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When Names Collide: Conflict in the Catalog and AACR 2

William Gray Potter

According to Lotka's Law, the percentage of authors producing one journal article in a particular field is 60.79 percent. Knowing the same figure for personal authors in the card catalog would be useful in planning for AACR 2. Two card catalogs of varying size were sampled, and it was found that approximately two-thirds of all personal authors have only one entry in the card catalog. A further sample of personal author entries for new titles revealed that over a six-month period about one-half of these entries are new to the catalog. The implications of these findings for the adoption of AACR 2 are discussed.

In 1926, Alfred J. Lotka published his findings on the productivity of authors in the fields of physics and chemistry. From his study of Chemical Abstracts and Auerbach's Geschichtstafeln Physik, he developed a frequency distribution for authors producing a given number of journal articles. In what has become known as Lotka's Law, he observed that the proportion of authors writing articles is equal to $1/n^2$ times the proportion of authors writing one article. From this observation, he derived the percentage of authors writing one article to be 60.79 percent in his theoretical distribution.

In the emerging field of bibliometrics, Lotka’s Law ranks with Zipf’s Law and Bradford’s Distribution as a standard. Many researchers have attempted to apply Lotka’s Law to the authorship of journal articles in fields other than chemistry and physics. The accuracy and the validity of these studies is not at issue here. Suffice it to say that there have been several studies whose findings support Lotka’s Law. More important, whenever an adequate sample is used, it is found that about two-thirds of all authors produce only one article.

A similar study has not been made of personal author entries of the type that appear in card catalogs. A study of the entire set of such entries would be impractical. However, a study of a single card catalog to determine the distribution of personal author productivity is practi-
cal and useful. Apart from satisfying human curiosity, knowing the percentage of authors who appear only once would be useful in making decisions regarding the nature and structure of library catalogs. This figure would be especially useful in two areas, both of which involve the adoption of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR 2). The first area involves the concept of a title page based cataloging code. There has been criticism of AACR 2 because it promotes the use of the form of the author's name as it appears on the title page as the basis of the catalog entry. Critics claim that in some cases this will inhibit collocation, or the entry of all works by an author under one author heading. Obviously, if a high proportion of authors write only one work, collocation is less of an issue. The second area involves the rate of change of established headings required by AACR 2. The Library of Congress has estimated this rate to be 11 percent. However, entries will need to be changed only when a heading for a new title conflicts with an established heading. Knowing the proportion of authors who appear once, or single incidence authors, will give an indication of how often this will occur. Conflict between personal author entries will also arise when two or more authors have the same name. This type of conflict is not related to the adoption of AACR 2 because it would have to be resolved regardless of the cataloging code being used. While not an issue in the present study, conflict between authors who have the same name should be investigated.

This paper then will attempt three things: first, to determine the distribution of author productivity in the card catalog and to compare this distribution with Lotka's Law; second, to evaluate the importance of these figures to a title page based cataloging code and to the issue of collocation; third, to analyze the significance of these findings to the adoption of AACR 2 in an existing catalog.

DATA COLLECTION

As stated, Lotka's Law has not been proved to fit the card catalog because it has not been tested on monographic and serial literature covering a wide range of subject fields. It has been tested on journal articles in many individual subject areas but not for the types of materials and disciplines covered by the card catalog. It might be argued that no two card catalogs are exactly alike and that evidence of author productivity might vary from one catalog to another. It would be best, then, to sample more than one catalog to present an adequate indication of author productivity as represented in the card catalog.

Two card catalogs were chosen for sampling—the catalog at the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater containing records for about 250,000 volumes and 170,000 titles and the catalog at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign containing records for approximately 6,000,000 volumes and 3,000,000 titles. The choice of catalogs was based largely upon convenience, but it is unlikely that a better pair of academic library catalogs could have been selected for this sample.

The University of Wisconsin–Whitewater has a medium-sized library
supporting a liberal arts program with master's-level graduate programs in business and education. It is representative of libraries of many state universities that were founded before 1900, often as teachers colleges, and that grew slowly until a period of expansion in the 1960s. Whitewater now adds approximately 10,000 titles per year but withdraws very few. The bulk of the library's collection consists of post-1965 imprints, and current acquisitions are almost entirely of recent material. The University of Illinois Library is one of the largest libraries in the country, supporting a broad range of subject fields with great depth in its collections. The library has grown steadily and with direction since the early 1900s. Illinois adds about 85,000 monograph titles per year but rarely withdraws the final copy of any title. In the past, the library has engaged in extensive retrospective buying and continues now to fill in gaps whenever funding permits. Efforts are made to obtain all editions and translations for major authors, especially Shakespeare and Milton.

The results from the sample of these two catalogs should indicate either that a difference does exist between the two libraries and thus suggest that the proportion of single-incidence authors will vary by the size and type of library or that no difference exists and thus suggest that the proportion of single incidence authors does not depend upon the size of the catalog and will be constant from one catalog to another.

The sample design for each catalog involved random samples but differed slightly due to the disparate sizes of the catalogs involved. Assuming Lotka's proportion and desiring a 95 percent confidence interval of finding the sample proportion within a half-width of 2.5 percent, the author used formula 1 to determine the minimum sample size. At Whitewater, the drawers of the card catalog are numbered from 1 to 763. Using a random number table, 18 catalog drawers were selected at random and the number of times a heading relating to one person appeared as either a main or added entry was tabulated. The occurrence of persons as subject headings was not counted. The results are shown in table 1. The final sample size of 2,762 is larger than the 1,475 minimum because of the nature of the sampling procedure. The sample percentage of single-incidence authors was 69.33 percent.

\[
\begin{align*}
n &= \frac{(z(1-\alpha/2))^2 p(1-p)}{h^2} \\
&= \frac{(z(.975))^2 (.6) (.4)}{.025^2} \\
&= \frac{(1.96)^2(.24)}{.025^2} \\
&= 1475 \quad [1]
\end{align*}
\]

The confidence interval for the percentage of single-incidence authors was constructed as shown in formula 2. In other words, assuming the normal distribution for the sample proportion and desiring a 95 percent confidence interval, it can be said that the true percentage of single-incidence authors in the Whitewater catalog lies between 67.6 percent and 71 percent.

At the University of Illinois, it was impossible to select 18 drawers at
### TABLE 1

**UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-WHITEWATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Works</th>
<th>Number of Authors</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sample</th>
<th>Total Number of Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>69.33</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2762</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

random and expect to get a spread over the entire alphabet because the catalog contains more than 6,000 drawers. Therefore, it was decided to take the first personal author in every other drawer. This was a valid procedure because the sample would be biased only when the cards for an author continued from one drawer to another. This condition occurred rarely and was ignored because it would not bias the

95 percent confidence interval = $\bar{p} \pm z(1-0.05/2) \cdot s(\bar{p})$

$$\bar{p} = 0.6933 \quad s(\bar{p}) = \sqrt{\frac{\bar{p}(1-\bar{p})}{n-1}} = \sqrt{\frac{(0.6933)(0.3067)}{2762}} = 0.0088$$

$$z(1-0.05/2) = 1.96$$

95 percent CI = $0.6933 \pm (1.96)(0.0088) = 0.6760 \leq p \leq 0.7105$
sample with regard to the occurrence of single-incidence authors. The sample size at Illinois was 2,345 authors. The results are given in table 2. A 95 percent confidence interval for the proportion of single-incidence author headings was calculated, resulting in the conclusion that the true proportion for single-incidence authors for the Illinois catalog lies between 61.4 percent and 65.6 percent with the sample proportion being 63.5 percent.

**TABLE 2**

**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Works</th>
<th>Number of Authors</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sample</th>
<th>Total Number of Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>63.50</td>
<td>1489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Works</th>
<th>Number of Authors</th>
<th>Percent of Total Sample</th>
<th>Total Number of Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>592</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>835</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>13148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the two sample proportions is not great, 69.33 percent versus 63.5 percent. To test the hypothesis that both catalogs have the same proportion of single-incidence authors, the test illustrated in figure 1 was used.\(^7\) It was found that the proportion of single-incidence authors in the two catalogs differs significantly statistically. More catalogs need to be sampled before valid conclusions can be drawn, but these findings do seem to indicate that in general around two-thirds of all personal authors appear only once. The fact that the figures for the two catalogs studied here differ statistically does not disprove this general observation. These findings appear to indicate further that the proportion of single-incidence authors is smaller for larger libraries, though this needs to be tested further.

LOTKA'S LAW

The application of Lotka's Law to the card catalog figures is complicated by two problems. First, Lotka's Law applies to the authorship of journal articles, not to the type of personal author entries that appear in the card catalog. Second, Lotka counted only the senior or first author when an article was written by more than one person, while all authors were counted in the card catalog study. If these limitations are recognized, the card catalog figures can be tested as to how they fit Lotka's distribution.

The percentage of single-incidence authors at Illinois was 63.5 per-
Alternative hypotheses:

\( H_0: P_2 - P_1 = 0 \)

\( H_1: P_2 - P_1 \neq 0 \)

weighted average of sample proportions = \( \bar{p}' \)

\[
\bar{p}' = \frac{n_1\bar{p}_1 + n_2\bar{p}_2}{n_1 + n_2} = \frac{1915 + 1489}{2762 + 2345} = .6665
\]

standard deviation of the difference between the two sample proportions = \( s(\bar{d}) \)

\[
s(\bar{d}) = \sqrt{\bar{p}'(1-\bar{p}') \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)} = \sqrt{(.6665)(.3335)(.0008)} = .0133
\]

difference between two sample proportions = \( \bar{d} = .6350 - .6933 = .0583 \)

action limits, using alpha value of .01

\[
A_1 = 0 + z(a/2)s(\bar{d}) = 0 + (-2.576)(.0133) = -.0340
\]

\[
A_2 = 0 + z(1-a/2)s(\bar{d}) = 0 + (2.576)(.0133) = .0340
\]

Decision rule:

If \( A_1 \leq \bar{d} \leq A_2 \), then \( H_0 \)

if \( \bar{d} < A_1 \) or \( \bar{d} > A_2 \), the \( H_1 \)

Analysis:

\( \bar{d} = -.0583 < -.0340 \)

Conclusion:

The two sample proportions are statistically different.

---

cent. Lotka's Law says it should be 60.79 percent. Statistically, using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, it can be shown that the Illinois distribution does match Lotka's theoretical distribution\(^8\) (table 3). The same test performed on the Whitewater figures shows that they do not fit Lotka's distribution (table 4). Given that only the Illinois data fit, no general conclusion can be made about card catalogs and Lotka's Law. It does appear that the larger the catalog, the more closely it will fit Lotka's Law. More important than the exact fit of the distributions is the appearance of a general pattern that between 60 percent and 69 percent of all authors produce only one work. Lotka's Law was never meant to be a statistical distribution like the Poisson or normal distributions. Rather, it is a broad observation, a rule of thumb for author productivity.

**COLLOCATION**

To sum up the findings from the Illinois card catalog, 63.5 percent of all personal authors appear once, 14.6 percent appear twice, 6.8 percent appear three times, 3.9 percent appear four times, and 1.9 percent appear five times. Cumulatively, 91 percent appear five times
| Titles/Author | Theoretical (Lotka) | $F_0(x)$ | Observed (Illinois) | $S_n(x)$ | $|F_0(x) - S_n(x)|$ |
|--------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|-------|------------------|
| 1            | .6079               | .6079   | .6350               | .6350 | .0271            |
| 2            | .1520               | .7599   | .1463               | .7813 | .0214            |
| 3            | .0650               | .8274   | .0682               | .8495 | .0221            |
| 4            | .0380               | .8654   | .0392               | .8887 | .0233            |
| 5            | .0243               | .8897   | .0188               | .9075 | .0178            |
| 6            | .0169               | .9066   | .0149               | .9224 | .0158            |
| 7            | .0124               | .9190   | .0115               | .9339 | .0149            |
| 8            | .0095               | .9285   | .0077               | .9416 | .0131            |
| 9            | .0075               | .9360   | .0051               | .9467 | .0107            |

$D = \text{Max} \left| F_0(x) - S_n(x) \right| = .0271$

at .05 level of significance K-S statistic

$$\frac{1.36}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{1.36}{\sqrt{2545}} = .0281$$

$D < .0281$

Therefore, distribution from Illinois fits Lotka’s Law.

or less and 95 percent appear ten times or less. With regard to the issue of title page based cataloging codes, these figures are significant. About two-thirds of all authors appear only once, and all works written by these authors will, of course, appear under the same author entry.

Collocation is a potential problem only with authors who produce two or more titles. This potential would be realized if the form of an author’s name differs on the title pages of different works by the same author. How often this occurs has not been determined. More data are needed on collocation before any hard conclusions are drawn, but the present figures support the use of a title page based catalog code.

**CONFLICT**

In the fall of 1977, the Library of Congress conducted a study of changes in established author headings expected to be necessitated by the implementation of the new code. This study found that 37 percent of the headings would require revision. Through subsequent rule revisions and decisions made on the implementation of specific rules, LC reduced this figure to 11 percent by the summer of 1978. While the LC study has not been validated by experience and is based on policies that could change, the 11 percent figure is the best prediction of expected conflict available at this time.

The anticipated impact of the new rules has caused a flurry of investigations into alternatives to the card catalog, alternatives that might absorb the expected shock of AACR 2 more easily. There are
TABLE 4
LOTKA'S LAW AND WHITewater

| Titles/Author | Theoretical (Lotka) | $F_0(x)$ | Observed (Whitewater) | $S_n(x)$ | $|F_0(x) - S_n(x)|$ |
|---------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|-----------------|
| 1             | .6079               | .6079   | .6933                | .6933   | .0854           |
| 2             | .1520               | .7599   | .1495                | .8428   | .0829           |
| 3             | .0650               | .8274   | .0626                | .9054   | .0780           |
| 4             | .0380               | .8654   | .0315                | .9369   | .0715           |
| 5             | .0243               | .8897   | .0167                | .9536   | .0639           |
| 6             | .0169               | .9066   | .0123                | .9659   | .0593           |
| 7             | .0124               | .9190   | .0101                | .9760   | .0570           |
| 8             | .0095               | .9285   | .0065                | .9825   | .0540           |
| 9             | .0075               | .9360   | .0025                | .9850   | .0490           |

$D = \text{Max } \left| F_0(x) - S_n(x) \right| = .0854$

at .05 level of significance K-S statistic

$D = \frac{1.36}{\sqrt{n}} = \frac{1.36}{\sqrt{2762}} = .0259$

Therefore, distribution from Whitewater does not fit Lotka's Law.

compelling reasons to replace the card catalog with some other format; chief among these reasons is the simple fact that the larger the catalog becomes, the more expensive and difficult it is to maintain and the more difficult it is to use. Other reasons are often given, but the cost of card catalog maintenance and the difficulty in using the card catalog are the most prominent and the most forceful—much more forceful than the prospect of having to revise the headings to meet AACR 2. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign plans to close its main catalog in November 1979 and continue it with a second card catalog until an on-line catalog can be implemented. This policy is not being followed solely because of AACR 2, but, more important, because the present catalog has simply ceased to function and has become too costly to continue. Admittedly, the adoption of AACR 2 will affect the cost and integrity of the card catalog, but the extent and nature of its impact has not been determined.

It is unlikely that anyone will, in the near future, attempt to edit an entire card catalog by examining every heading and changing the 11 percent that need to be changed. Such a project would be too costly. Further, it would be misdirected. The library user will be largely unaware of the formal changes involved in adopting AACR 2 and will not notice the inconsistencies caused by the rule changes anymore than he now notices the many layers of inconsistencies that already exist. Any card catalog more than twenty years old is already full of headings formulated under a number of different sets of rules. Resolving the problem of inconsistent headings in the card catalog would be an admirable endeavor, but there is no evidence to support the
contention that AACR 2 will make this problem any worse than it already is.

Given the economics of overhauling the card catalog and the fact that library patrons will be largely unaware of inconsistencies caused by rule changes, the question remains: When should an existing heading be changed? The obvious answer is that an existing heading should be changed when it is in conflict with a heading for a new title. Such a conflict will arise under two conditions. First, conflict exists when two personal authors have similar names. This problem does not relate only to AACR 2, because such a conflict would have to be resolved no matter which code was being used. The second occasion when conflict is possible occurs when an author produces two or more titles and the author entry for an earlier work formulated under an earlier code conflicts with the author entry for a later work formulated under AACR 2. It is this situation that is of concern.

If a library were to change every existing personal author heading in the card catalog that both occurs more than once and falls into the 11 percent of the established headings that would require revision under AACR 2, then, using the Illinois figures, 11 percent of 36.5 percent or 4 percent of all personal author headings would have to be changed. This would be the case if the catalog were not growing. Unfortunately, it is. Rather than change all existing headings, most libraries will change headings as conflict arises. The fact that 63.5 percent of all personal author headings appear only once suggests that over the extended period of time it takes to build a large card catalog, the majority of personal author headings will appear only once. However, this figure cannot be safely applied over a short period of time. It does not follow that of the personal author headings for titles added to a catalog in a given year, 63.5 percent will be for authors producing only one work or, conversely, that 36.5 percent will be established in the catalog. To determine the proportion of personal author headings generated in a given year that will encounter established headings, a second sample is desirable.

To draw such a sample, a large collection of headings for new titles is needed. Illinois has a six-month backlog, arranged in alphabetical order, used as a catalog supplement. Seven drawers were selected at random from the supplement, using a random number table, and every personal author was selected from each drawer. This procedure resulted in a sample of 1,366 personal authors. It was found that 92 percent of all the personal authors in the supplement appear there only once. Headings for these authors were then filed into the main catalog and the filers recorded when a heading for a new title encountered an established heading. The results are given in figure 2. Established headings were encountered 52.12 percent of the time. Thus, for only 52.12 percent of the cases was there a potential for conflict. Only 11 percent of these cases (or 5.73 percent of all headings for new titles) will require revision, however, if the LC estimate is accurate. If 10,000 unique personal author headings were generated in a year, conflict would arise 573 times. The number of changes will be
the greatest in the first year of implementation. Thereafter, AACR 2 headings will be in the catalog and will be encountered at an increasing rate, although further study is needed to establish the exact rate of increase.

How these changes will be absorbed into an existing catalog is another issue. In some cases, cross-references or guide cards could be used while in other cases card sets might be pulled and changed to fit AACR 2. If card sets were to be pulled, it would be useful to know the average number of times an author appears in the catalog. As stated, 712 of the 1,366 authors of newly cataloged titles were already established in the card catalog. Table 5 shows the distribution of these 712 authors by the number of times each appears in the catalog. The average number of times a personal author appears based upon this distribution is 7.71 (5487 ÷ 712).

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Works Already in Catalog</th>
<th>Number of Authors (N = 712)</th>
<th>Cumulative Number of Works</th>
<th>Cumulative Number of Authors</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent of Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>30.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>45.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>57.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>64.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>71.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1302</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>75.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>77.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1590</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>80.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1698</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>82.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>84.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>85.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>86.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2034</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>86.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>87.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2177</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>88.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2273</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>89.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2324</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>89.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>89.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2492</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>90.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Works Already in Catalog</td>
<td>Number of Authors (N = 712)</td>
<td>Cumulative Number of Works</td>
<td>Cumulative Number of Authors</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent of Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>91.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2637</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>91.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2703</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>92.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2818</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>92.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>93.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>93.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3018</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>93.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3099</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>94.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3127</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>94.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3272</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>95.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3332</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>95.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3363</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>95.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>96.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3591</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>96.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3661</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>96.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>97.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3735</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>97.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3776</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>97.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>97.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>97.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3909</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>97.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3960</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>97.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4016</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>98.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4074</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>98.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4143</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>98.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4213</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>98.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4287</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>98.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4365</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>98.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4452</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>98.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4542</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>99.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4637</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>99.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>99.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4873</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>99.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5005</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>99.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5146</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>99.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5301</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>99.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5487</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This figure is skewed, however, by the small number of authors producing a large number of works. Because the number of card sets that might require change is at issue, these highly productive authors can be dropped from the calculation. For example, if an author appears in the catalog 186 times and a change in the form of the author's name is required, most libraries would use a cross-reference rather than change the card sets. Indeed, cross-references could be used whenever the number of works exceeds an arbitrary limit determined by a library. While this limit will vary from one library to
another, twenty will be used for illustration. If twenty or fewer works are involved, the card sets would be pulled and either revised or replaced. If more than twenty are involved, a cross-reference or other technique would be used. Table 5 shows that 91.01 percent of the authors sampled appeared in the catalog twenty times or less. The average number of times these personal authors appeared was 3.91 (2532 ÷ 648).

These same 712 authors had a total of 1,209 personal subject headings in the card catalog, and these headings would, of course, also have to be treated in the event of conflict. These headings raise the overall average of headings per author from 7.71 to 9.4. This is obviously a significant increase. However, for those authors with twenty or fewer headings, the addition of subject headings actually drops the average number of headings from 3.91 to 3.85 (2480 ÷ 644). This difference is not significant and suggests that the fewer works an author produces, the less likely that author is to be the subject of other works.

It is interesting that 36 percent of all the author headings for new titles filed into the catalog from the sample of the backlog encounter two or more entries for that author already in the catalog. Figure 2 shows that 36.38 percent encountered two or more entries, 15.74 percent encountered one entry, and 47.88 percent encountered no established entries; i.e., they were new headings. Roughly 70 percent of all the headings for new titles that encounter established headings are for authors who have produced two or more titles already in the catalog. If the headings for new titles were distributed randomly, then 36.5 percent, not 70 percent, would encounter authors producing two or more titles. Thus, an author who is already in the catalog more than once is 2.3 times as likely to have a new title filed into the catalog than one who is there only once.

The important figures above are that 15.74 percent of the author headings for new titles will be for authors who now have only one entry in the catalog and will move these authors out of the 63.5 percent who have only one entry into the 36.5 percent who have two or more entries in the catalog. This would tend to increase the proportion of authors appearing only once, if it were not for the fact that 47.88 percent of all the authors of new titles will not have titles previously in the catalog. Thus, there is a replacement rate of more than three to one for single-incidence authors who become multiple-incidence authors, which is more than enough to maintain the proportion of 63.5 percent for single-incidence authors. Indeed, this proportion will actually increase.

CONCLUSION

Summarizing, we have seen that roughly 64 percent of all personal authors in the card catalog at Illinois appear only once. The proportion found at the University of Wisconsin–Whitewater was 69 percent. While these proportions do not match, we might assume that card catalogs at academic libraries comparable to the two studied will have
similar proportions in the neighborhood of 66 percent. Collocation of titles by an author may be less of a problem than anticipated because only about 30 percent to 36 percent of all authors in a catalog appear more than once. Finally, about 52 percent of all personal author headings generated in a year will encounter established headings and thus have the potential for conflict. If present LC policies are followed, it will be necessary to revise headings for 11 percent of the 52 percent or 5.7 percent of all headings for new titles. This rate of change should decline after the first year as the number of AACR 2 headings in the catalog increases.

A detailed study of corporate headings is needed to derive exact figures of the type detailed above for personal authors. Several other areas for future research are also suggested by this study. While it has been shown that collocation is a potential problem with the 36.5 percent of authors producing two or more works, how often this potential is realized needs to be determined. The implications of these findings for authority control also need to be examined. Given that about two-thirds of all personal author headings appear only once in a catalog, some exceptions in authority control might be considered, especially in an automated system with enhanced access.

Research into corporate headings and AACR 2 is being planned at the University of Illinois. Further, Illinois plans to implement AACR 2 in November 1979, more than a year ahead of the Library of Congress and most other libraries. Thus, Illinois will have data based on actual experience with AACR 2 in advance of most other libraries and will report these data in detail and in comparison with the above study.
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Successful Workshop Planning

Barbara A. Gates

Successful workshops require careful planning. This article offers suggestions concerning important elements of the plan: the organization of the planning committee; the planning of the program; definition of the topic and the purpose of the workshop; the statement of objectives; the audience; format; timing; selection of the site; registration; publicity; selection of speakers; contracts; budgets; and the evaluation questionnaire.

A workshop is a gathering of a group of people of similar interest, background and purpose to learn about new developments or changes that affect their mutual activities. An opportunity for the attendees to participate actively in at least some parts of the program differentiates the workshop from other types of meetings. A workshop can be presented by an organization with paid staff whose responsibility it is to plan such presentations, by concerned volunteer members of an organization, by cosponsoring organizations, or by combinations of organizations and volunteer members. For each type of sponsorship the planning of a workshop includes the same important preparatory steps: planning the program, arranging for space, budgeting, and evaluating.

Planning the Program

The planning committee needs to start work several months before the workshop is to take place. There should be a sufficient number of people to cover the necessary tasks and at the same time the committee should be small enough to be an efficient working group; a committee of five to nine persons is a good size. When the committee has been organized and has divided the responsibilities for the principal areas of planning among them, others may be invited, or may offer, to undertake certain tasks either as individuals or as members of subcommittees. If the committee members are not located in the same general locale, meeting times should be planned that will permit those from a distance to attend.

Imminent changes for technical services librarians, like the adoption of AACR 2, will undoubtedly occasion many workshops and conferences. So that others will not have to learn the hard way, the editor invited the chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups to share her knowledge and experience with LRTS readers. Barbara A. Gates is also head catalog librarian, Brown University Library.
The committee's first task in planning the program is to define the topic of the workshop, the objectives of the workshop, the audience to be reached, the size of the audience, the format of the program, and the time and locale for the workshop. If the planning committee has been appointed to present a workshop on a specific activity, e.g., learning the AACR 2 rules, the reason for that workshop has already been established. If the committee is a standing committee responsible for presenting workshops during a given period of time, it is important to assess the needs of the community, be it library staff, library patrons, or a regional group of technical services librarians, before selecting topics.

The topic of the workshop should indicate the information that is to be presented and the purpose of the presentation. From this statement of purpose the committee can define a title for the workshop. It is important that the title be clear and brief and leave no question in the reader's mind about the information to be covered. This title will be used in announcements of the workshop as well as in the program.

The statement of purpose leads into the development of the objectives of the workshop. The objectives are extremely important and should be expressed in clear, concise statements in which action verbs are used. The objectives should state exactly what the participants are to learn during the workshop. They serve as a guide to the planning committee and inform the participants what they should expect from the workshop. The objectives should also be stated in terms that can be measured in the evaluation questionnaire. They should be included in all announcements of the workshop.

The next step is to assess and define the community; for example, if the topic of the workshop is AACR 2, is the presentation going to be a general introduction to the new rules for a general audience of catalogers, or is it to be a special, in-depth workshop for serials catalogers? Are there specialty areas of the topic, such as cataloging of audiovisual materials, for which the committee should plan special sessions within a general workshop? The planning committee needs to know what the prospective participants in the workshop need or want. A brief questionnaire to the membership can elicit this information. Knowledge of the membership can also help. This information should then be used to develop the statement of purpose of the workshop and should be included in the statement of the objectives.

The topic has been defined; the prospective audience has been developed. What format will be used for the program presentation? This is the next task for the planning committee.

Since the program has already been defined as a workshop, the program format will probably consist of a general session that sets the tone and overall background and will be followed by discussion groups. The size of the workshop, i.e., the number of people attending, will dictate the number of discussion groups needed. Another factor to be considered is the number of aspects of the topic to be covered. For example, a workshop on AACR 2 could be broken down
into three separate discussion groups: physical description, choice of access points, and form of entry. If the audience consists of as many as fifty or sixty people and the program has been defined as a general introduction, it is possible that separate discussion groups will not be necessary. However, if in-depth presentations and discussions are planned, it may be advantageous to divide the participants into three groups, each of which will attend each of the sessions at some time during the workshop. Another possible scenario could be general sessions on physical description, choice of access, and form of entry with special small sessions on cataloging of special materials, such as serials, music and sound recordings, audiovisual materials, and rare books and manuscripts. For in-depth discussion groups a group of twenty-five participants is probably the maximum size. Depending on the size of the audience and the number of small sessions that have been held, it may be wise to have a final summarizing session of the whole group.

Occasionally an additional session may be included to cover a topic closely related to the workshop. However, workshop leaders should be careful not to present too much information in one workshop. It would be wiser to have other workshops on the related topic at another time.

Timing is a very important part of a good workshop. Time must be allowed for the opening welcome, for breaks between sessions, for meal breaks, for announcements and directions and for moving from session to session, if different rooms are used. If coffee is to be served during breaks, extra time needs to be allowed so that everyone can be served. Each section of the program should begin and end as scheduled, with sufficient time allowed for questions. Each person on the program must be aware of the amount of time allowed for each presentation and must be restricted to that time. A small card with the amount of time remaining can easily be slipped to a speaker.

With the format of the program established, the number of speakers and discussion leaders can be determined and the amount of space needed for the workshop can be ascertained.

ARRANGING FOR SPACE

The site for the workshop must provide the necessary meeting room space, space for gathering during breaks, public facilities, accessibility to the handicapped for all events, parking for the participants, and the necessary electrical facilities for microphones, taping of sessions, overhead projectors, slide projectors, screens and other equipment needed for the presentations.

If the workshop is scheduled for more than one day and there is to be a free evening, look at eating and entertainment facilities not only in the facility itself but also in the surrounding area.

Be sure to visit a site under consideration and make drawings of the areas to be used to assist the committee in making this important decision. Don’t forget to check the space and furnishings provided for registering the participants.
REGISTRATION

Planning for registration may also involve designing an advanced registration form. The advance registration form should include information about the workshop: title; statement of purpose; objectives; target audience; location; housing information if the workshop is to last more than one day; special housing rates; parking information; points of interest in the surrounding area; at least an outline of the program if the entire schedule has not been completed; the list of speakers; directions for reaching the location by car, train or plane, for which a small map is helpful; room reservation blank; and workshop reservation blank. Each reservation blank should carry clear instructions about deadlines; costs; cancellation of reservation, if allowed; credit cards accepted, if any; check payable instructions; space for the participant’s name, address and phone number; and mailing instructions.

A workshop registration receipt needs to be designed that can be easily made out and returned to each registrant promptly. As the registrations are received, it is helpful to prepare the draft list of participants, a step that makes the final preparation easier. Also name tags can be prepared ahead of time.

In setting the deadline for registration, be prepared to receive late registrations. If the maximum number of registrations have not been received by the deadline, you may be able to accept late ones. Do keep in mind the deadline for reporting to the restaurant or caterer the number to be fed, if there is to be an organized meal during the workshop. If it is not possible to accept late registrations or if the maximum number of registrations is reached early, be sure to return the late registrations and checks promptly with a short covering memo explaining the situation. If the workshop is oversubscribed early, the planning committee may want to consider the possibility of a repeat performance at a later date. This information can be included in the return form.

As noted above, be sure to allow for registration table, chairs and table space for handouts and displays when deciding on space requirements.

During the workshop have name tags, handouts, meal tickets if required, programs, list of participants, and evaluation forms arranged for easy distribution. Holders for handouts should be prepared ahead of time.

PUBLICITY

All publicity should carry the title of the workshop, its purpose and objectives, target audience, names of speakers, names of the sponsoring organization(s) and names of committee members, as well as time and location. This information should appear on all flyers, programs, registration forms, and in newspaper publicity, if this is used.

Plan the publicity as soon as the basic planning for the workshop is completed. One basic statement can be developed for use in all writ-
ten announcements. The title design can also be used several times. Keep designs and statements clear and simple.

**Speakers**

Select speakers who can present the topic clearly. It is helpful to ask the opinions of those who have heard the speakers under consideration at other meetings, particularly a keynote speaker. At the time the speakers are first selected, it is a good idea for the committee to agree on a second choice for each, since a refusal often requires prompt action.

The speakers should be invited as soon as the program has been developed. The invitation should inform the speaker about the purpose and subject of the workshop, the time and place, the size and type of audience, the subject the committee wishes the speaker to address and the time allotted, the other topics covered in the program, and, if possible, the names of the other speakers. He or she will appreciate an invitation that is not ambiguous about honoraria and the expenses which the sponsors will assume.

Ask speakers to notify the committee by a certain date about audiovisual needs, e.g., overhead projector, slide projector, and screens. The use of such equipment requires special advance arrangements with the manager of the site facility. If the speaker wishes to use handouts, plan to receive them in ample time to reproduce them and include them in the registrants’ packets.

Shortly before the workshop ask all speakers and discussion leaders to meet with some or all of the planning committee. This is the time to go over the entire workshop program. Give each person a complete schedule for the workshop and review it to be sure there are no questions. If the program includes a panel discussion, be sure each panel member will keep to the assigned topic and not take over the topic of another panel member. If the topics are clearly defined and understood by all at the time of assignment, repetition during the presentation can be avoided.

The amenities extended to invited speakers should not be left to chance. The planning committee should designate someone to get in touch with each speaker on arrival, answer any immediate questions, and make sure that the speaker is accompanied to coffee or other workshop meal functions. Particularly for speakers who have donated their services and/or paid their own travel and accommodation expenses, a thank-you letter is very much in order when the workshop is over.

**Contracts**

Contracts are of two types—an agreement between cosponsoring organizations and an agreement between the sponsoring organization(s) and the owners of the facility in which the workshop is to be held.

Cosponsorship with another organization dictates that a letter of agreement be executed. This letter of agreement should clearly state
the commitment of both organizations to sponsor a particular workshop. It should also clearly define the financial obligations of each, including who pays for what, who will be responsible for paying expenses, and which expenses, if costs are not fully covered by registration fees. It should clearly define how any profits are to be divided. This letter of agreement should also clearly state the program responsibilities of all organizations.

Contracts are important with the owners of the facility in which the workshop is held. They are especially necessary with commercial facilities. The contract should indicate specifically the exact space to be used at each time period, the equipment to be provided, and all costs involved, e.g., meeting room rental charges, equipment charges, and set-up fees. A note of any equipment that is to be brought into the facility should be made and attached to the contract. It should also state any stipulations the facility has concerning the use of union labor, limitations on weight or voltage and other matters. In this contract, terms of credit should be established that spell out exactly the organization's financial responsibility and method of payment.

If the workshop lasts for more than one day, there should be guaranteed room rates for various classes of rooms, and mention of the number and type of sleeping rooms being held. Include the facility's complimentary room policy plus the cutoff date for reservations. It is always good if the facility will agree to fill reservation requests after the cutoff date at the agreed upon rate on room availability. Include parking costs for both registered guests and commuting attendees if possible. If the workshop is being held in a location where attendees might want to stay either before or after the workshop, then specify in the contract the time limit for extending the agreed upon room rates before and after the conference.

Since the workshop might have to be cancelled for some unforeseen reason, make certain that there is a cancellation clause that clearly defines financial penalties to your organization if cancellation is necessary.

It is always wise to ask an attorney to look at the contract before the association officers sign it.

BUDGETS

As soon as the objective has been clearly defined and the program designed, it is necessary to write a budget. Budgets must be developed well in advance. The budget will determine registration fees, as most workshops should be designed to be self-supporting unless there is special funding.

Among the elements to be included in a workshop budget are the following: room rental; equipment rental; speaker honoraria; speaker travel expenses; and miscellaneous speaker expenses, which might be needed to cover additional meals because of necessary early arrival or reimbursement for tips and taxi fares over and above actual travel expenses.

Workshop brochures are another item to be included in the budget.
The printing costs, which must cover not only the cost of the actual printing but also the design and art work as well as the cost of the paper, will be placed in this category. Costs for disseminating the brochure once it has been produced must be budgeted. This item will include costs such as stuffing and addressing the brochure, the rental of mailing lists, and money for postage. If there is to be advance registration, the line item for postage must cover mailing the receipts as well as mailing the brochures.

Most workshop budgets provide for some food service. Refreshments for a coffee break require budgeting and advance arrangements. The cost of a meal function must be budgeted, a category that should provide for the speakers’ meals. The cost of printing meal tickets should be included if you require them. If the meal function is to be at a location different from the meeting, include the cost of printing maps. One meal function not to forget in the budget process is that of the briefing breakfast or dinner, in which a last minute of review of the entire program and everyone’s role in it takes place.

Most workshops have a giveaway packet. Include the cost of purchasing or printing of the materials for the packet as well as the cost of the packet itself.

Always include in the budget money for preparing for the workshop. There will always be committee expenses such as photoduplication costs, travel, and postage for mailings.

Last but certainly not least, there should be a budget for staff time involved in all aspects of the workshop, unless the workshop is totally a volunteer effort.

Once all of the elements above have been budgeted, total all of the budget figures for a subtotal. To the subtotal add 20 percent for price increases and unforeseen expenses for a final total. Divide the final total by the anticipated number of attendees to arrive at a registration fee.

The committee has planned well—nothing can go wrong. However, test all equipment to be sure it is working. Know whom to contact if the microphones don’t work, equipment fails, bulbs burn out, or the coffee doesn’t arrive on time. One person should be assigned the task of coordinator during the workshop, and there should be two or more other people well acquainted with the plans to assist, run errands, or cope with problems.

Evaluation

The last session of the workshop should be the evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation is to learn what the group participants gained from the workshop and how to improve future workshops. If a workshop is funded, an outside evaluator may need to be hired.

There are different kinds of evaluation instruments: personal contact or written evaluations. Written evaluations may consist of essay questions, structured questions, a checklist or a combination of these. In developing the evaluation instrument examine the objectives established for the workshop, which become the basis on which the work-
shop is judged. The evaluation form probably should include questions about the physical arrangement: the place, time, facilities, and food service, if included; the method used for the presentations; quality of speakers; programming techniques; use of time; the content: benefits to the participants; and success in meeting the objectives. During the evaluation session, instructions should be given for filling out the evaluation form and returning the completed forms at a designated place.

Following the workshop, the planning committee should examine the evaluations and use the information gained to assist in future workshops. The speakers should also be notified about the comments made about the workshop and their share in it.

Finally, plan well, remain calm, enjoy the workshop, make people welcome, and learn from the experience.
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In early 1975, the research library community was surveyed concerning its adoption and application of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR 1) for determining entry and heading. Participating libraries reported overwhelmingly that they had accepted AACR 1 as a cataloging standard. They described the techniques used for adopting AACR 1, the application of superimposition, and local variations and exceptions regarding specific provisions of the rules.

In early 1975, a survey was conducted to determine adoption and application of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR 1) by large research libraries, as well as catalogers' suggestions for code improvement. Sponsored by the Council on Library Resources through its Fellowship Program, the survey had among its objectives the compilation of specific data concerning:

- The extent to which AACR 1 has been adopted as the basis for cataloging by the research library community;
- The methods of implementing the rules, including the techniques used to reconcile entries prepared from AACR 1 with those derived from earlier rules;
- The local policies that have modified or excepted certain provisions of AACR 1 by libraries that have otherwise adopted the revised rules.

The survey encompassed the ninety-four member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) in early 1975. Eighty-one of these libraries agreed to participate in the study and received questionnaires, and, of these, seventy-five questionnaires were completed and returned.* Thus, 79.8 percent of the institutions holding mem-

*Three national libraries, not including the Library of Congress, participated in the study.
bership in ARL at the time are represented in the survey results. In this report the information gained about AACR 1 is shared with librarians and information scientists who follow developments concerning the bibliographic control of library materials.2

ADOPTION OF AACR 1

Determining the extent to which these libraries adopted AACR 1 as a basis for cataloging was the first objective of the survey. Early indications of its reception had been reported in two previous library surveys, both made shortly after publication in 1967. The results of the first of these were reported by Pauline Seely in 1968, based upon questionnaires returned by forty U.S. and Canadian libraries of various sizes and types.3 "The general conclusion," Seely found, "is that there has been no rush to apply the new rules. Several [libraries] frankly admitted that they had done little or nothing so far toward study and decisions." In the absence of firm policy decisions, Seely observed, most libraries "seem to be more or less slavishly following LC's entries," whether or not these conformed to the provisions of AACR 1.

A second survey, conducted in 1969 by Virginia Atwood, focused on library size as a factor in adoption of the new rules.4 Atwood found that, of fifty-nine small college libraries surveyed, 78 percent "were operating without any definite policy regarding the library's extent of adoption or modification of the code well over a year after the code was put on the market" and that 31 percent had chosen to disregard the new rules in their cataloging. Among twenty-two large university libraries surveyed, however, the response to AACR 1 was more positive. "No large university," she reported, "has in practice disregarded the code; half indicated the decision to modify it and half to adopt it as it stands." Among this group, moreover, 67 percent reported having already reached definite policy decisions concerning the extent of code adoption.

As a follow-up to these earlier reports, the 1975 survey found that, eight years after its publication, AACR 1 was universally accepted as the basis for cataloging by the research libraries responding to the survey in this country and in Canada. All of the seventy-five libraries in this group reported having adopted AACR 1; none reported having rejected the new rules. As will be seen, the extent of adoption was seldom complete—notably because of widespread use of "superimposition"—and because local variations and exceptions regarding specific provisions of AACR 1 were found to be common. Nevertheless, AACR 1 was well established by 1975 as the cataloging standard used by the research library community in North America.

METHODS OF IMPLEMENTING AACR 1

If AACR 1 was adopted in principle, in practice the overwhelming majority of ARL libraries surveyed continued to blend the new rules with the old, following the lead of the Library of Congress. LC had announced its approach toward adoption of AACR 1 in Cataloging
Service, bulletin 79 (Jan. 1967), calling its strategy "superimposition." AACR 1, it was explained, would be "superimposed" by LC upon headings and entries already in the LC catalogs.

The Library of Congress has adopted a policy known as "Superimposition" in applying the new rules. This means that the rules for choice of entry will be applied only to works that are new to the Library and that the rules for headings will be applied only to persons and corporate bodies that are being established for the first time. New editions, etc., of works previously cataloged will be entered in the same way as the earlier editions (except for revised editions in which change of authorship is indicated). New works by previously established authors will appear under the same headings.

The effect of this policy was that new cataloging copy produced by LC reflected a mixture of rules. Although new headings and entries were formulated according to AACR 1, headings and entries established earlier continued to be used unchanged, whether they were in accord with AACR 1 or not.

LC's lead had a profound effect on other libraries, the survey found. By a large majority, ARL libraries indicated that LC's superimposition policy was the adoption strategy that they, too, had chosen. Of the seventy-five respondents, fifty-eight (77.3 percent) reported having superimposed AACR 1 in their cataloging, and analysis of less clear-cut responses from seven other libraries indicated that, to one extent or another, they too practiced superimposition. Thus a total of sixty-five libraries in the sample (86.7 percent) were judged to have adopted AACR 1 in a modified, superimposed form, as had LC.

Superimposition, as a general technique for adopting the new rules, took varying forms, however. With regard to establishing new headings, for example, one Canadian library reported that these were always established in accordance with AACR 1. Another library indicated that it, too, adhered to this policy, noting that one of its basic guidelines for applying AACR 1 was that "when the entry is new to our library we follow AACR." Much more frequently, however, respondents reported that new headings were established in the form adopted by LC—whether this was AACR 1 or not—and that AACR 1 provisions were of only secondary importance. "We usually adopt LC entries if they are established," one library reported, "without regard for whether they are AACR or earlier. If none are established, we use AACR."

In the same vein, a large university library noted that "we would not, for example, establish a heading new to us according to AACR if we knew LC had established the heading another way." This predominant approach was amplified by another respondent:

Our policy is to comply with LC first and AACR second. . . . This includes the use of [LC] cards from our depository file, use of [LC] copy found in NUC or Mansell, use of CIP data, and most recently use of OCLC records indicated to have an LC source. This even includes [using related] LC records . . . to establish form of entry if no adaptable copy can be found. If no copy or related copy originating from LC can be found, we do original cataloging according to AACR.
As indicated by these responses and others like them, superimposition as practiced by many research libraries was a two-tiered policy, under which a new heading was established according to AACR 1 only if it was new both to a library’s own catalog and to that of the Library of Congress.

With regard to the treatment of existing headings under superimposition, variations in local practice were also apparent from the survey responses. In general, of course, existing headings—whether compatible with AACR 1 or not—were left unchanged in the catalogs of those libraries that superimposed, and they continued to be used unmodified even on new entries added to those catalogs. One library reported, however, that when there were ten or fewer main entries under a non-AACR heading in its catalog, its policy was to change the heading to AACR 1 form. Similarly, personal name headings were changed in another library whenever fewer than three main entries were involved, although this policy was not extended to corporate name headings.

Other libraries, too, indicated that some of their established headings were selectively revised, though without specifying the criteria they had adopted for deciding when to superimpose and when to revise. “We do not usually recatalog,” one responded, “though the number of cards involved and the nature of the changes determine whether we use the new form of name.” Another reported: “Taking superimposition into consideration, if we have several entries already in the catalog, we tend to retain the old form [of heading]” Significantly, this recataloging appears often to have been aimed at conforming with LC headings, rather than with the provisions of AACR 1. As one major research library replied: “In recent years we have made a considerable effort to match LC, whether the form was AACR or not. Our older forms were changed or linked by references, depending upon the quantity of work involved.” Another library reported having decided “to recatalog all conflicting entries as they turned up, trying to follow LC practice.”

These replies suggest that superimposition as practiced by many of the research libraries surveyed was a less clear-cut policy than was superimposition as practiced by LC. While LC superimposed AACR 1 upon headings in its own catalog, other libraries were presented with a more complex problem, that of striking a balance among three potentially conflicting courses: preserving the pattern of headings already established in their own catalogs, “following LC” by attempting to conform to whatever forms of heading LC produced, or following AACR 1. Although the balance struck among these three choices varied from library to library, as we have seen, the frequent referral to “LC practice” as the chief source of guidance suggests that LC usage was often accorded greater weight than were the provisions of AACR 1.

Although superimposition was the strategy chosen by the vast majority of libraries included in the survey, it was not the only approach reported by respondents. Systematically changing existing catalog entries to bring them into line with AACR 1 was another
major option open to libraries, and four respondents (5.3 percent of the sample) reported that they had chosen this course in lieu of superimposition. At one national library, this policy was implemented by systematically recataloging non-AACR 1 headings found in its catalog whenever these headings were used in current cataloging. A university library reported a similar policy, stating that "we adhere strictly to AACR for choice [and form] of entry, resolving conflicts and modifying copy in-process to accord with them." A third respondent added the ambiguous caveat that "we only change [non-AACR] headings ... which are already in our catalog when there is an occasion to recatalog the materials," leaving open to doubt how systematically this recataloging was carried out. And, finally, one respondent candidly replied:

[Our policy is] to apply AACR to all new acquisitions and, as a result, [to] recatalog any conflicting entries. I admit that . . . [our] practice has not always followed the adopted policy. In time, I feel that the present cataloging staff will work more conscientiously to comply with the stated policy.

Yet another adoption strategy, chosen by relatively few libraries, was that of applying AACR 1 to all current cataloging but without revising pre-AACR catalog entries retrospectively. Under this approach, two headings for the same author might coexist in the catalog, one in AACR 1 form (for currently cataloged works) and one in pre-AACR form (for works cataloged earlier), with see also references serving to connect the two. A total of eight respondents (10.7 percent of the sample) reported employing this technique, although four of these indicated that it was used only in conjunction with superimposition and therefore, presumably, infrequently. The remaining four respondents (5.3 percent of the sample) reported that the two-heading/see also policy was adopted in lieu of superimposition. One explained its method as follows:

[For corporate headings] we follow [AACR] as closely as possible. . . . Cross references are used from [the] earlier form of entry when complete recataloging is not feasible. We do not knowingly add to an obsolete form, although we may continue to have holdings under earlier rules.

For the most part, however, responses from this group of libraries were not sufficiently detailed to judge how systematically this adoption technique was employed in their cataloging.

In light of current interest in the closing or "freezing" of existing catalogs to coincide with the adoption of AACR 2 in 1981, it is noteworthy that only two libraries among those surveyed took such a step in response to the adoption of AACR 1. One of these, a national library, timed the closing of its old catalog to coincide with its adoption of AACR 1, so that all headings and entries in its new catalog were fully in accord with the provisions of the new rules. The other library that reported having closed its catalog did not do so until 1972, however, when it created a new book catalog covering all new acquisitions. Entries in the new book catalog were prepared in accord-
 ance with LC's application of AACR 1, however, and unedited LC cataloging data were used whenever possible. Thus, this new catalog was not created to embody the provisions of AACR 1 in their pure form, but rather reflected the mixture of cataloging rules inherent in LC's policy of superimposition.

Superimposition having been so widely adopted, the survey sought to identify the influences that led so many respondents to choose this method of implementing AACR 1. Almost all of the libraries that followed this approach cited LC's decision to superimpose as the major determinant of their own decisions to do so. Of the sixty-two libraries responding to this specific query, sixty-one (98.4 percent) reported that this was the case. Many of these respondents pointed to the ready and inexpensive availability of LC cataloging data and noted that the substantial cost of altering LC records locally or of producing original cataloging made harmonization with LC practice the only practical alternative open to them. Superimposition was "the least expensive method" of adopting AACR 1, one large university library replied, adding that "in recent years we have made a considerable effort to match LC." Another library observed that "economic considerations ... made it mandatory that new LC cards be used with minimal alteration." Yet another replied: "We cannot afford to vary much from LC practice, especially since the bulk of our cataloging is done by para-professional catalogers." "Since we rely heavily on LC copy," one respondent commented, "we are forced to follow their lead to a great extent."

Indeed, this reliance on LC cataloging was an important factor. Based on responses from sixty-eight libraries, LC-derived cataloging accounted for an average of 72 percent of the catalog records produced by these libraries in the year preceding the survey. Although this percentage varied widely among libraries, sixty-three respondents (92.6 percent) reported that LC was the source for at least half of their cataloging, and forty-eight (70.6 percent) reported that more than two-thirds of their cataloging data came from LC (see table 1).

The widespread acceptance of superimposition was not, however, based solely on the practical advantages of "following LC." Libraries included in the survey frequently cited as factors in their decision to superimpose some of the chief reasons that lay behind LC's own decision to do so. "There was no other choice available to a library with huge files of catalog records and with substantial new acquisitions. Existing records could not be changed because of the unacceptable costs involved," one respondent declared. Another response, in a similar vein, pointed to "a flood of purchases, no extra staff to cope with this, and none to revamp the catalog." One library reported being influenced "about equally by a desire to make optimum use of LC cataloging and by a concern to fit new entries into the 7 million-card General Catalog with a minimum of recataloging." A specialized local reason for avoiding such recataloging was advanced by one respondent, noting that "many bibliographies of [our] materials have been printed, and the staff and many regular users know [our] entries.
TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE OF CATALOGING OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
DERIVED FROM LC COPY, 1974/75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Cataloging</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
<th>Percentage of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two reasons led to keeping all established entries in their old form, even for new materials. "We would have preferred to establish AACR entries," one library acknowledged, "but [our cataloging] backlog . . . did not permit such an ambitious program."

The weight of such concerns, and the consequent attractiveness of superimposition as a means of dealing with the new rules, are indicated by statistics gathered on the cataloging activity of the libraries surveyed. Cumulatively, more than 2.8 million catalog records were produced in the year preceding the survey by the seventy-one libraries that contributed such statistics, including both original cataloging and copy cataloging derived from other sources, chiefly LC (see table 2). The average (mean) volume of cataloging among these libraries was approximately 40,000 records annually, but ranged from one library that produced more than 100,000 records down to four libraries that reported producing fewer than 10,000 records (see table 3).

Against this background, the survey responses suggest that superimposition, while it may have been conceived in order to meet LC's needs in adapting to AACR 1, may have equally met the needs of many other research libraries struggling to cope with a growing cataloging work load and seeking to absorb the change in cataloging.

TABLE 2
CATALOG RECORDS PRODUCED BY RESEARCH LIBRARIES, 1974/75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Record</th>
<th>Number of Records</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monograph</td>
<td>2,473,270</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial</td>
<td>136,117</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Categorized</td>
<td>254,135</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,863,522</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
rules with a minimum of disruption and expense. As one university library put it: "LC's decision [to superimpose] was [a] major influence. However, this was the direction we would have chosen for them to go."

Since, at the time of the survey in 1975, LC was publicly considering the abandonment of superimposition, respondents were asked to indicate how their institutions would react to such a step. Just as most had accepted LC's lead in adopting the superimposition approach to AACR I, so most expressed their willingness to follow LC in de-superimposing, as well. Out of the sixty-six libraries that responded to this query, forty-five (68.2 percent) indicated they would probably abandon superimposition if LC did so. None of the responding libraries indicated an intention to continue superimposing AACR I in this event, although a significant number (twenty-one libraries, or 31.8 percent) reported being unsure how they would respond to such a move by LC. The practical advantages to be gained by "following LC" were frequently cited as the most compelling reason for going along with LC's proposed de-superimposition plan, just as they had been for accepting LC's superimposition policy in the first place.

Nevertheless, a number of institutions expressed reservations about de-superimposing and indicated that they would do so only reluctantly. One university library, for example, said that it would abandon superimposition only "with great reluctance," and expressed the hope that LC would not proceed on such a course. Another respondent added, however, that if LC chose to de-superimpose "we cannot afford not to follow." Yet another institution observed that its membership in a library network would make it unwise not to follow whatever policy LC adopted. A university library declared that it would accept LC's decision to de-superimpose, but that it might "make exception in some cases where we feel a change would unduly confuse our patrons." An even stronger concern was voiced by another respon-
dent, arguing that de-superimposition “would make the catalog very difficult to service and would be confusing to the public and to inexperienced staff.”

The method for accomplishing de-superimposition that was most frequently mentioned was that of connecting old and new headings by means of see also references. One library expressed displeasure with this approach, because of the possibility that patrons might overlook such references, but added that “we might have to follow LC anyway.” Another library predicted that it might “selectively recatalog some entries used only a few times and perhaps provide references and refile some others using guide cards.” More extensive recataloging was contemplated by another respondent, observing: “We will probably change personal name entries and refile corporate entries behind guide cards, unchanged, with cross references from the previous forms.” Significantly, four libraries reported that they would consider closing their existing catalogs if LC decided to de-superimpose, although one of these expressed “doubt [that we] could sell the idea to staff and public.”

APPLICATION OF AACR 1

Within this framework of overwhelming acceptance of AACR 1, the ARL libraries participating in the survey indicated substantial compliance with its specific provisions. Their practices and policies suggest an overall pattern of conformance with the rules that comprise the code insofar as the research library community is concerned.

Chapter 1 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, covering entry, deals with conditions of authorship and provides for the determination of primary and secondary bibliographical access points to the materials represented in the library’s catalog. Forty-three respondents stated that it was the cataloging policy of their institutions to apply without exception the rules that constitute chapter 1. Of twenty-nine libraries that reported a lesser adherence to these rules, thirteen permitted exceptions only when necessitated by superimposition or to avoid conflict with Library of Congress cataloging. Analysis of usable responses, then, reveals that 77.8 percent of the group surveyed usually applied all the provisions of this chapter in their original cataloging.*

Sixteen respondents specified one or more rules within chapter 1 that were not followed in local cataloging. Of these, the rule that governs main entry for serial publications was the major source of deviation—and the only departure from the “general rules” in this chapter—by those catalog departments which made exceptions to AACR 1. “Serials are much more often entered under title than the rules allow,” stated one national library of its practices. A second na-

*In addition, three libraries described their policy as general conformance but did not specify the nature of the exceptions they allowed. Since it is not clear whether their application represented the constraints of superimposition or rejection of specific rules, their responses are not reflected in the data presented in this paragraph.
ntional library permitted violation of rule 6B1 by allowing main entry of serials under title “if [the title] contains [an] abbreviation of [the] corporate issuing body.” The comments of three university libraries suggest that their cataloging policy also resulted more frequently in title main entry of serials than AACR 1 permits. One of these based its choice of entry entirely on linguistic considerations: “We do not accept entry under title of a serial consisting solely of a generic term, but enter these under issuing agency; all with distinctive titles are entered under title with added entry for issuing agency.” This approach was followed by a large special library also, which represented serial holdings not in its public catalog, but in an annual printed list. Finally, one university library, which otherwise adhered to rule 6, did not accept that part that calls for entry of a serial by a personal author under that person’s name, according all such publications title main entry instead.

Several of the respondents also admitted rejection of rule 6D, which prescribes separate entry cataloging for serials that undergo a change of title, author, or name of issuing body. As one of this group explained:

[This provision] is extremely inadequate to handle the many complicated situations involving frequent changes in the names of agencies, subunits of agencies, and titles, particularly for government documents. There are many cases when unnecessarily complicated and misleading records result from successive cataloging, particularly when one is dealing with a great variety of changes that occur in a short time and when titles vary back and forth. Also, it often happens that changes aren’t caught until several of them have occurred, and then it is much more efficient to recatalog the whole publication at once.

However, the libraries that did not accept rule 6D in the present survey were considerably fewer in number than in 1968, when Seely found that only seventeen of forty libraries queried had abandoned the method of cataloging every serial as a single bibliographic entity under latest title or latest issuing body. Indeed, the preponderance of research libraries reported that they followed rule 6D; in addition, more than 80 percent expressed the view that they would oppose deletion of this provision. With the passage of time it had become apparent, as one university library’s respondent indicated, that “the constant recataloging required by [single entry cataloging] is a nicety libraries cannot afford.” The comments of those who supported AACR 1 in this matter reveal a belief that rule 6D articulates an approach that is far more economical, consistent with bibliographic citation practices, likely to promote automated serials control, and in keeping with requirements of programs aimed at exchange of serials data than the alternative convention of single entry cataloging. In short, as one institution that did not make the switch to rule 6D until 1973 has concluded: “Having had experience with cataloging done both ways, the successive title form of entry is highly preferable.”

*The prescripts of both the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials (ISBD(S)) and the International Serials Data System (ISDS) presume separate entries for serials that undergo changes in their “distinctive” or “key” titles.
Deviation from the other rules of chapter 1 seems to be rather localized. A few libraries rejected rule 8E, concerning entry for exhibition catalogs, because of its complexity and tendency to result in main entry under some aspect other than the name of the museum at which the exhibition was held. One state library has recast rule 17, which covers works issued by a corporate body with authorship attributed to one or more persons, to favor corporate body entry for documents published by the agencies of that state's government. A national library, on the other hand, restated this rule to give main entry to personal authors whenever these persons are officials of the government body served by that library. Only two respondents, including one national library, specifically reported disregarding that part of rule 19 that does not permit separate cataloging of works with titles that are indistinctive and dependent on titles of other related works; however, this departure from AACR 1 must be more widespread, since it is consistent with the MARC format, which does not accommodate the consolidation of entries called for by rule 19A. Finally, it is noteworthy that some libraries deliberately disregarded parts of rule 33, dealing with added entries, in order to restrict the making of these entries, while others modified the rule with the object of increasing the number of access points in their catalogs.

Allowing for exceptions produced by policies of superimposition and adherence to LC cataloging decisions, 76.4 percent of the respondents reported that they fully accepted and applied in their original cataloging the rules of chapter 2, which govern the construction of headings for persons. Seventeen of the participating libraries, however, did identify provisions of the chapter that were not implemented in their cataloging. While there had been little objection voiced about the underlying principles developed in chapter 1 (except for rule 6 covering serials), it is significant that the subject of greatest dissatisfaction with chapter 2 concerned aspects of the philosophy that it embraces. The practices reported by four university libraries, for example, contravened that part of the basic rule which, in Escreet's words, "sweeps away the preferences enshrined in some earlier codes" by requiring entry of persons under the names by which they are commonly identified. One of these libraries indicated a decision to establish personal author headings usually under real names, while two apparently limited this practice to those authors who write under pseudonyms; the fourth opted arbitrarily for entry under the "latest form of name."

"Another place where non-compliance showed up was in the question of fullness of a personal name," Seely reported. "At least five libraries [of forty queried] indicated that they are inclined to use the fullest form known at the time a book is cataloged. . . ." That this tendency persisted is confirmed by the fact that 13 percent of the re-

*This figure does not include the responses of three libraries that described their policy with regard to chapter 2 as general conformance but that did not specify the nature of exceptions permitted, since it is not clear whether their application represented the constraints of superimposition or rejection of specific rules.
search libraries surveyed in 1975 substituted a local requirement resulting in a fuller form of heading for persons than that produced by applying a basic principle of chapter 2 ("the form of name of an author ... is ordinarily determined from the way it appears in his works"). For most respondents, preference for fuller forms of names meant inclusion of data such as full forenames only if these were readily available. But for a few, the quest for full and stable headings led to in-depth searching: "We use supplemental bibliographies to provide full forenames and dates," reported one university library, "even though [the] name in the publication may provide sufficient differentiation in our catalog."

Of the remaining provisions of chapter 2 none was rejected or modified by more than one library. One respondent does not use an author's preferred form of name, known to differ from that resulting from application of the rules in AACR 1 (rule 40, footnote 3), and omits the term of address of a married woman identified only by her husband's name (rule 46G3). A national library rejected that part of rule 45C that provides for the omission of hyphens between given names in French, modified rule 47C to require the inclusion of English abbreviations of ordinal numbers in headings for persons who bear titles of nobility if sequentially numbered, and did not allow the addition of dates to headings for classical authors, although such prohibition is not stated in chapter 2. A university library disapproved rule 52B, authorizing the use of the same heading for two or more persons of the same name when it is not possible to distinguish between them with dates or words that are associated with the names in author statements or reference sources. One private university stated cryptically that its catalogers follow all provisions of chapter 2 except those for "works relating to the Catholic Church." Finally, since Seely had found in 1968 that "the omission of the designation pseud. in the entry has met with outright opposition and disapproval," it is worth noting that only one respondent admitted adding the term "pseud." to headings for pseudonyms, a practice not sanctioned by AACR 1.

Conformity with AACR reached its greatest extent with the rules encompassed by chapter 3, which treats headings for corporate bodies. Again allowing for exceptions that followed from superimposition and acceptance of LC entries, 84.5 percent* of the respondents fully adhered to its provisions in their original cataloging.

The only significant departure from the general principles of chapter 3 was conveyed by the comments of four university libraries that have decided not to accept in toto the amendments announced in May 1974 deleting the once-controversial rules 98 and 99. "We still establish many entries under place, particularly when other similar headings exist in our catalog," announced one respondent. Another noted: "We accept the old rule [99] for universities, rather than entering under 'University of—'." The third of these libraries reported entering "institutions under place name if we have no LC entry to the con-

*This figure does not include the responses of four libraries that described their application of chapter 3 as general rather than full, since they did not specify whether exceptions permitted are the result of superimposition or deviation from AACR 1.
trary,” while the fourth simply reported that it has not “completely abandoned rules 98 [and] 99.”

Only three other respondents mentioned practices that are at variance with the other basic rules of chapter 3. Two university libraries disregarded rule 68, which deals with changes in the name of a corporate body by prescribing separate headings, linked by references, for each form of the name; they preferred to collocate all entries for a given body under the heading that reflects the latest form of its name. In addition, a national library made one of its few qualifications to a literal application of AACR 1 with rule 65, pertaining to the addition of geographic data to headings for corporate bodies with the same or closely similar names. “If we follow this rule we are obligated to go back and add the name to the first heading when a different body of the same name is received,” it objected. This library, therefore, modified rule 65A to specify the addition of local place-names to corporate body headings “each time when the name of the body could not be described as distinctive” and qualified rule 65B to require the addition of the names of larger geographic entities to corporate body headings “whenever two different bodies with the same name exist (found in any catalogue, directory, etc.).”

The remaining departures from the provisions of chapter 3 were few in number and involved the special rules for geographic names, government bodies, and religious bodies. A comment by the respondent for one national library revealed that in its cataloging a “country name is not used with well-known cities,” a decision that may cause the headings in its catalog to be sometimes at variance from those that would result from a strict application of rule 73. Another national library arbitrarily began the headings for any agricultural experiment station situated in the United States with the name of the state in which it is located. This library also deviated from rule 79, covering subordinate agencies and units of government bodies, to the extent that it used indirect subheadings for all branches, sections, and similar divisions. Another national library shared this hesitation to establish subordinate agencies directly under the name of the governments they serve. “We are not going overboard with this rule,” it noted; “implications of each individual case are considered.” One university library modified rule 81 to omit the word “Congress” and its equivalents from the headings for legislative bodies. Finally, catalogers in a very large research library were told to enter autonomous Orthodox archdioceses “under the geographic name with the term designating the type of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in curves after the name,” finding itself unable to accept rule 83A2 because of a long-standing local practice.

Chapter 4 of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* develops a system of uniform titles that serve to bring together “all catalog entries for a given work when its editions, translations, etc. have appeared under various titles” and to identify a work “when its title is obscured by the wording on the title page.”10 Unlike the rules included in chapters 1 through 3, the provisions of chapter 4 are assumed to have variable applicability. In 1968 Scely had found that the rules for uniform titles
“had very little impact” on the respondents to her questionnaire, although “a few expressed interest in an increased use...” It is, therefore, not surprising to discover in 1975 that chapter 4 still represented the least accepted group of rules concerned with headings. Twenty-one (28.4 percent) of the seventy-four ARL libraries reporting on their use of chapter 4 for original cataloging indicated that they followed it fully. Five respondents (6.8 percent), however, totally ignored its provisions. In between these extremes, forty-eight (64.9 percent) of the institutions surveyed applied the AACR 1 rules for uniform titles selectively.

Table 4, based on seventy-four responses, suggests the extent to which research libraries apply the AACR provisions for uniform titles. It lists the major categories of works within the scope of chapter 4 and reports the percentage of responding libraries that use it for cataloging materials of each type. Within the pattern of this application, the comments of the respondents reveal that the rules for uniform titles were seldom modified in the course of local use.

Chapter 5 seeks to facilitate use of the catalog by describing a system of references and instructing in their provision. This group of rules “presents few problems, apart from that of securing effective implementation,” according to Escreet, who remarks: “Unfortunately it is not unknown for a cataloguer, or several members of a cataloguing department, to spend considerable time debating the pros and cons of a particular heading, and then to leave the job half done by omitting to make references from the competing forms of heading ultimately rejected.” It is encouraging that one-half of the seventy-four ARL libraries, including all three participating national libraries, followed all of the rules of chapter 5. In addition, 39.2 percent of the respondents described the practices of their libraries in this regard as ones of general conformance with some exceptions. “In the past, [we] made only those references called for by the works in our collection,” one of these libraries remarked; “now, by policy, we make all references that the cataloger judges will serve the user—subject to the provisions of AACR.” Nevertheless, although none of the libraries sur-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Work</th>
<th>Percentage of Libraries Using Uniform Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacred scriptures</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous works without titles</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liturgical works</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early literary works, chronicles, and collections</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creeds, confessions</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaties, international conventions</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolific authors</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual legislative enactments</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
veyed rejected the chapter as a whole, a small minority of 10.8 percent decided to apply its rules selectively, routinely making references for only certain situations.

Of the several types of references covered by chapter 5, the comments of fourteen participating libraries establish that explanatory references—those given when a simple referral is inadequate—constitute the category that was most frequently modified locally or disregarded by respondents. The practices of one library, quoted below, reflected a commonly expressed desire to avoid the complex text and the time-consuming research typical of many explanatory references:

We have stopped making nearly all see also or explanatory references ... and are using 'Name Information Cards' (NICs) instead. ... Public service librarians have accepted them, they are a good deal simpler for patrons to follow than history cards, and they save a great deal of time for catalogers and typists, because (1) they do not have to be traced (we put one NIC in our name authority file for each entry) and (2) they do not have to be tailor-made for each catalog, which saves time in figuring out individual variations and in typing individual cards. We put a NIC in each catalog that has an entry under one or more of the names listed on the NIC.

[Example:]
Salvation Army
The name of this body has varied because of name change and/or merger with other bodies.
The library may have material under the following names:
American Rescue Workers
East London Christian Mission
Christian Mission
Volunteers of America
Salvation Army

Some libraries went even further to save the labor of their cataloging staff and to achieve simplicity in their catalogs by choosing to supply see and see also references in lieu of explanatory references, while others used explanatory references, but only if available from LC.

Except as noted above, the rules for references for names of persons and corporate bodies were well accepted by the libraries that applied chapter 5 to any great extent. With regard to personal name references, however, at least three libraries reported that the instruction to “refer from a form of name used by the author ... when it differs significantly from the form used in the heading” was interpreted to exclude the case where the name varies as a result of substituting forenames for initials in a heading. In addition, two libraries did not follow that part of the rule for corporate body references that authorizes see also references between international and diplomatic conferences and the conventions and peace treaties they produce. Additional exceptions to the provisions of rules 121 and 122 were the practices of only a single institution.

There was somewhat less adherence to the remaining parts of chapter 5. Of those respondents that generally followed its provisions,
three did not use the rule for special headings for legal publications, five took exception to the rule for uniform titles, and six disregarded the rule for collective titles. Finally, seven libraries reported rejection of rule 126, permitting the use of references in place of added entries common to many editions. "The savings in cards is not enough to justify increased complications in cataloging procedures," stated one university library in a comment that expresses a conclusion reached also by others.

"When the needs of research libraries and those of other libraries are irreconcilable, alternative rules have been provided for the use of the latter," states the introduction to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 13 Several of these alternative rules appear in chapters 1-5. In addition, at certain points within these chapters, the code less formally describes practices that are authorized for implementation, even though they vary from those set forth in the body of the rules. Participating ARL libraries were asked to report their application of these alternative rules and practices.

Footnote 21 to rule 19B, concerning main entry for related works other than those with dependent titles, contains the first of these alternative rules. Here it is stated: "Enter a libretto under the provisions of 19B ignoring the exception" (which tells the cataloger to "enter a libretto for a particular musical work under the composer and/or title of that work"). Of the sixty-five libraries reporting on their use of the alternative, 86.2 percent indicated preference for the main rule. In addition, another 3 percent employed both the main rule and the alternative rule, presumably to ensure uniform treatment for the entry of works by literary figures not necessarily known as librettists. The fact that 10.8 percent of these respondents did not apply the main rule lends support to Escreet's contention that "the North American alternative rule applying the provisions of 19B to librettos is in no sense a rule better adopted to the needs of non-research libraries" 14 and to the view that it may indeed be suitable for use by research libraries.

Rule 40, the basic rule concerned with headings for persons, incorporates footnote 3a, which is linked to the first reference tracing in the "Doolittle, Hilda" example and provides: "In catalogs that have many entries for works with only the author's initials appearing in them, it may be preferable to make added entries in the manner described in 38J1, rather than references." The statements of seventy-four ARL libraries reveal that half employed added entries, 45.9 percent favored references, and 4.1 percent used both. The respondent for a library that preferred added entries argued that "the unit card makes the use of added entries easier and therefore attractive," while the respondent for a library that opted for references explained that "the use of references results in fewer cards and allows us to connect initials with the name used as entry, whether or not we have material published under the initials."

The first of the two alternative rules in chapter 2 (rule 42B footnote 5) reads: "If the works of an author appear under several
pseudonyms or under his real name and one or more pseudonyms, enter each work under the name he used for it.” Only one library in the survey indicated a consistent preference for this practice. A few respondents allowed occasional use of the alternative but generally followed the main rule, which stipulates use of a single heading (“the name by which [the author] is primarily identified in modern editions of his works and reference sources”). The second alternative rule in this chapter concerns rule 44B, which deals with the complex problem of personal names not in the roman alphabet. Here again, the main rule enjoyed widespread application: 97.3 percent of seventy-five libraries stating a decision rejected the more simplified practice authorized in the alternative rule.

There are no alternative rules to the provisions of chapter 3. However, a footnote to rule 64, which concerns determination of headings for corporate bodies whose names appear in different languages, states: “A form of name in a language suitable to the users of the catalog may be preferred to the form that would result from the application of these rules if the latter is in a language that is not one in which the library normally collects materials.” Thirteen of seventy-four respondents (17.6 percent) indicated that it was the practice of their libraries to establish some headings in English when application of AACR rule 64 would yield headings in other languages. Only two, however, related their implementation of the footnote to the acquisition programs of their libraries. The remainder resorted to it out of “sheer desperation,” in the words of one respondent. The representative of another library remarked: “We use English in preference to the language that would result from the application of the rules only when, after a reasonable search, we cannot establish the correct form in the vernacular.” (The following comments suggest that there seems to be some variation of interpretation as to the meaning of the footnote: (1) “We try to follow rule 64, but use the language on the publication when the official language form is not readily available in reference sources”; (2) “We have a great many publications from Japanese corporate bodies. If the text is all or partly in English, the main entry is romanized Japanese form. Added entries are made for the English form”).

Chapter 4 offers two solutions to the problem that arises when two or more authors represented in a catalog have used the same pseudonym and one or more of them is entered under a real name. Rule 121A1b deals with this situation by having the cataloger “make a pseudonym-and-title reference for each work of an author that is so entered,” while a footnote to the rule allows the alternative of an added entry under the pseudonym for each publication of such an author. The fact that only 75.4 percent of the sixty-nine ARL libraries reporting their practice in this matter adopted the main rule reinforces Escreet’s view that “alternative rule 121A1b ... is not one of those provided for the use of non-research libraries when their needs are irreconcilable with those of research libraries.” Seven of the respondents preferred the alternative rule, and two more permitted
their catalogers to follow either rule, depending on “individual ... preference” and “circumstances.” As one of the latter explained: “The unit card makes the alternative rule easier mechanically, but does not provide the distinctions that the main rule does.” It is significant that 11.6 percent of the participating libraries decided to reject both main and alternative rules in this instance. One popular practice among those who disregarded both was to list in a single reference all the headings that the user should consult in finding the one sought, e.g., “Theophilus. See Enriquez, Colin Metcalfe, 1884– ; Dickinson, Jonathan, 1688–1747.” Another variation was to use separate see references from each of the identical pseudonyms, adding dates if known to differentiate them and filing the references first by the pseudonym and then by the name referred to if dates were not known. To justify this practice, the respondent for one university library commented: “Avoiding the name-title reference simplifies our name authority file, prevents complications with branch catalogs, saves us from having to make a reference for each title, and allows us to connect a pseudonym with the real name in cases where we have material published under the real name and none under the pseudonym.”

CONCLUSION

These local variations and exceptions to specific rules notwithstanding, findings of the survey clearly confirm the success of AACR 1 in establishing itself as the cataloging standard of the research library community. Not all provisions of the rules were observed by every library, as we have seen; yet an overall pattern of substantial compliance was found to exist. It is true that superimposition significantly compromised the application of AACR 1 in practice—despite its overwhelming acceptance in principle—and limited the development of pure AACR catalogs. This compromise, however, reflected overriding practical concerns—large catalogs and limited resources—rather than any lack of commitment to or confidence in AACR 1. With the opportunity for a new beginning in 1981, it will be interesting to compare the decisions made in adopting AACR 2 with those made in adopting its immediate predecessor AACR 1.
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Planning for preservation involves an estimate of the proportion of the collection needing attention. The authors designed a simple rating scale and applied it to a sample of books in Western European literature at the University of Michigan. Findings indicate that a large portion of this particular section is seriously deteriorated.

Within the last decade, a number of research libraries in the United States have made a more or less organized effort to mount an attack against the steady deterioration of their collections. Shelley describes the functions of the Library of Congress Preservation Office and reports briefly on conservation programs at Harvard and Yale. Brock presents a conservation proposal for the collections of the University of California at Berkeley. Walker reports on a survey of preservation activities in large academic libraries, and Friedman gives the results of an earlier survey of preservation efforts in libraries in New York state. Ready lists some preservation activities currently under way, particularly in Canada.

Since all such programs must go forward with limited resources, however, the problem becomes one of determining the best method of using whatever staff time and institutional funds may be available for the purpose. Shelley considers two types of conservation action that might be taken by research libraries, and Darling makes specific suggestions for organizing and administering a program. Almost none of the literature on preservation relates to actual methods of surveying the collection or recording the information gathered. Only Shaffer illustrates forms and terms used for such an investigation.

Perhaps the cheapest and most frequently used procedure is to have the circulation staff set aside for remedial treatment any worn or deteriorated material that is returned after use; this has the obvious advantage of concentration on the active stock, but the equally obvious disadvantage of protecting only a segment of the entire collection. Another approach is to have one or more knowledgeable staff mem-
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bers walk through the stacks, pulling off worn or deteriorated volumes for treatment. This is a more comprehensive measure, but for this reason the time required is generally considered too great.

The University of Michigan Library had for some time been planning toward the preservation of its most seriously deteriorated volumes through microfilming. The problem was two-fold: how to determine the number of volumes needing treatment, and consequently the amount of money to be set aside for such a program; and where to begin—which of the volumes in the miles of library stacks were the most likely candidates for preservation through reproduction? While the library's Selection Officer, familiar with the stacks, could suggest that the literature sections were among the oldest and most heavily used areas, this specification still left far too large a field. In order to determine further which nation's published literature, as exemplified in its book production, was in greatest danger of disintegrating where it stood, we obtained a sample of the books from each literature and country and looked for the relationship between physical condition and such obvious characteristics as date and place of publication. Because the library's circulation system does not record the number of times circulated in the individual book, we were not able to examine the relationship between physical condition and number of times circulated.

CHOICE OF SAMPLE

The English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish literature sections of the graduate library circulating collection were chosen as the area of the collection to be used in the study. This choice was made after discussion with members of the library staff because the Western European literature sections of the collection were thought to receive at least as much use as most other parts of the circulating collection and were assumed to hold books of widely varying physical condition. These five areas of literature also gave a good mixture of places and dates of publication, two variables that we wanted to test.

The shelf list for the English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish literature sections was measured and found to contain about 1,800 inches of shelf list cards. A systematic sample of 2,000 titles (omitting open entries and noncirculating titles) was drawn from the shelf list by recording information from cards at .9-inch intervals. The sample size of 2,000 was chosen arbitrarily because it seemed to be the largest number of titles that could be inspected within a reasonable amount of time.

RATING SCALE

Finding a way to measure or rate physical condition of books—the dependent variable of the study—presented the first problem. A review of the literature did not produce a rating scale that seemed appropriate for the purposes of this study. An informal rating scale has been used for some time by the university library, but it, like other examples examined, seemed too subjective for reliable data collection.
Nevertheless, university library staff members who handle withdrawn books did provide a number of ideas on how physical condition might be judged.

Reading and discussion led to the decision to emphasize two aspects basic to the physical condition of a book. The first aspect was paper, which was considered most important and to which the most weight was given in constructing the rating scale. As a book was inspected, it was first assigned points (up to three) for the condition of the paper. The paper was judged “good” (and given three points) if it was supple and did not crease easily when bent; it was judged “fair” (and given two points) if it creased easily but did not break; and it was judged “brittle” (and given one point) if the fibers broke when the paper was bent. The paper was also inspected for discoloration; one point was deducted from the total rating for a book if the paper had not retained its original color. The last characteristic of the paper to be inspected was the width of the inner margins of the book. Any margin less than one-half inch was judged inadequate for purposes of rebinding, and a point was deducted.

The second aspect judged in rating a book’s physical condition was the binding—its original quality, present state, and attachment to the leaves. One point was added to a score if the book still had its original hard binding (either cloth or leather) or a good prebinding (as did many of the German, French, Italian, and Spanish publications). Points were neither added nor subtracted if a book had its original paper binding (either with or without reinforcement), a pamphlet binding, or a decent rebinding job. When a book was inspected to determine how well the physical volume was attached to the case, one point was added to the score if the attachment was secure with no signs of looseness. Points were neither added nor subtracted if the attachment was slightly loose or shaken, but points were deducted if the attachment was very loose, if the binding was broken, or if a great many pages were torn out of the book.

The final rating scale, therefore, provided for a possible score of 0 to 5 points (although books in extremely poor condition could actually have a minus score). Books with good paper, adequate margins, and original hard binding (securely attached) received a rating of “5.” Any books with original hard binding, securely attached, adequate margins, but only fair paper (with no discoloring) rated “4.” Other books earned a “4” for being original paperbacks with good paper, adequate margins, etc. A book rated “3” might have original hard binding (+1), good paper (+1), but have inadequate margins (−1) or be insecurely attached to its case (−1). A typical “2” might be a book with original hard binding (+1), firmly attached (+1), but with brittle paper that was either discolored or had inadequate margins. A book rated “1” might be securely paperbound, with fair paper and inadequate margins, or it might have a hard binding, insecurely attached, and brittle paper. If that last book also had discoloration or inadequate margins, it rated “0.” There were, of course, various combinations of conditions that could cause a book to receive any of the ratings below “5.” In
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**Library Needs** — Rising costs and shrinking budgets have forced many libraries to close branches, reduce hours, limit community programs, and eliminate staff. Yet, the information proliferation creates an ever-expanding need for improved access to library collections.
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Retired Librarian of Congress, L. Quincy Mumford answers librarians' questions about the new CUMULATIVE TITLE INDEX TO THE CLASSIFIED COLLECTIONS OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, 1978 the unique 132 volume, single-alphabet listing of virtually every work classified by LC since 1897.

Background: Librarians have been asking penetrating questions about the Cumulative Title Index to the Classified Collections of the Library of Congress (TLC) ever since it was first announced. We distilled what we believed to be the most significant of these questions and discussed them with retired Librarian of Congress Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, whose 21 year regime (1954-1974) witnessed such relevant landmarks as the beginning of MARC and the introduction of the Shared Cataloging Program. Here are some of the questions and his answers.

Carrollon: Dr. Mumford, just why is title access so important?

Mumford: Well, in the case of the Title Index to the LC Collections, its greatest value probably lies in its most obvious use. When only titles are known to a searcher, TLC will show authors' names (and the years of publication), which lead to National Union Catalog entries; precise LC Classification Numbers, which lead to specific card images on the LC Shellist microforms, and LC Card Numbers for ordering from the Cataloging Distribution Service. In the case of the Shellist, of course, searches for the precise Class Number should be made in TLC even if the author is known as well as the title. In addition to this primary use, I should like to comment on the recent trend by acquisitions departments to set up their records by title in order to enjoy faster and more precise access than is provided in main entry catalogs (especially when corporate authors and other problem authors are involved).

The Catalog Management Division of the Library of Congress converted its own Process Information File from a main entry to title arrangement about eight years ago, and I understand that their searching efficiency increased substantially after that change.

In short, librarians have long needed a definitive, single-alphabet title index to the Library's huge retrospective collection of the world's literature, and there is no doubt in my mind that this 132 volume set is going to fill that need.

Carrollon: Now that we've established the importance of title access, let's explore just how many and what kinds of titles are in the Classified Collections.

Mumford: Essentially, these contain all of the materials (both monographs and serials) which have ever been cataloged and classified by the Library of Congress since the adoption of its Classification System in 1897. As of January 1979, these totaled approximately 6.5 million titles. About one million (or 18 percent) of these records are included in the MARC (Machine Readable Catalog) data base which was established in 1968.

Carrollon: In view of the fact that access to the MARC data base is already available to libraries in a wide variety of segments and formats — and as it amounts to only one-sixth of the Library's collection — would you describe for us just what records make up the non-MARC portion of TLC?

Mumford: Yes. The more than 5½ million non-MARC entries in TLC will include the following:

- English Language works cataloged before 1968.
- German, Spanish and Portuguese Language works cataloged before 1975.
- Materials in the other Roman-alphabet languages cataloged before 1976, and
- Transliterated non-Roman alphabet materials cataloged by LC through 1978.

Because of these delays in entering the Roman-alphabet non-English-Language materials, it is estimated that more than half of the one million records prepared during the 12 years of the Library's Shared Cataloging Program have not entered the MARC data base.

A small number of exceptions to the above listing are represented by the Library's highly selective RECON (RETrospective CONversion) Program which after several years has only just reached its 150,000th record (most of which were covered 1968 and 1969 English Language reprints).

Actually, it has been the Library's long range emphasis on collecting and cataloging non-U.S. materials which has led it well beyond the role of a "national library" to its preeminence as a "library to the world". This emphasis is illustrated by the fact that in the last ten years, only 37 percent of the books processed by LC were in English (and, of course, a large number of these were of non-U.S. origin).

Carrollon: Well, that pretty well takes care of TLC's coverage of the non-MARC records. Now let's talk about OCLC. Several librarians have asked what benefits they would get from the Title Index that they would not already be getting as OCLC participants.

Mumford: First, of course, is the matter of coverage. Because of the overwhelming size, longevity and international scope of LC's holdings, the great majority of the 6.5 million records in TLC have never been included in MARC, OCLC, or any other data base. Actually, there's no way of knowing exactly how many records are in the LC Classified Collections that are not in OCLC. We know how many records LC has sent to OCLC (over one million MARC records) but we do not know how many non-duplicate retrospective LC records have been put into the data base by OCLC participants. In spite of the large numbers of records cited by OCLC, after one deducts the MARC input, non-print materials, duplicate records, local publications, and other non-LC materials, the number of retrospective non-MARC LC records entered by OCLC participants should be relatively small. Based on conversations with LC catalogers and others, however, my outside guess would be that some 1.5
millon unique non-MARC LC records may have been added by OCLC participating libraries.

This, of course, leaves 4 million non-MARC records in the Classified Collections that are not in the OCLC database.

The main reasons for the relative lack of OCLC overlap, as indicated above, are the size and international nature of the Library of Congress holdings when compared to those of even the largest of the OCLC participants.

COMPARISONS OF HOLDINGS

The overwhelming relative strengths of the LC collections in specific subject areas are best illustrated in the biennial report, *Titled Classified by the Library of Congress Classification: National Shell List Count* (published by the University of California at Berkeley under the auspices of the organization of “Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries”). This study compares the holdings of LC to those of 27 major U.S. research libraries in individual LC Classification Schedules.

The 1977 edition of this report shows that the Library of Congress holdings are often two or more times as large as those of second-place libraries in a wide variety of significant subject areas, including American History (Classes E-F), Social Sciences (H-Hx), Language & Literature (P-Pz), Technology (T-Tx), and Bibliography and Library Science (Z).

In a telephone survey conducted by Carrollton Press during September, 1979, of the 20 largest members of the Association of Research Libraries, it was learned that although 16 of them are currently OCLC participants, none submit significant numbers of retrospective LC records to OCLC. (A possible exception to this is the University of Texas, which has sent OCLC approximately 20,000 retrospective records to date.)

**LC CLASSIFICATION NUMBER CHANGES**

Tens of thousands of LC Classification-Number changes will have been picked up and printed in TLC. In many cases where participating OCLC libraries derive their cataloging data from old LC printed cards it would be beneficial if they would consult TLC entries before they contribute retrospective cataloging to the OCLC database.

Access to up-to-date LC Classification numbers, of course, will also be extremely important to libraries converting from Dewey to the LC Classification system. Moreover, OCLC participants can refer to TLC to find LC Class Numbers for those OCLC records which show only Dewey call numbers.

Carrollton: Dr. Mumford, you’ve demonstrated the usefulness and unique coverage of the LC Title Index. But the set is expensive (even with our pre-publication prices and extended payment plans). How can librarians justify its cost?

Mumford: I think the cost effectiveness of the set is best illustrated by the fact that for a one-time expenditure which is less than the year’s salary of a cataloger, TLC will go on year after year saving time and money for a library’s Reference, Acquisitions, and Cataloging Departments — and do so during those future years when inflation will have increased staff salaries and other costs.

Looking at it another way, TLC records cost only $1.78 per thousand at the pre-publication price — and even less if paid in advance. The arguments for ordering the set now and paying in advance also seem impressive to me. Those libraries which ordered Mansell’s Pre-1956 Imprints edition of the *National Union Catalog* when it was first announced paid less than half of today’s price for that set. Also, the 10% prepayment discount on the Title Index amounts to a healthy $1,143. It is therefore obviously advantageous for libraries to get their orders on record now at the pre-publication price. That way, they’ll be certain to get the “Z” volumes at the same price they paid for the “A” volumes.
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general, a book rated as "0" was in such condition that it should not be allowed to circulate.

The validity of the rating scale for physical condition was tested by asking a librarian who handles many of the withdrawn books in the university library to rank subjectively a group of books on physical condition and then applying the rating scale to the same group to determine how closely the rankings agreed. Reliability was tested by having a library science class use the scale to rate the condition of a group of books. These ratings were checked to see if all of the students tended to give the same rating to each book. When the results of both of these tests appeared to be satisfactory, the rating scale was ready for data collection.

**DATA COLLECTION**

Data on each book were recorded directly onto edge-notched cards (see figure 1). From the shelf list the call number, language of the title, place of publication, and date of publication were obtained. Each book was then searched in the stacks and, when located, was inspected for physical condition. When a book was not on the shelf, it was searched in the circulation file. Sometimes this search indicated that the book was in circulation (in which case the date due was noted and the book was searched again later); other times the file indicated that the book had already been reported missing. If the book was neither on the shelf nor recorded as being in circulation, both shelves and circulation file were searched again after approximately two weeks, in order to allow any books that were in the process of being taken out for use or being reshelved to make their appearance in one place or another. Table 1 shows the proportion of the sample that was actually located and inspected.

**FINDINGS**

Although data were analyzed in various ways, it became apparent early in the analysis that the most interesting relationships were those

![Data Collection Card](image)
between physical condition and age (as represented by publication date) and between physical condition and place of publication. In general, physical condition seems to decline as age increases. This is not a smooth relationship, however; the quality of paper and binding used in book manufacturing has not been consistent through the years. Figure 2 shows the relationship between the average rating of physical condition and age, when publication dates are grouped by decade.

When analysis of the sample as a whole indicated a relationship between age and physical condition, an attempt was made to look for differences from one country to another in the physical quality of the books published. This determination was made by comparing, decade by decade, the publications of the major publishing countries represented in the sample. Tables 2 through 5 give the results of this analysis. In comparing publications of the 1970s in the sample, U.S. publications are found to be in better condition than any of the others except the Italian, which are seldom used. The French and German publications tended to receive less than a “5” rating because many of them had been prebound and no longer have adequate margins. Inspection of the 1960–69 publications did not change the rankings, except for the French publications, which rated lower in comparison with the other countries than they had in the 1970s. Publications of the 1950s show a further decline in the relative standing of the French publications. For that decade the German publications appear to be in the best condition, with the British and U.S. publications ranking only a little below. For the war decade of the 1940s, the quality of German publications was not good, although the British and French publications held up reasonably well. The sample did not contain enough Italian and Spanish publications from the 1940s to include them in the comparisons for this period.

Paper quality is an important determinant of the useful life span of a book and was weighted heavily in the rating scale used in the project. Because of this fact, paper condition was analyzed separately for all the books in the sample. The percentages of books with good, fair, or brittle paper were compared from one country to another for each decade. Most of the publications of the 1970s have paper that would
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still be considered good—that is, no brittleness is yet apparent. However, slightly more than 20 percent of the books published in Great Britain had paper that could only be called fair. This trend is also apparent in the sample of books published in the 1960s. Nearly 5 percent of the British publications had paper that was already brittle, and only 70 percent had good paper. The Spanish paper in the 1960s also appeared to be of uneven quality. With the 1950–59 publications, the

### TABLE 2

**Physical Condition by Place of Publication**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Physical Condition</th>
<th>U.S. (N = 72)</th>
<th>France (N = 77)</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
<th>Great Britain (N = 42)</th>
<th>Germany (N = 52)</th>
<th>Italy (N = 22)</th>
<th>Spain (N = 19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated “5”</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “4”</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “3”</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “2”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “1”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “0”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

**Physical Condition by Place of Publication**

(1960–1969 Publications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Physical Condition</th>
<th>U.S. (N = 91)</th>
<th>France (N = 55)</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
<th>Great Britain (N = 41)</th>
<th>Germany (N = 29)</th>
<th>Italy (N = 14)</th>
<th>Spain (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated “5”</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “4”</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “3”</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “2”</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “1”</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “0”</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4

**Physical Condition by Place of Publication**

(1950–1959 Publications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating of Physical Condition</th>
<th>U.S. (N = 44)</th>
<th>France (N = 35)</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
<th>Great Britain (N = 33)</th>
<th>Germany (N = 27)</th>
<th>Italy (N = 10)</th>
<th>Spain (N = 16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated “5”</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “4”</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “3”</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “2”</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “1”</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “0”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

PHYSICAL CONDITION BY PLACE OF PUBLICATION
(1940-1949 PUBLICATIONS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated “5”</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “4”</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “3”</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “2”</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “1”</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated “0”</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study indicates that a large portion of the collection in major Western European literatures is in need of immediate attention if the texts are to be preserved for the users of this library. If one considers that those books rating “2” or less are candidates for preservation, then almost half the collection (44.9 percent) falls into this category. The confidence interval of 42.5-47.3 percent, calculated on the basis of this sample percentage, indicates that because of the statistical uncertainty introduced by taking a sample of this size we can be reasonably sure (with 95 percent confidence) that the true percentage of the collection needing attention falls within that range. If one takes a more conservative view and considers only those books rating “1” or “0” as needing attention, then 24.5 percent of the collection in major Western European literatures falls into that part of the scale. The 95 percent confidence limits are 22.4% and 26.6 percent, indicating that the true proportion of the collection needing attention probably falls within that range.

Within the total sample, the English literature section had the largest proportion (52.1 percent) of books rating “2” or less. Thirty percent rated “1” or “0.” This group includes books from the whole sample, with publication dates going back before 1800. For books published since 1940, those in the best condition were in the German or
English literature sections. Only 11 percent of the books in German literature rated "2" or less, and only 16.5 percent of the English. Books in the Spanish literature section were in the poorest overall condition: 28.5 percent were rated "2" or less. French literature was a little better, with 22.1 percent rated "2" or less.

The general superiority of U.S.-made books suggests that any library that has had a longstanding policy of preferring the British edition to the American edition should now examine its collection rather closely. Other factors being equal, the American publication is to be preferred for its longer life. A library with a collection with many non-U.S. publications produced before 1960 will probably find that its collection is in need of attention.

As previously mentioned, we were not able to relate book condition to the total number of circulations, since the library's circulation system does not record that information in the individual book. There was some indication that the amount of use varies from one part of the literature collection to another, however; 59 percent of the collection in English literature and 56 percent of the Spanish collection had circulated at least once since 1969 (when the circulation system changed), but only 32 percent of the Italian. Forty-seven percent of the German literature and 45 percent of the French had circulated at least once since 1969.

The literature sections of the collections at the University of Michigan Library were chosen for this study because they contained older materials and materials that were used heavily, and it is possible that these factors have made the situation look more serious than it is in fact or than it is in other research libraries. In other parts of the collection, paper quality should be similar but date of publication may vary less and use may have been lighter. We hope to consider the effects of heavy use by measuring some of these other areas.

The University of Michigan Library has accepted the conclusions of our study and has begun a program of reviewing the English literature section of the library stacks for books in poor condition that should be considered for preservation microfilming. The library hopes to be able to extend its review to other parts of the collection and to adopt other methods of conservation as well. The library staff expects to use the method of selection described here to verify impressions of staff members as to which parts of the collection need attention most urgently and to estimate the numbers of items to be handled if and when a more extensive conservation program is undertaken.

We have emphasized that this study examined only certain areas of literature in a particular collection. It is reasonable to assume that there would be variation in the findings from one subject area to another and from one library to another; the specific findings of this study would not necessarily be applicable in other sections of the classification or in other institutions. However, the methodology and approach of this study appeared to be workable and could be used in other situations, and the rating scale seemed to be valid, reliable, and easy to apply. It appears to us that the method that has been de-
developed for determining physical condition of books is a practicable procedure and one that could be followed by other academic libraries.
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This report describes a meeting of the technical committee on micrographics (TC171) of the International Organization for Standardization. The meeting, which was the first one to be held by the committee in its current form, took place in Paris, France, June 11-15, 1979. The report focuses on the committee's work relating to the reproduction of library materials within the general context of international standards-making activities.

In the spring of 1979 I was asked to become a member of the United States delegation to an international micrographics standards meeting. The opening of a position on the delegation occurred when Charles LaHood, chief of the photoduplication service at the Library of Congress, discovered that he would not be able to attend. Although I knew I would not be able to participate with nearly the skill and knowledge that LaHood brought to the task, I agreed to participate. This paper is a brief report on events of the meeting and the context in which they took place insofar as they relate to the reproduction of library materials.

Although it is not yet very apparent in the United States, there is a large and growing need for international standards. Each year more nations require their observance not only by their own citizens but by foreigners who trade and communicate with them as well. The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) is the leading source of these standards worldwide. A voluntary, nongovernmental, nonprofit organization, ISO currently has some 3,750 published standards and an additional 3,000 in preparation. It is made up of a national standards organization from each of eighty-seven countries.

These member bodies contribute expert participants to nearly 180 technical committees that ISO has established to draft standards. The technical committees do their work by correspondence and in meet-
ings, and, although as much work as possible is done by mail, about
1,800 meetings, with some 20,000 participating experts, take place
each year.

The United States member body of ISO is the American National
Standards Institute (ANSI), which, unlike almost all the others, is (like
ISO itself) a voluntary nongovernmental, nonprofit organization.
ANSI is a federation of 1,025 American standards-making and
standards-using organizations. It is a participating member of two ISO
technical committees dealing with the reproduction of library mate-
rials: Technical Committee 46: Documentation (TC46) and Technical
Committee 171: Micrographics (TC171).

ANSI's participation on TC46 is coordinated by its Z39 committee:
Library and Information Science and Related Publishing Practices.
The most recent meeting of TC46 took place in Warsaw, April 18–27,
1979, a report of which appears in the Library of Congress Information
Bulletin.¹

Until recently a subcommittee of TC46, TC171 held its first meet-
ing June 11–15, 1979, in Paris. Fifty-four delegates from eleven coun-
tries were active participants and three liaison organizations were
present as observers. In addition to me, the U.S. delegation to this or-
ganizational meeting of the committee was made up of Harold J.
Fromm, Eastman Kodak Company (head of delegation); Thomas C.
Bagg, National Bureau of Standards; Joseph F. Comiskey, IBM; Mar-
ilyn E. Courtot, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Senate; Robert A. Glot-
felty, National Micrographics Association; and Lester O. Kruger, 3M
Company. The host organization for the meeting was the Association
française de normalisation (AFNOR), the ISO member body that is
the secretariat for TC171.

The afternoon of June 11 and all of June 12–14 were devoted to
meetings of the committee's six working groups, with plenary sessions
taking place the beginning of the first and all of the last day. The
most important issue before the two plenary sessions concerned or-
ganization. As a full technical committee, TC171 has the option of es-
ablishing subcommittees. These subcommittees would be free to meet
independently of the full committee—as the technical committee for-
merly did when it was a subcommittee of TC46—and to create a sub-
structure of working groups on the same pattern as the organization
of the full committee. A good part of the week's work consisted of
discussions of a proposal by the United Kingdom delegation that sub-
committees be adopted as the organizational pattern and of a coun-
terproposel of the host delegation of France that the working group
structure be continued but with revised working group respon-
sibilities.

Mainly because the value of the change could not be well estab-
lished and because it would complicate the committee's organization,
TC171 decided against establishing subcommittees. Regrettably, since
it had provided strong and able leadership, this decision resulted in
the withdrawal of the United Kingdom member body as convener of
the second working group.
A second major organizational concern resulted from the decision of the South African member body that it could no longer be the secretariat, or convener, of the third working group, which deals with the microcopying of documents on 35mm and 16mm film.

Because the functions of working groups two and three were quite similar, the committee decided to avoid the appointment of two new conveners at the same time by merging the two groups. At the meeting the Canadian delegation indicated interest in being convener of the new group. The United Kingdom and South African member bodies will continue to participate in the technical committee's work, of course, despite their decisions to give up the role of conveners of their respective working groups.

In combining the functions of working groups two and three, the committee also slightly changed the focus of working group one, whereby partially adopting the counterproposal of the French member body, to avoid an overlap of responsibilities that had become apparent between working group one and the other two. Thus, the name of working group one, which was formerly Microfiche, is now Physical Characteristics of Microforms and Conditioning. Working groups two and three, formerly Engineering Drawings and Microcopying of Documents on 16mm and 35mm Film, respectively, are now combined as Working Group Three, Applications of Microforms. (There is no longer a working group two.)

In meetings during the three and one-half days between the opening and closing plenary sessions, the working groups met together to do the primary labor for which the technical committee is responsible. A full report of this standards-making activity appears in the *IMC Journal*, official publication of the International Micrographics Congress. This report concerns the progress of the two working groups on standards that relate to the reproduction of library materials.

Apart from the ones for which Technical Committee 46 is responsible, most library-oriented ISO micrographics standards are the responsibility of TC171's working group three. Prior to its June meeting, the group had put forward a draft standard for 16mm filming of press cuttings or clippings. Although this draft, which is now being balloted by ISO member bodies, was not discussed at the meeting, a companion draft concerning press cuttings on microfiche was thoroughly reviewed. The group agreed that it should be redrafted by the French member body so that it relates only to those aspects of press cuttings microfiche that are not dealt with in existing ISO standards. (The previous draft contained a variant grid option that was not thought necessary and gave filming details that repeated information already appearing in other standards.) The French member body will circulate their draft to the group, and should comments received be of only an editorial nature, the group has agreed that the draft will then be submitted to the secretariat for voting by ISO member bodies.

In the interests of clarity and simplicity, the working group agreed that its drafts for filming catalog cards on 16mm film and on microfiche, respectively, should be combined into a single document
that, like the press cuttings draft, is to address the specific characteristics of catalog cards not dealt with in existing ISO standards. The French member body agree to draft the microfiche sections and the U.S. member body, the 16mm film sections of the new version.

The working group spent the better part of its two meetings revising its draft of a standard for filming documents on 16mm film. It sorted out the difficulties the members of the group foresaw in trying to account for all of the types of documents that might be filmed, avoiding, as well as it could, the creation of a standard too general to be useful. In the end, the group agreed that the result was sufficiently complete to be sent to the ISO secretariat for what is called the combined voting procedure. All ISO member bodies that have elected to be participating members of TC171 (whether or not they actively participated in the June meeting) will now be asked to complete a ballot questionnaire on the draft, either giving their approval—with or without comments—or giving their reasons for not approving. Depending upon the outcome of this combined voting, either the standard is to be forwarded to the ISO Council, which will then make the final decision on publication of the document as an international standard, or it is to be returned to the working group for resolution of negative comments.

(There are currently seventeen participating member bodies in TC171: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, Spain, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom, United States, and the U.S.S.R. Fourteen member bodies have elected to take "observer" status: Australia, Austria, China, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. Only the participating, or "P," members vote upon draft standards. All the member bodies present at the June meeting—italicized in the list above—were "P" members, and none observer, or "O," ones.)

It is said to take an average of seven years from the first statement of need to the publication of an ISO standard. The draft for 16mm filming of documents, which originated in 1976, may be issued as a standard as early as 1980 (but more likely 1981), if unexpected impediments do not appear, making it a faster-than-usual effort.

The work of the groups other than working group three included a number of items related to the reproduction of library materials. Working group one completed work on a draft of micrographics flowchart symbols and sent it to the secretariat for voting. At the request of working group six of TC46, which is concerned with bibliographic description, the group reviewed and suggested minor editorial changes to a draft standard for bibliographic information in microfiche headers. (This standard is similar to a draft that is now being balloted by the American National Standards Institute.)

It also requested TC171's Working Group Four: Quality of Microforms, to investigate specifications for image-quality at reduction ratios up to 50 to 1. This action resulted from the group's concern regarding the approval by the ISO Banking Operations Committee of
the use of a ratio of 48 to 1, far higher than the 24 to 1 permitted in existing international standards. The group also recommended that the Banking Committee express a preference for a 24-to-1 ratio, leaving the 48-to-1 ratio as an option.

Working group two, prior to its merger with working group three, reviewed comments on draft procedures for filming elongated standard-paper-size sheets that are used in Europe. This standard relates to large documents that are in the ISO A series, almost never filmed in American libraries. With the merger of working groups two and three, it is likely that the expertise of working group two members will be available for work on standards for outsize library materials, such as maps and charts, as well as engineering drawings.

Working Group Four: Quality of Microforms spent almost all its time considering measurement of density of diazo and vesicular films, a draft for which is still in the early stages of review. The group agreed to add to its work the drafting of a standard on the creation of documents for filming, and it reviewed French and American documents on controlling the legibility of COM microforms. It became apparent at the end of the week that working group four has an extremely heavy workload, as three other groups referred important questions to it for review. These three referrals, like all other working group referrals, are done by resolutions proposed to the TC's plenary session and there debated and usually adopted. One of the three will require working group four to investigate specifications for filming up to 50 to 1 (as noted before), another deals with specifications for image quality as it relates to graphic characteristics of documents being filmed, and the third relates to specifications for a "micro" test object for use in evaluating the performance of microfiche reading equipment.

Working Group Five: Vocabulary of Micrographics continued to review chapters of the micrographics glossary it is developing. The two sections currently under review relate to "exposure" and "processing."

Working Group Six: Micrographic Equipment continued its work on a standard for reader performance, which is well along in development and should be ready for combined voting within two years; it also considered a relatively new standard on methods for measuring reader performance.

This first meeting of TC171 was successful and, in light of the organizational changes made—and proposed but not made—unusually significant. The barriers of distance, culture, and language were so small as to be inconsequential. The staff of AFNOR was efficient and gracious, and the accommodations were excellent. All the delegates at the meeting participated energetically and with a highly productive spirit of cooperation in working toward the common goal of creating standards for adoption as international norms. The next meeting of the technical committee is scheduled for October 1980. The British Standards Institute, ISO's United Kingdom member body, will host the meeting in London.

International micrographics standards contribute to the free flow of
information across national borders. With international standards, format and equipment specifications, production and storage practices, and methods for testing quality and longevity may be made uniform practically worldwide, and the information resources of one country may then be shared with many others. Since the standards are produced by committees of experts and are approved by multinational consensus, they reflect the procedural and technological capabilities within participating nations. Not only do they help prevent the introduction of microforms and microform equipment with valueless idiosyncrasies, but, being subject to periodic review, they also promote the adoption of changes that are truly advantageous. Just as the international micrographic standards are valuable to library resource sharing, so is the work required in making them an important library function, one in which the Resources and Technical Services Division and its Resources and Reproduction of Library Materials sections should continue to have a significant role.
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Coping with Subject Heading Changes

Gregor A. Preston

The Library of Congress will adopt numerous new subject headings when it closes its card catalogs in 1981. Libraries without subject authority control need to take steps to prevent the problems caused by having both obsolete and new subjects in their card catalogs. Three methods—Standard, Interfiling, and Split Files—are offered for preserving card catalog integrity. Tools and routines for subject maintenance are discussed. Each library must decide its own approach, but a minimum of subject control is recommended for libraries not switching to on-line catalogs in the near future.

If the Library of Congress closes its card catalogs in the near future (1 Jan. 1981 is the projected date), one result will be the adoption of numerous new LC subject headings, designed to replace terms that have become obsolete. LC has postponed making major subject heading changes until 1981 because of the enormous amount of work involved in manually correcting catalog cards. Automation can handle massive changes without encountering the problems imposed by a catalog card environment. While the updating of subject headings to conform to current terminology must be applauded, this step threatens to do serious harm to the card catalogs of those libraries that have neither the time nor the expertise to establish subject heading authority control.

It is possible for all libraries, even those without cataloging staff, to take steps to ensure that their subject catalogs continue to provide adequate topical indexes to their collections. This paper offers suggestions for handling conflicts caused by having both obsolete and current subject headings on the same topic in the card catalog. It is geared to smaller libraries, academic, public, or school, that plan to continue to use card catalogs in the foreseeable future. Many of the ideas advanced here are based on LC experience; some are derived from a workshop organized for the Pennsylvania State University.

*Proposals presented are equally applicable to other subject heading lists, such as Sears.

Gregor A. Preston is acting head, catalog department, Shields Library, University of California, Davis; formerly cataloger, Pennsylvania State University Libraries. Manuscript received April 1979; accepted for publication Sept. 1979.
Campus Libraries—which receive subject cards without authority control from the main campus library.

The main problem caused by a lack of subject heading control is that the user does not find the information sought. For instance, if the subject heading Social security is found, the user may not realize that earlier material is filed under Insurance, Social. The reverse is also true; if he is familiar with Insurance, Social, he may not locate the current heading, Social security. The foregoing is an example of a simple “one-to-one” change, but not all changes are of this type. LC sometimes changes a compound heading into its component parts: thus, Negroes becomes either Afro-Americans (for permanent U.S. residents) or Blacks (for persons residing outside the U.S.). Other changes may involve transposing a subdivision into a main subject—the old heading Pennsylvania—Climate is now Climatology—Pennsylvania—or making all geographic subdivisions “Indirect,” i.e., Banks and banking—France—Paris instead of Banks and banking—Paris. For the user not to be misled by such changes and for the card catalog to retain a semblance of integrity, there are three basic methods that can be used to resolve subject heading conflicts. It is both likely and desirable that all three methods will be used in a single catalog with the choice depending on the specific type of subject heading conflict being treated.

**STANDARD METHOD**

The Standard method is to change all obsolete headings (of the “one-to-one” type) to the new form by deleting the old heading and typing the new heading.

This traditional method is one with which catalogers are familiar, and it is a satisfactory solution whenever feasible. However, as noted earlier, not even LC has the necessary staff to make voluminous changes in this manner. Small libraries should consider this method only when the cards to be changed are few in number. It is important to remember that in an uncontrolled environment “old” subject cards may continue to appear after the change to the new heading has been made; therefore, it is essential that a see cross-reference be made from the old to the new heading; then, if an old heading is subsequently received, it can be caught when filing. Remember, too, that use of the Standard method necessitates refiling the changed subject cards. If a large file is changed (such as “Negroes” to “Afro-Americans”) it may mean that entire sections of the card catalog will have to be shifted to accommodate the new heading.

**INTERFILING METHOD**

In the Interfiling method, old and new headings that file next to each other may be interfiled together with an explanatory reference card:

(1) Automobiles—Law and legislation  
   Interfiled under  
   Automobiles—  
   Law and legislation

(2) Automobiles—Laws and regulations
Through use of plastic overlays, the reference card can be elevated above the subject cards for better visibility. The benefit of this method is that little work is involved—simply interfiling and typing a reference card—and the user will continue to locate both old and new headings in one file. It is possible also to interfile headings that would file in close proximity or even headings beginning with different letters of the alphabet, although the latter practice might be considered too confusing to the user. For subjects that do not file next to each other, two explanatory references are made—

In the S’s:

| Insurance, Social | Interfiled under Social security |

In the I’s:

| Insurance, Social | see Social security |

**SPLIT FILES METHOD**

The Split Files method is used for changes involving headings beginning with different letters of the alphabet. No changes are made to the old headings and the new headings are filed. This creates two separate files with explanatory references leading the user from one file to the other.

**A. "One-to-one" change:**

| Insurance, Social | see also Social security |

The heading "Insurance, Social" has been discontinued. Recent material on this subject is filed under "Social security."

**B. Change of a compound heading into its component parts:**

| Crime and criminals | see also Criminals Criminology |

The heading “Crime and criminals” has been discontinued. Recent material on these subjects is filed under “Criminals” and “Criminology.”

| Criminals | see also Crime and criminals |

"Criminals" is the current heading for this subject. Older material is filed under the former heading, "Crime and criminals." For current material on "Crime" see the heading “Criminology.”

Likewise, a duplicate of the above cross-reference would be filed for “Criminology.” As with the Interfiling method, little work is involved.
in constructing split files and once they are established nothing further need be done—later receipt of obsolete headings is not a problem. A possible drawback is that users may not read or understand the references. This problem may be dealt with by preparing guides to catalog use, by posters, and so forth.

Interfiling and Split Files are appropriate techniques for coping with subject heading changes involving more than a few cards. They ensure that the user is aware of all material on a topic owned by the library, no matter what terminology is used, thus preserving traditional cataloging aims.

MAINTENANCE ROUTINES

Two questions remain: How can new subject headings be discovered? and What work flows are best for establishing links between old and new headings? In a library without subject authority files, new subject headings are encountered sporadically. If the librarian in charge of the card catalog does not possess cataloging expertise, how does the small institution develop subject control? First, the LC Subject Headings (LCSH)—and its periodical supplements—or the Sears list—are essential. Keep them near the card catalog for patron use as well. A short guide explaining the use of LCSH can be prepared—interpreting what sa, x, etc., stand for. Unfortunately, LCSH is written for the cataloger, not the layman. Making sense out of the shorthand used in the supplements is especially tricky. Each line of the supplements is either a Change, a Deletion, or an Addition. The word Cancel or Change precedes the affected headings; however, headings being Added are not preceded by any word. A subscription to the free publication Cataloging Service Bulletin, which contains the latest information on changes in subject heading policy, is a good idea.

Looking at the catalog cards when they arrive with a book shipment or, better yet, checking them when they are filed into the subject catalog, develops familiarity with the headings and makes it more likely that new ones will be recognized. If possible, assign one person responsibility for subject heading work, since this is an area where learning comes with experience. When filing or revising filing, this “catalog maintenance” person can best spot a new heading when the card being filed is a “first.” Then, after the new heading is checked in LCSH for the heading it replaces (if any) it is necessary to see whether the catalog has any cards under the old heading. If it does, a decision can be made on which method—Standard, Interfiling or Split Files—is appropriate and the necessary reference cards typed.

A corollary benefit of subject heading control involves the weeding process. The librarian may wish to check holdings under obsolete headings for potential withdrawals of older titles.

Each library should decide its own approach to subject heading control. Such questions as perceived user benefits and number of staff

*It is LC practice when establishing a new heading to make the old heading a see reference to the new heading.
will help determine the kind of assistance provided. Very small libraries may decide to control only “major” subject heading changes or changes in sensitive terminology rather than attempt an exhaustive approach. User surveys are valuable—83 percent of faculty surveyed at one university expressed satisfaction with an uncontrolled card catalog (although it was not identified as such), while only 8 percent complained about “inadequate subject entries and cross-indexing.”

No doubt the 83 percent of satisfied users included many who did not know what they were missing or the significance of the question. Still, libraries cannot afford to pay a disproportionate amount of attention to subject heading control if it does not result in improved user service.

A minimum approach to reconciling old and new subject headings does seem called for in light of the large number of imminent changes promised by the Library of Congress. Eventually, all libraries will benefit from automation and on-line catalogs. In the meantime, those libraries that continue to exist in the 3-by-5-inch card environment must learn to cope with the effects of policies promulgated for a machine-readable world.
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False Economy; 
or, Sabotage at the Catalog!

Elisabeth Norie

A plea to maintain high standards in card catalogs until they are closed.

All large academic libraries are faced with adjustment problems these days, chiefly brought about by the wonders of automation, the imminent end of the card catalog as we know it, and the publication of AACR 2. Let us make sure that we use these tools to the greatest advantage of the library user, and that technical services personnel do not use automation as an excuse to shift problems to public services personnel and to the public.

There appears to be a real danger that the value of multimillion-dollar catalogs may be seriously depreciated by unnecessary changes during the last few years of the existence of these catalogs. The changes are supposedly necessitated by the demands of automation, and some of them are. Some of them are desirable and long overdue. But some are advocated by automation enthusiasts who are so enthralled by the new technology that they forget the purpose of the card catalog. For some years to come, the card catalog will remain the key to unlock the resources of a library. The key is not easy to use and it never has been, but until the library's collection is fully available on-line, and until the library can afford a vast array of terminals for public use, people will have to depend on the tool they already have.

If we give imprecise information on the library's holdings, if we fail to keep up the cross-reference structure, or if we allow filing errors to multiply, the catalog becomes less and less useful. Some compromises will have to be made. For example, the University of Washington used to indicate a subject heading by a stamped star and capital letters. About 1950 the capitalization was dropped to save typing time. Now, to make use of computer-produced cards we will have to revert to capitalization alone and simply interfile the different styles. It is a very expensive matter to update major subject changes, so it may be necessary to sprinkle the catalog with references of the "see also the earlier/
later heading” type, but let us keep these to a minimum. In terms of the user's time (and frustration) surely it is not too costly for a catalog division to change the headings on a few cards and to update the tracings on the main entry cards (especially if those main entry cards are to be the basis of a retrospective conversion). Implementation of AACR 2 will necessitate many name changes. As with subject headings, it will be desirable to change the old cards whenever feasible and to keep down the number of see also references. Faculty and students using the catalog will not be aware of the service rendered, but they will be aware of a plethora of confusing references. Reference librarians and other staff members helping patrons use the catalog will appreciate the time saved by finding all entries for an entity under the same heading.

One can no longer say when referring to card catalogs that “the future is longer than the past.” Hence changes in cataloging policy, even though they might be desirable in the long run, must be carefully scrutinized to see that they are really worth an added inconsistency in the present catalog. Converting the cards to microform or eventually converting the entire catalog to machine-readable records is not going to be accomplished instantaneously. Must an entire generation of patrons be deprived of adequate library service in the meanwhile?

Even though the days of the card catalog are numbered, the machine-readable records made from that catalog will repeat, if not multiply, any errors found therein. Computers cannot jump to logical conclusions as a human brain can do. Careless and incomplete records entered now in the card catalog will lead to time-consuming and thus expensive corrections in the future.

Catalogers are traditionally conservative. That is the way we have been trained. We are not necessarily averse to new ideas, but we believe they should be carefully considered, with a weighing of the pros and cons, and a study of all the ramifications involved, before they are implemented. We are aware that the end product of our labors is a complex tool, but we strive to make it as reasonable and consistent as possible. In academic libraries we can presume that our patrons are intelligent, but we should also presume that their time is valuable. We must not shift the expenditure of time from cataloger to catalog user, and that is the last thing that most catalogers want to do.

Let us continue to give tender loving care to the card catalog until a worthy successor is a practical and affordable reality.
The Division has experienced extensive turnover in staffing this year, especially in the RTSD headquarters office. In December of 1977 Carol Kelm resigned as executive secretary. Donna Harlan was hired March 15 to June 15, 1978 as an interim replacement until a permanent executive secretary could be found. Donna did an excellent job for the division, getting everything ready for the ALA Chicago Annual Conference before returning to her regular job in June. William I. Bunnell, from the County College of Morris (N.J.) Library was employed as of August 1 to fill this vacancy. Bill was eager and willing, actually assuming responsibility for the work of the office at the Chicago conference. A new secretary, Ann Menendez, was also hired at the same time. At year's end, however, Ann moved on to another job with a replacement due in after the Dallas Conference. It is interesting to note how history repeats itself. Just ten years ago acting president Carol Raney opened her annual report with word of president Margaret Brown's having to go on the inactive list just before Midwinter and of executive secretary Elizabeth Rodell resigning due to illness. Then, as now, members of the division helped fill many gaps in the transitional period.

The office of RTSD president also experienced turnover when incoming president Pauline Atherton regretfully had to resign. As the resignation was received during the 1978 election, the newly elected vice-president immediately became the president for a two-year term.

A change was approved in the bylaws to provide that should the president terminate during the election process, the president from the previous year would continue for six months, the vice-president-elect assuming the office of president in January also to serve a term of 18 months. This should relieve the demands of getting appointments made and also cover all other division responsibilities.

Numerous committee appointments remained open following the 1978 Annual Conference. It is a pleasure to report that prior to the Dallas Conference all of these vacancies had been filled. An effort was made to bring in some new people. Without a vice-president who normally handles committee appointments, however, the use of reappointments was also heavily relied upon this year to ensure that the units of the division had the full complement of personnel to carry out their assigned tasks. With a new vice-president, Karen
Horny, elected and on board this June, a major effort will be made to involve a greater number of new members on RTSD committees in 1980-81.

The editorships of both division publications also changed hands. Wesley Simonton submitted his resignation as editor of Library Resources & Technical Services after serving six years in this demanding position. Mary Pound submitted her resignation at the 1978 Annual Conference as founding editor of the RTSD Newsletter. An ad hoc committee chaired by Al Lane was appointed to locate successors for both positions. Wes and Mary graciously continued to edit their respective publications until Elizabeth Tate was appointed editor for LRTS and Arnold Hirshon editor for the RTSD Newsletter in March.

One of the milestones of the year was the publication of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules in December. It was offered in both hardbound and paperback formats. Upon its publication, the Catalog Code Revision Committee, under the capable leadership of John Byrum, had completed its work and was discharged with thanks.

A critical meeting was held at ALA headquarters on August 3 to discuss implementation of the new rules. The Library of Congress representatives and others assembled (including the RTSD president) agreed to delay implementation of the new rules for one year to January 1, 1981. This provided the division with some additional time to prepare its series of regional workshops and a preconference on AACR 2. A preconference was originally scheduled for Midwinter 1979 and a presentation in conjunction with LC on interpretation of the new rules at the Dallas Conference. This schedule was revised so that the preconference was presented at Dallas and the LC/RTSD program will be presented in New York in the summer of 1980 and then in a series of regional workshops during the following year.

Unlike the adoption of AACR in 1967 where a meeting was called a year after the rules were implemented to discuss the impact and problems encountered in applying the new rules, a series of national and regional programs on AACR 2 have been in the planning stages for several months to be presented prior to AACR 2 implementation. The ad hoc AACR 2 Introductory Program Committee, chaired by Doralyn Hickey, worked from its creation at the 1977 Midwinter Meeting until June of 1979 to prepare a preconference institute that included an audiovisual package that will be used at the upcoming regional institutes. The initial program was presented at Dallas with some 380 librarians being selected to participate from a list of nominees submitted by library organizations and institutions. The preconference was designed to educate librarians throughout the country on the historical perspective and application of AACR 2, as well as how to interpret the rules for use under guidelines currently available. They then returned to their respective libraries where they are available as resource persons for regional workshops and local seminars on AACR 2 given in their area. Administrators and public service librarians were among those selected to attend this preconference. Their training was viewed as providing them with the information to return to their libraries and be able to assess the fiscal and user implications that implementation of AACR 2 would have on their institutions. They are also available to share information with their colleagues in the region. The Council of Regional Groups, with chairperson Barbara Gates and vice-chair David Remington, worked closely with the AACR 2 Introductory Program Committee. In addition to coordinating the registration for the preconference, they have planned a series of up to thirty-four regional workshops over the next two years, working with the RTSD regional groups.

Prior to the ALA New York Conference in 1980, a second training session
is planned in conjunction with the Library of Congress. This meeting will actually be the first of twelve regional workshops cosponsored by RTSD and LC and again coordinated through the Council of Regional Groups. These training sessions will feature the AACR 2 interpretations and options as they will be applied by LC, coupled with the packet of RTSD audiovisual materials developed for use at the Dallas preconference.

[During the year] the Board discussed how best to handle future representation to and responsibility for the review process for future changes to AACR 2. The board voted this responsibility to the Cataloging and Classification Section, whose Executive Committee in turn voted responsibility to the Descriptive Cataloging Committee. This committee was subsequently reorganized, and its name changed to Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. It currently has responsibility for future code revision. Additional mechanisms for code revision are being considered to identify a more effective manner of interacting with other ALA and non-ALA organizations having a voice in the revision process.

The Council of Regional Groups has added four new members this year. They are:

1. Technical Services Chapter, California Library Association
2. Technical Services Section, Massachusetts Library Association
3. Technical Services Round Table, Pennsylvania Library Association
4. Technical Services Interest Group, Washington Library Association

The direct impact of AACR 2 on the catalog is of major concern. To facilitate dissemination of timely information, space has been made available in the RTSD Newsletter for a regular column entitled “News about AACR 2 Implementation Studies,” prepared by Mary Jo Lynch, director of ALA Office for Research, and others. The publication schedule for the Newsletter was reviewed. The RTSD Board approved increasing its frequency to six issues a year to improve the currency of information it is providing for the membership.

In addition to AACR 2, work was completed on “Guidelines for the Subject Analysis of Audiovisual Materials.” These “Guidelines,” prepared by the Cataloging and Classification Section’s Subject Analysis Committee, have been approved by the RTSD Board and published.

Four “Guidelines for the Formulation of Collection Development Policies” were completed by the Resources Section and were published in time to be available at the Dallas Conference. They include:

1. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Library Collections
2. Guidelines for the Evaluation of the Effectiveness of Library Collections
3. Guidelines for the Review of Library Collections
4. Guidelines for the Allocation of Library Materials Budgets

Bylaws changes were approved to provide for the division’s Councilor. Elizabeth Herman was elected the first RTSD Councilor to serve a four-year term. This new position will give each division a representative on Council. It was agreed to make the councilor a voting member of the RTSD Board.

The Planning Committee, chaired by Charlotte Hensley, completed a new RTSD “Goals for Action” statement that was approved by the RTSD Board at the 1979 Midwinter Meeting. The committee also completed guidelines for Regional Conferences.

The Filing Committee, chaired by Joe Rosenthal, continues to grapple with the complex questions associated with establishing a revised set of filing rules. It is anticipated a final revised draft will be available for review and comment.
at the 1980 Midwinter. Machine files and the impact of AACR 2 are being considered.

Programming has been active with the following programs presented at the annual meeting in Chicago:

1. Budgetary Planning for Libraries—LAMA/LOMS Budgeting, Accounting and Costs Committee and RTSD Resources Section, cosponsors.
4. Whither MARC and Mann?—CCS, PLA, RASD and RASD Catalog Use Committee, cosponsors.

Many hearings and discussions were also conducted during the conference. A special hearing was arranged at Midwinter to provide a forum for members to express reaction to the draft document “National Level Bibliographic Record—Books,” prepared by the Library of Congress.

The Dallas program schedule was equally full and diversified. The following sessions were held:

1. The AACR 2 Preconference—RTSD and its Council of Regional Groups.
2. Can Anyone Do It?—CCS Subject Analysis Committee.
5. AACR 2 and Its Effect on Serials—RTSD Serials Section.
7. Use and the User—RS Collection Development Committee.
10. The Public Catalog: Microform Alternatives—RLMS and RS, cosponsors.
11. Marking It and Parking It—Road Map for the Cataloging of Print and Nonprint—CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee.

Several things stand out when reviewing such a listing. The membership of the division is dynamically involved in working to present programs on topics of current interest to help their colleagues run their libraries better. While there was more cosponsorship of programs with other divisions last year, it is hoped that action being taken on two levels will further aid this area of concern within ALA.

In the area of personnel, the board approved the establishment of a Program Officer at the Midwinter Meeting. William Drewett from Green Gold Library System in Shreveport, Louisiana, was hired to begin June 11, 1979, to provide assistance in coordinating program planning and help the sections reduce redundancy in program content. A special benefit will be realized
from Drewett's skills in continuing education programming to be applied to the division's regional programming activities.

The division is entering a period in which it hopes to reach out more directly to the grass roots level of librarians, working within the framework of the Council of Regional Groups, and bring programs to them. Plans are firmly established to do this for the introduction of AACR 2. Other topics of national interest, such as networking, serials, preservation, resource sharing, and bibliographic access will be receiving attention as possible regional programming subjects in the years ahead.

Concern for overlap and duplication in programming both within the division and ALA is of major concern. In an attempt to begin to address this issue, the RTSD President wrote a letter to each of the other division presidents, suggesting some possible approaches to resolving this problem. Several presidents agreed to discuss it with their boards and bring the reactions to a DISC meeting at the Dallas Conference. It resulted in lengthy discussion, but because of schedule conflicts and the termination of DISC, no ongoing solutions were realized. Several divisions did pass resolutions on the overlap of programs.

The RTSD Board updated its 1975 resolution on programming that required all division units desiring program meetings at annual conferences to submit requests to the board one year in advance of the meeting date for approval or rejection of time slots. The 1975 resolution prohibited the scheduling of program meetings which overlapped and the duplication of programming. The revised resolution reads: Moved that the RTSD Board require that for a program to receive approval for presentation, it be presented to the Board in writing with answers to the following questions which are satisfactory to the Board:

1. What other units of the division and ALA have been considered as possible cosponsors or coproducers of the activity?
2. Have these units been consulted and the officers asked if they would like to participate?
3. What were the replies and what is the result in terms of the final planning and support for the activity?

Another major issue brought before the board in Dallas was concern with the changing status of Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information. The Library of Congress indicated that ALA's MARBI could no longer be the sole mechanism for review and approval of changes to MARC formats. LC needs to allow other MARC users, such as the networks, to have a voice in changes to MARC formats that they do not have through MARBI. The following motion was approved and forwarded to the ALA Executive Board. Moved that: The recommendations made by MARBI and transmitted to each of the sponsoring Boards on 23 June 1979 and modified at this meeting be made recommendations of this Board and transmitted to the ALA Executive Director.

MOVED: (1) That the American Library Association continue to maintain a strong and active role in matters relating to the interchange of machine-readable bibliographic data, in particular the development and maintenance of LC/MARC formats.
(2) That the Association negotiate with the Library of Congress a modification of the original relationship as defined in the "white paper." The preferred result of the negotiation would be:

—An analog to the Joint Steering Committee would be established to be a body sharing the decision-making responsibility for the development and maintenance of LC/MARC formats (perhaps to be called the Joint Steering Committee for Formats, and
in all likelihood to include representation not only of LC and MARBI but also of utilities, other associations, other national libraries, etc.)
—That this “Shared decision making” include a vote for each group represented in the body.

The board approved a motion that stated that the RTSD Board of Directors encourage the participation of technical services librarians in library bibliographic instruction. A resolution on preservation education was also passed and referred to the ALA Executive Board, and the revised Library Bill of Rights was endorsed.

The most significant change for RTSD this year was approval for the establishment of a Preservation Section within the division. This brings to five the number of sections in RTSD. The section will be operational immediately following the 1980 Annual Conference, with names for officers appearing on the next ballot. This section will replace the Preservation of Library Materials Committee. Its subcommittees and discussion group will be incorporated into the new section.

Paul Cors from the University of Wyoming was appointed the division's representative to the Freedom to Read Foundation. Ann Heidbreder Eastman was named the divisional representative to the Legislation Assembly while Arnold Hirshon is the new representative to LITA.

The International Cataloging Consultation Committee, chaired by John Byrum, presented to the board the Preliminary Report of ICCC for solicitation of comments and review at the 1980 Midwinter Meeting. The document will be published in *LRTS* as well. It is a report on the committee's charge "to study procedures involved in the development of international cataloging policies by international organizations and to propose methods to establish communication and ensure adequate consultation between these international organizations and RTSD."

The Education Committee, chaired by William Myrick, has identified nine areas of concern to be studied during the next several years. Topics will include need for instruction in the use of on-line systems and the extent to which preservation and the reproduction of library materials are taught in library schools, among others.

The Membership Committee, chaired by Francis Spreitzer, has developed an RTSD brochure that is being distributed widely. An RTSD booth was included in the exhibits at Dallas, the success of which will result in a repeat in New York. A new RTSD logo is in the drafting stages.

Discussion groups are certainly in vogue, with new ones being added for such topics as Heads of Cataloging and Catalog Maintenance. Both sectional and divisional ones are providing a vital forum for librarian-to-librarian exchange of information, which cannot be accomplished through committee meetings and program discussions and papers. This is clearly an area where the division is providing a major service for its membership.

David Weber, RTSD president in 1967–68, wrote in this annual report, “the World of RTSD is developing as never before.” With videodisc, expanding telecommunications and computer applications, shifts in publishing patterns and formats, networking and a variety of developments yet to be announced, it is equally true today. The technological problems involved in acquiring and processing library materials and information and in providing bibliographic access to them are being made more complex and demanding. RTSD will continue to strive to provide the means for librarians to cope with these changes through its programming, publications, and discussion groups. With the continued dedication of its membership, it should succeed admirably if the past year is any indication.
Cataloging and Classification Section

Frances Hinton, Chairperson

The activities of the Cataloging and Classification Section likely to have the most long-lasting effect on the work of the section were the reconstruction of the former Descriptive Cataloging Committee and the establishing of the new Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials. At its final meeting in Dallas, the Executive Committee approved a petition for a Catalog Maintenance Discussion Group.

Many hours of thought and discussion were needed to arrive at a final statement of the function and structure of the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. Demands had been made by other ALA divisions and other library organizations for a more effective voice in the making of cataloging rules. The configuration agreed upon was similar to that of the Catalog Code Revision Committee: a voting committee of the section with nonvoting official representatives selected by the other RTSD Sections, ALA divisions and round tables, and national library organizations outside ALA. The enlarged committee held its first meetings in Dallas, and a task force was appointed to develop procedures for handling discussion and reaching decisions.

The Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials was the recommendation of subcommittees of the Descriptive Cataloging and Subject Analysis Committees. Both had urged the need for closer and continuing communication between area specialists and generalist catalogers. This committee, with Thomas H. Lee as chairperson, held its first meeting in Dallas and was immediately faced with a proposal by the Library of Congress for changing its Chinese romanization to the Pinyin system.

Two public hearings were conducted during the Midwinter Meeting to provide opportunity for members of ALA to respond to matters of national and international bibliographic control. One, sponsored by CCS, was on the proposed National Level Bibliographic Record—Books. The other, a regular meeting of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee, was on Recommendations of the IFLA Working Group on Corporate Headings. Although those attending seemed more interested in learning than in making comments, meetings such as these may serve to forestall the reaction that some remote body is making decisions without soliciting opinions from the field.

The Margaret Mann Citation Committee presented, for the first time in history, a joint citation to Michael Gorman and Paul W. Winkler, the editors of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition.

The Nominating Committee presented a slate of five candidates. Nancy Williamson was elected as vice-chairperson/chairperson-elect and Barbara Gates and Patricia Oyler were elected as members-at-large of the CCS Executive Committee.

Although the Cataloging and Classification Section itself presented no program at the Annual Conference, because it was felt that the AACR 2 preconference was quite enough to ask of its members, two committees presented very successful programs. The Cataloging of Children’s Materials presented “Marking It and Parking It—Road Map for the Cataloging of Print and Non-Print.” The Subject Analysis Committee presented “Can Anyone Do It? The #1 Question of Universal Subject Access.”

The Policy and Research Committee concerned itself with studies of areas for research, prepared by Elaine Svenonius, and the need for continuing education, prepared by Eleanor R. Payne.
The SAC Subcommittee on Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis continued its investigations of terminology preferred by various ethnic groups and discussed the Library of Congress classification of materials relating to women.

The SAC Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture and Analogous Artifacts and Structures held its first meetings in Dallas and began to make its recommendations.

The Cataloging Norms Discussion Group continued to discuss quantitative and qualitative standards that might be considered norms.

There is an obvious and increasing interest in bibliographic control throughout the library world. Types of library divisions and the various sections of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) are beginning to establish committees to discuss cataloging questions from their own points of view. Since it seems impossible to prevent this proliferation of committees, CCS must continue to keep the lines of communication open so that recommendations made by specialist groups are considered in the broader context of general needs.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section

E. Dale Cluff, Chairperson

A year full of activity typified the Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS). Cosponsored by the Resources Section, the Dallas program “The Public Catalog: Microform Alternatives” made a significant contribution to the profession. Susan Baerg Epstein discussed “From Concept to Acceptance: The ACCESS Study at Los Angeles County Public Library.” Bill Gordon’s paper was titled “From Film to Fiche: A Carefully Considered Change.” Maureen Hutchinson spoke on “The Process of Closing the Card Catalog at Toronto.” Reactors to the three presentations were Nancy Eaton, Karin Trainer, and John Webb. A professional RTSD membership booth at Dallas displayed microform catalogs from sixteen libraries including those presented by the program speakers. The exhibit and the program made a nice tie-in.

Under the leadership of Deborah Raikes the discussion group continued to be an awareness forum, keeping people current on areas of interest and concern. Several topics were covered by those attending. Two recommendations came out of the group’s deliberations this year: (1) That a clearinghouse of locally produced guides to microform collections be created. Francis Spreitzer of the University of Southern California volunteered to coordinate the effort of collecting the materials and making them available to interested people. (2) That a committee be established to draft guidelines for the operation of a library microform facility.

Reports from RLMS representatives to other organizations served to keep members informed. The latest representative is Charles Willard, who is assigned to the Cataloging and Classification Section’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. Charles LaHood and Norman Shaffer reported on activities of the American National Standards Institute PH5 Committee, while Samuel Boone discussed copyright. National Micrographic Association representative Carl Spaulding reported that the National Micrographics Association (NMA) has decided to establish a new library committee to deal with standards that are particularly appropriate to libraries. A standard for microfiche envelopes will be one of the first topics for discussion.
The assistant editor of Library Resources & Technical Services, Francis Spreitzer, reported that Dale Cluff wrote the review article “Developments in Copying, Micrographics, and Graphic Communications, 1977,” and will do this for 1978 as well.

The Publication Committee, chaired by Douglas Freeman, kept busy during the year. RLMS Circular, No. 3, containing the abstracts of the papers presented at the Dallas RLMS/RS program was printed and distributed at the program and exhibit booth. The seventh edition of the Directory of Reprographic Services published during the year boasts of a microfiche supplement containing a study of the emerging pattern of micrographic series. This edition doubles the size of the sixth. Considerable effort was shown by committee members in soliciting material for the RLMS Microfile Series. Plans were laid to publish the Dallas program as one of the series.

Under the chairmanship of Robert D. Stevens, the Policy and Research Committee discussed at length the implications of a Preservation Section being created as part of RTSD. For the concept, but urging input in the early stages of planning, so that the respective functions and responsibilities of RLMS and the Preservation Section are clearly defined in such a way as to minimize overlap, the committee agreed that there “will need to be a high degree of coordination and cooperation between the two sections.” The committee hammered out a document titled “Tips on Operating Copiers,” which will be published as an RLMS Circular. The purpose of these guidelines for users of self-service photocopy machines is to put the user on notice that certain kinds of material do not copy well, reduce user frustration, and relieve the library staff member of some complaints.

The Standards Committee, chaired by Lawrence S. Robinson, also made significant progress during the year. The most-discussed topic again this year was which type of microform is best for use in libraries. After careful consideration of the issue of the use of standard and nonstandard microforms in libraries the committee reaffirmed its support of the joint resolution with the RS Micropublishing Committee that libraries purchase for their permanent collections only those types of film for which standards for archival permanence have been established by recognized standards organizations. The committee heard the full reports of Jeff Heynen, who attended the ISO (International Standards Organization) meetings in Paris; Charles LaHood and Norman Shaffer, who both kept in touch with the American National Standards Institute; and Carl Spaulding, who reported on NMA activities. People from the Standards Committee are cooperating with RS Micropublishing Committee members in studying the possibility of creating two groups, one of which will choose annually a micropublishing product that should be recognized for its outstanding qualities and the other to monitor the quality of microforms.

The Dallas program presented by the Telefacsimile Committee capped the year’s work by this group. Titled “Telecommunications Applications in Libraries 1979—Year for Decisions” and moderated by Joan M. Maier, the program featured discussions on recent projects funded by HEW by Howard Hupe; slow scan television by Stuart L. Meyer; TALINET project results by Margaret K. Goggin; video mass storage of documents by Norman Kreisman; view tech systems by Don Bynum; and satellite transmission by Townsend D. Breedan. As an outgrowth of the program, Telefacsimile Committee members will follow developments in the field, including slow scan TV, videodisc, electronic mail, projects and proposals facsimile, satellite transmission, and computer conferencing. Desretta McAllister, committee chairperson, and Ellen Detlessen had an article titled “Telefacsimile in Libraries and Information Centers” published in North Carolina Libraries.
Resources Section

Frederick C. Lynden, Chairperson

Through its committees and discussion groups, the Resources Section serves acquisition and collection development librarians by providing a forum for consumer advocacy and continuing education; by establishing national guidelines and standards; by promoting research and publication on topics relating to resources; and by advising and assisting librarians in the selection, acquisition, and evaluation of library materials. Its committees are concerned with a wide range of issues: Bookdealer–Library Relations (Susan Harrison, 1978–79 chair); Collection Development (David Perkins, chair); Library Materials Price Index (Noreen Gilb Alldredge, chair); Micropublishing (John Webb, chair); Policy and Research Committee (William Myrick, chair); and the National Library Services Resources Section Scholarship Jury Committee (Robert C. Sullivan, chair). Its discussion groups also provide a lively and open environment for deliberation on problems of common interest among resource librarians: Chief Collection Officers of Large Research Libraries (Paul Mosher, 1978–79 chair); Chief Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries (Margaret Jackson, chair); Booksellers Discussion Group (Barry Fast, chair); and Acquisition Discussion Group (Dana Allessi, chair).

Among the especially noteworthy accomplishments of the Resources Section committees in 1978–79 were: the publication of the Guidelines for Collection Development, edited by David Perkins, and consisting of instructions for developing collection policies, evaluation of collections, weeding of collections, and allocation of materials budgets; dissemination in the Bowker Annual of a media price index by David Walch, new consultant to the Library Materials Price Index Committee; a summer exhibit on COM catalogs by John Webb, Micropublishing Committee, in conjunction with the RLMS Section and Library Technology Reports; and final organization of events for the 1980 preconference by current and former members of the Bookdealer–Library Relations Committee: Edna Laughrey, Harriet Rebuldeela, and Susan Harrison. Harrison is working on tours of New York publishing houses for conference participants.

The activities of the committees are so numerous and varied, the following narrative can record only the highlights. This year the Bookdealer–Library Relations Committee invited representatives from publishers, booksellers, and a bibliographic utility to discuss specific problems. The committee issued an updated list of imprints under which the Gille Brothers publish, and worked on a proposal to prepare Guidelines for the Purchase of Out-of-Print Materials. A draft bibliography on the subject has already been produced by the committee. The Collection Development Committee changed its name to Collection Management and Development Committee. The committee is working on guidelines for both resource sharing and use and user studies. It is also planning regional institutes and other training efforts for collection development personnel. The Library Materials Price Index Committee is investigating prompter publication of its indexes. The Bowker Annual will continue to publish summary tables of all indexes on an annual basis, but it is hoped that all indexes will also appear in other publications prior to the annual cumulation. The committee will also be working closely with a newly appointed ANSI standards committee, which will be revising the current standard on price indexes. In view of the article by Carl Spaulding in the December 1978 issue of
American Libraries, the Micropublishing Committee reaffirmed its earlier joint resolution with RLMS that “libraries purchase for their permanent collections only microforms meeting recognized standards.” Micropublishing also established a subcommittee to set up criteria for a Microform Product of the Year award, a prize that might be given for the best microform product or the best microform publication of the year. It will be up to the subcommittee to decide. The Policy and Research Committee recommended that ANSI Z39 consider appointing a subcommittee to adopt standardized definitions for claiming and reporting terms used in acquisitions, such as “temporarily out of stock.”

This year the National Library Services Resources Section Scholarship Jury committee selected an article by Rose Mary Magrill and Mona East entitled “Collection Development in Large University Libraries,” which appeared in Advances in Librarianship, volume 8, as the best resources publication for 1978. The presentation of plaques to the winners and of $1,000 to the University of Michigan Library School was made at the RTSD luncheon.

Two Resources Section committees sponsored programs at the Dallas summer meeting. The Micropublishing Committee cosponsored, with RLMS, a program entitled “The Public Catalog: Microform Alternatives.” The program included presentations of microform catalogs at Los Angeles County Public Library, Prince George’s County Memorial Library System, and the University of Toronto, with reactions from librarians well versed in the use of microforms. The Microfiles series will publish the entire proceedings. The Collection Development Committee offered a program on use and user studies, as these studies relate to collection management. Speakers described major aspects of use and user studies, and reactors provoked discussion.

This year the Resources Section appointed Susan Vita, member of the Resources Section Executive Committee, to serve as representative to the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, Cataloging and Classification Section. This committee initiates proposals for additions to and revisions of the cataloging code. Although a representative cannot vote, the Resources Section now has someone to express its official positions on AACR 2 for the future.

Members for the Executive Committee for 1979 were: Sheila T. Dowd, past chair; Fred C. Lynden, chair; Jean Boyer Hamlin, vice-chair; Mona East, secretary; George B. Miller, Harriet K. Rebulde, Elaine Sloan, and Susan H. Vita, members at large. Their recommendations for section activities and support for section programs resulted in a year of solid accomplishments. The Resources Section can look forward to another year of progress as Jean Boyer Hamlin, Rutgers University, and Paul Mosher, Stanford University, take office as chair and vice-chair elect for 1979–80.

Serials Section

Judith N. Kharbas, Chairperson

The Serials Section continues to look to the future in both its programs and its committee work. The Annual Conference program entitled “Serials: Issues for the Eighties” was a great success, with more than 550 people in attendance. Papers on AACR 2 and serials cataloging, serials and catalog closing,
and decision points in retrospective conversion of serials were enthusiastically received by librarians looking ahead to a decade filled with challenges. The section was also one of the cosponsors of a program on the National Periodicals Center, another topic of interest and controversy for the eighties.

Section committees have been busy exploring new directions for serials. The Committee to Study Serials Cataloging decided to catalog twenty serial titles using AACR 2 rules and discovered, to no one's surprise, that in discussing just the first five rules interpretations differed. The committee will seek clarification of the rules for the information of serials catalogers. The Regional Serials Workshops Committee is preparing a directory of speakers on topics of interest to serials librarians. The directory will be alphabetical by speaker's name with subject, geographical, and type of library indexes. The committee hopes the directory will be published soon. The Serials Section Committee on Library School Education was changed from an ad hoc to a standing committee at the 1979 Midwinter Meeting and began its work at the Annual Conference. Its chairperson will also serve as liaison to the RTSD Education Committee so that the two groups can work more closely together. The committee's efforts will initially be directed toward compiling an annual bibliography and an annual list of serials courses and developing procedures whereby it can serve as a clearinghouse for serials instructional materials.

The Committee to Study Serials Records decided, at Midwinter, to concentrate its efforts on a specific topic for each meeting rather than to continue the earlier attempt to survey the entire area of serials records. The June meeting was devoted to serials holdings statements with focus on the Z39 subcommittee SC-40. Four speakers summarized the problems in developing both summary and detailed holdings statements.

The section's two discussion groups again had very interesting and well-attended meetings. The one for large research libraries had an update on National Periodicals Center developments since the March 1979 Open Forum, a report on a meeting the Library of Congress had with the National Library of Canada on reconciling AACR 2 and the ISDS guidelines, and a discussion of the Stanford, UC Berkeley, and UCLA Title IIC grant serials project.

The Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group focused on subscription agency conversion work, particularly the processes involved in decisions to change or merge vendors. Speakers offered information regarding what documentation needs to be available for review; how to keep the documentation; and what constitutes an environment that poses sufficient problems to dictate a change in acquisitions methods.

The Duplicates Exchange Union Committee has before it a proposal to change its status within RTSD to reflect more properly its function as an exchange for both serials and monographs. The committee will continue to work on defining its own role as well as that of the union in future meetings.

The Committee to Study the Feasibility of Creating Dynamic Lists of Core Serials is working on a questionnaire to be sent to library subject specialists to find out how they would use core lists of undergraduate-level serials and what information they would like included in the lists. The committee has established liaison with the Resources Section Library Materials Price Index Committee so work can be coordinated.

The Section Executive Committee passed resolutions endorsing the concept of a National Periodicals Center and encouraging continued cooperation between LC and the GPO on use of ISSN for federal documents. The committee also approved the section's cosponsorship of the 1980 Acquisitions Preconference.

The section also asked the RTSD Board, through its Organization Commit-
tee, to examine the charge and function of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials. The section has a representative to JUCLES but is questioning the need for continuing the committee since it has accomplished its original purpose.

All in all, it has been a very busy and exciting year for the Serials Section, which now passes to the able leadership of Dorothy Pearson, chairperson, and Marcia Tuttle, the new vice-chairperson/chairperson-elect. They will have the assistance of a very talented and energetic group of committee chairs and members as well as the support of a most enthusiastic section membership.
From: Susan Brynteson, assistant director of libraries for technical services, Indiana University.—In her article "Interfacing a Local System with OCLC: The Documentation Process" in the Spring 1979 issue of LRTS [23:129-38], Kathleen M. Purnell does not indicate that the interfacing system at the Indiana University Libraries which she describes was discontinued in September 1977. The Indiana University Libraries no longer have the local automated system described in the article and have not had such a system for over two years.

From: William E. Studwell, head, Cataloging Dept., Northern Illinois University.—Concerning Mr. Robert Rodriguez' article "Use of Alternative Class Numbers for Bibliography in the Library of Congress Classification System" (Spring 1979 [23:147-55]), may I offer the following suggestion as an addendum to his article: When the subject of a bibliography being classified outside of Z is assigned a span of numbers, the book could be placed in the number for dictionaries. If there is no specific provision for dictionaries, a number for some other reference-type material, e.g., gazetteers, would be used. If there is no provision for any type of reference material, the bibliography would be classed in general works (the same place LC would class a dictionary or other reference tool). This method has the practical advantage of always locating bibliographies near the beginning of a topic without resorting to made-up numbers or other "in-house" variations, as well as the theoretical advantage, as Mr. Rodriguez alludes to on page 151, of classing similar materials together. Northern Illinois University Libraries have successfully implemented this concept since 1976.

From: C. Derek Robinson, consultant, Canadian Nonprint Project. [Abridged]—PRECIS is a new system of subject retrieval, and discussions of it are welcome, particularly in American professional journals. Unfortunately, the recent Library Resources & Technical Services paper by D. K. Weintraub [Spring 1979, 23:101-15] contains several errors of fact, together with misinterpretations which will seriously mislead those who know little or nothing of PRECIS.

On page 106, for example, Weintraub writes, "Some of the letter codes are preceded by a dollar sign." All letter codes in PRECIS are preceded by a dollar sign, which functions as a conventional subfield indicator. On page 105 she says, "There are two completely different and equivalent sets of symbols identifying PRECIS conceptual types. They are called operators and manipulation codes. . . . There is no obvious reason why two sets of codes are needed" (her italics). This is an extraordinary howler. The role operator is an intrinsic part
of the manipulation code; and there is no equivalence between a whole and one of its parts. It is quite possible that Weintraub was misled by the arrangement of the Manual, for role operators are introduced well before the rest of the manipulation code. This, however, is standard teaching practice.

There is another factual error on page 108, where it is stated that PRECIS subject headings (not index entries) commence with the first lead term in the string, and that this would generate many unhelpful headings beginning with place names. Pages 400–3 of Austin's Manual are cited as authority for this statement. In fact, page 400 of the Manual lays down a rule for this method of generating subject headings. A term coded (0)—location—or coded as a dependent element of another term coded (0) is ignored unless it is the only term with an operator in the range (0) to (3) that is a lead term. Such a string is extremely rare in practice. The vast majority of headings generated in this way will not begin with a place-name.

On page 110 Weintraub contends that the coding of three strings differs “because these varying codes will lead to somewhat different forms of entry.” This is quite wrong. The use of different role operators simply reflects the concept analysis of different subjects. In the examples, “culture” is an action on a key system, “bacteria”; ”management” is also an action applied to a key system; but “air services” is the agent that performs the action of “passenger transport.” Weintraub’s assertion ignores a good deal of the Manual: it reveals that she has failed to grasp the essentials of PRECIS.

If I have understood page 106 correctly, Weintraub advocates the creation of lists of terms associated with their conceptual types. . . . In her estimation, these would be useful indexing tools. This directly contradicts the philosophy of PRECIS. The role operator assigned to a term is assigned in accordance with the role that term plays in the context of the subject statement. It follows that a particular term is not always given the same role operator. . . . Such lists would therefore be of little help to the indexer, and their construction would be laborious.

. . . Weintraub discusses PRECIS in terms of subject headings, in terms of classification, and in terms of chain indexing, until the reader feels some terminological confusion. She lacks the vocabulary to discuss it in its own terms as a system of subject indexing . . . since more than one hundred papers on PRECIS have been published in the last five years, is there any point in publishing in 1979 a paper that was written in 1977 about PRECIS as it was in 1974?

From: D. Kathryn Weintraub, associate professor, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago.*—It is quite correct that I did not describe PRECIS in its own terms. My intent was to compare it with other systems so as to identify those aspects of PRECIS which represent a unique contribution to the theory of alphabetical subject lists. Thus, the entries from all such systems are called subject headings and those headings whose name and form are defined through authority files are called subject names. Such a description makes clear that the unique contribution of PRECIS derives from the character of the string rather than its controlled vocabulary. Furthermore, the terms in a PRECIS subject entry are different from the terms in a chain index entry because PRECIS terms are associated directly with a conceptual type rather than with a facet that represents a fundamental category, as is the case for many chain indexes.

*The editor invited the author of “An Extended Review of PRECIS” to reply to Robinson's letter. This is her response.
The words and phrases of a natural language are typically ambiguous both in the sense of having more than one meaning and in the sense of overlapping in meaning with other words and phrases of the language. A phrase such as passenger transport can be assigned any of at least three closely related meanings. It can represent a type of action, e.g., John did a survey of transport of passengers during the recent United Airlines strike; or it can represent a transitive action with an object, e.g., John did a survey of the transport of passengers during the recent United Airlines strike; or the speaker can use the shorter phrase if he does not care to disambiguate the expression, e.g., John did a survey of passenger transport during the recent United Airlines strike. PRECIS does not include an operator that says, in effect, “not worth disambiguating” and so the analyst must choose between the first two alternatives, coding the phrase with a 2 if the first meaning is intended or splitting the phrase into two terms coded 1 and 2 if the second meaning is intended.

Potentially, this leads to two different problems for a phrase such as passenger transport where the distinction in meaning is slight and where the shorter phrase represents common usage for both meanings. First, if the strings are used rather than the subject names for organizing a machine-readable data file (which might be useful), then the search requests for one string will not match exactly with strings in the other form; and so additional links would be required.

Second, in those cases where the second meaning is intended, the coding would not lead to subject names that correspond with common usage. In such cases the analyst is required to make adjustments. One possibility is to use a substitute phrase as was done in the string that includes the phrase bacteria culture. Another alternative would be to write the string as if the first meaning were intended because it will lead to a more satisfactory form of subject name, and this is what I think would be done in at least some of the strings that include the phrase passenger transport.

The systems design for PRECIS is one of its more striking features—it is far more efficient than the sets of procedures associated with other systems—and for this reason it is disappointing to find a few instances where it could have been improved. Mr. Robinson is correct to point out that when only one heading is produced, the first lead term in the string defines the heading unless that term is coded with a 0 for location and there is also a second lead term coded with an operator in the range 1–3. The system would be more efficient if the test were not necessary.

Similarly, it would have been more appropriate if I had said that the system of operators and other conventions that are a part of traditional PRECIS exposition and teaching practice are equivalent to the set of symbols called manipulation codes. But the two systems are not identical. The manipulation codes differ in every case because they are defined in terms of position and sequence as well as character. In addition, the character codes vary somewhat between the two systems, and many character codes must be specified for the manipulation codes that are not necessary for the simpler system. Yet the shorter system has proven adequate and can be converted to the longer set algorithmically.

Incidentally, in those cases where letter codes are used to designate operators, dollar signs precede the operators that introduce the words within a term (the differencing operators and the connectives), but dollar signs do not introduce those letter codes that function as operators for terms in the string (the interposed operators).
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In preparing articles to be submitted for publication in Library Resources & Technical Services, please follow these procedures:

1. Submit only original, unpublished articles. Write the article in a grammatically correct, simple, readable style. Remember that the author is responsible for the accuracy of the statements in his or her article.

2. Devise a brief title. On a separate covering page give the title, the name(s) of the author(s), and the title and affiliation of each. Do not repeat this information elsewhere in the manuscript.

3. On a separate page type a brief abstract of the article, double spaced.

4. Use Merriam-Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 8th ed. (backed up by Webster's Third International), as your authority for spelling and usage; prefer the first spelling if there is a choice. Verify the spelling of names in an appropriate reference; don't rely solely on your memory.

5. Use the University of Chicago Press A Manual of Style as your authority for capitalization, punctuation, quotations, tables, and captions. (ALA style includes a few exceptions, which editors will mark.)

6. Type the manuscript on standard size, nonerasable paper, double spaced. Type quoted text double spaced also. Use the customary superscript numbers throughout the text for bibliographic references but do not type the reference itself on the same page.

7. Submit all references at the end of the paper, typed double spaced on a separate page. In general follow the practices recommended by Kate L. Turabian's Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations with these exceptions:

   Cite journal articles according to this pattern:
   author's first name or initials, author's surname, title of article, title of journal volume:page references (issue date).—e.g.,

   Note the punctuation and spacing pattern. Note also that the volume, but not the issue number, is given and that the names of the months are abbreviated and are not separated from the year by a comma. Note that the first line is not indented.

   For subsequent references to a previously cited work, the surname of the author, a shortened form of the title (do not use op. cit. or loc. cit.), and the page reference are enough, e.g.,
   If no other reference intervenes, use Ibid. (do not italicize) to take the place of whatever elements of the previous reference apply.
   Number items as 1., 2., etc.; do not use superscript numbers with the citations.
   Underline or quote all titles in both references and bibliographies.

   Use p.726–30, not pp. 726–730, for citations to a book; abbreviate volume as V.2 or 2v.

   Verify all citations carefully.

8. Submit all tables and illustrations at the end of the paper on separate pages, but indicate the desired placement in the text by adding an instruction in brackets, e.g., [Insert Table 2]. Provide a caption for each illustration and for each table. Type the tables double spaced and follow the examples in Turabian or the Manual of Style in constructing them.

9. Submit camera-ready copy for illustrations. Please protect it with cardboards when mailing your paper. Do not mar it with paper clips, staples, etc.

10. If you have presented your paper at a conference, identify the conference by name and date in your covering letter. Send the original, ribbon copy, and two photocopies to: Elizabeth L. Tate, Editor, LRTS, 11415 Farmland Dr., Rockville, MD 20852. Please include an addressed envelope with postage to speed the return of your manuscript during the editorial review.
FAXON ADDS UP...

100,000 TITLES
6 ORDERING PLANS
3 RENEWAL PLANS
1 YEARLY INVOICE
COMPLETE LIBRARY SUBSCRIPTION SERVICE

Faxon offers librarians a complete range of up-to-date computerized subscription services. Write or call Faxon today for our LIBRARIANS' GUIDE and SERVICE BROCHURE.

For total subscription service... Faxon adds up.

F.W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
Library Magazine Subscription Agency
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
Tel: 800-225-6055 (toll free)
617-329-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada only)

... all of it is well done and much of it is first-rate...
Every academic librarian, not just serials librarians, will find something of interest in it.”

CHOICE June, 1979

1979 Edition
University of California Union List of Serials Key Term Index

Titles from the University of California and The California State University and Colleges.
Access by approximately 104,000 Key Terms to 322,000 Titles and over 502,000 Holdings.
KWOC (Key Word Out of Context) format on 48x microfiche.
Prices $100.00 with binders
$ 85.00 without binders
Brochure on request

UCULS Distribution, University of California, Div. of Library Automation, 186 University Hall Berkeley, California 94720

A Style Manual for Citing Microform and Nonprint Media
Eugene B. Fleischer
This manual provides, for the first time, a style for citations of all the nonprint media. It is designed to be a companion to such works as Campbell’s Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers; The MLA Style Sheet for Reports and Theses; and Turabian’s A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations.
It includes models and rules for citations of the full range of nonprint media—micropublications and nonprint periodicals, charts, filmstrips, globes, kits, maps, microscope slides, models, motion pictures, realia, sound recordings, and video recordings. Brief and complete forms are furnished with many examples arranged for convenient reference.
74 pages Paper LC 78-9375
Order Department
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
... and again, the most complete catalog of Library and AV Equipment, Furniture & Supplies ever published. Write today for your free copy.

Highsmith
P.O. 25 LR9 Fort Atkinson, WI 53538

AMBASSADOR BOOK SERVICE, INC.

AMBASSADOR BOOK SERVICE, INC.
"serving academic and research libraries"
42 Chasner Street • Hempstead, NY 11550  Call us 516/489-4011 collect!
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 OUR 47th YEAR

MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

EUROPE’S BUSINESS NEWSPAPER
FINANCIAL TIMES

NOW AVAILABLE ON MICROFILM FROM RPI

From London, one of the key financial centers of the world, comes the FINANCIAL TIMES, an important newspaper for understanding international economic developments. Beginning January 1, 1980, current subscriptions to the FINANCIAL TIMES and complete backfiles since 1888 will be produced and sold exclusively by Research Publications, Inc. For the first time, the new Frankfurt edition of this critical business and economics publication will also be available. Together the London and Frankfurt editions of the FINANCIAL TIMES provide unrivalled coverage of European business news and the European Economic Community.

For more information about the FINANCIAL TIMES or our over 20 other world newspapers on microfilm, please write or call collect:

Research Publications, Inc.
12 Lunar Drive
Woodbridge, CT 06625
(203) 397-2600
Library Development Consultants  

Announces a series of continuing education seminars of special interest to technical service professionals


UNITED NATIONS DOCUMENTS: The UN publication program. The series of special interest to libraries of different types. Acquisition and processing methods. March 7, Philadelphia. April 4, Chicago. Luciana Marulli, Seminar Director.


Each seminar is six hours: 9:30 am - 12:30 pm and 1:30 - 4:30 pm. For details about spring, 1980 seminars, please write Library Development Consultants, North American Office, 349 0 Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024

Some publications of THE MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

MLA Technical Reports

No. 1. SLACC, the Partial Use of the Shelf List as Classed Catalog, by Donald Seibert. 1973. $6.50
No. 4. The Classification and Cataloging of Sound Recordings, by Barbara Knisely Gaeddert. Out of Print.
No. 5. Recordings of Non-Western Music: Subject and Added Entry Access, by Judith Kaufman. $6.00
No. 6. Index to Audio Equipment Reviews, 1978. Comp. by Arne Arneson and Stuart Milligan. $5.50

Music Cataloging Bulletin


Rules for the Brief Cataloging of Music in the Library of Congress. Exceptions to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 1970. $3.00

To order, make check payable and send to the Music Library Association Business Office, 2017 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103. Institutions may request billing.
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 Stecher Macmillan, Inc. is your one source—one service acquisitions agency!

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

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

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

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

TIMELY DELIVERY  
On Your  
Book Orders

SEPTMBER 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30

College and University Acquisition Librarians . . .

Now is the time to try the best source for:
• any book in print
• accurate invoicing
• meaningful reports
• rush order service
• competitive discounts
• plus many other services

Call 517-849-2117 Collect  
208 WEST CHICAGO STREET  
JONESVILLE, MICHIGAN 49250
Now available for the first time on Microfiche

1973-1977 Quinquennium
Library of Congress
National Union Catalog

and
Four Quinquenniums 1953-1972
also
Current NUC’s for 1978, 1979, 1980

all from a single source

Advanced Library Systems — the leading producer of the LC NUC on microfiche — now offers the 1973-1977 NUC Quinquennium on microfiche for immediate delivery. Also available for the first time, the four previous Quinquenniums (1953-1972) in the same microfiche format for immediate delivery. This gives you 25 years of retrospective NUC’s in one compatible and easy-to-use form.

ALS can also provide updates to your NUC collection with monthly, quarterly and annual cumulations from 1978 forward. Updates will be delivered in approximately two weeks after publication by the Library of Congress.

By switching to ALS microfiche from LC hard copy, you can reduce shelf space by 94%, and have the entire collection at your fingertips. The ALS current NUC subscription is less than 1/3 the cost of the LC hard copy.

ALS microfiche NUC service is COMPLETE ... COMPATIBLE ... CONTINUING ... and COST SAVING.

For complete information use the coupon below. Or call the number below left.

Advanced Library Systems Inc.
93 Main Street, Andover, Massachusetts 01810
(617) 470-0610

Serving Libraries throughout the World

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advanced Library Systems Inc.</th>
<th>LRTS180</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93 Main Street, Andover, Mass. 01810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(617) 470-0610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rush me full information on ALS’s NUC microfiche service, plus microfiche sample.

NAME ___________________________ TITLE ___________________________

ORGANIZATION ___________________________ ADDRESS ___________________________

CITY/TOWN ___________________________ STATE ___________________________ ZIP ___________________________

© Please have your representative telephone me at ( ) ________
The Sharp SF-810CN copies on paper. You won't have to hassle with special "bond" papers or expensive specially treated stocks. This key saving feature is a big help in these days of tight library budgets.

The SF-810CN has a stationary system, so it'll copy pages from books without breaking their backs.

Its dry toner system means messy dries will never touch you or your floor.

And speaking about your floor, compact desk-top copier will take very little room. And because we know how you feel about noise, we've made it very quiet.

As for reliability, there is an integrated microprocessor for trouble-free operation. But in case something goes wrong, the SF-810CN self-diagnostic system tells you what it is.

In fact, the SF-810CN is so reliable, you'll probably make more money on this overdue copier than you ever could on overdue books.

For a free demonstration, or for more information, send in this coupon or call your authorized Sharp Copier professional. He's listed in the Yellow Pages.

And do it soon. Your library really needs this machine in circulation.

Sharp Electronics Corp.
10 Keystone Place, Paramus, N.J. 07652

Please send me more information on your SF-810CN Copy-Vending Machine.

Please set up a demonstration.

NAME

TITLE

LIBRARY/CO

STREET

CITY

STATE ZIP

PHONE

(Area Code)

Dept. CPD-T-LRT-1-0

The sixth edition of the standard professional cataloging text is completely revised to include AACR 2, DDC 19 and Sears 12. Following the mnemonic structure of AACR 2, the all new descriptive cataloging section illustrates basic rules with sample bibliographic record elements, and features a complete model bibliographic record for each type of material, thus providing easy classroom and library use.

Notes on all available LC implementation decisions have been included. The subject analysis section examines DDC 19 and Sears 12. Authority files and networking highlight the final section.


Thoroughly reorganized and updated by Dr. Lois M. Chan, the third edition of this classic work includes all new and revised LC schedules, and brings the Guide up to date to reflect current LC practices and policies. An entirely new chapter on special types of library materials has been added. Dr. Chan is author of Library of Congress Subject Headings: Principles and Applications (Libraries Unlimited, 1978).

CUTTER TABLES
Libraries Unlimited, Inc. is the sole distributor of Cutter Author Tables. Each of the tables is in the Swanson-Swift revision, 1969. Place orders direct or through book jobbers.

C. A. Cutter’s Two-Figure Author Tables. -208-4. $11.00.
C. A. Cutter’s Three-Figure Author Tables. -209-2. $15.00.
Cutter-Sanborn Three-Figure Author Tables. -210-6. $14.00.

ISBN Prefix 0-87287
Libraries Unlimited, Inc.
P.O. Box 263
Littleton, Colo. 80160
End your search.

Your order for any amount is welcomed at any time.
Call, write, or telex today:

P.O. Box 2543/Birmingham, Alabama 35202
(205) 252-9010/Telex 5-9717

EBSCO SERVICES:
ALL PERIODICALS
CONTINUATIONS
ANNUALS
YEARBOOKS
BIAINNUALS
DIRECTORIES
PERIODICALS
NEWSPAPERS
IRREGULAR BOOK & MONOGRAPH SERIES
NUMBERED
UNNUMBERED

IN ALL FORMATS
HARD COPY
MICROFORM
AUDIO CASSETTE
FILM

FROM ALL NATIONS

11 U.S.A. OFFICES / TORONTO / RIO DE JANEIRO / AMSTERDAM

EBSCO SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES
130,000 SERIAL LISTINGS FROM 47,000 PUBLISHERS WORLDWIDE
“Definitive”
“Indispensable”
“Important”
“Basic”
“Essential”
“Comprehensive”
“Most Useful”

1980 Edition Just Put
ENCYCLOPEDIA ASSOCIAT

EA is uniquely useful as the soul of associations and professional societies, by connecting infotopically and more, to highly qualified sources. The name of EA tells you exactly whom to visit for information too fresh to periodicals.

Vol. 1, NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OF THE U.S. (1,566pp./$90.00), describes 14,019 active organizations in 17 subject categories. Entries give: official name of group, popular name or acronym, address, phone number, chief executive, number of members, committees, publications, convention/meeting schedule, and more. With a massive 47,000-line Keyword/Alphabetical Index.

Vol. 2, GEOGRAPHIC AND EXECUTIVE INDEX. (816pp./$75.00), provides two additional approaches to the information contained in Volume 1. The first part lists the associations in state and city order; the second lists all the executives. Each listing in both indexes gives organization name, chief executive, address, phone number, and the entry number of the more detailed organization entry in Volume 1.

Vol. 3, NEW ASSOCIATIONS AND PROJECTS (inter-division subscription, $85.00), is a periodical supplement that maintains and increases the usefulness of Volume 1 by furnishing full entries on newly formed and newly discovered organizations, which are of particular interest because they tend to be concerned with new problems and new ideas not adequately covered elsewhere. Cumulatively indexed.

Reviewer's Praise This Standard Reference Book

Reference and Subscription Books Reviews: "Indispensable...As a result of the work's currency and extensive coverage and the continuing high demand for the type of data found in the Encyclopedia of Associations, it remains one of the most useful and essential titles in any library's reference collection." (Booklist, Apr. 1, 1979)

American Reference Books Annual: "Still the single most useful directory of its kind." (1977)

Choice: Listed in the current edition of Choice's "Opening Day Collection."

Association Management: "This comprehensive reference source furnishes easy-to-use information on a wide range of subjects, designed to put users in touch with basic organizational data and contact persons for further research." (Aug. 1977)

Library Journal: "Required in virtually every library where business is served." (Dec. 15, 1956)

ROF: "A basic reference tool. All libraries should have it." (Spring 1973)


Word Processing World: Included in Word Processing World's list of 20 basic references for a word processing center. (Dec. 1974)

Association Trends: "The definitive compendium of America's voluntary organizations of all kinds...A MUST reference for anyone wanting to stay on top of the national association community." (Mar. 31, 1978)

Guide to Reference Books for School Media Centers: "The only comprehensive source of detailed information on nonprofit American membership organizations of national scope." (1973)

EA Online: EA is now searchable as File 114 on Lockheed's DIALOG information retrieval system.

All Standing Orders for Gale Books are billed at a 5% discount. The discount applies to all Standing Orders now in effect and to all Standing Orders placed in the future.

GALE RESEARCH CO.
BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MI 48226