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Some Practical Observations on the Writing, Implementation, and Revision of Collection Development Policy*

CHARLES B. OSBURN
Assistant University Librarian
for Collection Development
Northwestern University Library
Evanston, Illinois

This paper was conceived in the context of the "RTSD Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies." It describes fundamental qualities of policy applicable to all kinds of libraries and recommends a step-by-step process leading to the successful realization of policy planning. Placing an emphasis on the values of the process itself, the paper also suggests implications for collection development personnel and for the library as an organization, when a working policy is adopted.

The RTSD "Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies" imply that a written policy serves several essential management functions. It serves as a planning guideline and working tool for selectors; it serves as a communications medium between the library and external administrative bodies; and its serves as the codified rationale for decisions in budgetary matters. These are weighty demands to place upon a document of paper, but projections for educational service agencies, including libraries, over the next two decades are dismal at best and suggest strongly that the design of some new mechanism will, indeed, be required in order to give coherent direction to an energy which—far too frequently—appears to be unharnessed. At the same time, both logic and experience indicate that a document of paper has no more value than a puff of smoke, if it is merely an administrative gadget to be displayed on appropriate occasions. The substance and format of library policy on collection development are critical, and the RTSD "Guidelines" offer a sure course to the establishment of a practical and rationally founded

*Edited version of a paper presented at the Preconference Institute on Collection Development sponsored by Collection Development Committee, Resources Section, RTSD, Detroit, June 1977.

Volume 23, Number 1, Winter 1979
document. However, while considering the nature of the policy that is recommended and the use to which it might be put, it is equally important to take into account the benefits accompanying the experience of planning, creating, and first testing a policy of pervasive and long-lasting influence. For, in the long run, it is the quality of these process values that will determine the quality of the policy's relationship to the collection development function.

There are three very important process values to be gained from the drafting of policy on collection development: (1) the gaining of knowledge about existing collections and related collection development activity; (2) the gaining of control over budget and over the influx of materials; and (3) the securing of enhanced participation and interaction of a substantial portion of the professionals in the library. Those who are engaged in the planning, drafting, and implementation of collection development policy will have to be especially mindful of these abstract values throughout the process of policy formulation, lest they be forgotten in the wake of the more practical complexities that are certain to be encountered in this undertaking.

A key element both in the efficient use of time devoted to the establishment of a comprehensive policy on library collection development and in determining the quality of the finished product is adequate planning. Fortunately, this stage of policy making has now been facilitated, because the RTSD "Guidelines" constitute the basic planning document. Since the responsibilities of almost every professional in the library are affected in one way or another by collection development activity, an essential part of planning is to be found in making widely known the intention to formulate a comprehensive policy. Moreover, certain concerns felt by library staff and even the clientele may advantageously be anticipated. Among them are: what a collection development policy can and cannot be expected to do, how it will be used, who will write it, why it is needed, and what it will look like.

Surprisingly little is commonly understood about collection development policy in the profession. Preconceptions and misconceptions are abundant. Policy on collection development often has been viewed through a cloud of mystery, which in part has arisen from the formulation of policy by only one person or by very few persons, whose rationale could not be made clear to others. Indeed, one apparent reason for the necessity of the RTSD "Guidelines" at this time is precisely that relatively few libraries have bothered to formulate written policies and because, in many cases, those policies that do exist have proved to be ineffectual. The planning stage is the time when fundamental questions should be raised and answered in a broad forum, so that full advantage can be taken of the wide range of experience, knowledge, and insights that is to be found in almost any large library staff. This is done in an effort to identify potential problem areas, as well as to engender a widespread sense of commitment to the project and an understanding of its goals.
Also during the planning stage, it is useful to apprise administrators of neighboring or consortium-affiliated libraries of the plan to be followed in formulating a policy. The incorporation of existing or potential arrangements among institutions is especially important at this stage, in view of the likelihood that appropriate librarians at those institutions will be approached repeatedly throughout the writing stage in order to confirm and refine cooperative agreements. If interlibrary consultation at this stage arouses an interest in the formulation of policy at those other institutions, then so much the better, for cooperative arrangements will be more comprehensible and more assured of continued success if they are defined in the policy of both libraries and formulated on comparable plans. Similarly, it can be useful in the planning stage to alert certain local administrators outside the library—such as budget and program officers—of the intention to formulate policy, since this information can provide the opportunity for the library to incorporate in a formal way some of their requirements. This exchange will also emphasize that the capability to plan is understood within the library to be a primary ingredient in the successful development of its resources.

To summarize the approach to this whole undertaking that is recommended here, the completed document should be the result of an intellectual effort that incorporates the experience, knowledge, and judgment of a wide range of professionals beyond those who are engaged in the act of drafting policy. Therefore, the plan for policy writing must give adequate attention to the role of systematic consultation and coordination.

The RTSD "Guidelines" obviously serve as the basic planning document in this project, but they do require a supplemental plan of action for local use before writing begins. Specifically, these are determinations as to: chief editorship, assignment of authorship, format and order of the document, scheduled work plan, process for review of the finished product, and the mechanism for carrying the work of policy formulation forward. Consistent with the principles that have already been suggested, it is useful for the editorship or coordinating role to be assumed by the chief collection development officer, with the authorship, however, assigned to those who are engaged in collection development on a regular basis. If the number of librarians thus identified to be involved in writing policy is small (a half dozen), then the operation should be quite manageable. If, however, a considerably larger number is involved, then a coordinating committee should be formed of those who would have responsibility over a broad span of subjects, with responsibility for subsections to be delegated further. In either case, the vehicle for moving the project forward most effectively is a committee of subject librarians, numbering about a half dozen, chaired by the chief collection development officer of the library.

The many parts of a collection development policy and the principles behind its structure are most comprehensible when considered as
an organic whole rather than as individual parts or principles. Therefore, the RTSD “Guidelines” constitute a system, and it is crucial that everyone involved in the project be mindful of this concept. However, the heart of the policy clearly is to be found in the application of codes for levels of collection density and of collecting intensity to the classification scheme used in describing the collections. The significance of this complex combination depends, in turn, on the definitions assigned to collection levels, since they must be based on common interpretation among the authors of policy. This is an essential part of achieving whatever balance may be desirable in the collection. A logical extension of this “principle of common interpretation” lies in the area of interlibrary cooperation, where meaningful coordination of acquisitions is very difficult at best, but impossible without this specific commonality of understanding. Briefly, this is what is implied in the word comparability, which is one of the key words in the RTSD “Guidelines.” Some librarians may find fault with the definitions of levels recommended in the RTSD “Guidelines,” but their primary strength lies in their endorsement by a national organization for adoption throughout the United States. Indeed, these definitions are so critical to the future of the development of library resources nationwide, that the RTSD Collection Development Committee should be urged to consider definitions of a quantitative nature in order to make these qualitative definitions more precise. This would be of great assistance in interpreting the definitions and in furthering their comparability.

Of equal importance in designing a collection development policy is the scheme to be followed in describing the collection and its development. Just as the most advantageous context for the selection of materials in a large, comprehensive collection is the entire universe of selection possibilities, the most effective approach to the description of collections and their development is from a universal perspective. The primary function of a collection development policy is to guide the systematic selection of the world’s recorded knowledge, and it should do so according to a rationale founded upon priorities that have been identified to serve the community most effectively. Consequently, the format for the central part of the collection development policy can best match these needs if it is structured by a classification of world knowledge. There are various such schemes in vogue, but the one that is by far the most influential in the United States—and increasingly abroad—is the Library of Congress (LC) classification. Whatever doubts may be expressed from a scholarly point of view about the validity of subject segmentation in the LC classification, one must bear in mind that the essential principles behind the planned collection development policy are comparability, a system perspective, and flexibility. The last is a criterion generally neglected but can be accommodated with progressive facility as the detail of the scheme increases. The specific modification of the LC classification recommended in the
“Guidelines” is a valid choice, because it is already in use as the basis of comparison among a growing number of large libraries.

Policy on the breadth and depth of collection development related to segments of the classification may be labeled “subject statements” for the purpose of discussion here. They are best drafted by the librarians who are responsible for selection in each respective area. Once the classification scheme is superimposed on the current configuration of selection assignments, some new assignments based on a rethinking of subject coverage relative to community needs may already be in order. This new perspective on collection development is likely to reveal areas that either are not monitored adequately or are monitored unnecessarily by more than one selector.

Although a policy on collection development will almost invariably reflect, in large measure, the status quo in collection development activity, it should also provide an unequalled opportunity for a new beginning. This new beginning for the provision and management of library resources—which both statistics and informed opinion indicate is quite in order—should be conducive to change in three areas: (1) a perspective for selection that incorporates all areas of human knowledge; (2) the identification of new patterns of research or of new knowledge interests that must be accommodated by the library, relative to other research needs and knowledge interests; (3) the identification and adjustment of traditional biases in selection.

Both the concerns of society and the needs of academic research have changed immensely in the United States during the past three decades, yet traditional goals for collection development—some of which may now be anachronistic—often hold sway. Perhaps this is largely the result of the persuasive powers of the oral transmission of policy. The vast majority of librarians have been trained formally in the humanities and history. It is not too much to assume that this conditioning, in conjunction with the oral transmission of a selection policy lacking in tested rationality, has directed collection development during the past three decades, and that the development of collections is now out of phase with community priorities. In any case, the codification of collection development policy along the lines recommended in the RTSD “Guidelines” offers a fresh approach with a new perspective. That approach ensures not only that duplication of effort in selection will be avoided, but also that all areas of knowledge will be given appropriate attention.

The subject statements may be drafted effectively according to the following four-stage plan: (1) the coordinating committee divides responsibilities for various segments of the classification scheme; (2) each coordinator assigns subsections of that responsibility to other appropriate selectors in the library (again, depending upon the size of the selection staff in the library); (3) each subject statement is written to reflect current practice as closely as possible; (4) each subject statement is modified as required.
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It is especially with the beginning of writing that consultation and coordination become critical, for the long-standing problems of overlap and of gaps in selection finally have to be resolved. Before any of the subject statements are discussed within the coordinating committee, each committee member should separately review these statements carefully with their authors in order to identify possible overlap and gaps in coverage, and in order to test the validity and the uniformity of each statement, as each is prepared. The broader segments should then be submitted to the same kind of review procedure in the forum of the coordinating committee. It is a safe assumption that several drafts will be required before all criteria are satisfied. The subject statements then represent current selection activity so that they can be modified—through a similar process—according to whatever changes in policy are considered to be required. In an effort to assign relative priorities among sections of the classification scheme, consultation at all stages of writing is necessary. It should involve other librarians and members of the community wherever additional information or opinions can productively be found.

As a practical measure, it would be highly useful to precede the drafting of subject statements with a comprehensive evaluation of the collections, according to a uniform plan. If this cannot be accomplished, ad hoc evaluations almost certainly will be carried out in areas where the librarian responsible for authorship is not fully familiar with the collection. Without a well-founded understanding of the collections in place, and of their relevance to the community to be served, it is difficult to devise a sound plan for their future development.

Drafting the subject statements will be the most complex part of the project, but the effort can be rewarded by the knowledge about collection development that can be gained by all participants, particularly in terms of broadened perspective. The subject statements constitute the foundation of collection development policy, to which all other parts of the document will refer in one way or another. However, the selection of some materials, such as maps, newspapers, and others that tend to be treated by format, is not prescribed through the subject statements and will have to be dealt with separately. Similarly, every library has certain technical policies on such matters as gifts, duplication, and materials for reserve that also belong in the general collection development policy appended to the subject statements. Both of these kinds of policies, however, will be better informed by the effort spent on the subject statements and therefore should follow them in the project schedule.

While the advantages of using a scheme like the LC classification for the formatting of policy are to be found in its comparability, its flexibility for revision, and its combination of comprehensiveness with detail, its most evident disadvantage is its poor readability. Readability may not be a necessary quality for a document that is to be used in-
house or for the purpose of communicating with other librarians elsewhere, but it is a desirable quality in communicating with the layperson, whether administrator or clientele. For this reason, it also may be useful to synthesize the subject statements by larger classes or by departmental units in the library system. From a management point of view, this synthesis of policy may have the value of providing the kind of perspective that will facilitate review of the total collection development program as well as its parts.

The finished policy on collection development is not in itself the solution to selection problems, for the degree of its utility is commensurate with the knowledge that is possessed and continuously upgraded by those who implement it. Errors in selection caused by loose organization, a careless approach, or by uninformed decisions will no longer be obscured quite so quickly as they were before policy became the tangible standard against which collection development performance could be measured. The selector will have to be a student of the current publishing industry in order to be aware of trends in publishing and in scholarship, and to be informed about related developments that will stimulate library interest in the community. In this connection, the selector must be especially attentive to activity in the fields of collection development assignment. The selector will have to be apprised regularly about collection development in other libraries: locally, regionally, and nationally. The selector will have to have a rather good understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the collection—as it stands and as it develops—and of the areas where theft and mutilation cause a special kind of problem. Above all, the selector must have an understanding of why and in what ways the community might need the library, both currently and in the future. And more than ever before, the selector whose work is to follow the guidelines of explicit policy on collection development must be able to select in the context of an assigned budget with a good idea of how much material that budget may be expected to acquire during the fiscal period.

Selection according to a precise guide to collection development has implications, too, for the library as an organization; the organization must be able to adapt to the capabilities that have been built into the policy if the goals of that policy are to be realized to their fullest. For example, the capacity to control acquisitions by priorities is paramount. Moreover, the flexibility that is incorporated into the policy must be adaptable throughout the library wherever workflow is dependent upon selection decisions. Flexibility may be required by changing conditions of the budget, or of the publishing industry, or of community priorities. Implementation of an exacting policy also has implications for personnel, since the responsibilities of collection development assignments will tend to be more rigorous. It will be important to reconsider the qualifications for those positions in order to be certain that long-standing collection development assignments are
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allocated to those librarians who have both the ability and the inclination to fulfill the responsibilities successfully. Finally, because budget and policy are closely interdependent, the library will have to design a system that will permit the regular monitoring of expenditures analyzed in some way that reflects reasonably well the essential segmentation of the policy and related collection development assignments.

By way of summarizing the functional implications of a detailed policy, it may be observed that just as the collection development policy should be formulated both to reflect and to guide a system of organized activity, that activity must be accommodated into the overall operations of the library as part of the larger system. Logically, then, all procedures that flow from the policy and conclude at the time the selected material is made available to the public should be geared to the efficient implementation of that policy. Therefore, the priority for the implementation of collection development policy relative to the goals of other library operations should be established within the system before policy is finalized.

The allocation of the entire acquisitions budget may best be determined by one or a few relatively disinterested administrators whose judgment is not biased by daily subject selection responsibilities; however, the process for arriving at that decision should involve all selectors, since it is they who are most familiar with the policy and its fiscal implications. Upon the allocation of funds, each selector then is responsible for implementing policy within the framework of a known budget. Both the policy and the budget will be utilized to greatest advantage if selection is paced regularly throughout the fiscal period in conjunction with the regular monitoring of budget encumbrances and expenditures.

However valid the collection development policy may be at the time of its formulation, it is not a definitive statement; it constitutes just one step in an ongoing systematic activity that falls into a natural cycle. (No matter how administratively “neat” the policy and related procedures may be, the quality of collections developed still will be most profoundly dependent upon the application of sound, well-informed professional judgment.) The natural cycle linking collection development policy to other collection development activities is as follows: first, assessment of community needs, which leads to evaluation of the collection, which, in turn, leads to the formulation of policy, from which follows selection; and then back to the beginning of the cycle—reassessment of community needs and reevaluation of the collection, and so on. So while the policy is intended to guide selection, the whole collection development cycle should be directed so that it will be conducive to an alertness to the need to revise that document and not simply to bring selection into conformity with written policy.

One aspect of collection development that is only recently receiving its due attention is that of weeding the collection, or of deselection.
This exercise can be most helpful in indicating aspects of the collection development policy that may require revision, for it provides a fresh perspective on the quality of the collection at a given time, and it begs a healthy questioning of current selection practice. Beyond the obvious benefits of freeing space and of intellectually tidying the collection, a systematic weeding operation also offers the benefit of the identification of misjudgment in selection and the opportunity to take corrective measures; and all this with the definite advantages of hindsight.

Collection evaluation and the assessment of community needs are both integral parts of selection and, consequently, are continuous processes that may point the way to desirable revision of policy. In this connection, the importance of unbroken and substantive consultation between collection development librarians and the community cannot be overemphasized, particularly in an academic setting. It is always useful, however, to balance expressed and observed local needs with an understanding of publishing and subject trends on a broader national scale. Collection use studies have their value in informing library management, but they give evidence only about which materials on hand are used and not about the materials which might have been used even more gratefully by the community had they been available.

Revision of each section of collection development policy can be recommended by the appropriate selector in the form of an annual report on collection development activity related to the criteria of that policy. Depending upon the extent of revisions to be made in various sections of the policy, there is no reason why they cannot be adopted as they are recommended and reviewed. However, it will still be advisable to plan on a comprehensive review of the policy on a regular basis—perhaps every five years or so—in order for the library to benefit from some of the same process values that were gained in the original policy formulation.

In conclusion, the essential message intended in these paragraphs is that the adoption of a comprehensive and detailed policy on collection development has far-reaching implications both for the routine of collection development and for the atmosphere in which it will function. As a management tool endowed with something more than a hint of precision, the policy serves as a new measure of performance, stimulating at the same time a heightened sense of accountability in decision making. Accordingly, selection will be influenced more than ever before by a keen sense of community-derived priorities. It is true that this implies less freedom for individual self-expression and creativity on the part of those who select the material than has been the case in the past; but it is equally true that the full implementation of the kind of document recommended in the RTSD “Guidelines” presents a new kind of challenge for collection development and calls for a new kind of creativity. In fact, these are also the general requirements of the new era of librarianship we have already entered.
Collection Evaluation in Research Libraries: The Search for Quality, Consistency, and System In Collection Development*

PAUL H. MOSHER
Assistant Director for Collection Development
Stanford University
Stanford, California

The history, literature, and methodology of collection evaluation or assessment in American research libraries are reviewed; current problems, tools, and methodology of evaluation are discussed; and an ongoing collection evaluation program at the Stanford University Libraries is described.

ROGERS AND WEBER remind us that a distinguished collection of books is the sine qua non of a great research library. Librarians and nonlibrarians alike may forget this because of the current preoccupation with computers, the enormous fiscal problems associated with larger and larger library buildings, and the vexatious bibliographic problems of controlling huge bodies of materials in increasingly diverse formats. However important these other factors may be, we should not forget that they are subsidiary to the root element that gives the library its name—liber the Latin word for book.¹

We would by now agree, I am sure, that the generic term “book” includes an impressive array of formats which are not strictly books but which serve the needs of our readers and scholars in ways still analogous to the rolls and codices which filled the libraries of Alexandria or Rome.

“Evaluate” is an English word coming from the French term évaluer—to determine the value of something. In the case of collection evaluation, the term has to do with measuring or assessing the quality

¹*Edited version of a paper presented at the Preconference Institute on Collection Development, sponsored by the Collection Development Committee, Resources Section, RTSD, Detroit, June 1977.
of a collection or collections. Let me avoid a possible early pitfall by defining quality as "the utility or benefit of library collections to library patrons, their needs and work, and to institutional programs"; in the case of academic libraries, for example, the utility of collections to the requirements of academic programs of teaching and research.

Evaluation of collections is most often considered a function of collection development and should be related to the planning, selection, and pruning of collections. The benefits of a well-planned program of collection evaluation are many, including the following important ones:

1. A more accurate understanding of the scope, depth, and utility of collections.
2. A guide and basis for collection planning.
3. An aid to the preparation of a collection development policy.
4. A way to measure the effectiveness of a collection development policy.
5. A method to ascertain collection adequacy or quality.
6. A means to rectify inadequacies in and improve library holdings.
7. An opportunity to focus human and monetary resources on collection areas most needing attention.
9. A demonstration to administrators that something is being done to change the "bottomless pit" of library acquisitions budgets.

Collection evaluations cannot only provide answers to questions like "How large is our collection in, say, art history?" or "How good is our collection in French linguistics?" They should also be able to tell us how well we are doing and how rapidly we are achieving specified goals.

Now that I have introduced the topic and described some of its benefits, I would like to do some other things: first to give a brief overview of the history and progress of the art of collection evaluation in American academic libraries, then deal with some common problems of recent scholarship and practice—particularly the issues of quality versus quantity, subjective versus objective evaluation, and the degree to which collection evaluation can be considered an art or a science at this stage of its development, and finally to describe the theory and practice of some recent methodology.

History

Surveys were undertaken at a number of university libraries between 1933 and 1950, including Chicago, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Stanford, Cornell, New Hampshire, Texas A & M, and Alabama Polytechnic. Robert Downs presented the results of a statistical survey of research materials in U.S. libraries (primarily academic) in 1942 and completed a similar study for Canada in 1967. With the exception of Raney's 1933 study of Chicago, Orr and Carlson's report on Texas A & M, and to a lesser extent Wilson, Downs, and Tauber's
examination of Cornell, all of these were descriptive surveys rather than analytic or systematic evaluations. The distinction between a survey as a descriptive overview and an evaluation as a systematic analysis is important and should be kept in mind as we proceed.

The principal body of collection evaluators, describers, and selectors during these decades consisted of the department faculties of each institution, and they were responsible for the descriptive or evaluative portions of nearly all of these studies. The most comprehensive of the three surveys that attempted evaluations of collections is the Chicago study of 1933, which involved 200 faculty members checking some 400 bibliographies and a schematic master list compiled from the *Union List of Serials*; a separate check of lists or bibliographies was made by each department or school of the university. While the methods and products were uneven, the overall result was very impressive. This mammoth enterprise, which was never again undertaken in the same scope and which may first have given collection evaluation its reputation of being inordinately costly and time-consuming, was orchestrated, though not carried out, by M. Llewellyn Raney, the director of libraries. In retrospect, its achievement may possibly have been worth the work involved. It resulted in justification of retrospective needs of 1,400,000 volumes, and expenditure of the then staggering sum of $4,000,000, with a “fallback” core of 713,000 volumes costing $2,700,000 which Raney urged upon Chicago’s trustees as the effort necessary to bring Chicago’s collections to the level of those at Harvard or Yale. The study also resulted in a vastly improved understanding of Chicago’s library collections and needs and set the university library on a path of development that created one of the greatest library collections of the central United States.

Library surveys have remained a common form of simple evaluative tool—especially in the area of accreditation, which I will not cover here—and the 1930s had a distant echo in 1961 when the University of Michigan conducted a faculty survey appraisal of the University Library collections, which appears to have had little more practical result than most of its predecessors.4

All of the surveys before 1950, both the analytic one by Chicago and the purely descriptive ones elsewhere, were carried out by faculty rather than librarians. During this period collection development was regarded as a faculty preserve. Harry Bach reports that librarians did not participate as “active agents in the selection of a majority of books that went into the library,” and in 1930 a study of U.S. land grant universities and colleges revealed that in thirty-three institutions librarians functioned in the collection development sphere only to prevent duplication. In ten other institutions, books were ordered by departments without any supervision by librarians.5 This pattern of faculty control of collection development in American academic libraries continued into the 1960s, as Periam Danton has noted.6 It is still regarded as the natural order of things in some libraries. In reporting
on a survey of library resources carried out at Columbia in 1958, Tauber reported that 2,250 faculty members were questioned about collection scope and adequacy, and 644 responses were received "in fairly complete shape." Tauber dealt with faculty as the proper principal selectors but expressed concern with the inconsistency, lack of system, lack of agreement, and inadequate levels of interest and support such a faculty pattern provided. He suggested that the alternative for a good research library would be to obtain subject and field specialists who could anticipate future collection requirements as well as respond to faculty expression of need. He seems to have regarded this possibility as remote, however, for he appealed to universities to get their faculties, departments, and schools to assume a greater collection development responsibility, for libraries to involve them more, and even exhorted departments to hire faculty members with respect to their ability to strengthen library collections.

During the next decade, academic libraries—especially large research libraries—found Tauber’s idealism increasingly impractical and utopian. In addition to the fact that departments had come less and less frequently to hire faculty because of their capacity to develop systematic library collections, university enrollments, faculties, and physical plants began the nearly unrestrained growth and expansion pattern of the 1960s. At the same time, the output of library materials was growing rapidly, the "publish or perish" syndrome overtook U.S. universities everywhere, and the "new professionalism" in American scholarship resulted in greater demand on the materials resources of libraries and, at the same time, less interest in "doing the library's work for it," as the faculty said. The older pattern of library dependence on the faculty for collection development became increasingly impractical and unrealistic, and many libraries began to build staffs of subject area or language specialists in acquisitions or reference departments, as independent units, or a combination of these. In an important review article published in 1968, David Lane found that most librarians had changed to the view that collection development was a responsibility of librarians rather than faculty but that change in practice has followed rather more slowly.

The value of having subject-educated specialist librarians responsible for collection development in research libraries had been demonstrated as early as 1936 by Waples and Lasswell in a study of holdings of 573 notable titles in 4 social science fields by 6 major American research libraries. Excluding data for the Library of Congress, they discovered that the New York Public Library (NYPL) held 92 percent of the titles compared to 68 percent at Harvard, the next highest ranking institution. In commenting on the results of this study, Danton inquired into the reasons why this should be so; he found that the significant difference was that selection at NYPL, unlike the universities, was the ongoing responsibility of a corps of subject specialist librarians. The other libraries depended at that time entirely—or al-
most entirely—on a less consistent and systematic pattern of faculty selection and recommendation.

Another point made by Waples and Lasswell that deserves repeating today is that while NYPL made a better showing in books and journals than any other library evaluated—American or European—it spent less money than any of the other five American libraries. As Waples and Lasswell observed: "In terms of our previous discussion and of the data available, the New York Public Library appears more attentive to the future needs of American scholars in the social sciences. It pays greater deference to posterity."12

The move of primary collection development responsibility from the faculty to the library, the increase of attention devoted to collection development which resulted, and the common attempt to systematize, rationalize, and improve the planning and procedures of library collection development during the ensuing decade and a half (which in a sense has produced the present preconference) has been one of the most significant and original contributions to the growth of professional librarianship in the United States during the last generation.13

One of the first problems academic libraries have faced as a result of this quiet revolution has been a need to discover where they are with respect to the adequacy and quality of their collections and to develop plans and programs for more systematic improvements and growth of their library resources. This has produced between the late 1950s and the present "more work... on the evaluation of collections... than on any other facet of the library."14

* Literature and Methodology *

The two best and most comprehensive recent surveys of the literature of collection evaluation are those of George Bonn and F. W. Lancaster.15 The American Library Association has prepared guidelines for the evaluation of collections that provide the most complete and helpful information on principles and methods of collection analysis, and the Association of Research Libraries has assembled a useful collection of documents from libraries and organizations actively involved in collection evaluation efforts.16 Bonn provides a general literature survey with commentary, followed by some very useful pages of summary and criticism. Lancaster has as his primary aim the evaluation of collection use levels with the ultimate aim of "optimizing storage of the collection," but the section on evaluating the quality of collections and his up-to-date bibliography are highly valuable. The ARL Office of University Library Management Studies is also sponsoring a self-study collection analysis project (CAP) among research libraries, which is developing a set of reports and procedures concerning collection evaluations.17

Discussion of the purpose, goals, and methods of collection evaluation during the last fifteen years has been plagued by controversy and
debate over two issues. The major debate concerns the issue of objectivity versus subjectivity, simplistically transformed by some into an apparent conflict between quantity versus quality, which itself resolves into issues of methodology and philosophy: Should evaluation of collections be qualitative or quantitative in nature? Is quantitative study or data more objective and “scientific” than evaluative or judgmental data? The second issue revolves around matters of the purpose or goal of an evaluation. Often techniques are interpreted as more broadly useful or applicable than they were intended to be. A technique appropriate for an accreditation survey, for example, may convey little useful information to a librarian or faculty member concerned about a library’s collection in classical studies, however easy the data may be to gather.

The value of using statistical measurements in evaluating library collections and services, and as a survey technique for purposes of accreditation or measuring gross collection adequacy, has been propounded by a number of librarians: perhaps the most important and influential among them has been Robert Downs. In “Resources of American Libraries: A Quantitative Picture,” his first substantial statistical survey, Downs eschewed definitions of quality or of research materials, a term he said he was using “almost without definition.” “No differentiation is being made,” he said, “between items on any basis of quality or applicability to research needs.”

Downs followed this initial survey with statistical evaluations of many other libraries, library systems, and the research collection resources of Canada as well as the U.S. While Downs admitted that large collections do not themselves a great library make, he nevertheless concluded that the absolute size of collections had been demonstrated to be an important factor in judging collection adequacy. He also found strong correlation between the size of an academic library and the prestige of a parent university or college and listed other correlations between library—or even university—quality and rate of annual collection growth, comparison of size with other universities, the number of journal subscriptions, and the number of volumes in the reference collection.

Quantitative methods of evaluating library collections have become increasingly popular in recent years for reasons other than Downs’ influence. Quantification is currently in high fashion in the social sciences, and librarianship, calling itself “library science,” sometimes identifies closely with this development of the larger group of disciplines of which many librarians feel themselves a part.

Many scholars of librarianship have devised formula approaches to library size, models to measure the effectiveness of collections, computer evaluation techniques, and a host of other statistical measures of collection adequacy and quality that are described and debated in the literature. George Bonn tends to favor “quantitative” as more realistic than “qualitative” ones but ultimately argues for a balance of methods.
designed to match collections with user needs. Lancaster devotes a good deal of effort to quantitative methods of evaluating collection quality; while he takes Downs, Williams, and Blau and Margulies to task, for example, for their conclusion that there is a positive correlation between absolute collection size and the academic excellence of an institution, he then goes on to argue that rate of growth of collection size is a better indicator of collection quality, but that the rate of increase in the absolute number of volumes added plus the absolute size of the library in number of volumes together correlate to the best indicator of "academic excellence of the university." Without regard for the logical problems of trying to assess university excellence on the basis of library collection measures, one may question whether correlations may have been extended too far.

The tendency to rely more and more often on quantitative measures of collection quality and adequacy has come under attack from a number of directions. A group of Canadian librarians centered at Dalhousie University, coming from a tradition of conservative and scholarly library service, decry what they see as a growing reliance on "numerology," taking quantifiers like Downs to task for their failure to address questions of quality and for their ex post facto hoc ergo propter hoc mentality. John Ettlinger and John Miller are often witty and sometimes devastating in pointing out the logical and procedural fallacies of their "numerologist" opponents, but occasionally allow passion to dominate what others might call common sense.

There have been second thoughts and words of caution even from within the ranks of Ettlinger's "numerologists." George Piternick has described basic fallacies in attempts to correlate the rate of growth of collections and the overall quality of an educational program, observing that strong positive correlation between two sets of data does not in itself establish causal connection between them. The existence of a high correlation between absolute size of library holdings and the academic quality of the institution does not establish that the former causes the latter. ... It does suggest strongly, however, that the two are not independent—very likely cause and effect are intertwined, as Clapp has concluded.

James Krikelas has commented that statistics are useful to support administrative decision making and to describe various types of library activities. But he also points out that statistics can be meaningless, data can be inadequate, categories can be ambiguous, and published data may contain internal inconsistencies. "Mensuration is an important element in any scientific discipline, but it is not the primary objective; it is, rather, a means to an end." Krikelas put his finger directly on the knot of the dispute: the issue is not really one of "subjective" versus "objective," which even Bonn has suggested. Quantitative data is not necessarily "more objective" than qualitative or evaluative data. A statistic is susceptible of mislead-
ing presentation and interpretation, just as a judgment may be based on insufficient information. An accurate, soundly based judgment may be as objective a datum as a set of statistics.

There is a useful adage about collection development librarians which asserts: "In nature, it is the early bird which catches the worm; in collection development the bird that catches the worm is the one who recognizes a worm when he sees it!" The point is that librarianship is a profession that requires a capacity for discrimination and judgment. The acquisition, storage, and provision of access to thousands or millions of items requires that librarians be capable of making many judgments and discriminations each day. This is certainly true in collection development. These can be made less subjective by the use of appropriate criteria, policies, guidelines, and tools, but the exercise of choice and judgment cannot be completely eliminated from the practice of librarianship. These judgments can and should be as well informed as possible, based on evidence both quantitative and qualitative, on faculty and specialist opinion, upon statistics of size and growth rate, upon analysis of teaching and research programs, and the study of research patterns in various disciplines. The issue is not one of subjectivity versus objectivity or quantitative versus qualitative measures; it is an issue of choosing the right methodological tools to produce the kind and quality of result needed.

Many tools are available to the librarian who wishes to evaluate library collections, and it is the librarian’s business to ascertain on the basis of the institution’s nature, mission and goals, the collection development policy statement, and on the nature of the information needed, what evaluative techniques will be most helpful and meaningful.

I would like to endorse the view of the draft ALA “Guidelines” and of Harry Bach that in most cases the best evaluation will normally involve the application of more than one technique and a comparison or combination of the resulting data. But the extent of one’s means and the length of time available for evaluation will often provide external limits to the depth and length of an evaluation project, and these factors will have to contribute to the technique one chooses.

Conduct of Evaluations

One should begin any process of collection evaluation with the institution’s missions and goals firmly in mind. Possession of a recent, accurate collection development policy statement is vital for determining areas and objectives for the assessment of collections. An evaluation planner should also be sure to remember any coordinated collection arrangements or assignments among branches, or with libraries at other institutions.

It is important to identify the questions to be answered by the evaluation or analysis. Is the collection of adequate size? Is it serving the needs of the patrons? What materials can be pruned for storage?
Does the library possess the most needed materials for graduate field exam reading in anthropology? Can data be obtained on collection adequacy as ammunition for the next budget go-around? What is the quality, for research purposes, of the Latin American collections? What is the adequacy of the undergraduate collections in history? An evaluator should always keep in mind the nature of the library and the nature of the need. For example, the Clapp-Jordan methodology will supply useful data on collection size adequacy if you want to know if your collection is adequate in numbers, but it will provide no help in ascertaining the quality of collections.

With this material and these decisions in hand consult the ALA “Guidelines,” and guides such as Bonn and Lancaster, and develop a plan or campaign of action. In consultation with an appropriate group of informed users—or administrators if budget justification is desired—seek to measure the utility and the practicality of the plan and tools; you will want to use those that will produce the most useful, appropriate, practical, and beneficial results.

Research or large academic libraries usually consist of a congeries of branches—research, special, undergraduate, high-use—with a central main core collection. Each branch or major collection of such an institution should normally be considered as a unique unit when planning an evaluation, and the methodology should be specially designed around its nature and goals.

Evaluation of the humanities and social sciences collections of the main library and branches remains a special problem of academic librarianship. Gross measures of collection size by subject breakdown, such as the comparative shelflist measurement project carried out under the aegis of the RTSD Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group, have provided quantitative comparisons giving indicators of relative collection size, which may be interpreted as a crude measure of adequacy if one keeps in mind problems such as obsolescence, duplication, and erroneous or omitted data. Such comparative data does provide information for some of the uses of collection evaluations mentioned at the beginning of this paper, but it does not adequately address the issue of quality in the subject collections of research libraries.

In 1958 Harry Bach addressed the issue of the difference in library needs between colleges and universities, and the problems in evaluating quality in large research library collections. He concluded that there was no single satisfactory method of collection evaluation and called for the devising of sampling techniques, using specialized rather than standard bibliographies, for evaluating research subject collections. He further suggested that some sort of “tiered” process might be useful, beginning with a rapid sampling process as a “strainer” to identify strength or weakness in areas of the collection.

Since that time there have been a number of evaluations of research collections, and at least four such efforts have been reported in the
literature. R. P. Coale undertook a systematic evaluation of the research utility of the Newberry Library's holdings in the colonial history of Latin America. He used the "monographic bibliography" approach, checking bibliographies of 100 to 400 titles in classic books written by recognized scholars and, for current publications, subject samples from the *Handbook of Latin American Bibliography*. The purpose of the evaluation was to ascertain: (1) whether the scholars who had written the sampled books could have done so at Newberry, (2) whether the Newberry collection contained the significant printed primary source material and the important secondary accounts, and (3) whether the library had been keeping up with current scholarly output. To give the resulting data greater meaning, Coale took comparative samples at the University of California, Berkeley, the University of Texas at Austin, and the Library of the Hispanic Society of America. The study was successful, and its only significant failure was the inability to develop a program of improvement based on the findings.

Robert Burns conducted an evaluation of holdings in science and technology at the University of Idaho in 1968. This evaluation updated and improved an earlier study and was designed both to measure the basic graduate research support adequacy of the collections and to chart directions for future growth in support of a new Ph.D. program. The survey was made against standard published lists and guides in the various fields and concentrated on serials and professional society publications. The evaluation summarized the strengths and weaknesses of the collection for each field and its capacity to support basic graduate instruction and research. Significantly, it developed a program for future acquisition, both current and retrospective, based upon the conclusions.

Mary Cassata and Gene Dewey published some helpful and suggestive guidelines for the conduct of collection evaluations based upon the results of an evaluation carried out by subject bibliographers at SUNY-Buffalo in 1969. The Buffalo evaluation utilized a variety of techniques. The faculty contributed subjective evaluations of the research collections in their fields. The bibliographers developed goals statements for their areas of collection and examined the relationship between these goals and academic program scope by gathering and analyzing data on graduate and undergraduate course offerings and enrollments, graduate programs, faculty staffing plans, reading lists, etc. Undergraduate collections were measured against basic lists such as *Choice's Opening Day Collection* and *Books for College Libraries*. Research collections were tested by a number of means: checking the bibliography and footnotes of definitive books or dissertations, checking the percentage of authors in the Library of Congress classification schedule represented in the library's card catalog, and checking the library's holdings against the catalogs of special collections listed in Lee Ash's *Subject Collections*. The results of each specific subject evaluation
were stated in a report by the subject bibliographer who conducted or supervised the evaluation.\textsuperscript{31}

The approach and methods suggested by Coale and Burns received further improvement and refinement in the work of William Webb on the process and results of a series of collection evaluations carried out at the University of Colorado libraries.\textsuperscript{32} The approach used by Webb has served as a foundation for a series of research collection evaluations at Stanford University.

The purposes of the Colorado assessments were to provide a foundation of collection knowledge for the development of a collection development program, to develop a campaign of more thorough evaluations of and improvements in areas of weakness, to use the findings as support for the library's book budget requests, and to contribute to the professional growth of subject specialist staff and their relationships with faculty.

Webb found that the "standard bibliographies" touted by most earlier articles on evaluation did not exist for most research collections in the humanities, so that specialized bibliographies had to be chosen by subject specialists and faculty working together. He also found that different categories and fields require different approaches; a sampling approach was not appropriate for evaluating reference collections, for example, because they really wanted to find out what they didn't have and develop a campaign to procure the material.

Webb's methodology was based upon a "tiered" approach, as is Stanford's. After bibliographies were chosen for each field, samplings were selected (for this purpose Webb argues that statistically correct or random samples are not necessary) on the following basis: 10 percent of bibliographies containing 100 to 1,000 items, 5 percent from 1,000 to 2,000 items, and 1 percent over 2,000 items. The data were tabulated and reported subfield by subfield, providing meaningful information without telling in detail what was or was not possessed. The data gave a good indication of strength and weakness and in some cases shocked the librarians who had very different perceptions of library holdings in certain areas. At this stage, graduate student assistants did the checking, and the average evaluation took sixty to seventy-five hours. When areas of weakness were thus identified, or when title-by-title checks of bibliographies were needed, trained support staff were used to guarantee greater accuracy, and they produced lists of lacunae and desiderata for focused collection building efforts.

The Colorado evaluations showed that economies of effort are appropriate to research collection evaluation: percentages of acceptable error are great enough in broad sampling evaluations to allow the use of graduate student assistance at relatively low cost with a high yield of useful data. I should mention, however, that both at Colorado and Stanford it has proved desirable to give graduate assistants some basic training and orientation in catalog, serial record, and government
document searching. Corporate entries, as might be expected, are especially problematic.

The results of the Colorado experience were heartening: a solid basis of information and direction for collection building was laid; a great deal of useful information about collection strengths and weaknesses was gained at reasonable cost; excellent data were obtained for budget presentations to university administrators and the legislature; and the administration was persuaded that something was being done about the "bottomless pit" of library acquisitions budgets.

Collection Evaluation Program at Stanford

A series of evaluations similar to the Webb model has been carried out at Stanford during the last year and a half and will be continued during the next few years in order to gain a fairly systematic picture of the quality—that is, the research and teaching adequacy—of the collections. Funded by a portion of special endowment revenues, the evaluations are intended: (1) to provide us with means for our bibliographers to learn and to know better their own portions of the multimillion volume research collections, (2) to establish useful bases for the revision of Stanford's collection development policy statement, (3) to provide data for us to use in attempting to coordinate some aspects of Stanford's collection development process with the University of California at Berkeley, (4) to provide information on which to build deliberate and shaped plans and specific recommendations for the improvement of Stanford's library collections, and to do so in the most rapid, useful, and efficient way, (5) to add support to our book budget requests, and, (6) to make possible the most productive and cost-efficient expenditure of library resources.

The program is tiered in a manner similar to that developed by Webb at Colorado. The need for evaluation is sometimes suggested by faculty responses to collection development staff interviews in which faculty are asked to evaluate the adequacy of the library collection in their own fields for teaching and research. At other times, evaluations are undertaken as part of a systematic effort to sample collection effectiveness in large subject fields within the library's collections, especially where oral tradition or complaint suggest problems.

Normally a sampling is first searched, with a statistically significant number of titles in each of a number of subfields. For example, to evaluate the collections in early modern French history, we searched 165 titles from Robert Mandrou's Introduction à la France Moderne, divided into categories such as humanism, philosophy, history of science, religious life, art and artists, political and social theory, popular life, etc. When, by consulting the academic program needs and collection development policy statement levels, we have found that holdings are substantially lower than programs warrant, we mount more thorough searches and develop both current and retrospective acquisitions campaigns to rectify the inadequacies discovered.

* * *
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In other instances, such as the sciences or "hard" social sciences, evaluative techniques are specially developed or borrowed from the literature to provide information about specific problems of collection availability or quality.

Evaluations have been completed or are underway in over twenty-two different subjects in the humanities and social sciences, and effort in the sciences is underway. Graduate students who have completed their comprehensive examinations in the field of study being evaluated are normally used to conduct the evaluations and, as indicated above, we have found it useful to provide some orientation and training for them. Graduate student bibliographers are currently paid at the upper levels of the hourly student range depending on training and experience. To date, Stanford has completed about fifty evaluations at an average cost of about $400 which, to put it in scale, is about the same as the cost of acquiring and processing a dozen books. I would agree with Webb that the benefits have far outweighed the costs. Each graduate student is supervised by a library subject specialist in the area being evaluated. The subject specialist, the department faculty, and, in many cases, the graduate student, join in evaluating and selecting bibliographies for searching, keeping in mind the goals and scope of the academic program, the mission of the library collection, and the collection development policy statement parameters. The choice of bibliographies or other tools used for evaluation is a crucial one.

Four basic survey techniques for evaluation have thus far been used, each having a rather different goal:

1. A check of a sampling chosen from one or more accepted important subject bibliographies.
2. A check of one or more monographic or journal article bibliographies of works on the cutting edge of research in a discipline or subject.
3. A careful search of all titles in a significant subject bibliography in areas where weakness was revealed by methods one or two above.
4. For initial surveys in the social sciences, checks of basic lists of most-used and valuable titles to determine collection adequacy for graduate instruction and the availability of basic materials.

Methods one, two, or three often also involve checking holdings at Berkeley to provide comparable data and to take advantage of the Berkeley-Stanford Research Library Program cooperation. If Berkeley has an item we may well decide not to purchase it; if it is an expensive item, a journal, or a series, the two libraries may agree on a single location or share the purchase.

Each evaluation must result in a formal report submitted through the supervising subject specialist to the assistant director for collection development. The report is normally divided into two sections. The first consists of evaluative information and a description of the evalua-
tion process, and the second part contains the data. At Stanford this usually tells us—as a minimum—by subfield and total, (1) the number of titles checked, (2) the number and percentage at both Stanford and Berkeley, (3) the number and percentage at Stanford, (4) uniquely at Berkeley, and (5) at neither. Other types of data relevant to the goals of the particular evaluation may also be added. The introductory data includes: (1) the nature and goal of the evaluation, (2) the source, (3) the sampling used, (4) problems encountered (including unusual patterns of difficulty in finding the titles and materials found while searching which may suggest a different result than the data would imply), (5) general comments about the collections, (6) a list of specific areas of unusual strength or weakness, and finally—and the importance of this part of an evaluation cannot be overemphasized—(7) a plan or campaign of action to develop and build collections in areas of undesirable weakness (areas the collection development policy indicates should be stronger than the findings indicate that they are). Often a list of desiderata, ranked in importance is included, but this is usually an appendix rather than the substance of the plan for improvement. Normally the subject specialist, and perhaps faculty, will be involved in preparing this section of the report.

We always prepare a summary of each report. Gathered together and arranged, the summaries are used in reporting on the progress of the program to administrators as guides for collection planning, etc. The summaries normally include: (1) the evaluation title, (2) the departments or fields which the evaluation covers or touches, (3) a note about the sampling, (4) a summary of findings including areas of special strength or weakness, and (5) a conclusion summarizing action necessary to bring the collection to the desired level.

We have found that areas requiring particular care in planning collection evaluations are the selection of fields for evaluation (based upon faculty recommendation or suspicion of areas of weakness), the selection of bibliographies and other evaluative tools, the plan of the search, the selection of able, careful, and precise searchers, and the preparation of reports of quality and accuracy containing standardized, consistent, and program-related information and data. Reports presenting the perceptions and judgments of a trained graduate student with faculty and subject specialist contributions, as well as standardized statistical data representing the library's holdings, have proved as useful to us as data concerning specific items held or not held.

As a result of its collection evaluation program, Stanford shares in the benefits suggested at the beginning of this paper. We have certainly found the effort worthwhile.

An ongoing, consistent, and well-thought-out campaign of collection evaluation can be carried out over a number of years as need, time, and resources dictate and can assist a library to obtain and maintain the excellent and responsive collection that is its goal. A sound collect-
tion evaluation program interacts with the collection development policy, with the allocation of funds in support of collection development, and with the pruning of collections in forming the principal and most useful constituents of any library’s collection development program.
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33. Mailed questionnaires have consistently proved less useful than personal contact; responses are usually too few to be significant. However, brief questionnaires filled out in the course of interviews have proved useful.
Selection Methodology
In Academic Libraries*

HENDRIK EDELMAN
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Rutgers, The State University
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An attempt is made to describe the elements of a selection decision model. Definitions are provided and an outline for a classification of library materials by source of origin is developed. There are descriptions of short- and long-term goals for collection development as well as an outline of macro- and microselection decision making.

IN THIS PAPER I will attempt to identify and describe the different concepts and activities that make up what is usually called book selection. Definition of terminology is the basis for any scholarly and scientific discipline, and I would like to propose a model designed to help us understand the concepts and activities involved in selection, i.e., a model that would help us to understand the decision-making processes in book selection. I further propose that such a model is worthy of more than just casual consideration. There have been serious and successful efforts over the past fifty years to deal with book selection in public libraries. In sharp contrast, the literature on book selection in academic libraries is on the whole uninteresting. The Western Europeans have produced some thoughtful studies, but in America very little scholarly work has been published on the subject of book selection. This is ironic since the United States is the country where collections have been built, have developed, or have grown on an unprecedented scale and in an unprecedented way. It is only recently that systematic studies have begun to appear, but it would seem that James Wellard's conclusion in 1937 that there is no theory of book selection still holds.¹

Let us first try to set in logical order a number of basic terms that are sometimes used interchangeably: collection development, selection,

*Edited version of a paper presented at the Preconference Institute on Collection Development sponsored by Collection Development Committee, Resources Section, RTSD, Detroit, June 1977.
and acquisition. I suggest that there is a distinguishable hierarchy among these terms.

The first level is collection development, which, although it can be interpreted as a passive term when it describes collection growth, should in fact be seen in the active sense. It is, in the words of Keyes Metcalf, “the most important single task for which a librarian is responsible.” Collection development is a planning function. A collection development plan or policy describes the short- and long-term goals of the library as far as the collections are concerned, taking them into account and correlating them with the environmental aspects such as audience demand, need, and expectation, the information world, fiscal plans, and the history of the collections. From the collection development plan flows the budget allocation in broad terms.

The second level is selection, which is a direct function of collection development. It is the decision-making process concerned with implementing the goals stated earlier. Criteria and methodology for the identification and selection of library materials should be seen separately from the collection development plan.

The third level of this hierarchy is acquisition. The acquisition process implements in turn the selection decisions. It is the process that actually gets the material into the library. Although I fully recognize that in practice these three levels interact and often even overlap it is important for our discussion that we keep them, at least conceptually, separate.

In other papers from this meeting the basic considerations leading to a collection development plan have been spelled out and discussed. In order to arrive at a better understanding of the selection criteria and dilemmas, it is necessary to go into much further detail than the collection development policy guidelines indicate. Actually, decision making is the final step in the selection process. First we must describe and categorize the universe from which selections are to be made.

Let us start with a brief description of what may be called an outline of a classification of library materials by source. This outline may serve to describe existing collections as well. Eliminating, for the time being, materials needed strictly for curriculum and teaching support, as well as special collections in one form or another, I would like to suggest that the general reference and research collections in all academic libraries include the following components:

1. The primary data published by governmental, intergovernmental, official, and semiofficial agencies throughout the world.
2. The major cultural, social, and political expressions of world societies of various historical periods.
3. The published outputs of the major academic, scholarly, professional, and research groupings in the world.
4. The secondary sources, critical or descriptive in nature, reflecting scholarly as well as popular evaluation over various time periods.
5. A range of introductory materials providing an encyclopedic view of the universe of knowledge.

6. A comprehensive collection of the bibliographic and other reference sources needed to provide access to available materials here and in other collections.

There are obvious refinements possible in this scheme, but we can apply it in its present form to almost any section of the collection, and in the process of doing so we can categorize and break up the published literature in order to give smaller frameworks for decision making. If we correlate these source categories to subject fields and/or geographic and linguistic areas as well as historical periods, we see a substantial difference in the mix of each literature. For instance, in classical literature we have an identifiable number of authors whose work, in whatever edition (textual, critical, or translation) should be considered for the library collections. We can leave manuscripts, unpublished or published in facsimile, out of consideration for the moment. This gives us approximately five hundred years of publishing and an active ongoing program. We can, if we wish, quantify and describe our universe precisely. We also can qualify that book production and by process of reduction, using historical, linguistic, as well as numerical variables, we can identify what is of potential interest to the library. The smallest library may come up with the ultimate reduction simply by ordering a complete Loeb collection. Secondary sources in this field are published as books as well as periodical articles. Language, time of publication, and publisher become prime variables in the identification process. Reference and bibliographical tools in this field are largely modern and numerically not extensive.

The published literature in chemistry or any subdivision of that field has a very different nature and mix. The primary sources are research reports, which appear as preprints, conference papers and periodical articles, and, to a limited extent, research monographs. We have convenient tools to describe our universe. We can quantify (and price for that matter) the literature in terms of audience needs. Secondary sources are not extensive if we apply language restrictions, but we notice substantial literature in category five, the introductory and encyclopedic range, from which actual choices will have to be made. Reference and bibliographical tools are well defined and represent a necessarily expensive part of the literature package. The identification process as described here is actually a negative selection process. By eliminating types and blocks of material we narrow down our choices substantially.

I hope that I also have demonstrated here that a universal or even consolidated selection practice statement is out of the question. Each field, or type of literature, has its own character, and the mix of media will be determined by audience needs, which in turn differ locally from field to field. Moreover, the selection will be made by different people or even groups of people. This lack of compatibility in
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different collections has created great conceptual and practical problems in university libraries where consolidation of selection functions as well as budgeting has been tried. The uncertainty in handling problems in the rising cost of serials subscriptions by grouping all periodicals together under format of publication is an example.

Let us now complicate the matter. Classification by source of origin gives us a most useful model for identifying the universe of published knowledge. We can apply historical, linguistic, geographical, or other elimination factors, and it is possible to correlate it with the “A” through “E” collection intensity descriptors as developed in the guidelines. However, the interests of the audience as defined in a given collection development plan may require different uses of the library collection. A single subject mix of the collection is being used for a variety of purposes, including informational need, teaching support, general reference and research, as well as specialized research. In whatever way we define these different levels, in practice the selector selects with two main objectives in mind: short-term demands and long-term needs. These two objectives are sometimes in conflict with each other. Catering to the short-term demand of the audience, the selector has to identify and choose from the universe those titles that are likely to be requested. This utilitarian selection takes place mainly on the lower level of the earlier defined scale but it is geared to specific needs of a specific audience. These demands fluctuate with the coming and going of individuals as well as topics of current interest. I do not have to elaborate here on the fact that the heaviest traffic in any collection is on a very small number of titles. This bread-and-butter aspect of the collection, which I prefer to call the “supermarket” collection, needs careful attention from a selection as well as a maintenance and service point of view.

The second objective deals with long-term needs and involves selection for collection building. The main criteria will have been defined by policy, but balance, reliability, and comprehensiveness, in that order, are the principal goals. In other words, the audience should know what they can and can’t expect. In this case, it is useful to remember that the demand most often is created by the supply or the availability. Policy priorities as well as collection history will determine the mix of current and older publications. This may be a good place to mention the old but still current dilemma between selectivity and comprehensiveness. The Europeans often claim to select only the “good” books in a discipline. In America we have learned to differentiate. We know that so called “ephemera,” or gray literature, can be the primary source of information in a number of disciplines, especially in non-Western studies. There are, or at least there should be, substantial differences between different types of libraries as well as different collections within each library. The well-developed collection development plan will have determined these differences and assigned relative priorities to them. For instance, a library may want to
be comprehensive in American poetry but may be able to achieve the goal only if extra funds are available.

I now would like to consider the identification process. In academic libraries, identification is a function of the selection process. As a matter of fact, identification is the most important factor in selection decisions in academic libraries. Sometimes identification is all that is needed. Let me try to illustrate this. Once again we have two differing decision-making processes. Macrodecision making is the first. Once a block of literature in a subject field has been identified, quantified, and priced, experience as well as efficiency and expediency suggest that the highest yield of bibliographical items per decision is the most economical decision in the long run. This thought process allows for periodical subscriptions, series standing orders, deposit collections, blanket orders, and retrospective collection purchases. A very large part of the intake as well as the budget expenditures of academic libraries is thus predetermined (whether by design or through a series of historical accidents or neglect) and except for some trimming at the fringes, it does not require any more decision making. Needless to say, this methodology has not escaped the attention of publishers and booksellers, many of whom are packaging and tailoring their offerings to fit this macrocriterion. A substantial part of the currently published scholarly literature from around the world can be identified and acquired in that fashion, and if we recognize that much of the quality of the nation’s best libraries has been developed by en-bloc purchases of scholars’ private collections, then it is at least understandable that a certain credibility is given to these macrodecisions.

The second type of decision making is item-by-item selection (microdecisions) which in fact covers a relatively small part of the actual intake although the percentage is higher in smaller academic libraries. These microdecisions also receive most of the attention, and sometimes in selection discussions at home or at ALA I am reminded of one of Parkinson’s laws. Professor Parkinson expounds on his Law of Triviality, which is briefly stated as “the time spent on any item of the agenda will be in inverse proportion to the sum involved.” This seems readily applicable to many aspects of the library selection procedures. We have now dealt with an analysis of the universe as well as with various selection criteria and philosophies that can be applied.

In practice, the identification and selection process takes place through bibliographical tools and techniques. We usually identify three stages in the item-by-item selection process. The first, a rough cut, is taken from strictly bibliographical tools such as national and trade bibliographies, ads, fliers, brochures, booksellers’ lists, as well as the short and quick review in the library and book industry trade press. Blanket orders fall into this category as well. In the second stage we recognize audience requests and evaluate reviews in the subject journals, which can often come as late as two or three years after publication. The second stage serves as a quality check on the first
stage. Of course, this applies only to underselection. There is, to my knowledge, no short-term answer or even indicators to overselection, i.e., those materials that probably should not have been acquired. This is a worthwhile research topic in its own right. In the third selection stage, which is often omitted because of talent and fund shortage, the retrospective review of the collection as well as selection processes takes place. This third process includes identification and selection from bibliographies and bibliographical references as well as the careful perusal of offerings through the second-hand booktrade, of course. Availability in other libraries may become an important issue here.

I hope that I have not given the impression that the selection process can be reduced to such small decision-making frameworks that it is possible to program them for automatic decision making. The selector, however, should be aware as well as familiar with the many fixed items and variables in the subject world. The model should be constructed and actual selection decisions as well as use patterns should be tested against it at regular intervals. The selector, the director of libraries, as well as the audience should have the benefit of these processes. It also is clear, however, that the role of the individual selector and the collective participation of librarians and faculty and other outsiders will provide the necessary “couleur locale.” Each collection or segment of it represents the ambition and abilities of a few individuals and the ultimate subjective approach is one of the greatest values of academic freedom in action. History has shown that strengths in collections, at least as perceived by generations of users, have been the result of the composite of such macro- and microdecisions. Much more work is needed in this area, especially for each of the subject fields.
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The heart of the library lies in its collections, and collections have to be built continuously. Budgetary constraints perforce stress the need for better defined collection development policy, although the ultimate goal should be an improvement of library service rather than any reduction of library cost. A written collection development policy facilitates a consistent and balanced growth of library resources, and a dynamic policy is one that evolves as the institution grows. Such a policy is based on the understanding of the needs of the community it serves and seeks to define and delimit the goals and objectives of the institution. A collection development statement is not a substitute for book selection; it charts the forest but does not plant the trees. It should be used as a guidepost, not a crutch. Book selection requires judgment and the courage to choose. A sound collection development policy, on the other hand, provides the necessary rationale without which a collection may grow amoebalike, by means of pseudopodia.

"THE LIBRARY is the heart of education," we are told. When the Widener Memorial Library was first built in the midst of Harvard Yard, there were some professorial grumblings about its "ungainly size" which prompted the famous and beloved (at least by librarians) retort from George Kittredge: "You could destroy all the other Harvard buildings and, with Widener left standing, still have a university." But I am sure even the architect of that building would not mistake Professor Kittredge’s remark for an aesthetic appreciation of his edifice. True, buildings are important, just as clothes are important. "The basic elements of any library are books, people, and buildings," and, to quote Lawrence S. Thompson, "in precisely that order of importance.” In other words, the heart of the library lies in its collections.

The foundations of the Boston Public Library were not made of
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bricks and mortar but rather the private collections of books and documents from Edward Everett, George Ticknor, Theodore Parker, and a munificent gift from a Boston boy made good, Joshua Bates, a systematic, intensive, global acquisition program to stock the new library with “a collection of books in as many departments of human knowledge as possible.” The three-year Bates plan itself netted the fledgling institution some 27,000 volumes, “purchased in the great book marts of Europe.” And these are the cornerstones that made the BPL a research library.

So, collections are important. And collections have to be built continuously. Learning, so goes a Chinese saying, is like sailing against the tide: if you don’t advance, you retreat. So does a library collection. A first-rate collection, if not properly nurtured, will invariably deteriorate—and not merely in its physical aspect. But growth is a complex and many splendored thing. We grow taller and indeed sometimes shorter as we grow older; we grow fatter or thinner, stronger or weaker, prettier or, alas, homelier; we grow older but may feel younger; we become happier or sadder, and if we are blessed, wiser and kinder. A collection also grows in a myriad of ways. It may grow in size, it may grow in market value, and it may grow in its relevance and use. It may grow in the scope of its coverage, and it may grow in the depth of its specialization; or, it may just grow, amoeba-like, by means of pseudopodia—in this case, a mixture of available funds and articulate personal preferences, whether from the librarian or the user.

And somehow, in each case, it implies a collection development policy; for even the conspicuous lack of it describes a practice that reflects a certain philosophical rationale. And many libraries, while not in possession of a written collection development policy statement, nevertheless do operate with certain goals, objectives, and guidelines when selecting the materials to be acquired. And while some libraries follow detailed collection development policies with minute subject breakdowns and specific imprint requirements, others may opt to pursue their task with broad outlines and general objectives. And, either way, good library collections have been developed. But we are here this morning to consider the need for a written collection development policy statement, or rather, a standardized statement to allow comparison and facilitate cooperation.

Do we need it? And if so, why? In these days of universal fiscal constraints, it is only natural to bemoan the information explosion and to contemplate library ecology. Budgetary limitations necessitate the setting of priorities, which in turn requires a reexamination of goals and objectives and the definition of the precise role and function of the institution. In this sense, the present shortage of money is perhaps a blessing in disguise in that it forces us to think. Here, at the very outset, I should like to say that I don’t believe we should formulate collection development policy to save money. In fact, I don’t believe the
prime purpose of the library is to save money. Consortia, networks, resource sharing all are important, but the purpose of librarianship is to provide better library service, not to reduce library expenditure. If library A chooses not to subscribe to certain journals or purchase other books because it can rely on the holdings in library B, it can claim to have improved its service only when it thereby can use the money “saved” to subscribe to other journals or purchase other books which otherwise would not be available to its users. Resource sharing must be progressive, not regressive. Library consortia as well as technological innovation may very well cost money instead of saving money, but the governing criterion lies in the services increased and improved, not in the dollar figure decreased. If saving money be the primary goal, there is no surer way than simply to close down the library.

Returning to the rationale for a collection development policy, one may ask why it should be desirable to have a written statement. First of all, the very process of writing one affords the opportunity for self-examination and reflection, two essential ingredients for growth and renewal. All work, however creative or interesting at the beginning, can easily settle down to a routine that sometimes breeds boredom and blurs, if not kills, vision. Times change, people change, our needs change, and our resources change. What’s best for the past may not always be best for the present, not to mention the future. Collection development policy, once defined, must serve at once as a base for current operation and as a springboard for future growth.

The second reason, which is the raison d’être for any collection development policy, is that such a statement assures a consistent and balanced growth of library resources. Book selectors, be they faculty members or librarians, specialists or generalists, are, like the rest of us, susceptible to personal preoccupations and not immune from the temptations of the popular and the trendy. Sound development of a collection must pay due attention to long-term needs as well as immediate demands, from the smallest popular library to the largest research institution. The difference lies mainly in the kinds of materials collected and in the degree of intensity in collecting. In referring to “the temptations of the popular and the trendy,” I am concerned not merely with best-sellers and gadgetry. The “temptations” can be scholarly and serious but nonetheless inappropriate in terms of the goals and objectives of the specific institution. And consistency also means a continuous commitment to a set of policies regardless of the personal interests and specialties of those who select the books. Professors and librarians come and go, but the books in the libraries stay. A library collection is not merely an assembly of books, not even an assembly of good books; they have to relate to each other. There has to be a rationale for the presence of these, but not others. And that rationale is provided in the collection development policy statement.

And that statement also seeks to insure the desired balance between
the subject matters covered. This, of course, does not mean equal depth of coverage, nor equal allocation of book funds; it does mean a considered definition of emphasis from the perspective of the whole. Furthermore, a clearly stated policy serves to remind and alert the book selectors of the legitimate needs of the inarticulate as well as the articulate members of the community, and this is equally important in an academic library and public library.

Two supplementary, and perhaps practical, reasons for the formal establishment of collection development policy are:

1. To provide a guarantee against undue special interest pressure. This is perhaps particularly, but by no means exclusively, true in public libraries. A well-defined policy statement should serve to resist undue pressure to include irrelevant materials as well as to exclude unpopular or controversial materials. How many of us can recall with relief the occasions on which we could graciously refuse a gift or request for material of limited value on the grounds that the subject matter, or the format, or the language fell outside of the library’s established collection development policy? And how often we have pointed with pride and conviction to our credo that the library “must provide free access to all points of view on public questions.”

2. To serve as a vehicle to facilitate interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing. Union lists provide the means by which libraries share what they already own. Coordinated collection development policies provide the means by which the libraries can share their future resources. And in order that such cooperation can be operable, terminologies need to be standardized, and criteria need to be comparable. Hence the RTSD “Guidelines”.

However, the standardization of guidelines does not mean uniformity of goals and objectives. Each library serves a unique community, be it a township, metropolitan city, high school, multiuniversity, or the United Nations. The library must therefore first of all know its community and assess the needs of all segments of the community, not merely the conspicuous and the vocal. For the objectives and goals of the library must be to serve the whole community. Merely meeting the demands of the known and the articulate cannot assure the development of a collection that will serve the immediate present and the long-term future. Perhaps I should add here a word of caution. In setting goals and objectives, it behooves us to be realistic—realistic in seeking the attainable, realistic in accepting what’s needed, not what’s attractive, and realistic in defining one’s own role, not somebody else’s.

No man is an island, and no library is totally self-sufficient. But there are degrees of self-sufficiency, and libraries are fundamentally different from one another. As a result, each library needs to assess its own resources. Collection development requires not only maintaining a balanced growth but also building on strength. A strong collection
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needs to grow to retain its eminence. This is no vainglorious indulgence. Scholarship is better served by one great collection than two or three incomplete ones. And in our days of library cooperation, it is only logical that we take into consideration the resources of other accessible libraries. I said “accessible,” because cooperative collection development is only feasible when resources can be readily shared. Pie-in-the-sky pronouncements of cooperative enterprises lead only to disappointment and worse, distrust, and thus do a great disservice to our profession.

A collection development policy statement must therefore define the library's goals and objectives, identify the short-term and long-term needs of the community it serves, assess the degree of strength and weakness of its existing resources, and determine the depth and scope of its acquisition policy. The “meat” of such a statement usually consists of a listing of subjects, with accompanying annotations indicating the degree of coverage recommended. Delimitations by language, date, format, and cost offer further refinements. As in the case of almost all library tools, the usefulness of such an instrument, especially if it is a detailed one, will be greatly enhanced if an index is provided.

And now, some thoughts on what a collection development policy statement is not or should not be. First, a collection development statement is not a substitute for book selection. At best, it defines a framework and provides parameters, but it never selects a specific book. Each title has to be individually chosen, whether by means of blanket order, approval plan, or a corps of specialist book selectors. And no matter how specific and detailed the collection development policy statement may be, individual judgment still needs to be applied in the last analysis. Collection development charts the forest, but it does not plant the trees.

Further, a written statement, whether broadly outlined or specifically itemized, should not be fossilized for eternity. Just as institutions grow, collections grow; so should the collection development policies grow. The strength of tradition lies in the proper use of the past to nurture the present, and the purpose of such a policy statement is to assure stability, not rigidity. Therefore, the presence of a written policy statement cannot be a substitute for intelligent discernment, nor for an ever-alert awareness of the changing needs of the community it serves. For this reason, too, therefore, it is highly desirable, indeed imperative, that such a statement undergo regular, periodic review.

Even the dictum of “building on strength” mentioned earlier is not an immutable law. There may be times when it is wiser to “call it quits.” The continuous maintenance of a collection, regardless of its intrinsic worth and accompanying prestige, must always be justified by its relevance—immediate or potential—to the community it serves. And ultimately, perhaps, by its contribution to scholarship and knowledge in general. One does not collect just for the sake of collecting,
And sometimes it may be more appropriate to give up or transfer some responsibilities to other institutions which are better equipped to assume them. One must not be afraid to admit past errors or to change directions when good judgment so indicates; nor should one be trapped in one's own past virtues. We need constantly to use our judgment and exercise our right—indeed, duty—to think, and sometimes having a piece of paper in front of us may make us forget that duty.

To confuse what's good for one library with what's good for another is to be intellectually lazy or socially irresponsible. Many factors come into play. What's adequate for one first-rate library may not be adequate for another. For years I watched with considerable concern some undergraduate libraries dutifully acquiring titles listed in the Lamont Library Catalog, thinking perhaps that if they had everything Lamont had, they too would serve their students well. But Lamont has Widener next door, not to mention Houghton and the dozens of other library facilities in the Harvard University system. Often what's unwanted by one library may well be treasured by another. A collection of third-rate novels adds little to the quality of a suburban public library, but the same collection may fit in well in a special collection which makes a large research library great.

And speaking of large libraries, perhaps we should remind ourselves once more that size is not synonymous with excellence, maybe not even eminence. Quantity does not assure quality, although neither does it preclude it. The nineteenth-century pipe dream of acquiring every worthwhile book has long evaporated in the puff of twentieth-century information explosion. True, very large collections of books are necessary to scholars, whether the books are used frequently or not, and indeed many will not be used frequently. And libraries, at least some libraries, are repositories as well as circulating entities and as such need to be both diverse and deep. But just as no newspaper can really print "all the news that's fit to print," neither can any library collect all the books that seem desirable to collect. Indeed, to seek and even to acquire everything is not to have the best. Harvard University Library prizes the preeminence of its collections by their excellence, not their size. Its book collection is always selective. And a well-coordinated smaller collection is indeed much more useful than a topsy-turvy mass of unguided growth. Acquisition requires skill, and book selection requires judgment. Collection development policy statement is a guidepost, not a crutch. A good collection development policy statement does not guarantee a good library collection, but it helps. To decide what to select and what not to select requires the courage to choose—to choose what to have, and what not to have, however tempting. And a sound collection development policy provides both a rationale and a reminder, lest vanity or timidity should lead us astray.
Allocation of Funds in Support of Collection Development in Public Libraries*

ANN BENDER
Branch Librarian
Walt Whitman Branch
Brooklyn Public Library

A discussion of allocation of funds in support of collection development in public libraries based primarily on interviews held with administrative officers of the Brooklyn Public Library and Tompkins County (New York) Public Library is presented. The author concludes that no materials budget, however strong, can be used effectively without quality service at the level where the individual librarian brings material and patron together.

This paper is concerned with the allocation of available funds, rather than collection development, in public libraries serving populations of over 50,000. Libraries serving less than 50,000 are excluded because their budgets are generally too small to include allocations for collection development and they must concentrate on the minimum amount of books and materials necessary to stock the library.

Public library collections are divided into adult and juvenile materials, with juvenile materials defined as those for children to age thirteen or fourteen. Present public library standards suggest an allocation of two-thirds of the materials budget for adult and one-third for juvenile.

In some cases a further distinction is made for “young teen” or “young adult” materials, with the standards recommending that “at least 5 percent of the annual additions should be materials of specific interest to young adults.” When staffing is available, young adult materials may be housed separately, with an identifying symbol, and serviced by a “young adult” librarian. When staffing is less adequate, this
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category may be subsumed under either the adult or juvenile collection.

Some libraries budget separately for reference books and materials. Because of increasing loss rates in some areas, some public libraries have put some expensive books in reference, even though they really may be of a circulating nature. Likewise the periodicals which are likely to be stolen because of their popularity may be made reference, even though interest may be in current issues only.

Many of the larger public libraries are organized into a main, or central, library and branches, or system subdivisions. The central library may have a collection which supports research but which also serves as the general reading collection for the whole geographic area that it serves. For example, the Grand Army Plaza central library has become for some a symbol of the Brooklyn library. Sometimes branches are devoted to special collections. Again, in Brooklyn, a special business library is located in the financial-government area, although it is housed in the same building as the neighborhood Brooklyn Heights Branch. Under a special gift, the Donnell Library Center of the New York Public Library provides special collections and services for young adults.

The number and location of branches are based on policy decisions. Brooklyn's policy is to have a branch no farther than a half mile from any point so that everyone can theoretically reach a branch on foot. But economics and politics can influence policy. If a community is organized and its political leadership is committed to public library service, it may be easier to get the requisite capital funding for a branch. Sometimes history is important. A neighborhood branch may be maintained long after the neighborhood has declined in population. Traditional patterns of neighborhood organization may mean continuing an already existing branch, sometimes to the detriment of opening new branches where the population has moved, unless such population becomes vocal and politically visible.

Materials in public libraries can be just as diversified in form as in academic libraries. The ALA Minimum Standards lists them as books, periodicals, pamphlets, newspapers, pictures, films, slides, filmstrips, music scores, maps, recordings, and various forms of microreproduction. One may also wish to distinguish documents; federal, state, local, and international. With regard to format one must consider whether the material is available in paperback, hardcover, or both, and which to order and when to bind. For periodicals the question may be whether to bind or order in microform. The availability of equipment from separate budgets enters into consideration here. Whether an item is a monograph or a serial may have implications for purchase and certainly for technical processing treatment. Monographs issued serially may be purchased from separate standing order funds, e.g., the various almanacs purchased for reference.

While public libraries may subscribe to Greenaway Plan agreements
with various publishers or on-approval plans from others, blanket ordering is less common than in a university or college setting. Some libraries prefer to order multiple copies through rental plans like the McNaughton Plan or in paperback to avoid filling shelves permanently with multiple copies of best-sellers or other ephemera.

An important aspect of collection development in public libraries is the selection agent. By and large the selectors in public libraries are generalists. Very little selection is done by subject specialists except in subject divisions of very large or central libraries. Selection is usually divided between adult and children's librarians, but some public libraries have found it beneficial to broaden the concept of generalist to include service to all ages.

The book selection process may vary from highly centralized to greatly dispersed. Sometimes the center of power remains with the specialists in adult or children's services in central libraries or larger libraries that service other smaller libraries. In some systems, branches can only select books after they have been selected for the central library.

At Brooklyn, all professional staff share in book selection as a matter of policy. In the golden era of the late 1960s, each book for adults or young adults was reviewed in writing and sometimes orally as well at a central meeting for book selection chaired by the adult services coordinator. The meeting was also attended by the assistant coordinator for young adult services and the Materials Selection Committee, which reviewed the ordering, suggested items for heavier ordering, and called attention to significant titles.

Lists were sent to the branches prior to those meetings to be initialed for preferences by the branch heads and the entire professional staff. Each librarian attended the central meetings in turn. The person whose turn it was to attend the meeting each week had complete responsibility for the titles chosen for his agency that week and reported back to the branch at a book meeting held at the branch level after the weekly central meeting. Later the central book meetings were dispensed with as the library started ordering through Brodart and Bookazine Companies in an attempt to get more books on the shelves faster. Central book order days were still scheduled but without a meeting for oral reviews. Librarians came individually to order the miscellaneous books received on Greenaway Plan or on approval and individual new editions, paperbacks, pamphlets, etc. For the most part these titles lacked written reviews and were ordered on the basis of information on the jackets, knowledge of the author, or inspection of the books.

Under Brodart and Bookazine each branch ordered adult and young adult books in the manner determined by its head. In some agencies all librarians were expected to read reviews and submit suggestions to the branch librarian. In other instances book order lists were divided up among the professional staff. Each librarian searched
reviews in his section, then all came together at a book order meeting or meetings to discuss the monthly order. The first assistant to the branch librarian often had the final authority to coordinate what was suggested for purchase at the meetings with the budget allotments.

In Brooklyn, children's books still receive individual reviews. In addition the Book Evaluation Committee composed of the most experienced and or capable children's librarians go over the reviews and suggest another review where advisable. The assistant children's coordinator and the children's coordinator also see the reviews.

In the Tompkins County Public Library, the assistant director is responsible for the book collection, with input from general staff meetings, regular professional meetings, and regular reference meetings as to what is needed particularly in regard to big sets. All librarians share the reviewing media and are expected to initial choices in their area of competence.

Probably the most heavily used book reviewing sources in public libraries are Library Journal and School Library Journal, Publishers' Weekly, New York Times Book Review, ALA Booklist, and Kirkus. The selection aids for periodicals, audiovisual materials, and other forms have been discussed in Katz and Ford.

The reviewing sources used in public libraries are, as a whole, less scholarly and less specialized than those available to selectors in academic libraries. In addition, it is essential for public librarians to read the newspapers. Often ads, notes of forthcoming author appearances on television, or notices of books or plays to be made into movies provide practical aids for selection of material for popular appeal. Librarians may feel obliged to supply materials in spite of poor critical reviews because of large anticipated demand. While connoisseurs of books and culture may be against this in principle, it is difficult for anyone who works in a public library to be against it in practice.

Some public libraries have written selection policies as advocated by the American Library Association. Many libraries do not. Some libraries have policies that are inadequate or tacitly ignored. Some librarians, e.g., Eric Moon, are skeptical as to how one applies a written policy in practice.

The selection policy issued by the Brooklyn Public Library in 1969, discussed widely in library literature, encompassed adult and juvenile selection, took into consideration newly vocal inner city residents, and included all types of materials, not just books. But as I recall being on the spot, we librarians were not so much influenced by what was written down as by the whole ethos of our communities and the professional milieu in which we worked. Community concerns, sometimes with political implications, formed our mandate. Book selection policies may be, however, a definite asset, even a crucial necessity, in preventing or ameliorating attempts at censorship by some group within the community. If the policies provide a procedure for the re-
view of materials, they can provide a safeguard against the zealots of whatever persuasion who may wish to remove certain materials from the collection.

Henri Veit, assistant division chief of the History Division at Brooklyn's Central Library, shared with me his collection development views. In an academic, special, or subject library one can state confidently that one will collect in a certain area of existing strength, that one will build up an area of present deficiency, or that another area will not be covered at all for a variety of reasons. In most public library situations, however, particularly in branches, the library must be so responsive to the immediate needs of its public, needs which are often fast changing, that collection development statements may become obsolete as soon as they are written. And sometimes the needs of the public are not to be met by the addition of materials to the collection but through the better organization and communication of information, as in information and referral networks or computer-based information networks.

In any case the preparation of a collection development policy involves more than the mere writing down of general principles. It involves:

1. Knowing the community and its needs, actual and projected.
2. Careful analysis of the existing collection and determining its strengths and weaknesses.
3. Establishing a weeding policy.
4. An estimate of possible or likely fluctuations in the materials budget.
5. Considering the rates of inflation in books and materials prices.
6. Considering which items may be deemed part of a core collection, which must be replaced continually, and how much to set aside for new materials.
7. Considering what and how much to purchase in nonprint forms and what the relationship of such materials will be to the existing collection.
8. Considering factors of space, rate of deterioration of materials, optimum size of the collection and its elements, loss rates, etc.
9. Knowing what other library resources are available in the community either through other agencies in the same public system or in private, academic, and nonacademic libraries in the same community and assessing the degree to which cooperation in collection development is possible.

A cursory survey of the budget statistics for some fifty-six public libraries for the period 1974–1976 suggests a range of 9 to 11 percent of public library budgets being spent on materials. In the Brooklyn Public Library, allocations are made by a committee consisting of the deputy director; the chief, public services; the adult services coordinator; the children's services coordinator; and the chief and the assistant chief, branch administration. The deciding factor
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in their consideration for the Central Library is the information provided by the chief of the Central Library as to how active the divisions have been over the past few years as compared to the funds they have received. If one division has received less, it may receive more, or vice versa. Records of figures are kept for six or seven years.

For branch allocations various factors enter into consideration:
2. The knowledge of the adult and children's coordinators about the branches based on their visits to the branches.
3. The views of the branch librarian.
4. Noticeable changes in the size and composition of a community.
5. The physical state of the collections. A statistical expert may be consulted for advice on the amount of inventory loss at each agency.

In the Brooklyn Public Library there is a guideline that 70 percent of the materials budget should go for replacements (including retrospective purchasing) and 30 percent for new titles, but the degree to which this guideline is adhered to in all branches is not known. Audiovisual materials were to have 10 percent of the materials budget, but losses have been so great that the figure has been cut to 5 percent. Funds for expenses like binding, plastic covers for periodicals, pamphlets, micromaterials, standing orders, on approvals are taken off the top of the funds before allocations are made to the branches and the central library. The administration has smaller funds for unanticipated needs. Special programs, e.g., Spanish, Reading Improvement, Homebound, Senior Citizens Office, Job Information Center, Learn Your Way, etc., get small sums for materials.

In Tompkins County for January-December 1977, books were allocated $35,943, audiovisual materials $6,600, periodicals $4,050, and pamphlets $814. The library conducted two extensive surveys of library use that seemed to indicate that "people do not read what librarians think they read." The circulation of audiovisual items was particularly heavy.

So we see that the ALA Minimum Standards may be used as a guideline for collection development in public libraries, but there may be deviations. It is difficult to formulate a model of allocation of funds for collection development because of the variety of considerations, sometimes political, which are involved. Because of the differences in practices in public libraries, predictability is not possible. In the last analysis it is the flexibility and commitment that librarians have that is crucial. For they have the most impact on the use to which materials will be put. No materials budget, however strong, can be used effectively without quality service at the level where the individual librarian brings material and patron together.
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AT THE PRECONFERENCE Institute on Collection Development in June 1977, five workshop sessions were held on various aspects of collection development. Highlights of those workshops are reported here. Copies of the "Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies" and drafts of more specialized guidelines relating to the selection process, allocation, evaluation, and weeding were considered and formed the basis of much discussion in the workshops, as noted below.

The workshop on collection development policy statements noted that:

1. A collection development policy statement must take into account the realities of who controls the budget when it isn't the library. Specifically, "How do you deal with faculty groups that control their own funds?"

2. Quantitative standards for levels of coverage need further study in view of the difficulties and possible pitfalls of such standards.

3. The specification of subjects presented in the "Guidelines" was subject to considerable criticism on the basis of unevenness. In addition to the breakdown by LC classification, there is need for a good set of descriptions.

4. The objectives of the parent institution should be included as part of the policy statement.

5. Interdisciplinary areas present special and difficult problems of description by LC class, as do area studies.

6. A collection development policy may be used for many purposes, so it should be made as useful as possible in a variety of ways by including data that is of interest to (and comprehensible to) all possible users, including administration.

7. The levels of collecting should be defined further, especially at study level and below.
8. The public librarians’ group thought that the policy guidelines could be adapted to public libraries. They also mentioned the need for flexibility, specifically to be able to respond to special opportunities as they arise.

9. Developing a collection development statement takes more time than you think it will take, no matter how much time you think it will take. By far the most effective way to go about it is to have a part-time or full-time person who has full responsibility for at least the gathering and organization of the basic data.

10. The problems of curatorship by departments of special collections, as they affect and conflict with subject responsibilities, should be clearly delineated, if possible.

11. The guidelines seem to be more focused on monographs than serials and are slanted toward the humanities and social sciences.

The workshop that discussed the draft “Guide to Selection Tools” concluded that:

1. The development of lists of reviewing journals in specific subject fields and of a guide to selection tools for foreign materials should be encouraged.

2. Both Appendix 1, the checklist for describing and evaluating selection tools, and Appendix 2, suggested elements for inclusion in a review, are good, and Appendix 2 should be sent to as many editors of reviewing tools as possible.

The workshop on the allocation of library materials budgets generated these comments:

1. The guidelines on the allocation of library materials budgets seemed to be pushing the formula approach unduly. (Not all agreed with this assessment.)

2. There was general approval of the openness and organization of the guidelines.

3. It is important not to confuse formulas for internal allocations in libraries with formulas for total dollar allocation to libraries, e.g., the Clapp-Jordan and Voigt formulas, and the latter should be removed from this set of guidelines.

4. A concern was expressed that a formula can be used adversely by one who fared worse in the formula than his/her present budget reflects.

5. There is a danger of overallocating, i.e., of allocating to too many very small, specialized departments or units, with a resulting loss of flexibility.

6. There is need to allocate in a way that reflects actual selection and selecting patterns.

7. There was a sentiment for a strong statement naming collection developing officers as those responsible for collection development. This was largely for smaller libraries, to establish their credentials with faculty.
8. There was a feeling that these guidelines and other guidelines were prepared simply in response to budgetary cuts and not in order to facilitate better planning.
9. The public librarians' group expressed concern about the generally poor budget allocation programs in public libraries and also discussed the possible applicability of the McGrath formula.

Comments from the workshop on evaluation included the following:
1. There is a need for overall evaluations or impressions of collections by users, in addition to the detailed statements on separate parts of the collection
2. Guidelines should give more help as to what should be evaluated and how a field should be defined.
3. Criteria for establishing adequacy of an evaluation should be set before starting. Is a holding of 50 percent of items on a list to be considered "good"?
4. A great need was expressed for sample lists on specific subjects, for evaluative purposes, with a clear statement of their scope and quality.

The workshop on the role of weeding of library materials for storage or discard noted that:
1. Weeding for discard is a very emotional subject, and the term weeding should not be used in the guidelines, especially when referring to storage.
2. The guidelines have a generally negative tone, with an excessive emphasis on discarding. Rewriting for clarification as well as for a change of tone was suggested.
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In addition to discrete terminology for more specific headings, Library of Congress achieves specificity by means of adjectival and phrase modifiers, compound headings, dates, and subdivisions. Examples and problems of subject heading specificity are presented and discussed.

FROM CUTTER to the present time, writers on subject heading theory have recommended that subject headings be as specific for a given work as the material in the work. Reversely stated, the specificity of the subject covered by the work should be matched by the specificity of the subject heading to cover it. Generally speaking, this concept is accepted and is questioned only occasionally by someone who objects to the dispersal of subject material in subject headings to the point where subject headings are represented by few items for a particular subject heading. This paper presupposes the desirability of specific headings, even when it results in headings having only one or two titles entered under them. Subject heading usage has developed so that headings are not only specific but also direct in form; that is, a work on the Canada goose is entered under the heading Canada goose, not under Zoology—Ornithology—Birds—Water-birds—Geese—Canada goose.

This study is an examination of the methods by which specificity is achieved in Library of Congress subject headings, examples of the application of these methods in particular headings, and a brief discussion of problems of consistency and level of specificity. The study was based on the eighth edition of Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). A sample used for the study consisted of the boldface headings on pages ending with the cipher 4, thus covering approximately one-tenth of the headings in LCSH, but the study was not limited to the sample. To determine how the headings are applied, the 1965–69 cumulation of Library of Congress Catalog: Books; Subjects (LCCBS) was consulted.

The most obvious way to achieve specificity is to use terminology
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appropriate to the various levels, of which the example of Canada goose being five steps more specific than Zoology is pointed out in a previous paragraph. Four other examples of series of headings in order of specificity are:

- Recreation; Amusements; Play; Games; Cards; Poker
- Transportation; Vehicles; Automobiles; Ford automobile
- Language and languages; Speech; Phonetics; Consonants
- Agriculture; Dairying; Dairy products; Cheese; Swiss cheese.

Sometimes the degree of specificity is not apparent from the terminology. One might assume that the heading Buildings is more specific than Architecture, but the reverse is true. According to an LC scope note, Buildings is used for general works on structures while Architecture is used for works on style and design and Building for works on construction.

Many subject headings are formulated as modified forms of other headings. The English language lacks enough unique terminology for every subject treated in books, so much use is made of modified terminology. In the foregoing examples such modified headings as Water-birds, Ford automobile, and Dairy products appear. The modifiers may be adjectives or nouns used as adjectives, and the form may be direct or inverted. Two-word headings are very common. In the sample from LCSH there are 1,742 two-word direct headings and 189 two-word inverted headings, the direct headings outnumbering the inverted headings approximately 9 to 1. Some of the headings are repetitious in that the first word is repeated in a variety of headings. For example, there are thirteen direct two-word headings beginning with animal on the page chosen for the sample; there are eighteen more such headings on adjoining pages not counted in the sample. Other direct two-word headings of which a number of cases occur include the first words Business, Educational, Mine, and Social.

Many two-word direct headings begin with a national, linguistic, or ethnic modifier, such as Flemish drama, Hungarian fiction, Indic literature, Japanese poetry, Latvian language, Malay language, Nabaloi dialect, Persian philology, Polish newspapers, and Russian periodicals. Of the above forms drama, fiction, and poetry are more specific than literature, and all are modified by a proper adjective. In the sample there are 124 modifications of language, 23 of languages, 34 of literature, and 22 of poetry.

Grammatically some of the two-word direct headings are nouns modified by adjectives, but they are not instances of headings modified to make them more specific. Distinction must be made between true modifiers and modifiers that are part of usage. Examples of the latter are Alimentary canal, Black death, Dust devils, Fancy work, Specific gravity, and Worthier title, all terms that have become established usage in particular fields.

When nouns are used in two-word direct headings, the meaning of the heading can be translated in various ways. Bookbinding machin-


ery, Bookkeeping machines, and Forging machinery can be translated as “Machinery for bookbinding,” “Machinery for bookkeeping,”
and “Machines for forging.” School physicians, School nurses, School psychologists, and School secretaries can be translated as
“Physicians [Nurses, Psychologists, Secretaries] in schools.” Insect control and Wound healing have the meaning “control of insects” and
“healing of wounds” and could be set up as subdivided headings: Insects—Control and Wounds—Healing. In the heading Children’s art,
it is not readily apparent whether the heading refers to “art of children” or “art for children”; the scope note indicates it is the
former.

The 189 instances of two-word inverted headings in which the modifier follows the noun comprise 9.8 percent of the total two-word
headings in the sample. Fifty-four of the modifiers are national, linguistic, or similar modifiers, as in Authors, American; Educators,
Muslim; Engineers, Jewish; Hymns, Spanish; and Refugees, Algerian. Thirteen headings have modifiers relating to historical period,
such as Artists, Medieval; Geography, Ancient; Maps, Early; and Swords, Prehistoric. In fourteen headings the modifier is Fossil, as in
Monkeys, Fossil. Samples of other inverted headings are Authors, Blind; Columns, Wooden; Distilling, Illicit; Lampshades, Glass; and
Salmon, Canned.

Approximately one-fifth of the inverted headings in the sample (from Explorers, American through Jurisdiction, Territorial) were
checked to see if the noun occurs also in the unmodified form. Most of them do; there are four exceptions, with three of the exceptions
being related to one noun: Fees, Consular; Fees, Ecclesiastical; Fees, Professional; and Groups, Continuous.

There are 218 examples of three-word direct headings. Many of them are formed by adding a word to a direct two-word modified
heading. Thus, with the addition of a word, Balsa wood, Birth control, Collective bargaining, Crime prevention, Mule deer; Music box,
Particle board, and Sunflower seed become Balsa wood craft, Birth control clinics, Collective bargaining unit, Crime prevention sur-
veys, Mule deer hunting, Music box music, Particle wood industry, and Sunflower seed oil.

The sample includes forty inverted three-word headings, which
comes to 15.5 percent of the total three-word headings, an appreci-
ably higher percentage than for the inverted two-word headings. The
usual form is a two-word heading followed by a comma and a
modifier. Examples are Cardiovascular instruments, Implanted; Dur-
able goods, Consumer; Piano quartets, Arranged; Poliomyelitis vacc-
cine, Oral; and Textile fibers, Synthetic. Only two headings in the
sample consisted of one word and a two-word modifier: Artists, Phys-
ically handicapped and Refugees, East Indian.

A large proportion of the modifiers are national, linguistic, and
ethnic, the total being twenty-four of the forty. Examples of such
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headings are: Buddhist sermons; Chinese; Emperor worship, Roman; Folk literature, Arabic; Processional crosses, Coptic; and Talking books, Swedish.

The large proportion of inverted three-word headings having national, linguistic, and ethnic modifiers raised the question whether three-word headings with such modifiers are always inverted, and a search was made for exceptions in which the heading was direct. Only a few were found, the most numerous being English [etc.] prose literature, but it is analogous to English drama and English poetry. An atypical heading is American books abroad in which the word abroad appears to be an adverb, although the dictionary indicates it may be either an adjective or an adverb. There is a heading Chinese examination essays, a heading for a topic that is peculiar to Chinese culture. Direct three-word headings with religious modifiers are Hindu [Islamic; Jewish] devotional calendars and similarly modified Devotional literature.

In the sample from LCSH there are sixteen four-word direct modified headings, of which the following are examples: Charge account bank plans, Interconnected electric utility systems, Real estate investment trusts, and Saline water conversion plants. The sample includes one inverted four-word heading (Air traffic rules, International) and two five-word direct headings (Fleet ballistic missile weapons systems and Multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles).

In addition to noun and adjective modifiers, a noun may be modified by a prepositional phrase. There are 441 instances of such headings in direct form in the 203-page sample. The preposition in is by far the most frequently used with a total of 301 headings. There are forty-three headings using the phrase in art, Dragons [Emotions, Fur garments, etc.] in art, and seventy-three examples of similar headings using the phrase in literature. Although enclosed in parentheses, the phrase in religion, folk-lore, etc. serves the same purpose as in art and in literature; there are twenty-four examples in the sample. Other headings of the same nature but of which there are only a few examples include Characters and characteristics in moving-pictures; European War, 1914–1918, in motion pictures; and Fleeing in the Bible.

Geographic specificity may be achieved with a prepositional phrase using in. The sample includes twenty-two headings that add in foreign countries to such typical headings as Japanese property, Lithuanian literature, and Polish students. There are thirty-seven headings for which a particular country is specified, e.g., Finnish language in Sweden, French students in Great Britain, Javanese in Sumatra, and Malay race in Ceylon.

In forty-nine headings the in prepositional phrase specifies the application of a process or a material in a particular field, e.g., Echo sounding in fishing, Explosives in forestry, and Radio in fire prevention. Other prepositional phrases with in include Amines in the
body, Intussusception in children, and Scab disease in cattle.

If the _in_ prepositional phrase is intended to make the heading more specific, it is logical to expect that there are other headings beginning with the same word or words. This is generally true in those headings for which the specification is _in art_ and _in literature_, for headings specifying _in foreign countries_ or in a particular geographical area, and for headings specifying application in a particular field of endeavor. But there are a few in which it is not true. For example, _Dampness in buildings_ is the only heading beginning with _Dampness_. There is a _see_ reference from _Buildings, Dampness in_ and a _see also_ reference from _Buildings—Protection_. _Group guidance in education_ is the only use of _Group guidance_ although the heading _Group counseling_ is used. _Humor in advertising_ and _Humor in education_ are the only headings beginning with _Humor_, but there is a reference from _Humor to Wit and humor_, the usual wording of the heading.

In a few headings the _in_ prepositional phrase does not seem to make the first word more specific but rather the reverse in that the first word is the more specific term. In _Duplicates in libraries_ the prepositional phrase does not make _Duplicates_ more specific by distinguishing it from other duplicates but rather names a specific facet of library practice. A similar interpretation could be placed on _Dampness in buildings_. _Herding behavior in animals_ does not distinguish it from herding behavior in other creatures, but it is a more specific heading than _Animals, Habits and behavior of_. In _Interaction analysis in education_ the prepositional phrase is useful for establishing the context. In the heading _Dedications (in books)_ the prepositional phrase in parentheses is a gloss.

In the 441 examples of prepositional phrases, the next most commonly used preposition is _of_ with 67 examples in direct form and 12 in inverted form. The direct form includes _Absorption of light, Conservation of natural resources, Heredity of disease_, and _Offset printing of newspapers_. A few headings are questionable examples of increasing specificity but are more likely terms of common usage: _Abstracts of title, Lost tribes of Israel, Origin of species_. The sample includes twenty-four headings _Photography of animals [art; automobiles; etc.]_ with seven similar headings on the following page. Samples of the inverted headings are _Chess players, Rating of; Matter, Kinetic theory of; and Search, Right of._

Twenty-five headings in the sample use _as_ in a phrase to make a heading more specific, of which eleven refer to profession, as in _Ship-building as a profession_. Other typical headings are _Fleas as carriers of disease, Monkeys as laboratory animals, Oats as feed_, and _Wild animals as pets._

There are eighteen headings in the sample with _for_ prepositional phrases. The object most often is a particular category of people: _Basketball for women, Camps for the handicapped_. In a few headings, things follow the preposition, as in _Fenders for docks, piers, etc._
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and Indicators for gas and oil engines. Only one of the eighteen examples could not be included in either of these groups: Packing for shipment.

Other prepositions are represented in the sample by only a few examples for each preposition: Metals at high temperatures, Export duties on canned fruit, Jurisdiction over aircraft, Legal assistance to service men, Monologues with music, Absence without leave.

The sample includes twelve headings relating to the effect of something on something else, usually a substance or a part of the body. These headings include three prepositional phrases and are inverted: Cement, Effect of temperature on; Skin, Effect of radiation on the; Plankton, Effect of water pollution on.

Another manipulation of terminology to increase specificity is to use a modifier in parentheses following the subject. The modifier may be an adjective as in Infants (Newborn) and Infants (Premature) or it may be a noun as in God (Hinduism) and God (Judaism). In the headings for infants the parentheses can be omitted and the modified heading made either direct or inverted: Newborn infants or Infants, Newborn. Legal subject headings are made more specific by adding the system of law in parentheses, such as Oaths (Canon law) and Oaths (Greek law). Parentheses are also used to enclose a gloss designating the field to which the terminology is applied: Categories (Mathematics) and Categories (Philosophy). Strictly speaking, this is not intended to make the heading more specific but to distinguish between homonyms used in more than one field.

Sometimes the word or words in parentheses is added to a heading that is already modified in some way: Manuscripts, Latin (Medieval and modern); Manuscripts, Russian (Old); Hymns, Greek (Classical); Pacemaker, Artificial (Heart); Swiss newspapers (German). Sometimes a word may be omitted from the parenthetical designation. For example, the headings Reading (Adult education) and Reading (Higher education) are used and also Reading (Elementary) and Reading (Primary).

French drama (Comedy) and French drama (Tragedy) are examples of noun modifiers used to make the headings modified by a linguistic adjective more specific. On the surface it can not readily be seen how to effect the specification otherwise; however, since Comedy and Tragedy are established headings in LCSH, why not use French comedy and French tragedy?

In subject headings for music scores, which are really subject form headings, parentheses are consistently used to enclose precise specifications of kinds and numbers of instruments following the musical form, thus: Rondos (Clarinets (4)); Variations (Violin and violoncello with string orchestra); Piano music (Pianos (2) 8 hands); Septets (Piano, clarinets (4), kettledrum, percussion).

When the subject heading covers a subject in relation to something else, the heading is formed by two nouns connected by the conjunc-
tion and. Such headings include Church and state, Crime and the press, Music and literature, Religion and science, and Television and sports.

Many headings are made more specific by adding a date or inclusive dates, the date or dates being separated from the rest of the heading by a comma. As may be expected, events in history are the principal headings so modified. In some cases there is only one heading in the LC list, but it is nevertheless modified by the date, such as Korean resistance movements, 1905-1945; Saxon emigration, 1838-1839; Krupp trial, Nuremberg, 1947-1948. In the case of European War, 1914-1918, and of World War, 1939-1945, there are cross-references from World War, 1914-1918, and European War, 1939-1945. But in other headings the specifying date is used to distinguish between two events of the same name: Peasants' War, 1524-1525; Peasants' War 1595-1597; New Orleans, Battle of, 1815; New Orleans, Battle of, 1862; Aix-la-Chapelle, Peace of, 1668; Aix-la-Chapelle, Peace of, 1748. Often the date is added to an event used as a subdivision under the name of a city as in Antwerp—Siege, 1584-1585; Philadelphia—Riots, 1831; Johnstown, Pa.—Flood, 1889. In one instance the day of the month is also specified, although no other similar heading is listed: Monguagon, Mich., Battle of, Aug. 9, 1812.

A date is sometimes added to a heading that is not a historical event but for which the date distinguishes the time treatment: Campaign songs, 1840; United States—Appropriations and expenditures, 1966. In a few instances both an ordinal numeral and a date are used: United States—Census, 18th, 1960; and Crusades—First, 1096-1099.

A major means of achieving specificity in a subject heading is by a subdivision separated from the heading by a dash. The four generally recognized types of subdivisions are form, topical, geographic, and chronological.

A form subdivision is added to a subject heading when the treatment of the subject matter is other than a discussion of the subject or when the work is an example of a particular form or a collection of that form. The list of most commonly used subdivisions (LCSH, p.xviii-1xxii) includes 130 such subdivisions. The user wanting to know what is available in a particular field may consult the heading with subdivisions Bibliography, Book reviews, Abstracts, and Indexes. One who is interested in humor relating to a particular subject should be looking for subdivisions like Anecdotes, facetiae, satire, etc.; Cartoons, satire, etc.; History, Comic, satirical, etc.; and Humor, caricatures, etc. Graphic presentations are represented under headings with the subdivisions Charts, diagrams, etc.; Designs and plans; Drawings; Iconography; Pictorial works; Portraits; and Photographs from space. The literary forms used as subdivisions under a heading include Drama, Fiction, Legends and stories, and Poetry. Types of presentation helpful to students include Handbooks, manuals, etc.; Laboratory manuals; Observers' manuals; and Out-
lines, syllabi, etc. The person interested in words may consult the subdivisions Concordances; Dictionaries; and Glossaries, vocabularies, etc. These are only a sample, and not all are used under any heading.

Entering a work under a heading with a form subdivision not only sets it apart for the user who wants it but also for the user who doesn't want it; one can ignore forms in which one is not interested. A few subdivisions are included as form subdivisions although they are discussions of the subject because it is assumed they may have particular appeal for certain users. They include Early works to 1800, Juvenile literature, and Popular works.

Topical subdivisions in LC's list of most commonly used subdivisions number 431. The variety of the subdivisions can hardly be imagined, and they cover the span of human thought and activity. Some can be categorized as events followed by the year in which they occurred (Avalanche, Flood, Storm); structures (Churches; Hotels, motels, etc.; Walls); public facilities (Bathing beaches, Hospitals, Schools); and procedures (Abstracting and indexing, Cooling, Street-cleaning). But many resist categorization and include such diverse subject aspects as Biblical teaching, Diseases and pests, Seal, and Valuation.

Many of the topical subdivisions are peculiar to a particular field of study or category of main heading. LC furnishes two lists for subdivision under place-names, one of 179 subdivisions to be used under names of regions, countries, states, etc., and the other, 217 subdivisions, under names of cities. Each list includes both form and topical subdivisions and subdivisions that are further subdivided. Many of the subdivisions in the two lists are identical.

The topical subdivision History can be modified to make it more specific: Church history; Constitutional history; History, Military; and History, Naval.

Among the hundreds of commonly used subdivisions listed in LCSH there are eighteen that can be used either as form or as topical subdivisions; that is, LC uses them both for samples of the form and for discussions of it. Some of these subdivisions are Autographs, Law and legislation, Nomenclature, Programmed instruction, and Trademarks.

Place or geographic subdivision is added to a subject heading whenever it is appropriate. This pertains to any subject that is treated from a local point of view or when the data is limited to that of a local area. The greatest problem in place subdivision is whether to make it direct or indirect. In indirect subdivision the name of a larger geographic area is inserted between the subject heading and the smaller geographic area, as in Music—Wisconsin—Milwaukee, the direct form being Music—Milwaukee. Examples of subject fields for which LCSH specifies indirect subdivision are Botany, Folk literature, Geology, and Music, while Architecture, Opera, Taxation, and Theater are given direct place subdivision. The trend in recent years is to use
more direct than indirect subdivision.

An interesting example of place specification being achieved in several ways is exemplified by the heading *Negroes*. No place designation is added when the subject covered is Negroes in the United States. When the subject is Negroes in a specific location in the United States, the subject is subdivided by place: *Negroes—Alabama* and *Negroes—Philadelphia*. When the subject covered is an area outside of the United States an *in* phrase is added: *Negroes in Canada*.

Subject headings that lend themselves to chronological, usually historical, treatment have subdivisions to reflect the subject content of works dealing with a particular time era. The specific time divisions are chosen to reflect the appropriate time divisions of the particular subject.

Time subdivisions are listed under the *United States* topical subdivisions *Church history*; *Civilization*; *Description and travel*; *Economic conditions*; *Economic policy*; *Foreign relations*; *History*; *History, Military*; *History, Naval*; *Politics and government*; *Religion*; *Social conditions*; and *Social life and customs*. Examples of the form are *United States—Civilization—19th century*; *United States—History—Colonial period, ca.1600-1775*; *United States—History—Civil War, 1861-1865*; *United States—Religion—To 1800*; and *United States—Social life and customs—1865-1918*.

Period subdivision is used under all subjects that are treated from a historical point of view and in which the treatment of a particular treatise may relate to one particular period of time. Even the heading *History, Modern* is subdivided by the various centuries, such as *16th century*. The heading *Music* is subdivided by *History and criticism*, which has period subdivisions: *To 400*; *Medieval, 400-1500*; *16th century*; etc. Examples of time subdivisions in which history is implied but not stated include: *Bibliography—Early printed books—16th century*; *English language—Middle English (1100-1500)*; *English language—Grammar—1500-1800*; and *Religious thought—Middle Ages, 600-1500*.

A topic on which much has been written will have subdivisions of all four types. *American literature* is divided directly for geographic subdivision; a list of chronological subdivisions is included; and the form subdivision *Bibliography* with further subdivisions and several topical subdivisions is listed. The wide range of subdivisions actually used is shown in *LCCBS* for 1965-69. Form subdivisions include *Addresses, essays, lectures*; *Bibliography*; *Dictionaries*; *Outlines, syllabi, etc.*; and *Translations from French*. There are topical subdivisions such as *Catholic authors*; *History and criticism*; and *Study and teaching*. The period subdivisions include *Colonial period*, *Revolutionary period, 19th century*, *Early 19th century*, and *20th century*. The heading *American literature* is subdivided geographically by cities, states, counties, and areas, e.g., *Boston*; *North Carolina*; *San Diego County, Calif.*; and *Southern States*. All of the subdivisions
may be further subdivided. For example, the form subdivision Bibliography is further subdivided by the form subdivisions First editions and Periodicals. The topical subdivision Jewish authors is subdivided by the form subdivision Addresses, essays, lectures and the topical subdivision History and criticism. The period subdivisions have such form subdivisions as Bibliography and Addresses, essays, lectures and most of them have the topical subdivision History and criticism. Several of the geographic subdivisions are further subdivided by History and criticism and form subdivisions such as Addresses, essays, lectures and Bibliography.

To this point, this study has been concerned with methods of achieving specificity. The applications of these methods to the subject fields of architecture, cookery, and children will now be shown.

In the field of architecture the more specific headings by terminology include headings for particular kinds of buildings (Castles, Clubhouses, Factories, Monuments, Theaters); parts of buildings (Domes, Floors, Gables, Walls); and concepts in architecture (Modular coordination (Architecture); Orientation (Architecture)). The buildings may be specified by their use: Archive buildings, Farm buildings, and Office buildings.

The heading Architecture is modified in direct headings such as Church architecture, Landscape architecture, Library architecture, and Military architecture and in inverted headings such as Architecture, Domestic and Architecture, Industrial. The inverted modified headings include those with national adjectives, styles of architecture, and cultural modifiers: Architecture, Italian; Architecture, Egyptian; Architecture, Gothic; and Architecture, Shaker.

The adjective architectural is used as a modifier in both direct and inverted forms: Architectural acoustics; Architectural drawing; Architectural models; Architectural societies; Decoration and ornament, Architectural; Lighting, Architectural and decorative; Photography, Architectural.

There are a few compound headings with the conjunction and, such as Architecture and climate, Architecture and religion, and Architecture and society. Others have the order reversed: Liturgy and architecture, Music and architecture. Another kind of compound heading relates architecture to persons having special needs: Architecture and mentally handicapped children, Architecture and the aged, Architecture and the physically handicapped.

Comparatively few prepositional phrases are used. They include Architecture as a profession, Architecture in art, Architecture in literature, Color in architecture, and Light in architecture. In one heading the phrase is in parentheses: Architecture (in numismatics).

The subdivisions under Architecture include form subdivisions—Collected works, Congresses, and Designs and plans—and topical subdivisions appropriate to the field, such as Conservation and restoration, Orders, and Psychological aspects.
Architecture is subdivided geographically, with various place subdivisions further subdivided by an assortment of subdivisions similar to those listed under Architecture. The word architecture may be a subdivision under Indians and similar headings like Indians of North America. The subdivision Study and teaching has direct geographical subdivision, resulting in the heading Architecture—Study and teaching—Italy (meaning study and teaching of architecture in Italy) instead of Architecture—Italy—Study and teaching (meaning study and teaching of the architecture of Italy), whereas the history topical heading is Architecture—Italy—History.

History of architecture is designated in various ways. For general overall histories of architecture the subdivision History is used with Architecture; it is also used with inverted headings like Architecture, Baroque and Architecture, Domestic, with geographic subdivisions of Architecture, and with geographic subdivisions of Architecture, Domestic. However, for the major time divisions in history, the inverted headings Architecture, Ancient; Architecture, Medieval; and Architecture, Modern are used. History is used as a topical subdivision under Architecture, Modern, but for specific centuries the heading is subdivided by 17th–18th centuries, 19th century, and 20th century as appropriate.

The methods of achieving specificity under Cookery are interesting. Specific terminology for procedures include Baking, Broiling, and Roasting (Cookery) and for finished products, Bread, Pizza, and Stews. The direct modified headings are used for methods relating to equipment: Electric cookery and Pressure cookery. The inverted headings Cookery, Marine and Cookery, Military are used for cookery in the armed services. All other inverted modified headings with Cookery are national, ethnic, or cultural (Cookery, Danish; Cookery, Greek; Cookery, Mennonite) except Cookery, International and Cookery, Tropical. Another section is devoted to cooking of particular food materials in which the specifying term is enclosed in parentheses: Cookery (Beans), Cookery (Cheese), and Cookery (Veal). Works on quantity cooking have the heading Cookery for institutions, etc. Other headings with the preposition for relate to cookery for people with dietary problems: Cookery for cardiacs, Cookery for diabetics, and Cookery for the sick. There is one heading using the preposition in: Cookery in literature.

Specification in subject headings relating to children is diverse. The main heading Children has topical subdivisions like Care and hygiene, Employment, Language, and Religious life. More specific headings of different terminology include Boys, Girls, Infants, and Stepchildren. Direct modified headings include Abandoned children, Exceptional children, and Runaway children. The direct modified headings include ethnic modifiers: Jewish children; Negro children, and Oriental children. Sometimes the subdivision Children is added to ethnic headings: Eskimos—Children; Indians of North
America—Children; and Maoris—Children. Some inverted modified headings are: Children, Adopted; Children, Blind; and Children, Vagrant. Some headings include a gloss in parentheses for specific kinds of law: Children (Hindu law), Children (International law), and Children (Islamic law).

The relationship of children to other subjects is expressed by compound headings: Children and animals, Children and death, and Children and politics. In some headings the wording is reversed: Comic books and children, Dancing and children, and Traffic safety and children.

Prepositional phrase headings include Children as actors, Children as musicians, Children as witnesses, Children in art, Children in classical antiquity, Children in Egypt, Children in foreign countries, and Children in the Bible. Headings including the preposition of relate to the kind of parents: Children of immigrants, Children of the rich, Children of working mothers. In some headings children is the object of the preposition: Books and reading for children, Education of children, Etiquette for children and youth, and Social work with children.

Two similar headings with somewhat different meanings are Radio and children and Radio programs for children. Analogous headings are used for television and moving-pictures.

There are a number of headings in direct form with the possessive children's modifying a noun, as in Children's clothing, Children's dreams, Children's museums, and Children's rights. These can be reworded with of or for as “Clothing for children”; “Dreams of children”; “Museums for children”; and “Rights of children.” Children's literature is literature for children; Children's writings are writings of or by children. Occasionally the order is reversed: Children's librarians, but Libraries, Children's. Library of Congress uses Portraits and Prayer-books and devotions as subdivisions under Children. Why not “Children's portraits” and “Children's prayer-books and devotions”? There is a heading Children's missals.

The word children is a topical subdivision in World War, 1939-1945—Children. Another subdivision with a somewhat different meaning is United States—History—Civil War, 1861-1865—Juvenile participants.

In addition to headings with children phraseology, there are a few with child or juvenile: Child study; Child welfare; Juvenile courts; Juvenile detention homes; Opera, Juvenile; and Press, Juvenile. The word juvenile is also used in some form subdivisions: Dictionaries, Juvenile and Juvenile literature.

There is a lack of consistency in the formation of specific headings in some facets. In formulating headings relating to research, perhaps the most common form is a modified direct phrase: Botanical research, Historical research, and Linguistic research. Three-word headings are also relatively common: Small business research, Social
sciences research, and Solar energy research. There is only one heading in which the heading is inverted: Research, Industrial. Instances in which research is a subdivision are common: Banks and banking—Research; Children—Research; and Nutrition—Research. In the field of music the pertinent heading is Musicology to which there are cross-references from Musical research and Research, Musical.

For exhibitions the form is usually the subdivided subject: Book industries and trade—Exhibitions; Engineering—Exhibitions; and Photography—Exhibitions. A few headings are modified and direct: Agricultural exhibitions, Horticultural exhibitions, and Livestock exhibitions. There are no inverted headings relating to exhibitions. Specialized headings are Dog-shows, Flower shows, and Horse-shows. There are see references from Libraries—Exhibitions and Library displays to Library exhibits. The heading Library exhibits apparently relates to exhibits in libraries, rather than to exhibits concerning libraries.

Some headings are not as direct as one might expect. Branch banks is a subdivision of Banks and banking. It might well be a subject by itself, just as Chain banks and Savings-banks are separate headings. Likewise Children’s dances is a subdivision of Dancing and could be a separate heading like Children’s art and Children’s songs.

We may be inclined to smile when we encounter a heading as specific as Leaflets dropped from aircraft. On the other hand, there are some which are less specific than we might expect. Sometimes two topics that are related are covered in a compound heading, as in Clocks and watches, although more specific headings are listed for each, such as Calendar watches and Tower-clocks. LCSH combines Encyclopedias and dictionaries instead of making two separate headings. A heading may consist of two opposites, as Belief and doubt. This heading treats belief from a philosophical standpoint; works relating to religious belief and doubt are assigned the one-word heading Faith. In some headings an object and a process may be combined, as in Wine and wine making, or an establishment and its business, as in Banks and banking. In each case there are more specific headings that indicate the subject could be divided.

Some subdivisions are worded to lump various designations together, and, when the subdivision closes with etc., the subdivision can be quite broad. Examples are Auditoriums, convention facilities, etc. and Stores, shopping centers, etc. There is a subdivision Cases, clinical reports, statistics to be used under medical headings, but Statistics is the subdivision to be used when the work consists of only a compilation of statistics. Subdivisions dealing with two aspects that could presumably be treated as two separate subdivisions include Collectors and collecting, Diseases and pests, and Emigration and immigration.

Formulation of broad headings is sometimes a difficult problem.
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LCCBS cumulations covering 1950-69 do not include the heading *Children's paraphernalia*, but in the more recent cumulation it is used for two titles: *Antiques of American Childhood* and *The Age of Innocence; An Exhibition of the Child and His World*. The heading is subdivided by *Collectors and collecting* and *Exhibitions*. Other examples of broad headings used by LC are *Earth sciences* and *Life sciences*, but not *Behavioral sciences*.

The problem of achieving specificity is very real and urgent for the cataloger who must assign one or more headings to a work. With the subject of the book and its usefulness in mind, the cataloger must establish the degree of specificity and then express that specificity by appropriate terminology, which may be specific terminology, terminology with adjectival or phrase modifiers in direct or inverted form or added in parentheses, or subdivision appropriate for form, topic, place, and/or period, or by a combination of methods. The user of the catalog must be aware of the variations in specificity and the terminology, with the added realization that search under a less specific heading may be rewarding. Specificity is a major problem in subject heading formulation.
Examining the Library of Congress
Subject Catalog

DAVID F. KOHL
Head, Holland Centralized Circulation
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

The developing role of automation at the Library of Congress is causing a
review of its book catalog publishing program. With the possibility of substi-
tual changes in sight, the Catalog Use Committee of the Reference and Adult
Services Division of the American Library Association (RASD), in conjunc-
tion with the Library, undertook a survey of the LC Subject Catalog to
determine how purchasing libraries used the catalog and what changes in
format, content, and cost would be most desirable. Among the findings, the
survey revealed that the catalog is used primarily by technical service person-
nel, that the non-English language listings are substantially more important to
users than the listings requiring special subject headings, and that there is
considerable opposition to a microfilm version of the catalog.

THE PRINTED catalogs of the Library of Congress have been a
familiar feature in most libraries for over three decades. Beginning in 1942 with the publication of the first volumes of *A Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards Issued to July 31, 1942*, the Library of Congress book catalog publishing program has
grown steadily. By 1953 there were separate book catalogs for books
(both author and subject), maps, motion pictures and filmstrips, and
music and phonograph records. And in 1956 the Library of Congress
began its largest single bibliographic project, the *National Union
Catalog, Pre-1956 Imprints*.

These book catalogs were made possible by the development of a
photo-offset technology that allowed the transfer of a photographic
picture of the catalog card directly onto the printed page. Applied to
the Library of Congress card catalogs, this technology opened up a
new dimension in the dissemination of bibliographic information and
made available to both the library community and the general public
an important national resource. Now, in turn, the photo-offset tech-
niques are giving way to a new technology that promises to radicalize
further the possibilities of library catalogs—the computer-based
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The impact of automation at the Library of Congress is not expected to eliminate the printed book catalog program there, but it will substantially affect the publishing program. The speed with which events are progressing is perhaps shown by the fact that hearings were held at Midwinter 1978 on the projected freezing of the Library of Congress card catalogs January 1, 1980, in order to go to an automated system (now postponed to January 1, 1981, because of pressure from the library community). With the production of LC printed catalogs from MARC records a new era will open in terms of format, content, organization, and cost of LC-produced book catalogs.

It was in anticipation of these developments that the Catalog Use Committee of RASD undertook a study of the Library of Congress Subject Catalog to determine how this book catalog presently was being used in libraries and which changes in format, content, organization, and cost would be most beneficial to libraries and their patrons.

The Subject Catalog was selected because it was a major LC book catalog and because adapting it to automation based publishing presented some unique challenges. A chance to consider changes in the Subject Catalog is somewhat unusual for it has undergone little substantive change of scope or design since it was first proposed by Seymour Lubetzky in 1948. This lack of change has been due to the foresight and thoroughness with which Lubetzky proposed and implemented production of the catalog and in part to the inflexibility of the photo-offset production process.

History of the Subject Catalog

The successful publication and wide acceptance of the Library of Congress 1942 book catalog not only led to a proposal for its continuation in 1947 under the title Cumulative Catalog of Congress Printed Cards but began to stir interest in a subject version of the catalog as well. The LC book catalogs generated to this point had been essentially an author record. In 1948 the Library of Congress Information Bulletin reported a plan by Seymour Lubetzky to “produce a subject list of optimum value at the most economical cost.”

Although offered only as a proposal for comment and criticism, the plan showed characteristic Lubetzky thoroughness and outlined what were later to be the basic features of the Subject Catalog. In terms of scope, Lubetzky’s proposal stated that:

Entries were to be alphabetical under their subject headings, and although entries from libraries other than LC would be included, only the LC form of subject headings would be used. Entries for publications not normally assigned subject headings—fiction, autobiographies, administrative reports, and the like—were to be supplied with spe-
cially created subject headings. Although the creation of these special subject headings would be costly and time consuming, there was no other acceptable way to have a complete subject catalog parallel to the primarily author record of the earlier Cumulative Catalog. Production was to be from cards using the same photo-offset method used to produce the Cumulative Catalog.

Lubetzky did give consideration to the possibility of a classified subject list—arranging entries by classification number rather than by subject headings. However, such a list was seen to have several drawbacks. It would have required an index to mediate between class number and topic, multiple class numbers for interdisciplinary materials, and special arrangements for areas such as law, which did not have Library of Congress class numbers. It also would have posed problems for users accustomed to the one step subject organization of bibliographies, indexes, and local card catalogs. Consequently, Lubetzky rejected the classified subject list.

Not surprisingly, Lubetzky's ideas were considered sound, and in 1950 the first volumes of the Library of Congress Subject Catalog were published closely following Lubetzky's 1948 proposal. The Cumulative Catalog was appropriately renamed Library of Congress Author Catalog. This parallelism worked until 1953 when the range of book catalogs produced by LC was further widened. Then the author and subject catalogs became respectively the Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Authors and the Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects.

For Books: Subjects this name change reflected a change in the catalog's scope as well. From January 1953 on, maps and atlases, motion pictures and filmstrips, music and phonorecords were removed from the subject catalog and listed instead in the separate book catalogs now being produced by the Library for each of these areas. Subsequently unchanged for almost twenty years, the name of the subject catalog completed full circle in the name cycle when its name recently was changed once again to Subject Catalog.

Method

To determine how this catalog, conceived almost thirty years ago, was meeting today's needs, the committee felt that the appropriate instrument for investigation would be a survey questionnaire sent to a random sample of Subject Catalog users. A questionnaire was developed in conjunction with LC focusing on three main areas: who used the Subject Catalog; how important were its "special features"; and what alternatives users would be willing to pay for and at what price.

The questionnaire was sent to a survey group of eighty-four libraries—sixty-four domestic and twenty foreign—selected at random from the Library of Congress mailing list of libraries purchasing the Subject Catalog. Both foreign and domestic groups constituted a 10 percent sample of their total populations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Checking classification numbers</td>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject heading authority</td>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature search</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining parallel subject</td>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headings</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use by patrons</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check of material available</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in a specific discipline</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification of references</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The return rate was relatively good. Thirteen of the twenty foreign libraries responded (65 percent), while fifty-six of the sixty-four domestic libraries (88 percent) returned completed questionnaires. Of the eight domestic libraries not responding, four did not reply at all, while the other four replied but did not fill out the questionnaires because of various misunderstandings. There was no observable pattern among those libraries not completing the questionnaire, and so those responding did not appear to represent a skewed group.

**Findings—Use**

Although the committee's main interest in the Subject Catalog was as a public service tool, our survey revealed that it was of primary importance to the technical service units. Fifty-seven percent of the libraries reported they had copies of the Subject Catalog in acquisitions and cataloging areas, and the two most common tasks for which the catalogs were used—checking classification numbers and as a subject heading authority—are cataloging tasks. The strongest evidence of the importance of the Subject Catalog to the technical service units, however, came in response to the request, "Indicate the importance of the use of the Subject Catalog within your department." Twenty-four of the institutions clearly specifying for which department they were responding reported the Subject Catalog as indispensable. Of these twenty-four, nineteen were cataloging departments, while only five were reference departments.

The value of the Subject Catalog to the public services was by no means small, however. Seventy-three percent of the libraries reported they had copies of the Subject Catalog either in a public area or in a nonpublic area with public access permitted, while 31 percent of the catalogs were located specifically in reference areas. The third most common use of the Subject Catalog was for literature searches.

The survey also showed that the number of copies of the Subject Catalog sold does not adequately indicate the extent of its use and value. Twenty-nine percent of the libraries reported that other institu-
tions made use of their Subject Catalog, and almost half (48 percent) reported that they gave superseded issues of the catalog to other libraries or agencies.

Findings—Special Features

Both the non-English language listings and the special subject headings of the Subject Catalog constitute special and expensive elements of the catalog. The non-English language listings provide an easily identifiable group of listings that we felt might be of particular interest to many libraries. Also, the MARC data base does not include any listings in a nonroman alphabet and so inclusion of such listings once the Subject Catalog is generated from MARC tapes would require extra expense and time. The special subject headings are those assigned to cataloged items which do not in the normal course of cataloging receive subject headings. Generating these special subject headings for belles lettres, e.g., French Fiction, Fiction in English, etc., solely that an item may be entered in the Subject Catalog is an expensive and time-consuming process. There is, however, no other way to include these items in the Subject Catalog. We were, therefore, curious to know how important these aspects were to user libraries.

More important to libraries were the non-English language listings. Seventy-five percent of the libraries reported that they used the non-English language listings, and 57 percent indicated that they would be significantly handicapped without them. The special subject headings were considered much less important. Forty-nine percent of the libraries said they used them, but only 20 percent reported they would be significantly handicapped without them.

When asked if they would buy a separate volume of either the non-English language listings or the special subject listings, responding libraries showed considerable interest—48 percent would buy the non-English language volume and 33 percent would buy the special subject volume. But only one library in each case reported that it would buy the separate volume in place of the Subject Catalog. The overwhelming majority—96 percent of the institutions interested in the special entries volume and 94 percent of the institutions interested in the non-English volumes—indicated that they would buy the special volumes in addition to the Subject Catalog.

Findings—Alternatives

The third purpose of the questionnaire was to determine what kinds of changes would be acceptable to or welcomed by users. Since it was felt that cost would be important, all these questions were put within varying cost contexts. For example, question nine asked: "If both formats were available, would you purchase the Subject Catalog in microform rather than your present hard copy edition, if it cost: (A) The same, (B) 10 percent less, (C) 25 percent less, (D) 50 percent less."

The most surprising finding in this section was the resistance to a
microform version of the Subject Catalog. At a 10 percent reduction in the current price, only 4 percent of the libraries reported they would buy microform rather than hard copy. At a 50 percent reduction in the current price, less than half of the responding libraries (48 percent) indicated they would switch from hard copy to microform.

This resistance was confirmed by another question that asked if the library would buy a microform version of the Subject Catalog if only that form were available. At the current price, 35 percent of the libraries said "no," and even at a 25 percent reduction in the price, 16 percent continued to reject microform even if hard copy were not available.

The comments section at the end of the questionnaire underlined librarians’ reluctance to see the Subject Catalog produced in microform. Although only three of the responding libraries made comments, all the comments dealt with the microform issue and none were positive. It appeared that the main resistance to microform was from the public service units, but to what degree they alone were responsible for the consistent reaction against microform was unclear.

Among other findings concerning alternatives, one of the most interesting was that librarians still did not wish to see the Subject Catalog replaced by a classified—Lubetzky’s discarded alternative. Even if the price were reduced by 25 percent, more than half of the responding libraries (55 percent) would not consider the index an acceptable substitute. The response to this question is complicated by the fact that the proposed alternative would have included only titles cataloged by LC, not other libraries.

Summary

The Library of Congress Subject Catalog appears to be primarily a tool for the technical service divisions, though significant use is made of it in the public service divisions as well. Of the two special features of the catalog, the non-English language listings are by far the more important to responding libraries than the special subject headings.

In terms of format the responding libraries showed a surprising reluctance to accept microform even when considerable cost savings were involved. And Lubetzky’s decision in favor of an alphabetical subject catalog over a classified index was solidly reaffirmed by responding libraries almost thirty years later.

A detailed report with recommendations was made to the Library of Congress on June 22, 1976. Copies of the full report are available at photocopy cost ($ .50) from: David F. Kohl, Holland Library, Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164.
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Library Resources & Technical Services
President’s Report

NORMAN DUDLEY, President

The completion of the second edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* and the Library of Congress’ decision to adopt these rules on January 1, 1980, precipitated several of the most important activities undertaken by the division in 1977–78. The RTSD board first had to consider the question of the most effective structure for the ongoing revision of the rules after the publication of the second edition, as well as the appointment of the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee.

When the ad hoc Catalog Code Revision Committee was created in 1974, its charge included the provision that, upon publication of *AACR 2*, authority within ALA for code revision would revert to the Descriptive Cataloging Committee (DCC) of the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS). The board asked its International Cataloging Consultation Committee to make recommendations as to whether this was the most appropriate path to follow, and at the 1978 Midwinter Meeting that committee recommended that authority for code revision and maintenance be vested in either an RTSD divisional level committee or in DCC.

It recommended further that these two options be placed on the RTSD ballot for the election of 1978–79 officers for expressions of preference by the membership. The board tabled this recommendation until the 1978 Annual Conference, but it also instructed the RTSD president to solicit opinions on the matter from those who were involved and interested in it and to report on the response to this solicitation at the Annual Conference. An open letter from the RTSD president was therefore sent to a number of RTSD and non-RTSD members, and it also appeared in the *RTSD Newsletter* and the *LC Information Bulletin*.

A total of 128 responses was received by the time of the Annual Conference, with opinion being divided almost exactly evenly between a divisional committee and the DCC. This was reported at an open meeting of the RTSD board at the 1978 Annual Conference, and, after considerable discussion by board members and others in attendance, the board voted to assign the authority and responsibility for catalog code revision and maintenance to the Cataloging and Classification Section, which in turn assigned it to its Descriptive Cataloging Committee. The board also named Frances Hinton, incoming chairperson of CCS, to be the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for a term of two years, this appointment to be subject to renewal.

In addition to providing for ongoing catalog code revision and maintenance after the publication of *AACR 2*, RTSD was also involved in the development of programs to help introduce the second edition. The board appointed an ad hoc *AACR 2* Introductory Program Committee, under the chairmanship of
Doralyn Hickey, and at the 1978 Annual Conference approved the following recommendations from that committee.

1. An introductory audiovisual presentation, consisting of four videotapes and a series of graphics, would be designed under the guidance of RTSD, with negotiations being undertaken with ALA Publishing Services to produce and market the presentation.

2. An introductory training conference on AACR 2 would be conducted under the auspices of RTSD in conjunction with the 1979 ALA Midwinter Meeting, the conference to be limited to approximately 200 participants selected from appropriate ALA and non-ALA groups. It would utilize the videotapes and graphics prepared by RTSD, together with knowledgeable speakers and discussion leaders, with specific attention being given to preparing the attendees for a future role in serving as resource persons for subsequent conferences and workshops on AACR 2.

In addition to the activities of the AACR 2 Introductory Program Committee, Joseph Howard, head of the Processing Division of the Library of Congress, informed the RTSD president in spring 1978 that LC had developed a training program for its own staff to introduce AACR 2, and he offered to present this program in a two-day workshop prior to the 1979 Annual Conference in Dallas and to present it also to local groups around the country in the summer and fall of 1979 if RTSD would assume responsibility for making the arrangements and paying the travel and living expenses of the program leaders. The RTSD board accepted this offer enthusiastically at the 1978 Annual Conference and asked the executive secretary and the chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups to be responsible for making the arrangements.

The RTSD and LC programs will complement each other. The former is to be broadly designed, for an audience that will include administrative and public service staff and informed laypersons, as well as catalogers and other technical service personnel, while the latter will focus on the specific needs of catalogers who will be using AACR 2 on a daily basis.

In addition, during 1977-78, the Filing Committee completed a draft of the new filing rules that was reviewed and discussed at an open meeting at the Annual Conference. It is hoped that the completed rules can be published and available by the time AACR 2 is adopted by LC.

The board also considered the matter of the division's support of RTSD and ALA representatives to international meetings. At the Midwinter Meeting it passed a resolution that, pending establishment of a clear, general policy by the ALA Executive Board on this matter, RTSD would not approve the payment of more than 30 percent of the total expenses of a person who is attending an international meeting when that person is representing both RTSD and ALA.

The division did pay a portion of the expenses incurred by Doralyn Hickey in attending the meeting of the IFLA Professional Board, which was held in The Hague in November 1977. Hickey is a member of that board by virtue of her position as chairperson of the Division of Bibliographic Control, and she prepared a report for the Annual Conference on the present and future activities of the board.

The RTSD Planning Committee has deferred completion of its ALA Planning Chart, pending clearer guidelines from the ALA Planning Committee, and devoted its energies in 1977-78 to revising the RTSD Goals for Action, which were last revised in 1974.

In the last general election, ALA membership ratified an amendment to the ALA Bylaws, Article IV, Section 2(b), which reads: "Each division of the As-
association shall be entitled to one Councilor to be elected for a term of four years by the members of the division." In order for RTSD to be in conformity with ALA, the RTSD board instructed its Bylaws Committee to prepare an amendment to the RTSD bylaws that would reflect this new ALA Bylaws provision. It also instructed its current Nominating Committee to nominate candidates for RTSD Councilor in the next election. The ALA Election Committee, in order to provide for a staggering of terms for divisional councilors, drew lots for the terms for the initial divisional councilor elections, and RTSD was one of those assigned a four-year term. The RTSD divisional Councilor will therefore be elected for the 1979-83 term.

At the Midwinter Meeting the board adopted a policy on the copyrighting of works published in LRTS, the contents of which had not been previously copyrighted. Under the new law, however, copyright exists from the moment of creation of a work and remains with the author unless assigned elsewhere. Under the terms of the new policy, contributors to LRTS will be offered three options: (1) retain all rights and register the work, (2) assign certain rights to ALA, according to an agreement to be developed, (3) take no action. In the first case the article will indicate that the work is copyrighted by the author. In the second case it will indicate that the work is copyrighted by ALA. In the third case the article will contain no statement regarding copyright.

In other actions, the board, upon the recommendation of the RTSD Organization Committee, approved the creation of the RTSD Education Committee, to replace the RTSD/LED Committee on Education for Resources and Technical Services, and dissolved the ad hoc Committee on Interlibrary Networks and the RASD/RTSD/ASLA Public Documents Committee, instructing the RTSD president to appoint a representative to GODORT, at their request.

RTSD's budget outlook for 1978-79 is bright. It was anticipated at the time of the 1978 Midwinter Meeting that the division would start the year with a balance of more than $29,000 to be carried forward. At that time revenues of $65,100 and expenses of $71,600 were projected for 1977-78, which would have resulted in a year-end balance of approximately $23,000. Expenses in 1977-78 have been less than anticipated, however, and revenues have been greater, so the beginning balance for 1978-79 should be even greater than was projected in January.

Much of the most interesting and substantive activity in RTSD takes place in its four sections, Cataloging and Classification (CCS), Reproduction of Library Materials (RLMS), Resources (RS), and Serials (SS), and I am not including any mention of what they have accomplished in 1977-78 in this report only because each section chairperson has prepared an annual report that summarizes the activities of that section much better than the president can from his more distant vantage point.

Four major resignations within RTSD during 1977-78 made it a memorable year for many of us. In December 1977 Carol R. Kelm, executive secretary of RTSD for the past nine years, resigned. Procedures for replacing her were instituted almost immediately, with interviews being held at the Midwinter Meeting in January 1978 and at ALA Headquarters in May 1978. William Bunnell, head librarian at the County College of Morris in New Jersey, was appointed executive secretary of RTSD, effective August 1, 1978. From March 1, 1978, to June 15, 1978, RTSD was extremely fortunate in being able to enlist the services of Donna Harlan, currently on leave from the Indiana University Library, as interim executive secretary. The division owes Mrs.
Harlan an enormous debt of gratitude for the outstanding job she did in holding things together during that difficult interim period.

At its Midwinter Meeting, the RTSD board adopted a resolution expressing regret for Mrs. Kelm's resignation and commending her for her "dedication to the goals of the Division, for her intelligent and efficient fulfillment of the responsibilities of the position, and for her never-failing courtesy in serving the officers and members of RTSD."

On May 16, 1978, Pauline Atherton, RTSD vice-president/president-elect, resigned that position, effective immediately. The newly elected vice-president/president-elect, William Gosling, assistant university librarian at Duke University, assumed the duties of the presidency immediately following the 1978 Annual Conference and will hold that office for two years, in addition to discharging the duties of the vice-president for the first year, 1978-79. Other new RTSD board members are the four newly elected section vice-chairpersons, Julie Nilson (CCS), Jeffrey Heynen (RLMS), Jean Boyer Hamlin (RS), and Dorothy Pearson (SS), and the newly elected vice-chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups, David Remington.

In December 1977 Mary Pound, editor of the RTSD Newsletter since its inception in January 1976, submitted her resignation from that position. The resignation was originally to have taken effect on June 30, 1978, but she later indicated that she would be glad to continue until a successor could be found. The RTSD board adopted a resolution at the Annual Conference commending Mary Pound for services as editor and recognizing her significant contribution to the promotion of the activities of the Resources and Technical Services Division.

In June 1978 Wesley Simonton, nearing completion of two terms as editor of Library Resources & Technical Services, asked the board to seek a successor and indicated that he would continue until a successor could be found. The RTSD board adopted a resolution recognizing his contributions to advancing the interests of the division.

At the Annual Conference the board also appointed an ad hoc committee to prepare announcements of these two vacancies, to invite applications for them, and to present the results to the board at the 1979 Midwinter Meeting.

It is quite possible that every RTSD president, in looking back over the year of his or her incumbency, has felt that it has been a particularly challenging, lively, even hectic year. Whether or not this is so, and I strongly suspect that it is, 1977-78 can certainly be characterized in those terms. It was a wild time, and I wouldn't have missed it for anything.

Cataloging and Classification Section Report

ELIZABETH L. TATE, Chairperson

This year, as in the past, the story of the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) is told in the activities and accomplishments of its various units.

The three committees with deadlines permitting no extension fulfilled their responsibilities capably and punctually. The Margaret Mann Citation Committee selected as this year's recipient a member of the British Library staff, Derek Austin, in recognition of his outstanding work in developing, refining,
and sharing the concepts of the PREserved Context Index System (PRECIS). The Nominating Committee, in spite of unforeseen obstacles, assembled a slate of nominees with time to spare before the election. The Program Committee offered conference a program on June 26, 1978, that explored the question of whether or not the development of bibliographic networks and standards is affecting our traditional user-oriented philosophy of cataloging. The fact that the audience was as large after intermission as before attests to the interest and excellence of the papers presented by William DeJohn, D. Kathryn Weintraub, Ruth L. Tighe, and Michael Gorman at “Whither MARC and Mann?”

This program was a cooperative undertaking, cosponsored by the Public Library Association, the Reference and Adult Services Division, the RASD Catalog Use Committee, and RTSD, whose participation the CCS Program Committee had invited as one means of keeping open the communication channels between the public services and the technical services librarians. At the invitation of the RASD Catalog Use Committee, CCS cosponsored the successful all-day program, “Commercial COM Catalogs: How to Choose—When to Buy.”

The CCS representatives to the RASD Catalog Use Committee and to the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee also serve to keep communication channels open. Appointed for the first time this year, the CCS representative to the Subcommittee on Bibliographic Control of Microforms of the Resources Section Micropublishing Committee has kept the Executive Committee fully informed about the projects of that group. And the assistant editors faithfully reported the state of affairs with regard to the twenty-two contributions in cataloging and classification reviewed for LRTS. For the section’s new Cataloging Norms Discussion Group the topics of principal interest were quantity and quality norms for professional and paraprofessional personnel.

The four committees with long-term assignments continued their efforts to find solutions to the problems before them. The Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee concentrated its attention on an alternative catalog card format more appropriate in catalogs serving the younger public. However, because the changes advocated by the committee relate chiefly to descriptive cataloging, the committee has decided to postpone further work until after the publication of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR). The Policy and Research Committee also must await the publication of the revised code before addressing certain of its primary concerns. In realizing its self-set goal of becoming a vital part of the decision process in CCS, the Policy and Research Committee has been helpful and supportive to the Executive Committee in considering the questions before it.

At the June 1978 meetings, the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), the most active of the CCS committees at present, received the final report of its Subcommittee on Subject Analysis of African and Asian Materials and reviewed the progress made by the Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis in the ambitious program it has undertaken to help implement the 1976 ALA resolution. At the Midwinter sessions, SAC adopted the final report of the Subcommittee on Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials. The “Guidelines for the Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials,” which constitutes the essence of this report, has been designed primarily to standardize and improve the quality of the AV cataloging prepared by centralized processing agencies. The Executive Committee on June 24 accepted the “Guidelines”
with some modifications and has referred it to the RTSD Board for approval prior to dissemination to the professional press. In its continuing efforts to tackle specific problems in subject analysis, SAC has decided to create a subcommittee on subject headings consisting of names other than persons, places, or corporate bodies, a problem that is particularly troublesome for catalogers in art libraries.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee (DCC) received and adopted the final report of its Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging of Asian and African Materials on June 27. Throughout the year, the committee has been monitoring the work done by Margaret Maxwell on a manual to be published by ALA for use with revised AACR. This has been a crucial year for DCC, for its continued existence has been in doubt. The assignment of responsibility for catalog code revision and maintenance after publication of the second edition of AACR was a major item on the 1978 annual conference agenda of the RTSD Board. After the Board's decision favoring CCS, the Executive Committee quickly returned the responsibility to DCC. However, the Board suggested certain changes because the milieu has changed since the responsibility previously belonged to DCC, and the CCS Executive Committee has created an ad hoc committee to make recommendations about the future functions and structure of DCC. The Board delegated to CCS the privilege of nominating the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR, as now reconstituted, and concurred with the Executive Committee's selection of Frances Hinton.

One other question was a primary concern to the Executive Committee. It has become increasingly apparent that catalogers specializing in area materials feel the need for an opportunity to discuss and seek solutions to their area-oriented problems. Various organizational patterns by which CCS could accommodate this interest were explored at a well-attended meeting on June 27. Rejecting the discussion group as a solution, the Executive Committee concluded that either the subcommittee or committee pattern should be selected in terms of the specific interests of the members asking for representation. To solve the problem that placed the issue on the agenda, the Executive Committee established a standing committee to succeed the two ad hoc subcommittees on the cataloging of Asian and African materials.

Of all the sections and round tables that comprise ALA, the Cataloging and Classification Section, as of May 31, 1978, was surpassed in memberships by only one other section. One reason surely is the dedication of those whose work has been described above. Without the energy and enthusiasm of all of them, and of the chairpersons in particular, the story of CCS would have little substance.

**Resources Section Report**

SHEILA T. DOWD, Chairperson

The Resources Section's accomplishments are the sum of the work of its several committees: Bookdealer-Library Relations (Edna Laughrey, Chair); Collection Development (Jean Boyer Hamlin, Chair); Library Materials Price Index (Noreen Gilb Alldredge, Chair); Micropublishing (Francis Spreitzer,
Chair); and Policy and Research (William Myrick, Chair). In reviewing the events of the past year it is clear that these groups have developed a sense of direction and purpose that gives a continuity to their work and enables them to make solid contributions to the library community. The formal committee struc-
ture is supplemented by four discussion groups which permit section mem-
bers to participate in exchanges of ideas, to raise questions, and to pro-
vide stimulus for the further work of the committees. Three of the discussion
groups have been meeting for several years: Chief Collection Development
Officers of Large Research Libraries (Wilmer Baatz, Chair); Chief Collection
Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries (Noreen
Alldredge, Chair); and Acquisition of Library Materials (Sara Heitschu,
Chair). This year the Resources Section Executive Committee approved the
establishment of a fourth, the Library Booksellers Discussion Group. The ap-
proval was won when the organizing efforts of Barry Fast and colleagues
demonstrated that a sizable number of the section’s members recognized a
need for such a forum. Seventy-five discussants attended the June 24 meeting
in Chicago at which Fast, Clara Mac Chittum, Lucille Gordon, John Secor,
and Don Surratt were elected to the Steering Committee for 1978/79.

A summary of the activities of this vigorous section must be selective. After
many months of hearing and investigating complaints from librarians regard-
ning nondelivery of prepaid orders, the Bookdealer-Library Relations Commit-
tee published a paper, “The Dilemma of Prepayments,” in the November
1977 American Libraries. The committee also enlisted the support of appro-
priate legal agencies for libraries attempting to secure refunds on unpub-
lished or undelivered orders. The Micropublishing Committee and its subcommittees
initiated dialogues with representatives of the micropublishing industry and
staff of the Library of Congress, the ultimate objectives being the monitoring
of microform advertising in the former case, and the improvement of bibli-
ographic control of microforms in the latter. This committee and other Re-
sources Section units responded, through the Executive Committee, to the
Government Printing Office’s proposal to distribute diazo microfiche to de-
pository libraries. It also, through the Executive Committee and the RTSD
Board, communicated to the RTSD/CCS/Descriptive Cataloging Committee its
dissatisfaction with AACR 2’s provision for the treatment of microform pub-
lications as editions rather than as reprints. The Library Materials Price Index
Committee continued to work for improvement of domestic price indexes and
to explore possibilities for the development of international price indexes for
library materials. The committee chairperson has this year been invited to
prepare an introduction to the library materials price index section of the
Bowker Annual. The Collection Development Committee revised its four draft
guidelines (collection development policy statements, evaluation of library ma-
terials, review of library collections, and allocation of funds for library mate-
rials) in response to criticisms received at the committee’s very successful 1977
Detroit Preconference on Collection Development. Publication has, unfortu-
nately, met with delays (in conformity with Dowd’s Law: Everything takes
longer than you think), but the first three, at least, are expected to appear
soon. Meanwhile, the Collection Development Committee has begun to con-
sider the development of continuing education programs for collection de-
velopment librarians, using the guidelines as the basis for a course outline.

The section cosponsored two programs at the 1978 Annual Conference.
“Automated Acquisitions: What’s Good? What’s Bad? What’s Missing?” was an
all-day session of the RTSD/AAP Joint Committee and the Resources Section
Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee. The section collaborated with the LAD LOMS Budgeting, Accounting and Costs Committee to produce a four-hour session on "Budgetary Planning for Libraries."

One of the pleasant responsibilities of the Resources Section is the naming of the recipient of the National Library Services/Resources Section Scholarship Award. The award is given in recognition of the best article or book in the field of acquisitions, collection development, and related areas of resources development in libraries. The 1977/78 Scholarship Jury (Joe Hewitt, Chair; Frank McGowan and William Webb) awarded the honor to J. Michael Bruer for his article, "Resources in 1976," *Library Resources & Technical Services*, Summer 1977 (v.21, no.3, p.232-248). The jury acknowledged the profession's debt to Bruer not only for this but for five excellent annual review articles in the series.

At the end of the Chicago Annual Conference of 1978 Frederick C. Lynden, Brown University, assumed the chair of the Resources Section. Jean Boyer Hamlin, Rutgers University, Newark, is the new vice-chair/chair-elect. Their capable leadership and the continuing interest and enthusiasm of the members should assure the Resources Section a productive year.

**Serials Section Report**

LOIS N. UPHAM, Chairperson

The 1977/78 activities of the RTSD Serials Section proceeded relatively smoothly despite the fact that several of its officers either moved during the year or were preparing to move at year's end.

The two chief activities during the year were a partial realignment of the section committee structure and the presentation of a very successful program at the Annual Conference in Chicago.

The ad hoc committee to study the progress of the CCRC (Catalog Code Revision Committee) was dissolved, and a standing committee to study serials, cataloging was established in its place. A new ad hoc committee was set up to study the feasibility of creating dynamic lists of core serials. The future of the Serials Section ad hoc Committee on Library School Education is uncertain, and the section is waiting to see what effect the newly-created division-level committee may have on the entire area of library education for technical services when it begins to meet at Midwinter 1979.

The Annual Conference program was of great interest to many people, and several hundred showed up to hear C. Lee Jones (director of the Council on Library Resources project to create technical specifications for a National Periodicals Center) speak about plans for the proposed center. Three reactors commented on the presentation before questions were received from the audience. The reactors were: Robert L. Clark, Jr., director of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries; James Michael, manager of the Main Branch, St. Louis Public Library; and Larry X. Besant, assistant director for public services, Ohio State University.

The section's Duplicate Exchange Union also had a program meeting at the Chicago summer conference.

Regular section business was, of course, conducted as usual, and after having served a two-year term as section chairperson following the unexpected
resignation in January 1977 of Elizabeth Greer, Lois Upham passed the chair into the able hands of Judith Kharbas. Dorothy Pearson was elected vice-chairperson/chairperson elect, and Anita Farber was elected member-at-large.

Catalog Code Revision Committee Report, 1976/78*

JOHN D. BYRUM, Chairperson

The ALA/RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) restructured itself internally for its September 1976 meeting, abolishing the Rule Review and Revision Proposal Teams which had been effective in an earlier stage of revision in favor of four larger teams that could more comprehensively review the drafts of rules and chapters, which were beginning to appear at that time. Thereafter CCRC met only as a single group to insure that each committee member would be involved throughout the final phase of the exercise, which was devoted to consideration of the final drafts of the text.

At its fall 1976 meeting, the committee undertook further to recommend that the code revision timetable be extended to allow for a comprehensive examination of the second edition by the national committees and their constituents during the six-month period following the editors' end-of-year deadline. This proposal was approved by the Joint Steering Committee (JSC), and funding for an additional JSC meeting to follow this exercise was secured. CCRC administered the Draft Review Program within the American library community and invited all groups that had been involved in any way with the code revision effort—as well as several RTSD units, including its discussion groups—to participate. Most units contacted chose to cooperate in the review.

The committee devoted the major part of the agenda for its winter 1977 sessions to consideration of the text which had been prepared and submitted to the author organizations to determine whether it was sufficient for the purposes of the Draft Review Program. Although CCRC approved the text comprising Part I (Bibliographic Description), it recommended that Part II (Access Points) be rewritten to improve its style, clarity, and usability and further that the rewritten chapters be subject to the committee's approval before its distribution to U.S. reviewers. As a result of this decision, participants in the Draft Review Program received their copies in three separate mailings and had less time to consider the provisions of Part II than was originally intended. Nevertheless, of fifty-eight review copies issued to representatives of participating groups, thirty-seven were returned or partially returned; only three of these included no comment whatsoever.

Approximately 700 pages of substantive comments were collated for committee review during its June 1977 meeting. Editorial comments were forwarded directly to the editors. Among the latter, many points of criticism were directed at the format of the text or applicable only to the typescript; others pointed out the need for additional definitions in the glossary. It also became apparent that some rules needed more examples or that the examples

*Regrettably, because of editorial oversight, Mr. Byrum's report for 1976/77 did not appear in the Winter 1978 issue of LRTS, as scheduled. He has kindly consented to prepare this two-year report to complete the historical record.
themselves needed explanation. Finally, many points of confusion would have been avoided had the introductions to the code and to its parts been distributed for review with the text of the rules.

In discussing Draft Review comments and CCRC members' reactions, the committee came to several recommendations, among them:

1. Examples displaying romanized forms of names should be in the form approved by ALA/LC as in the present text.
2. The general material designation "multimedia" should not be used, nor should the "GMD + GMD" technique be allowed. An item consisting of more than one type of material should be described in terms of the predominant form or, if there is no predominant form, as "Kit."
3. Microforms should be described as such, whether they are original publications or reproductions of printed material.
4. An artist could be considered as the author of a reproduction or a collection of reproductions of his or her work.
5. The rules for legal materials should enter laws enacted or promulgated by one jurisdiction for another under the jurisdiction governed by the laws.
6. The rule prescribing for additions to place names should not include the name of the country as well as the name of the state, province, county, etc.
7. The criteria for government bodies to be entered subordinate should be reconsidered and tightened.
8. Uniform titles for music should be made an exception to the rule entering a part of a work under the title of the part.

These proposals together with several hundred additional suggestions of a lesser magnitude, which were approved for transmittal to JSC, were forwarded in July 1977.

Following extensive consideration of the proposed text and reviewers' reaction to it, the committee (with one member absent) unanimously recommended to the RTSD Board of Directors that it endorse publication of the second edition of AACR. In response the Board held an open meeting, at which representatives of ALA units and other organizations participating in the review presented their views. In addition, the Board requested and received a statement summarizing the amendments to the draft text which the committee intended to propose. The deliberations were often heated, inasmuch as those favoring and those opposing publication felt very strongly about their respective positions. By a vote of eight to two in favor of the CCRC recommendation to approve publication of AACR 2, the Board finally resolved the issue on June 20, 1977.

The Joint Steering Committee held its final meeting August 7-12 in Washington, D.C., at which time it considered recommendations deriving from the various review programs and submitted by the organizations represented on the committee. The JSC approved many changes in the draft text, several of which were directed toward tightening definitions and clarifying rule provisions; among the major substantive changes that were agreed upon were all that are enumerated above. At the end of this session it was agreed that JSC has considered all recommendations, either editorially or by formal deliberation of the committee. The editors were instructed to incorporate these decisions in the final text. In addition the JSC required that the text be delivered to the printer by January 2, 1978, in the expectation that AACR 2 would thereby be published later that year; this timetable was observed.
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Throughout this concluding phase of the code revision project, CCRC continued its liaison efforts with groups that had expressed interest in the development of the second edition. In addition, the CCRC chairperson and Frances Hinton, the deputy representative to JSC, prepared a summary of the code revision project, including major changes expected to be incorporated in AACR 2. This paper was presented to the RTSD Board in January 1977, and similar information was related that year by the authors at the ISAD/RTSD-sponsored institutes on “Technical Change and the Card Catalog.” On several other occasions, they and other committee members made similar appearances for the purpose of keeping the American library community advised about the progress of the second edition.

A proposal for a multimedia program to introduce AACR 2 to the library community, developed by CCRC member Doralyn Hickey, was endorsed by the committee and submitted in application for the J. Morris Jones Award. The award was not granted to the project, however. The committee was then instructed to work together with the Cataloging and Classification Section’s Executive Committee to seek alternative sources of funding and to further consider the design of the project. In 1978 the RTSD Board established an ad-hoc committee (Doralyn Hickey, chairperson) to pursue these functions and has continued to support its effort to mount an authoritative orientation to the provisions of the second edition for the benefit of librarians throughout the U.S.

Looking to the future, the Catalog Code Revision Committee supported a proposal to extend the duration of JSC beyond the date of publication of the second edition for the purpose of providing a successor body as a mechanism for regular maintenance of the code. The organizational aspects and functions of the reconstituted JSC were reviewed by CCRC, and its recommendations were approved by the RTSD Board in January 1977. Subsequently, negotiations related to the constitution and responsibilities of this body have been concluded, and it will commence regular meetings one year after the publication of AACR 2 unless required to convene earlier to advise on the preparation of an abridged version of the second edition. The reconstituted JSC comprises five members representing the author institutions (American Library Association, the British Library, the Canadian Library Association, the (British) Library Association, and the Library of Congress) together with the two editors of AACR 2; Frances Hinton has been appointed to serve on behalf of ALA.

Also looking to the future, the RTSD Board has conducted extensive investigations concerning the appropriate repository of ALA’s authority for catalog code maintenance since CCRC’s responsibility for this function is due to expire upon publication of the second edition. After considering several alternatives identified for the Board by the Special Committee on International Cataloging Consultation, it decided the matter in June 1978 by stipulating that the authority should revert to the Cataloging and Classification Section.

In addition to its role in the preparation of AACR 2, CCRC continued its participation in activities related to the development of International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBDs). At its July 1976 meetings, the committee undertook extensive consideration of three of the ISBDs available from the IFLA Office for UBC as “Provisional Drafts.” The ISBD for Serials and the ISBD for Non-Book Materials were reviewed, and a joint position on their contents was developed with the Library of Congress. The generalized framework for the description of all media, known as ISBD(G), which to a
large extent was generated as a result of the AACR revision effort, had been endorsed by the committee at its spring meeting; further consideration of this standard at the July 1976 meeting consisted of open hearings for those attending the ALA Annual Conference during which the chairman of CCRC presented a brief history of the development of ISBD(G) and joint editor of AACR, Michael Gorman, responded to comments from the audience. The committee's position on the content of the ISBD(G), ISBD(S), and ISBD(NBM) was conveyed to the appropriate IFLA units by the CCRC chairperson, who attended their August 1976 meetings in Lausanne, Switzerland, as the RTSD representative.

In completing its work, CCRC has paid attention to the need for a policy to govern disposition of the documentation which comprises its archive. With CCRC's approval, the chairperson appointed Helen Schmierer, committee member and representative of ALA's Library Research Round Table, to collaborate with the RTSD executive secretary in reviewing this material and identifying that part of it which merits retention for future reference. At the committee's final session, it was reported that this undertaking is currently in progress and would go forward.

Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee Report

JOHN P. COMAROMI, Chairman

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee held its annual meeting (no. 77) at the Library of Congress on March 3, 1978. All members were present: John Comaromi, chairman; Lois Chan, Margaret Cockshutt, Betty Croft, Joel Downing, Frances Hinton, Joseph Howard, John Humphry, Clare Ryan, and Marietta Shepard. Also present at the meeting were Benjamin Custer, editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification; Margaret Warren, assistant editor; Judy Greene, secretary; and by invitation Walter W. Curley, chairman, Forest Press Committee.

Discussion without action took place on several heads. (1) The index to Ed. 19, which will be approximately 25 percent longer than that to Ed. 18, has been modified in several ways: many references to "built" numbers have been deleted, noticeably those to "prod. econ."; many long sequences have been replaced by cross-references; cross-references have been replaced by full information when the information referred to is limited to only two or three items. (2) The manual of application of the DDC, which is to be published shortly after Ed. 19 and is to be a fuller guide than that prepared shortly after Ed. 16 (Guide to Use of Dewey Decimal Classification, Lake Placid Club, New York: Forest Press, 1962), is to be written by John Comaromi with input from the committee, the Decimal Classification Division, British and Canadian experts, Forest Press staff, and perhaps an advisory group. The manual will probably not exceed 200 pages in length, may be used as part of the curricula for the workshops and seminars for Ed. 19, and will be composed of a unit on general principles; one on a class-by-class analysis of citation orders and problem
areas, one on a discussion of problems crossing disciplinary lines, and one including a glossary and index.

After discussion the committee acted upon the following matters: (1) Phoenix 780 was sent to the editor to bring it into line with DDC practice so that the committee can make its final recommendation. (2) The committee affirmed the policy of true abridgment for the abridged edition. (3) Resolutions were made in thanks to Richard Sealock for his work while executive director of Forest Press in contributing to the successful execution of the work of the committee, in honor of Frances Hinton for her exemplary work as member and chairman of the committee, and in honor of the late Godfrey Dewey for his contributions to the continuity and development of the DDC, a copy of the last resolution to be sent to the daughters of Godfrey Dewey.

The committee recommended to Forest Press Committee that in order to alleviate the problems that librarians will meet upon the publication of Ed. 19, the Forest Press Committee consider publishing a conversion table for numbers changed from Ed. 18 to Ed. 19. Such a conversion table would be in Ed. 19 order, would be of a temporary nature, and would serve librarians for a period of about two years after the publication of Ed. 19.

John Comaromi was reelected chairman of the committee. Its next meeting (no. 78) is scheduled for April 6, 1979, at the Library of Congress.
RTSD Nominees—1979 Election

Resources and Technical Services Division

Vice-president (President-elect) (1979–81):
John D. Byrum, Jr., Processing Department, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.

Director-at-Large (1979–82):
Suzanne Massonneau, University of Vermont, Bailey Library, Burlington, Vermont.

Councillor (1979–83):
Elizabeth Herman, University of California—Los Angeles, University Research Library, Los Angeles, California.
Karin A. Trainer, New York University, Elmer Holmes Bobst Library, New York, New York.

[Nominating Committee: Rose Mary Magrill, chairperson; Abigail Dahl-Hansen (RS); Judith Hopkins (CCS); Neal L. Edgar (SS); Joseph Z. Nitecki (RLMS); Susan K. Martin; Joseph S. Pulsifer.]

Cataloging and Classification Section

Vice-Chairperson (Chairperson-elect) (1979–81):
Michael Fitzgerald, Harvard University, Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Nancy J. Williamson, University of Toronto, Faculty of Library Science, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Member-at-Large (1979–82):
Barbara A. Gates, Brown University Library, Providence, Rhode Island.
Robert N. Hiatt, Library of Congress, Assistant to the Director for Cataloging, Washington, D.C.
Patricia G. Oyler, Simmons College, School of Library Science, Boston, Massachusetts.
Jerome Pennington, Stockton–San Joaquin County Public Library, Assistant Director of Library Services, Stockton, California.

[Nominating Committee, CCS: Judith Hopkins, chairperson; Lizbeth J. Bishoff; Helen H. Britton; Bruce E. Langdon; Richard F. Woods.]
Reproduction of Library Materials Section

Vice-Chairperson (Chairperson-elect) (1979–81):

Secretary (1979–82):
Jack E. Pontius, Pennsylvania State University, E5 Pattee Library, University Park, Pennsylvania.
Deborah A. Raikes, Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.

[Nominating Committee: J. Z. Nitecki, chairperson; Margaret M. Byrnes; Mary Lou Lucy.]

Resources Section

Vice-Chairperson (Chairperson-elect) (1979–81):
George B. Miller, Jr., University of New Mexico, Zimmerman Library, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Paul H. Mosher, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California.

Member-at-Large (1979–82):
Robert Gray Cole, University of Missouri—Columbia, Columbia, Missouri.
Linda F. Crismond, University of Southern California, Doheny Library, Los Angeles, California.
Thomas W. Leonhardt, Boise State University Library, Boise, Idaho.
Marion T. Reid, Louisiana State University Library, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

[Nominating Committee: Abigail Dahl-Hansen, chairperson; Michael Bruer; Sara C. Heitshu.]

Serials Section

Vice-Chairperson (Chairperson-elect) (1979–81):
Charlotta C. Hensley, University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder, Colorado.

Secretary (1979–82):
Doris Anne Bradley, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, J. Murrey Atkins Library, Charlotte, North Carolina.

[Nominating Committee: Neal L. Edgar, chairperson; Mary E. Jackson; Patricia O. Rice.]
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Ember Associates Announces...

EMBER INPUT SYSTEM (MONOGRAPHS)

...a simple, economical way to create machine-readable bibliographic records for COM catalogs or any automated library system.

CHECK THESE FEATURES

☐ Contains pre-programmed MARC tags and record structure
☐ Available in specific MARC formats for monographs, serials, media
☐ Accepts any length record
☐ Includes complete 008 field
☐ Conforms to all MARC standards
☐ No on-line equipment or communication expense
☐ Processed on available IBM Selectric typewriter
☐ Costs a fraction of comparable methods
☐ Easily integrated with existing bibliographic control systems

SEND FOR MORE INFORMATION OR CALL COLLECT

Ember Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 80666
San Diego, California 92138
(714) 233-6591
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SAN DIEGO, CA. 92138
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Our historical data bases can save you time, effort, and expense.

AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE
If your search topic is related to the U.S. or Canada, from prehistory to current events, you'll find the relevant journal literature, dissertations, and book reviews accessible through the AMERICA: HISTORY AND LIFE data base, file #38 on the Lockheed/DIALOG® Information Retrieval System.

HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS
When your search concerns world history outside Canada and the U.S., HISTORICAL ABSTRACTS, DIALOG file #39, will afford quick access to article abstracts and annotations from current periodicals in history, area studies, social sciences, and the humanities.

Our tools enhance the practice of your very special trade.

* DIALOG is a trademark registered by Lockheed Missiles & Space Company, Inc.

Publishers of: Historical Abstracts • America: History and Life • ABC POL SCI • ARTbibliographies • Online Data Bases • Reference Books

American Bibliographical Center • Clio Press
Riviera Campus, 2040 A.P.S., Box 4397, Santa Barbara, CA 93103
Some Things You Can Count On.....

- Inadequate book budget
- Priority orders
- Books wanted "Yesterday"
- THE BOOK HOUSE

Call 517-849-2117 Collect —

JOIN

It pays to join the American Library Association.
The investment is small.
The return: a better future for you and better libraries for everyone.

Write:
Public Information Office
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611
C.C.P.

The ROYAL LIBRARY (Koninklijke Bibliotheek) in The Hague announces the second edition of C.C.P. (Centrale Catalogus van Periodieken en seriwerken in Nederlandse bibliotheken).

A Dutch Union Catalogue of periodicals and serials in 7 volumes.

Replaces the first edition of 1971 and the cumulative supplements published in the years following.

C.C.P. is a computer processed Union Catalogue of 160,000 extensively described titles of periodicals and serial works in Dutch libraries.

C.C.P. is an important instrument for interlibrary lending in the Netherlands and is of increasing value in international lending. Cumulative supplements will be issued regularly.

One of the most attractive traits of this Union Catalogue is its “inclusiveness”: no limitation as to period, place of issue or type of serial publication.

An abridged introduction in English is added for foreign users’ convenience.

Price: Dfl. 500.00 (postage included).

For orders apply to: Koninklijke Bibliotheek
P.O. Box 30469
2500 GL Den Haag
The Netherlands
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® 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

McGregor Magazine Agency

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
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054
You Need Only One.

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 acquisition 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 BOPFA (Blanket Order Program for French Acquisitions) and PONTA (Popular New Titles From Abroad) plans—its 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

Faxon makes the difference.

Faxon offers access to more than 95,000 titles through three renewal services and six ordering plans, with one yearly invoice and a full range of valuable subscription services, enabling serials librarians throughout the world to operate their departments with efficiency and economy.

Faxon combines the computerized services librarians need with the personalized attention librarians appreciate.

Write or call Faxon today for our LIBRARIANS’ GUIDE and SERVICE BROCHURE.

F.W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
Library Magazine Subscription Agency
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
Tel: 800-229-7894 (toll free)
617-329-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada only)

Above...just one of
221 Ways to Store Magazines
— in the Highsmith Catalog

Highsmith offers you an expanded selection of protective and well-organized homes for magazines, pamphlets, photos, reports. Scores of colors and styles in a wide range of sizes, all guaranteed to last indefinitely. They’re in the new Highsmith Library/AV catalog. Write today for your copy.

Highsmith
P.O. Box 25, Fort Atkinson, WI 53538
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221 Ways to Store Magazines
— in the Highsmith Catalog

Highsmith offers you an expanded selection of protective and well-organized homes for magazines, pamphlets, photos, reports. Scores of colors and styles in a wide range of sizes, all guaranteed to last indefinitely. They’re in the new Highsmith Library/AV catalog. Write today for your copy.

Highsmith
P.O. Box 25, Fort Atkinson, WI 53538
The Washington Post is a newspaper of record, essential for a complete presentation and interpretation of national and international news. Beginning January 1, 1979, current and retrospective issues of The Washington Post will be available on 35mm microfilm exclusively from Research Publications, Inc.

A new and more comprehensive index to the newspaper will also be available. The index will serve as a guide to this vital source for modern and contemporary history, national and world news, and opinions.

For detailed information, please contact:

Customer Order Department, Research Publications, Inc.
12 Lunar Drive, Woodbridge, Connecticut 06525 (203) 397-2600
SEARS LIST OF SUBJECT HEADINGS:
Canadian Companion

Compiled By Ken Haycock And Lynne Isberg

This list of Canadian subject headings complements and is based on the principles used to develop Sears List of Subject Headings, Eleventh Edition. As in Sears List, classification numbers have been assigned to each heading and the one-column page provides ample space for the addition of new or modified subject headings according to the needs of individual libraries.

In the basic edition of Sears the State of Ohio and the City of Chicago serve as "keys" to display the subdivisions that can be used under any state or city. In the Canadian Companion the Province of Manitoba and the City of Vancouver serve as "key" province and city. Entries under Canada are given in full, including historical subdivisions, and the historical periods are displayed under each province.

Primary sources for the development of the Canadian Companion include A List of Canadian Subject Headings (Canadian Library Association, 1968), Colombo's Canadian References (Oxford University Press, 1976), and of course, the Eleventh Edition of Sears List of Subject Headings. Where desirable and possible, headings which appeared in the now out-of-print A List of Canadian Subject Headings have been retained for the sake of consistency and precedent.

Sears List of Subject Headings: Canadian Companion is expected to be useful to school and public libraries, faculty of Library Science students, Ministry of Education courses for teacher-librarians, and as a reference tool for book wholesalers in Canada as well as in the United States.

Mr. Ken Haycock is the current president of the Canadian Library Association, and is Coordinator of Library Services, Vancouver School Board. Ms. Lynne Isberg is Manager, Central Processing Centre, Library Services Department, Vancouver School Board.


SAMPLE ENTRIES FROM CANADIAN COMPANION

Acadia 971.01
Use for materials dealing with France's Atlantic seaboard possessions in the New World including what is now Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and parts of Maine and Quebec

Acadians 971.01
Acadians—Expulsion, 1755 971.01
x Winslow's Expedition for the Expulsion of the Acadians, 1755

Act of Union (1841) 971.04
xx Canada—History—1841–1867

Actors and actresses, Canadian 920; 927
x Actresses, Canadian; Canada—Actors and actresses; Canadian actors and actresses

Actresses, Canadian. See Actors and actresses, Canadian

Agriculture—Canada 639.971
x Canada—Agriculture

Intergovernmental tax relations—Canada 336.2
x Dominion-provincial tax relations; Federal-provincial tax relations—Canada; Provincial-municipal tax relations

Inuit—Canada 970.3
May be subdivided as appropriate like Indians of North America—Canada
x Eskimo Indians—Canada; Esquimaux—Canada; Inuit—Canada

Inuit—Canada—Literature. See Canadian literature—Canadian Inuit authors

Inuit literature (Canadian). See Canadian literature—Canadian Inuit authors

Irrigation—Canada 333.9; 631.7
x Canada—Irrigation

Joual. See French language in Canada

July First. See Canada Day

Junior Achievement 369.4

Klondike gold fields. See Gold discoveries—Canada

THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY
950 University Ave., Bronx, N.Y. 10452
To not leave the odd ones to bother you, EBSCO's title file of over 75,000 U.S.A. and over 60,000 non-U.S.A. serials IS THE MOST COMPLETE.

Experienced assistants for you in our 14 regional administrative offices . . . providing personalized service locally.

Ask about our computerized serials management reports . . . designed to save you time.

EBSCO SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES

11 U.S.A. Offices / Toronto / Rio de Janeiro / Amsterdam
P.O. Box 2543 / Birmingham, Alabama 35202
(205) 252-9010 / Telex 5-9717