, dramatically increasing your access to up-to-the-minute facts about American book publishing output. Over 1,000 just-published and soon-to-be-published titles in each compact, 32 to 40 page issue. Just $10.00 for an entire year—less than 20c a week!

Subscribe now! Fill out and mail the coupon today.

R.R. BOWKER Subscription Dept.
P.O. Box 67, Whitinsville, MA 01588

☐ I want a one-year subscription at $10.
☐ I want a two-year subscription at $18.
☐ I want a three-year subscription at $26.

Name

Institution

Address

City/State/Zip
FOREIGN & DOMESTIC SERIALS SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE TO ALL TYPES & SIZES OF LIBRARIES FROM 11 REGIONAL OFFICES IN THE U.S.A. AND CANADA

COMPREHENSIVENESS

EBSCO services periodicals, newspapers, annuals, yearbooks, irregular book/monographic series (numbered or unnumbered), and continuations. Our computerized price file lists over 100,000 titles. However, we gladly research any title ordered and do not expect the customer to provide publisher name and address. Our research cycle is thorough and provides a quick answer if we are unable to identify the publisher. We service titles from all nations of the world. The only titles we cannot (normally) service for you are order-direct by the publisher's requirement. (However, if you are a librarian who desires to place 100 per cent of all serials with a single agency, we can handle even the order-direct publishers for you.)

FLEXIBILITY

We believe what we do for you and how we do it should be determined by your needs. We have suggested procedures and formats. Our order processing and records are computerized, and we are able to employ our computer to service any special requests you may have. In the event you have a request which a computer, for some reason, cannot honor, we keep our typewriters handy and a perfect willingness to do whatever is necessary to suit your needs.

PERSONALIZED SERVICE

Our network of 11 regional offices headed by General Managers with experience and authority to act guarantees you responsiveness. Our 11 Managers have 151 years' experience among them in servicing libraries with serials subscriptions. Order control is located at our regional office. The Manager who controls. Each of our customers is assigned to one Customer Service representative, so there is consistency in communications.

WRITE OR PHONE TODAY

EBSCO SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES

826 South Northwest Highway
Barrington, IL 60010
(312) 381-2190

P.O. Box 2543
Birmingham, AL 35201
(205) 942-2413

161 Forbes Road
Braintree, MA 02184
(617) 843-2383

615 Carillon Tower West
Dallas, TX 75240
(214) 387-2426

Suite 110-B
Diamond Hill Complex
2480 W. 26th Ave.
Denver, CO 80211
(303) 433-3235

P.O. Box 92901
Los Angeles, CA 90009
(213) 772-2381

EBSCO Building
Red Bank, NJ 07701
(201) 741-4300

681 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 391-3500

Suite 204
8000 Forbes Place
Springfield, VA 22151
(703) 321-9630 / 321-7494

17-19 Washington Ave.
Tenafly, NJ 07670
(201) 569-2500

Six Thorncliffe Park Drive
Toronto, Canada M4H 1H3
(416) 421-9000

division of

Elliott Publishing Company
Buying full-text copies of journal articles as few as 5 at a time?

Then you'll probably find our Original Article Tear Sheet (OATS®) service is faster, better and less expensive than any other source of full-text copies.

Certainly you've at least heard about OATS. The service that usually provides actual tear sheets of articles, not just photocopies. The multidisciplinary service you can count on for all-but-instant response to just about any request.

Yet perhaps you still hesitate to use OATS because you feel any service that good must be expensive. If so, you've just caught up with another "must be" that isn't. Here's what OATS really costs any time you can order as few as 5 journal articles at once:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items Ordered at One Time</th>
<th>Cost per 10-Page Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>$3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 100</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare our prices to those charged by other full-text sources. You'll find we're more than competitive. Place an order, and you'll find our service is, too. Or, for more information before you order, mail the coupon to OATS specialist Alan Clarke. You'll hear from him.

---

Yes, Alan Clarke, I like those OATS prices and the idea of one-stop shopping for journal items. So . . .

- [ ] Mail me more information.
- [ ] Phone me.
- [ ] Have an ISI field rep contact me.

Name ____________________________________________ Phone No. ________________________

Organization ______________________________________

Address __________________________________________

City ________________________ State __________ Zip ________

---

ISI® Institute for Scientific Information®
BOOK REVIEW INDEX
Edited by Gary C. Tarbert. Annual Cumulations published shortly after the close of each year, $68.00/year. Periodical Issues appear bimonthly (every second issue cumulates the preceding issue), subscription, $68.00/year.

Annual Cumulations of BRI from 1965-1974, Citing Over 700,000 Book Reviews

With the publication of the retrospective index for 1969, the three-year gap that formerly existed in BRI coverage has been filled. This is an appropriate time for libraries with broken runs of BRI to order all missing back volumes. Covering 700,000 reviews of 340,000 books and stretching from 1965 through 1974, the ten volumes of BRI, all of which are in print, offer an unmatched research resource.

Book Review Index covers all reviews appearing in over 230 magazines and newspapers, including all major literary and educational periodicals plus more specialized publications that review books on arts and crafts, business and economics, religion and philosophy, minority affairs, current social issues, and many other topics. Each listing provides the author's name, title of book, reviewing publication, date of issue, and page of review.

REVIEWERS PRAISE "BOOK REVIEW INDEX"

"A basic reference tool which belongs in all libraries" (Choice, January, 1966).

"No other indexing service offers the speed and diversity of Book Review Index. It is recommended for all libraries" (Booklist and Subscription Books Bulletin, November 15, 1965).

"BRI will certainly become a first choice for all libraries since its scope is so broad, and its accuracy and timeliness exceptional" (Nancy Buckeye, Reference Services Review, October/December 1974).

All Gale Books are sent on 30-day approval. Place standing orders for periodical issues and annual cumulations of BRI.

GALE RESEARCH CO. BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48226