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Evaluating Coin-Operated Copying Equipment for Library Applications

Despite their importance, coin-operated copying machines have rarely been discussed in library literature. Yet, the librarian who carefully evaluates available equipment and pricing plans and implements sound procedures for machine maintenance and cash accountability can expect to realize significant benefits from this essential reprographic service. In evaluating equipment, librarians should consider the ability of machines to reproduce representative library materials, ease of operation by the uninstructed patron, speed, durability, size, mobility, and the integrity of the coin-mechanism. Attention should be given to supply requirements, especially convenience and economy of use. Alternative pricing plans should be carefully examined. The librarian should consider purchase, rental, and lease arrangements. Once equipment is selected and pricing is agreed upon, the librarian should arrange for maintenance contracts to keep equipment operational. To guard against lost revenue, strict cash control procedures are required. During all stages of program organization, time spent in a thorough analysis will be repaid in successful operation.

COIN-OPERATED COPIERS, a commonplace in most libraries, have rarely been discussed in library literature. To be sure, Library Technology Reports contains highly informative evaluations of the performance of selected machines, but equipment evaluation is merely one step—albeit an important one—in the organization of this essential reprographic service. There are few sources to which librarians can turn for guidance in organizing, reorganizing, or administering the various facets of a coin-operated copier program. Loes’ work, intended primarily as a promotional piece, is helpful but hardly comprehensive.¹

This void in library literature is especially unfortunate because a successful coin-operated copier program can prove to be a valuable, if not

Manuscript received February 1974; accepted for publication August 1975.

Volume 20, Number 2, Spring 1975

essential, supplement to conventional photoduplication services. Success depends, however, on a knowledgeable evaluation of available equipment, thorough consideration of alternative pricing plans, and the establishment of sound procedures for continuing machine maintenance and cash accountability. This article suggests guidelines for librarians charged with responsibility for organizing or implementing a coin-operated copier program.

A Market Overview

Before visiting vendors' showrooms to examine equipment, librarians should be aware of two significant, and seemingly contradictory, facts about the relationship between library coin-operated copier applications and the reprographics industry. On the one hand, the copier industry has always been eager for library business. Addressograph-Multigraph, Apeco, Dennison, Olivetti, Savin, Saxon, SCM, the 3M Company, and Xerox currently offer coin-operated copying equipment for library use. Yet, despite the competitive nature of the market, vendors rarely offer librarians coin-operated copying equipment that meets their needs. The design of the imaging surface, or platen, on electrostatic copiers is a case in point. Over ten years ago, Hawken pointed out the importance of the raised or edge-mounted platen in facilitating copying from bound volumes and minimizing the likelihood of damage to bindings. Today, only Dennison, Olivetti, SCM and, to a limited extent, Xerox, offer coin-operated copiers with raised or edge-mounted platens, and some librarians consider even these ineffective. Xerox models 914, 720, and 1000, long the most popular coin-operated plain paper copiers, have flat platens that force the user to coerce book bindings into conformity with the imaging surface of the machine. Furthermore, few vendors offer librarians new equipment for coin-operated use, and fewer still manufacture copying equipment expressly for coin-operated applications, preferring to find a second market for older equipment in school and public library coin-vend applications. The SCM Corporation stopped manufacturing new Coronastat 55's seven years ago, and Xerox models 914, 720, and 1000 are fast being driven out of office applications by the improved models 3100 and 4000. Given this state of affairs, librarians responsible for the selection of coin-operated copying equipment can expect to see machines with relatively long exposure times, slow first-copy speeds, and elaborate paper paths that contribute to paper jams. This does not mean that available coin-operated copiers cannot perform satisfactorily in library applications. It does, however, force the librarian to choose from among a number of more or less acceptable machines rather than from several highly suitable ones.

Criteria for Equipment Evaluation

All of the machines currently offered for library coin-operated applications employ the electrostatic process. A charged photoreceptive surface is exposed to light reflected from the document to be copied. The
charges are dissipated in areas of the photoreceptor corresponding to the non-text areas of the document, leaving a latent text image that is made visible through the application of powdered or liquid toner. In the direct electrostatic, or electrofax, variant of the process, the copy is made on photoreceptive paper coated with zinc oxide in a resin binder. Xerographic or transfer electrostatic, copiers develop the image on a photoreceptive surface, usually a cylindrical drum coated with selenium, and transfer it to an ordinary sheet of paper. Unlike office copiers which are usually used to copy typescripts and similar line-copy originals, the machine chosen for a library coin-operated application must be able to reproduce a wide variety of materials, ranging from books with texts printed in small type faces to photographs and drawings with large solid areas. In general, electrofax machines do a better job of reproducing halftone and continuous-tone illustrations and are more sensitive to all colors of the visible spectrum than the xerographic equipment currently being offered for coin-operated use. Xerox models 914, 720, and 1000 are capable of making consistently good reproductions of typed or printed originals, but are notorious for their inability to resolve halftones, solid areas, and certain shades of blue. In applications where the reproduction of halftones and solids is of great importance, librarians would do well to select a Xerox 4000, a Dennison Fotofax, or 3M VQC-I. These machines offer the coin-operated user high-quality reproductions of photographs and drawings. Where only passable reproduction of these hard-to-copy originals is required, most electrofax copiers will render recognizable facsimiles of halftones and solid areas. Given the customer’s usual preference for plain paper copies, it is unfortunate that the newer Xerographic copiers—the Saxon PPC-I or Canon NP 70, for example—with their improved image development systems, are not available for coin-operated use.

Once the librarian is satisfied with the ability of a machine to make acceptable copies of representative library materials, careful attention should be given to the copier hardware itself. Any copier chosen for a library coin-operated application should readily admit of operation by an uninstructed user. The Olivetti Coinfax is an excellent example of such a machine. The library patron aligns the document to be copied face down on the machine’s platen, inserts a coin, selects letter- or legal-size copy length by pressing a button which in turn activates the machine’s exposure lamp, and removes the original when the lamp goes out. The copy is delivered in about ten seconds. Contrast this with the operation of the Xerox 1000 which requires the user to first press the print button and then deposit a coin, a reversal of the more familiar order of operations that frequently results in the loss of a coin. Librarians considering the Xerox 1000, or any other copier modified for coin-operated use, should insist that machine operation be modified in the interest of simplicity.

In evaluating machine capability, it is especially important that the copier selected have speed and durability well suited to the application.
It would be as inappropriate to select a Dennison Copymaster for a library producing 60,000 copies each month as to place a Xerox 5600 in an application doing only 5,000. In considering the speed of coin-operated copiers, only the first-copy speed is relevant, since the machine will produce only one copy during each transaction.

Where library floor space is at a premium, special consideration should be given to machine size. The Savin 220, a compact, tabletop copier, may prove attractive in such applications. If the copier is to be located in a study area, it must operate with a minimum of noise. Unfortunately, many of the reconditioned machines offered for coin-operated use do not incorporate improvements to reduce operating noise levels. If library needs change seasonally, mobility can prove to be a definite advantage in meeting dynamic use patterns. Special power requirements that can have an effect on machine placement should be carefully noted. The librarian should also determine whether a machine requires a dedicated power line.

The coin mechanism is a frequently overlooked feature of coin-operated copiers, but its construction and integrity demand careful attention. There are two types of coin mechanisms: those located inside the copier (Olivetti Coinfax and SCM Coronastat 55) and those attached to the outside of the machine (Xerox 1000 and Savin 220). In evaluating interior coin mechanisms, it is important to note whether the opening of the machine’s supply compartment for routine replenishment of paper and toner allows access to any of the machine’s accumulated revenue. When the supply door of the Olivetti Coinfax is open, for example, the machine’s change fund is vulnerable. Librarians selecting the Olivetti Coinfax must consequently restrict access to the machine’s supply compartment. The SCM Coronastat 55, on the other hand, has separate supply and cash receipts compartments, making the use of trusted employees to merely change paper and toner unnecessary. External coin boxes should be securely attached to the copier chassis. Obviously, coin mechanisms that make change are more convenient than those that do not and eliminate the need for separate change-making equipment or change service at the library circulation desk, although they may contribute to copier malfunctions.

Turning from hardware design to software requirements, all coin-operated copiers use paper, toner, and developer or concentrate. Since xerographic-type machines copy onto unsensitized stocks, librarians can take advantage of the competition among several suppliers. Paper requirements for electrofax copiers are more stringent, however, and librarians are well advised to purchase coated papers from only those sources recommended by the manufacturer of the equipment. All of the coin-operated Xerox machines use sheet paper stock. With the exception of the SCM Coronastat 55, all of the electrofax copiers offered for coin-operated applications use roll paper stock. There are advantages and disadvantages to both types of paper supply. Roll-fed machines generally have greater paper load capacity. The Olivetti Coinfax, for ex-
ample, can be loaded with rolls large enough to make 1,750 letter-size copies. The SCM Coronastat 55, on the other hand, will accept a maximum of 500 sheets, but the paper tray can be brought up to full capacity at any time, whereas, to achieve maximum economy, roll paper supplies should not be changed until an entire roll is used up. Manufacturers of roll-fed machines claim greater freedom from paper jamming, although mixed reports from users make it difficult to verify this claim. A more substantive limitation of sheet-fed copiers is the inability to provide the user with a choice between letter- and legal-size copy lengths. In roll-fed machines, the copier will cut the appropriate paper length from the roll in response to selection by the user. Sheet-fed machines must be loaded with either letter- or legal-size stock. In making legal-size copies from sheet stock, however, SCM claims 19 percent reduced paper costs over roll stock. In every case, the librarian should make independent computations to determine authenticity of vendors’ claims.

All copiers require some combination of powdered or liquid toner and developer or concentrate. The Addressograph-Multigraph 5000 and the 3M VQC-I differ from other electrofax coin-operated copiers in using dry rather than liquid toner. Xerox copiers use dry toner as well. In evaluating copiers for coin-operated use, the librarian should carefully examine all supply items for economy of use and ease of replenishment.

As a final point in this discussion of equipment evaluation, the importance of thorough market research as a prerequisite of knowledgeable machine evaluation cannot be overemphasized. Time spent in examining the equipment of all available vendors will be repaid in a better selection.

Alternative Pricing Plans

Coin-operated copiers are available for purchase, rental, or lease. Purchase plans involve a high initial cash outlay with prospects for lower long-term equipment costs. While the prospect of paying thousands or even tens of thousands of dollars for copier hardware may present problems for libraries, many vendors are flexible in arranging purchase plans to meet library needs. For large accounts, some vendors offer payments spread over three, six, or even twelve months without interest. This generosity is understandable since, for electrofax machine vendors, there is considerably greater profit in the sale of coated paper and related supplies than in the sale of copier hardware. The prospect of selling a number of machines to a library where supplies will be consumed for the length of the machines’ life-span is an attractive one. Many copying equipment users are reluctant, however, to purchase machines. They feel that new developments will make their equipment obsolete before its useful life has expired. Unquestionably, the copying industry is in a state of rapid change. New machines, especially plain-paper copiers, are appearing regularly. But, given the tendency of vendors to populate the coin-operated market with reconditioned equipment, con-
cerns about machine obsolescence through changes in the state of the art seem unwarranted.

This does not mean that purchase is the preferred method of machine acquisition. Some vendors, in fact, place prohibitively high prices on their equipment to discourage purchases, preferring instead to rent or lease copiers. For the large number of libraries looking for alternatives to equipment purchase, there are three basic types of rental plans. Flat-rate rentals involve a monthly payment for the use of the machine with supplies purchased separately. Metered rental rates are based on the number of copies made per machine per month, with the incentive of lowered unit prices with increased monthly volume. In the best-known metered rental system, Xerox model 1000 costs $.0315 for the first 7,500 copies made each month, $.0275 for the next 12,500 copies, and $.02 for copies in excess of 20,000. Paper, toner, and developer costs are not included in these charges. Most metered rental plans include a provision for minimum monthly machine billings, making them unsuitable for machines with fluctuating volumes. A Xerox 1000, for example, is billed at a minimum of $156.50 each month, whether the machine tallies one or 5,000 copies.

A third rental alternative, cost-per-copy pricing, differs from flat rate and metered plans in that the customer does not pay directly for copier hardware. Instead, a unit price is established for each copy based on an estimated monthly volume. In return for an agreement to be the exclusive source for a stipulated quantity of supplies, the vendor allows the customer free use of one or more machines. Each month the customer buys enough paper and toner to produce the estimated monthly volume. Good inventory control is required to allow for fluctuations in volume and to insure that sufficient supplies will always be on hand.

Most rental plans allow for cancellation on a thirty-, sixty-, or ninety-day notice. Lease plans offer lower rates in return for longer commitments. As a rule, the longer the lease, the lower the price. Third-party leases, in which dealers offer the equipment of one or more manufacturers on three- to five-year contracts deserve consideration from librarians willing to enter into such long-term agreements. In large coin-operated applications, some dealers will vend an account themselves, paying the libraries a lump sum or percentage of cash receipts. Where the librarian does not want to become involved in the business of machine maintenance and daily supply replenishment, vend agreements can prove attractive.

Whichever pricing plan is selected, the librarian should be sure that all costs are clearly understood. Be especially careful to note any installation and removal charges, as well as additional charges for special machine features. Xerox, for example, charges $15.00 per month for the coin mechanism attached to its equipment. Know the conditions under which the agreement can be cancelled. In a day of paper shortages and escalating costs, it is important to obtain written confirmation from the vendor concerning the length of time that quoted supply prices will prevail.
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Users of electrofax copiers should remember that coated paper will be their single most significant expense. It is equally important to make provisions for the addition of equipment under the terms of the initial contract. Large libraries ordering more than fifteen machines should request an additional copier at no charge to use as a “floater” to test potential market areas for new machine placements. Faced with the prospect of increased business, many vendors will agree to such an arrangement.

**Administering the Program**

Once equipment is selected and a pricing plan agreed upon, the librarian must implement procedures for continuing machine maintenance and cash accountability. There are two types of machine maintenance: supply replenishment and repair. Supply replenishment consists of refilling paper trays (on sheet-fed copiers) or changing paper rolls (on roll-fed machines), keeping toner supply at the recommended level, and adding developer or concentrate. These tasks, together with routine cleaning of the machine's glass imaging surface, can be performed by any responsible employee. Unless they have been given special training by the vendor's service representative, library employees are ill-advised to attempt to repair machine malfunctions other than the clearing of routine paper jams. To deal with machine breakdowns, the library should purchase a maintenance contract for each of its machines. Such a contract is normally included in the price of rented or leased copiers, but librarians who have purchased machines outright must arrange for a separate maintenance agreement once the new machine's warranty expires. Where a large number of machines are involved, the librarian should inquire about the availability of a dedicated service representative to be stationed on site. If such an arrangement cannot be negotiated, the librarian should insist on priority service. Most vendors are willing to make concessions in the area of machine maintenance in order to secure a large account. Whether the account is large or small, avoid vendors who cannot demonstrate the ability to respond to service calls promptly.

To guard against loss of revenue and to satisfy the demands of auditors, the librarian in charge of the copying program must institute procedures for strict control of cash receipts. Each copier should be equipped with two meters, one to count the number of copies made by the machine, the other to count the number of coins deposited in the coin box. Ideally, there should be one coin in the coin box for every copy made by the machine, but test copies must be made when maintenance is performed on the machine and some copiers are equipped with a mechanism to allow library employees to make copies by circumventing the coin box. In such cases, the total number of copies made by the machine, less the total of service copies and copies made by the by-pass mechanism, should equal the number of coins in the coin box. Vendor service representatives should be instructed to present all service test copies to the librarian, and the vendor should be expected to credit the
library's account to defray the charges incurred when the copies were made. Careful control of the by-pass mechanism is essential. Large numbers of copies made by library employees can place a tremendous strain on the copying program's budget.

As is the case with equipment selection and pricing plan evaluation, time spent in the implementation of sound maintenance and cash control procedures will be repaid in successful program operation.
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NEW BRITISH STANDARDS

The British Standards Institution has recently published the following standards: The Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals, Part 2 Word-abbreviation List (BS4148 Part 2, price £6.50); Guide to Copy Preparation and Proof Correction Part 1 Recommendations for Preparation of Typescript Copy for Printing (BS 5261, price £4.00); Principles Governing the Positioning of Control Keys on Keyboards of Office Machines and Data Processing Equipment (BS 5231, price £1.30); Universal Decimal Classification, English Full Edition, Section 621.3 (Electrical Engineering) (BS1000 (621.3), price £6.50); Universal Decimal Classification, English Full Edition, Section 72 (Architecture) (BS1000 (72), price £5.00). The standards are available from BSI Sales Department, 101 Pentonville Road, London N1 9ND.
The reasons for including the date of publication in a catalog entry are discussed, in the light of rule 139 of the revised chapter 6 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American Text. Rule 139 is compared with the former rule 141 in the 1967 edition. Parts of rule 139 are then analyzed for meaning and ease of application, using a decision flowchart to interpret and clarify the logic of the revised rule for dates.

Introduction

THE PUBLICATION DATE OF A WORK is a valuable piece of information both as a means of identification and as evidence of the currency of the content of the work. It is unusual for the date of publication to be used as an access point for individual items in a catalog, but it is widely used in constructing call numbers. In some cases the classification itself provides for subarrangement by date, e.g., century; in other cases the date is added to a class number to distinguish a particular edition. If the actual date of publication is unknown an approximate date has to be supplied.

There is little disagreement among catalogers and bibliographers about the importance of the date of publication of a particular work. There is room for considerable confusion and disagreement as to which date is to be regarded as the date of publication. Is it the latest copyright date? Or the latest printing date? Or the earliest printing date of the particular edition? Is special significance to be attached to a date on the title page? Because of the importance of date, both as a means of identification and for purposes of selection, it is essential that the rules...
for date in any cataloging code meet, in so far as possible, the following criteria:

1. They should assign an order of preference to the various dates publications can and do bear. This preferred order should serve the purposes of both identification and selection.
2. While it would be unrealistic to require that they account for all conceivable variations that might be encountered in cataloging, they should cover all likely combinations and give clear indication of the principles that should be applied in solving special problems.
3. They should produce imprint statements that are clear, intelligible, and as brief as possible.
4. The rules themselves should be consistent, clearly written, and logically organized.

The revised chapter 6 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American Text (AACR) which incorporates the provisions of ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications has introduced changes both with respect to the date or dates to be used in the imprint and also in the method of recording them. It is the purpose of the authors to compare the new rules with the old, to identify changes, and to evaluate the new rules in terms of the criteria stated above. To this end they have been analyzed by reducing them to a sequence of binary decisions in the form of a decision flowchart. This method of analysis is a powerful tool for gaining a thorough understanding of the underlying logic of a set of rules. It is also useful in revealing contradictions, alternatives for which no provision has been made, and problems in order.

Comparison of AACR (1967) and Chapter 6 (1974)

According to both sets of rules a date printed on a title page is always recorded. There is a significant difference between the original AACR and the revised chapter 6, however. The preferred date in AACR is the title page date. Lacking it, a date of publication or printing found elsewhere in the work is to be used. The revised chapter 6 begins by stating that the preferred date is the date of publication of the first impression of the edition. This date is always given first, whether or not it is on the title page, provided it is not known to be incorrect. If the title page date is not the date of the first impression of the edition, it is given in second place and is identified as the title-page date. The title-page date is of particular importance for purposes of identification; the date of first impression of the edition is of more value as an indicator of the currency of the content of the publication.

Another change in the rules that is relevant in this connection concerns the use of square brackets. According to the original chapter 6 of AACR, only data from the title page may appear without square brackets, thereby making it possible to determine whether or not the date was taken from the title page. With the new rules, square brackets are not
Flowchart of Rules 139A & 139F-H
of Revised Chapter 6 of AARC
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used with data from a "primary source." For imprint data, the primary sources include title page, preliminaries, and colophon. The resultant reduction in the number of square brackets used will certainly improve readability, but it is no longer possible to tell whether or not a date has been taken from the title page or from some other source such as the verso of the title page, the half title, an added title page, or the colophon. The net result is an overall gain for the general user because the preferred date is superior for purposes of selection, and because the elimination of a high percentage of square brackets constitutes no loss. For the bibliographer attempting to identify a particular issue of a work, failure to distinguish title page data from other data results in a loss of precision.

A clearer order of preference for dates is indicated in revised chapter 6, and this order is based on sound theoretical considerations. The date of the first impression of an edition is the preferred date. In addition, a later printing date may also be used if it is important to distinguish a later printing from the original. The importance of title page date is recognized, first in that it is always included, and second in that it is assumed to be the date of the first impression unless there is evidence that it is not the date of the first impression. While not explicitly stated in the rules, it has been confirmed by the editor of AACR that such evidence must include the date of the first impression. The other alternatives suggested in revised chapter 6 are consistent with the preference for the date of first impression. The preference is for the copyright date over the date of the impression in hand as probably being closer to the date of first impression. If both are available and they differ, both are given in the order: copyright date, printing date. Similarly, if the date of the first impression (or the title page date, on the assumption that it is the date of the first impression) is used and there is also a copyright date that differs, both dates are used, but in this case the order is: date of first impression, copyright date.

One other significant difference between rules for date in AACR as originally published and the revised chapter 6 concerns the problem of supplying an approximate date when an exact date cannot be found within the work itself, or in reference sources. The earlier rules carried approximations to "century certain" and allowed the cataloger to use "no date" ("n.d." in square brackets) if the century could not be supplied with certainty. This expedient was deleted in 1968 to "to make possible chronological computer searches in all cases, however vague and uncertain century may be." The cataloger is now forced to supply a date, but he has been given an additional option: "century uncertain." A date such as "17-?" may not be of great value in selection, but it provides the essential minimum for a call number. Since "17-" is used for the eighteenth century when the century is certain, the approximation "17-?" probably implies a date not earlier than the seventeenth century and not later than the nineteenth century, which is considerably more specific than "no date."
It is reasonable to expect the rules to be stated in the order in which they are to be applied and to have general rules precede rules for special cases. Neither of these expectations holds for the original AACR. Some improvement in order has been achieved in the revised chapter 6, but the order is basically that of the original and leaves much to be desired. Rules 139B to 139E, for example, which deal with special cases, should have been left to the end as they interrupt the sequence of rules that apply to all monographic publications. They have not been included in the analysis which follows.

Analysis of Rule 139 (Revised Chapter 6)

In preparing the flowchart, every effort was made to adhere strictly to the order and wording of the rules. A few departures were necessary, as explained below. The decisions required by the rules have been expressed as questions and are identified by the diamond-shaped symbol. The associated actions are enclosed in rectangles. Locations in the flowchart are indicated by a system of coordinates: rows are identified by letters and columns by numbers, e.g., C3, H4, etc. The problems revealed by the flowchart are discussed below.

The necessary decisions regarding the use of square brackets have not been included in this discussion or the flowchart because the rule for brackets applies to the imprint as a whole (rule 136A revised chapter 6—all subsequent references to rules are to the revised version). It is our opinion that any mention of square brackets in the specific rules for date add an unnecessary complication. Their use in examples below makes the practice clear.

The rules for date begin with rule 139A which defines the true date of publication as the date of first impression of the edition and establishes it as the most important date for the imprint. This is followed by a discussion of how to deal with a date on the title page.

Three different possibilities for title page date are considered. They are: the title page date is the date of the first impression of the edition; the title page date is incorrect; the title page date is the date of a later impression. Considering these alternatives in this order, the order in which they appear in the rules, creates complications in the flowchart because it becomes necessary to repeat some of the questions to cover all possibilities. They have, therefore, been sequenced arbitrarily as shown in the flowchart (B3 and B4).

The first possibility is that the title page date is incorrect. The rule covering this situation calls for the correct date to be added to the title page date. The example given is “1975 i.e. 1957” leading to the supposition that the rule is concerned only with logical impossibilities (in this instance, a work cataloged in 1957 with a title page date of 1975). The rule is silent on the procedure to be followed if no correct date can be found. If rule 139F is intended to be used, a reference to it should be made. The flowchart avoids the problem of the correct date not being known by assuming that it is known (C3).
The second possibility is that there is evidence that the title page date is not “the date of the edition” (B4). Two questions arise here also: what constitutes evidence? what is meant by “date of the edition”? The editor has confirmed that “date of the edition” is to be understood as date of the first impression of the edition. As to evidence, it must consist of the true date of the first impression that differs from the title page date, in order to apply this rule. This case is treated as shown in the rules: “1970, t.p. 1973” (B5).

The third possibility is that there is no evidence that the title page date is not “the date of the edition.” In this event the title page date is assumed to be the date of the first impression (C4).

There is provision for including the date of a later impression in addition to the date of first impression “if it is important to identify a later impression as such, e.g., because it contains textual variations.” Operationally, the decision would depend on whether the changes were important enough to warrant treating the item as another edition rather than as an added copy of the first edition.

Next comes the question of cover date. The intent of the rule for cover date is that a cover date which varies from a title-page date is to be treated like any other date insofar as possible—that is, if it is a correction or the date of a later impression, it is to be treated as such, and it is to be identified as a cover date only if the reason for the variation is uncertain or unknown. Unfortunately, the text does not make this distinction clear, as the sentence

If the cover date varies from the date on the title page both dates are recorded unless the cover date is known to be the true date of publication or the date of a later impression.

implies that only a single date should be recorded in those instances. The following wording is suggested as a clarification of the meaning of the text:

If the cover date varies from the date on the title page it is also recorded. If it is known to be the date of first impression it is recorded as a correction.

1970 i.e. 1968.

If it is known to be the date of a later impression it is recorded as the date of a later impression.

1873, 1875 printing.

When the nature of the variant cover date is not known or is uncertain the form to be used is:

1873, cover 1875.

It is this second interpretation which is represented in the flowchart following G2 and F4, because it is the understanding of the authors that this was the intention of the rules.

The rules have dealt with the recording of two dates: the date of first impression, and the date of the impression in hand when the two dates differ. The rules also provide for a third type of date to be added, the copyright date, and logically one would expect that the rule for adding
it would follow immediately after rule 139A. The last sentence of rule 139A provides for using the copyright date if the publication date cannot be ascertained, but the main rule for copyright date occurs two pages later, at 139G (C5 and J4). It is now possible to have three dates in an imprint: date of first impression, date of printing, and copyright date. No examples of such a combination are provided in the rules, but a number of instances have been noted on Library of Congress cards, for example: “1963, 1974 printing, c1943” on the card for Nikolaus Pevsner’s *An Outline of European Architecture* (75-306293).

If there is no date on the title page but a date of first impression can be ascertained it is used (D2). As in the preceding case, date of later impression may also be used. Interpreting the rule for cover date literally, it is to be used only if there is a date on the title page. In the opinion of the authors, however, the intent is to use cover date in this instance too. For this reason the flow line from D2 joins the flow line into F4.

If the date of first impression cannot be ascertained, copyright date is the preferred date if available (F2). It may be followed by the date of later impression. Again the authors are assuming that the cover date rule applies here too (G2 and G3).

If neither the date of first impression nor the copyright date is available, the date of the impression in hand is to be used (L2).

The final alternative, if all the above alternatives fail, is to supply an approximate date. Rules 139F and 139H cover this situation (M1). The present separation of these two rules and their sequence suggest that rule 139H should not be applied unless the criteria for rule 139F cannot be met. In point of fact, dated prefatory matter and suchlike can be the evidence on which an approximate date is based. In the opinion of the authors the intent of these rules would be clearer if they were to be combined somewhat as follows:

Date uncertain. If the publication date of the first impression of the edition, the copyright date, or the date of the impression in hand cannot be ascertained, an approximate date is supplied as follows:

- 1892 or 1893, one of two years certain
- 1892, probable date
- ca. 1892, approximate date
- between 1906 and 1912
- 189— decade certain
- 189— decade uncertain
- 18— century certain
- 18— century uncertain

If the prefatory or other matter, such as an introduction, letter of transmittal, or epilogue, is dated, this date may be of use in approximating the date of publication of the edition in hand. Such a date may be used in the imprint, preceded by a term which shows that it is not necessarily the date of publication (e.g. pref. 1889) or be followed by a question mark, if a more precise approximation can thus be supplied. Any term, English or foreign, may be used in the imprint to qualify the date if it is taken from the work being cataloged and con-
sists of a single word. If a phrase is required to explain the questioned date, it is given in a note. If a qualified date is not a year of the Christian era the provisions of the rule for dates not of the Christian era are to be applied.

(pref. 5730 i.e. 1969 or 1970;)

Conclusion

As has been shown, the rules in revised chapter 6 assign an order of preference for the various types of dates, and this order appears to be the one most appropriate for the general user. Unquestionably the rules for date in the revised chapter 6 produce clearer and fuller imprint information. It is now possible to record the date of first impression, a date of later impression, and the copyright date for a single item. Nice distinctions, such as between issue date and title-page date, can be made. Most eventualities have been provided for, though this becomes apparent only after very close scrutiny of the rules. There is considerable room for improvement in the way the rules are formulated and organized.

The method of analysis applied here has proved useful both in pinpointing problems in the rules for date and in clarifying the intent of these rules. While valuable as a means of studying the logic, consistency, and clarity of the published code, decision flowcharts might be used even more profitably in the process of code revision. Furthermore, if published and made generally available for use with the new code the flowcharts would provide clear, concise summaries of the rules for use by catalogers in the day-to-day decisions in applying AACR.
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The effect of catalog division on catalog departments in terms of cost, physical expansion of the catalog, as well as methods and different kinds of division are considered. The decision to divide or retain a dictionary catalog should be based on present circumstances and use of the catalog itself. This discussion of divided and dictionary catalogs suggests that catalog congestion and complexity and size of a library and its collection are not sufficient reasons for dividing a dictionary catalog. Users will have difficulty with either format. Of more value to the library user than division of the catalog is formal instruction in bibliographic tools.

DIVIDED CARD CATALOGS have received a great deal of attention recently as a result of attempts by libraries to cut costs and improve service. This essay discusses the literature which has been written relating to the theory of, reasons for, and various forms of, the divided catalog.

Four different publications lead one to most of the literature on the subject of divided catalogs. The Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook no. 8, 1939, includes articles by Dean, Lubetzky, Wood, and Wright; they treat the subject diversely. A literature search some twenty years later resulted in the summary of Grosser, abstracting forty articles and books. A list of libraries whose experiences are recorded is given as well as a type of scorecard on advocates, opponents, and those reserving opinion on the divided catalog. A short article on divided catalogs by Morgan includes a bibliography with fifty-three references whose dates are from 1938 through 1959. Only twenty-one articles are cited by both Grosser and Morgan. Morgan's references are heavily weighted in the subject aspect of cataloging. Tauber's bibliographic essay of 1960 gives no new
citations, but presents food for thought on future research on divided catalogs.

**Methods of Dividing the Catalog**

A divided catalog has all the types of entries which the traditional dictionary catalog contains: authors, titles, subjects and other added entries, and cross- and general-reference cards. However, these are separated into various alphabets depending on the function of the division. The usual division is based on the type of entry: author, subject, title; but other divisions are possible including chronological arrangements. Until fifteen years ago, the discussion on divided catalogs was mostly concerned with a two-way division. For the majority this meant an author and title section and a subject section. However, there was not complete unanimity about the scope of either section. Problems of corporate authors whose publications give much information about the author and the separation of items by and about a person brought forth the recommendation of a name catalog, including titles, with the subject catalog limited to topical subjects. The suggestion by Elrod of having an author-title-person file and a subject file which contains all subjects except individual persons is intended to offset the necessity of duplicating subject cards for autobiographies as well as the many name cross-references most libraries make.

Titles have been logically assigned to both the author and subject catalogs. Those in favor of the author section argue that the title is a unique piece of identification. Those opposed argue that the title relationship to subject is much closer than to authors. In addition, the catch-title or partial title, used for a possible future subject, can certainly not do the same job in the author section. Another consideration noted by Field is that readers are more likely to think of a title as the subject of the book.

It is perhaps because of this unclear view of titles that some three-way divided catalogs are in use. J. Nitecki states his opinion succinctly:

Theoretically, a combined author-title catalog is a functional paradox. Author entries like subject entries, aim at bringing together related works (by author, series, subject, etc.). The title entry, on the other hand, is a unique feature of each individual work, separating it from any other bibliographical entry. Title arrangement adds a third dimension to the public catalog, which is radically different from the linear, or horizontal, listing by authorship and from the depth, or vertical, grouping by subject. Practically, the verification of library holdings by a known title is a simple activity, easily grasped by patrons versed in library rules, and a fast and reliable method in a pre-order search by the staff.

With that rationalization, Nitecki reports that the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee redivided its author-title catalog in August 1967. Their policy was to make a title entry for each book, including meaningless and/or common titles. Following consideration of the pros and cons
of this policy, the conclusion is drawn that it is better to have the title catalog include all titles in the collection without exception. More study on the usage of meaningless titles could very well change this policy, but perhaps it is easier to omit something after a length of time than to add something at a later date. A short but detailed description of the project, as well as statistics of cost are included in this informative article.

As the thirty-five-year-old discussion by Hagedorn proves, the three-way division idea has been around a long time. Maintaining that it is an obvious step toward the simplification of the complexity of a large dictionary catalog, the author examines this division with respect to the reader's approach. The reader will be able to recognize the distinct function of each part as well as being able to follow the simplified alphabetic filing which results. Hagedorn considers five reasons usually given for retaining the dictionary catalog: (1) accepted form, (2) patrons led astray by the divided catalog, (3) duplications of cards avoided, (4) three files versus one, and (5) "works about" kept together with "works by." Only the third is tenable, he concludes, and that only if economy is placed above service.

Other proponents of the three-way divided catalog are Morgan, Adams, Axford, and Metcalf. The latter reports that a decision to divide Harvard's Widener Library catalogs in 1952 was negative and discusses the six major varieties of cards in a catalog. He then proposes a tripartite division when the need arises: (1) personal name, (2) topical subject, and (3) title-corporate name catalog. Thus, "United States—Foreign relations" goes in the second and "United States. Dept. of State" in the third.

Division by author-title-subject has been termed vertical division. Wright proposes horizontal division by date, but this term is also applicable for such catalogs as those for subject departments and children's collections. Believing that up-to-dateness is one criterion that many readers use for choosing books, Wright thinks that a catalog that lists only titles of the last five or ten years would not only eliminate wasted time on the part of the user, but would also save wear and tear on catalog cards. Ellis, Field, and Lipetz recommend subject cards arranged in chronological order with latest date first because most users are interested in the date of subject material and not authors. Maintaining current subject headings is an on-going activity which most advocates of divided catalogs mention as a very easy task with the divided catalog. This is especially true when the subject headings are not typed on the individual cards, but identified through the use of subject guide cards. Schwartz, Pachefsky, Ellis, and Field are proponents of this feature for the subject section and indicate techniques for filing and making cross-references.

Reasons for Dividing

Congestion and complexity of filing are the reasons usually given for
changing a dictionary catalog to a divided catalog. The problem of congestion is associated with such inconveniences as the traffic encountered in making one's way to a desired catalog drawer, having access to a drawer interfered with by other users in the vicinity, and finding the desired drawer already in use. Lubetzky analyzes this spatial problem and concludes that it is not a valid reason for dividing a dictionary catalog. Heinritz develops this premise further by mathematical means; he maintains that congestion is too ambiguous a term and too complex an aspect to quantify and some variables cannot be identified. Shore's reply to Heinritz does not refute this; it only gives ways of alleviating the congestion. McGregor believes a divided catalog relieves congestion in one way only to have it crop up in another form. In a recent study, Bookstein analyzes congestion using a mathematical model (queuing-theory) which takes variability into account. He considers three measures: (1) probability that the drawer is being used, (2) average time needed to wait for use, and (3) average number of people attracted to the drawer at a time. His conclusion is that one cannot make general statements about the relative superiority of different types of catalogs in regard to congestion but must first measure various properties of the library; once this is accomplished, quantitative statements are possible. He gives formulas for each of the three measures of congestion studied.

A plea for teaching catalog users was heard during a series of meetings held by the Philadelphia Regional Catalogers Group the winter of 1955–56. Harris edited the abridged summary of papers presented and discussions held, including a brief history of cataloging, divided catalogs, and book catalogs; a review of literature relating to divided catalogs which includes catalog usage and maintenance; indication of methods of dividing catalogs; and a discussion of administration in relation to cataloging procedures. In relating some of the individual library experiences, librarians from Lehigh University and LaSalle College stated that the need for instruction in using the catalog is far greater than for a decision on dividing the catalog. Phipps is one of many who discuss different ways of showing a library's public what the purposes and scope of the card catalog are. In Chervenie's opinion, the function of the card catalog is not to be an index to the specific materials in a library's entire collection, but rather to be a catalog of only the book collection.

In considering the problem of filing complexity as a reason for dividing a catalog, one must keep in mind that most of the articles were written about libraries which had filed their cards in accordance with A.L.A. Rules for Filing Catalog Cards (1942) or Cutter's Rules for a Dictionary Catalog (4th ed., 1904). The second edition of A.L.A. Rules for Filing Catalog Cards (1968) eliminated most of the elaborateness of the former filing system, but whether or not a library uses this edition as its filing authority is another matter.

The activity of filing is mentioned by all writers on divided catalogs. The account of the division of the catalog at Baker Library, Dartmouth College, as reported in "Crisis in the Cards" includes an example of
filing in a dictionary catalog as compared to a divided catalog. The Osborn and Haskins article on catalog maintenance examines letter-by-letter filing versus word-by-word filing and concludes that for divided catalogs the letter-by-letter system may be better. The seeming vagaries of various filing codes is illustrated by Williams, using Harvard's Widener catalogs as the example. This article includes pros and cons on many points of filing rules. Hines and Harris state that ALA filing rules were designed for a dictionary catalog. With the capabilities of the computer in mind, they offer a filing code for divided catalogs, a form represented by modern printed book catalogs. Dulka and Nitecki present the rules used by a library which has a three-way divided catalog.

Catalog Use Studies

For years librarians have been seeking information on that polymorphic character—the user of the card catalog. Although the composition of the sample did not permit comparisons between divided and dictionary catalogs in Jackson's study, this inquiry draws conclusions that point to the value of divided catalogs. Since the percentage of card catalog users failing to find what they want increases directly as the catalog increases in size, it was recommended that potential advantages of the divided catalog be investigated. Also recommended for investigation were different kinds of division including one in which older holdings were incorporated in book catalogs.

Frarey's summary and evaluation of studies of use of the subject catalog published in 1953 points out that although a beginning had been made in studying the catalog user, much remained to be done. Lilley discusses the difficulties involved with various studies; he considers the difference between qualitative and quantitative use of the catalog. Only the latter has been explored in catalog use studies.

Most of the studies discussed by Frarey were based on a small sampling over a short period of time. Lipetz reports on a study carried out over a period of eighteen months at Yale University Library. This study was structured to overcome the weaknesses of methodology of previous studies. Enough data was gathered so that many hypotheses could be tested. Among the many conclusions reached are that title and author information predominate over other types of search clues with respect to both availability and accuracy, and that of three possible approaches to improving catalog services—coverage, user education, and modification or expansion of catalog entries in an existing catalog—the latter approach seems to have the least potential. These conclusions are somewhat similar to those reached in Markley's study, conducted some twenty years earlier.

A study which indicates which approach is used by certain types of users is recorded by Elrod. When a library has no official authority catalog, most staff members use the main entry, whereas faculty and graduate students tend to use the author approach, and undergraduate students tend to use the subject approach.
Studies of Divided Catalogs and Accounts of Division

The literature relating to the theory, rationale, and methodology of divided catalogs reflects varying degrees of sophistication and erudition ranging from "how-we-do-it-here" to the philosophy behind catalogs in general and divided catalogs specifically. Articles reporting research on the use of catalogs, their cost and maintenance, and procedures that catalog departments have adopted in studying or implementing divided catalogs are most useful.

Thom attempted to make an objective appraisal of divided catalogs by sending questionnaires to institutions of higher education approved by the Association of American Colleges and the Association of American Universities, to determine whether the divided catalog achieves its purposes. Twenty-four of 457 libraries had divided their catalog. The reasons for division as well as the ratings of the accomplishments of the division were discussed. The study concludes: "On the whole, the divided catalog has been found a more effective tool than the single catalog, but its superiority does not appear to be outstanding. . . . Simplicity for the student was the great objective, but apparently not the great success of division. . . . It is suggested that every effort be made to increase the effectiveness of the dictionary catalog before resorting to division."

One of the most recent studies is that of Krikelas, which tested the hypothesis: assuming all other factors to be equal, subject searches through a file containing subject entries alone will produce more pertinent references and less inappropriate references than identical searches using a file combining all entries into a single (dictionary) sequence. Two catalogs—the University of Illinois' dictionary catalog and the University of Wisconsin's divided catalog (subject and nonsubject entries)—were selected and the appropriate sections verified in regard to similarity in size and complexity. Students randomly selected at the two institutions were given a set of search questions. Regardless of the type of catalog, all of the students encountered difficulties. Explanations for the difficulties include the selection of the wrong search term, problems with the filing of catalog entries, and failure to understand or interpret correctly the meaning of "see also" references. Krikelas writes:

As a result of this study, it was concluded that for a series of questions representing different levels of difficulty and for a fairly limited range of catalog use habits and abilities, changes in the arrangement of large catalogs would not result in more effective use. At the same time there was no overwhelming evidence obtained in this study to indicate that one type of catalog was distinctly superior to the other.

The division of the public catalog at the University of California, Berkeley, resulted in studies by Nyholm, Markeley, and Merritt. Nyholm's study on the use of the divided catalog reflects a disenchantment with the dictionary catalog. Members of the university community were asked questions relating to these topics: Awareness of the catalog being divided, ease of use, amount of time needed to use, part
of the catalog most used, awareness of duplication of cards for biographies, knowledge of which catalog to use, and awareness of the filing system. The author believes that the evidence supports the use of the divided catalog for a large university. She feels that user ignorance of the dictionary catalog and the professors' emphasis of the author and title approaches furnishes further support.

Problems of cataloging arrearages, rapid growth of the card catalog, and rising costs in the catalog department prompted the Markeley and Merritt catalog use studies. They assumed that simplifying descriptive cataloging would not effect any worthwhile savings and that since authorship is an essential aspect in organizing library material, there could be no cutback there. Therefore, subject cataloging was the only available alternative for finding economies. Users of the catalog were interviewed to determine which subject headings were used, the amount of material wanted, languages acceptable, age of material wanted, purpose for which material was wanted, and success in using the catalog. Since 78 percent of the users required books in English, subject catalog analysis could be limited to books in English, or reciprocally, only non-English books would be entered in the subject catalog, and printed bibliographies such as Cumulative Book Index could be used for the subject approach to books in the English language. It would also be possible to limit the subject catalog to books of recent imprint without penalizing many users. This study measured quantity rather than quality of use. The Merritt study, based on circulation data, came to similar conclusions: by eliminating subject cataloging for all foreign books and for all English-language books more than twenty years old, the subject-cataloging load could be reduced by 65 percent. The efficiency of the subject catalog in relation to books circulated, although progressively declining, would not reach a level lower than 80 percent of its present efficiency.

One of the reasons noted by Wood for dividing the University of California Library catalog was that an expansion of the catalog was imminent. The detailed steps followed in carrying out this large undertaking are related. Public inconvenience was minimized by notification of what was being done, by separating the cards in each individual tray before the actual physical division was effected, and by having cabinet and tray labels ready for the final shifting of cards. These steps taken for dividing are in contrast to those proposed by Kramer, where the separating and removal of cards is done at the same time. However, Kramer's technique would have to be used when the library is closed. After the division at Berkeley, it was decided to duplicate biography and criticism subject cards for the author-title catalog. The possible effects of the reorganization on such cataloging policies as subject heading assignments related to catch-word titles and duplication of cards are acknowledged.

Allez discusses the catalog division (author-title and subject sections) done at Central State Teachers College Library at Stevens Point, Wisconsin, in 1934. The decision to divide was based on a long-standing antipa-
thy to the conventional dictionary catalog and the propitious expansion of the existing catalog.

In addition to the need for expansion, Adams presents a unique reason for dividing the catalog at Montana State College: the photographing of all author cards for the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center file. Montana State College Library was small; the number of cards did not exceed 150,000 and the number of existing drawers was 144. This points to the fact that divided catalogs are found in any size library.

That size is relative is further borne out by the following three accounts. Drenner presents the experience of a small public library (less than 50,000 volumes) in Coffeyville, Kansas, with four sections in its catalog: author-title, subject, fiction, and shelflist. The inclusion of the shelflist has initiated the practice of users browsing through the cards rather than through the books. Carmie and Llewellyn discuss the experience of the Regina Public Library, a medium-sized public library which changed from a three-file catalog (author, subject, and title) to a two-file catalog (author/title and subject). Ellis reports on division of the catalog of a comparatively small public library system which evolved through the merging of the catalogs of the Library Board of Western Australia and its State Library.

The "how-to" approach may be found in Burch's article on Duke University Library catalog. Separate catalogs for serials and periodicals were made first, followed by the division of the dictionary catalog into author-title and subject sections. Computation of needed drawer space for each was accomplished by first separating the cards in each drawer.

In 1957 the dictionary catalog at Victoria College was divided, primarily because of congestion which was aggravated because the library did not have an official catalog for staff use. Spratt presents a proposal for locating the author-title catalog in a wall separating the public catalog area from the catalog division, thus allowing for the removal of drawers from either side.

Shore mentions a congestion problem at an author-title catalog (three seventy-two-tray units) occasioned primarily by the need of staff members to check bibliographies, verify entries, etc. Efforts toward relieving congestion seem to lie in the direction of scheduling staff time at the catalog, especially at times when it is being used least by the public. In spite of this inconvenience, this library has no intention of returning to the dictionary catalog, primarily because of measurable savings in catalog maintenance time.

Harkins reports that the hope of achieving economy in filing costs and greater ease for those using their catalog prompted the Central Baptist Seminary Library to divide its catalog in September 1959. She presents statistics showing a 1.78 percent increase in card typing over the first six months. A small study conducted six months after division to determine user reaction indicated that more instruction on catalog use was still needed, but, on the whole, the comments were very favorable for division.
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A poll of users at New York University reported by Marke indicates that 87 percent of the law students and faculty prefer the divided catalog to the dictionary; 69 percent consider it easier to use; 70 percent believe that it saves time; and 69 percent prefer using the subject approach for legal research. The staff found that users could be taught to use the catalog in a minimum amount of time and that clerks were quickly trained to file cards.

Preferring not to put Ottawa Public Library's experience into numbers, Osborne states that their division is good because it works. Because their dictionary catalog was growing to be a tool difficult for even the staff to use, the librarians considered three alternatives: (1) separation of the cards for English and French books, (2) separation of the cards for books published in the last ten years, and (3) division of the catalog into author-title and subject files. The third alternative was selected. Osborne's advocacy of the divided catalog is challenged in the same article by Bethune, who relates the history of the separation, partial combination, and second separation of the University of Toronto Library catalog before a final merger into the dictionary form. She maintains that this dictionary arrangement gives satisfactory service to its users, but fails to convince the reader that sufficient thought was given beforehand to the consequences and necessary procedures for each rearrangement of this catalog.

Slater and Fraser discuss the reasons for continued satisfaction with their dictionary catalog at the University of Toronto Library. Recognizing the validity of some of the arguments on both sides of catalog arrangement—dictionary versus divided—the authors point out that the deciding factor for continuing the dictionary catalog is the cost of reorganization and maintenance. This discussion is based on several of the studies relating to this problem: Metcalf, Thom, and Nyholm.

Librarians concerned with costs will be interested in a study reported by A. Nitecki. In 1959, two libraries of similar size and with similar catalogs, Flint College of the University of Michigan Library and the Flint Community Junior College, conducted studies on the cost of dividing a dictionary catalog and the cost of maintaining two catalogs: one dictionary and one divided. After studying the costs of dividing the catalog and alphabetizing, filing, and revising in both types of catalogs, the author concludes that maintenance of the divided catalog pays for the cost of dividing within five to ten months after the division. He also found that motivation on the part of the workers could not be accurately accounted for by the statistics.

More recent articles on libraries that have divided their catalogs include Castle's report on Eastern Kentucky University, notable for its account of a well-organized procedure following fundamental decisions. Pieter discusses the necessity of typing and tracing titles in order to create a complete title catalog, rather than the total process of dividing a catalog. Axford forcefully states that librarians are more interested in maintaining the status quo of card catalogs than in helping the user by
changing. She cites the circumstances of three academic libraries splitting their catalogs into three sections: author, subject, and title. Statistics on time saved in typing and filing are given. Montgomery presents a thoughtful critique on Axford's paper and forces a second look at the positive aspects of dividing the catalog. Morris' satirical essay will not help one decide for or against a divided catalog, but if feelings are running high on this subject, it may help to read this article and enjoy a laugh.

Conclusion

The divided catalog can be found in all sizes of library and in a number of forms; it has proven useful in all the various library environments. Whether or not a library should consider implementation of a divided catalog depends on the present circumstances of its catalog. Is it becoming more of a burden to file in and maintain? Is it functioning as it should? A reading of the literature of divided catalogs reveals measures which may be taken to ensure that any catalog remain in the best condition for providing service to the user. A divided catalog is neither a last resort nor the ultimate in catalogs, but it may be the one most suitable for some individual libraries.
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**BIBLIOGRAPHY ON LIBRARY AUTOMATION**

A bibliography on library automation covering the latter half of 1971 thru the first half of 1973 has been published by the Information Science and Automation Division of the American Library Association. The bibliography was compiled by Martha W. West, San Jose State University, as a part of the *State of the Art II* proceedings of an ISAD institute held in 1973 in Las Vegas and is now available as a separate reprint from ALA Order Department, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611, at $.50 prepaid.

The thirty-five-page bibliography is arranged by subject under headings such as "Bibliographies and Information Sources," "MARC," "Cataloging," "Serials," "Circulation," "Automated Retrieval and Data Bases," "Networks and Cooperation," "College and University Libraries," etc.
Division of the University of Oregon
Library Catalog

The University of Oregon Library accompanied the division and expansion of its 2.8-million-card dictionary catalog with implementation of improved card production and catalog maintenance procedures. Highlighting replaced overtyping of secondary cards and retyping of call numbers on printed cards was ceased. New subject heading work was assigned to one paraprofessional, relieving catalogers and library assistants of routine subject heading checking. The typing, proofreading, filing, and revision time gained by these innovations increased departmental productivity by 12 percent by the end of the fiscal year.

DURING THE 1973-74 ACADEMIC YEAR the University of Oregon Library converted its 2.8-million-card dictionary catalog to a three-way divided catalog. To increase efficiency and effectiveness, new procedures affecting card production, catalog maintenance, and, to a lesser degree, cataloging and acquisitions processes were instituted. Although adopted concurrently, these procedures were not contingent upon each other and could have been implemented independently. This article describes the division of the catalog and revision of technical processes routines and analyzes the results of these changes.

Planning for conversion of the dictionary catalog into three catalogs—author, title, and subject—began in mid-September. It was recognized that this division would require some duplication of cross-references and would separate works by personal, corporate, or geographical entities from works about the respective entities. However, it was thought that the three catalogs would provide (1) quicker entry retrieval, (2) faster, more accurate filing requiring less revision, (3) decreased congestion, and (4) easier patron reorientation resulting from familiarity with the concepts of author, title, and subject.

Useful preliminary information was obtained from a review of re-
sults obtained by a Portland State University Library questionnaire circulated among academic libraries having divided catalogs. Specific policy and procedural questions were considered by the entire cataloging staff, with subsequent small-group meetings on matters requiring decisions. Final policy decisions were made by the head catalog librarian following a review of staff recommendations.

Contents of the Catalogs

The initial decisions related to the contents of the catalogs, as follows:

AUTHOR CATALOG

1. personal and corporate entries, including those under place names: main entries including such form and hybrid entries as U.S. Laws, statutes, etc.; U.S. Constitution; British Museum. Mss.; Catholic Church. Liturgy and ritual; Anonymus Londinensis; Anne, Saint, mother of the Virgin Mary. Legend; Concord (Ship), etc.
2. personal, corporate, and geographical cross-references if it could be determined immediately that no subject cards were involved.
3. series entered under author/title.
4. information cards such as those for Readex microprint sets.
5. form cards for corporation reports and for newspapers entered under geographical entity (local variations).

TITLE CATALOG

1. a title entry (main or added) for each work represented in the catalog, including such nondistinctive initial words as “journal,” “works,” “proceedings,” and including entries for motion pictures, filmstrips, and radio and television programs. The lack of a name-authority file necessitated a thorough review of all personal, corporate, and geographical references.
2. series entered under title.
3. uniform title entries and added entries for anonymous classics such as Bible, Koran, Dead Sea Scrolls, Roman de la Rose, Three little pigs, etc.
4. periodical titles used as main and added entries.

SUBJECT CATALOG

1. all subject entries.
2. all cross-references relating strictly to subjects.

Procedures for Division

Preliminary division of the catalog took place in November, with actual shifting of drawers between terms, so as to cause a minimum of patron inconvenience and allow uninterrupted use of the catalog. Five four-member teams of professional, paraprofessional, and clerical per-
sonnel did the preliminary division. Each team was responsible for dividing 720 drawers. With each person working two one-and-one-quarter hour shifts per day, at a rate of 2,600 cards per hour, division of the 2.8 million cards was completed in nineteen working days rather than the projected twenty-one days.

Each card was reviewed and author cards were moved to the front of the drawer. Title and subject cards were removed and placed in separate piles, while maintaining the alphabetical order. After a drawer was sorted, orange guide cards labeled "authors," "titles," or "subjects" were inserted at the head of the appropriate sections. Cross-references which would apply to more than one of the three catalog divisions or for which the appropriate division could not be readily identified were removed for later revision. The designated leader of each unit examined questionable entries.

Upon completion of division of the catalog, a team of four professional and paraprofessional staff members measured the author, title, and subject sections within each drawer and recorded the measurements to the sixteenth of an inch. The author cards totaled 11,936 inches; title cards, 6,563; and subject cards, 11,624 inches. On the basis of these figures, the 5,040 available drawers were allocated as follows: author catalog—1,680 drawers; title catalog—1,200 drawers; and subject catalog, including allowance for header cards—2,160 drawers.

The physical shift began on 17 December with teams of three or four professional, paraprofessional, and clerical members working on rotating two-hour shifts from 7:30 to 5:00 each day.

The number of inches per drawer was determined by dividing the total number of drawers allotted for each catalog into the card total for that catalog. Initially cards were measured with a ruler to approximate the established specifications before transferring into the new drawers. This process proved unsatisfactory, and premeasured boxes providing faster, more consistent measurement were devised. These were filled and the cards were then transferred into the appropriate drawers.

With one team member responsible for shifting the cards into the new drawers, two others determined the best alphabetical division between drawers and prepared temporary labels, and the fourth member of the team was responsible for moving drawers.

Except for short periods of inconvenience when individual drawers were being divided or shifted, the catalog remained available for public use over the entire transition period. Comprehensive instructional posters alerted patrons to changes in the catalog, while reference and cataloging staff provided additional direction during the shifting process, which was completed 4 January. For the remainder of January, clerical and paraprofessional workers typed and affixed permanent labels.

The removal of the cross-reference cards crippled the catalog, and, as a result, revision and refiling were expedited. The entire professional cataloging staff spent a total of 600 hours checking the references.
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against the catalogs, determining which needed duplication, and refiling those references needing no revision or duplication.

New Routines

Card production routines have been revised since the division. A simple highlighting system, using orange for author catalog entries, blue for title catalog entries, and pink for subject catalog entries has replaced overtyping of added entries. Color-coordinated drawer labels and directional signs emphasize these three colors and their relationship to the catalogs.

Details of the highlighting are as follows:

1. author main entries: not highlighted.
2. author added entries: in the tracing, with a diagonal to the head of the card.
3. title main entry: not highlighted, but blue mark placed below hole to identify as belonging in title catalog (especially necessary in a large catalog with many foreign language and script entries).
4. title added entry: for main title, in tracing only.*
5. title added entry: for partial title, in tracing with diagonal.
6. subject entries: in tracing only.
7. series entries (orange or blue, as appropriate): if series is traced in full, highlighting is in tracing with diagonal; if not traced in full, highlighting is in series note.

To save further typing and proofreading time, call numbers are no longer overtyped on printed cards. Call numbers on locally typed copy and those on printed cards which require revision are typed in a raised position. Location symbols are stamped beside the printed number or above the typed call number as necessary. Patron and staff adjustment to this innovation has been surprisingly easy.

Highlighting in the subject catalog is accompanied by the use of header cards (8.5-by-12.5-cm. guide cards on white stock covered with plastic shields). These guide cards are filed at the beginning of each subject heading and each subdivision and see also reference. See references are typed on header card stock, but are not preceded by header cards. Cross-reference tracings are typed on the verso of header cards.

During the division process, subject header cards were prepared and filed by typists, working with divided drawers at their desks. Approximately 45,000 header cards had been typed by mid-December when a lack of supplies brought this project to a halt. No completion date is presently projected for the typing of the remaining 255,000 cards.

All subject heading work is coordinated under one paraprofessional; catalogers and library assistants working with printed copy no longer

---

* Determination of the amount of a particular title to use in filing is made at the catalog by the filer. Highlighting the title tracing rather than the title in the body of the card provides greater filing flexibility and reduces the likelihood of future filing conflicts.
search every subject heading in order to determine new or incorrect subject headings (estimated at 12 to 15 percent). Trained clerical filers (filing without revision) give the subject heading editor all new cards which conflict with existing headings or represent new subjects or subdivisions. The subject heading editor then verifies the headings, making necessary cross-references or corrections. If possible, subject headings are corrected at the catalog rather than sending them to the typists. The subject heading tracings are usually corrected on the author card which remains the authority card for each card set. When correcting large files for which it is not feasible to correct the tracing on all author cards, a special note (signaled by an “over” note on the front of the header card) is made to insure that the reference is not removed from the catalog. Because the subject heading editor checks new subject heading listings against the catalog and makes necessary revisions and references, the subject catalog serves as its own authority catalog.

Although statistics documenting filing and revision time savings are not available, several changes are readily observable. Subject filers are filing without revision after brief training periods. Paraprofessional rather than professional personnel revise the filing in the author and title catalogs. Filing is simpler and faster in all of the catalogs, but the complexities of author-entry filing were not necessarily decreased by the division of the catalog.

Cross-references are made for each catalog in which an entry appears. References for entries appearing in only one catalog are made only for that catalog; if these entries are later introduced into another catalog, the references are made for that catalog. References are made as needed between the author and title catalogs, i.e., author/title entries (author catalog) to title entries (title catalog) and vice versa. A brief phrase leads the patron to the appropriate catalog. For example:

Rand report.
See AUTHOR CATALOG under
Rand Corporation.
Rand report.
U. S.Environmental Protection Agency.
Water pollution control research series.
See TITLE CATALOG under.
Water pollution control research series.

Cross-references withdrawn during the division process were duplicated or amended to conform with present practice.

Earlier conversion of the Library of Congress depository files to title order was so successful in increasing the efficiency of bibliographic searching that it was decided to use the title catalog for acquisitions searching. Separate outstanding order and process files were discontinued and these records were filed into the title catalog. Slips filed when an order is placed are stamped “on order” while slips for books already in hand (gifts, depository receipts, and subscription items) are stamped “in
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process," in order to determine the status and location of a given item if it is requested.

Cost and Results

According to cost study figures prepared at the end of the 1973-74 fiscal year, 4,754 hours (1,639 professional and 3,115 paraprofessional and clerical) were spent in division and expansion of the catalog and related activities at a cost of $23,528. The breakdown per activity, in hours, follows:

- Planning: 91
- Supervision: 66
- Division of catalog: 970
- Preparation of header cards*: 691
- Catalog expansion: 1,136
- Cross-references*: 1,724
- Title project*: 76

As indicated, three activities related to the division were not completed during the 1973-74 fiscal year. Necessary work in preparation of header cards has been described above. The cross-reference project has subsequently been completed. The title project involves reading the tracing of all main entries in the author catalog in order to locate all works for which title added entries were not provided in the past, in order to add them, in conformity with present practice. Mid-1976 is targeted as the completion date for the title project, but no cost estimates are available, nor has a specific completion date been set for the subject header project.

To summarize: patrons and staff find the divided catalog easier to use. Conversion to a divided catalog has reduced filing and revision time and has relieved the professional staff of filing revision. Congestion at the catalog has decreased. The substitution of highlighting for overtyping of secondary entries and the cessation of retyping printed call numbers has reduced the time devoted to typing and proofreading. The introduction of header cards and highlighting into the subject catalog combined with the assignment of subject heading revision to one person has decreased the time previously spent by catalogers and library assistants in checking all subject headings. The interfiling of process and order slips into the title catalog has expedited preorder bibliographic searching.

A comparison of cost/time study figures for the 1973-74 fiscal year with those for 1972-73 shows a 12.41 percent increase of productivity when measured by dollars spent per volume processed. Productivity measured in terms of minutes spent per volume processed increased 12.89 percent. It is anticipated the 1974-75 figures will show additional savings as the staff becomes increasingly familiar with the new routines and the remaining projects related to the division near completion.

* Indicates projects not completed during this cost study period.
A reasonable evaluation of a cataloger's efficiency requires accounting for expenditures of time in activities other than cataloging. A study conducted at Wichita State University reveals that slightly less than two-thirds of the work day of the catalogers was spent in actual cataloging. Accounting for all expenditures of time in whatever kind of activity affords also a sensible basis for a reorganization of departmental work flow and for adjustments of work relationships among personnel assignments in order to allow catalogers more time for cataloging.

Oh, joy! to see the Library staff perpetually jogging.
And to see the Cataloguer in the act of cataloguing.¹

IT IS TO BE HOPED that library administrators and other noncataloger librarians have a somewhat better understanding of cataloging than can be expected of the layman.² There is, nevertheless, an undeniable understanding gap between the noncataloger and the cataloger. The understanding gap has been further widened by a communication gap. Catalogers have had trouble explaining their work to other librarians who have a different training and experience. Tuttle has identified several kinds of fears of misunderstanding as reasons for catalogers' failure to communicate.³

When the noncataloger is the administrator who judges the performance of catalogers and whose decisions affect their salaries and their product, catalogers suffer anxiety. When the noncataloger is the administrator who bears the responsibility for building the library's collection and for allocating funds for cataloging, it becomes imperative that the cataloger make an effort to bridge the gaps. It is the administrator's business to buy both quantity and quality as cheaply as possible. It is the cataloger's business to help him maintain a nice balance between the

Manuscript received June 1974; accepted for publication July 1975.
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two. Unreasonable quantity pressures and too many shortcuts taken in the interest of speed will be followed inevitably by the deterioration of the catalog. Errors and omissions, if not handled gradually and continuously, will multiply error upon error and omission upon omission until their resolution becomes exceedingly costly. The wisest principles of book selection and acquisition will be defeated, and many valiant and enlightened efforts of reference librarians will be effectively thwarted.

The administrator understands figures which support statements. He needs to know what the catalogers in his library are doing with their time; why cataloging takes the time it does; whether the work could be done just as well more quickly, therefore, more cheaply; whether all of it needs to be done by catalogers; whether some of what is being done needs to be done at all. The present paper does not attempt to answer all of these queries, but it does describe what the catalogers in a study conducted at a single library were doing with their time and presents some ideas of the significance of their time expenditures.

Published cataloger production studies neglect to indicate how much of the cataloger's workday is devoted to activities other than the time spent in the act of cataloging itself. These "other" activities either represent work which must be done or are expenditures of time for other purposes, but they do not contribute to cataloging in the sense of turning out newly cataloged books for cataloging production count. Any accurate estimate or equitable judgment of a cataloger's performance must take into account the time spent in activities which erode cataloging production time. The method described here is a simple means of discovering whether a cataloger's production achievement is at an acceptable level.

Table I presents data relating to the 1972-73 production and performance of four catalogers who carry the load of original and problem cataloging in the Wichita State University Library, plus original reclassification of books from the Dewey collection for which no Library of Congress (LC) classification is given in the National Union Catalog and its predecessors. Nonbook materials, though not classed, are allocated to these catalogers by the same subject arrangement as their classification assignments in order to facilitate subject cataloging of these materials.

A few words of explanation regarding the data are in order. Item 1 presents statistics of total production, including new titles (item 2), reclassifications (item 3) and "workload" items (item 4), items such as adjusting the cataloging and classification of temporarily cataloged books to agree with that presented on Library of Congress cards, recording added copies, cataloging of analytical entries, and reclassing from obsolete LC class numbers to revised numbers.

It is possible to secure a rough measure of activity by dividing the totals in item 1 by the number of days worked (item 8), with the result shown in item 10 (the average number of books handled per day), but these figures are not valid because catalogers do more than catalog
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### TABLE 1

ACTIVITIES OF FOUR CATALOGERS AT WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY 1972/73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cataloger</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Items Handled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>4,121</td>
<td>5,700</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>3,403</td>
<td>15,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>7,064</td>
<td>6,796</td>
<td>5,823</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td>24,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Items Cataloged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>9,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>3,892</td>
<td>16,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Books Reclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>2,549</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>4,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>2,748</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>6,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Workload Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Catalog Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Time for Meetings, Conferences, etc.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total Noncataloging Time*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total Working Days*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>227.5</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>237.5</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154.5</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Net Time for Production Cataloging*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All time records expressed in terms of eight-hour day equivalents.

new books. First, much of their time is devoted to catalog maintenance activities. The department no longer makes a precataloging check of new titles except in the series and subject authority files, on the assumption that most entries will be integrated into the existing catalog without conflict, with the result that an after-cataloging review (during filing revision) is more efficient. The review must be made, however, at some point, by persons who know what they are doing. The tendency to place cataloging of books with LC copy in the hands of subprofessionals makes it imperative that professional catalogers edit the catalog. In editing the catalog, the cataloger must watch for various kinds of entry disagreements and cataloging inadequacies, such as bringing entries into agreement with changes made by the Library of Congress, making adjustments required by name changes of publications, reconciling entry
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changes occurring through application of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, making adjustments required by the application of the new filing rules, clarifying inconsistencies in series treatment, eliminating duplicate entries, noting the need for cross-references, explanatory cards, guide cards, and the like. Each daily review session results in the cataloger discovering a number of catalog maintenance problems needing resolution. As the department has, at this time, no catalog maintenance section as such, this work falls principally upon these four catalogers. Item 5 presents figures on catalog maintenance as performed at Wichita State.

Second, a certain amount of time is devoted by the catalogers to university and library faculty meetings, departmental meetings, university and library committee meetings, and other meetings or conferences, including attendance at professional conventions or in classes, some of the catalogers being enrolled in course work (item 6). Time allowed for research and professional study is also included here, as are the daily "break" periods. The total working days for the year, adjusted to reflect absences for illnesses and authorized vacation days, is given in item 8.

It should be apparent that a true measure of a cataloger’s performance can only be derived if time devoted to activities other than those requiring the handling of books (item 7) is subtracted from the total working days (item 8). Examination of the figures in the table reveals a range of 53.1 to 68.4 in the percentage of time devoted to cataloging for production, with an overall figure of 63.4 percent. The true average daily cataloging performance or capability can only be determined by using the adjusted number of days worked (item 9), with the results shown in item 11.

The method described here, which requires only that catalogers record time expenditures for other-than-cataloging time for production count, is easily applied and is suggested as pertinent and useful in any cataloging department. It suggests to the noncataloger that the cataloger cannot, does not, and should not devote all his time to production cataloging. It allows the library’s director and the head of the Cataloging Department an opportunity to interpret each cataloger’s performance and to make an equitable and reasonably accurate judgment of the cataloger’s efficiency and ability, thus relieving the catalogers’ fears that quantity of production is all that concerns the administrator. It affords the head of the Cataloging Department basis for thoughtful reorganization of activity assignments and personnel configuration to allow more time to catalogers to perform “the act of cataloging.”

REFERENCES

2. As used here, the term cataloging is comprehensive and meant to encompass descriptive and subject cataloging, as well as classification.
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4. The present paper is not meant to suggest comparisons with the production or performance of catalogers in other libraries. The presence of the reclassification items would seem to make any such comparisons invalid, if indeed production comparisons can ever really be made from one cataloging situation to another.

5. The department is refiling the public catalog according to the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards (2d ed.; Chicago: American Library Assn., 1968).

6. Although it is a simple enough matter to total numerical production and performance figures, complexity and difficulty of the work and the quality of the accomplishment are, of course, less-tangible characteristics; and judgments of the quality of performance prove to be more elusive.
Seven decades after Charles A. Cutter's death, his classification is still being used by a dozen American and Canadian libraries. These libraries are identified and their use of the Cutter classification is briefly discussed.

TO WHAT EXTENT is Charles A. Cutter’s classification scheme still being used? Gattinger reported that three Canadian academic libraries were using Cutter in 1965, Ruoss indicated that five American and Canadian theological libraries were using it in 1966, and Mowery noted that two American academic libraries were using it in 1967.1 Aside from these brief references, library literature has all but ignored the fact that Cutter is still being used. The task of this study is the documentation of its continued use.

During 1971-73 the author surveyed the classification practices of sixty-seven American, Canadian, and British libraries which had been identified by library literature, library educators, and librarians as past or present Cutter users. Through personal letters, follow-up letters, and personal visits, responses were obtained from all but four of these libraries. One product of this survey was the identification of twelve libraries which were continuing to classify the majority of their new acquisitions by Cutter.

Table I lists these libraries. Five are clustered in Massachusetts, Cutter’s native state, while a sixth is located in neighboring Rhode Island. Three others are in the Montreal-Ottawa region, two are in the American Midwest, and one is in South Carolina. Four are tax-supported public libraries, four are subscription or proprietary libraries, and four are governmental or other special libraries; none is a general college or university library (the Presbyterian College Library is a special library).
### TABLE 1

**Libraries Classifying the Majority of their New Acquisitions by Cutter (1973)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State or Province</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Volumes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Illinois State Historical Library, Springfield</td>
<td>129,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Boston Athenaeum</td>
<td>468,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forbes Library, Northampton</td>
<td>297,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holyoke Public Library</td>
<td>155,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Watertown Free Public Library</td>
<td>136,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Westfield Athenaeum, Westfield</td>
<td>104,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>St. Louis Mercantile Library Association</td>
<td>207,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Redwood Library, Newport</td>
<td>131,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Charleston Library Society</td>
<td>78,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Geological Survey of Canada Library, Ottawa</td>
<td>132,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Museums of Canada Library, Ottawa</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Presbyterian College Library, Montreal</td>
<td>21,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Nine of these twelve own more than 100,000 volumes, and seven budgeted more than $20,000 for new acquisitions in a recent year.

The Cutter schemes used by the Boston Athenaeum and the Redwood Library of Newport, Rhode Island, are based on the classification system devised by Cutter for the Boston Athenaeum and described by him in an 1879 article. The systems used by the other ten libraries are based on the *Expansiae Classification* (EC) published by Cutter during 1891–93 and succeeding years. By 1973, four of these twelve libraries had adopted either the Dewey Decimal Classification or the Library of Congress Classification for certain subject areas; nevertheless, all were continuing to classify the majority of their new acquisitions by Cutter.

While the directors of these libraries are quite aware of the problems associated with their continued allegiance to Cutter, they tend to express qualified appreciation of the system’s serviceability. The attitudes of four of these directors are conveyed by their comments:

Our schedules are constantly being expanded and modified to accommodate subjects never dreamed of by Cutter. But the fact that they can be expanded speaks well of the Cutter classification.

We find Cutter adequate, but nobody to my knowledge is an enthusiast about it.

The Cutter system has been called old-fashioned, but it has always worked well in our library.

I am reconciled to the Cutter classification and am so accustomed to it that I have no concrete plans to change. Besides, it works.
A number of other libraries continue to make some use of Cutter's EC. The Newberry Library of Chicago classifies certain reference books by its distinctive version of EC, while the City Library of Springfield, Massachusetts, classifies history and several other subjects by EC. Various other libraries which classify their new acquisitions by another system still possess many older books classified in EC. A number of these libraries, including the Newberry Library and the University of Wisconsin Library, plan to retain sizable "Cutter collections" indefinitely.

Seven decades after Charles A. Cutter's death, his classification continues to be used in a surprising number of libraries. That his system is still considered serviceable by these libraries is a tribute to his work as a classificationist.
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NEW AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS

Most of the names of the state-level governments of Nigeria are generic rather than specific in nature and have been entered in inverted form under the name of the country in major Nigerian libraries. It is suggested that all such names should be entered in direct (natural word-order) form whether used as authors or as subjects. It is further suggested that for Nigeria, indirect subdivision of subject headings should be through the name of the state instead of through the name of the country (Nigeria) as in normal Library of Congress practice.

THIS ATTEMPT TO ESTABLISH author entries and subject headings for the state-level governments of Nigeria is based for author entries on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)\(^1\) and for subject headings on Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress\(^2\) (as well as on the interpretation of these headings as shown in the Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects).\(^3\) AACR is the basic international authority (in the English-speaking world) for establishing author entries, and the Library of Congress list of subject headings is used by many major libraries in Nigeria.

It is important to consider the names of state-level governments both as author and as subject entries since use of catalogues will be made easier for the reader if the names used in the two ways are identical. As noted by Haykin: “As a rule, the form of name used in a subject heading should be the same as that chosen as an author heading. . . . As a corollary, in choosing the form of name, account should be taken of its dual use as author and subject heading.”\(^4\)

**Names of State-Level Governments, 1900–Present**

A brief chronology of the history of Nigeria may be helpful in understanding the names involved.
Following its creation in 1900, Nigeria was administered as Northern and Southern Protectorates. In 1914 the two protectorates were amalgamated and the country was administered as Northern and Southern Provinces with headquarters in Lagos. In 1939 the Southern group was divided into Eastern and Western Provinces. In 1954 Nigeria became a federation of three regions—Northern, Eastern, and Western, plus a Federal Territory of Lagos. In 1963 the Mid-Western Region was created making Nigeria a Federation of four regions—Northern, Eastern, Western, and Mid-Western.

In October 1963 Nigeria became a republic and on 27 May 1967, was divided into twelve states:

1. North Eastern
2. North Western
3. North Central
4. Benue-Plateau
5. Kano
6. Kwara
7. East Central
8. South Eastern
9. Rivers
10. Lagos
11. Mid-Western
12. Western

A committee appointed by the Nigerian military government is to make recommendations by December 1975 concerning the formation of new states. If new states are recommended, preliminary steps for their establishment are to be completed by April 1976. Their formation should not change in principle the proposals presented here, although the fact of continual political change causes problems in nonautomated catalogs.

Present Nigerian Practice

Nigerian libraries, as exemplified by cataloging practice at the National Library (NLN) and the University of Ibadan (UI), have not yet decided on a common policy for entering the names of the state-level governments which accords with AACR. The practice at NLN and UI is to enter all state-level governments in inverted form, e.g., Nigeria. South-Eastern State. (NLN entry) and Nigeria (States). East-Central (UI entry), instead of: South-Eastern State of Nigeria and East-Central State of Nigeria. The use of inverted names is contrary to AACR 60: Headings for Corporate Bodies, which states that a corporate body is to be entered directly under its name. Nevertheless, because of the numerous changes of names in this century of the state-level governments in Nigeria, and because of the fact that prior to 1967 the state-level governments had names referring to their geographic location (e.g., Western Nigeria) the inverted headings have served to keep all entries of a state-level government together fairly well. For example: if the direct
form of name is used, the reader must search through the following series of headings: Eastern Protectorate, Nigeria; Eastern Provinces, Nigeria; Eastern Region of Nigeria, whereas if the inverted form is used, the various names all begin with Nigeria, Eastern . . . and are thus perhaps more easily located (although this practice complicates the filing rules considerably).

As far as the current names of the Nigerian states are concerned, only five of the twelve have proper names (Benue-Plateau, Kano, Kwara, Lagos, Rivers) whereas the rest are identified, as were the former regions, according to geographic location. At the time of formation of the new states in 1967, the University of Ibadan decided, because of the possibility of the states someday being renamed with proper names, to enter them all under Nigeria, using an inverted form (e.g., Nigeria (States). North-Central) instead of under the direct name (e.g., North Central State of Nigeria). Unfortunately, the inverted form, as noted above, not only contradicts the AACR rule for corporate entries but is also awkward and artificial. It should further be noted that the Library of Congress has consistently used the direct form for each of the state-level governments. It is suggested, therefore, that direct entry for the names of the state-level governments be accepted in principle. If direct entry is accepted for author entries, it should also be accepted for subject entries.

State-Level Names as Author Entries

Concerning the author entry for governments, AACR 75 states: “Use the conventional names of a country, province, state, county, municipality . . . as the heading for its government, unless the official name of the government is in more common use.” For changes of name of corporate bodies, AACR 68 states: “establish a new heading under the new name for cataloging publications appearing under this name. Make appropriate cross references between the headings under which publications of the body appear in the catalog.”

From 1939 to 1967, Nigeria was divided into three, and then four, parts which were defined by their geographic location. Each change of name in fact reflected the creation of a new corporate body, so that whether AACR 68 is strictly applicable here or not (i.e., change of name of a corporate body) each change of name must be reflected in a new author entry. Some confusion, therefore, may result from the use of, for example, Northern Nigeria and Northern Region of Nigeria, for, although the region existed from 1954 until 1967, the term “Region” was dropped along the way from the official publications (the same practice was followed for all the regions). In this case, it may be best to use Northern Nigeria to cover also the term: Northern Region of Nigeria, even though the term: Northern Nigeria also refers to a name used from 1914 to 1939. Further, Northern Nigeria, Eastern Nigeria, Western Nigeria, Mid-Western Nigeria are the conventional names for these governments, so there is further reason for dropping the term “Region.”
For the state-level units existing during the period 1900–66, the following author entries would thus be established:

Eastern Nigeria  
Eastern Provinces, Nigeria  
Mid-Western Nigeria  
Northern Nigeria  
Northern Protectorate, Nigeria

As of 1967, the situation is much simpler, and the principle of direct instead of inverted entry should be observed.

The introduction to “Geographic Names” in AACR states that the standard source for geographic names for American libraries is the publications of the U.S. Board on Geographic Names. The gazetteer for Nigeria refers to each state by its name, e.g., North-Central State, but does not use the full name: North-Central State of Nigeria. From an international standpoint, however, it would seem advisable to include “Nigeria” in the name of the state, as the Library of Congress has done in most instances. The following LC entries have appeared in the National Union Catalog in recent years:

Benue-Plateau, Nigeria  
East-Central State, Nigeria  
Kano, Nigeria (State)  
Kwara  
Lagos State, Nigeria (also as Lagos)  
Mid-Western State, Nigeria (also as Mid-Western Nigeria)

(It is interesting to note the different forms for the states of Kano and Lagos, each of which includes a city of the same name. The entry for Kano is established in accordance with the form specified in AACR 77, which covers entries for “governments with the same name,” but that for Lagos is not.)

State-Level Names as Subject Headings

As noted earlier, it is preferable that the name of a government be the same whether used as author entry or as subject heading, but for some of the names this may not represent the best practice.

In political jurisdictions where the name is frequently changed, the name which has a “purely geographical connotation” is the one to be preferred, since the geographical name is the one which should last the longest. This statement should affect the choice of subject headings for political jurisdictions whose boundaries are not substantially changed.

Under the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, 1949, if a corporate body changed its names, all author and subject entries were changed to conform to the latest name, with references from the earlier names. However, since AACR provides that the name used at the time of publication be the author entry, the subject heading practice
is also affected. In January 1970 the Library of Congress announced a policy concerning “subject heading practice regarding corporate bodies and political jurisdictions whose names have changed”:

When the name of a country, state, city, etc. has been changed without substantially affecting its territorial identity, all subject entries are made under the new name regardless of the period covered by works being cataloged. All subject entries under the old name are changed to the new name.8

The example given is that of the (then) Congo (Democratic Republic).

CONGO (Democratic Republic)

Proclaimed an independent state in 1885, the Congo Free State was successor to the International Association of the Congo. It was annexed to Belgium in 1908 as the Belgian Congo. On June 30, 1960, it became the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with capital at Leopoldville.

Works by these bodies are found under the following headings according to the name used at the time of publication:

Congo (Democratic Republic)
Congo, Belgian
Congo Free State
International Association of the Congo

Subject entry: Works about this country are entered under Congo (Democratic Republic) regardless of period covered.

References are provided, as follows:
Congo, Belgian
For subject entries see Congo (Democratic Republic)
Congo Free State
For subject entries see Congo (Democratic Republic)
International Association of the Congo
For subject entries see Congo (Democratic Republic).

As a result of the change of name from Congo (Democratic Republic) to Zaire in 1971, we find the subject heading: “Labor laws and legislation—Zaire” assigned to the Code du travail of 1971, entered under Congo (Democratic Republic). Ministère du travail et de prévoyance sociale, and the heading “Zaire—History—Early period to 1908” assigned to Jesse Reeves’ The International Beginnings of the Congo Free State, originally published 1894 (both examples from the 1973 National Union Catalog).

In the case of the state-level governments of Nigeria, this practice will affect primarily the provincial and regional governments of the period 1939–67. During that time their boundaries were not altered significantly and a single name can be used for each unit throughout the period. Furthermore, terms which have been used to designate political jurisdictions but which have also a “geographical connotation” can be chosen. As of 1967, the boundaries were substantially changed, and as of this date, the subject headings will change as well.

Therefore, to cover the period from the creation of Nigeria in 1900
to the establishment of the twelve states in 1967, five subject headings will suffice:  
Eastern Nigeria (used for the period 1939–66)
Mid-Western Nigeria (used for the period 1963–66)
Northern Nigeria (used for the period 1900–66)
Southern Nigeria (used for the period 1900–66)
Western Nigeria (used for the period 1939–66)

For the states created in 1967, the same name will be used for author and subject headings. Thus, Peter Kilby’s Development of Small Industries in Eastern Nigeria, published in 1963, will have the subject heading Small business—Eastern Nigeria, and the First Development Plan of the East-Central State, published in 1971, will have the subject heading East-Central State, Nigeria—Economic policy (both examples from the National Union Catalog 1973).

In the case of the western part of the country, the boundaries of the Western State have been changed considerably during the formation of the Mid-Western State in 1963 and Lagos State in 1967, but those of the Mid-Western State have not been changed at all. Because their names as states have changed only slightly, it is suggested that the preferred subject entries be Mid-Western Nigeria and Western Nigeria.

Finally, history cards of the kind illustrated above should be established, stating the names used as author entries according to the time of publication and stating the subject headings used for each area.

Subject Headings: Indirect Subdivision for State-Level Governments

A decision is also necessary concerning the form of subdivision to be used for subject headings in which the political name is used to subdivide a topical heading. Library of Congress practice calls for either “direct” (Education—Ibadan) or “indirect” (Education—India—Assam) subdivision to the area concerned. Approaching the specific area through the name of the country applies to most, but not all countries. In particular, the Library of Congress makes an exception for states of the United States. If the book is about education in a particular state, for example, the subdivision is “direct” to that state, and not through the name of the country, e.g., Education—Illinois, not Education—U.S.—Illinois and “indirect” subdivision is through the name of the state to the specific area (Education—Florida—Leon County).

It is suggested that the principle applied by the Library of Congress to its home country, the United States, should be applied by Nigerian libraries to their country, Nigeria. Therefore, a book about education in Ibadan would not receive the following subject heading (according to LC subject heading rules): Education—Nigeria—Ibadan, but would instead have the subject heading Education—Western Nigeria—Ibadan. Thus, indirect subdivision as applied to Nigeria would always be through the name of the state, and not through the name of the country.
This policy is followed by the *Australian National Bibliography*:

**Subject Cataloguing:**

When local subdivision of subject is designated “indirect” in the Library of Congress list or its supplements subdivision by Australian place names is effect ed in this way: The names of the States of Australia are always used directly after the subject heading and names of shires, cities and other subordinate units are added, if required, as further subdivisions, e.g., Geology—Victoria—Gippsland not Geology—Australia—Gippsland.11

Applying this policy, however, may require extensive changes in the subject catalogues of Nigerian libraries. For example, NLN uses both the LC form and the form: Education—Nigeria, North-Central State, which may be considered a form of direct (albeit inverted) subdivision. UI uses the form: Education—Nigeria (States) North Central. If the principle of direct entry for the names of the Nigerian states and state-level governments is observed, the subject entry would be: Education—North Central State, Nigeria.

The problem involves first, accepting the principle of direct entry, and second, attempting to change existing entries in the catalogues to conform to a new practice. Unless a cataloging section keeps an authority file of all subjects under which the Nigerian states have been used for geographical subdivision, the changes can be made only as the original headings are found. Furthermore, it must be admitted that as far as the subject catalogue is concerned, the use of inverted headings has a certain practical value. All subdivisions of Nigeria are thus collected in one place, whereas under direct entry, they are scattered. Even the Library of Congress has had trouble deciding on direct versus inverted entry for the Nigerian regions. In the 1965–69 cumulation of *Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects*, we find subject entries under both Eastern Nigeria (twenty-five entries) and Eastern Region of Nigeria (two entries) and under both Nigeria, Northern (twenty entries) and Northern Nigeria (two entries) with no cross-reference from Nigeria (Northern Region), etc. Earlier cumulations show Nigeria, Northern as a frequently used entry in addition to Northern Region of Nigeria.

Nevertheless, if we accept the principle of direct entry for author entries, we should accept it for subject entries also. Following the Australian policy of subdividing directly through the name of the state for indirect subdivision would result in headings like:

**Education—North-Eastern State, Nigeria—Maiduguri**
(rather than Education—Nigeria, North Eastern State—Maiduguri or: Education—Nigeria—Maiduguri)

**Education—Lagos State, Nigeria—Ikorodu**
(rather than Education—Nigeria, Lagos State—Ikorodu, or: Education—Nigeria—Ikorodu)

For division of a subject by a geographical area which was also a region, the following form would be used:
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Further, current forms of names of states should always be used in preference to earlier names of regions even in instances in which the work being catalogued covers a time span longer than that of the state. Thus, a history of education in Owerri covering the period 1939 to the present should be assigned the heading Education—East-Central State, Nigeria—Owerri rather than Education—Eastern Nigeria—Owerri.

Conclusions

1. The principle of direct entry as specified in AACR should be accepted for the names of state-level governments of Nigeria, whether used as author or subject entries.

2. Whatever form of name is decided upon, it should be used consistently for a given unit.

3. Nigerian libraries should adopt the practice of indirect subdivision as applied to the states of the United States by the Library of Congress and as adopted by the Australian National Bibliography for the states of Australia whereby subject headings for which indirect subdivision is specified will include the name of the state rather than the name of the country as the first place name in the heading. This practice should be considered for adoption by all countries outside of the United States where the Library of Congress subject headings are used, as representing a more logical approach and one more in keeping with the point of view of these countries.
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APPENDIX

List of Names of State-Level Governments of Nigeria as Author Entries and Subject Headings (Separated as in a Divided Catalogue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author Entries</th>
<th>Subject Headings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benue-Plateau State, Nigeria*</td>
<td>BENUE-PLATEAU STATE, NIGERIA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Benue-Plateau State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Benue-Plateau State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-Central State, Nigeria</td>
<td>EAST-CENTRAL STATE, NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. East-Central State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. East-Central State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Nigeria</td>
<td>EASTERN NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Eastern Region of Nigeria</td>
<td>x Eastern Provinces, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria, Eastern</td>
<td>x Nigeria, Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria, Eastern Region of Nigeria</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Eastern Region of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Provinces, Nigeria</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Eastern Provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Eastern Provinces</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Eastern Region of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For subject entries see</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Eastern Region of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kano State, Nigeria*</td>
<td>KANO STATE, NIGERIA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Kano State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Kano State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwara State, Nigeria*</td>
<td>KWARA STATE, NIGERIA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Kwara State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Kwara State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos State, Nigeria*</td>
<td>LAGOS STATE, NIGERIA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Lagos State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Lagos State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western Nigeria</td>
<td>MID-WESTERN NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Mid-West Nigeria</td>
<td>x Mid-West Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Mid-Western Region of Nigeria</td>
<td>x Mid-Western Region of Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria, Mid-Western</td>
<td>x Mid-Western State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria, Mid-Western Region of</td>
<td>x Nigeria, Mid-Western Region of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western State, Nigeria</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Mid-Western State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. Mid-Western State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. Mid-Western State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For subject entries see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Western Nigeria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Central State, Nigeria</td>
<td>NORTH-CENTRAL STATE, NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Central State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Central State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Eastern State, Nigeria</td>
<td>NORTH-EASTERN STATE, NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Eastern State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Eastern State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-Western State, Nigeria</td>
<td>NORTH-WESTERN STATE, NIGERIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Western State</td>
<td>x Nigeria. North-Western State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Author Entries

Northern Nigeria
  x Nigeria, Northern
  x Nigeria, Northern Region of
  x Northern Region of Nigeria

Northern Provinces, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Northern Provinces
  For subject entries see
  Northern Nigeria

Northern Protectorate, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Northern Protectorate
  x Protectorate of Northern Nigeria
  For subject entries see
  Northern Nigeria

Rivers State, Nigeria*
  x Nigeria. Rivers State

South-Eastern State, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. South-Eastern State

Southern Protectorate, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Southern Protectorate
  x Protectorate of Southern Nigeria
  For subject entries see
  Southern Nigeria

Southern Provinces, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Southern Provinces
  For subject entries see
  Southern Nigeria

Western Nigeria
  x Nigeria, Western
  x Nigeria, Western Region of
  x Western Region of Nigeria

Western Provinces, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Western Provinces
  For subject entries see
  Western Nigeria

Western State, Nigeria
  x Nigeria. Western State
  For subject entries see
  Western Nigeria

Subject Headings

NORTHERN NIGERIA
  x Nigeria, Northern
  x Nigeria. Northern Protectorate
  x Nigeria. Northern Provinces
  x Nigeria, Northern Region of
  x Northern Protectorate, Nigeria
  x Northern Provinces, Nigeria
  x Northern Region of Nigeria
  x Protectorate of Northern Nigeria

RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA*
  x Nigeria. Rivers State

SOUTH-EASTERN STATE, NIGERIA
  x Nigeria. South-Eastern State

SOUTHERN NIGERIA
  x Nigeria, Southern
  x Nigeria. Southern Protectorate
  x Nigeria. Southern Provinces
  x Protectorate of Southern Nigeria
  x Southern Protectorate, Nigeria
  x Southern Provinces, Nigeria

WESTERN NIGERIA
  x Nigeria, Western
  x Nigeria. Western Provinces
  x Nigeria, Western Region of
  x Western Region of Nigeria
  x Western State, Nigeria

* Strict adherence to AACR principles would call for entries under Benue-Plateau, Nigeria; Kwara, Nigeria; Rivers, Nigeria; and, in the case of the two names used for both a city and a state, the forms Kano, Nigeria (City) and Kano, Nigeria (State); and Lagos, Nigeria (City) and Lagos, Nigeria (State) in contrast to the forms suggested here. The latter are presented because, even in Nigeria, the names are frequently known as Benue-Plateau State, Kwara State, etc.
The Duplicate Periodical Problem in the Academic Library

DAVID WALKER LUFTON
Head, Serials Section
Colorado State University Libraries
Fort Collins, Colorado

An analysis of the problems created by receipt of duplicate periodical issues in an academic university library is presented, together with a suggested solution designed to improve the economics of handling duplicate periodicals.

Introduction

Many academic libraries are faced with the problem of unsolicited duplicate issues of periodicals and other serials, which find their way into the serials department and perhaps eventually the bindery as unneeded and unwanted duplicate issues. Their usual destination is the United States Book Exchange (USBE), a duplicate periodical mailing list, or, if one is expedient, the waste basket.

In an age of accountability, the economic factors involved in processing duplicate issues must be weighed. A study was undertaken recently at Colorado State University in order to determine the nature and extent of the problems created by the receipt of duplicates in the hope of determining methods which could be used from both a financial point of view and from the point of view of best utilization of staff time to bring the duplicates under control. The study was conducted over a fifteen-month period, in a file containing 13,000 current titles. The results were most surprising, for they indicated that many of the issues identified as duplicates were not true duplicates. The findings further suggest that many libraries must certainly be paying twice for items that are discarded without further review.

Identifying the Duplicate Problem

In order to determine the source of the duplicate periodical issues, a procedure was established whereby the mailing envelope remains with
the piece until it is recorded into the check-in file. The duplicates can be reduced somewhat merely by examining the mailing labels as a clue to the problem. Some duplicate issues will have an address easily identifiable as different from that of your library, indicating that the issues were simply incorrectly delivered to the library.

A similar method is involved if mailing labels are affixed directly to the issues. If the reviewer has both the original issue and the duplicate available, it may be found that the labels have either slightly different addresses or expiration codes, thereby accounting for the second copy.

*Establishing a “Duplicate Hold Shelf”*

The situations presented above concerning mailing labels are no problem when the original and the duplicate issues are received simultaneously; however, a more frequent occurrence is that the first mailing envelope has been discarded at an earlier check-in date. One satisfactory solution is to place a dated note in the check-in file with instructions to save all future mailing envelopes for the errant title. If there proves to be a continuing duplicate problem with the title, the duplicate mailing address will usually be produced with the next published issue and a form letter can be sent to the publisher, illustrating the comparison of these mailing labels. In the meantime the duplicate piece and the one mailing label presently at hand can be filed on a “duplicate hold shelf.” If no further duplicate issues appear, it can be assumed that the problem has solved itself. It is conceivable that the publisher has inadvertently affixed two identical mailing labels to two copies of the same issue, or that he has mailed the second copy as a “sample copy.”

*Duplicates and the Check-In Clerk*

To return to our original question, how are these duplicate issues originally discovered? They are usually identified by the periodical/serials check-in clerk. If the issue in hand has already been checked in on the record card, it is assumed that the piece in hand is a duplicate copy. The most obvious source of error has already been mentioned—the duplicate issue was delivered to the library by mistake. But there are other possibilities. The check-in clerk may have decided at an earlier time that the issue in question was overdue and claimed for the delinquent issue. In the meantime the publisher, behind schedule, has placed your “missing” issue in the mail, resulting in the receipt of a duplicate issue. If your library keeps a record of claims sent, this overlap can be discovered. Many times the publisher will indicate that the issue being sent is in response to your claim notice, and usually a stenciled mailing label will not be used, but rather a typed or handwritten one.

One large U.S. scientific journal publisher has recognized this potential overlap created by zealous periodical claimers and inserts a printed notice with each “claimed” issue mailed which reads as follows:

We are pleased to enclose the claim adjustment copy (s) you have requested. If your regular subscription copies have been received in the interim, we would ap-
precipitate having the duplicate copies returned using the attached label.

Your cooperation in this matter would be most appreciated.

Other sources of error may result during the check-in process, including the situation in which the check-in person records the issue into the file, is distracted, and upon returning to the file sees that the periodical issue at hand has already been checked in. Thus a duplicate is actually created and so marked. Upon trying to locate the “other issue,” it has been our experience that this source of error is not as uncommon as it may appear to be.

On other occasions interruptions may result in an item being marked, property stamped, and sent to the shelves without having actually been recorded in the files. The gap in the records will be seen by the periodical claimer who will send for the “missing issue,” and upon its receipt the library will have an unwanted “dup” on its hands for disposal. Fortunately, this situation is usually the exception.

Duplicates and the Publisher

Publishers also make mistakes, in addition to creating duplicate mailing labels. Not infrequently the periodical claimer will request a missing issue, and the publisher will send the correct issue number or month but for the wrong year. More frequently the publisher misnumbers the issues, in effect creating what appears to be a duplicate issue to the periodical checker. Frequently this error is caught when the title is shelved or prepared for binding. With the system described below, however, the error may be caught before the “duplicate” issue is discarded, thereby eliminating the need for a replacement order.

Duplicates and the Budget

Once the potential duplicate issues are identified during the check-in process, the question is to determine what can be done about them. Discarding may seem to represent the easiest solution, but this may represent a loss of money allocated to the library for subscriptions and for bindery needs. Examination of payment records may reveal double payment (possibly once by volume and once by year). These duplicate payments represent the source of a majority of duplicate issues, in our experience.

Institutional membership in organizations that publish journals may account for duplicates, as a library may receive one copy as a member and a second copy by subscription. It is also possible that the duplicate issue may indeed be a legitimate “copy 2” subscription for binding. Or, alas, it may be that long-awaited replacement issue needed to complete a volume before binding—the original having been lost, stolen, or mutilated.

A Proposed Solution

Obviously not all duplicate issues are worth pursuing or saving for
future disposal. At Colorado State University it has been found that it is expedient to have them separated into two categories: gifts/exchanges and purchases. Since the gift titles (received from individuals or departments on campus and sometimes directly from the publisher) and the exchange titles are of no direct expense to the library serials renewal budget, an immediate decision is made by the serials librarian for each of these duplicate issues. If the piece appears to be “substantial” in nature, it is checked by a clerk against the pieces in the stacks to determine whether or not it is indeed a duplicate issue. Gift and exchange duplicates of this quality are either held by the bindery until the issue in question is bound (thus serving as a replacement issue if necessary), offered to the United States Book Exchange, or placed on a duplicate periodical mailing list. In essence it is assumed that gift/exchange duplicates are more expendable than those for which the library has a paid subscription.

If the duplicate issue is for a title received on a paid subscription, the procedure is as follows: First, the suspected duplicate issue is checked against the shelves in an attempt to locate the identical “original,” perhaps bearing a mailing label. This course of action turns up variant mailing labels and misnumbering by the publisher. In the case of a true duplicate, the payment record is then checked for duplicate payments, and the check-in records examined for an error and for possible “copy 2” subscriptions that may have been overlooked. Finally, bindery request files and claim files are checked as a source for the duplication.

If the mailing labels show the correct address, but read differently, it may be conjectured that the publisher’s subscription records are in error in recording two or more subscriptions for the library with variant mailing labels. The problem may be resolved quickly and efficiently by sending a form letter explaining the situation with the variant labels enclosed.

Usually the publisher corrects the situation, with or without notifying the library. In the case of those who do not, the file of form letters (arranged alphabetically by title or entry) serves as a reminder that the publisher has been notified and the duplicate may be forwarded to the bindery or to USBE, or discarded.

Although the “duplicate problem” in academic library serials departments may seem to be merely a minor daily irritation (approximately one percent of all subscription titles in our case), the problems and the unwanted pieces can rapidly mount to headache proportions. Our figures indicate that over one-half of all subscription title duplicates did not represent true duplicates. Had they not been checked against the library’s holdings, library funds would be going directly into the waste basket. On the other hand, if the library is receiving duplicate subscriptions because of an error in the publisher’s subscription file, it is not only good public relations to apprise the publisher of the problem, but healthy for the economy and ecology.
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 information provided by John Byrum and Frances Hinton and summarizes major items from the June and October 1975 meetings of the committee. The most recent earlier account of the committee's activity appeared in the fall 1975 issue of this journal.

Recommendations to the Joint Steering Committee

Among the major recommendations which CCRC has made to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules are the following: (1) abandon form subdivisions for legal and religious headings (2) eliminate "dashed on" entries and enter a related work under its own author or title with an added entry for the work to which it is related (3) enter a personal name in the form appearing most frequently on title pages; if the forenames appear as initials, give the full names for which the initials stand in parentheses (4) substitute "the language of the cataloguing agency" for "English language" in appropriate rules so that the revised code will be more international (5) use systematic romanization in headings for corporate bodies whose names are in languages using non-Roman alphabets (no recommendation was made for personal names) (6) provide no special rules for exhibition catalogs or government publications.

Other Actions

The Committee has accepted in principle the concept of a General International Standard Bibliographical Description (ISBD(G)), which provides a generalized framework for bibliographic description that can be used for all forms of library materials. (See LRTS 20:91-93. Winter 1976 for an outline of ISBD(G).)

The Committee has not yet succeeded in formulating a definition of corporate authorship, but has forwarded to the Joint Steering Committee statements describing types of publications which may be considered to be of corporate authorship.

The Joint Steering Committee has decided that recommendations regarding rules for legal materials, incunabula, maps, and music should be submitted directly to the editor, who will draft rules taking all submissions into account. The Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files will submit its final report and recommendation in the same way. The Committee on Computer Filing and the Inter-
divisional Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI) are monitoring recommendations and drafts of revised rules to make sure that they do not impede machine handling of records.

Publications

Chapter 12, revised, Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials was published in 1975 by the American Library Association. The revisions of chapter 14, "Phonorecords" were published under the new title of "Sound Recordings" in the Library of Congress Cataloging Service 115, fall 1975.

CCRC has agreed that the second edition of AACR should consist of two parts, one containing rules for description and the other, rules for choice and form of headings. The two parts will provide for all media. No recommendation has been made concerning the order of the parts.
RTSD Program Meetings
at the 1976 ALA Conference
in Chicago

RTSD Membership Meeting
Monday, July 19, 8:00–9:30 a.m.
Sponsored by RTSD.
An informal coffee hour giving members and friends of RTSD an opportunity to meet and talk with RTSD division and section officers. A short business meeting to include the presentation of the 1976 Esther J. Piercy Award and the 1976 CCS Margaret Mann Citation will also take place.

The Theory and Practice of Classification
Tuesday, July 20, 2:00–4:00 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD and Cataloging and Classification Section.
Speakers: "Mr. Dewey's Classification, Mr. Cutter's Catalog, and Dr. Hitchcock's Chickens" by Phyllis Richmond (Case Western Reserve University School of Library Science). "Dewey Decimal Classification from a Pragmatic Point of View" by Benjamin Custer (Library of Congress) and Richard Sealock (Forest Press).

Microcosmos 1976
Tuesday, July 20, 8:30–10:30 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section.
Speakers: "Computer Output Microfilm Applications in the Library, with Special Emphasis on Catalog Applications" by Carl M. Spaulding (Council on Library Resources), "State of the Art of Library Micrographics" by Dr. Francis F. Spreitzer.

The International Flow of Books
Sunday, July 18, 10:00 a.m.–noon and 1:00–6:00 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Resources Section and other ALA units.

Presentation of the 1976 Resources Scholarship Award.
Speakers: Dr. Julian Behrstock (UNESCO), W. Bradford Wiley (Chairperson, Task Force of the Government Advisory Committee on International Book and Library Programs). In the 2:00–4:00 p.m. time, concurrent small group discussions of the book trade of Africa, Canada, Commonwealth, Western Europe, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Middle East, East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and U.S. book-trade abroad will take place.

Conclusion: A session on "The World of Books." Speakers: Alan Taylor (Johns Hopkins University); Herbert Lottman (reviewer, columnist).

Possible Uses of Machine-Readable Data Bases
Wednesday, July 21, 2:00–4:00 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Serials Section, RASD and ISAD.
Speakers: Jack Speer (Informatics); Mildred Nilon (University of Colorado Library).

ALA-RTSD Role in Standardization
Monday, July 19, 10:00 a.m.–noon.
Sponsored by RTSD Council of Regional Groups.
A review of the roles of ALA and RTSD in standardization activities within the association and to discuss the roles of ALA and RTSD in standardization activities sponsored by other organizations, for example the American National Standards Institute, and the International Federation of Library Associations. A luncheon is planned at 12:30 p.m. with tickets available only by advance registration.
School Library Marketing

Thursday, July 22, 10:00 a.m.–noon.
Sponsored by AAP/RTSD Joint Committee and other ALA units.
Speakers to be announced.

Reviews: Who Needs Them?

Thursday, July 22, 2:00–6:00 p.m.
Sponsored by AAP/RTSD Joint Committee and other ALA units.
An open forum to examine the book reviewing process and discuss the needs of librarians, publishers, wholesalers, and the review media.
Speakers to be announced.

National Union Catalog in Machine-Readable Form—What Should It Do and How?

Monday, July 19, 2:00–4:00 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee.
Speakers to be announced.

Preserving the National Heritage: Developing Library Conservation Activities

Tuesday, July 20, 10:00 a.m.–noon.
Sponsored by RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee.

Costing Methodology: A Look at the Cost and Process Alternatives in All Types of Libraries

Monday, July 19, 2:00–6:00 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee and the Commercial Processing Services Committee.
There will be five speakers and a hands-on demonstration workshop. Attendance will be limited to 150 persons.
Preregistration before July 1, 1976, is being handled by Jerome Yavarkovsky (Columbia University Libraries).

Collection Development Area Discussion Groups on Selection

Monday, July 19, 8:00–10:30 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD RS Collection Development Committee.
Concurrent small group discussions on collection development in: Southeast Asia; Far East; South Asia; North Africa and the Middle East; Africa South of the Sahara; Eastern Europe; Northern Europe (Scandinavian countries); Southern Europe (Italy, Portugal and Spain); Western Europe; English and French-speaking Canada; Oceania; and Latin America.
Proposed Amendments to the RTSD Division Bylaws, 1976

In accordance with 1975 and 1976 ALA Council-approved resolutions, sexist terminology is to be avoided in official documents of ALA. Therefore the word, chairperson (in the singular or plural), is to be substituted for the word, chairman (in the singular or plural), in the following places in the RTSD Division Bylaws: Article VI, sec. 1 and 2a; Article VII, sec. 1, 2c, and 3c; Article VIII, sec. 1, 2c, 2d, and 3; Article IX, sec. 1a; Article XI, sec. 5a, 5b, 5d, and 5e; and Article XII, sec. 3.

These and the following changes in the RTSD Bylaws will be voted upon at the 1976 RTSD Membership Meeting in Chicago. Refer to Library Resources & Technical Services 17:458-66; 18:182-84; and 19:83-84 for the present RTSD Bylaws and the changes since the last full printing.

Article VI.
Sec. 1. Strike out the second sentence in the second paragraph, “No candidate shall be presented who is not a personal member in good standing of the Division at the time of his nomination.” and insert “No candidate shall be presented who at the time of nomination is not a personal member in good standing of the Division.”

Article VII.
Sec. 2. (a) Strike out the words “In addition to his regular duties” and insert “In addition to the regular duties of this office,”; strike out the words “carried out. He shall recommend to the Board of Directors such action as he deems to be in the interest of the Division. He shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to his office.” and insert “carried out, shall recommend to the Board of Directors any action deemed to be in the interest of the Division, and shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to this office.”
Sec. 2. (b) Strike out “In addition to his regular duties, the vice-president shall perform such duties as the Board of Directors may assign to his office.” and insert “In addition to the regular duties of this office, the vice-president shall perform such duties as the Board of Directors may assign to the office.”
Sec. 2. (d) Strike out “In addition to his regular duties,” and insert “In addition to the regular duties of this office,”; strike out “required to the Board of Directors. He shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to his office.” and insert “required to the Board of Directors, and shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to the office.”
Sec. 3. (a) Strike out “for one year. He shall not be eligible for the office of president or president-elect for a period of at least one year following his service as immediate past president.” and insert “for one year and shall not be eligible for the office of president or president-elect for a period of at least one year following completion of service as immediate past president.”
Sec. 3. (b) Strike out “In case of a vacancy in the office of president, he shall succeed to the office of president and shall serve in that capacity until the expiration of the year for which he was elected president.” and insert “In
case of a vacancy in the office of president, the vice-president shall succeed to that office and shall serve in that capacity until replaced in the normal succession by the president-elect.”

Sec. 3. (d) Strike out “and shall serve at his pleasure.” and insert “and shall serve at the pleasure of the Executive Director.”

Article VIII.

Sec. 10. Strike out “to his membership in the Board.” and insert “to the representative membership in the Board.”

Article IX.

Sec. 5. Strike out “its sections. He shall have published annually” and insert “its sections; and shall cause to be published annually”.

Sec. 6. Strike out “the member shall commence his service, and shall serve until the adjournment of the meeting at which his successor is appointed.” and insert “the member shall commence this service and shall serve until the adjournment of the meeting at which the member’s successor takes office.”

Article X.

Sec. 2. Strike out “may affiliate with as many sections as he may wish, and shall enjoy all privileges of membership in each section he may join.” and insert “may affiliate with as many sections as desired, and shall enjoy all privileges of membership in each section joined.”

Sec. 3. (b) Strike out “he shall notify the executive secretary promptly,” and insert “the executive secretary shall be notified promptly”; strike out “he shall notify that presiding officer and the executive secretary promptly; under these circumstances, the section presiding officer may designate a substitute voting member from the governing body of the section which he represents.” and insert “that presiding officer and the executive secretary shall be notified promptly; under these circumstances the section presiding officer may designate a substitute voting member from the governing body of that section.”

Article XI.

Sec. 5. (d) Strike out “he deems” and insert “are deemed”.

Article XII.

Sec. 3. Strike out “his regular duties,” and insert “the regular duties of the office.”.

Article XVI.

Sec. 1. Strike out “by him” in the second sentence.
Proposed Amendments to the Section
Bylaws, 1976

In accordance with 1975 and 1976 ALA Council-approved resolutions, sexist terminology is to be avoided in official documents of ALA. Therefore the word, chairperson (in the singular or plural), is to be substituted for the word, chairman (in the singular or plural), in the following places in the Bylaws of all Sections of RTSD: Article V, sec. 2; Article VI, sec. 1, 2b, and 2c; Article VII, sec. 1, 3a, and 3b; Article VIII, sec. 1, 2a, 2b, and 6; Article IX, sec. 6 and 8; Article X, sec. 3; Article XIII, sec. 1.

These and the following proposed changes in the Bylaws of each Section will be voted upon at the 1976 RTSD Membership Meeting in Chicago. Refer to Library Resources & Technical Services 17:466-71; and 18:182-85 for the present RTSD Section Bylaws and the changes since the last full printing.

Article VI.
Sec. 1. Strike out the second sentence in the second paragraph, “No candidate shall be presented who is not a personal member in good standing of the Section at the time of his nomination.” and insert “No candidate shall be presented who at the time of the nomination is not a personal member in good standing.”

Article VII.
Sec. 3. (a) Strike out “one year. He shall” and insert “one year and shall”. Strike out “following his service” and insert “following completion of service”.
Sec. 3. (b) Strike out “the expiration of the year for which he was elected chairperson.” and insert “replaced in the normal succession by the vice-chairperson.”

Article VIII.
Sec. 2. (d) Strike out “for which he was elected.” and insert “for which that candidate was elected.”

Article IX.
Sec. 6. Strike out “his” in the phrase “the member shall commence his service.”.

Article X.
Sec. 3. Strike out “his regular duties,” and insert “the regular duties of the office.”.
CLR TO ASSESS POTENTIAL OF COMPUTER OUTPUT MICROFILM FOR LIBRARY USE

The potential of computer output microfilm (COM) for library applications is the subject of an investigation recently undertaken by the Council on Library Resources, Inc. As a first step, a panel of micrographics and computer experts gathered on January 26–27, 1976, to establish the specifics of an inquiry into the degree to which existing or soon-to-be-available COM hardware, software, and services can be effectively applied to library services and operations.

Principal investigator for the COM study is Brett Butler of Butler Associates. His report will answer a series of questions, principally concerned with bibliographic applications that were developed by the advisory panel. Points to be covered include the current and prospective cost ranges for generating COM output of bibliographic data, the availability of character fonts and formats, suitability of the readers and reader/printers presently available, limitations of COM formatting, user reactions, and the identification of existing bibliographic products that are good candidates for conversion to COM.

COM applications in the library field, while generally successful, have been limited. However, the recent successful field trial of a COM version of the Library of Congress Subject Headings, published some months before the printed version appeared, demonstrated that COM may have broad appeal as a means of disseminating bibliographic data. The Library of Congress is now preparing to publish a COM edition of the Register of Additional Locations. This project should result in more timely publication, more frequent cumulation, more complete location listings, and possibly even lower cost. Both micropublications are derived from large machine-readable data bases created by the MARC Development Office. This development suggests that other machine-readable bibliographic data bases may have great potential as sources of COM products for libraries.
Library Technology Reports (LTR), ALA's bimonthly consumer publication for librarians, is now available in a low-cost microfiche edition called The Sourcebook of Library Technology. Issued annually, the Sourcebook contains an edited cumulation of reports previously appearing in Library Technology Reports, 1965 to date, and thus serves as LTR's annual buying guide edition.

The 1976 edition of The Sourcebook of Library Technology, covering the years 1965 to 1975, is issued in a single looseleaf binder containing a printed table of contents and index and thirty microfiche in a special fiche holder.

The Sourcebook of Library Technology is available for purchase for $50, a savings of 50 percent over the regular LTR subscription price. Libraries with limited budgets can thus receive the reports contained in Library Technology Reports on an annual basis at a substantial savings. Orders for the Sourcebook should be addressed to Library Technology Reports, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.

Guide to Special Issues and Indexes of Periodicals

The second edition of Guide to Special Issues and Indexes of Periodicals is now available. The Guide provides easy and direct access to the specialized contents of 1,256 U.S. and Canadian periodicals. The main text contains a detailed descriptive listing, in alphabetical order by periodical title, of annual special issues (features, supplementary issues, and/or sections appearing on a recurring basis) and information on editorial and advertiser indexes. A comprehensive subject index, including association names, directs the user to the contents of the specials. A classified list presents a rapid locator to periodicals in particular subject areas.

This expanded edition contains 450 more entries than the first edition. New features include a representative number of Canadian periodicals, the subscription price and address of each periodical, and strong emphasis on the specials. Also, the price of the special issue and indication if it is a separate release are noted.

IN THE MAIL

A British View of Changes in Dewey

There has recently been some correspondence in American library journals concerning changes that followed the introduction in the Decimal Classification of new Area Tables for Great Britain. As chairman of the Decimal Classification Sub-committee of the (British) Library Association I feel it is my duty to respond to the criticisms. It is obvious that though there is a considerable interest in British affairs amongst American librarians, there is imperfect knowledge of the geography of the United Kingdom and of our constitutional structure.

For some time the British government had given consideration to the need for local government reform which would include changes in structure and boundaries. These were to become effective during 1974 and 1975, but well before that, many representations were received from British librarians for an immediate revision of the Area Tables as they appeared in 18DC and earlier editions to reflect the proposed changes. Some preliminary changes in local government in Greater London had been included in 17DC and accepted without question. The changes that were to take place nationally were on a much greater scale and necessitated such a complete revision that the Forest Press, the publishers of the DC, agreed to regard the revised -41 and -42 tables as receiving "phoenix" treatment.

In view of the existence and interest of the British DDC Sub-committee it was asked by the DC Editorial Policy Committee to supervise the preparation of the new British Area Tables. It was the objective of the Sub-committee to provide places for all major local authorities in line with the detailed subdivision which applies in the Area Tables for the United States. In order to assist classifiers the names of the superseded authorities were included as scope notes so that both retrospective and current publications could be correctly classified. In addition all significant natural features, many of which were missing from DC, were added to the new Area Tables, so that the Classification could match literary warrant.

One of the long-standing complaints which British librarians have expressed to DDC was its inability to differentiate between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the country of England. These two concepts are not the same. Ask any Scotsman or Welshman! To use -42 for England as well as for Great Britain is analogous to locating Hawaii within the North American continent. With the revision of the Area Tables it was more than reasonable to correct a mistake made initially by Melvil himself in the early years of the classification. Consequently it was only logical to extend the treatment applied in the Area Table to 914-Geography and to 970-History. Though such decisions will cause some difficulty in libraries, particularly those with open ac-
cess, the distinction which can now be applied throughout the schedules can do nothing but good for the organization and control of current and prospective material.

It must be appreciated that there is an increasing number of books on British history as distinct from English history, and that they are as different from the latter as are books on Scottish and Welsh history. Retrospective material specifically concerned with English history does not need to be relocated. Only these titles—most of which have been written in recent years—concerned with British affairs (i.e., the totality of English, Scottish, and Welsh) need to be reclassified. I am certain that no library in the past has placed books on Scottish and Welsh history at the general number for English history, yet the Classification is being criticized for giving its users the opportunity to classify specifically the whole as well as all of the parts. I find this comment, from those who are concerned so much for the right of the individual, somewhat incongruous.

American librarians must realize that the Dewey Decimal Classification has a world-wide reputation and applicability. The profession at large does not require a proliferation of general systems of classification. If Dewey can mean more to the world at large, we shall all benefit. The credit will be generously bestowed upon those in America who have so continuously supported the Classification.—Joel Downing, Chairman, Dewey Decimal Classification Sub-committee, The Library Association

ADVISORY GROUP ON NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL ESTABLISHES WORKING PARTIES

The Advisory Group on National Bibliographic Control (jointly supported by the National Science Foundation, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, and the Council on Library Resources) has announced the establishment of the first two working parties under its aegis: the Working Party on Formats for Journal Articles and Technical Reports, chaired by Margaret Park of the University of Georgia and the Working Party on Bibliographic Name Authority Files, chaired by Ann Curran of the Boston Public Library. The Advisory Group and the working parties it appoints to deal with specific tasks were established on the strong recommendation of participants in an April 1974 meeting on national bibliographic control.

If there is to be a truly national information handling system, a comprehensive and coherent approach to national bibliographic control is an absolute requirement. The recently published national program document of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science further underscores this need. Regardless of where the overall organizational responsibilities for the national information network reside, certain bibliographic files and procedures will be required in order to resolve problems of incompatibility among the systems of those who produce, store, disseminate, and use bibliographic information. The activities of these and future working parties constitute efforts lead-
ing toward the development of some of the building blocks from which ultimately will evolve a national system.

These efforts are based on the following assumptions:

1. Each processing organization will remain free to design its own internal formats, procedures, products, and services. Compatibility among these diverse systems will be achieved by standardizing the structure, content designation, and data content of the records to be exchanged among them. The price each must pay is to agree to provide for in-and-out compatibility with the standard medium of exchange.

2. Working party products must be comprehensive enough to accommodate all of the data elements required by publishers, abstracting and indexing services, information delivery systems, and libraries.


4. Neither the working parties nor their sponsors are standard-setting agencies. If the work of a party at any time indicates implications for bibliographic standards work, the chairperson will inform the Advisory Group so that proper and formal action can be taken via existing channels.

The primary objective of the Working Party on Formats for Journal Articles and Technical Reports is to develop and refer to the Advisory Group format specifications for handling these machine-readable records that are being distributed or interchanged by the library, abstracting and indexing, publishing, and information delivery communities—both public and private. It is intended that the work of this party will result in at least the following products:

1. Written specifications for formats for the communication of the bibliographic records on magnetic tape.

2. A comprehensive content designation scheme that will satisfy the requirements of the communities enumerated above and yet take advantage of, complement, and be compatible with content designation schemes already in national use for the communication of bibliographic records.

3. Written guidelines to cover, to the degree possible, the input and tagging of these bibliographic communications records.


The primary objective of the Working Party on Bibliographic Name Authority Files is to define and report to the Advisory Group the national requirements for a name authority file and develop a standard format and content designation scheme for name authority records. It is intended that the work of this party will result in at least the following products:

1. A statement of requirements that clearly identifies the need for and intended uses of this file by the various sectors of the information community.

2. A national record format for name authority records, to include the accommodation of appropriate cross-references.
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3. A comprehensive content designation scheme.
4. A recommended method for the linking of name authority records to the bibliographic records and vice versa.
5. A set of written guidelines to cover the input, coding, and tagging of the national name authority records.

Members of the Working Party on Bibliographic Name Authority Files are Eleanor Aronson, National Technical Information Service; Olga Luchaka, Defense Documentation Center; Suzanne Massonneau, Texas A&M; Mary Ellen Padin, Engineering Index, Inc.; Joseph Price, Library of Congress; John Rather, Library of Congress; James Rizzolo, the New York Public Library; Andrew Uszak, R. R. Bowker Company; and Edwin Buchinski, National Library of Canada, as observer.

Requests for information should be directed to the Advisory Group on National Bibliographic Control, One Dupont Circle, Suite 620, Washington, DC 20036.
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 your 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 commits is 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) 942-2412

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
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New 5th edition

Introduction to Cataloging and Classification

BOHDAN S. WYNAR
with the assistance of John Phillip Immroth

The sweeping changes in cataloging practice brought about by the adoption of ISBD and the revision of AACR are all covered in the 5th edition of Introduction to Cataloging and Classification. The entire text has been revised and reset. The card samples, almost all of which are new, illustrate LC use of ISBD and revised AACR rules. Among the many changes in the text is a new section that provides a comparative analysis of major classification schemes, an enlarged chapter on DDC and LC classification, a comprehensive glossary of terms, and an up-to-date bibliography. The section on LC subject headings incorporates new information from LCSH 8 as available at press-time. Introduction to Cataloging and Classification, 5th edition, is the most current cataloging text in print. Feb. 20, 1976. 448p. $14.00 cl.; $9.00 pa.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CLASSIFICATION AND NUMBER BUILDING IN DEWEY
Marty Bloomberg & Hans Weber
Edited by John Phillip Immroth
A comprehensive yet easy-to-understand presentation of number building using Dewey Decimal Classification tables.
July 1976. ca.200p. $11.00.

CATALOGING WITH COPY: THE DECISION-MAKER'S HANDBOOK
Arlene Taylor Dowell
The handbook examines problems in altering and integrating outside-prepared cataloging copy into an existing card catalog.

Libraries Unlimited
Put Widener on your shelf.

The Widener Library Shelflist is an invaluable reference guide for scholars and librarians, based on the collections in Harvard University's famed Widener Library.

Each shelflist contains a detailed subject classification as well as an alphabetical and a chronological listing of all material. The essential bibliographical description of a book — author, title, place and date of publication — is at your fingertips. It's like having part of the Widener Library card catalog on your shelf.

The first twenty volumes in the series were produced from computer printouts and average seventy entries per page. In subsequent volumes copy is set by computerized photo-composition in two-column pages with approximately 140 entries per page. Volumes are each 8½ by 11 inches, printed on durable paper and bound in cloth.

Other Widener Library Publications:
Current Journals in the Sciences/Sixth Revision Paper only, $9.50
Building a Great Library/The Coolidge Years at Harvard William Benton-Smith/$17.50

Harvard University Press
Cambridge, Mass. 02138

The latest additions to the collection include:

Ancient History.
This volume catalogs more than 11,000 works on the history, civilization, government, economic and social conditions, and geography of the Mediterranean region and Western Asia down to the Barbarian invasions in Europe and the Arab conquest in Asia and Africa. Included as well are listings of Egyptian and Assyro-Babylonian literatures. Although works on archaeology and prehistoric times are generally excluded, those on Assyrian and Babylonian archaeology form a part of this volume. No. 55 $40.00

British History.
Included in this catalog are 45,000 works on the history, civilization, government, general social life and conditions, and various races of the British Isles. Most works on economic history and conditions and on special aspects of social conditions can be found in Widener Library Shelflists 23-24 and 45-46. An exception is the inclusion in this catalog of works on the general economic history of Ireland. These volumes also cover writings on the English-speaking peoples and the British Empire in general. Nos. 53 & 54 $85.00
Should researchers and librarians pay publishers royalties when they copy journal articles?

Most people agree that publishers should be compensated for the copying of material on which they hold copyrights. The problem is developing a payment system that will take care of royalties without inhibiting researchers' daily use of journals or deluging librarians with bookkeeping.

At ISI® for about 15 years now we've had the kind of payment system that most people think still needs to be devised. We pay publishers royalties on the basis of a simple computer system which records each transaction whenever OATS, our Original Article Tear Sheet service, provides articles from any of over 5,000 journals to researchers and libraries.

Besides copyright compliance, OATS offers a number of other advantages. These include fulfillment of orders within 24 hours after receiving them and prices that compare well with other sources of full-text copies. But one of the biggest advantages is the fact that most articles supplied through OATS are not photocopies but the tear sheets themselves—literally torn from extra copies of the original journals.

To learn more about OATS, ISI's unique library service, just fill in the coupon below and mail it today.

Please send me complete information about OATS®.

Name
Title
Organization
Address
City State
Province Zip Country

©1976 ISI

ISI® Institute for Scientific Information®
325 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 19106, U.S.A., Tel. (215) 923-3300, Cable: SCINFO; Telex: 84-5305
THE SERIALS LIBRARIAN is a new quarterly journal devoted to the practical aspects of serials librarianship. Articles deal with:
- serials management
- relationships with subscription agencies & publishers
- selection and acquisition
- binding, microfilm, and computer applications
- new issues and technology facing serial librarians today
Each issue of this quarterly journal also includes a comprehensive news section, and Serials Digest, a special feature summarizing important articles relating to serials work appearing in the major library journals.

Editor: Peter Gellarly. Head Serials Division University of Washington Libraries

Publication Date: Fall 1976
Frequency: Quarterly
Price: $18 a year, including Index *

THE DE-ACQUISITIONS LIBRARIAN is devoted to research and practical methods of weeding books and periodicals in libraries of all kinds. Articles deal with:
- determining the least-used books & periodicals in your library
- selling or delegating weeded stock
- determining a library's core collection
- role of networking and cooperation in library weeding
Each issue of this newsletter also includes a Current Guide to Literature Related to Weeding, analyzing recent periodical literature useful for de-acquisitions planning and rational collection management.

Editor: Stanley J. Stote, Ph.D. 
Advisory Editor: Lee Ash

Publication Date: January 1976
Frequency: Quarterly
Price: $16 a year, including Index *

LIBRARY SECURITY NEWSLETTER is devoted to the protection, maintenance, and preservation of library assets. Articles deal with:
- book and periodical theft & theft prevention
- vandalism and willful mutilation
- fire security and fire prevention planning
- inventory methods, insurance, & risk management
- conservation, preservation & restoration of library materials
Each issue of this newsletter also includes a news section, new products, and Abstracts on Library Security, summarizing important articles relating to library security from the major journals in librarianship, security management, fire prevention technology, conservation, and institutional administration.

Editor: Bill Cohen
The Haworth Press New York City

Publication Date: January 1975
Frequency: Bi-monthly
Price: $18 a year, including Index *

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH REVIEW. A new type of "current-awareness," recurring annotated bibliography and review publication, featuring current abstracts of journal articles related to community mental health from psychology, psychiatry, social work, sociology, and law...a major review feature, current book contents, and book review digests. Provides approximately 600 abstracts/annotations per year.
Publication Date: January 1976
Frequency: Bimonthly
Price: $24 a year, including Index. Duplicate subscription for binding/routing: $5 a year.*

OFFENDER REHABILITATION. A new professional journal devoted to all aspects of offender rehabilitation, prison reform, recidivism, and the training and vocational education of ex-prisoners. Articles include psychological and sociological research on offender rehabilitation, counselling and social work services for ex-prisoners, and program news.
Publication Date: Fall 1976
Frequency: Quarterly
Price: $30 a year, including Index *

THE HAWORTH PRESS 174 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, N.Y. 10010
*CANADIAN ORDERS: add $2.00 a year postage & handling
OTHER FOREIGN ORDERS: add $5.00 a year postage & handling
If you've never had your book acquisitions commercially processed because no company could meet your library's individual cataloging requirements, now there's a company that can.

Brodart offers an advanced new technical support service called TECH-SERV. It's a complete MARC-based service that combines speed, comprehensive title coverage, cataloging accuracy and the flexibility required to make commercial processing practical and economical for the academic library. TECH-SERV lets you specify call number format, request additional main entry cards, and choose from several processing options, including books delivered completely cataloged and processed, or with complete processing kits matched to each book.

Let Brodart save you time, effort and money by supplying all your books with TECH-SERV support. We think you'll be pleased to discover that we can do it for you the way you do it yourself.

Please send this coupon, or write to:
Mr. Robert Lyle, Account Executive
BRODART, INC., Dept. 1609 Memorial Avenue
Williamsport, Pa 17701

Please send complete information on TECH-SERV including a specification form ( ). Please send me information about all Brodart book services for academic libraries ( ).

Name: __________________________
Title: __________________________
Library/Organization: __________________________
Address: __________________________________
City: __________________________ State: __________________________ Zip: __________________________

THE LIBRARY COMPANY
1609 MEMORIAL AVE., WILLIAMSPORT, PA 17701
1250 SD. HATCHER ST., CITY OF INDUSTRY, CA 91746
6 EDMONDSON ST., Brampton, Ontario L6T 5M5
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. $35.

Microform Catalog Data Retrieval Systems

Theft Detection Systems for Libraries
A revealing and valuable 98-page survey of manufacturers and users. In the May 1974 issue of LTR. $20.

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
Working bibliographic tools that save time, space, and money.


As a librarian, you already know the reference value of the Library of Congress/National Union Catalogs. Now discover the working value of LC/NUC on fiche. You will find it's a useful tool that can make your cataloging and bibliographic searches more convenient, more productive, and more economical.

The entire 1898-1974 series — more than 500 volumes — can be stored in less than 15 linear feet of drawer space. Just a fraction of the 86 feet of shelving required for hardbound volumes. Apart from substantial storage cost savings, this format greatly simplifies access and increases usability.

With the tip of your finger you can quickly flip through eye-legible headings to the entry you seek. No heavy volumes to handle; and since you retrieve individual fiche, many people can access the file simultaneously.

Need a catalog card? The touch of a button yields a full-size master for copying, in a matter of seconds.

With all these benefits, LC/NUC on microfiche costs 55% less than hardbound. Considering the savings, you can afford to place this invaluable tool in most reference and technical departments in your library.

The Library and Education Division of Information Handling Services (formerly Microcard Editions) offers a full series of LC/NUC on fiche. This includes complete Library of Congress Catalogs from 1898 to 1952 and National Union Catalogs from 1952 to the present. They are available by section, but if you purchase the entire 1898-1974 series, we will include a Vantage I reader, free.

Rounding out our comprehensive bibliographic services, we now publish the 1942-1962 Master Cumulation on fiche, and we offer a monthly LC/NUC service to keep your catalogs complete and up-to-date.

To learn more about how LC/NUC on fiche can help make your work easier and more productive, please clip and mail the coupon or call IHS directly. Information Handling Service, Library and Education Division, P.O. Box 1154, Englewood, Colorado 80110. Telephone (303) 771-2600 TWX 910/935-0715.

---

Information Handling Services
Library and Education Division
Formerly Microcard Editions
P.O. Box 1154
Englewood, CO 80110
Telephone (303) 771-2600
TWX 910/935-0715

☐ I'd like to see your LC/NUC Series
Please have your representative call for an appointment.

☐ Send information about your complete LC/NUC Series

Name ___________________________
Title ___________________________
Institution _______________________
Address _________________________
City/State/Zip ____________________
Telephone ______________________
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The least expensive and most up-to-date source of cataloging:

MARCFICHE

$375 per week includes five cumulative indexes. Free trial use and/or samples available from:

MARC APPLIED RESEARCH COMPANY
Post Office Box 40035, Washington, D.C. 20016

A Division of The Library Corporation
Announcing . . .
The Ultimate Label For Library Books

**Perma/Seal™**

_AT LAST._ . . . A breakthrough in label adhesive technology has created a label that really sticks to books. University Products **PERMA/SEAL™** is a white, flexible, smudgeproof label with an adhesive that has proven superior to all brands that we tested. So-called extra tacky labels don't compare with PERMA/SEAL.

**UNIVERSITY PRODUCTS'** "In House" production capabilities assure prompt delivery of standard items as well as the ability to produce special configurations to meet any library's particular needs. Write for free samples or information, or telephone . . .

_Toll Free 1-800-628-1912_

**UNIVERSITY PRODUCTS, INC.**
P.O. Box 101, Holyoke, Mass. 01040
TAKE ADVANTAGE OF

Gale's STANDING ORDER SERVICE

- select the titles you wish to receive automatically
- avoid wasting time on routine acquisition decisions
- receive books immediately upon publication
- cut back or cancel your standing orders at any time

Standing Order Service is available for new editions of Gale's standard reference books and new volumes in our continuing series. All come to you on 30-day approval, and may be returned without obligation if they do not meet your needs.

You may place Standing Orders for the following reference books. Write for our complete catalog for full descriptions of these and other titles available on Standing Order.

Acronyms, Initialisms, and Abbreviations Dictionary, 5th Edition (just published), $38.50.
Biographical Dictionaries Master Index—1975-1976 (in print), $65.00.
Contemporary Authors, Vol. 57-60 (in print), $38.00.
Contemporary Literary Criticism, Vol. 5 (just published), $38.00.
Consultants and Consulting Organizations Directory, 3rd Edition (just published), $78.00.
Encyclopedia of Associations, 10th Edition. Vol. 1, National Organizations of the U.S. (just published), $64.00; Vol. 2, Geographic and Executive Index (just published), $45.00; Vol. 3, New Associations and Projects (inter-edition supplement), subscription, $55.00.
Encyclopedia of Governmental Advisory Organizations, 2nd Edition (in print), $75.00; New Governmental Advisory Organizations (inter-edition supplement), subscription, $65.00.
Research Centers Directory, 5th Edition (in print), $68.00; New Research Centers (inter-edition supplement), subscription, $64.00.
Something about the Author, Vol. 8 (just published), $25.00.

If you wish to know whether you have specific titles on Standing Order, or if you have other questions, please contact our Library Services Department. Call collect: (313) 961-2242.

GALE RESEARCH COMPANY
Book Tower • Detroit, Michigan 48226