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The Writings of Paul S. Dunkin: A Review Article
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A Staff Member of the Folger Library, a faculty member of the Rutgers University Graduate School of Library Service, an active member and officer of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, and associate editor and later editor of Library Resources & Technical Services, Paul Dunkin played an active role in the development of American librarianship in the mid-twentieth century. It was his writings that had the broadest impact and influence and which will remain his most lasting contribution. In addition to four books, Dunkin wrote more than forty articles and as many reviews. His column in Library Journal in 1967, which formed the basis for Tales of Melvil’s Mouser, and his nine annual col-
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columns in *Library Resources & Technical Services*, which from 1958 through 1966 provided a lively summary of the state of the art of technical services, provided forums for him to cover a wide range of topics. Basically, though, he concentrated in his writings on the fundamental questions of cataloging and bibliography. In that area he dealt especially, and most intelligently, with the questions of why certain policies and practices exist and what the logic and rationale behind our work in those areas are. As he said in his introduction to *Cataloging U.S.A.*, “The purpose of this book ... is not to list facts and techniques with elaborate sets of examples. Instead it proposes to examine attitudes towards techniques and toward what seem to be facts. ‘Why do it?’ The answer can only be opinions—my opinions.”

In asking why and in presenting his opinions, Dunkin was one of the most thoughtful observers of this major aspect of librarianship. He was a thinker whose ideas and influence have not yet been fully appreciated. We at last are now beginning to move, through automation, beyond the bounds of the traditional approaches to technical services. Dunkin’s writings, which succinctly summarize and synthesize those traditional approaches and the ideas behind them, should serve to help us shape new ideas. One of Dunkin’s chief themes was the continuing significance of Cutter’s ideas; along with Cutter’s works, those of Dunkin deserve the most careful consideration by those who are venturing into new approaches to technical services. He came at what most likely will soon be seen as the end of a major period in American librarianship. Like others of his time, he only began to see the new ideas and concepts that were emerging and so dealt with them only briefly and inadequately. For that reason he may soon be forgotten. He did, however, serve a role as perhaps the major summarizer of the ideas and concepts of the period that was ending. There is still much of that period which is of enormous significance to us. While new questions must be asked and new systems and ideas developed, those systems and ideas will be the weaker if they have not built upon the past and Dunkin’s brilliant analysis of that past.

**Style**

In accord with his early training as a classicist, Dunkin was not a man to waste words, nor did he appreciate those who did. His writing was always to the point. His style was simple, direct, and brief. He asked very plain and very straightforward questions. He had a good command of the English language and a good sense for its use. Many of his reviews criticized language usage in detail, even that of such skillful writers as Lawrence Clark Powell. Throughout his writings there also was always an underlying sense of humor, which, inevitably, was apt to be brief and wry. The following piece is typical of his humor and style:

“Books please.” The gay mobile flaunts itself just outside Professor Poofen’s office door. Because Poofy is tall and skinny, he could bump his head against it as he passes . . . .
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"Books please." The pedant in Poofy comes awake. What do the words mean? Why, they can mean one of at least two different things.

1) "Books please." Just like that. A simple declarative statement, Mr. Pedant. And what do you make of that, Sir?

For some, the delight of his work comes from sharing that sense of humor, but it was, it must be admitted, in its own way somewhat pedantic and not to everyone's taste. Dunkin was perhaps too fond of catch phrases ("the little year that wasn't there") and of popular culture, especially the work of Walt Kelley in his comic strip "Pogo."

But his humor is, after all, a side issue. In presenting his ideas Dunkin was always direct and forceful. There was never any question of misunderstanding what it was he meant to say.

His own brevity and sparseness in the choice of words and the expression of ideas was a major influence in his approach to bibliography and cataloging. He clearly endorsed as a major principle the idea that once we had identified why we wished to do something and what purpose it was to serve, we should then seek to express it in the fewest possible words or symbols required to clearly convey the meaning. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in his article "Happiness is a Long Footnote," which carried to an extreme his notions of brevity. In that article he advocated the briefest of footnotes, with brilliant rationale, suggesting an extreme that was unquestionably carried too far. As Phyllis Richmond was to point out in her rejoinder "Misery Is a Short Footnote," his briefness would in many cases not allow the reader to identify and locate the reference. It should be noted that, of course, Dunkin never used the brevity he was advocating, either as an author or as editor of Library Resources & Technical Services. That article was, like most of his work, successfully designed to challenge our thinking.

**Likes and Dislikes**

Because he was gentle in appearance and manner, it is somewhat surprising to note that Dunkin, especially in his writings, was a man with strong likes and dislikes when it came to his professional colleagues and their ideas. He had an enormous admiration for Charles A. Cutter. In the introduction to Cataloging U.S.A., he stated that "cataloging in the United States derives from Cutter. A study of the theory and principles of American cataloging is largely a study of the theory and principles of Cutter and what we have done with them." That may well be true, but it is unfortunate that Dunkin's admiration for Cutter was so great that much of his own work was only an examination of the logic behind Cutter's work and a restatement of Cutter's ideas. He argued strongly for a return to the basic principles of Cutter. In the atmosphere of the times, especially in light of the struggle to achieve code revision, that was needed. It was also a time, however, when automation was first beginning to impinge on technical services. Attached to Cutter, Dunkin wrote only rarely about the changes that
automation might bring, although he knew, for instance, that it was "not impossible that whatever may replace the dictionary card catalog will have to answer our basic doubts and questions about the basic principles of that catalog." Unfortunately no one has yet approached that question, and many other questions involving the impact of automation on technical services, with the intellectual background and depth of understanding that Dunkin had. We need to challenge our approaches to cataloging, which may be still dominated too much by the concepts of Cutter at a time when new ways of thinking are needed. Is, for example, the concept of main entry valid in an automated system in which any access point is as available and as good as another? While it was, in large part, a matter of the time in which he lived, perhaps if Dunkin had not been so strong a disciple of Cutter he might have done more to begin to raise those challenges.

At the other extreme Dunkin's admiration for brevity and clarity of thought led him to have equally strong dislikes that were also sometimes carried too far. Bowers, Ranganathan, and Shera were the three people whose ideas and theories of cataloging and bibliography he most often and most strongly challenged.

In Bibliography; Tiger or Fat Cat?, as well as in other writings, many of Bowers' ideas were questioned, often in asides that add little to and detract from the main thrust of that book. He felt, especially, that the detailed approach, which Bowers presented in arguing for analytical bibliography as an area of scholarship in its own right, was overly detailed and emphasized esoteric scholarship rather than practical usefulness. As he put it, "The cataloger and the information scientist think the analytical bibliographer a pedantic and arty dabbler in trifles and pretty books."8

For Ranganathan, in particular, Dunkin had little intellectual respect. In two of his essays in Tales of Melvil's Mouser, he took a bitter satirical look at Ranganathan's work, concluding in one that dealt with the Five Laws of Library Science that Ranganathan should "trundle up the mountain once again, my Master."9

Along much the same lines Dunkin attacked Jesse Shera and Margaret Egan for their "macrocoscopic" approach to bibliography.10 In a lengthy, and often acrimonious rejoinder "Foundations in the Sky," Dunkin forcefully presented the idea that bibliographies should be useful, practical tools designed to accomplish a specific task—a micromosaic approach—not a part of some mysterious philosophical approach to the meaning of the universe.

Just as his admiration for Cutter hindered Dunkin's ability to go beyond those ideas, so, too often, did his lack of intellectual respect for Bowers, Ranganathan, and Shera and their broader approach to problems prevent him from seeing the very real contribution that their ideas made to the basic understanding of the intent and purposes of cataloging and bibliography. Dunkin was, at times, simply too practical.
Paul Dunkin played a major role in the catalog code revision activities of the 1950s and 1960s. He spent an enormous amount of time and effort on code revision, which included membership on the Catalog Code Revision Steering Committee and active participation in the institutes that were held to present the code and the foreign discussions that followed the work in this country. For the presentation of the draft code at the Montreal Institute in 1960, he prepared a clear and lucid commentary. He was, along with Seymour Lubetzky, Sumner Spalding, and Wyllis Wright, one of the chief advocates of the need for revision and one of the chief architects of the code. In addition he was perhaps the major advocate of the code in professional journals. In more than sixteen articles, the comments in his annual state-of-the-art articles in Library Resources & Technical Services, and many reviews, Dunkin argued strongly for the need for a basic revision of the cataloging code to meet the needs of libraries and their users.

He was, above all, an advocate of the position that a return to the basic principles of Cutter and a simplification of the rules and practices were needed. The argument, for example, that the catalog was a reference tool designed, among other things, to provide complete biographical information on all authors did not impress him; rather, the Library of Congress study, which showed that the “no-conflict” rule resulted in far less work for catalogers and presented no serious problems to users, did impress him. That study served to reinforce his basic tendencies of simplicity and practicality. On the other hand he was never persuaded, despite his practicality, that the tradition of existing practices and the enormous potential costs of change should impede code revision. Once the code was revised and accepted, the question of how it could best be applied could be dealt with. There were, he understood, various options for libraries in how they would choose to adopt, whatever that meant, and apply the code. He approached that, as he did most matters, from the standpoint of a cataloger. In addressing the question of the costs of change he commented, “Cost depends, of course, on what the library administrator will let us do; it depends even more on what we ask him to let us do.”

Caught up today in the current controversy over code revision and the closing of card catalogs, it is difficult for us to assess the results of this earlier activity and of Dunkin’s role in it. By the 1950s it had become evident that there was a pressing need for code revision. It appears as though the work that was done in that initial phase was in the right direction, especially in continuing the trend toward an approach that would help to reduce the ongoing costs of technical services operations; but by not giving sufficient attention to the potential impact of change and how it could be dealt with, Dunkin, and
How to Catalog a Rare Book

In its two editions *How to Catalog a Rare Book* represents one of Dunkin’s most useful contributions. It explains the fundamental aspects of how books are printed and put together in a way that is simple, authoritative, and easy to understand. Dunkin also goes clearly and precisely into the question of how detailed knowledge of the rare book as a physical entity should be translated onto a catalog card. His brief summary in the second edition tells both what the book is about and what his approach is.

A cataloger can catalog almost any rare book adequately if he has an intelligent skepticism. The important thing is not so much what he does to the card as what he does to the book. He will examine the book as a physical entity, and as he does so, he will keep asking three questions: (1) Is everything what it seems or professes to be? (2) What features are significant? (3) Is the book complete? Then, briefly, and clearly, he will tell of the chief ways in which that book may differ from other editions and issues of that particular title and all other copies of that particular edition and issue. This means that he will give: (1) rather brief title and imprint; (2) collation by gatherings in simple language; (3) collation by pages; and (4) other descriptive notes as necessary. He will be thorough and accurate, but he will not try to tell everything. Only if he takes the calculated risk of leaving out much will he have time to get the job done.13

In *How to Catalog a Rare Book* Dunkin seeks to address two fundamental questions that have faced rare book catalogers and bibliographers for some time. In both cases he comes down on the side of the brief practical approach. The widely used convention of quasifacsimile transcription to represent the title page of a rare book does not appeal to Dunkin as a cataloging device. While he more than adequately describes the techniques of quasifacsimile transcription, through which an attempt is made to reproduce as closely as possible the title page in all of its details, Dunkin points out that even such a transcription cannot tell everything. While the distinctions that it cannot represent are usually insignificant, in some cases they may be the distinguishing features. He describes in somewhat greater detail how to describe a rare book through the somewhat more limited full contents approach in which content, line endings, and spelling are given as in the book but no effort is made to reproduce the details of type faces and type sizes. Dunkin rejects both of those approaches as being
too costly and time consuming for cataloging purposes. Instead he argues strongly for the kind of calculated risk that is described in his summary quoted above. It is less time-consuming and will, in almost every case, serve to adequately describe the work in question. What more is needed?

Without referring to Henry Stevens’ landmark work on photographobiography, Dunkin concludes with a too brief statement that photographic reproduction of the title page is “best of all.” He points out that such a reproduction, which can easily be included in a bibliography and even on a catalog card, is the most accurate way, despite Bowers’ objections, of representing the contents of the title page clearly and accurately. He is perhaps too brief in his presentation of this possibility, which, despite Stevens and Dunkin, has received only very limited use to date. It remains an idea deserving of fuller consideration. Certainly it is an idea that should be kept in mind for many possible uses as new storage devices capable of handling that kind of reproduction come into use in automated systems.

The second major problem that he deals with is the complicated one of how to represent in the collation for a rare book the gathering of the signatures that went in to making up that book. In only twenty-five pages, which seems long for him but is short for the subject, Dunkin as clearly and simply as possible delves into all of the mysteries that a complicated assemblage of gatherings, such as might be found in the mythical College Founder’s Sixty Sermons Saving Sinners’ Sickle Souls, can present. As he does so he presents a system for describing that assemblage that he feels will work best for cataloging purposes. He then treats briefly the differences between the kind of “longhand” system he proposes as suitable for cataloging and Bowers’ “shorthand” collation, which he feels is not necessarily much briefer and is certainly too complicated to understand without an explanation. Apart from the fact that there is no good way to interpret or explain Bowers’ notation in a card catalog, Dunkin feels that, in general, the kind of arbitrary symbols of the kind Bowers suggests are confusing and serve no useful purpose. One can, after all, be too practical.

Taken as a whole, How to Catalog a Rare Book is one of Dunkin’s more lasting works. It is well written and explains as simply as possible how to handle what can be an enormously complicated task. It is an outstanding treatise of great practical value, both for its brilliant description of how a book is put together and for its advice on cataloging, as well for the novice in a rare book library as for the cataloger in the general library who may have only occasional need to catalog a rare book.

Cataloging U.S.A.

Cataloging U.S.A., Dunkin’s masterpiece, deserves to be widely read and widely used for many years to come. There is no other work that approaches it in presenting a clear and lucid picture of cataloging and
classification ideas and practices in the United States from the time of Cutter down to the middle of the twentieth century. Its brilliance lies not just in its description of the growth and development of certain ideas and practices but also in its examination of what lies behind those ideas and practices.

In *Cataloging U.S.A.*, Dunkin begins by describing, in chapter one, “Mr. Cutter’s Catalog,” presenting there a review of his ideas placed in the context of historical developments; Dunkin then proceeds to review cataloging codes from the Anglo-American code of 1908 through that of 1967. While his description of those codes is more than adequate, it is not, by any means, the heart of the book. It is rather Dunkin’s four chapters on author and title entry and heading, descriptive cataloging, subject entry, and call numbers that make this book so valuable. In the space of only 114 pages, Dunkin describes in language that is, in his usual fashion, brief but accurate, the rationale behind all of what we do in the cataloging and classification process.

In the last chapter, “Mr. Cutter’s Catalog: Today and Tomorrow,” Dunkin attempts to summarize the ideas that lie behind our practices and to cast them into an examination of “standardization in cataloging U.S.A., past, present, and future.” Here he treats of Jewett, the Library of Congress, centralized and/or commercial processing, the machine, and the book catalog. While he recognizes that “the machine demands that we rethink our whole attitude toward our work,” he himself never quite accomplishes that rethinking, or at least not enough of it to be of any real value. Instead he deals largely with the fact that the machine makes possible a return to the book catalog, which was one of the main views held in the late 1960s when this book was written. He reviews that prospect but goes little beyond it. Not even the suggestion of on-line catalogs and of the closing of card catalogs is present. In conclusion Dunkin notes that “everything changes . . . . Change is a fact in cataloging. But is it the substance of cataloging—or only the surface?” Clearly in asking that question Dunkin felt that it was only the surface and not the substance. One can hardly have expected him, writing in 1969, to have foreseen the developments in automation that were only beginning to be apparent about that time but which have since come on apace. They suggest that change will indeed be the substance not only the surface of cataloging.

*Tales of Melvil's Mouser*

As explained in the prologue to *Tales of Melvil's Mouser*, Eric Moon, then editor of *Library Journal*, persuaded Paul Dunkin to write a column of general observations on librarianship for *Library Journal* in 1967 that was later expanded into this book. Writing much in Dunkin's style, Moon explained his reasons for seeking out Dunkin: “Surely a man who could write not just with wisdom but with wit about cataloging could bring his gifts to just about any topic. Come
write for my library Bible, the journalist pleaded. Scintillate about the whole wide captivating world of library land. Reach out from your little 5 x 3 ghetto. You are too good to be left in the LRTS. And so Dunkin did. That general commentary ranged far beyond his usual areas of interest and gave him an opportunity to deal with all aspects of librarianship in the brief, satirical way that suited him. In those columns, and in the book, he dealt with many of his pet peeves, including audiovisual fads, the folly of committees, the vagaries of the academic bureaucracy, the endless and meaningless debate about librarianship as a profession, the boredom of ALA conventions, Ranaganathan, the temporary nature of the quest for relevance in library education, the waste of discussing curriculum reform in library schools, and, in general, any of the current issues of librarianship that struck his fancy. Throughout the essays, of course, he attacked jargon and obscurantism at every opportunity.

It is difficult to give the flavor of these essays, which are so unlike most library literature. In addition to “Books Please,” which was cited above, “Wagon Full of Maize” is one that best suggests the nature of his writing in this book. It deals with the Code of Ethics for librarianship.

Do not hang your head and sneak away, friend. You do too have a Code of Ethics. Just like the Doctors—the M.D.’s, that is.

And just like the Doctors’ Code, your Code was not born yesterday. It goes all the way back to December 1938. Sort of a Christmas present, even if it was in ancient times just like the Doctors’ Code . . . .

Do you serve all the public? You had better serve them all; it is in your Code. All the public, that is, “who are entitled to use the library.” If some group or class is not “entitled”—well, that lets you off the hook . . . .

Do you get a living wage for what you do? Well, your Code does not really say. But why be nitpicking all the time? Think of all the great things your Code does say. Service, friend, that is what counts. Service with a Smile and a capital S.

There are a lot more real helpful hints in your Code. But my list stops here. So get out your Code and read it yourself, friend.

It is really loaded.

Unfortunately Dunkin chose to people his essays with a cast of characters whose names change even if their folly and stupidity do not so they are not always lasting or memorable. To a large degree, too, Dunkin’s wit and allusions are directed at current issues in such a way that it is likely to be difficult for future readers to sort out his meaning and his references. Rather than to create his own situations with only a general relationship to current topics, Dunkin generally comments on contemporary situations in a loosely disguised fashion. In many cases his fictional accounts make the situation seem so ludicrous that, without a good prior understanding of its relationship to reality, the meaning is already lost on the reader. His tirade in “How to Build a Log,” for example, that deals with how library school buildings are
designed and the disparity between the treatment given to administrators and faculty in the process is clearly an outgrowth of his dissatisfaction with the design of such a building at Rutgers. The problems of understanding and interpretation can only increase over time. Nevertheless, even without reference to particular events, Tales of Melville's Mouser is likely to be a valuable source of commentary for future generations on the issues and foibles of American librarianship in the mid-twentieth century. We can only hope that it may not then seem still quite as relevant as it does today. ("Is the library relevant to the world of today? Is the library school relevant? Is the librarian relevant? Are you relevant, Buster?"

Bibliography: *Tiger or Fat Cat?*

*Bibliography: Tiger or Fat Cat?* is a disappointment. Of all Dunkin's works, it is the least satisfying and has little to recommend it. It seems to lack a unifying theme and to deal with a number of arcane and obscure aspects of bibliography (e.g., press figures) for no apparent reason. It is intended largely as a review of the current status of analytical bibliography in an attempt to do for that subject what he did for cataloging in *Cataloging U.S.A.* and, perhaps, to relate the interests of analytical bibliography to those of cataloging. He simply does not succeed in either respect. While Dunkin writes, as always, in everyday language, somehow his writing lacks its usual clarity and precision. Too often this work seems little more than an attack on Bowers. In several instances this leads him into long and complicated arguments that seem to serve no purpose. This is especially true, for example, of a long section at the end of the book in which he analyzes and comments upon, point by point, an article by Bowers that reviews the work of Gaskell. Regrettably his conclusion about analytical bibliography—"Cat or tiger? Who cares?"—sums up only too accurately the content of the book.

**Conclusion**

What then of Paul Dunkin's work as a whole? The work must be viewed in two respects. First of all it must be treated in terms of its impact and value at the time of publication. Generally his books were well reviewed, but I have made no attempt to undertake an analysis of all of the reviews. His work does not need that. There is little question that Paul Dunkin was a creative and provocative writer whose work, taken as a whole, was extremely effective in terms of its immediate value and impact. His comments, whether in an article, book, or review, were much to the point and almost always did express very clearly a particular viewpoint that needed to be strongly stated. Especially in the area of cataloging, and to a lesser extent bibliography, his work added much to the formation of contemporary thought on many major issues.

His more general observations on librarianship, such as appeared in
his column in Library Journal and subsequently in Tales of Melvil's Mouser, probably had less contemporary impact on the thinking of librarians. They must be seen largely as amusing pieces, presenting a particular viewpoint in a satirical fashion, which, perhaps, caused the readers to reflect on their own views and actions but, more likely, simply gave them a chuckle. They are, as was previously mentioned, likely to have some value in the future as a good example of a particular contemporary viewpoint on some of the issues of the time. That value may well be severely limited by the immediacy of his comments and the difficulty of relating those comments to the actual happenings which they describe.

From the point of view of the lasting value of Dunkin's work, most of his writings and commentaries on cataloging and bibliography are likely to endure. In those writings, as exemplified in How to Catalog a Rare Book and Cataloging U.S.A., Dunkin dealt with a range of important questions in a way that did much to shed light on those questions and which brought to those questions an understanding of the background and rationale behind those problems that was unmatched. Dunkin's writings should serve, for some time to come, as a fundamental basis for all those who wish to understand the approaches to cataloging and bibliography in his time. His writings can, and should, serve as an important part of the building of the systems of bibliographic organization and control of the future. If they are wisely used, the systems of the future will be that much sounder. Change may be only the surface not the substance of cataloging after all. If that is the case, those who ignore Dunkin's analysis of the logic of cataloging do so at their own peril. Even if change is the substance of cataloging, Dunkin's thinking should assist those who wish to bring about change to better understand the substance of the past.
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Additional Readings

Most of Dunkin’s works appeared in the major American library journals and can readily be located through the use of Library Literature. A complete bibliography of his works, therefore, seems unnecessary in this context. The following is a selected list of items, not already cited, that may be of interest to those who wish to read more of his work.


NOTIS-3  
(Northwestern On-Line Total Integrated System):  
Technical Services Applications
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Northwestern University library's locally developed automated support system, NOTIS, operational since 1970-71, is described with particular attention to technical services aspects. Both internal applications and relevance to projected national networking developments are considered. NOTIS supports the full range of processing operations from acquisitions, including claiming, through cataloging and on-line serials check-in, to production of punched cards for the on-line self-service circulation system. From the viewpoint of both economy and efficiency, the system serves local needs effectively while maintaining adaptability for future demands.

In these days of expanding bibliographic network activity, Northwestern University library's locally developed automated system elicits many questions as to its advantages for in-house applications and its potential for future cooperative links. Encompassing acquisitions and processing activities for both monographs and serials as well as circulation functions, NOTIS (Northwestern On-Line Total Integrated System) is in its third, thoroughly redesigned version. The first phase prototype system, developed in the late 1960s, was never fully implemented. The second phase became operational in January 1970, when the circulation subsystem of NOTIS-2 was implemented to coincide with the opening of a new main library building. Technical services subsystem input of shelflist information for some 28,000 serial titles followed directly. The remaining NOTIS-2 acquisition and processing modules were launched on October 4, 1971, and, rather remarkably, ran successfully from day one. The original operating version of NOTIS-2 utilized IBM 2740 typewriter communication terminals, which proved adequate for monographic record applications but too slow for issue-by-issue check-in of periodicals. Totally on-line serial check-in became a reality in 1974, with the arrival of IBM 3270 cathode-ray tube terminals to replace all of the system's 2740s.
In March 1977, a completely revised version of the monographic programming was implemented, followed in May by exchange of the IBM 370/135 Administrative Data Processing Center computer for a 370/138 with 512K and implementation of an improved serials module. This current system, NOTIS-3, provides flexible, powerful, and relatively inexpensive support for a full range of library operations from collection development through processing to public services. Although only a few staff members are assigned to computer terminals for major portions of their working days, most of the technical services personnel, as well as many public services and collection development staff, make frequent use of the CRTs and have assigned time available. Library users check out materials at self-service circulation charge terminals and use a CRT to find out the status of materials not in their normal locations (e.g., loaned, on reserve, at the bindery, etcetera). Enthusiastic use of this kind (sometimes more than 1,000 inquiry transactions per day during the regular academic year) suggests the likelihood of positive response to an on-line substitute for the card catalog, now in planning stages. Among the many current and proposed applications, this paper focuses on technical services utilization.

In technical services, system use begins as early as receipt of an order request with a search of the NOTIS data base. Northwestern's practice is to capture authoritative bibliographic data, when available, at the earliest possible moment. To this end, the library has a Search Department, which is responsible for both the preorder and precataloging verification steps and which attempts to fulfill the requirements of both prior to order placement for newly requested titles. Since its formation in 1970 with two professionals and eight library assistants drawn from the Order and Catalog departments, the Search Department has handled a volume of individual title searches that has exceeded 70,000 annually upon occasion.

The first approach in any search is the on-line data base, consisting of some 300,000 records as of December 1977, representing monographs cataloged since 1971 and all serials, both current and ceased publications, held by Northwestern. If no record is found in the NOTIS file for a title being searched, the operator initiates a search of the MARC data base unless the item is unquestionably out of MARC scope. Northwestern maintains the complete MARC and COMARC files off-line, searching requests each night and retrieving the most current records for the following day and older records according to a regular schedule.

After the transfer of data from MARC tapes into the on-line system, input from the Library of Congress (LC) or National Union Catalog (NUC) copy, or entry of provisional data, the basic bibliographic record, with appropriate modifications, is used for computer production of all hardcopy output, from purchase orders through catalog cards and punched circulation cards. NOTIS-3 bibliographic records in full MARC format utilize LC mnemonic tags for ease of
field identification and are accessed by means of a dynamically updated file of alphabetically arranged author/title and title/author indexes.

The technical services subsystem operates in two modes: bibliographic and order. Each requires a different password and, although all data may be displayed in either mode, modification is only permitted by operators with the proper sign-on code. NOTIS-3 records are displayed in a linked screen format, which provides a default sequence of operator commands to present basic processing data in a quick and efficient normal progression.

Requests

The top line of the computer screen serves as the “Request Line” on which the terminal operator enters the appropriate command in either upper- or lowercase characters. Commands will automatically display in the default sequence of the various operations but may be overridden at any time by the operator. After the terminal’s “Enter” key has been pressed, the computer response, in the form of either requested information or further instructions, appears on the second line of the screen or in formatted screen display. In both the order and bibliographic transaction modes, function codes are used to create a record or access or modify information in an existing record.

Data Access

In both modes the indexes provide the major access points when the bibliographic record number is unknown. All name entries, whether main or added entries, and all title entries, including generic and variant forms, appear in the index listings. As new bibliographic records are created, the main entry and main title fields cause immediate on-line update of the indexes. Other indexed fields in the bibliographic record, such as name and title added entries, result in batched off-line updating at periodic intervals. In order to search the index, an operator enters a search term of from one to seventy characters prefaced by “a=” or “t=”, indicating whether the primary approach is by author or title. Corporate name entries appear in both normal and rotated forms for ease of access to the lowest body in the corporate hierarchy. When only one entry matches the index term input, the computer immediately displays the appropriate record. If more than one entry matches the request, an index display is produced, and the operator may request either the full bibliographic or holdings record for any index line item or may display brief bibliographic data for a selected listing at the bottom of the screen, retaining the index display. A separate paper describing the index function is in preparation.

New Record Creation

Three types of screen displays are possible in the bibliographic mode: full bibliographic data, copy holdings, and volume holdings.
On the bibliographic data screen, the fixed fields are formatted at the top and the variable data fields, headed with MARC mnemonic tags, display in MARC numeric order below. To create a new record in the proper format, the operator inputs a command indicating which of the MARC formats is to be used. Provisional or non-MARC LC bibliographic data are entered on the resulting new record screen. The computer system automatically recognizes a variety of common operator errors in tagging and delimiting and, if one is made, responds with a message as to the type of error, identifying the field concerned by highlighting the characters. All indicators, delimiters, and single-character codes in the fixed fields are compared with tables of permissible values. When provisional data have been entered, a MARC search is instituted if appropriate. MARC data may be matched by LC card number, ISBN/ISSN, or author/title information, and a generic search is possible based on various combinations of main entry and title data. When such a match occurs, the MARC data is automatically copied into the NOTIS database. A search of new MARC records will automatically continue for a year, or until operator cancels if such a data transfer has not occurred.

Ordering

It is possible to generate a purchase order after the provisional bibliographic data and location/copy designation have been entered, regardless of whether or not a MARC transfer has occurred. In the order mode an operator inputs the appropriate vendor information, including any special instructions, and calls for printing of a purchase order. The bibliographic record number in conjunction with an order sequence number furnishes the purchase order number.

In the order mode, the holdings screen provides the link to all orders, with alphabetical status code indicating if the order is open, cancelled, complete, or a replacement. The operator selects the desired order number and receives a screen display that includes the brief bibliographic data, the vendor information, the copy control number, and the order/payment/receipt data fields. The first of these fields, the order scope statement, indicates the order status, fund, encumbered amount, and an action date for claiming purposes. Any payment statements will appear next and include the amount paid, invoice number and date, invoice control number, and any necessary piece identification (crucial for serials payments). A receipt statement, forty-one characters in length, is used to record pieces received. Additional receipt statements may be used as needed. In the case of serials, a new automatic claim date is calculated based upon the latest receipt statement modification date and predetermined claim interval information. Both the machine-set latest modification date and claiming action date appear on the screen.

Each night the computer generates a list of expired action dates that prompts claiming. In response to this list, an operator reviews
each record and produces a claim memo by entering a statement containing an appropriate code and data. Claims may also be generated at any time a gap is discerned without waiting for an action date list to prompt the claim. A wide variety of messages can be generated automatically. Approximately fifty memo-producing codes are in current use, generating claims for missing and overdue periodical issues and unsupplied monographs, requests for permission to return duplicate or imperfect items, and requests for unsupplied invoices. For example, to claim a missing volume on a standing order, the operator input code “somi=v.3” would produce a computer-printed claim form headed with the appropriate bibliographic information and reading: “Our records indicate we have a standing order for the above title. We have not yet received v.3. Please send or advise.” This type of printed output is produced overnight for dispatch in the following day’s mail. A note statement entered in a data field in the order record is used to record the vendor response as to the order status (out of stock, back ordered, et cetera).

Cataloging

The current number of terminals available in the Technical Services Division (eleven, including three in the Serials Department, as of December 1977) does not permit individual catalogers to conduct most activities directly on-line. Upon receipt of an item, temporary cataloging slips and a worksheet are generated for the use of cataloging staff. The cataloger, who is thoroughly familiar with the MARC format, notes necessary additions and corrections in both bibliographic and system data on the computer-printed worksheet and forwards it to a terminal operator for input. After operator input is reviewed, cards are requested via a specially formatted screen that provides a default display indicating catalog cards to be computer-printed according to a “profile” associated with each copy location. Extra cards may be generated or printing of cards suppressed to accommodate any nonstandard situation. Requests for computer-produced book pocket labels and punched circulation cards are entered at the same time.

Notes and Codes

In addition to bibliographic notes, internal processing information may be recorded in title or copy level note fields. For common circumstances, this information is usually coded and in many cases, such as the claiming situation described above, these codes can be used to generate printed memos for dispatch to vendors. For every item cataloged in NOTIS, a title level note is used to record the type of cataloging (original, copy, or partial copy) and the cataloger’s initials. This note is printed along with the date of cataloging on the bottom line of all catalog cards. Codes in copy level note fields are frequently used to print additional messages on catalog cards. These include such holdings information as “Current issues in Periodical Room” and “Latest volume in Reference.”
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One of the most greatly appreciated features of NOTIS is its ability to accommodate full issue and volume holdings information for both serials and monographic sets. The holdings record displays complete location/copy/holdings data, including piece-level information rather than merely summaries.

In the Serials Department all basic ordering, check-in, and claiming activities are conducted entirely on-line. In addition to title/author and author/title access, an ISSN index provides an increasingly useful approach. There are no longer any hardcopy check-in records. William Willmering has described both the NOTIS-2 serials operations and the NOTIS-3 version in separate papers. The specific volume holdings and claiming applications of the system, as well as binding control and public and remote access features, make the on-line serials control functions particularly valuable and powerful aspects of NOTIS.

Current Impact and Future Plans

Production levels using the automated system have matched or exceeded those established in previous manual operations and, since only limited staff reductions have been expected, it has been possible to accomplish various projects to improve the caliber of access to the collections. Among these projects was a thorough review and updating of the subject catalog with expansion of long neglected authority files. Developing authority control within the NOTIS system, establishing direct interface with the university’s budgetary accounting system, and implementing a public access mode in anticipation of closing the card catalogs are high on the priority list for the future.

Networking Implications

Looking toward bibliographic networking and resource sharing, Northwestern has been developing data base sharing capabilities in an arrangement whereby the adjoining theological seminary libraries (Garrett-Evangelical and Seabury-Western) use NOTIS for their combined technical services acquisitions and cataloging activities. Their cataloging subsystem file was established in the spring of 1976 and ordering was implemented a year later. For purposes of index display, the seminaries’ records appear, with an appropriate location symbol, in the same listing with Northwestern’s own records. Each library may view any bibliographic record and copy it for its own use. If more than one library holds a particular item, both locations appear in the index, but internal processing information is only modifiable by operators with the proper institutional codes. Since Northwestern participates with the seminaries in a cooperative arrangement for library use and a division of responsibilities for acquisitions, the appearance of index entries for records created by all locations is a great advantage to bibliographers and search staff.

Another current cooperative project involves conversion to machine-readable form of bibliographic information for publications by Venezuelans and about Venezuela. This special project, under-
taken for the National Library of Venezuela and funded by the Foundation for the Recovery of Venezuelan Documental Material, utilizes the bibliographic mode of NOTIS-3 for the formation of the database.

Northwestern also has recently begun a project with the Library of Congress, with funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities, to study the role of a research library with a specifically designated subject area of responsibility (Africana, in Northwestern's case) as a decentralized bibliographic control center. Under this plan, data control, conversion, and maintenance is handled by Northwestern, with anticipated on-line access to LC's machine-readable files to assure consistency. Data can then be transferred at intervals to the Library of Congress for inclusion in its data base and distribution via the MARC service. As a by-product of the machine-readable data base, Northwestern will be publishing a computer-produced replacement for the present Joint Acquisitions List of Africana. The project is intended to provide one model for future national network development based on decentralized bibliographic data generation and maintenance by an individual subject area control center linked to the Library of Congress for purposes of data verification and as the central distribution point. This project will be a first step in demonstrating the viability of special centers of subject strength taking responsibility for the development of portions of the national data base. This concept is receiving considerable attention in discussions of the development of a national bibliographic network.3

Aside from the benefits of potential future linkage into a developing national network and the possibility of NOTIS availability for mini-computer use by other libraries, Northwestern has found that the primary advantage of this in-house system is the efficient support it provides for our own operations. Technical services and circulation applications are only the beginning of improved service for the library's users.
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As the percentage of budgets spent on standing orders increases, a review of standing orders is needed. Three ways to conduct such a review are the utilization of (1) subjective judgment, (2) circulation records, and (3) a more comprehensive, primarily objective system incorporating all important factors. This paper describes a methodology for the third type of review in the form of a point system that rates titles according to: support of university programs, interlibrary loan availability, language, price, frequency, access by analysts, indexes, or abstracts and circulation, followed by results of the application of the system to a sample of 109 titles.

LIBRARIANS AS CONSCIENTIOUS AGENTS for the acquisition and distribution of information must actively pursue solutions to the problem of inflation as it affects libraries. Indeed, it is the economic crisis that is forcing many librarians to reevaluate their concept of collection development, from the formulation of policies concerning acquisitions to renewed and concentrated efforts toward storing, weeding, and sharing.

Concurrent with the diminution in the purchasing power of library budgets due to inflation, there has been an increase in the percentage of those budgets expended for standing orders. "... In 1969 large academic libraries were spending more than two dollars on books for each dollar spent on serials. By 1973, this had dropped to $1.16 for books for each dollar spent on serials . . . . It can be shown that, even
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at the 1969–1973 rate (and there is evidence for assuming an acceleration in the rate), by the late 1980’s large academic libraries will have ceased to purchase books entirely . . . .” At Bailey Library, University of Vermont, the percentage of the materials budget spent on standing orders has increased steadily since 1973, resulting in a 4.25 percent average annual increase for fiscal years 1973–77. If this rate of increase is continued in coming years, the materials budget will be consumed by standing orders in 1990. Thus, as Richard De Gennaro reminds librarians, not to decide whether to continue or cancel standing orders is to decide. It is to decide, that is, that an even larger proportion of dwindling library dollars will be expended for those orders, while the proportion allotted to single monographic orders and to new standing orders will diminish as the power of the dollar diminishes and as existing standing orders use more of that dollar.

For this reason, libraries should periodically and systematically review all standing orders. In the words of Herbert White, “the expedient of shifting dollars from the book to the serials budget to avoid difficult decisions about discontinuing periodical subscriptions was and is temporary. Sooner or later academic libraries must make these decisions about what subscriptions to place, and what subscriptions to cancel.” This concept is equally valid for nonperiodical subscriptions. Having completed a review of periodical subscriptions two years ago, we are now proposing that our library undertake a review of all other standing orders, those for nonperiodical serials and for monographic series.

There are three possible ways to conduct a review of standing orders. One is the utilization of purely subjective judgments regarding the value of titles. We have rejected this as the sole method for many reasons but primarily because of its necessary inconsistency and the lack of sufficient expertise among the staff. A second possible method is the utilization of circulation records. In his review of literature on weeding, Stanley Slote concludes that circulation records are the most valuable basis for weeding activities. However, being aware of considerable feeling among our library staff that circulation statistics alone do not provide desirable criteria for deselection activities, we also rejected this as the sole approach. The third method for reviewing standing orders involves an attempt to devise a system that is as objective as possible and which takes into consideration all important and measurable factors.

The purpose of this paper is to describe a methodology for this type of review. It is primarily objective, utilizing a point system to balance the important criteria. Our basic assumption is that subscriptions to titles that have low records of use, low potential for future use, and reasonable availability through interlibrary loan act as unnecessary deterrents to the purchase of other materials. We do not consider our proposal a panacea for the woes of shrinking budgets, overcrowded facilities, and ever-increasing amounts of published materials but
rather as a beginning step in the right and necessary direction.

The first step in our proposal is the elimination of Reference and Special Collections standing orders from the evaluation, because criteria for maintaining these orders differ from criteria for orders for the general collection. Secondly, all titles received for less than five years or for which we have received fewer than ten volumes are eliminated from evaluation on the assumption that we do not yet have enough information about them to make a valid determination. Finally, all those titles that have an impressive circulation rate are automatically continued. “Impressive circulation rate” is defined as circulation of at least 40 percent of the volumes received at least once. This is admittedly a simple formula, but it does eliminate the possibility of one frequently used volume (which might better have been ordered separately) skewing the statistics for a particular title. The figure 40 is admittedly arbitrary, but it is probably conservative; particularly in comparison with Williams’ findings that, unless a title is used more than about six times a year, it is cheaper for a library to borrow it than to buy it.  

The relation of unrecorded in-house use to circulation is admittedly difficult to measure. The literature on this subject is limited, perhaps because the determination of in-house use is costly and time-consuming. However, the most frequently cited study indicates that “…nonrecorded use is roughly proportional to recorded use.”

In order to minimize the time required for checking the circulation rate, only the last ten years or twenty volumes, whichever is less, need be reviewed. The rationale for selecting ten years as the cutoff point is based on the Williams study, which indicates that the demand for each year of a serial declines by 7 percent annually, and Garfield’s assertion “that the typical cited article is most heavily cited during the two years after its year of publication.”

For those titles that circulated less than 40 percent, we propose an evaluation by the point system outlined below. It should be emphasized that this point system has been designed for a specific library (with approximately 750,000 volumes and a materials budget of $700,000) in a specific medium-sized university (approximately 7,500 undergraduate and 1,000 graduate students, with a primary commitment to undergraduates). We offer it only as an example of an objective method of evaluation. Other libraries will have different needs, requiring variation in the point structure and the possible elimination of some categories as well as the addition of others that do not appear here at all.

Support of University Programs

A university is committed to serving the needs of its community; research on both graduate and undergraduate levels must be supported by adequate resources. The degree of such support is the most important criterion and is therefore allotted the most points, but it is also
## OUTLINE OF POINT SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Total No. of Points Possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Programs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports a discipline that offers degrees or</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certificates beyond four-year undergraduate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports more than one discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of annual student credit hours enrollment in the discipline:</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–999</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000–1999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000–3999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000–4999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000–5999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000–6999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7000–7999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000–8999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9000–9999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective evaluation</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ILL Availability:</strong></td>
<td>35 maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NST-ULS (0–4 holding libraries) AND OCLC (0–1 holding libraries)</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NST-ULS (5 or more holding libraries)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC (2 or more holding libraries)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German, French, or Spanish</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other taught at UVM</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0–50</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$51–150</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$151+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less often than once a year</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 times a year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More often than 2 times a year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzed, indexed, or abstracted</td>
<td>7.5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–39%</td>
<td>7.5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–19%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In applying the frequency factor, titles that are “irregular” are counted in the following manner: count the number of pieces issued in the title during the last five years and divide by five.

†For the purpose of this project, we define “analyzed” to mean the provision of catalog access for separate monographs within a series, whether or not the series itself is traced.

*Volume 22, Number 4, Fall 1978*
the most nebulous and subjective. There is, however, some basis for
objective evaluation. The extent of a university’s commitment to vari-
ous subject areas can largely be determined by (1) the extent to which
departments offer postgraduate instruction and degrees and (2) the
number of students enrolled in courses in a particular discipline.
Points are therefore assigned to reflect those factors. In the case of an
item that is interdisciplinary in nature, we suggest assigning the max-
imum number of points for any single discipline it supports in a sub-
stantial fashion. Thus, if an item supports economics (5,300 student
credit hours), political science (7,000), and history (6,300), fairly
equally, it will receive seven points for political science since that
department has the greatest number of student credit hours. Such ma-
terials will also receive an additional three points for their greater
potential for use by a larger number of patrons.

In addition to these objective criteria, we also recommend that
within this category there be a subjective analysis of the pieces on the
shelves, with a point assignment based on this hands-on analysis. Al-
though subjective, this type of analysis will allow for the expression of
the less tangible merits or weaknesses of a title. Following are sugges-
tions for the types of things one should consider while completing this
portion of the evaluation: (1) narrowness or breadth of treatment, (2)
triviality or substantiality of treatment, (3) support of special areas of
research being conducted at the university not directly reflected in the
curriculum, (4) fulfillment of current awareness needs of the univer-
sity community. We assume that the evaluator will look at a large
enough sample of titles to be able to assign points with an acceptable
degree of fairness and uniformity.

Interlibrary Loan Availability

“The laissez faire philosophy which university librarians, in particu-
lar, have been inclined to follow, attempting to achieve virtual au-
tonomy in wide areas of knowledge and to serve all the needs of their
clientele without reference to other institutions, will call for drastic re-
vision.” The urgency of the economic situation places a greater de-
mand than ever before on the system of interlibrary loan (ILL) and
the entire concept of cooperation. Basic to our proposal is the as-
sumption that, since we are evaluating only those titles that have low
use records, ILL availability will make it less essential to retain stand-
ing orders for them. Participation in the Center for Research Librar-
ies and the British Lending Library provides support in a general way
for discontinuing standing orders for infrequently used titles. More
specifically, we propose a point system based on the number of library
holdings symbols as identified in the Ohio College Library Center
(OCLC) data base, Union List of Serials (ULS), or New Serial Titles
(NST). In the case of OCLC, we feel that because of the tremendous
potential for the addition of holdings symbols to records, as well as
the constantly expanding role of OCLC in ILL, holdings retrieved
from the OCLC data base are more valuable than holdings listed in either ULS or NST. They are valuable in that they indicate a high probability of availability through ILL and therefore less need to keep the title in the local library. Thus they receive zero points. If a title does not appear in OCLC with a minimum of two holdings symbols, it will be checked in ULS or NST where five holdings symbols for a title would provide some certainty of ILL availability. Titles with less than two holdings symbols on OCLC records and less than five in ULS or NST have low probability of availability. Thus it is more important to keep them in the local library, and they are given fifteen points.

Language

Language of the publication is an important consideration in determining the potential for future use. A recent weeding experience led us to view with suspicion the frequent use of non-English-language material. We are not alone in this suspicion as White notes: "In cancellation decisions there is also a noticeable tendency to cancel foreign titles, particularly those in languages other than English..."10 Our language point structure is based on the assumptions that materials in those foreign languages that are taught at the University of Vermont have greater potential for use than those in languages that are not taught here, and that those in German, French, and Spanish have greater potential than any others.

Price

The phenomenon of increase in serials prices is well known. Not only have prices of standing orders placed directly with publishers steadily increased, but many publishers have lowered or completely eliminated discounts formerly granted to agents,11 a major source of standing order subscriptions. Libraries have been forced to bear the burden of these diminishing discounts in the form of service charges that "... have increased sharply over the last several years, from what was a discount from list price not many years ago to present service charges ranging from 4 percent to 10 percent and more."12 It seems appropriate to consider price as a factor in determining whether or not these subscriptions for little-used titles should be kept. Our starting point for establishing the price ranges is the average price of a periodical subscription as listed in Clasquin's annual report on periodical prices. The average price paid by colleges and universities from July 1976 through June 1977 was $41.85.13 Accordingly, we consider any subscription price under $50 well within the norm and those greater than $150 exhorbitantly beyond the norm.

Frequency

In addition to the initial purchase price, there are "the costs of maintaining a serial title, whether purchased, donated, or exchanged, ... which continue during the life of a serial subscription."14 In the
four libraries surveyed by Williams, maintenance costs other than the subscription cost, such as check-in, claiming, binding, and marking, were nearly as high as the subscription costs themselves. Osborn suggests that the “hidden costs” of serials are often three times as high as the subscription costs. The greater the frequency, the greater the number of pieces subject to ever-inflating maintenance costs. Thus, we consider frequency to be a factor equal to price in the decision to continue or cancel a particular serial title.

Access through Analysis, Indexing, or Abstracting

Whether or not a title is indexed, abstracted, or analyzed is significant in determining its potential future use. Therefore, we assign a title points if it can be determined that this sort of access is available.

Circulation

As indicated in the introduction, only titles of which less than 40 percent of the volumes have circulated will be considered for cancellation. It will be noted that some weight is given to those titles that do have a use record of 20 percent or more.

Results

In applying our proposal, we evaluated nonperiodical standing orders from six Kardex drawers, yielding a total of 109 titles. The following lists indicate the results.

**Titles to be Kept**
**Because of Receipt of Fewer Than 10 Volumes or Less Than 5 Years**
(26% of the total sample)

- Early English Text Society. Supplementary series.
- Eastern Electronics Packaging Conference. Record.
- Ecology and conservation.
- Education Development Center. Annual report.
- Educational comment.
- Educational media yearbook.
- Educational research and practice.
- Electron spin resonance.
- Engineering laboratories.
- English literary renaissance: monographs.
- English literary renaissance: supplements.
- Environmental damage and control in Canada.
- Environmental geology series.
- Ethnographic Survey of Africa: Central Africa, Belgian Congo.
- Ethnographic Survey of Africa: Southern Africa.
- Ethnographic Survey of Africa: West Central Africa.
- EUROCON digest.
Excited states.
Geological journal. Special issues.
Händel-Jahrbuch.
Harvard studies in comparative literature.
Harvard University. Center for International Affairs. Annual report.
Holstein-Friesian Association of America. Annual report. Human behavior and social institutions.

Titles to be kept because
40 percent or more of the volumes have circulated at least once
(28% of the total sample)

Earth sciences.
Ecological studies.
Engineering geology case histories.
English Place-Name Society. Survey of English place names.
Environmental quality and safety.
Estudios de cultura Maya.
Ethnographic Survey of Africa: East Central Africa.
Ethnographic Survey of Africa: Northeastern Africa.
Ethnographic Survey of Africa: Western Africa.
Evolutionary biology.
General systems yearbook for the Society for General Systems.
Genetics lectures.
Georgetown University roundtable on language and linguistics.
Greece and Rome. New surveys in the classics.
Greek, Roman and Byzantine monographs.
Harvard East Asian studies.
Harvard economic studies.
Harvard historical monographs.
Harvard Slavic studies.
Harvard University. Russian Research Center. Studies.
Hermeneia.
Historia de America y de los Pueblos Americanos.
History and theory. Beihefte.
Hoover Institution studies.
Hudson's Bay Records Society. Publications.
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Titles Evaluated
With Their Point Assignments
(46% of the total sample)

72 Early English Text Society. Original series.
72 English miscellany.
71 Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Center for Strategic Studies.
   Special reports.
69 Harvard studies in romance languages.
68 Harvard historical studies.
67.5 Emporia State research studies.
66 Hesperia supplements.
65.5 Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique.
65.5 Entomological Society of Canada. Memoirs.
61.5 Electrical/Electronics Insulation Conference. Proceedings.
61.5 Great ideas today.
61 Handbuch der Histochemie.
60.5 Harvard University. Harvard Forest, Petersham, Mass. Annual reports.
60 Harvard East Asian monographs.
59.5 Elizabethan and renaissance studies.
59.5 Georgia. Dept. of Mines, Mining and Geology. Bulletins.
58.5 Heine Jahrbuch.
57.5 Georgia. Dept. of Mines, Mining and Geology. Information circulars.
57.5 Headline series.
57.5 Historische Zeitschrift. Sonderhefte.
54.5 Environmental geology notes.
54.5 Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. Neue Folge.
53.5 Hakluyt Society. Works.
53 Harvard University. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and
   Ethnology. Papers.
52.5 Das erbe deutscher Musik. Sonderreihen.
52.5 Georgia. Dept. of Mines, Mining and Geology. Circulars.
52.5 Goethe-Jahrbuch.
51.3 Études Gobiennes.
   Statistical bulletins.
49.5 Eastern African studies.
49.5 Grundlagen der Germanistik.
48.5 Hokkaidō Nōgyō Shikenjō, Sapporo, Japan. Research bulletins.
47.5 Les Études Bergsoniennes.
47.5 Geological Society of America. Special papers.
46.5 Greek, Roman and Byzantine studies; scholarly aids.
44.5 Hansische Geschichtsblätter.
43.5 Germanistische Arbeitshefte.
42.5 Das erbe deutscher Musik.
42.5 Hawaii International Conference on System Science. Proceedings.
Finally, we decided to test our proposal by comparing our list of evaluated titles with the following lists based on circulation statistics.

**Titles that Circulated 20–39 Percent**

- English miscellany.
- Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. Center for Strategic Studies. Special reports.
- Harvard studies in romance languages.
- Harvard historical studies.
- Hesperia supplements.
- Entretiens sur l’antiquité classique.
- Great ideas today.
- Handbuch der Hiistochemie.
- Heine Jahrbuch.

**Titles that Circulated Less than 20 Percent**

- Emporia State research studies.
- Harvard East Asian monographs.
- Elizabethan and renaissance studies.
- Headline series.
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A comparison of these lists with our “keep” list of titles with fifty-four points or more indicates that only one title would be dropped following our proposal, but kept if a circulation rate of 20 percent or higher were the sole criterion for maintaining a subscription. Our proposal would save twelve additional titles, however. The system, then, is adequate to retain those titles that circulate and in addition provides criteria for the more elusive decisions about those titles that have not circulated widely.
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Setting Up an Exchange Operation in the Small Special Library

HARRIET H. CARTER
formerly Librarian
Fels Research Institute
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Dayton, Ohio

A temporary budgetary curtailment was the precipitating factor in one small special library's decision to participate in two national exchange programs. The planning process and the procedures that were established to get started in exchange activities are described, and the methods for evaluating the degree of success of these activities at the end of the first year are explained.

Introduction

As budgetary problems continue to plague special libraries all over the country, exchange activities are assuming an increasingly important role in enabling librarians to maintain their current subscription holdings, as well as to build their library collections. The following is an account of one small research library’s experiences with two national exchange programs during a period of temporary budgetary curtailments.

The Fels Research Institute Library’s primary objective is to supply the information needs of the ten senior scientists and their associated staffs at the institute, so that they may carry on their basic biomedical research. The library collection, which is under the supervision of one full-time librarian, consists of approximately 10,000 volumes, of which 70 percent are serials (200 current subscriptions) and 30 percent are monographs. To supplement the collection, the library obtains approximately 700 interlibrary loans for the research staff each year.

In recent years, several outside forces have had an impact on the library’s operations, the major one being the increasing budgetary problems that are haunting libraries all over the country. After enjoying several years of budgetary expansion, which kept pace with increasing costs, in the 1975-76 fiscal year, we encountered a 32 percent reduction in the acquisitions budget, with current subscriptions (accounting for approximately two-thirds of the budget) being particularly affected. We anticipated that this financial crunch would be temporary and that in two or three years we would be able to resume normal operations; however, we felt an obligation to our research
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staff somehow to maintain the quality and viability of the library collection during this crisis period. Therefore, rather than to reduce the size of our periodical collection, we decided to join the Medical Library Association Exchange and the American Library Association Duplicates Exchange Union, hoping that these two exchanges would provide replacements for some of the subscriptions we were forced to cancel. While we realized that we would not be able to get the issues we needed for several months to more than a year after publication, still it was better to get them late than not at all. In addition, we hoped that our exchange activities would enable us to expand the library collection to provide further support for our research staff.

The Planning Process

In order to receive the greatest possible benefit from our investment in exchange activities, it was necessary first to have a rational acquisitions policy. Our first step was to explain the situation to each of the senior scientists, soliciting their suggestions on specific journal titles that could be dropped from the subscription list without too much harm to their research activities. In addition, we explained how the exchange programs worked and revealed our plan to replace as many of the canceled journal titles as possible, as well as to add other journals that might be useful to them in their research. We took this approach because we felt that the scientists themselves would be best able to assess the quality and utility of the literature within their own fields of study. Furthermore, it was believed that we could be more assured of their understanding and cooperation during the period of subscription cancellations if they had taken part in the decision-making process. Finally, we felt that any new materials added to the collection from the exchange programs would receive more extensive use if the potential users had participated in the acquisitions plan.

To give added support to the suggestions of new journal titles that should be added to the library collection, an analysis of our interlibrary loan statistics was made to see which journal titles had been requested most often during the previous three-year period. In order to emphasize the "current-research" aspects of our acquisitions policy, we eliminated from consideration all citations published more than five years ago. One of the library's major objectives is to meet the information needs of the research staff with the least possible delay, and we therefore felt that periodicals that had been cited five or more times in any one-year period ought to be in our own collection, where access to them could be both immediate and direct.

Next, an inventory of our present periodical holdings resulted in a list of missing issues or volumes and other gaps in the collection, many of which had previously been ordered from the publishers but were unavailable because they were out of print. Thus, our final acquisitions list (subsequently nicknamed our "want list") consisted of the following: subscriptions necessary to cancel in order to balance the
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budget, new titles the researchers had suggested be added to the collection, titles that had established their importance by being repeatedly requested through our interlibrary loan department, and gaps in the existing collection.

The ALA Duplicates Exchange Union

Once we had our acquisitions list, we were ready to join the two exchange programs we had selected. The American Library Association Duplicates Exchange Union (DEU) is easy to join. One merely writes to the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association and requests that the name and address of one's library be added to the Duplicates Exchange Union membership list. Twice a year, a new membership list is sent to each member library, and this list is then used as a mailing list to distribute exchange offerings to the other members. Because the member libraries are responsible for distributing their own exchange lists, the lists tend to arrive in an unpredictable manner. Some days, six or seven lists may be in the morning mail, and other days there may be none. Even so, a member library can expect to receive several exchange lists each week.

While there is no membership fee per se, as a condition of membership in DEU, libraries are expected to publish at least one exchange list each year. The process of compiling a list, having it duplicated, and getting it ready to mail can entail a considerable expense, depending upon the size of the list and the efficiency of the library operations. Assuming that one wants to mail a three-page exchange list to each of the 473 other members of the DEU, the postage expenditure alone can vary from $9.93 (third-class bulk mailing rate) to $70.95 (first-class rate) for each mailing. The cost of paper and duplicating can vary from $7.09 to $141.90, depending upon the equipment or service to which one has access. Finally, the labor cost can vary considerably, ranging from zero if volunteer help is used to a figure reflecting the salary of a professional librarian in a one-person library. These costs must be compared with the value of the materials received through the exchange activities in order to determine whether the membership in the Duplicates Exchange Union is worthwhile.

The MLA Exchange

The Medical Library Association Exchange operates in a somewhat different manner. In order to qualify to use the MLA Exchange, a library must become an "institutional member" of the association, with a fee ranging from $75 to $175 a year depending upon the number of current subscriptions held by the member library. The scope of offerings on the exchange lists is rather narrowly confined to the medical and biological sciences. On the other hand, there is no requirement of periodic submission of exchange lists. Further, when a library does publish an exchange list, the expense of distributing it is
considerably reduced. One merely sends a single camera-ready copy of the list to the association's Exchange manager, who assumes the burden of duplicating and distributing the list to other member libraries. Once a month, the MLA Exchange List, which numbers more than 100 pages and contains some 70 to 80 individual lists, arrives in the mail. The librarians receiving the list then write directly to the offering libraries to request the materials they need.

The offering libraries are encouraged to hold their exchange materials for a period of six weeks following the publication of the list and then to distribute the items in such a manner that all of the requesting libraries will receive at least some of the items that they ordered. However, in recent years, the association has been unable to obtain full cooperation on this policy, and most members appear to offer their exchange holdings on a "quick-clearance" basis; that is, the first requests received are the first requests fulfilled. It is, therefore, advisable for librarians to subscribe to the "first-class" mailing service, which costs $23 extra a year. An informal survey of the MLA members within a twenty-five-mile radius of our library revealed that the libraries subscribing to the first-class service received their lists an average of twelve days sooner than the other libraries that accepted the no-cost, third-class service.2

Exchange Department Procedures

Once we had established our memberships in the two exchange programs, we set out to obtain the items on our "want list." A "check-in card" was typed for each title on the want list, flagged with a colored tab, and filed into our regular serials check-in record. When the exchange lists arrived, the colored tabs in the check-in record enabled us to determine our needs very quickly. Furthermore, when the exchange materials arrived, they could be checked into the serials record in the same way as regular subscription periodicals, thus insuring that our want list was continually and automatically kept up to date.

We found that each ALA Duplicates Exchange Union list could be processed in a few minutes. As these lists arrived almost daily, we established a routine of handling them as soon as we had finished checking in the regular subscriptions and the exchange shipments that had arrived that day. The monthly MLA Exchange List could be processed in five to six hours; and after a few months, we were able to predict fairly accurately which day of the month the list would arrive, so that we could reserve the time to process it within twenty-four hours of its arrival.

As the success of any library program or service depends largely upon the extent to which it is advertised and then taken advantage of by its potential users, we made a special effort to keep the research staff continually informed about our exchange activities. Thus, we recorded on three-by-five-inch index cards the title, volume, and issue number of the items we received, and at the end of each month we
sent an alphabetized list of our exchange acquisitions to each of the scientists on the staff. In addition, when we received an issue that catered to a specific area of interest of one of our scientists, we sent the issue to that scientist for review. Not only did this serve an excellent public relations function, but also the feedback that resulted provided an opportunity for us to test continually the value and usefulness of the items we were receiving.

Evaluation of Exchange Activities

In order to evaluate the performance of the exchange activities, certain statistical information was needed. For each piece received, the date of arrival and the postage cost were recorded, to be summarized and analyzed at the end of the year.

To arrive at a total cost for the year, we added the following individual costs together:

1. Exchange membership fees: $100.00
2. Extra charge for first-class service from MLA headquarters: $23.00
3. Labor and materials to process exchange lists and send out requests: $376.69
4. Labor and materials to check in exchange shipments: $172.51
5. Reimbursement of donors’ postage: $83.55
6. Labor, materials, and postage to distribute our own exchange lists: $104.48
7. Labor, materials, and postage to fulfill requests and ship materials: $345.01
8. Less: Postage that was reimbursed to us: (40.21)

Total cost: $1,165.03

After determining our costs, we then computed the value of the materials we had received. A list of the periodical titles that were checked into our serials record was compiled, after which we counted the number of issues we had received and calculated the equivalent number of volumes for each title. For example, if we had received twelve issues of a quarterly, this was counted as the equivalent of three volumes. Next, we assigned a value to each title by checking currently available subscription prices and computing a “per-volume” price for each title. This method provided a reasonable, though conservative, estimate of value. Another method, as reported by Victor Novak, is to base the value of materials received upon the values that are assessed by dealers of secondhand periodicals. Either method will result in similar figures for smaller libraries.

Over the course of our first year of exchange activities, we requested a total of 8,287 items from 548 libraries, and received 3,981 items from 414 libraries. Thus, we experienced a 75 percent success rate on positive responses from libraries and a 48 percent success rate on individual items received compared to the items that were requested. Furthermore, for a total expenditure of $1,165.03, we received materials that were valued at $12,313.00. Hence, the return on
our investment in exchange activities was an astounding 1,056 percent.

There were other advantages, as well. In the first place, we were quite successful in maintaining most of the subscriptions we had been forced to cancel, although we did experience a lag between the publication date and the date that these issues first appeared on the exchange lists. At the same time, we were able to add 200 new journal titles to our library collection, and we completed five-year runs on about 50 of these titles in the first year. This served to increase substantially our library's self-sufficiency, as evidenced by the changes that we noted in our interlibrary loan statistics. While we had experienced a 38 percent increase in interlibrary loan requests from our staff members during the year before we began our exchange program, this figure dropped to a 2 percent increase in the first year of the program, and it dropped further to a 30 percent decrease in the first half of the second year. At the same time, our library collection was becoming an important resource for materials and information for other libraries in the local area. In the year before our exchange program was implemented, we had seen a 9 percent decrease in interlibrary loans supplied to other libraries, but during the first year of our exchange activities, this figure changed to a 22 percent increase and then to a 40 percent increase in the first half of the second year.

Conclusion

We conclude that our first year's experience in the two national exchange programs was a tremendous success. During our budgetary crisis, we were able to reduce our acquisition costs by canceling many of our subscriptions and obtaining them on exchange at a fraction of their purchase price. Moreover, the exchange programs enabled us to expand our library collection, which, in turn, increased our self-sufficiency, thus enabling us to achieve our objective of supplying the information needs of the institute's research scientists. In subsequent years, when we were given enough budgetary support to resume normal operations, we implemented a plan to purchase the subscriptions that we had canceled, as well as to add the new titles that we had been picking up on exchange. Any activity that can provide a 1,056 percent return on investment and help a special librarian to get through an economic crunch, as well as to augment the library collection by building extensive back files at a minimum cost, is too important to be ignored.
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The Use of a Subscription Agent's Computer Facilities in Creating and Maintaining a Library's Subscription Profile*

DONALD J. MORTON, Library Director
University of Massachusetts Medical School
Worcester, Massachusetts

A library's subscription profile should reflect the needs of library clientele, but creating such a profile can require extensive clerical work. It was found that a subscription agent's computerized facilities could be used to facilitate a program of this type by providing initial serial listings for use in a survey, by manipulating data obtained from such a survey, and by producing listings identifying resulting serial titles and costs according to requesting disciplines. The data base thus created is updated as subscriptions are added or deleted so that the profile remains current.

THE SELECTION OF SERIALS is a major concern in many libraries. Whereas it is important to receive titles of significant value to library clientele, the high and repetitive costs of subscriptions stress the importance of receiving only materials that are clearly useful. The librarian has to satisfy both the users who may request a wide variety of journals and the administration that wants to prune out dead wood.

Many articles have been published describing various approaches toward developing relevant subscription profiles. Truelson's recent review summarizes the considerations involved in adding and canceling titles and gives references to pertinent literature dealing with making such decisions.1

*The assistance of Frank F. Clasquin, executive vice-president, F. W. Faxon Co., Inc., in making this study possible is gratefully acknowledged.
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This paper describes a procedure for developing a subscription profile tailored to the users of a given library. Emphasis is placed on the use by a small library with limited facilities of the computerized capabilities of its subscription agent to survey the needs of various disciplines, manipulate and evaluate the results of such a survey, and produce printouts designed to clarify for institutional administrators the basis for selection of titles on the library’s subscription list.

Background

The University of Massachusetts Medical School is a new institution, which first accepted students in 1970. Serial subscriptions were initiated in 1966 based on a cross section of titles being received by several other medical school libraries. Subsequent additions to the list have included some titles that were estimated to have little usage. Because selection was not based upon precise and current information, it was considered likely that the library’s subscription list of about 2,000 titles might vary significantly from the profile that would best satisfy institutional needs. A shortage of funding accentuated this concern and stressed the desirability of being able to document the importance of each subscription. Administrators were prone to note during infrequent library visits that most titles appeared to be read rarely, if at all, and to suggest that many might profitably be eliminated. Therefore, it became evident that a survey of library subscription needs would be helpful in order first to determine which titles should be received and then to use this information to solicit support for appropriate funding.

Normally, a thorough study of this type is impractical for libraries with small staffs because of the extensive clerical assistance needed to obtain, tabulate, interpret, and present the large quantities of information that are involved. In this case, however, it was possible to make such an analysis because the library’s subscription agent, F. W. Faxon, Inc. (hereafter referred to as Faxon), donated the use of its computerized data bases and services.

Methodology

In developing a serials profile reflecting school needs, it was necessary to determine which titles were considered by each discipline to be important. Thirty-seven categories were established for the academic and administrative disciplines of the medical school and its hospital, as shown with corresponding codings in table 1. The class designated as “Library” was included to denote all of the bibliographic tools and other general works that might be overlooked by specific disciplines.

First, Faxon supplied listings of the titles indexed in Cumulative Index to Nursing Literature, Hospital Literature Index, and Index Medicus. These were sent to faculty in all disciplines with the request that they identify those considered to be important for their programs.

Next, Faxon prepared a printout of the library’s subscription list
after first programming its computer to exclude all titles included in the three indexes mentioned above. This was also sent to all faculty members for their identification of important journals. Faculty in each discipline were then asked to supply the names of any important titles not included in either of the first two lists. The several lists, coded in each case by discipline, were sent to Faxon, which produced a list of those current subscriptions that had not been selected by any discipline. As insurance against the inadvertent dropping of a desirable serial, this list was then sent to all faculty with the warning that all the titles included would be dropped unless they were chosen by some discipline. Additional titles thus selected were sent to Faxon, where they were added to the data received previously. From this adjusted information, two printouts were made: (1) a master title listing, showing discipline codings and cost for each title, and (2) a title listing for each discipline giving individual and total title costs.

Results and Discussions

The survey revealed that there were 557 current subscriptions costing about $27,000 that could be canceled and 313 additional titles costing about $22,000 that should be obtained, a reduction of 244 titles and about $5,000 in subscription costs. Of particular importance, the study enabled the library to alter its subscription profile so as to
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reflect the needs of its clientele.

A total of 1,456 titles was requested—756 (51.9 percent) by two, 163 (11.2 percent) by three, 103 (7.1 percent) by four, 71 (4.9 percent) by five, 52 (3.6 percent) by six, and 37 (2.5 percent) by seven or more disciplines. The fact that more than half the titles were requested by only one discipline shows the high degree of specialization represented by medical serials.

Of possible significance to other libraries is the fact that the library was able to use its subscription agent's computerized facilities to conduct the survey effectively. By using information already stored in its data base, Faxon was able to provide subscription costs for all titles, a list of titles subscribed to by the library, and listings of titles indexed by major indexing tools. From this, Faxon provided (1) printouts of appropriate serials for use by clientele in evaluating titles, (2) rapid manipulation of clientele responses into usable configurations, and (3) title listings showing associated disciplines and costs. The information is kept current by assigning discipline designators to all orders for additional subscriptions. Obviously, for such a program to be maximally effective, it is necessary that all of a library's subscriptions be placed with only one agent. Once a library's entire subscription list has been tagged with discipline descriptors, future analyses of the serial profile can be computed quickly and easily as the need arises.

The periodical listings resulting from the study have been especially useful in demonstrating to institutional administrators the subscription needs of specific disciplines, which, collectively, approximate the library's subscription needs. In this way, they have helped simplify the librarian's task of showing that the impact of subscription restrictions falls mainly upon the disciplines, rather than upon the library, thereby increasing administrative respect and disciplinary support for library subscription requests.

In addition to producing the basic listings described above, Faxon also found it possible to combine the findings of the study with other data already in the system and to derive information on the number of titles and subsequent subscription costs for the various disciplines, yielding comparisons that had not been possible before.
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Bradford's Law and the Selection of High Quality Papers
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A comparison of the Bradfordian ranking of journals by their production of papers in a subset of the psychological literature with the same journals ranked by quality of papers as judged by their frequency of citation shows no significant correlation. Quality is more closely related to circulation and to the journal's rejection rate.

Introduction

Librarians have had a rational, objective method of journal selection since the discovery and subsequent refinement of "Bradford's Law." Bradford, after studying the scattering of articles on lubrication over various journals, found that

... if scientific journals are arranged in order of decreasing productivity of articles on a given subject, they may be divided into a nucleus of periodicals more particularly devoted to the subject and several groups or zones containing the same number of the articles as the nucleus, when the numbers of periodicals in the nucleus and succeeding zones will be as 1:n:n²:...¹

That is to say, as one moves from high-contribution journals in the literature of a subject to low-contribution journals, the number of journals necessary to produce an equal number of papers increases
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exponentially. Since then, the law has been applied innumerable times to all manner of scientific literatures, with varying degrees of success, and restated more formally in several ways.

There is some debate as to how exactly a complete subject literature conforms to the law.² This, however, seems to have little bearing on the use of the scattered nature of a subject literature to devise a strategy for the most economical journal selection that will provide maximum coverage in the subject.

The obvious procedure is to buy those journals that contribute the most papers on the subject, those that rank first in the Bradford distribution. It is not the zones of productivity, or the exponential nature of the decrease in productivity, but the simple decrease itself that leads to the selection strategy. Only relatively equivalent contributions by all journals contributing to the subject would defeat the strategy, and we know of no data that would suggest this to be the case.

Clearly individual studies of all literatures of interest to the average library seem beyond the resources available, particularly since contribution patterns are diachronic and any study can only show the current state. However, some centralized automated system could certainly supply this data on a recurring basis if the cost were widely spread. There is, however, another question that should be resolved.

Whether or not the law holds for a literature, the strategy will be successful only in terms of quantity of papers acquired. The purchase of journals providing the most papers will certainly give the most cost-effective coverage of the subject literature. It may or may not give the most cost-effective coverage of the subject itself. That is to say, it may not select the papers of highest quality. Pope has mentioned the problem,³ and Freeman has noted that a discrepancy may exist.

Because the entire method is based on quantity rather than quality of articles there will be a constant situation where a high quality periodical with low frequency of papers will not appear in the core or nucleus areas. Subjective decision will therefore be required...⁴

There is, however, some reason to suspect that a correlation does exist. Brookes⁵ describes the mechanism of the law in bibliographic terms as a success-breeds-success mechanism in which a “nucleus” of journals is formed, as a result of their past publishing in the subject, and then limited, as the subject grows, by editorial decision and space considerations. This restriction would lead the “nucleus” journals to a more selective policy and, one might well argue, to a concentration of high quality papers.

Lamb investigated this correlation in the literature of mathematics. Articles indexed and abstracted in Jahrbuch über die Fortschritte der Mathematik and Mathematical Reviews for 1934–54 were used in determining a quantity Bradford distribution. This ranking was compared to a quality Bradford distribution from bibliographies of mathematici-
cians belonging to the Institute for Advance Study. Using this method, a high correlation was found.⁶

But a dichotomous determination of quality (membership versus nonmembership in the institute) as used by Lamb may more accurately measure the quality of the author rather than the individual articles. Even eminent scientists may occasionally write mediocre papers. Cole and Cole have determined that

... good papers have a high probability of being recognized regardless of who their authors are, but lesser papers written by high-ranking scientists are more likely to be widely diffused early than are lesser papers by low-ranking authors.⁷

There is, of course, another objective method for determining the quality of a paper, which Cole and Cole have endorsed as “better by far than anything else thus far developed in the sociology of science.”⁸ This is the method of assigning quality ranks to papers in terms of the number of times they are cited in the literature. It is our purpose to test the correlation between the high-quantity journals in a Bradford distribution and journals that rank high in production of heavily cited papers.

Methodology

The bibliography chosen for this experiment was one on experimental extinction, a subject dealing with removal of a conditioned response to a stimulus, compiled by Smith and Bowles,⁹ which hereafter will be referred to as EXBIB (EXtinction BIBliography). EXBIB consists of 877 items published from 1935 through 1970, of which 839 are articles from 47 English-language psychology journals. The other thirty-eight represent doctoral dissertations, master’s theses, and papers read at meetings.

It is suspected that EXBIB is incomplete. The test for completeness set forth by Brookes¹⁰ does not apply accurately to a journal population as small as that of EXBIB, but it does suggest that a journal population in the hundreds would be more accurate. Since the concentration at the top of the EXBIB distribution is quite high, one might well expect a great deal of scatter in the missed papers, although a preliminary expansion of the bibliography by use of the bibliographies of its recent papers is not conclusive on this point.

Table I presents the figures on article distribution among journals. Whatever shortcomings may be present, the distribution certainly suggests a purchasing strategy and seems to be quite adequate for comparison with journals with the greatest contribution of high-quality papers.

In order to utilize Science Citation Index (SCI) in the analysis, the sample was reduced to references of the last eight years, resulting in a selection of more than one-third of the journals (18) and more than one-half the papers (452), as shown in table 2.
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TABLE 1

Dispersion of Experimental Extinction Literature among Journals, 1935–70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

Bradford Analysis for Experimental Extinction Literature 1963–70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determination of Quality

It was decided that the citation count method to be used in determining quality would be a variation of Garfield’s "impact factor," used by him to determine the relative importance of scientific journals. It is calculated by
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... dividing the number of times a journal has been cited in *Science Citation Index* by the number of articles it has published during some specified period of time. The journal impact factor will thus reflect an average citation rate per published article.11

This impact factor was adapted for use in determining the relative importance, or quality, of journals in EXBIB. The term “Quality weight” is here substituted for “impact factor” to avoid confusion, as impact factor deals with all citations to, and articles in, a journal. Quality weight of a journal deals only with EXBIB items and citations to them. It was calculated by dividing the number of citations to EXBIB items in a journal in *SCI* by the number of EXBIB items the journal published during some specified period of time. A ranked list of journals by quality weight will represent the relative quality of journals in terms of the EXBIB items they contain.

Garfield’s impact factor studies involved two years of items and citations to them in a quarter year of *SCI*.12 The EXBIB sample, while small in size compared to Garfield’s sample, still stretches over eight years. Because the impact of a scientific paper decays with age, its citation rate will also decay with age. If one year of *SCI* were used to count citations to all of EXBIB’s items, older items would receive fewer citations than recent items, making the comparison of journals’ quality weight impossible. A special counting method was devised to avoid this. Citations in *SCI* to EXBIB items were manually searched and counted for five consecutive years after the item’s publication, including the year of publication. The *SCI* set available covers the scientific literature consecutively from 1964, but only EXBIB items published from 1963 through 1970 (452 items) were used. *SCI* statistics show only 3.36 percent of 1963 items were cited in 1963, so it was not felt that the 1963 items were adversely affected.13

Discussion

A number of definite problems arose when performing the citation counts to the 1963-70 EXBIB items. First and foremost among these was the amount of errors and ambiguities found in *SCI* between 1964 and 1974. Some can be attributed to mere typographical errors, e.g., a 1969 item cited as 1968, a volume twenty-one cited as volume one, or an author’s name slightly misspelled. These were relatively easy to spot and identify as the correct item, although some wildly misspelled authors’ names may have been missed. Other errors, harder to spot, can probably be attributed to nonstandard citation practices. Most common of this type were the variant use of authors’ initials and journal title abbreviations. These usually resulted in the identical cited item being repeated and separated from itself, causing difficulty in spotting and counting citations. *SCI* uses a computer program to recognize and standardize journal title abbreviations, but at least during the period of the study, the program was less than completely satisfactory, as for example, *Psychological Monographs* was seen cited as *Psychol*

Several citations were so strange or confusing that the citing article had to be located in the original to ascertain what was really being cited. The strangest error found in SCI, however, was the unexplained absence of known citations. In locating citations that occurred in the 1971 volume of SCI, the EXBIB citations were always noted, though not counted, but for 9 of 282 EXBIB items published between 1967 and 1970, the EXBIB citation did not appear. The omission rate of more than 3 percent seems rather high.

Another type of problem with citations results from using SCI over a long period of time. SCI has continued to add journals to its indexing file since it began. As shown in table 3, the number of psychology journals indexed by SCI has increased dramatically over the period of this experiment, 1964–74. The entire SCI source coverage has increased accordingly, but most citations to EXBIB items will occur in the psychology journals. Concern was raised whether this increase in file size (with a corresponding increase in the raw number of citations to recent items) might affect the comparison of quality weights. Cole and Cole controlled for this in their studies by only counting citations in 1966 that appeared in journals included in the 1961 volume. They found that citations due to an increase in file size were randomly distributed, with all scientists benefiting equally, and that no control was necessary. Likewise, citations due to an increase in file size should benefit all journals’ quality weight randomly, and no control should be necessary for EXBIB.

### Table 3

**Psychology Journals Indexed in SCI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965–69</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4 indicates the results of the raw citation counts for the 1963–70 EXBIB items. The five-year counts ranged from zero to sixty. The modal count was zero, with 20.6 percent (ninety-three) of the items never being cited in five years. The mean citation count for
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**TABLE 4**

**FIVE-YEAR CITATION COUNTS FOR THE 1963–70 EXBIB ITEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Citations</th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1928</strong></td>
<td><strong>452</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All items was 4.07. The mean citation count of all cited items was 5.12. These figures yield respective average annual citation rates of .81 and 1.02. Garfield has reported that the average scientific paper is cited 1.7 times a year. Of the 452 1963–70 EXBIB items, only 12.8 percent (58) were cited an above-average number of times, which may well be indicative of psychologists' citation habits rather than overall low quality of EXBIB items.

After five years' worth of citations were counted for each paper used, the papers were sorted by journal and quality weight calculated by the method described above. A ranked list of journals by quality weight was then produced and is presented as table 5. It remained only to correlate the two lists using a rank order coefficient.

**The Results**

Table 2, the Bradford analysis of the eighteen EXBIB sources, indi-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quality Weight</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Bulletin</td>
<td>20.600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Review</td>
<td>15.400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Monographs</td>
<td>8.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology</td>
<td>6.103</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>5.800</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Experimental Psychology</td>
<td>4.274</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Verbal Learning Behavior</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Psychology</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychonomic Science</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Psychology</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Genetic Psychology</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Record</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Reports</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished Dissertation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Read at Meeting</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cates that two journals contribute more than half the 1963–70 EXBIB items. These two journals, Psychonomic Science and the Journal of Experimental Psychology, belong in the nucleus of experimental extinction literature as defined by Smith and Bowles.

Table 5 lists the sources of the 1963–70 EXBIB items with their corresponding quality weights and quantities. Note that the top four quality weight journals contributed only a few articles, whereas the two nucleus journals ranked eighth and twelfth in quality weight. For an overall correlation of quality and quantity, a rank-order correlation computation using Kendall's tau method was performed. This produced a coefficient of .1285 at the .467 significance level. Initially, this seems to indicate only a slightly better than random correlation between quality and quantity.

The rather large discrepancy between quantity and quality in several of the journals led to individual investigation of these journals in an effort to explain their performance. The "Instruction to Authors" sections, which appear regularly in the journals, were consulted to determine the type of articles each journal produces. Psychological Bulletin, the top quality weight journal, and Psychonomic Science, the top
quantity journal, seem to vary widely from the typical scientific journal's publication policies. Psychological Bulletin publishes only evaluative reviews and interpretations of research issues. It does not publish original theoretical articles. Psychonomic Science functions as a research report journal, publishing articles up to 1,200 words long. It is not intended to serve as an archival record of psychological research but rather as a quick announcement journal with a corresponding relaxation of editorial review.

Since it is to be expected that review articles receive more citations than ordinary articles and that report items receive fewer citations than ordinary articles, these two journals may be distorting the quality-quantity correlation, especially since Psychological Bulletin has few articles for its high-quality weight and Psychonomic Science has many articles for its low-quality weight. To control for this, Kendall's rank-order correlation was again calculated but without including Psychological Bulletin and Psychonomic Science. This raised the correlation to .1975 at the .296 significance level. This value, however, is only slightly higher than the original, and certainly does not indicate firm correlation.

A few other sources exist in the EXBIB sample, which it was felt should also be excluded from the correlation computation. One of these is an unpublished doctoral dissertation and another a paper read at a professional meeting. These neither have the capacity for multiple article publication nor are likely to be considered for purchase by a library. Finally, there is the single article published in Science. Science, a multidisciplinary scientific journal, should probably not be considered with journals publishing only psychology articles. Certainly it would not be considered if one were attempting to select high-productivity journals for a subject literature. Such high-quality multidisciplinary journals would be acquired as a matter of course.

Excluding these three sources, plus the two mentioned above, produced a correlation coefficient of .0790 at the .712 significance level. This is even lower than the original, unadjusted correlation, leading to the conclusion that, using the quality weight concept, there is little or no correlation between quality and quantity in a Bradford distribution of the literature of experimental extinction.

Other Possibilities

If the quantity of subject articles in a journal has little or no bearing on the quality of subject articles in that journal, what does determine the quality of subject articles? Two possible determining factors surfaced while performing the individual investigation of the journals. In addition to the information derived from the "Instructions to Authors" sections, circulation figures and percentage of articles-accepted figures were determined to the extent available. Table 6 lists both of these figures along with source quality weights. For the 12 sources with available circulation data, a Kendall correlation coefficient of
### TABLE 6

**Source Quality Weights Compared with Circulation and % of Articles Accepted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Quality Weight</th>
<th>Circulation*</th>
<th>Accepted†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Bulletin</td>
<td>20.600</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Review</td>
<td>15.400</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Monographs</td>
<td>8.667</td>
<td>ceased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>149,557</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Exp. Anal. Beh.</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Comp. Phys. Psych.</td>
<td>6.103</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer. J. Psych.</td>
<td>5.800</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Exp. Psych.</td>
<td>4.274</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Verbal Learn. Beh.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Psych.</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. J. Exp. Psych.</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychonomic Sci.</td>
<td>2.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. General Psych.</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1,693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Genetic Psych.</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1,616</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Record</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych. Reports</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpub. Dissert.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Read</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


.6155 at the .006 significance level is obtained between quality weight and circulation. Six sources had available data for percentage of articles accepted for publication. The Kendall correlation coefficient between quality weight and percentage of articles accepted for publication is -.7333 at the .039 significance level.

Quality weight thus has a strong positive correlation with a journal's total circulation and a very strong negative correlation with percentage of articles accepted for publication. One possible explanation of this situation is that a high-quality journal is recognized as such by librarians and scientists and thus builds itself a large subscription base and high quality weight. This has perhaps resulted from the editors being very selective about what they publish and choosing only the best. Conversely, a low-quality journal is also recognized as such, resulting in fewer subscriptions and a low quality weight. This has perhaps resulted from the editors not being very selective in what they publish. Another possible explanation exists, however. A journal for some reason or another has a large circulation, leading to its being inundated by papers from authors hoping to have their research seen worldwide. Because of space limitation, only a few of these papers can be published, leading to a low percentage of articles accepted. Co-
occurring with a large circulation is the easy availability of the journal to researchers, which leads to its being cited rather heavily, in turn leading to a high quality weight. A journal with a small circulation accepts a higher percent of the relatively fewer papers submitted to it and has a lower quality weight because of its relative inaccessibility. Further research needs to be done on the dynamic interrelationships between these three factors. No matter what explanation exists, it appears that quality weight, circulation, and percentage of articles accepted for publication are interrelated in some manner and that quantity of articles published is not related.

**Conclusion**

The sample used for this experiment is relatively small compared to other research with Bradford's distribution. As it contains only English psychology journals, it is necessarily incomplete, as all bibliographies are necessarily incomplete to some degree. Neither does EXBIB produce a very "neat" Bradford solution. But this should not detract from the findings. What is important is that a Bradford distribution is realized from a ranked list of quantities of subject articles contained in journals, and it is on this that journal selection using a Bradford distribution is based. A ranked list of quantity journals in EXBIB, when compared to the quality of the articles in these journals, showed little or no correlation. If these same findings are found to apply in other literatures, a serious deficiency is raised in using only a Bradford distribution as the basis of journal selection.

If, based on a rank order list of quantity, a library had purchased high-quantity EXBIB journals only, it would also have purchased relatively low-quality articles. Simultaneously, many high-quality articles, undoubtedly in high demand by library users, would be unavailable. Quality of articles must be considered as well as quantity in journal evaluation. Some type of decision-making model for journal selection will have to be developed whereby both factors have input.

Finally, a word about the correlation found between quality weight and circulation. Quality weight and impact factor may indeed represent some measure of a journal's true value. Consequently, circulation may further reflect the scientific community's recognition of this value. But circulation of a journal is also a measure of that journal's accessibility to members of the scientific community: a large circulation meaning easy accessibility and a small circulation meaning difficult accessibility. Since it is relatively easy to cite available journals and relatively difficult to cite unavailable journals, journal citation counts may actually be reflecting circulation rather than true quality. Because of the rapidly growing use of citation counts to evaluate scientific publications, research is urgently needed to resolve this question.

We can only say that if a measure based on citation counts is used to reflect quality, one can have little assurance of selecting high-quality papers using the Bradfordian distribution as a selection tool.
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CORRECTION

The name of Doris Carson was, regrettably, misspelled as Doris Carlson on pages 249 and 260 in the Summer 1978 issue of this journal.
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Introduction

In 1974 FOREST PRESS, publisher of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), contracted with the Library Research Center of the University of Illinois to conduct a survey of the use of DDC in libraries of the United States and Canada. Under the direction of an advisory committee, Lucille M. Wert, Mary Ellen Michael, and Janet Bloom of the center joined the principal investigator, John P. Comaromi, chairman, Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, in carrying out the survey. The findings reported here are based on responses to two questionnaires and interviews conducted by the principal investigator in 9 academic and 22 public libraries with holdings of more than 500,000 volumes. The first, detailed questionnaire (eighteen pages in the English version and twenty pages in the French) was designed, pretested, and sent to 1,876 libraries, constituting a 10 percent sample of those listed in the 1974–75 edition of the American Library Directory; a gratifying response rate of 60 percent (1,152 libraries) was achieved. This questionnaire was also sent to 121 processing centers (all that could be identified for libraries other than school li-
braries), with a response rate of 33 percent, and to 247 libraries identified in the 1974–75 edition of the *American Library Directory* as holding 500,000 volumes or more. Two groups of school libraries and processing centers for school systems were identified from the records of Forest Press. The first group, consisting of 424 libraries and centers, representing a 10 percent sample of those that had purchased the eighteenth edition, received the detailed questionnaire. Their responses are included in the report of the general survey, which represents the main source for the findings reported here. All the respondents to this survey are referred to here as “general DDC users.” A second group of 105 libraries and centers, representing a 25 percent sample of those that had purchased the tenth abridged edition within one year of its publication, received a slightly modified version of the questionnaire. Their responses were digested for a special report, of which a few conclusions are reported here. Respondents to the special survey are usually referred to as “school users of the abridged edition.”

**DDC Use**

The DDC is used in 85.4 percent of all libraries in the United States and Canada. The Library of Congress Classification (LCC) is used in the remaining 14.6 percent. Virtually all university libraries and half of all college and junior college libraries use LCC. Several public libraries have switched, or have begun to switch, to LCC. DDC is used in almost all school and public libraries and in half of all college and junior college libraries. The stream of refugees in the flight from Dewey is now a trickle. When asked what might induce them to switch to LCC, 70 percent of the general DDC users and 87 percent of the school users responded that they would not consider doing so for any reason. (The LCC percentage above is actually somewhat less as school libraries using the abridged DDC were not taken into account.)

Edition eighteen is the primary edition used in at least 76 percent of all DDC libraries—excluding school libraries—and in at least 17 percent of all school libraries. The heaviest use of full editions other than the eighteenth (or of abridged editions other than the tenth) occurs in public libraries, of which one-third use other than current editions. Among general DDC users, 40 percent consider five years to be the optimum period between editions, 16 percent consider ten years to be ideal, 10 percent opt for seven years, and 34 percent have other views or no opinion. This is the first instance of a question on which there was a disquietingly high number of no responses, no opinions, or “don’t know” answers. We had assumed that librarians would have opinions or answers concerning most of the questions in the survey.

**Sources of DDC Numbers**

The major source of DDC numbers in the United States is, of course, the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress,
which provides the class numbers found in CIP (Cataloging in Publication) books, on LC cards, and on MARC tapes. For school libraries, CIP and commercial services still provide most of the cataloging information used.

The primary services to which general DDC users turn to secure a DDC number are Booklist (used to some extent by 47 percent of the respondents); Wilson services, Book Publishing Record, and LC cards or proofsheets (31 percent); and the National Union Catalog (23 percent). (Inadvertently, CIP was not included in the checklist of services in the first questionnaire.) School librarians using the abridged edition reported their primary services as CIP (65 percent), Wilson services (57 percent), and Booklist (42 percent).

Views on Classification

No instance of any use of DDC other than for shelf arrangement was found. Among the users surveyed, 5 percent use close classification, 52 percent use broad classification, and 43 percent indicate that the situation dictates the preference. It is interesting to note that another 5 percent indicate a preference for close classification. These responses seem to indicate a preference for short numbers. By a margin of 64 to 32 percent the respondents favor integrity of numbers over keeping pace with knowledge. This preference is reflected by the amount of reclassification that is accomplished in libraries as new editions appear and as new numbers are developed and assigned between editions. Only 12 percent (139) of all respondents answered the question regarding the degree of reclassification. Of these, only 12 percent (17) carried out a substantial amount of reclassification. It appears that reclassification is not widely practiced. Thus, major changes in the classification result in separating like materials in most libraries of the United States and Canada. One-third of the respondents interviewed indicate that their work is less efficient as a result and that patrons are badly served by this separation.

Assistance to Classifiers

Half of all DDC users think that more notes, and more detail in instructional notes, would be of great help. Moreover, there is a generally held belief that more assistance than the introduction gives is needed in the application of DDC, especially in those libraries where no professional is employed or where the library training of the person involved is deficient. (The survey of the teaching of classification in American and Canadian library schools, a part of the overall survey, and the opinions expressed upon library education in the questionnaires and to me personally reveal that whether by intent or by accident many library school graduates are not prepared for positions in which a working knowledge of DDC is requisite.)

Fifty-two percent of all users wish to have alternative locations retained; 42 percent had no opinion in the matter. Forty-four percent
of all users object to the introduction of notational devices such as letters or signs. Though 70 percent of the respondents support continuing revision, 64 percent do not want the meanings of numbers to change.

Though an explanation of how DDC numbers are segmented is desired by some of the respondents, a third of general DDC users and slightly more than half of all school librarians using the abridged edition never or rarely use the information provided by segmentation. A large number of all DDC libraries have set arbitrary limits on the length of the number beyond the decimal point: 43 percent of general users limit the number arbitrarily, and of these, 75 percent limit it to three digits or less; 57 percent of school users of the abridged edition limit the number, and of these, 99 percent limit it to three digits or less. Many librarians are aware of the consequent loss in the efficiency of their performance and of the loss to the patron of the awareness of the existence of other works upon a subject than those that happen to be where the patron lights. But the limits have, more often than not, been dictated by the administration of their libraries, by the width of labels, or by the limits of a computer's capability.

Standard Subdivisions

Policies relating to the use of standard subdivisions represent a major influence on length of numbers. For instance, the use of -09 usually requires the use of at least two additional digits. Consequently, at least four digits beyond those needed for the subject are needed to express those subjects treated by place. In most instances, this creates a number longer than is allowed by the arbitrary limit discussed above. More often than not it creates a number longer than many librarians will accept even when no arbitrary limit is dictated. Of course, -09 is not the only problem in table 1: any standard subdivision attached to any but the shortest of numbers creates problems for most librarians.

Index

The index to the eighteenth edition is modeled upon that of the first index for the seventeenth edition. Thus it is occasionally an index to itself (that is, it refers to entries in the index) and does not possess the ease of use achieved by the second index to the seventeenth edition, which was produced upon the lines of the fourteenth and sixteenth editions. On the other hand, the new index leads to more entries in the schedules and tables. There are a few problems, however; for example, it takes longer to use when a see reference occurs. The survey attempted to determine classifiers' opinions of the new index, no easy matter as it turned out. According to questionnaire responses, no less than 80 percent of all DDC users find the index satisfactory to use "all," "most," or "some" of the time. Opinion in the forty-one processing centers and larger libraries, however, is not so sanguine. Eigh-
teen of these gave negative responses; twenty-three gave positive ones. However, nine of the twenty-three were on editions other than the eighteenth or gave positive responses because they considered an index a good thing to have. Classifiers who have used the LCC usually were happy that the DDC has a unified index.

**Divisions Needing Revision**

A major objective of the survey was to discover which divisions are most in need of revision and, further, which parts of each division were causing difficulty. It should be noted here that a respondent's indication of dissatisfaction with a given division reflects an unknown degree of dissatisfaction, e.g., perhaps only with 001, 301.451, or 320.9 when 000, 300, and 320, respectively, were indicated. In any event, we have assumed dissatisfaction with more than one number in a division. It should be noted that 37 percent of all users indicated no division as in need of revision, with many respondents indicating that they did not have time to respond to this point.

Table 1 presents figures on classes needing revision as seen by general users and school users. It is clear that the 300s and 600s are most in need of revision.

In table 2 are listed in descending order, according to frequency of indication, the divisions seen to be in need of revision. Attached to each division number is an index number that gives the rate of indication on a 100-point scale (100 being the number of indications for 300).

School users of the abridged edition responded to the same question with a list of divisions differing somewhat in inclusion, order, and degree. Divisions indicated by this group are given in table 3 with an index number for the rate of indication. The interests of the users of school libraries are, as one would expect, somewhat different from those of users of public and other academic libraries, age probably being the primary variable giving rise to the difference. Nevertheless, the similarity in opinion between school librarians using the abridged and everyone else using the unabridged edition is remarkable.

**Biography**

Biography is arranged in a number of ways. The range 920.1–928.9 is used for collected biography by 19 percent of all users and for individual biography by 7.7 percent of all users. The letter B or 92 is used for individual biography in 60 percent of all libraries; 920 is used for collected biography by 62 percent. The standard subdivision 092 is used by 14 percent of general DDC users. Biographies are classified with the subject with which the biographee was associated in 12 percent of the libraries of general DDC users, with no indication being given that the works are biographies. Whatever the practice, 55 percent of all users think that classing a biography with the appropriate subject should be the preferred method.
### TABLE 1
**Classes Requiring Revision: Percent of Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>General Users</th>
<th>School Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
**Divisions Indicated by General DDC Users as Being in Need of Revision, with Index Number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Index Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3
**Divisions Indicated by School Users of the Abridged Edition as Being in Need of Revision, with Index Number for Each**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Index Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>620</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miscellaneous Findings

Librarians dealing with the public directly have a warmer regard for DDC than do those in technical services, and those who had gone from reference work in a DDC library to the same sort of position in an LCC library and then returned to a DDC library were unanimously happy to be back working with a classification that was "personal," could be used for shelf searching, and assisted the librarian in fulfilling obligations to the patron. On the other hand, respondents (in either DDC or LCC libraries) who had worked with both DDC and LCC invariably preferred LCC when classing works falling in the following classes: art, economics, education, history, literature, mathematics, music, political science, psychology, sociology, and technology. Where the classification to be used is determined by technical services personnel and where those making the decision have worked with both DDC and LCC, it is likely that LCC will be most often chosen.

The survey found little evidence that DDC libraries intend to convert or switch to LCC. It did find a large reservoir of good will toward DDC. Librarians generally wish to see it continued and improved.

This summary has treated very few of the many aspects of DDC examined in the survey. Readers who wish to pursue further the aspects discussed here and to study those not discussed may secure a copy of the survey from Forest Press, 85 Watervliet Ave., Albany, NY 12206: A Survey of the Use of the Dewey Decimal Classification in the United States and Canada.
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The problem of geographic names in subject cataloging practice has received scant attention in American library literature. Three articles that have appeared in the last decade have examined the problem of maintaining consistent and up-to-date names of African and Asian countries. Other than these, little significant discussion is available.

One assumption that may be made about the dearth of literature on geographic names in subject practice is that most libraries have developed procedures to establish such names as a matter of course, so that no bibliographical problem exists as far as they are concerned. If such procedures (e.g., the maintenance of a subject authority file) are indeed a matter of course, the end result has nevertheless involved research as detailed as that employed in the establishment of an author authority file, which depends primarily on the National Union Catalog and the Library of Congress Name Headings with References. Unlike other headings, the form of entry for a country as an author may differ from that of the country as a subject. It is this difference, and how correct form headings are determined and the way in which these distinctions are conveyed to the users of the library's subject catalog, that the literature should address, because the problem has been left to local resolution in contrast to long-established practice for determining author entries.

The principle for determining the name of a country or geographic
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area when a change of name is involved is stated succinctly by the Library of Congress:

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 the works being cataloged. All subject entries under the old name are changed to the new name . . . .

However, in establishing corporate author entries, the problem of the currency of the name is not a concern, since the name of the body at the time of publication of the work is the assigned name. Bibliographic searching for corporate authors can be limited to establishing the form of entry, although the responsibility remains for providing see references from unused or popular names and see also references to supplement Library of Congress information cards.

In subject cataloging, bibliographic searching for author entries will help orient the cataloger who may lack familiarity with the recent history or the geography of an area, e.g., Africa or Asia, but the established heading for a country as an author may differ from that of the country as a subject, as stated above. No single bibliographic tool will readily indicate the relations between former and current geographic names or the relations among territories divided or merged into new national entities. Nor will standard tools of Library of Congress author usage be conclusive in subject practice. While Library of Congress information cards include subject entry information, the cards are not serviceable to libraries with a divided catalog nor to libraries using the National Union Catalog and LC Subject Catalog as their primary sources for verification of subject entries. Only the author portion of LC information cards appears in the NUC. The various gazetteers of the United States Board of Geographic Names will aid in the cataloging of specialized materials, but in many cases the cataloger must undertake patient examination of the Subject Catalog of the Library of Congress.

The following categorization of changes of geographic names is presented as a summary of the types of problems that may be encountered, with indication of the kind and number of history cards and cross-references that may be required. Examples are limited to Africa, but may be considered as typical of other areas.

1. In the simplest change of geographic name, a one-to-one change, the new heading includes material on any historical period and conforms precisely to the Library of Congress principle quoted above. Thus, for example, the heading Benin includes all works about the former Dahomey, occasioned by the adoption of a new name by the west African country in 1975. No territorial change was involved. Similarly, the British protectorate of Bechuanaland became the independent nation of Botswana in 1966 without territorial revision, and the colony of Basutoland became Lesotho in the same year. In no case is more than a see reference from former to present name required,
although an information card may be desired.

Subject information card:

Lesotho

Here are entered works on the independent nation of Lesotho, which succeeded the British colony of Basutoland in 1966.

Works about governmental agencies or official bodies of a former government will remain under the original heading, as in author entry practice, suggesting the need for an information card in the subject catalog to alert users of this distinction.

Subject information card for official name:

Gold Coast (Colony)

Here are entered works about specific government agencies. General works about the Gold Coast are entered under the heading Ghana.

The subject cataloger should scrutinize all apparent one-to-one name changes to ensure adequate understanding of what the change involves. Uncritical revision may result in inaccuracies. In the case of South Africa, for example, a name that the Library of Congress recently revised from the heading Africa, South on the basis of usage rather than change of name of the country, many works under the former heading must in fact be assigned the heading Africa, Southern, because they describe a region rather than the Republic of South Africa.

Other one-to-one changes of country name may suggest more detailed information cards. Clearly the information provided by the Library of Congress author information cards is sufficient as the basis for a subject information card, but adaptation to the subject catalog is necessary in order to indicate the single correct heading for general works (whereas each entry of the author information card is used) and the coverage of the single correct heading. The degree of detail adapted is, of course, a local decision.

Sample Library of Congress author information card:

Zaire.

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 Léopoldville. On October 27, 1971, its name was changed to Zaire with capital at Kinshasa (formerly Léopoldville).

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.
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Adaptation for subject catalog:

Zaire.

Here are entered works on the independent nation of Zaire (established 1971), the Democratic Republic of the Congo (1960–1971), the Belgian Congo (1908–1960), the Congo Free State (1885–1908), and the International Association of the Congo.

The information may be extended to include related headings, such as Congo, Congo (Kingdom), and Congo (Brazzaville). See references are required from former names listed in the information card to the heading Zaire.

2. One-to-two changes involve the partition of a single territorial entity into two distinct areas or states. This change is illustrated by the division of the region of Ruanda-Urundi, historically part of German East Africa and later under Belgian mandate, into two nations upon independence in 1962—Rwanda and Burundi. In the subject catalog information cards should relate the former to the present entities.

Subject information cards:

Ruanda-Urundi.

Here are entered works on Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate and as part of German East Africa, to independence in 1962. Works on the independent nations after 1962 are entered under Burundi and Rwanda.

Burundi.

Here are entered works on the independent nation of Burundi. Works on Burundi before independence in 1962 are entered under Ruanda-Urundi.

Rwanda.

Here are entered works on the independent nation of Rwanda. Works on Rwanda before independence in 1962 are entered under Ruanda-Urundi.

Because the territorial identity of the two nations does not correspond to that of the single entity Ruanda-Urundi, see also cross-references are employed; all headings are retained. Thus the user of the subject catalog seeking materials on any one name is provided information and the optional directive about the territory before and after nationhood.

3. The converse of the name change above is the two-to-one change illustrated by Tanzania, formed by the merging of Tanganyika and Zanzibar in 1964—two territorial entities becoming one.

The statements on the information cards parallel the provisions of the one-to-two statements.
Subject information card:

Tanzania.

Here are entered works on the independent nation of Tanzania, formed of the merging of Tanganyika and Zanzibar in 1964.

See also cross-reference:

Tanzania

see also

Tanganyika

Zanzibar

Information cards for the headings Tanganyika and Zanzibar will link the former entities to the current heading. However, works on Tanganyika or Zanzibar as historical and geographic entities will still be assigned these headings respectively, as indicated by the see also cross-reference.

4. Perhaps the most complex of the country name changes involves three territorial entities derived from one. In the case of the federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, the relationships are further complicated by conflict in the use of an identical geographic and national name.

The territory of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was historically distinguished as Rhodesia (Northern and Southern) and Nyasaland up to federation under the combined name in 1953. Upon independence in 1964, Nyasaland became Malawi and Northern Rhodesia became Zambia. However, the name of Southern Rhodesia was retained by the Library of Congress (in inverted form) as the heading for the present state of Rhodesia, capital at Salisbury, probably because the conventional national name would conflict with the equally established geographic and historical name of Rhodesia. Rhodesia is still used by the Library of Congress for works about the region of Northern and Southern Rhodesia collectively and the colonial territory before 1953, while Nyasaland has been retained by the LC with similar meaning.

The complexity of these relationships can be readily elucidated by an information card.

Subject information card:

Rhodesia and Nyasaland.

Here are entered works on the British federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (1953–1964). Works on Nyasaland after independence in 1964 are entered under Malawi. Works on Rhodesia after independence in 1964 are entered under Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia) and Rhodesia, Southern (capital at Salisbury).

Cross-reference:

Rhodesia and Nyasaland

see also

Malawi

Zambia

Rhodesia, Southern
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Such an information card and cross-reference briefly establishes the relation of the federation to the subsequent nation-states, though without reference to the overlapping geographic meanings. The information card for the heading *Rhodesia* must indicate its status as a separate colony, its status as a region of the federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (under which works covering the period 1953–64 are retrieved), and its relation to the current heading, under which materials on the contemporary country are to be found. Similar facts must be included in an information card about Nyasaland. Again, the details offered to the subject catalog user must be a local decision, but distinctions between political entities and geographic or historical entities should be provided.

In Africa, geographic name changes of similar complexity occur in the cases of Cameroon and Somalia and Somaliland. An important point for subject catalogers to consider in complex cases is that the Library of Congress often employs conventional headings as geographic and historical headings in order to distinguish the names of nations from their regional boundaries before the colonial or the modern period. Sometimes the searcher will be alerted to this practice by use of a qualifier (e.g., *Congo (Kingdom)* or *Guinea (Region)*), or retention of a colonial name with a specific geographic meaning (e.g., *Somaliland* for the region and *Somalia* for the nation), or slight revision of a colonial name in order to accommodate modern circumstances (e.g., the heading *Africa, French-speaking West*, which revises the heading *French West Africa*). But former names may reappear in works about governmental agencies of the former political entity, so that revision of information cards may require ongoing procedures as a formal aspect of subject catalog maintenance.

Above all, the subject cataloger should always refer to the needs of the library's users in determining the degree of detail and the scope of information cards and cross-references. There is no substitute for a subject catalog that reveals the relationships between headings in a logical and self-sufficient way.
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The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification for 1978 is awarded to Derek Austin in recognition of his significant contribution to the establishment of a new direction in subject analysis through the development of the PReServed Context Index System, his persistence in refining and perfecting its techniques, and his skill in defining, interpreting, and sharing its concepts.

The career of Derek William Austin has been marked by significant contributions to both classification and indexing. As a longtime member of the Classification Research Group, he has contributed to the discussions and research that have made this group a visible college in fact if not in name. The time he spent on the group's research project aimed at discovering principles for a new general classification system.
proved to be invaluable. While the new general classification has yet to be developed, Austin’s work led directly to a viable new indexing system: PRECIS—Preserved Context Index System.

The research, development, and implementation of PRECIS as the subject index to the British National Bibliography took four years. Innovations made during this process have caught the attention of librarians all over the world. In fact, it is now hard to find Derek Austin at his desk, so great is the demand for instruction on how to index with PRECIS.

Derek Austin was born in England on August 11, 1921. He was educated at the Enfield Grammar School and London University. After six years in the army, stationed in India, Burma, China, and Germany, Austin spent a year in the Enfield Public Library. Deciding upon a library career, he attended the Loughborough School of Librarianship from 1947 to 1949. During this period, he passed the Library Association Registration Examination (LA) and the association’s Final Examination (with Honours). In the year after leaving Loughborough, he completed a thesis and was elected Fellow of the Library Association (FLA). In 1974, he registered as an external student in the Sheffield University School of Library Science, for a master of arts degree by thesis, with the possible option of continuing to the doctorate.

After Loughborough, he was a regional librarian (North Herts) in the Hertfordshire County Library. From 1951 through 1953, he was librarian-in-charge, Headquarters Reference & Students’ Section, in this library. Then in 1954 he moved to the Tottenham Public Libraries as librarian-in-charge of the Science & Technology Division, where he remained until 1962. From here, in 1963, he went to the British National Bibliography as subject editor. After the two years (1967–69) spent on the Classification Research Group’s project, he returned to the BNB as principal investigator of the PRECIS Research Project (BNB/MARC) under the auspices of the Office of Scientific and Technical Information (OSTI). When BNB was merged with other institutions into the new British Library, Austin, in 1974, became head of the Subject Systems Office.

He has written a number of articles and one book: PRECIS: A Manual of Concept Analysis and Subject Indexing (London, Council of the British National Bibliography, Ltd., 1974). Most of his present publication activity relates to PRECIS. He has also attended many national and international meetings. Each year he conducts a goodly number of two-week training courses on PRECIS all over the world.

Austin has served on various standardization committees, both British and international, notably the International Standards Organization Committee on Mono- and Multi-lingual Thesauri and Indexing Practices. Currently he heads a research project dealing with extension of PRECIS to non-English languages. The results are proving helpful in English as well.
In 1976, he was awarded the Ranganathan Award for his research in classification and indexing.

The career of Derek Austin combines knowledge of science and technology, logic and philosophy as requisite in classification and indexing, as well as linguistics and history. He has a delightful sense of humor, a good tenor voice, wide intellectual interests, a fondness for beagles, and infinite faith that British drivers will stop for pedestrians in zebra-striped crosswalks. His globetrotting, which began by courtesy of the British army, has given him a rare understanding of international communication aspirations and problems. He is fortunate in having the support of a charming wife, Joan, also a librarian.

The award of the Margaret Mann Citation is in recognition of an innovator in the subject analysis field. Once one has become familiar with the concepts and options in PRECIS, it is virtually impossible to look upon subject indexing in the same way as before. Austin's work has been fundamental to a new understanding of the indexing process.

**NOMINATIONS FOR 1979 MARGARET MANN CITATION**

Nominations for the 1979 Margaret Mann Citation are now being accepted. They should be submitted by December 15, 1978, to Neal L. Edgar, Kent State University Library, Kent, OH 44242.

The Margaret Mann Citation is awarded annually for outstanding achievement in cataloging or classification through:

- publication of significant professional literature,
- contributions to activities of professional cataloging organizations,
- technical improvements and/or introduction of new techniques of recognized importance,
- distinguished teaching in the area of cataloging and classification.

Names of persons previously nominated but not chosen may be resubmitted. Letters of nomination should include a résumé of the nominee's achievements.

The citation has been awarded annually since 1951 by the Cataloging and Classification Section, Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, and its predecessors, in honor of Margaret Mann.

Margaret Mann served as head of the catalog department of the Carnegie Library in Pittsburgh, the Engineering Societies Library in New York, and the University of Illinois Library. From 1926 to 1938 she served in the University of Michigan School of Library Science. Her *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification of Books* is a classic in the field.
Esther J. Piercy Award, 1978:

S. Michael Malinconico

The Esther J. Piercy Award for 1978 is presented to S. Michael Malinconico in recognition of his work as an advocate of the application of computer technology as a tool for facilitating the cataloging process, preserving cataloging principles, and enriching bibliographic access and control. He has steadfastly demonstrated through his development of the automated cataloging system at the New York Public Library the validity and viability of traditional cataloging principles in an automated environment. The high quality and depth of his thinking can be seen in his numerous carefully researched and clearly presented articles in both popular and technical journals. He is a dedicated and energetic leader in professional associations at the local, national, and international level. He is committed to quality, efficiency, and the best possible delivery of library services to the user. In short, his professional accomplishments meet the high standards of which Esther J. Piercy would have been proud.

S. Michael Malinconico

Maurice J. Freedman
Associate Professor
School of Library Service
Columbia University
New York, New York

S. Michael Malinconico's exemplary contributions to cataloging theory and the automation of cataloging well bespeak the career pro-
professional and are all the more noteworthy for his relatively short tenure in librarianship.

A native of Brooklyn, New York, Malinconico holds a bachelor's degree from Brooklyn College, awarded in June 1962. While attending Columbia University he was awarded the master's degree in physics and completed all of the requirements for the doctorate in that field save the dissertation. Utilizing this strong scientific background, he worked for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) as a systems analyst from 1967 through July 1969. In that capacity, he participated in the Apollo project, which ultimately culminated in the United States landing on the moon.

In August 1969 he was hired by the New York Public Library's Systems Analysis and Data Processing Office as a systems analyst and was assigned to the automated book catalog project. Since then he has held progressively more responsible positions, serving successively as head of systems analysis, assistant chief of the Systems Analysis and Data Processing Office, and, since June 1978, coordinator, Technical Services Office, Branch Libraries. As assistant chief of Systems Analysis and Data Processing, he was directly responsible for the automation of all bibliographic systems for the New York Public Library, including the Branch Libraries and the Research Libraries.

During his service with NYPL, he has been either involved with or responsible for several major noteworthy automation projects that have had significant impact, not just on the bibliographic delivery systems at that institution, but on the national scene. On the automated book catalog projects, he was responsible for the design, development, and implementation of the New York Public Library book catalog system and played a major role in the design of the authority control system that provides perhaps the only automated catalog control system fully operating in American libraries today.

Two other major achievements must also be reported. He was directly responsible for the developments that culminated in the inclusion of nonroman scripts in the automated book catalog system, the first electronically composed Hebrew vernacular characters in an American library catalog product. Subsequently he converted source cataloging data expressed in the Cyrillic alphabet into machine-readable form as well and was responsible for its being published in the New York Public Library's automated book catalog.

Most recently he was responsible for the planning and development of the Library of Congress–Research Libraries Group computer-to-computer link, the first real-time computer-to-computer linkage of bibliographic systems in this country.

Malinconico's career is also notable for a number of major writings on bibliographic control, the range of which is indicated by the titles of papers presented at three major institutes: "The Economics of Computer Outout Media" (University of Illinois Clinic on Library Data Processing Applications, 1976), "Technology and Standards for
Bibliographic Control” (University of Chicago Graduate Library School conference, 1976), and “The Library Catalog in a Computerized Environment” (ISAD conference on The Catalog: Its Nature and Prospects, 1975), the latter selected for The Best of Library Literature 1976. In these papers, particularly the latter, he has built upon the great tradition of Cutter and Lubeetzky, emphasizing the importance of the catalog in organizing the library’s collections and advocating the application of computer technology as a tool for facilitating the cataloging process, preserving cataloging principles, and enriching bibliographic access and control.

Within the American Library Association, he has been active at a number of levels. Having served as RTSD representative to the interdivisional Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI), he is now chairperson of the committee. His activities in the Library Information and Technology Association (formerly ISAD) have centered on institutes: planning, chairing, giving papers. On the international front, he serves as the ALA representative and voting delegate to the International Federation of Library Associations’ Mechanization Section. Most recently, he was elected to the Board of Directors of RTSD and served as a member of the ALA president’s committee, which drafted a “National Information Policy” statement.

In addition to his outstanding accomplishments in the areas of systems development, research and publication, and professional societies, he is a serious enthusiast of the music of Hank Williams, Robert Zimmerman (aka Bob Dylan), and W. A. Mozart. Given proper inducement, Malinconico will quote from the lyrics of the former two, as well as the poetry of T. S. Eliot and Dylan Thomas. His personal heroes are Seymour Lubetzky and Roy Campanella.

Truly a man of many parts, S. Michael Malinconico’s accomplishments in the automation of bibliographical procedures are awesome, particularly for one who holds no library degree.

NOMINATIONS FOR 1979 ESTHER J. PIERCY AWARD

Nominations for the 1979 Esther J. Piercy Award are now being accepted. They should be submitted by December 15, 1978, to Joseph Z. Nitecki, executive director of libraries and learning resources, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, WI 54901.

Since 1969, ALA’s Resources and Technical Services Division has given the Piercy Award. Its purpose is to recognize contributions to librarianship in the field of technical services by a younger librarian—one who has no more than ten years of professional experience and who has shown outstanding promise for continuing contributions and leadership.

The award may be granted for:

- leadership in professional associations at local, state, regional, or national levels;
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• contributions to the development, application, or utilization of new or improved methods, techniques, and routines;
• a significant contribution to professional literature;
• conduct of studies or research in the field of technical services.

Names of persons previously submitted but not chosen may be resubmitted. Letters of nomination should include a résumé of the nominee's achievements.

Esther J. Piercy was active in ALA and several of its divisions. The author of Commonsense Cataloging and numerous articles in the field of librarianship, Piercy was also, from 1950 until her death, editor of RTSD's journal, Journal of Cataloging and Classification, and its successor, Library Resources & Technical Services.

NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES/RESOURCES SECTION SCHOLARSHIP AWARD

The winner of the 1977 National Library Services/Resources Section Scholarship Award is J. Michael Bruer, assistant director of CLASS (California Library Authority for Systems and Services), for his article "Resources in 1976" (Library Resources & Technical Services 21:232-48 Summer 1977).

This award, established in 1976, is given annually to honor the author(s) of an article or book that reflects creative or innovative research in the field of acquisitions, collection development, and related areas of resources development in libraries during the past year.

The winner of the award selects a library school in the United States or Canada as the recipient of a $1,000 scholarship donated by National Library Services, Inc., of Norwalk, Connecticut, to be presented to a student concentrating in acquisitions or collection development. Bruer has chosen the George Peabody College for Teachers School of Library Science to administer the scholarship.

NOMINATIONS FOR THE 1979 AWARD

Nominations for the 1979 award, identifying the most significant 1978 article or book, should be submitted by December 15, 1978, to Robert C. Sullivan, Order Division, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540, chair of the Resources Section scholarship jury charged with identifying the most significant 1978 publication.
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### RTSD 1979 MIDWINTER MEETINGS

**Washington, D.C.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Day/Date</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Board of Directors</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Luncheon</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRTS Editorial Board</td>
<td>Thurs., Jan. 11</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAP Joint Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>12:00-2:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Pres. Gosling &amp; Section</td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chairs Meeting</td>
<td>Sun., Jan. 7</td>
<td>8:00-10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACR 2 Introductory Program Committee</td>
<td>*Sun., Jan. 7</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Acquisitions Preconference Program Planning Committee</td>
<td>Sat., Jan. 6</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bylaws Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Processing Services Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>4:30–6:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Program Committee (Dallas)</td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>2:00–4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>9:30–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Cataloging Consultation Committee</td>
<td>Sat., Jan. 6</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>8:00–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piercy Award Jury</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00–4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Committee</td>
<td>*Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>4:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Library Materials Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>8:00–10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Library Materials Sub-committee on Library Binders Relations</td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>4:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation and Support Committee (COPES)</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>8:00–10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD/LITA/RASD Representation in Machine-readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.–12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Services Cost Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging Maintenance Discussion Group (Organizational Meeting)</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-order and Pre-cataloging Bibliographic Searching Discussion Group</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>9:30–11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Discussion Group</td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>2:00–4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Professional in Academic Research Technical Services Department Discussion Group</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>4:30–5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Closed meeting.*
Technical Service Administrators of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group
Mon., Jan. 8  2:00-4:00 p.m.

Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group
Sun., Jan. 7  9:00 a.m.-4:00 p.m.

Technical Service Directors of Smaller Research Libraries Discussion Group
Mon., Jan. 8  9:30-11:00 a.m.

CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION SECTION (CCS)

CCS Executive Committee
Sun., Jan. 7  9:30-11:00 a.m.
Tues., Jan. 9  8:00-10:00 p.m.
Wed., Jan. 10  2:00-5:30 p.m.

CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
Mon., Jan. 8  9:30-11:00 a.m.
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30-11:00 a.m.

CCS Conference Program Committee Dallas
Wed., Jan. 10  9:30-11:00 a.m.

CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee
Wed., Jan. 10  11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Thurs., Jan. 11  11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

CCS Margaret Mann Citation Committee
*Sat., Jan. 6  8:00 a.m.-12:00 noon

CCS Policy and Research Committee
Sun., Jan. 7  2:00-4:00 p.m.
Wed., Jan. 10  9:30-11:00 a.m.

CCS Subject Analysis Committee
Mon., Jan. 8  9:30-11:00 a.m.
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30-11:00 a.m.

CCS SAC Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis
Mon., Jan. 8  2:00-4:00 p.m.

CCS Cataloging Norms Discussion Group
Mon., Jan. 8  2:00-4:00 p.m.

REPRODUCTION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS SECTION (RLMS)

RLMS Executive Committee
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30-11:00 a.m.
Wed., Jan. 10  2:00-4:00 p.m.

RLMS Conference Program Committee (Dallas)
Tues., Jan. 9  11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

RLMS Policy and Research Committee
Mon., Jan. 8  9:30-11:00 a.m.

RLMS Publication Committee
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30-11:00 a.m.

RLMS Standards Committee
Mon., Jan. 8  4:30-5:30 p.m.
Tues., Jan. 9  4:30-5:30 p.m.

RLMS Telefacsimile Committee
Wed., Jan. 10  9:30-11:00 a.m.

RLMS Standards Committee/RS Micropublishing Committee Joint Meeting
Mon., Jan. 8  2:00-4:00 p.m.

RLMS Discussion Group
Tues., Jan. 9  2:00-4:00 p.m.

RESOURCES SECTION (RS)

RS Executive Committee
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30 a.m.-12:30 noon
Wed., Jan. 10  2:00-4:00 p.m.

RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee
Sun., Jan. 7  11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

RS Collection Development Committee
Mon., Jan. 8  9:30-11:00 a.m.
Tues., Jan. 9  9:30-11:00 a.m.

RS Conference Program Committee (Dallas)
Mon., Jan. 8  4:30-5:30 p.m.

RS Micropublishing Committee
Sun., Jan. 7  2:00-4:00 p.m.

RS Micropublishing Committee/RLMS Standards Committee Joint Meeting
Mon., Jan. 8  2:00-4:00 p.m.

*Closed meeting.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RS Micropublishing Committee, Subcommittee on Bibliographic Control of Microforms</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>8:00-9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Micropublishing Committee, Subcommittee on Monitoring of Microform Advertising</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Policy and Research Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS National Library Service/Resources Section Scholarship Award Jury</td>
<td>*Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>7:00-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Sat., Jan. 6</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS Booksellers Discussion Group (Proposed)</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SERIALS SECTION (SS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee/Group</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS Executive Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>8:00-10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Committee to Study Serials Cataloging</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Committee to Study Serials Records</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Conference Program Committee (Dallas)</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Duplicates Exchange Union Committee</td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wed., Jan. 10</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tues., Jan. 9</td>
<td>8:00-9:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Policy and Research Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>4:30-5:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Regional Serials Workshop Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Feasibility of Creating Dynamic Lists of Core Serials Study Committee</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Large Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>2:00-4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td>Mon., Jan. 8</td>
<td>9:30-11:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Closed meeting.*
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General Procedures Used in Compiling the Index

(1) The following types of entries are included:
   a. authors—of articles and of letters
   b. subjects of articles; subject entries for individuals are provided sparingly and
      are identified by “(about)”
   c. titles of articles

(2) Corporate names have been indexed under the common form of the name as it
 normally appears in print (not in inverted form). Acronyms and initialisms are
 recorded as such, and they are filed as words, whether they are so pronounced
 or not.

Paging of the Volume
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BALLOTS, 41, 240–41
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Bliss Bibliographic Classification, 250–51
Blume, Edward J., 83–86
Boyce, Bert R., 390–401
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High Quality Papers,” 390–401
Bruer, J. Michael, 421 (about)

C

“Cancellation Decisions: Evaluating
Standard Orders,” 368–79
Carter, Harriet H., 380–85
Catalog Code Revision Committee. Sub-
committee on Rules for Cataloging
Machine-Readable Data Files, 335
Cataloging, 34–41
Cataloging and Classification Section,
83–86
Catalogs and catalog production, 227–28,
236–38
Centralized processing, 379
Chan, Lois Mai, 126–36
Children’s materials
Classification, 174–78
Clark, Doris Hargrett, 137–44
Classification
Bliss Bibliographic, 250–51
Dewey Decimal, 88–89, 249–50, 402–08
Library of Congress, 174–78, 250
Cluff, E. Dale, 263–93
Cole, Jim E., 168–73
Collection development, 312–15, 368–79
Comaromi, John P., 88–89, 402–408
Computer output microfilm, 33, 237–38,
278–79
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“Computer-Output-Microfilm (COM)
Hardware and Software: The State of
the Art,” 33
“Conference Publications: Serials or Mon-
ographs?” 168–73
Copyright, 263–65, 306–07

D
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“Decision Tables: A Tool for Librarians,”
42–46
Descriptive cataloging, 191–95
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263–93
Dewey Decimal Classification, 249–50
Dewton, Johannes L., 106
Dunkin, Paul S., 349–360 (about)
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Exchange, 380–85
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Fasana, Paul J., 81–83
Fleishauer, Carol, 368–379
Freedman, Maurice J., 418–420
Funk, Mark, 390–401
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Gapen, D. Kaye, 5–21
Garner, Jane, 86–87
“Geographic Names in Subject Catalog-
ing,” 409–414
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Heinritz, Fred J., 42–46
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Romanization,” 179–90

N

Networks, 235–36
Nitecki, Danuta A., 196
“NOTIS - 3 (Northwestern On-Line Total
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vices Applications,” 361–67
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OCLC, 5–21, 238–40
“OCLC at OSU,” 5–21

P

Payne, Eleanor R., 34–41
Perkins, John W., 174–78
Photocopying equipment, 265–67
“Poland Is Not Yet Defeated,” 158–67
PRECIS, 253
“Present-Day Publishing in Hong Kong,”
47–60
“The Principle of Uniform Heading in
Library of Congress Subject Head-
ings,” 126–36
Publishers and publishing, 47–60
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“Punctuation in Library of Congress Subject Headings,” 145-53

R

“A Rationale for the Use of Split Files for Subject Headings,” 154-57
“Recommended Data Elements for the Descriptive Cataloging of Computer-based Educational Materials in the Health Sciences,” 191-95
Reid, Marion T., 117-25
Reproduction of Library Materials Section Annual Report, 86-87
“Micro-File Series,” 33, 196
Resources, 310-34
Resources and Technical Services Division Annual Reports, 81-89
Bylaws, 92-105
Nominees, 1978 Election, 90-91
President’s Report, 81-83
Schedule of Meetings, 422-
“Resources in 1977,” 310-34
Richmond, Phyllis A., 415-17
Rodriguez, Robert D., 409-14
Romanization, 179-90

S

Saffady, William, 33
Serials, 294-309, 368-79
Acquisition, 386-89
Serials Section, 87-88
“Setting Up an Exchange Operation in the Small Special Library,” 380-85
“Some Current Reprographic Concerns Related to Interlibrary Loan,” 196
“Standardizing the Reporting of Cataloging in the University of California System,” 34-41
Steinweg, Hilda, 145-53
Stevens, Norman D., 349-60
Stokley, Sandra L., 117-25
“A Study of Performance of Five Book Dealers Used by Louisiana State University Library,” 117-25
Subject headings, 154-57, 409-14
Systems analysis, 42-46

U

Upham, Lois N., 87-88
“The Use of a Subscription Agent’s Computer Facilities in Creating and Maintaining a Library’s Subscription Profile,” 386-89
“Use of the Dewey Decimal Classification in the United States and Canada,” 402-8

W

Walker, Pamela, 154-57
Wellisch, Hans H., 158-67, 179-90
Wepsiec, Jan, 61-80
“The Writings of Paul S. Dunkin: A Review Article,” 349-60

Y

When selecting an acquisitions agent or changing from your current agent, what are your needs and who should you be looking for?

Does your library need . . . ?
- 1. Economical programs specially designed to aid library budgets.
- 2. Complete U.S. and European sales/service staffs and fulfillment centers.
- 3. Periodicals, continuations, and monographs, domestic and foreign.
- 4. Frequent bibliographic and service publications.
- 5. Coordinated programs for conversion from "direct ordering" or other agents.
- 6. Worldwide resources.

If these are your needs, then Stechert Macmillan, Inc. is your one source— one service acquisitions agency!

With over 100 years of acquisitions experience, Stechert's tradition of excellence (started way back in 1872 by Stechert-Hafner) offers you a total, comprehensive service, whether your library is large or small, academic, public or special, domestic or foreign.

Coupling these six Stechert Macmillan services with our annual "Holdings Renewal List" and quarterly claims report for periodicals, "Standing Order" program for continuations, Publisher Relations Program, and BOPPA (Blanket Order Program for French Acquisitions) and PONTA (Popular New Titles From Abroad) plans—it's easy to see why, when you select Stechert Macmillan, "You Need Only One!"

Why not write our Sales Promotion Manager today for information about the complete line of Stechert Macmillan services?

Stechert Macmillan, Inc.
Serving Libraries Since 1872
866 Third Avenue / New York, N.Y. 10022 USA

---

PERSONALIZED SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

Every customer is assigned an experienced "Home Office" representative. You correspond direct; any title needs, changes, cancellations or problems can be handled promptly by letter or phone. This makes your job easier and keeps you abreast of your subscription needs at all times.

With over 45 years experience, McGregor has built a reputation of prompt and courteous service on both domestic and international titles. We prepay subscriptions ahead of time. Our customers, large and small, like the prompt attention we give them. We think you would too! Ask about McGregor's "Automatic Renewal" plan described in our new brochure. Write today for your free copy.

McGREGOR Magazine Agency

OUR 46th YEAR

Mount Morris, Illinois 61054
On its first publication in 1967, Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules was greeted as "the best Code we have, or are likely to have," and was soon adopted by libraries around the world.

The second edition of AACR consolidates the achievements of the first and builds on them to meet the challenges of development and change. In an intensive three-year project, two distinguished editors and an international Joint Steering Committee—on which the national library associations and national library services of the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom were all represented—have produced a revision that harmonizes the two differing texts of the first edition. AACR 2 incorporates the latest international standards, makes provision for the whole range of new materials and media now in our library collections, and takes notice of the impact of machine-readable cataloguing and bibliographic systems. There are adjustments to the text and presentation that nation-wide reviews by AACR users have shown to be essential.

One innovation is of particular importance: the rules for Description are presented in an integrated structure that provides a uniform basis for recording not only every known category of print and nonprint material, but those still unknown and uninvented. AACR 2 can be the Code to take cataloguing into the twenty-first century.

Order your copies now!
Lois Mai Chan

Library of Congress Subject Headings
Principles and Application

This work re-examines the underlying principles of LC Subject Headings in light of recent developments and describes current subject cataloging practices of the Library of Congress. Appended is valuable current information on Free-Floating Subdivisions, Abbreviations, Capitalization, Punctuation, and Filing.

Lois Mai Chan is Associate Professor of Library Science at the University of Kentucky.


Sarah K. Vann
Melvil Dewey
His Enduring Presence in Librarianship
Given the wide range of Melvil Dewey's accomplishments in the library field, a work such as this one is long overdue. Following the format of the other series volumes, it provides a biographical sketch, selections from Dewey's writings, and a bibliography of his works. A valuable contribution to the study of library history.

Sarah K. Vann, an authority on Dewey, is Professor of Library Studies at the University of Hawaii.


G. Edward Evans
Developing Library Collections

The first new approach to teaching collection development in many years, Dr. Evans interrelates six distinct elements of the process: community surveys, development/selection policies, selection of books, selection of AV materials, acquisition procedures, weeding the collection, and evaluation. Additional chapters survey the book trade and producers of AV material, library materials distribution systems, cooperation, copyright, and censorship.


Libraries Unlimited, Inc. P.O. Box 263 Littleton, CO 80160
If you haven't browsed through an issue of Booklist lately, you're in for a big surprise.

Booklist has changed in many ways.
From cover to cover. Inside and out.
In appearance and in content.
For example, by working with publishers' galleys, we now review many titles in advance of publication.
We are also packing more reviews into each issue. Reviews of more than 5,000 books and 1,600 nonprint items were published in the last volume year.
And remember, with the exception of those in the Reference and Subscription Books Section, every review in Booklist is a recommendation to purchase.
Remember, too, that Booklist is the only review medium that includes Dewey Decimal classifications and Library of Congress subject headings with each review.
The idea, of course, is to provide as much helpful information as possible on new books and nonprint material to assist you in making sound selections for your library or school media center.
This is why, in addition to our regular reviews, new columns have been added to the first-of-the-month issues: Cookbooks, Plants and Gardening, Paperback Nonfiction, Series and Editions, First Novels, Science Fiction, Westerns and Video.
In addition, special features such as Adult Basic Education, Canadian Books, Popular Reading for Children, Professional Reading, and Slides appear in Booklist periodically.
Booklist. Over 38,000 libraries subscribe to it. And for one reason—the reviews. Reviews that are better than ever. But don't just take our word for it.
Rediscover Booklist.
Fill out and mail the coupon below. If you like, we'll send you the latest issue of Booklist with our compliments. Look us over. Review our reviews. There's no obligation to subscribe. But, be warned: you may be so pleased with just one issue of Booklist that you won't be able to wait to come back for more.

Rediscover booklist
For the ultimate listening-learning experience: P/H Wireless Library Broadcaster

...transmits 2 to 12 separate programs simultaneously to unlimited numbers of students using wireless headphone/receivers. They can select, or be assigned, any program by turning the program selector knob on their headset to a specific channel. Consoles accommodate standard cassettes; an auxiliary input panel accepts sound from any source. Because the system is wireless, students may sit anywhere. For a dramatic, free, no-obligation demonstration, contact P/H Electronics...manufacturer of MONI-COM\textsuperscript{TM} II, the patented two-way wireless language laboratory.

P/H ELECTRONICS
A Division of Duncan Electric Company
117 E. HELENA STREET
DAYTON, OHIO 45404
(513) 461-5898

INFORMATION A LA CARTE.

The 3M Brand Bibliographic Control System is a unique bibliographic subscription service on microfiche. BCS sends you data drawn from the Library of Congress and other major sources on a bi-weekly basis.

Conforming to library—not computer—sorting rules, BCS provides manually prepared separate indexing for title and main entry. That makes working with BCS faster and easier than with the N.U.C.

Write or call: 3M Library Systems, 3M Center, Building 220-9E, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

617-944-2224.
"Literacy is not an end in itself. It is a fundamental human right."

From *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries*

**Reading and the Adult New Reader**
Helen Huguenor Lyman

A reliable guide for librarians, teachers, editors, library science professors, and students who are involved in the evaluation, uses, and creation of materials for adult new readers. The focus is on the readability of materials in collections for such readers; it organizes the theories of readability for practical application as well as describing the reading interests of minority group members.

Lyman's method of identifying works suitable for adult new readers extends the relevance of this book to the entire field of adult education. Major topics that are discussed include reading services: trends in society; beliefs, attitudes and values affecting readers and reader groups; reading collections for the adult reader; evaluation of reading materials; and implications of these topics and factors for library service. This work points out a direction for bringing the adult reader and library resources together.

272 pages Cloth LC 76-44431 ISBN 0-8389-0228-6 $15.00

**Library Materials in Service to the Adult New Reader**
Helen Huguenor Lyman

Published here as a comprehensive report, from the background of the research through to the principal recommendations, this volume not only establishes criteria for evaluating reading materials, but also provides a multitude of information about the new literate and their use of the media. This study will guide librarians, community workers, teachers, publishers, and editors in both creating and selecting literature for these newcomers to the reading public.


**Information for the Community**
Joseph C. Donohue and Manfred Kochen, editors

This book is the first comprehensive treatment of community information and referral (I & R) centers—those agencies that act as contact points between people with problems and the services that are needed to help with these problems. It analyzes the needs that gave rise to the many organizations now providing I & R services, and describes some approaches that have succeeded and some that have failed.

294 pages Cloth LC 75-40168 ISBN 0-8389-0208-1 $10.00

**Information for Everyday Survival: What You Need and Where to Get It**
Priscilla Gotsock of the Appalachian Adult Education Center

Presents an annotated list of free and inexpensive materials arranged under such basic categories as aging, children, free time, and housing. Some sample subheadings are abortion, getting a job, personal finance, and remodeling a home. Titles, descriptions, and sources of each item are arranged in a tabular format to facilitate identification. The titles were selected for readability, and the reliance on booklets keeps purchasing costs low.

400 pages Paper LC 76-13554 ISBN 0-8389-0211-1 $10.00

**Other titles of interest:**

- *Literacy and the Nation's Libraries* by Helen H. Lyman
- *Reading and the Adult New Reader* by Helen Huguenor Lyman
- *Library Materials in Service to the Adult New Reader* by Helen Huguenor Lyman
- *Information for the Community* by Joseph C. Donohue and Manfred Kochen

Order Department
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
If Frobisher had written this letter on Permalife, it would still be around today.

Permalife is a “permanent/durable” paper. It is ideal for books and records which must last more than a lifetime. Tough, to resist folding and bending, with a slightly alkaline pH to resist the acids in the air, Permalife should be your archival grade. It’s available in bond, ledger, text, cover and library card stock. Permalife costs far less than 100% cotton content sheets yet lasts just as long. Insist on Permalife. Make sure the folk of 2378 know what we did today.

Want samples? Please write on your letterhead.

Howard Paper Mills, Inc., 115 Columbia Street, P.O. Box 982, Dayton, Ohio 45401
Subscriptions...the professional way.

With costs increasing as library budgets shrink, modern librarians are called upon to use their professional skills more than ever.

That's why Faxon's last, accurate, flexible subscription service makes sense for so many busy libraries. Ordering through Faxon helps manage costs, and free librarians for important management tasks.

Write or call today for our Librarians' Guide and Service Brochure. Faxon. For subscription service...the professional way.

Library business is our only business—since 1881.

F.W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
Library Magazine Subscription Agency
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
Tel: 800-225-7884 (toll free)
617-329-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada only)

MORE ENTRIES TO THE INCH.

We've made the National Union Catalog available on compact 4" x 6" microfiche.

It packs two feet of published volumes into just two inches of film. So you can search the entire collection at your desk.

Subscribers receive the complete catalog, its nine monthly issues and annual cumulation.

Subscribe to the National Union Catalog.
Write or call: 3M Library Systems, 3M Center, Building 220-9E, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101. 617-944-2224.
Problem: How can anyone involved in serials selection and collection building remain up to date with the changing world of periodicals, journals, newspapers, almanacs, directories -- serial publications of all kinds?

Solution: Subscribers turn to Serials Review for current reviews, informative and entertaining articles, and indexes to serials. Twelve regular features include Reference Serials, Government Publications, Tools of the Trade, Review Sources, and Serial Review Index. Special features enhance this invaluable publication designed to be a major source of advice on which serials and related materials should be on the shelves of your library.

Published quarterly. $25/yr. for institutions. $14/yr. for individuals.

PIERIAN PRESS
5000 Washtenaw
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Visi·Tape Periodical Labeling

A revolutionary system that allows quick visual review of shelved periodicals. Simply apply this pressure sensitive tape to publications in their order of issue. Fast, inexpensive, efficient. One of hundreds of bright new products you'll find in the newest Highsmith Catalog. Send for your free copy.

Highsmith
P.O. 25
Fort Atkinson, WI 53538
If you ever have a problem, we’re just a (free) phone call away!

Midwest Library Service possesses a staff of finely-trained Customer Service Representatives to answer any of your questions or assist you in quickly solving any problems that might arise. And whenever you call your specially-assigned Service Representative, please use our toll-free WATS number. Midwest Library has served college and university libraries for more than 18 years and the cornerstone of our business has always been personal service. So although we use “impersonal” computers to fill your orders, we promise you we will never abandon the “personal touch” that continues to please our many hundreds of customers.

Call toll free: 1-800-325-8833
Missouri customers call collect: 0-314-739-3100

Midwest Library Service
11400 DORSETT ROAD • MARYLAND HEIGHTS, MO. 63043
Brand-new edition covers 178,949 terms in an easier-to-read format . . .

Acronyms, Initialisms, and Abbreviations Dictionary

Sixth Edition
Edited by Ellen T. Crowley
Published in 3 volumes

Vol. 1, ACRONYMS, INITIALISMS, AND ABBREVIATIONS DICTIONARY. 1,103 pages. $45.00.

The growth of this now-standard dictionary from 12,000 entries in the first edition (1960) to 178,949 in this new edition testifies to the ever-increasing role acronyms play in modern communication. For 18 years, Gale's AIAD has helped readers and researchers unravel the tangle of letters. The new edition not only identifies 45,000 more terms than the previous one, but it does so in a new page format designed for easier reading.

AIAD serves the needs of the modern businessperson, government official, student, and interested citizen. For this reason, most of the terms are drawn from modern American material. Nevertheless, increasingly close ties with other countries have accounted for the inclusion of a number of terms originating in Europe, the Soviet Union, Japan, and elsewhere. (English translations are usually given.) Also defined are important historical acronyms and abbreviations, such as the ancient Roman SPQR.

Supplement to Volume 1 . . .

Vol. 2, NEW ACRONYMS, INITIALISMS, ABBREVIATIONS: 1979 and 1980 Supplement supplement will cumulate all 1979 entries. Soft $38.00/both. Acronyms proliferate so rapidly that offers an annual supplement service between edit Volume 1. New Acronyms covers such changing as data processing, aerospace technology, me education, and social welfare.

A different approach . . .

Vol. 3, REVERSE ACRONYMS, INITIALS AND ABBREVIATIONS DICTIONARY. 1,103 (Ready January 1979) $48.00. To complete the demystifying acronyms, Gale publishes a "back companion volume to AIAD. All of the entri appear in the new AIAD are in Reverse Acrony here they are arranged alphabetically by complete or terms rather than by acronyms as in AIAD.

REVIEWERS AND USERS PRAISE AIAD . . .

"Hardly a librarian alive is not aware of this standard work. . . . It is the most complete and useful work of its kind available. . . . Planned annual supplements between editions will make it a much more up-to-date tool. . . . Highly recommended for all libraries, academic and public."—Robert L. Wagner, American Reference Books Annual, 1978.

"[RAIAD] will be a necessary purchase for all libraries that currently possess the earlier portion of this edition."
—Reference Book Review, November 1976

"You have the profound thanks of the entire staff of the library who consult your book so often comprehensive is this reference work we no longer suit our other works on the subject."—Carl F. Section Manager—Library, McDonnell Douglas

"This is an extremely useful book, and one who greeted with cheers by our research staff. . . . Fo of us who cope with this sort of communicative daily basis, the volume pays for itself quickly."—M Review, January 1977

ALL GALE BOOKS ARE SENT ON 30-DAY APPROVAL PLACE STANDING ORDERS FOR ALL 3 VOLUMES OF AIAD

GALE RESEARCH CO. • BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MI

Customers in the U.K., Continental Europe, and Africa order direct from:
Gale Research Co. • c/o European Book Service • P.O. Box 124 • Weesp, Netherlands