CONTENTS

The Life and Death(?) of Corporate Authorship. C. Sumner Spalding 195
Adapting an Existing Card Catalog to AACR 2: A Feasibility Study. Peggy S. Kline and Marion R. Taylor 209
New Attempts to Resolve Old Conflicts: Chapter 22 of AACR 2. Bruce E. Ford 214
Year's Work in Descriptive Cataloging: 1979. Constance Rinehart 217
Year's Work in Subject Analysis: 1979. Doris Hargrett Clack 235
Collection Development and Preservation in 1979. Rose Mary Magrill 247
Serials in 1979. Dorothy J. Glasby 274
Micrographics, Reprography, and Graphic Communications in 1979. William Saffady 283
Letters 294
In Memoriam: Wyllis E. Wright, 1903–1979. Benjamin A. Custer 297
In Memoriam: Carolyn Small. Frances B. Woods 298
Assistant Editors:

- J. Michael Bruer for Resources Section
- Phyllis A. Richmond and Edward Swanson for Cataloging and Classification Section
- Dorothy J. Glasby for Serials Section
- Francis F. Spreitzer for Reproduction of Library Materials Section

Editorial Adviser:

Barbara Gates (for Regional Groups)

Library Resources & Technical Services, the quarterly official publication of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, is published at 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. Editorial Office: American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. Advertising Traffic Coordinator: Leona Swiech, Advertising Office, ALA Headquarters, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. Circulation and Business Office: Central Production Unit/Journals, ALA Headquarters, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. Subscription price: to members of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, $7.50 per year, included in the membership dues; to non-members, $15.00 per year; single copies $4.00.

Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois, and at additional mailing offices (ISSN 0024-2527).

Library Resources & Technical Services is indexed in Library Literature, Library & Information Science Abstracts, Current Index to Journals in Education, Science Citation Index, and Hospital Literature Index. Contents are listed in CALL (Current Awareness—Library Literature). Its reviews are included in Book Review Digest, Book Review Index, and Review of Reviews.

Instructions for authors appear on p.87 of the Winter 1980 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services. Copies of books for review should be addressed to Central Production Unit, American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.

The contents of this journal, unless otherwise indicated, are copyrighted by the Association. All material in this journal copyrighted by the American Library Association may be photocopied for the noncommercial purpose of scientific or educational advancement.

©American Library Association 1980

Publication in Library Resources & Technical Services does not imply official endorsement by the Resources and Technical Services Division nor by ALA, and the assumption of editorial responsibility is not to be construed necessarily as endorsement of the opinions expressed by individual contributors.
The Life and Death(?) of Corporate Authorship

C. Sumner Spalding

The historical development of the concept of corporate authorship, from its Anglo-American beginnings to its eventual broad international acceptance is summarized. The seeming contradiction in terms involved in the idea of a corporate body as an author is noted, and a rationale is provided to justify the idea. "Responsibility" has proved to be an unsatisfactory criterion for corporate authorship and "collective activity" is suggested as better. Limitations on the acceptability of corporate authorship are explored. The abandonment of corporate authorship in AACR 2 is attributed to an effort to secure satisfactory entry for serials without a special rule for them, a solution considered regrettable.

It is ironic indeed that the span of a few months in 1978/79 saw the first history and theoretical development of the Anglo-American concept of corporate authorship and the disappearance of that concept from Anglo-American cataloging rules. In February 1979 Michael Carpenter's doctoral dissertation, Corporate Authorship, was accepted at the University of California, Berkeley, three months after the publication of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR 2) in which corporate authorship was eliminated as an operating principle in cataloging. These events are of some importance in cataloging theory and invite thoughtful consideration and comment from those who are concerned with this theory.

A Mini-History of the Concept of Corporate Authorship

In his historical survey of corporate authorship, Carpenter cites Jewett as the first to regard corporate entries explicitly in the conceptual framework of authorship, as is illustrated in the following extract:

XXI. Academies, institutes, associations, ... or other bodies of men, under whatever name, and for whatever purpose, issuing publications, whether of separate works, or of continuous series, under a general title, are to be considered and treated as authors of all works issued by them, and in their name alone.

C. Sumner Spalding, assistant director (cataloging), Library of Congress, prior to his retirement in 1975, served as a resource person to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee.
In the fourth edition of *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*, Cutter states that “Bodies of men are to be considered as authors of works published in their name or by their authority.” He also quotes his previously published statement that, “As a matter of fact, these bodies [of men] are the authors not only of their own proceedings but also of their own collections regarded as a whole.”

The ALA/ALA Catalog Rules of 1908 include in their second definition of “author”: “In a broader sense, the maker of the book or the person or body immediately responsible for its existence … Corporate bodies may be considered as the authors of publications issued in their name or by their authority.” Substantially identical words appear in the glossary of the 1941 code.

The first rule of the 1949 code begins: “Enter a work under the name of its author whether personal or corporate. The author is considered to be the person or body chiefly responsible for the intellectual content of the book, literary, artistic or musical.”

Lubetzky in *Cataloging Rules and Principles* under the caption, “Works of Corporate Bodies,” says: “The principle proposed is to enter under the name of the corporate body publications issued in its name—that is, communications purported to be those of the corporate body and bearing the authority of that body. Other publications should be entered under the person or unit who prepared the work.”

In the *Code of Cataloging Rules* (CCR), Lubetzky’s unfinished draft for a new edition of the code, this principle is reiterated: “A work produced by, or issued in the name of, a person or corporate body is entered under the name of that person or corporate body.” In his rule 22a, as revised, we read:

A work representing an act, communication, or product of the activity of a corporate body, or any other work for the contents of which a corporate body is expressly or implicitly responsible, is entered under the name of that body … This includes (a) the proceedings, transactions, debates, reports and other works produced by or issued in the name of a corporate body; (b) administrative, regulatory, and other official documents—such as constitutions, rules, decisions, periodic reports of activities, announcements, guides, catalogs … and (c) works issued by a corporate body, normally within its sphere of interest or activity, without the name of an author or compiler and not represented as anonymous works.

The 1950s saw a great leavening of interest in cataloging matters in many of the countries of Europe, affected to no small extent by Lubetzky’s writings, cogent reasoning, and extensive correspondence with cataloging experts in foreign countries. France introduced the principle of corporate authorship in its cataloging rules as early as 1950. Many German librarians became willing to accept at least the principle of corporate main entry. Prospects appeared to be excellent for achieving at least some measure of international agreement where none had been thought possible before.

In 1956 a Working Group on the Coordination of Cataloguing Principles, established by IFLA, came up with a “Report on Anonyma and Works of Corporate Authorship” in which the following definition
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be defined as the collective responsibility of a body of persons for the content of a document. Where such responsibility is recognized as a form of authorship, an author catalog will contain main entries under corporate authors as well as under personal authors." Further on is the following statement:

For the purpose of entry in an author-catalogue, a corporate body is regarded as the author of any work for the content of which it takes complete responsibility. (Where any such work does not relate directly to the activities, functions or internal administration of the corporate body [as in the case with constitutions, rules, reports, catalogues, lists, of members, etc.] but is an unsigned monograph or pamphlet on some other subject, the main entry may be made either under the corporate body or under the title of the work, with an added entry under whichever is not chosen for the main entry.)

At the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (ICCP) in 1961, formally designated national delegations of experts from fifty-three countries and twelve international organizations discussed, debated, and voted on a "Draft Statement of Principles" for an author and title catalog, by A. H. Chaplin, section nine of which concerns corporate authorship.

Vasilyevskaya (USSR) opened the discussion with this summary of comments on the issue: "It was apparent that there was general agreement on the necessity for a category of corporate authors." The delegates from Poland, Norway, West Germany, Austria, Belgium, and Great Britain expressed their support for the principle. Verona said that Yugoslav libraries agreed that the principle of corporate authorship should be adopted in restricted form, though only a few had adopted it. Chaix stated that all Swiss libraries favored adoption of the principle, while Honoré reported that corporate authorship had been adopted in France eleven years earlier. Osborn of Australia described this agreement as a historic occasion and thanked the countries now accepting the principle of corporate authorship on behalf of those that had used corporate entry in the past.

Countries expressing opposition to the principle of corporate authorship were Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, the Netherlands, and Sweden, 11 percent of the fifty-three countries.

The details of the first three subsections were then fully discussed, after which a working group was appointed to produce a final text that would take into account the various views expressed by the delegates. The finally approved text is given below in such a way that all changes from the draft can be seen, with deletions enclosed in parentheses and new text in italics.

9. Entry under Corporate (Authors) Bodies

9.1 The main entry for a work should be made under the name of a corporate body, i.e., any institution, organized body or assembly of persons known by a corporate or collective name, (may be treated in the catalogue as the author of a work or serial publication)

9.11 (if) when the work (or publication) is by its nature necessarily the expression of the collective thought or activity of the corporate body,* (or) even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or
servant of the corporate body, or

9.12 (if) when the wording of the title or title-page, taken in conjunction with the nature of the work, clearly implies that the corporate body is collectively responsible for the content of the work.**

9.2 In other cases, when a corporate body (has issued or sponsored a work or publication or) has performed a function . . . subsidiary to the function of the author, an added entry (may) should be made under the name of the corporate body. (as a collaborator)

9.3 In doubtful cases, the main entry may be made either under the name of the corporate body or under the title (.) or the name (of the personal author), with an added entry in either case under the alternative not chosen for the main entry.

* e.g. official reports, rules and regulations, manifestoes, programmes (, even if signed by a person in the capacity of an officer or servant of the corporate body.) and records of the results of collective work.

** (This excludes collections and periodicals consisting of articles by individuals but sponsored or published by a corporate body.) e.g. serials whose titles consist of a generic term . . . preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body.16

Most striking is the change of caption from “Corporate Authors” to “Entry under Corporate Body,” especially in view of the long procession of speeches supporting the theory of corporate authorship. It must be supposed that the change represented an effort to reach a text that could be accepted by a greater number of the delegates. How successful was it? I have earlier mentioned that six countries expressed opposition to the corporate author concept. Did the change in terminology capture their vote? There were four separate votes: subsection 9.1 (exclusive of the footnote to 9.12), that footnote, 9.2, and 9.3. Czechoslovakia, Finland, and Hungary voted against or abstained in the case of all four votes. Sweden voted for all but 9.1. The Netherlands voted for 9.2 and 9.3. Denmark gave qualified support for the footnote to 9.12 and for 9.3. It does not appear that the change in caption and the associated rewording of the subsections achieved much success in its supposed aims.

The rules in the first edition of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR 1)17 were based on the ICCP “Statement of Principles.” With respect to corporate authorship there was one minor and several major deviations. The former consisted of a rejection of the last clause of the footnote to 9.12. The latter consisted of the collective form subheadings for certain legal, judicial, and liturgical materials. These subheadings were baggage from earlier rules that law and theological librarians insisted must be retained in the AACR. The definition of “author” in the glossary specifically includes corporate bodies, as does the first rule for entry.18

In the years following the publication of AACR 1, the rules were adopted by many countries other than the three author countries. They were translated into Spanish, Portuguese, French (primarily for French Canada), and Persian. Parts of the rules were translated into Japanese, Arabic, Korean, and Greek. Most significant for our present purpose was the decision in 1972 by Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and
Norway to base their own cataloging rules in principle on AACR 1, British text.\textsuperscript{19} The first three had opposed the concept of corporate authorship at the ICCP in 1961. Thus, by 1972 it appears that at least 94 percent of the fifty-three countries attending the ICCP had accepted the principle of corporate authorship. What an extraordinary success for Jewett's idea, first expressed 120 years before!

By 1974 the first steps had been taken in the preparation of the second edition of the AACR (AACR 2). Final decisions on the rules in this revision were made by a Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC). At its meeting in May 1976 the JSC decided, in effect, to wash its hands of corporate authorship as a principle in favor of defining categories of publications that should receive main entry under the heading for a corporate body and decided that the relevant rule should begin "enter a work emanating from a corporate body under the heading for that body if it falls into one or more of the following categories."\textsuperscript{20} Shades of ALA 1949!

Although the decision to eliminate the authorship principle from this rule caught the American Catalog Code Revision Committee by surprise, the committee eventually voted its concurrence with the decision. The rule we now find in the code (21.1B2) sharply limits main entry under corporate heading.\textsuperscript{21} Exit corporate authorship!

**CORPORATE BODY AS AUTHOR—A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS?**

One of the main problems in gaining acceptance of the idea of a corporate body as an author has been the feeling that this idea involves a contradiction in terms, i.e., only a person can act as an author, whereas corporate bodies, being normally large, complex entities, cannot conceivably do what one individual does when he acts as an author. But this apparent contradiction in terms will not withstand close examination; in fact, the contradiction can be shown to be an illusion once the concept of personal authorship is examined more closely and once the dual aspects of corporate bodies are properly appreciated. I propose to demonstrate this assumption by a set of five basic theses concerning authorship, personal and corporate, in library cataloging.

**Thesis 1.** Personal authorship is not necessarily confined to the action of one person.

When persons collaborate in writing a work, no single person is the author; each one shares authorship with the other(s). Main entry in cataloging aside, authorship is distributed among all concerned.

**Thesis 2.** In cataloging, personal authorship does not include the actual writing or drafting of works issued solely under the name of another person or of a corporate body.

When a person who has been engaged to make a speech procures the services of another person to write the speech or to draft it, the authorship of the speech that the first person makes is considered to be his, since, by the act of delivering it, he invests it with his own
authority; its ideas, meritorious or otherwise, redound to him.

Thesis 3. Collaborative personal authorship constitutes corporate authorship when the resultant work is issued under a group (or corporate) name.

A recording of a work of improvisation performed by collaborating jazz musicians and issued under the name they give themselves as a group is a work of corporate authorship.

Thesis 4. A corporate body must be considered in two different aspects; first, as a unitary, impersonal entity acting within a certain field and, in most cases, responsible under law for its actions; second, as a collectivity of persons who, either in the role of members or in the role of employees, are the living agents through whom the activities of the entity are carried on.

The aspect of corporate bodies as faceless, inanimate, legal entities seems to dominate the general view of corporate bodies. It is in this aspect that it seems impossible to cast them in the role of authors. But in the other aspect of corporate bodies as collectivities of persons, through whom and only through whom they are capable of functioning, the idea of corporate authorship as a special kind of collaborative personal authorship becomes more reasonable.

Thesis 5. Corporate authorship results when the body (1) in its aspect as a collectivity of persons, produces a work and (2) in its aspect as an entity issues the same under the authority of its corporate name and without any attribution of personal authorship.

A work produced by the collective collaboration of members or employees of a corporate body is as much a corporate act as producing physical products, buying or selling property or equipment, or providing needed services to the public. When such a work is published by the body itself or is issued by another publisher with the name of the body prominently featured, one may be assured that the body has authorized such publication and has invested the publication with its corporate authority. (Is it just a coincidence that the English words “authority” and “authorize” have as their root the word author?)

RESPONSIBILITY VERSUS COLLECTIVE ACTIVITY
AS THE CONTROLLING CRITERION

Even among those cataloging experts outside of the Anglo-American tradition who became disposed to accept the idea of corporate authorship, there has seemed to be one major stumbling block, the criterion of “responsibility” that has pervaded Anglo-American cataloging rules and their glossaries over the years since 1908. I extract below from previously given quotations:

AA 1908 “the person or body immediately responsible for its [the book’s] existence”

ALA 1941 [The same as the above]
ALA 1949 “the person or body chiefly responsible for the intellectual content of the book”

CCR “any work for the contents of which a corporate body is expressly or implicitly responsible”

ICCP “collectively responsible for the content of the work”

AACR I “chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work”

Carpenter and, in her discussion of Anglo-American rules, Verona, constantly protest the unsatisfactory “vagueness” of the criterion of responsibility. Verona, indeed, parades the witness of many distinguished experts against its use: V. A. Vasilevskaya, Ákos Domanovszky, M. Nádvorník, Carlo Revelli, Hellmut Braun, Seymour Lubetzky, John Horner, Åke Koel, and Susan Haskins. Two quotations will suffice.

Vasilevskaya: “the acceptance of the responsibility of the corporate body as the deciding criterion may in practice mean the abandonment of all criteria.”

Haskins: “the principle of responsibility . . . actually is no more easily interpreted than the concept of authorship.”

It seems to be quite clear that some criterion other than that of responsibility is badly needed.

Eva Verona has developed a definition of authorship that successfully avoids use of the criterion of responsibility. In her Corporate Headings: Their Use in Library Catalogues and National Bibliographies, she proposes the following:

A work should be considered to be of corporate authorship if it may be concluded by its character or nature that it is necessarily the result of the creative and/or organizational activity of a corporate body as a whole, and not the result of an independent creative activity of the individual(s) who drafted it.

This definition focuses on the right criterion, the collective activity involved in the formulation of the text of the work.

I would like to suggest a slight rewording in the above text for a definition of author.

Author. 1. A person who writes or otherwise creates a work, but not including one who prepares a work for issuance under the name of another person or under the name of a corporate body.

2. A corporate body that produces a work that, by its character or nature, may be concluded to be necessarily the result of a collective intellectual or creative activity on the part of some or all of the membership or employees of the body and that is without attribution to any specifically named person(s) as author(s). [A further addition will be suggested later on.]

Let me give my reasons for some of the changes in Verona’s wording. First, in defining corporate author in combination with the defini-
tion of personal author, I can take care of Verona's final words, "individu
al(s) who drafted it," under personal author where this matter be
longs. The role of a drafter is in the same relation to another person
as it is to a corporate body. I think collective is both clearer and more
precise than organizational. Also creative is a high-flown word; intellec
tual is more realistic for almost all cases but creative has to be retained
to cover cases such as recordings of musical improvisations by a
named group. I have dropped "as a whole" as being far too restrictive
as well as being impossibly difficult to ascertain. I have preferred the
criterion of absence of attribution to named persons to the criterion
that the work may, in fact, be the result of the independent creative
activity of the drafter(s) of the work, because absence of attribution is
objectively determinable.

LIMITATIONS ON THE
ACCEPTABILITY OF CORPORATE AUTHORSHIP

Even among those who accept corporate authorship as a valid cata
logging principle, there will be agreement on categories of publications
to which application of this principle will yield unsatisfactory results.
These categories are comprised primarily of publications most com-
monly identified by title. In many cases these limitations on the accep-
tability of corporate authorship are not openly recognized as such in
our cataloging rules, but are disclosed in the rules themselves as unex-
pressed exceptions to the general rule.

The first category is motion pictures. For the sake of this discussion,
I shall speak only of theatrical films, though nontheatrical films are
subject to the same considerations. If ever a work were a product of
corporate authorship, it is a theatrical film. The production company
decides that a certain novel should become a film. It contracts for the
rights. It employs a scenarist to adapt the novel for motion picture
performance. It decides on the personal producer and the director. It
controls the casting. It decides that music should be included and em-
loys a composer to write the score. Its employees provide the cinema-
tography. Its editors determine the final form of the film according to
policy decisions of management. Finally, it markets the film.

But where could you find anyone who would accept main entry
(and, in a single entry listing, sole entry) of a theatrical film under
production company? A practically universal bibliographic tradition,
and, consequently, viewer demand, argues strongly for title main en-
try. This category would constitute a valid exception to the principle
of corporate authorship.

The next category is that of the publications of certain commercial
publishers. To explain this category involves getting around a de-
cency in our language (and perhaps not in ours alone). By "com-
mercial publisher," we simply mean one who publishes on a "for
profit" basis. The vast majority of these publishers operate by receiv-
ing or soliciting manuscripts for the publication of which they are
either paid or on which they are willing to venture capital in the hope
of profit from sale. But another kind of commercial publisher oper-
ates in an entirely different fashion. They produce, by their own
corporate effort, the information contained in their publications. Here is the difficulty—there is no simple term by which to distinguish this kind of publisher from the others. For the sake of clarity I will refer to the latter as "producer/publishers." Certain clearly identifiable categories of publications are either normally or frequently the products of producer/publishers, e.g., encyclopedias, dictionaries, who's who's, city directories, business, financial and legal services, and civil service practice examinations.

Producer/publishers of such works are as much corporate authors as any corporate author can be. But I suspect that there would be a strong consensus among reference librarians that in most of these cases the one single best entry (main entry) would be title. This preference, again, would be based on a long and strong tradition of how these works are cited and how they are sought after by readers.

For maps published by the producing body there would probably not be a consensus for title main entry, because of the enormous numbers of maps produced by official civilian and military agencies of governments. Main entry under the name of the agency is a well-agreed practice.

AACR I was the first Anglo-American or American code to make a distinction between typical commercial publishers and producer/publishers, but its provisions in this regard were limited and not conceived as part of the larger problem of limitations on the acceptability of corporate author as main entry.

A third category consists of certain legal and liturgical works. The decision to drop collective form subheadings such as "Laws, statutes, etc." and "Liturgy and ritual" in AACR 2 will be warmly received by those who felt them to be foreign elements in a name/title catalog system. Without these subheadings, laws and liturgies appear to be entered under their authors or authorizing bodies. In AACR 2, however, no underlying principle controls the types of publications that are to receive main entry under a corporate heading. The rules simply state that laws and liturgies are to be entered under the headings for the jurisdictions or denominational entities to which they apply. In effect, the results are the same as those expected from the application of the principle of corporate authorship—with certain special exceptions discussed below.

Some laws may embody the same text, without major substantive changes, as (1) a model law produced, for example, by the American Bar Association, or (2) the text of a law of another jurisdiction, with appropriate adjustments. Under the concept of corporate authorship, the law derived from the earlier text cannot be considered as the work of the government that has passed the law. A similar case exists when one religious community adopts, with or without revisions, a liturgical work of another community. An example might be the Book of Common Prayer adopted by the Protestant Episcopal church in the United States of America in 1789, which is a revision of the Book of Common Prayer that was first established as the liturgy of the Church of England by act of Parliament in 1549. The former cannot be considered to be a new work.
In spite of what I have said above, I do not believe that the theory of corporate authorship should exclude such cases from main entry under the body responsible for making them law or official liturgy. I believe that the act of investing a text with the status of law in a particular jurisdiction or of investing a text with the status of official liturgy of a particular religious community is a significant creative act in itself that should override the authorship of the adopted text.

Accordingly, I would propose broadening my definition of author with respect to a corporate body, as follows:

2. A corporate body that (1) produces a work that, by its character or nature, may be concluded to be necessarily the result of a collective intellectual or creative activity on the part of some or all of the membership or employees of the body and that is without attribution to any specifically named person(s); or (2) in the case of territorial or religious bodies, invests an existing text, not of its own creation, with the status of law or of official liturgical use in its own jurisdiction.

Laws, constitutions, and court rules, created by one jurisdiction for application in another are further instances in which entry under the corporate body that produced the text is not acceptable. I believe they should be treated as exceptions to the principle and entered under the body affected.

I advocate this exceptional treatment because law librarians and law library patrons use main entries for these materials to locate the laws, etc., that apply to a given jurisdiction. The jurisdiction or body designated constitutionally or by the legal system to promulgate the sought-for documents is irrelevant to almost all legal searches. In short, users of the catalog entries are not looking for corporate authors but for texts of the controlling law, etc., of the jurisdiction or judicial body. In the majority of cases the corporate author and the jurisdiction or body controlled are the same. To channel off the unusual cases in which the corporate author is different from the jurisdiction or body controlled seems to be a disservice to library users, at least in any single-entry listing.

The last and most significant category of publications for which the application of the corporate author principle has had its most severe challenges is serials. Before discussing the special reasons for these challenges, I wish to call attention to the provisions of the ICCP with respect to serials. As regards corporate authorship, these "principles" were certainly unprincipled since, in one case, serials not of corporate authorship are to be entered under the body and, in another case, certain serials of corporate authorship are to be entered under title. Section 9.11 seems close to the definition of corporate authorship that we have been discussing. Note that 9.2 deals, for example, with the function of the body as editor. Now, then, what is the function dealt with in 9.12? What is "collectively responsible for the content of the work" if it is not what is specified in 9.11 and not what is specified in 9.2? Implying that "the corporate body is responsible for the content of the work," the footnote to 9.12 cites "serials whose titles consist of a
generic term (Bulletin, Transactions, etc.) preceded or followed by the name of a corporate body, and which include some account of the activities of the body.” The footnote seems to sanction entry under the corporate body for periodicals consisting of articles by different individuals, providing the publications have a generic title, contain in the title the name of a corporate body, and contain some account of the activities of the body.

In section 11, “Works entered under title,” the draft “Statement of Principles” did not mention serials, but after conference discussion, the working group to develop the final text of this section brought back a new subsection, 11.14, which detailed as a class of publications to be accorded main entry under title:

11.14 works (including serials and periodicals) known primarily or conventionally by title rather than by the name of the author.

It is difficult to see how a cataloger dealing with a new serial can know if it is known “primarily or conventionally by title.” However, I must suppose that the intent was to encourage entry under title for corporate serials with distinctive titles. The Library Association’s Cataloguing Rules Subcommittee must have interpreted the aforementioned provisions similarly in developing their rule 6 in the British text of AACR 1.

Now let us consider some of the reasons that, taken together, make a strong case for entry of serials of corporate authorship under title. Two sets of reasons can be developed: one relating to reader approach to serials in libraries, the other relating to the processing and control of serials in libraries.

Of the reasons relating to reader approach I would cite:
1. Unlike monographs, most of which have some kind of an author, many serials have no author at all.
2. The continuing appearance of issue after issue tends to imprint the title on the mind more than the normally single appearance of a monograph.
3. Citations in both the monographic and serial literature to source material in serial publications are normally by title or title abbreviation.
4. Most general and special serial indexes, bibliographies, and union lists cite by title of title abbreviation.

Of the reasons relating to serials processing and control in libraries I would cite:
1. When a corporate author undergoes a change of name, very frequently many or all of its serial publications continue without change of title.
2. In the labor-intensive operation of the daily recording of incoming serial issues, recording by title is simpler and requires much less training of staff.
3. The same is true of the operations of finding and refiling unbound issues.

A new impetus for title main entry came on the scene in late 1972 with the functional beginnings of the International Serials Data System (ISDS) which, through a network of national centers, endeavors to
identify the serials of the world by "key title" and to assign to each an International Standard Serial Number (ISSN). The differences between the ISDS and the AACR 1 system with respect to criteria for making new records shows up most when a corporate author changes its name. If the serial continues to use the same title, in most cases no new key title or ISSN will be required, but a new catalog entry will always be necessary.

AACR 2

In the process of developing AACR 2 the major struggle in the area of assignment of main entry was focused on serials. Spalding and Joseph Howard got into the fray early. The former called for treatment of monographs and serials alike in cataloging, with recognition of corporate authorship when involved, for updating rather than changing titles when only the name of the corporate author changes, and for recording and storing unbound issues by title. The latter called for entry of all serials under title, or, failing that, under title unless the title is generic. At the Midwinter Meeting of ALA in 1975 a well-attended special meeting on the topic of the cataloging rule for serials featured a number of papers, including those by Carpenter ("No Special Rules for Entry of Serials"), Paul Fasana (who supported the distinctive/generic title criterion for determining main entry), and Howard, whose views are noted above. These were not the only papers that appeared on this subject in the years 1974–76. An enormous file of correspondence on this matter was also accumulated and analysed by the CCRC.

The briefs in, the decision process began. James analysed the options as "(1) do not change the rule [rule 6, AACR 1] at all, (2) do not have a separate rule for serials, (3) enter all [] serials under author, generally corporate, (4) enter all serials under title, even if generic, and (5) enter serials with a distinctive title under title and all others under corporate body."

At the 1975 Annual Conference the CCRC voted "to request the editors to frame a rule for the entry of serials under title." In January 1976 the committee rescinded that vote in consideration of its acceptance, earlier in the same meeting, of a drastic restriction on the application of corporate main entries as proposed by the Library of Congress.

The ground was prepared, the Joint Steering Committee decided that corporate authorship was dead, and AACR 2 rule 21.1B2 became the grave marker.

POST MORTEM

In retrospect, I believe that the fundamental issue was not the nature of corporate authorship but whether or not serials should be treated *sui generis*. The AACR 2 answer to the latter question was No. But to avoid *sui generis* treatment required a major change in corporate entry policy. In my early innocence I too, had answered No to this question. But that was before I learned what the price would be! I now (too late, alas) recant. It would have been better to treat serials
cataloging as *sui generis* than to treat monographic cataloging in *modo seriale*. Consider the following monographs, now condemned to title entry:

- An assessment of mineral resources in Alaska (United States. Geological Survey)
- Design of formats and packs of catalog cards (Ohio College Library Center)
- Evaluation of the effects of alternatives to incarceration of juvenile offenders (Harvard University. Center for Criminal Justice)
- Introductory cases in the analysis of public controversy (Harvard University. Social Studies Project)
- A Review of the actual and expected consequences of family size (National Institutes of Health)
- A Selective and annotated bibliography of economic literature on the Arabic speaking countries of the Middle East (American University of Beirut. Economic Research Institute)
- Solutions to 3500 labor problems (Commerce Clearing House)
- Some references on metric information (United States. National Bureau of Standards)

If it is valid to state that serials are different from monographs, it is equally valid to state that monographs are different from serials!

AACR 2's rule 21.1B2 is:

1. A major departure from international agreement represented by the ICCP "Statement of Principles," section 9.11, which prescribes entry under the heading for a corporate body for works that are expressions of collective activity of the body (permitted in 21.1B2 only in the case of conferences, expeditions, and events).
2. A major reversal of Anglo-American cataloging practice since the 1908 joint code with respect to works issued by corporate bodies.
3. An about-face in the steady march towards international agreement on the principle of corporate authorship.

* * *

CORPORATE AUTHORSHIP
1852–1976
R.I.P.

(In lieu of flowers, friends of the deceased may wish to send a contribution to the Charles Coffin Jewett Memorial Fund.)
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Adapting an Existing Card Catalog to AACR 2: A Feasibility Study

Peggy S. Kline and Marion R. Taylor

The feasibility of adapting the Emory University Woodruff Library card catalog to AACR 2 was tested by examining all personal and corporate name access points in a sample of recently cataloged titles. Only 15 percent of these headings would require modification in 1981 if LC's policies for implementation of AACR 2 are accepted. Kinds of changes and extent of disruption to the filing sequence were considered in setting criteria for four types of action: interfile, making changes confined to one tray, making changes requiring shifts to other trays, or creating split files.

The Robert W. Woodruff Library at Emory University has made the decision that it is expedient to plan for an on-line catalog in the future. Since it is doubtful that such a step will be taken by January 1981, a decision must be made on the method of accommodating AACR 2 at that time. Data from other studies have been useful, but it is uncertain how much of this information is relevant to the situation at Emory. As a preliminary to a decision about implementation, a test of the feasibility of adapting the existing card catalog to AACR 2 was undertaken. The nature and limitations of the study were predetermined by the urgency of developing data for a course of action in January 1981.

Out of 1,615 titles cataloged in March 1979, 330 titles selected at random were examined. These titles contained a total of 610 access points that would be affected by the new rules. Thirty-three headings appeared more than once so the study covered 577 distinct headings. The number of cards in the card catalog with these access points was also examined. A total of 14,399 cards was found, which included every card for each access point in both the general catalog and a separate serials catalog. Although entries in the serials catalog are not duplicated in the general catalog, a small number of this total represents cross-references providing linkage between the two catalogs. The 14,399 cards examined are less than 1 percent of a dictionary catalog of an estimated two and a half million cards.

Peggy S. Kline is assistant university librarian, Catalog Department, Robert W. Woodruff Library, Emory University, while Marion R. Taylor is an associate professor, Division of Librarianship, at the same university.
The sample consisted of printouts of 300 OCLC data base records new to the Woodruff Library and 30 work forms of records added to the OCLC data base by Woodruff. Since the Woodruff catalog is a union catalog for the campus, the cards studied included campus library contributions as well as those of the Woodruff Library. The study sample, however, included only titles cataloged in the Woodruff Library. Another limitation to the study is the exclusion of non-Roman alphabet cataloging data from the sample. The amount of such material added to the library is less than one tenth of one percent per annum.

The investigators are satisfied that the 330 titles examined are reasonably representative of the cataloging done at the present time for the library. Examination of a previous year's cataloging showed that 85 percent was in the English language. The sample included 85 percent English-language titles. In a categorization by LC classification, the distribution for the sample compared favorably with the distribution for additions made to the collection from October 1976 to May 1977 (table 1).

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF TITLES BY LC CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LC Class</th>
<th>Percent of Titles Cataloged in 1976/77</th>
<th>Percent in Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;Z</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C–G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H–L</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M–N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q–V</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 2 and 3 show the sample data by language and country of publication. These data are included to characterize the type of material the Woodruff Library regularly catalogs, as an indication of the extent to which the findings of the study might have applicability to another library.

TABLE 2
STUDY SAMPLE BY LANGUAGE OF TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes: Dutch, Italian, Latin, Rumanian
Examination of the 577 access points showed that 176 would change using AACR 2, that is, 31 percent. In describing its plans for implementation of the new rules, the Library of Congress has published a list of types of changes required by AACR 2 that will not be made in 1981. It seemed advisable to identify access points in the sample that are considered by LC as compatible headings, more popularly known as "tolerable" headings. Accepting LC decisions on compatible headings would reduce the number of changes by 50 percent, that is to 87 access points, or 15 percent. For a library that is considering adapting the card catalog to AACR 2, whether as an interim measure or as a permanent one, the 50 percent reduction in changes to headings by use of LC tolerable headings makes it almost mandatory that these practices be accepted.

In terms of cards, it was found that 42 percent of the 14,399 cards examined would need modification with application of AACR 2. Only 27 percent would need to be considered for revision if LC decisions on compatible headings are accepted.

The next step in the study was to analyze the kinds of changes that are specified by AACR 2 and LC policies for its implementation and to determine what actions would be required to accommodate the changed headings in the Woodruff catalog. Of course, the sample data examined in this part of the study were limited. For corporate headings, there were 49 access points, involving 2,966 cards. For personal headings, there were 38 access points, involving 967 cards.

The changes required could be handled by three different procedures:

1. Interfile old and new headings when the effect on alphabetization would be minimal. The headings that could be treated by this method include corporate names with additions that need to be enclosed in parentheses or, in the case of "conference" headings, slightly rearranged and differently punctuated, e.g., changing from Kokusai Bunka Kaikan, Tokyo to Kokusai Bunka Kaikan (Tokyo) and from Conference on Environmental Impact Analysis, 2d, Monticello, Ill., 1977 to Conference on Environ-

---

**TABLE 3**

**STUDY SAMPLE BY COUNTRY OF PUBLICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Publication</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Percent of Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes: Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Greece, Hong Kong, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Puerto Rico, Rumania, South Africa, Spain.
mental Impact Analysis (2nd : 1977 : Monticello, Ill.). In the sample, 22 access points and 342 cards could be handled by this method.

2. Delete portions of the headings at the catalog without removing cards. Personal name headings susceptible to this kind of treatment include those containing forenames, maiden names, titles, etc., that are omitted by AACR 2. This method could be used for 8 access points and 373 cards as illustrated by the following examples: Changing from Butler, Josephine Elizabeth Grey to Butler, Josephine; from Chorley, Katharine Campbell Hopkinson Chorley, Baroness to Chorley, Katharine; from Oswald, Saint, King of Northumbria to Oswald, King of Northumbria; and dropping the designation Pres. U.S. from Roosevelt, Franklin Delano.

3. Use more elaborate procedures for handling changes involving such steps as removal of the cards, making deletions in or additions to headings, or refiling cards. These procedures would apply to all other headings subject to change. It seems that each of these headings has to be considered individually. In some cases it would be possible to delete and refile, e.g., Paris. Folies-Bergere—delete Paris. Some headings would require deletion plus additions, e.g., South Carolina. University—change to University of South Carolina. Other headings would need to be replaced, e.g., pseudonym—Streuvels, Stijn—replacing real name—Lateur, Frank. The size of the file would be a determining factor in deciding when to make changes and when to leave the old headings as they are and create split files by making see also references linking former headings and AACR 2 forms.

Fifty-seven access points, that is, 10 percent of the access points examined, need to be considered individually. The number of cards involved is 3,218, or 22 percent of the cards examined. The cards in this category would have to be removed for revision and refiling or considered for split files.

On the basis of the study, it is possible to recommend criteria for making the transition to the new rules within the framework of the existing card catalog. Consideration of user convenience has influenced the decision not to use split files for personal names except when called for by AACR 2, Rule 22.2.C3-4. It is thought that the user would accept the difficulties of split files for corporate names but would resist looking in more than one place for a personal name. The criteria for corporate name changes are based on the dislocation of the card catalog that would result from the repositioning of cards, on the time and effort required in making changes in headings, and on convenience to users.

Split files would be considered in two instances: (1) if the change requires that more than two hundred cards be moved from one catalog tray to another, and (2) if the change requires retyping of more than fifty cards. Recommendations on criteria for handling corporate name changes are summarized in figure 1.
Adapting an Existing Card Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Change Required</th>
<th>Number of Cards</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deletion only, cards remaining in same tray</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>Make change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deletion only, cards shifted to another tray</td>
<td>1–200 cards</td>
<td>Make change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 + cards</td>
<td>Split file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of heading</td>
<td>1–50 cards</td>
<td>Make change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50 + cards</td>
<td>Split file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1
Criteria for Handling Changes in Corporate Name Headings

Further study is needed to test the validity of the criteria in relation to the catalog as a whole. Plans are being made to conduct this study using random sampling methods.
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Chapter 22 of AACR 2 includes new provisions intended to resolve the conflicts between the two objectives of author-title cataloging in ways more satisfactory than those tried earlier. Its provisions concerning use of initials in headings (with full names added in parentheses) facilitate achievement of both objectives and represent a real improvement over earlier provisions; but its new rules concerning headings for persons who use more than one name do not represent an improvement. They pose a threat to the second objective, and because they are nebulous, they threaten standardization and thus impede interlibrary cooperation.

American librarians expect their author-title catalogs to serve two objectives. These objectives, first articulated by Cutter, were restated by Lubetzky:

The objectives implicit in our rules for entry are two: the first objective is to enable the user of the catalog to determine readily whether or not the library has the book he wants. . . . The second objective is to reveal . . . under one form of the author's name, what works the library has by a given author and what editions or translations of a given work.¹

Cataloging practices ideally suited to the achievement of one objective often impede the achievement of the other. Entry of each of an author's works under the name and form of name that appear in it facilitates searches for known items but scatters the works of an author and may even separate editions of the same work. Entry of all an author's works under a heading that is both uniform and unique, required for achievement of the second objective, often causes inconvenience to the person who is searching for a specific item. Rules for author and title entry dictate terms of compromise between the two objectives.

The ALA rules of 1908² and 1949³ favored the second objective, taking little account of the first. AACR 1,⁴ while requiring the use of

Bruce E. Ford is head of the Catalog Department of the Newark Public Library.
uniform and unique headings for personal authors, took greater account of the first objective than its predecessors by directing that, to the extent compatible with achievement of the second objective, headings for authors were to be based on the names they used in their works. Nevertheless, many of the headings constructed according to its provisions and designed to meet the requirements of the second objective still hindered searches for known items.

Chapter 22 of AACR 2, which contains the rules governing construction of headings for persons, includes certain new provisions intended to resolve the conflict between the two objectives in ways more satisfactory than those tried earlier. One of these new provisions succeeds admirably. AACR 1 provided that, when an author used initials in his works to represent forenames, these initials were to be used in the heading under which his works were entered in the catalog, unless use of initials was likely to result in conflict. However, if use of initials in a heading created a conflict, or, if the author's surname was a common one, forenames were to be spelled out. Spelling out forenames represented by initials impeded attainment of the first objective, of course. Library patrons looking for works by D. H. Lawrence suffered the inconvenience of being referred to "Lawrence, David Herbert." AACR 2, in contrast, directs that the initials used by authors in their works are always to be retained in headings but that, where use of initials results in conflict, the names represented by these initials are to be added in parentheses. An optional provision permits the addition of names represented by initials whenever they are known in order to prevent conflict in the future. Thus, works of D. H. Lawrence are to be entered under "Lawrence, D. H. (David Herbert)." The rule about initials applies even to initials used to represent surnames. The user who goes to the catalog looking for works of H. D. will no longer be referred to "Doolittle, Hilda." He will find her works entered under "H. D. (Hilda Doolittle)." Headings in which initials used by authors in their works are retained and full names are added in parentheses serve both objectives well. They are unique, but they still permit entries to be filed where they are most likely to be sought.

Unfortunately, the provisions of AACR 2 that concern authors who use more than one name are less satisfactory than those of AACR 1. The rules presented in the body of the text of AACR 1, which were followed by LC, required that all the works of an author who used more than one name be entered under a single heading. An alternative rule (42B), printed in a footnote, permitted each of the works of such an author to be entered under the name appearing in it, but required that see also references be made to link entries appearing under different headings used for the same person. Many public libraries chose to follow the alternative rule, particularly in cataloging fiction. In so doing they chose to give priority to the first objective; and so long as they made the required see also references, they satisfied the requirements of the second, at least partially. Only if they failed to make the necessary references did they forsake the second objective entirely. The LC practice of entering all the works of each author
under a single heading helped libraries that followed the alternative rule know when references were needed. For example, if a cataloger found that LC had entered a novel written by John Creasey as J. J. Marric under “Creasey, John,” and he chose, instead, to enter it under “Marric, J. J.,” the LC entry reminded him to make references to link entries under both headings. If he later encountered a novel written by Creasey under the pseudonym Jeremy York, and he discovered that LC had entered it under “Creasey, John,” he knew that he needed to make references to link entries under Creasey, Marric, and York. AACR 2 directs that works of an author who writes under several names be entered under the “predominant name,” but includes a modifying provision which directs that if such an author is not known predominantly by any one name, each of his works is to be entered under the name that appears in it. The code requires the cataloger to decide whether any of several names used by an author is predominant. The difficulties the cataloger faces in doing so are obvious. So is the probability that his decisions will differ from those of his colleagues in other libraries; and every disagreement among catalogers will hinder interlibrary cooperation. Furthermore, LC’s adoption of the AACR 2 provisions poses a threat to local achievement of the second objective that may not be immediately obvious. If LC decides that none of the names used by John Creasey is “predominant” and chooses to enter the works he wrote as J. J. Marric under “Marric, J. J.,” the cataloger who works with LC copy but does not have access to LC’s authority files will not know that he needs to make references to connect entries under “Marric, J. J.” with those under “Creasey, John,” and he will inadvertently forsake the second objective. On-line access to LC authority files would, of course, eliminate the difficulties mentioned above; but, if the application of a rule requires excessive reliance on subjective judgment, even the judgment of LC, the rule is inherently defective.

The development of new and very satisfactory provisions for use of initials in headings demonstrates that catalog code revision is a worthwhile undertaking. The inadequacy of the new provisions respecting authors who write under several names demonstrates the need for further revision.
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Year's Work in Descriptive Cataloging: 1979

Constance Rinehart

To speak of the "aftermath" of AACR 2 may carry a certain disparaging sense about it; still, how else can one describe the ebb in publication in descriptive cataloging that followed this notable bibliographic event? Following the appearance of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2d edition, at the close of 1978, the completion of years of dedicated labor on the part of a great many people, a kind of pause—whether for contemplation or in a collective sigh of relief—seems to have settled over the cataloging community.

Once AACR 2 had become generally available, the next obvious steps were to become familiar with its provisions and to decide how the rules might affect the situation with regard to bibliographic access in any given library. A number of review articles appeared during 1979, attempting to summarize the code, forecast its effects, commend or bewail its provisions, or suggest practical or philosophical amendment. Simonton offers a compend of the major points in AACR 2, changes from what is now referred to as AACR 1, and plans for implementation by the major cataloging agencies. Referring particularly to the delay between publication and implementation of AACR 2, Simonton points out that because of this interim, "catalogers and other librarians have a unique opportunity and responsibility to identify any ambiguities and likely problems in the application of the new code in advance of its formal implementation."1 Two other lengthy studies are those of Weintraub, who approves of AACR 2's logical arrangement but suggests that "many of the specific details and fine points have not been thought through as carefully as they could have been,"2 and Shinebourne, who contends that both AACR 2 and its predecessor "have failed to define fundamental bibliographic concepts and have thus failed to present a clear set of principles which could guide and standardize cataloging practice."3 A review by Friedman concludes that AACR 2 presents the cataloger's job as a "more exacting activity than ever before,"4 but Hacker and Moore feel that the code's impact will be one of "instant obsolescence" for the library's catalog and propose a pattern of bibliographic control that permits the closing of local catalogs in favor of national networks and large data bases.5

Constance Rinehart is a professor at the School of Library Science, University of Michigan.
Two Canadian reviewers approve AACR 2 because of its greater flexibility and consistency, but point to the "unhappy compromise" reached in regard to certain legal and religious publications and to the lack of standardization permitted by references to "home country" and preferred language; and a British reviewer complains that "the practical problems of implementation and the likely costs" are matters that should be considered in any discussion of rule changes—a view which no doubt would be seconded by many library administrators in the U.S. Downing, however, lightens the mood (and who can do it better?) by surveying some of the comments made about the 1908 code, another Anglo-American production. A brief comparison of AACR 2 with the new German rules has appeared (in English), noting major differences between the two codes.

Aftermath—or possibly Death and Transfiguration—is more directly the subject of two major works published during the year: Requiem for the Card Catalog, a collection of papers from the Conference on Management Issues in Automated Cataloging held in 1977 under the sponsorship of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest; and The Future of the Catalog: The Library's Choices, by Malinconico and Fasana. The first of these publications is concerned only with the automated catalog, by which the various speakers appear to mean the bibliographic record supported in some way by computer technology. The catalog so created may be on cards received through OCLC or another utility, or it may be a microform printed by computer. The on-line catalog receives only a passing comment in this volume, as being "an ideal resource that still lies too far in the future for practical consideration by most library managers." Although The Future of the Catalog discusses first the traditional catalog and its functions, this work, too, is principally concerned with the application of computer technology to the library catalog. Malinconico and Fasana offer a comparison of alternatives, and an appendix presents a cost analysis of the various catalog options—card, book, microform, and on-line—for a hypothetical library.

For their "joint effort and contributions...to the content and structure" of AACR 2, the editors, Michael Gorman and Paul Winkler, received the 1979 Margaret Mann Citation at the ALA Annual Conference in Dallas, and later, in a special ceremony, they received from ALA President Russell Shank copies of the new code specially bound in "cream-colored morocco with copper lettering," as did members of the Joint Steering Committee.

**TRAINING IN AACR 2**

It is difficult to prepare to use or to teach the use of a new cataloging code without the help of some interpretations and worked examples. Hagler's Where's That Rule?, while not a book for beginners, offers a careful explanation of changes in AACR 2 as well as a cross-index of the two editions. Hunter has produced a short and tightly written programmed text on the new code, and ALA has at last announced a vague date for the publication of Maxwell's long-awaited
Handbook for AACR 2. Bernhardt's Introduction to Library Technical Services, a textbook for library/media technology programs, devotes several chapters to cataloging but attempts to cover AACR 2 in an appendix, where it is discussed only as it affects rules previously presented.

Decisions of the Library of Congress concerning choice of options in chapters 2-11 of the new code appear in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin of August 10, 1979; decisions on chapters 1-2, 12, and 21-26 were published in 1978. Updated information about the implementation of AACR 2 at the Library of Congress and rule interpretations for chapters 22-25 appear in Cataloging Service Bulletin for Fall 1979. In the same issue, the library began to publish the form of heading that will be used after 1980 for those persons, bodies, and uniform titles appearing twenty-five times or more in the MARC bibliographic files. (The availability of a privately prepared index to bulletins 1-125 of Cataloging Service is noted.)

Another useful preparation for working with the new code is attendance at some sort of training session, of which there is a wide selection. The first of the major introductory programs might be considered that of the International Conference on Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, organized by Doris H. Clack at Florida State University and held in Tallahassee in March 1979. The proceedings included a number of papers on the code itself and others on more general concepts and on problems of implementation. At the same time, the Joint Steering Committee for AACR met in Tallahassee to discuss the concise version of the code being prepared by Gorman.

A preconference in Dallas, organized by the AACR 2 Introductory Program Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD), served as ALA's "official" introduction of the new code. Several hundred persons who were willing to serve as leaders in workshops on AACR 2 saw four videotapes on the new code and a series of transparencies showing chief sources of information and the bibliographic records derived from them. These resources have now been made available by ALA for use in other group training sessions; slides have been substituted for the transparencies, and an accompanying script explains the rules used in each case. For groups wishing to follow the Dallas program format, or as a basis for developing sample records, these materials should be most useful.

Several other programs aimed at introducing practicing catalogers to the new rules have already been held by state organizations, network offices, and library schools, and many others are planned, including a series of "LC road shows" in 1980 and 1981 to publicize LC's interpretations and choices of options in using AACR 2. In Britain, an International Workshop on AACR 2 was held in July 1979 at Liverpool Polytechnic, which was charged with the preparation of a sample group of bibliographic records to be used in teaching the use of the new code. This project was commissioned by the Cataloguing and Indexing Group and supported by a grant from the British Library. Britain has designed a national training program for AACR 2, in which all British library schools will participate.
IMPACT OF THE NEW CODE

One of the major topics of discussion mentioned in the “Year’s Work” article for 1978 was that of the future of card catalogs; the problem continued to occupy those in positions of responsibility during the past year. At its ninety-fourth meeting in May 1979, under the title “National Planning for Bibliographic Control,” the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) heard a number of speakers refer to the impact of AACR 2, and proceedings of a 1978 meeting sponsored by the Boston Library Consortium became available as Beyond Day 1: The Future of the Catalog. Proceedings of two institutes on the general topic of the card catalog and its future, sponsored by the Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), were published during 1979; included are the papers, debates, and discussions from the New York meeting on “The Catalog: Its Nature and Prospects” in 1975; and the New York and Los Angeles meetings of 1977 on “The Catalog in an Age of Technological Change.” Proceedings of LITA’s New Orleans (November 1978) and San Francisco (February 1979) meetings on “Closing the Catalog,” previously announced for publication in 1979, are now listed for 1980. Thompson’s remarks at the 1979 convention of the Catholic Library Association summarize factors which must be considered in the decision to close the catalog, decisions which must be made, and major options for a second catalog.

In an attempt to coordinate information concerning the various “impact” studies being made in individual libraries, ALA President Russell Shank created an ad hoc Committee on AACR 2 Implementation Studies for the period January 1979 to January 1981. The committee, which was directed to “monitor and facilitate studies of the impact of implementing” AACR 2, was later dissolved at the request of its chairman, Richard Dougherty, on the grounds that the committee itself could not conduct studies, adequate means already existed for communicating information about such studies, and the committee’s infrequent meetings made it impossible for them to attempt to solve problems resulting from implementation of the code. Beginning with the first issue of 1979, the RTSD Newsletter began a column of “News about AACR 2 Implementation Studies,” edited by James Thompson of Johns Hopkins University Library, and the ALA Office of Research will continue to receive and correlate AACR 2 implementation studies.

Not everyone, however, saw the end of the card catalog as an immediate result of the implementation of AACR 2. A survey of the Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group of RTSD indicated that while twenty-one of the respondents planned to close their card catalogs, four directors indicated that their card catalogs would continue after January 1, 1981. This view is supported by Hewitt and Gleim, who feel that the best alternative available to libraries is the continuance of the present card catalogs “while at the same time planning for their eventual replacement by COM or online” forms.
RESEARCH FINDINGS

While a number of small studies were being carried on in individual libraries concerning the number of records affected by the use of AACR 2—or by LC's choice of options in AACR 2—one major research project was undertaken. Early in 1979, ARL surveyed its members and approximately one hundred other academic research libraries on "their interest in a program to provide cost models for developing alternatives to present card catalogs." King Research, Inc., was to make studies in several libraries, develop the cost models, and hold two seminars to discuss concepts, applications, and implications. The report of the King Research Library Catalog Cost Model Project was to have been published in 1979 as Alternatives for Future Library Catalogs: A Cost Model, but publication was delayed until "early 1980." In the meantime, ARL reported "several unexpected findings" from the project: implementation of AACR 2 appeared to be less expensive than anticipated; of twelve alternative forms of the catalog considered in the project, the unified card catalog appeared to be the most economical; having the old catalog on cards and the new catalog on COM appeared to be much more costly than expected; and a unified catalog of any kind appeared to be less expensive than a split catalog of any kind. Support for the last of these findings is voiced by Dwyer, who found that users tended to consult only one catalog in a multiple file system.

Other projects have concentrated on specific provisions of AACR 2. Tate, continuing an earlier study of the efficiency of catalog codes in fulfilling the finding list function of the catalog, concluded that AACR 2 was superior to AACR 1 in this regard, and that both were superior to the ALA code of 1949. Gorman and Hotsinpiller carried out a study of the descriptive data on catalog records with relation to the controversy over ISBD; their conclusion was that the difficulty for readers in using the descriptive information on such records "lies in the nature of that data, not in the manner in which it is presented."

Two publications offer assistance to libraries working on their own impact studies. Heinritz presents a method for the quick and precise selection of random sample categories through the use of a computer program; and Nachlas and Pierce discuss "microcosting," a method of isolating the cost of providing a specific service that might reasonably be applied to cataloging procedures.

Weintraub reviews research on the problem of bibliographic access and concludes that the findings of the various studies cannot be coordinated due to the lack of an overall theory of bibliographic organization. Research studies on the performance of the card catalog have been summarized by Hafter, who also considers the methodology used in such studies ("questionable and ... characterized by a general lack of attention to technical details"), the policy issues raised by them (most relate to the on-line catalog), and the results reported ("the major conclusion that emerges ... is that the card catalog works"). Hafter concludes that the adoption of alternative catalog
forms may bring a still greater need for research on library catalogs and studies of catalog use.\textsuperscript{50}

**AUTHORITY CONTROL**

The impact of AACR 2 and prospects for closing card catalogs—or, more especially, for maintaining unified files—cannot be considered apart from the matter of authority control, and LITA's major program for 1979 was "Authority Control: The Key to Tomorrow's Catalog." Malinconico's paper from this conference has been published,\textsuperscript{51} and some others have been distributed informally. Clement's paper presented at the IFLA conference in Copenhagen described the authority file system of the National Library of Canada and the pilot project using an on-line system (Dortmunder Bibliotheks-System or DOBIS);\textsuperscript{52} the latter is also discussed by Newman and others.\textsuperscript{53}

Dowell points out that it would not be necessary to close the catalog after January 1, 1981, if libraries kept sufficient control over differing forms of names.\textsuperscript{54} Bregzis, in a paper prepared for the first national conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1978, suggests that in a machine-based system, both old and new forms of entry can be used, with records linked either in the coding or at the time of searching.\textsuperscript{55}

**COM AS AN ALTERNATIVE**

Fitzgerald, summarizing the New Orleans LITA meeting for his Harvard colleagues, commented that "the catalog of the immediate future for the larger library is most likely to be a fiche catalog of current acquisitions produced from machine-readable records."\textsuperscript{56} ALA's Reference and Adult Services Division (RASD) is already getting used to the microform alternative. Their program at the Dallas Annual Conference was concerned not only with the effects of AACR 2 on public service operations but also with the effective use of the catalogs resulting from its implementation. One of the papers from this meeting reports that in using the COM catalog, the University of Toronto Library "overestimated the user's affinity for a card catalog and underestimated the library staff's resistance to change."\textsuperscript{57} Also at Dallas, two RTSD Sections sponsored a joint program on "The Public Catalog: Microform Alternatives"; speakers represented the University of Toronto, Prince George's County (MD) Library System, and the Los Angeles County Public Library System.\textsuperscript{58}

An extensive independent study, conducted for the Los Angeles County Public Library System in 1977 to provide data on patterns of use of the COM catalog and degree of public acceptance of the form, was published in a revised edition in 1979.\textsuperscript{59} The study concluded, in summary, that "the COM catalog is more acceptable to patrons than either its book or card alternative; the specialized viewing equipment used in the test posed no obstacles to patron use of the catalog, except for patrons wearing bifocals; the most significant factor in providing satisfactory
patron service is having enough viewers available at a given site . . . ;
provision of information in COM form seems to increase general use
of the catalog; there is no significant difference among types of user
groups in reaction to the COM catalog . . . ; staff training, proper in-
stallation and illumination, and adequate information about the catalog
are as important as provision of the COM publication and the
viewers."60

Other research of interest to libraries considering COM as the cata-
log form for 1981 and beyond was done by Ronald and Jo Ellen
Force, who developed a computer simulation queuing model intended
to determine the number of terminals or readers needed by a library
going to the on-line or microform catalog.61 Ayres and Yannakoudakis
determined the average size of the various elements in the UK MARC
record; this information should make it possible to figure the cost of
any particular element in the record, and thus aid in the design of the
COM catalog.62

During the year several libraries reported on their successful COM
projects. Blackburn published a general statement on Toronto's deci-
sion to close the card catalog and begin use of COM;63 St. Louis
County Library reported on its direct conversion from card to film
through Brodart;64 Hyatt described the experience of the University
of Oregon Law Library in using the Blackwell/North America
system;65 and Hines discussed procedures, products, and practices re-
resulting from the change to COM at the IBM library in Rochester,
Minnesota.66 White has produced a planning document for the Vir-
ginia Commonwealth University Libraries including a review of the
advantages and disadvantages of COM, format and film type, methods
of conversion, and factors relating to catalog closing; appendixes cover
card catalog maintenance costs, offer a framework for cost-benefit
analysis, and suggest a design for a catalog use study.67

OTHER CATALOGING ACTIVITIES

LC began a series of meetings with the National Library of Medi-
cine and the National Agricultural Library, with the announced inten-
tion of "resolving wasteful differences [in technical processing], pro-
moting cooperation . . . and working towards open communication
about their respective operations."68

A proposal that could affect several types of libraries and library
activities is LC's plan to reconsider its order of priorities in cataloging.
The draft statement and guidelines, as published in the Library of Con-
gress Information Bulletin for August 17, 1979, indicated that the new
approach would be reviewed in "a reasonable time" and adjustments
made if necessary; but librarians were reminded that "these guidelines
have to meet a great variety of different and often contradictory
needs and are, of necessity, a compromise in responding to an ex-
ceedingly complex problem."69 In the line of expansion, however, is
the library's announcement of plans to add seven languages to its
romanized cataloging program.70
SPECIALIZED MATERIALS

The bibliographic control of special forms of material has been a subject of long and occasionally heated discussion in library literature and at meetings of library and education professionals. In a review of the development of cataloging rules for nonprint materials, Harrison suggests that AACR 2 may provide an answer to those who were seeking “a basis for co-operative cataloging both nationally and internationally”; ISBD(G), she suggests, was a most important step in this direction. Harrison points out that one of the factors holding up agreement during the past decade has been the lack of internationally acceptable standard descriptions, and she regards the glossary in AACR 2 as generally adequate but still incomplete. An extensive bibliography is included.71

Harrison’s emphasis on the importance of standards for nonprint is reflected in other writings also. The International Office for UBC has published a summary of recent IFLA activities toward bibliographic control of these materials, emphasizing the need both for cooperative action and for accepted standards.72 LaPlume echoes the call for standards,73 and Rogers reports on a survey of school library supervisors which indicates not only that many different sets of rules are in use by school librarians, but also that providing bibliographic access to library materials is not a top priority of the school library specialists in the departments of education in the fifty states.74

Ferris reports on a special project in the field of nonprint materials—the Learning Materials Recording Study of the British Library and the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA). Aims of the project were to upgrade and convert into machine-readable form part of the ILEA catalog, to assess ways of preparing the records, to determine whether book and nonbook records could be merged successfully, and to determine the market for the resulting list. AACR 2 rules were used (in draft form) in the physical description area. The records prepared during the project will appear as an experimental British Catalogue of Audiovisual Materials.75

A major publication in the nonbook area, Nonbook Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collections, was published in a revised edition during the year; it is intended as a companion and supplement to AACR 2.76 A second edition of Croghan’s Bibliographic System for Non-Book Media also appeared in 1979,77 as did the second volume of Redfern’s Organising Music in Libraries. Revised and rewritten from Redfern’s earlier text, this volume is devoted to the cataloging of music and includes a comparative study of AACR 2 and the Code International de Catalogage of the International Association of Music Libraries.78

In the special field of early printed books, IFLA announced the distribution in draft form of the ISBD(A) for the description of older monographic publications. The report points out that a separate standard is necessary for older materials because they are “considered as artifacts to be described in such a way as they can be clearly distin-
guished for the purpose of comparison with other copies and other editions of the same work”; modern items, on the other hand, require “a recognisable entry in a predictable form.” The draft ISBD(A) forms part of the background for a first draft, distributed in December 1979, of LC’s Rules for Bibliographic Description of Early Printed Books. At least one further draft is expected before publication.

A related publication is the final report containing fifteen Proposals for Establishing Standards for the Cataloguing of Rare Books and Specialized Research Materials in Machine-Readable Form submitted in December by the Ad Hoc Committee on Standards for Rare Book Cataloguing in Machine-Readable Form of the Independent Research Libraries Association. The proposals are intended “to provide means of access to information about the characteristics of specialized research materials that at present cannot be recorded in standard ways in machine-readable records”; all the proposed rules would be, if adopted, entirely optional in any given library.

During the year ARL applied for a $50,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities in order to develop a project for improving the bibliographic control of microforms. The International Federation of Film Archives published a work on Film Cataloguing, intended as “a practical guide” and including chapters on the handling and care of films as well as on cataloging and catalog systems. An extensive bibliography covers material on cataloging rules, film cataloging, and computers in libraries and archives.

Among publications relating to more specialized forms or types of materials, Emmett reported on the effects on cataloging of the Northwestern University Transportation Library’s entrance into Northwestern’s automated system; Barnett suggested a formula for making bibliographic records for the printed guides or catalogs of art collections; De Lorge described a cataloging system for building plans and offered to send sample work sheets; Evans and Stein discussed the use of image-bearing catalog cards as a means of access to pictures; and Kaufman presented a system for cataloging and arranging photographs and other visual materials. Dodd described the creation of an on-line bibliographic data base for machine-readable data files, and late in the year the Library of Congress reported that it had completed a draft MARC format for such files. A draft cataloging manual for cartographic materials, based on AACR 2, is being prepared by the Anglo-American Cataloguing Committee for Cartographic Materials and will be edited by the National Map Collection of Canada.

During 1979 the Library of Congress became engaged in developing a series of manuals for special materials—rare books, prints and photographs, manuscripts, films, cartographic materials, and government documents—which will expand and interpret AACR 2 and may offer changes for consideration.

A group of representatives of specialized library associations met in January to discuss the role of such organizations in future catalog code revision; later in the year the Council of National Library and...
Information Associations agreed to "attempt to present the concerns of the specialized libraries to those authorized to revise the code."

**NETWORK DEVELOPMENTS**

MacGregor, in a brief discussion of bibliographic network development in the United Kingdom, concludes that the principle of creating or acquiring catalog records through the computer is now established; "what remains to be developed is a viable organizational structure which will best meet the needs of all libraries for their catalogue records."

In an attempt to discover this structure, the Council on Library Resources announced during the year its major new Bibliographic Service Development Program (BSDP), for which the council raised more than $5 million; the program is expected to extend over four or five years. According to the program's chief officer, C. Lee Jones, BSDP was inaugurated because "careful analysis . . . led to the conclusion that a comprehensive system for bibliographic control is essential. Such a system should take full advantage of the nation's capacity to produce bibliographic records and should make those records available to all libraries that need them. The system must accommodate records from other nations as well." It is recognized, however, that the United States is not likely to have one file of bibliographic records for the whole country; instead, BSDP is based on the premise that the national data base "will be composed of files distributed at various service sites."

In the beginning, the program is expected to concentrate on "matters surrounding the creation, maintenance, distribution, accessibility, management, and use of data bases." Interests that surfaced in early meetings were the creation of a system for internetwork computer communication, identification of the kind of data base which should be made available and the kind of record it should contain, and development of an authority control system.

Two advisory groups have been established by BSDP: the Network Advisory Committee, to help with planning and policy decisions, and the Network Technical Advisory Group (NTAG), to consider technical matters. The latter of these, NTAG, has been more thoroughly described by Avram and Hartmann, who write that the group's primary objective is the design of an interconnection of bibliographic utilities. The first task is seen as the determination of the rules and standards in use in U.S. libraries and the extent to which they must be accommodated, and a further matter (number ten in the authors' list) will be the consideration of problems related to varying interpretations and applications of AACR 2. The fifth in NTAG's series of Network Planning Papers appeared during 1979, Long's Study of Message Text Formats, an examination of the search arguments of the different utilities. A paper by Salton, which proposes a "cooperative network arrangement between library centers" and discusses some of the technical problems which might arise under such arrangements, might serve as a further contribution to the plan.

The networks themselves, however, tended to concentrate on their own development rather than on any moves toward cooperation.
OCLC’s annual report listed, as usual, growth in number of states reached, number of libraries participating, and number of terminals in use. Major tools published by OCLC during the year include its Cataloging: User Manual, describing operations in the OCLC cataloging subsystem; Name-Authority: User Manual, with instructions for retrieving LC authority records from the on-line file; and Searching the On-Line Union Catalog, with information applying to all OCLC subsystems.

OCLC for you and me has been capably described in OCLC: A National Library Network, edited by Allison and Allan. Included in the coverage are articles on network organization and activities, staff training, use of OCLC in library schools, cataloging workflow, and acceptance of member library cataloging. The full, annotated bibliography is a noteworthy addition.

The cost of using OCLC has been investigated by Morris, whose results will surprise no one: charges vary from one contracting center to another, and in general heavy users pay less. Purnell offers a method of creating documentation for a new system that interfaces with OCLC. Tracy and Remmende found that OCLC gave the highest number of “hits” in a sample of 1,018 titles checked against BALLOTS, BNA, OCLC, and WLN to determine probable success in finding records for conversion. Boissonas reports on the quality of OCLC member cataloging; Matthews considers OCLC’s effect on workflow in law libraries; and Heine and Yedlin survey the information needs of the Health Sciences OCLC Users Group. Rzecz- kowski describes the use of OCLC by a small college library that “rents” terminal time from another institution; the time and cost figures given should be useful to other small institutions.

An OCLC affiliate, the AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, announced that it was separating from its parent body (the Interuniversity Council of the North Texas Area) and would establish a Bibliographic Resource Center with the ultimate aim of providing an on-line catalog for members; and the boards of eight networks—AMIGOS, SOLINET, MIDLNET, PALINET, NELINET, MINITEX, PRLC, and FEDLINK—met to discuss areas of further cooperation. Innovative Interfaces, Inc., of Berkeley, California, announced the development of a system to permit the direct transfer of data appearing on an OCLC screen to the CLSI circulation system. The device, which would enable an operator at the terminal to create both catalog and circulation records at one time, was expected to be “cost effective for those libraries that have CLSI systems which process several thousand new records through OCLC each year. It can mean a real saving for those which undertake simultaneous retrospective catalog and circulation record conversion projects.” The issue of “third party use” of network records became a major issue briefly in 1979; some RLIN members threatened to sue OCLC if they were not permitted to share a data base which they helped build.

The Research Libraries Group (RLG) and its network, RLIN, were also in a period of expansion; RLG added several institutional mem-
bers during 1979, and the number of libraries contributing to RLIN increased as well. RLG succeeded in attracting $1 million in grant money from the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to aid in the development of a utility designed for a network of research institutions.119

Among major RLIN publications for the year are its Bibliographic Data Element Tagging Workbook: Books Format, which deals with the application of the format in creating and modifying bibliographic records; and three audiovisual programs that can be rented or purchased as slides or videotapes: RLG: An Introduction, Searching the Books Data Base, and Searching the RLIN Non-Books Data Bases.120 A series of RLIN Cataloging Notes began in January, to "record answers to cataloging and coding questions and to disseminate announcements and policies. The information will include answers from the Library of Congress and interpretations of RLIN cataloging standards."121

With the Library of Congress, RLG began work on a data base describing the MARC data elements—tags, indicators, and subfield codes. The data base, which will be made up of information in various LC documents, will be maintained by RLIN and made available from LC in loose-leaf form as an integrated MARC format.122,123

RLG had also entered into cooperation with the third major U.S. utility, the Washington Library Network (WLN), when the two "agreed to share their databases and to work together in the development of network services." Both bibliographic data and technical plans were included in the plans for exchange.124 WLN, meanwhile, had taken a giant step, at least geographically, by installing its software in the National Library of Australia.125

Weisbrod, head of the Systems Office at Yale University Library, has been asked to review all of the MARC formats for the Library of Congress, in order to "evaluate them in terms of networking requirements." Weisbrod will be assisted by a working group funded by the Council on Library Resources.126

The National Level Bibliographic Record (NLBR)—Books, issued as a draft document late in 1978, gave specifications for the data elements to be included in machine-readable catalog records. Representatives of the Association of Research Libraries met with Library of Congress staff in January 1979 and agreed to substitute for the three levels of content originally proposed (full original, transcription of LC, and minimal original) "a continuum of levels of input" ranging from "an absolute minimum level to a full level record." Records would be coded to indicate the level of completeness in description, name and title access points, subject headings, classification, content designation for variable field length, and coded data fields.127

By studying the detection of duplicate records, which can be a major problem in the large on-line network, Hickey and Rypka developed an algorithm that "can be more accurate than all but the closest human scrutiny."128 A project with similar aims was reported by Williams and MacLaury, who were successful in developing a system for eliminating duplicates in three large sample files.129 Research
involved in developing the key used for the first pass matching in the scheme is further described by MacLaury in a companion article.\textsuperscript{150}

In a general survey of the bibliographic network scene, Thompson looks at the developments of the past decade.\textsuperscript{151} Corbin attempts a brief state-of-the-art report;\textsuperscript{132} Rine offers a short description of each network;\textsuperscript{133} and De Gennaro concludes that the rise of competition among networks since the appearance of RLIN may force all the utilities to be more efficient and responsive.\textsuperscript{134}

Among other automation activities, Warner-Eddison Associates, Inc., of Cambridge, Massachusetts, announced the development of a software package that would permit small college libraries to build a data base of their holdings on a PDP-11 computer and to produce book cards, labels, accession lists, etc., from the stored information.\textsuperscript{135} Cline of the Princeton-based Educational Testing Service began work on a research project funded at $86,850 and aimed at studying "the impact of automation upon the structure and function of academic libraries"; cataloging is one of the functions to be covered by the project.\textsuperscript{136,137} The MITRE Corporation received $74,370 for a study intended to lead to an automation guidebook;\textsuperscript{138} the University of North Carolina was awarded $250,000 by the Office of Education under Title II-C of the Higher Education Act in order to improve mutual access to its collections and those of North Carolina State and Duke University through a local bibliographic network; the New York State Education Department received $250,000 "to incorporate the monographic holdings of the state network into a national data base"; and the universities of Virginia, South Carolina, and Alabama, with Vanderbilt University received $300,000 "to extend regional and national data bases for rare research materials and to increase the availability of the materials at participating libraries."\textsuperscript{139}

CONCLUSION

The attentive reader will have noticed that subheadings used for last year's survey of cataloging might well have been repeated for 1979: the future of the catalog, specialist interests, automation and networks. There were few major new topics of research or activity; it was a period in which the new information was being absorbed, the plans made, the research designs formulated or put to use, and the data gathered. The year's investigations should lead in 1980 to interesting and useful reports on the implementation of the new catalog code and suggestions for its improvement as well as new efforts toward a national bibliographic network.
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Year’s Work in
Subject Analysis: 1979

Doris Hargrett Clack

Comparatively speaking, the year 1979 was a rather lean year in the growth of the body of literature on subject analysis; nevertheless the publications that appeared reflected the superior caliber of scholars and practitioners who produced them. Unfortunately several works announced for a 1979 publication schedule failed to appear, such as the third edition of Immeretho’s Guide to the Library of Congress Classification,\(^1\) Aman’s Cataloging and Classification of Non-Western Library Materials,\(^2\) and the Cataloging & Classification Quarterly.\(^3\)

An analysis of the literature published revealed no single pivotal point around which the year’s activities centered. Classification, subject headings, and indexing constitute the specific areas under which the majority of the literature falls. A few publications dealt with subject analysis in general and have been so noted below.

General Subject Analysis

In the ongoing attempt to seek ways to recover information from a store of literature, professional techniques have developed and have become both invaluable and indispensable. The increasing demands being made on contemporary information systems and the concomitant problems have developed, economically and scientifically, into the important area of subject analysis, the fundamental process of which is far from being fully understood or mastered. The whole process of transmitting messages conveyed by a phrase or term or of recognizing groups of subjects and their interrelationships is considered fundamental to effective subject retrieval and is in the national interest to be improved. The ALA/RTSD/CCS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), concerned with finding ways to improve subject access, was seeking answers to perplexing problems when it asked the theme question “Can Anyone Do It?”\(^4\)-\(^6\) at its program at the American Library Association Annual Conference in Dallas. The participants in the SAC program sought to identify the needs of libraries, varied by type and size, and to explore the desirability and possibility of meeting all of those needs. The theme question sought to identify the organiza-
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tion that could adequately, effectively, and economically provide for the multiplicity of needs. A commitment on the part of the profession to support a national-level central agency devoted singly to the efforts of universal subject control was seen as a primary goal. This agency would maintain a national authority file, develop and utilize the full potential of the computer, a suitable switching mechanism to link the various local and national information systems, and coordinate the various subject access efforts. Ample research must be followed by positive action if any measure of universal subject control is to become a reality.

A research report by Harris and Clack concerns the subject heading treatment of people and peoples.7 The object was to identify areas in Library of Congress (LC) subject headings and classification and the Dewey decimal classification where subject analysis is prejudicial or offensive to an affected group, and to examine the vocabulary for objectiveness. Numerous problem areas were identified. Recommendations include suggestions for improving the structure, upgrading the vocabulary, removing obvious biases of LC subject headings, and relocating certain topics in the classification. Also concerned about the treatment of people in subject analysis, Davis asserts that the subject cataloging of disability-related topics is inadequate.8 Subject headings and references are often archaic, derogatory, and either overly general or missing completely.

Because of the increased importance of the role of automation at LC and the possibility of radical changes in cataloging, the Library of Congress and the ALA Catalog Use Committee undertook an examination of the LC Subject Catalog to determine how it was being used by libraries.9 Little use was being made of the catalog in microform in comparison to the hard copy, which was found to be more heavily used by technical services librarians than by any other group. Evidence supported retaining the catalog in its present format with little or no change in content. OCLC may soon be able to provide an alternative to the LC subject catalogs, if the results of research undertaken by the Bibliographic Retrieval Services (BRS) prove worthwhile. BRS wishes to improve subject access to the rapidly accumulating OCLC bibliographic records contributed by libraries over the nation by providing file access through keyboard searching.10 Already at LC the Congressional Research Service (CRS) is providing subject access to a variety of data bases to members of Congress and their staff through its own thesaurus.11 Unlike the standard LC subject headings the vocabulary used in the CRS thesaurus is current, in controlled nomenclature, flexible, and regularly revised.

One chapter in the newly published second volume of Redfern’s Organising Music in Libraries12 is devoted to subject analysis and complements volume 1, Classification, quite well.

The state of subject analysis abroad varies from an “infancy” level as with Bengali materials13 to the highly sophisticated University of Toronto’s Libraries Automated System (UTLAS), which influenced the closing of another classified catalog, that of the Laurentian Uni-
versity Library—the University of Boston and the National Library of Canada having given up their classified catalogs earlier. The Laurentian University Library in Sudbury, Ontario, decided to join a cooperative, UTLAS, to facilitate the creation and maintenance of their dual French and English subject catalogs. Subject headings in the French language catalog will be linked to those in the English language catalog.14

CLASSIFICATION

The big news in classification was the publication of the nineteenth edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) in June and the eleventh abridged edition in December,15 the retirement of its editor for the past quarter century, Benjamin A. Custer, and the appointment of his replacement, John Comaromi.16 The various changes in the new edition having been identified and analyzed,17-19 the Library of Congress, the Canadian National Library, and the Australian National Library agreed to begin using it in January 1980. The British Library believes that it is in its best interest to delay implementation until January 1981 when it begins to use AACR 2. A number of workshops and seminars have been scheduled on Dewey 19, the first of which was held in New York under the auspices of METRO (New York Metropolitan Reference and Research Library Agency) and the Forest Press.20 Learning to use the DDC can be fun, as it is in Kenosha, Wisconsin, where videotapes and games have been developed and used in the Kenosha Unified Schools.21 Of all the major general classification schemes available, the Dewey decimal classification is the one chosen for use in all Danish public libraries.22

The Library of Congress continues to find ways to economize in its subject cataloging practices. It was announced that the Subject Cataloging Division will discontinue to class English fiction in PZ1, PZ3, and PZ4, but will use PS, PR, and the original notations for the various national literatures.23 Rodriguez finds some of LC’s changes problematic.24 In 1975 LC broke with tradition and began dispersing bibliography with the subject rather than classing it in Z. According to Rodriguez the new position of “general works” in the various subject areas is a poor selection since it does not always come at the beginning of the class, nor does it integrate bibliography with the subject.

Other traditional classification systems seem to be well and prospering. Several new parts of the English and the Portuguese editions of the Universal Decimal Classification were published25 as well as a manual of instructions for their use.26 New uses for this international classification scheme have been reported. Tomimatsu found it suitable for use in small libraries27 while Hindson finds that it lends itself excellently to computer processing.28

Maltby and Gill made a case for the Bibliographic Classification of Henry E. Bliss. Their work provides an opportunity for library science students and catalogers to examine the merits of the system in light of other more popular systems with which they may be more familiar.29

The strong theoretical base on which Ranganathan developed his
Colon Classification continues to influence classification. Mahapatra designed a special classification system based on the principles of the Colon Classification. He describes it as one of many “depth” classification schemes published in India using the idea of the “Idea, the Verbal and the Notational Planes” initiated by Ranganathan.30

Numerous other special classification schemes have been devised and published, some of which display the ingenuity of librarians the world over. Special schemes are available for business studies, visual materials, physics, nursing, polymer literature, fiction, and Islamic materials. The London Classification of Business Studies, compiled by Vernon and Lang, recently has gone into a second edition,31 which incorporates suggestions from users. Noting its international reputation in the organization and retrieval of information on business studies, Bakewell describes its scope and structure, explains the differences between the two editions, and predicts a favorable reception from the business studies library community.32

The University Archives of the State University of New York at Buffalo developed a system for classifying photographs and other visual materials. This unique classification system groups materials into different categories, subarranges them by size, then by subject.33 An International Classification System for Physics has been developed under the aegis of the International Council of Scientific Unions and marks a significant event in the area of subject analysis and data processing on an international scale.34 Although the National Library of Medicine Classification is the most practical system for medical librarians, problems result when it is used for nursing services and health professionals. Materials written for them may only be placed in the arbitrary form class WY instead of in the classes for body diseases and systems. As a solution to this problem, the Brockton Hospital Library devised a modification that adequately organizes this body of literature.35 Over the past thirty-five years polymer science and technology have been growing at a rapid speed into a considerable body of literature with unique nomenclature and language. A classification system has been developed to meet the needs of polymer scientists and engineers in an industrial environment.36 Islamic materials37 and fiction38 also have had special schemes developed to meet the unique needs and to reflect the multidimensional interests of their users.

The International Patent Classification scheme used in patent offices around the world to group families of patents relating to the same invention was studied by Eisenschitz and Oppenheim to determine the degree of consistency in the use of the system. The lack of consistency they found in the application of the scheme among users negates its intended international advantage.39

Looking at classification from a historical perspective in “Classificatory Thinking from Kinner to Wilkins,” Schulte-Albert examined the ideas of seventeenth-century British scholars and related their classificatory theories to modern mechanisms for vocabulary control. They either created “analytico-synthetic” classification schemes with elaborate systems of notation or made plans for them. Their universal lan-
guages were failures, but they met with success in providing “primordial schedules” that exhaustively enumerate all known things and notions. Modern technology is sufficiently advanced to overcome the difficulties faced by Kinner, Dalgarno, and Wilkins in their attempts to produce a universal language. Their contributions, nevertheless, are considered milestones in classificatory history. Modern technology has made possible the Broad System of Ordering (BSO), a modern classification scheme designed for information exchange and switching.

Germany was the host country for three conferences on classification. The Second Seminar on Classification and Education was held in Köln, and its primary concern was the teaching of classification in library schools. The Third Annual Conference of the Society for Classification was held in Königstein and may be remembered as a milestone in classification history for “cognition.” The First Regional Conference of FID’s Committee on Classification Research also met in Königstein. Its theme question was: How can classification help in the creation, presentation, and mediation of knowledge?

The forty-fifth Congress and Council Meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions was held in Copenhagen, where the Round Table on Classification of the Division of Bibliographic Control was voted section status, reflecting an increasing awareness of the importance of subject analysis in libraries.

Papers from two conferences held during previous years are now available. The seventeen papers of the forty-first American Society for Information Science Conference are devoted to both classification and indexing while the four published papers of the 1978 International Federation for Documentation Congress relate to trends in classification. The fifty-eight papers from the third International Study Conference on Classification Research held in Bombay, India, in 1975 have finally been published.

The teaching of classification is seldom addressed in the literature. Although the environment is Germany, Römer’s article, “Classification Teaching for Students of Librarianship,” is a welcomed addition to this impoverished body of literature. A syllabus for advanced courses in classification in India at the master’s and post-master’s level is also quite impressive.

**Subject Headings**

Any discourse on subject headings in general is likely to produce mental images of the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) in particular, and a review of the literature supports this equation. Because the LCSH occupies the status of “the ultimate authority,” it also is the object of much criticism, serious study, examination, and evaluation. O'Neill made such an examination of the characteristics of LC subject headings occurring in cataloging records taken from the OCLC data base to find out how many subject access points are available and what their characteristics are. His concern was primarily with application rather than with the inherent characteristics of the terms themselves.
Steinweg revives the topic of specificity. Specificity is expressed in LCSH with specific terms, adjectival modifiers, terms in glosses and subdivisions, compound headings, duplicate headings, and dates. Problems can result if the ideal of specificity is applied.

On the other hand, Wilson supports the ideal of specific entry in subject cataloging and disapproves LC's new policy of providing duplicate entries at specific and generic levels. They reveal nothing new about the collection and are a wasteful way of repairing the deficiencies of the syndetic structure. Pankin facetiously suggests to catalogers that they read the LCSH in their spare time to enjoy the "menagerie of colorful topics" that appears there. In addressing the annual convention of the Association of Jewish Libraries, Berman discussed the "Jewish question" in Library of Congress subject headings. Among other faults, there is a hidden bias in favor of Christianity.

The Library of Congress has been quite responsive to suggestions from the library community, but its policies are tempered by its own needs. The decision to delay the closing of the catalog until January 1, 1981, also altered the library's plans to make changes in subject headings in a separate machine-readable file of subject headings without incorporating them in the LCSH supplements. Instead, changes will now be implemented gradually, with major changes occurring close to 1981. An order of priority has been established as to the headings to be changed first.


Special collections are best served by special subject headings. The Library and Statutory Distribution Service of the Government Printing Office are working on the development of a KWIC index for the Monthly Catalog to supplement the existing Library of Congress subject headings. The Hennepin County Public Library published a list of consumer-related subject headings.

A new edition of Muench's Biomedical Subject Headings was published. The list consists of parallel listings of MeSH and LC subject headings. Also from the National Technical Information Service come revisions of its trio: Permut Medical Subject Headings, Medical Subject Headings: Annotated Alphabetic List, and Medical Subject Headings: Tree Structures.

Activity abroad relating to subject headings includes the compilation of a list of Australian subject headings to be used in the Australian National Bibliography and on AUSMARC tapes. The original plan to have the list as a supplement of LCSH was scrapped in favor of a completely new and separate list. Also in Australia is a project, BISA (Bibliographic Information on Southeast Asia), undertaken at the University of Sydney with the assistance of three other libraries to create a bibliographic data base of the growing volume of materials on Southeast Asia. Though inadequate for this purpose, the eighth edition of LCSH is used in the project for the sake of standardization and exchange of bibliographic records.
The Aslib Library has gathered a collection of thesauri, subject headings, and classification schemes for particular subject fields to answer inquiries about the existence of a particular scheme.67

INDEXING

An ordering system for a global information network is necessary to enable the effective retrieval of particular information. Classification, the traditional method of ordering, is based on the idea of partitioning the universe of knowledge into mutually exclusive classes. Ranganathan's faceted classification rejects traditional genus-species relationships but its five categories, PMEST, pose the difficult problem of semantics because of their ambiguity. Taube's coordinate/indexing system frees concepts from being bound to any category and allows total freedom to combine terms when necessary. Ghose and Dhawle describe MANIS, a computerized information system designed primarily for management studies that retains some aspects of traditional classification and relies heavily on the type of freedom typical of Taube's coordinate indexing system.68

Order is the first law of documentation. Fugmann identifies those classification principles which determine the caliber of performance of any information supply system: definability of a search topic, a sufficient degree of order in the file of the information system, predictability, and fidelity. Only highly syntactic indexing languages will be effective in responding to the increased demands made for accuracy. The syntax represents the links between words and, consequently, between concepts, documents, and search requests. Nonsyntactical indexing languages do not have connections and, therefore, are ineffective.69

Maron refutes the idea that depth of indexing is the most essential issue in the design of effective document retrieval systems as was once thought. To be concerned with optimal depth is useless because there is no single "best" depth of indexing. Patrons are too varied.70

In analyzing the contents of documents for indexing, Peitersen recommends that the task be done with the potential users in mind, especially their criteria for choosing library materials. The indexer must have knowledge of users' needs and experience with the individual reader's characterization of the subject content of documents.71

Promising indexing systems that remain in the news are PRECIS (Preserved Context Index System) and POPSI (Postulate-based Permutated Subject Indexing). Weintraub provides a concise review of PRECIS in which she recounts the effects of the system on subject analysis72 while Matter describes a project undertaken by the British Library to develop the potential of PRECIS as a system for translilingual indexing. A set of routines permits the automatic conversion of a "string" of indexing terms into a source language.73 Bett defends PRECIS against the criticism voiced in Atherton's report, Books Are for Use, by noting that it is a contextual system that weighs a term through a precise and meaningful grammatical relationship.74 Sive suggests that librarians in the United States would do well to follow
the lead of Canadians who have imported PRECIS and have developed it “in imaginative ways to help order data in areas where such order is desperately needed.” The seventy-four-page bibliography compiled by Sørensen reflects the general interest of the library community in the subject.

POPSI is regarded as an all-purpose indexing procedure that is amenable to computerization. Bhattacharyya examines the system and illustrates how subject terms are displayed in natural and artificial language similar to PRECIS strings.

The materials relating to the visual arts and career counseling have encountered theoretical and practical difficulties in subject analysis. Fawcett believes that the problems with the indexing of visual arts materials result from a lack of coordination of efforts and standardization in indexing methods. There is a need for an internationally accepted system of indexing such as PRECIS and LCSH or indexes such as RILA (International Repertory of the Literature of Art) and the Répertoire d'Art et d'Archéologie. Clack developed a method for indexing career counseling materials with The Dictionary of Occupational Titles as the source of vocabulary and notation.

Reviews of two major conferences were reported during the year. The National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing sponsored a three-day seminar during which various vocabularies used in indexing were discussed. In Oxford the Fifth Conference of the Aslib Coordinate Indexing Group (now Informatics Group) was held. Topics of interest included discussions of indexing languages, computer techniques, and artificial intelligence.

ABI/INFORM is one of six on-line data bases of Data Courier (Kentucky). Until 1978 ABI/INFORM was not indexed, and the original decision not to index was based on certain problems that existed: (1) the subject range was so broad; (2) minute definitions of terms would be necessary but difficult to supply. Trubkin describes a project that made use of the autoindexing process to prepare an index for ABI/INFORM. The controlled vocabulary proved very useful to searchers because of the many cross-references and accompanying dictionary of terms.

Harris studied the changes in the vocabulary of information science over a period of eleven years to determine the effects of such changes on index vocabularies. The research showed that vocabularies change at a rate of 4 percent per year with old terms leaving the vocabulary at about the same rate as new terms entering it. The number of hardware-oriented terms was declining while the number of management and cataloging terms was increasing. If index vocabularies are not frequently updated to reflect the subjects of newly indexed documents, a burden is placed on the user who must then try to guess where their subjects are likely to be entered.

CONCLUSION

Cooperation and research hold the promise for the future of library catalogs. An overview of the literature in the area of subject analysis
reveals that activities were initiated on a case by case basis with little or no group efforts to solve common problems. Few reports of new starts of research projects, such as those previously done by Atherton, O'Neill, and Harris, were noted. Vocabulary control and a suitable switching mechanism to encourage cooperation and to permit access to a network of data bases seem to be major needs. An independent central agency to provide leadership in such efforts has been suggested as a goal worthy of consideration.

The publication of Dewey 19 was, without doubt, the major event of the year. To be sure, implementation in 1980 will encourage further dialogue for some time to come.

Overall it was a good year. The year’s work in subject analysis could provide that needed impetus for fundamental changes in the methods and tools so desperately needed if improvements in subject access are to meet the needs and expectations of library users with any measure of success.
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The writer of Ecclesiastes could well have been reviewing the 1979 literature on resources when he recorded “and there is no new thing under the sun” (Eccles. 1:9). Slight changes in the amount of attention given a particular aspect of resources are evident—for example, the concern for preservation is clearly growing—but no topic that appeared in 1979 can be called a completely new development. Instead, debate continues about such topics as the rising costs and true effectiveness of our scholarly communication system, the proper role of the federal government in resource collection and management, the need for a national periodicals center and/or other resource sharing arrangements, and the application of quantitative evaluation techniques to collection management.

One very subtle but potentially significant change that does appear in the literature of 1979 is the gradual acceptance of and adjustment to restricted materials budgets as the normal situation. Lucker sums up the prevailing attitude: “Except for the largest research collections, buying for speculative or anticipated needs will be greatly reduced. This is a function both of financial necessity and accountability. Most of us do not have, nor will we ever again have, the resources to buy most or even a part of what our patrons might need. We will have to do a much better job of defining and obtaining what they will need.”

The acceptance of lowered expectations may or may not be a good thing for library collection development. White warns library administrators that they have been working too hard to cover up the effects that limited financial resources must have on library collections. He argues that quietly making adjustments in the allocation of available funds has irritated faculty, “because faculty still think we should buy everything they ask us to, and then they get annoyed with us when we don’t” and has caused academic administrators to believe that the earlier dire predictions and pleas for funds by librarians were exaggerated. Faculty must be forced to “face the reality of what appears to be an enormous change in the value system for library acquisition” and given the choice of “retreating from their lofty collection aspirations, or of accepting and urging programs for regional library acquisition policies.”

---

Rose Mary Magrill is professor, School of Library Science, University of Michigan.
The REIIIARC Database

The MARC program has enabled librarians everywhere to benefit from access to about one-sixth of LC's total cataloging efforts. REMARC offers access to the remaining five-sixths.

You know the contents of the more than one million MARC records. Here's what the more than five million REMARC records will contain:

- pre-1968 materials in all languages.
- 1968-1971 materials in all languages other than English,
- 1972-1973 materials in all languages other than English and French,
- 1973-1974 materials in all languages other than English, French, Spanish and Portuguese and,
- 1975-1978 materials in all languages using other than the Roman alphabet.

Libraries, service bureaus, and other customers will receive "hit" records (which match libraries' holdings) on a quarterly basis beginning October, 1980. Production will proceed at a rate of some 1.4 million records per year until the scheduled completion date in 1984.

The main database covers all LC records cataloged prior to December 31, 1978. Annual supplements will update the collection.

The records will be offered online via established telecommunications services, and offline on magnetic tape, COM, computer printout, and catalog cards. They may be purchased directly from Carrollton Press or indirectly through service bureaus, networks, or circulation control systems contractors.

If you think that retrospective conversion is a long way down the road . . .
The REMARC Record

REMARC records are designed for use in both online catalogs and circulation control/ILL systems.

Although it will not contain all of the detailed data in a full MARC record, the REMARC record will include the following items in MARC format: complete main entry; including author's dates and other descriptors; full title up to the first major punctuation; edition statement; place of publication; publisher; date of publication; designation of transliterated entries; full tracings, including subject, series, title, and author added entries (each tagged separately); complete LC call number (including brackets and suffixes); the full LC card number; and finally, the most common diacritical marks will be included on main entries, titles, and tracings (for printout on equipment with appropriate character sets). In the case of non-Roman records, only those fields which have been transliterated will be included.

In offline retrospective conversion projects, the price per record will vary with the size of the collection and with the method of identifying the non-MARC records to be converted. In most cases however, this price should not exceed fifty cents per "hit" (the transfer of the REMARC record (on magnetic tape) to a library or its service bureau for use within a specified constituency). The prices for abbreviated records and offline printouts should be even lower.

(703) 525-5940
RATIONALIZING COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

As Lynden noted in reviewing resources in 1978, when financial resources diminish, libraries put more effort into planning and analysis of alternative ways of spending funds wisely. As part of the approach toward rationalizing collection development, some librarians have been looking more closely at the ways researchers use library resources. In a broad survey of post-World War II patterns of academic research in the three disciplinary clusters of the sciences, social sciences, and humanities, Osburn identifies trends in each area that he believes have implications for the way research collections should be developed. He gives particular attention to the ways in which federal funding of research has influenced the problems and methods chosen by researchers and urges librarians to be sensitive to all such shifts in the academic community.

In a related paper, not part of the conference proceedings, Wilson and Farid ask whether the use of research literature is really necessary to the conduct of further research. They argue that "use of the literature is avoidable in theory and often in practice, except insofar as conventional requirements of scholarship prescribe its use" and conclude that "librarians overestimate the importance of what Voigt calls the 'exhaustive approach,' the need for access to complete bodies of published research ancestral to one's own. It is likely that the need for access to original literature in contributory fields has similarly been overestimated. The frequency of the need for comprehensive retrospective literature searches has been overestimated, as has the width and depth of familiarity with donor research areas that is needed for the conduct of research. It is likely too that, as a conse-
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quence, librarians overestimate the benefit that would come from improvements in physical and bibliographical access to the research literature.\textsuperscript{12}

How the collection development function of a library is carried out remains a topic for research. Late in 1979, Cornell University Libraries issued an interim report on the first phase of work under a Mellon Foundation grant to examine its collection development and management. To this point the efforts have been concentrated on identifying and defining the factors that might make up a “unified model for collection development and management” and on finding ways to measure and evaluate the factors.\textsuperscript{13} A British study on book selection sources and their relative effectiveness has also issued an interim report.\textsuperscript{14} Most of the research reported in 1979, however, takes the form of studying the end result of collection development or the actual use of a library’s resources. These studies will be discussed later in this paper.

There is still a preoccupation with formalizing collection development policies and procedures. Goehlert expressed the concerns of many: “Without a concrete collection development policy, one which states clearly the mission and purpose of the library, it is difficult to see how acquisitions are more than a series of unrelated decisions. . . . If we are to maintain a modicum of credibility in the academic community, we must articulate our collection development policies in ways our constituents can both understand and, having understood, believe in.”\textsuperscript{15} Libraries which have recently developed or revised their written policies for collection development shared the final products as well as their experiences in 1979. Although they were completed in 1978, the policies of the University of Kansas Libraries and the John Vaughan Library/Learning Resources Center of Northeastern Oklahoma State University became generally available in 1979, as did the educational reference book collection policy of California State University at Northridge.\textsuperscript{16–18} The Washington University School of Medicine Library not only distributed its new manual on selection and acquisitions,\textsuperscript{19} but also three staff members have supplied an informal account of how it was produced.\textsuperscript{20} In a similar style, Cargill explains how written acquisitions policies improve communications within the library staff at Miami (Ohio) University.\textsuperscript{21} Another example of communicating procedures is the preorder searching manual issued by the Cornell University Libraries.\textsuperscript{22} The British Library Lending Division selection criteria and acquisition practices are discussed by Wood and Line.\textsuperscript{23,24}

Collection development in smaller academic libraries is sometimes neglected in the literature, but 1979 produced several articles on this subject. Miller and Rockwood review previous literature on building college library collections and argue that small academic collections must be based directly on the abilities and interests of the students and the immediate needs of the curriculum.\textsuperscript{25} Farber joins the discussion with a few of his own points about buying periodicals and allocating funds.\textsuperscript{26} For those who have wondered how, if at all, college
libraries developed written collection development policies, Hellenga's description of the experiences at Knox College with department acquisition policies will be particularly welcome.27

General discussions of collection development continue to appear. Two textbooks and a collection of readings were published in 1979.28-30 Beck, in his article for the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science, offers concise, general comments on the factors that influence library collections.31 Looking at the history of one university library, Schultz devotes a chapter to the factors that influenced the collection of Texas A&M University.32 Hoffman discusses how certain accepted principles of management might be applied to the collection development process.33 Martin suggests that a new element has been introduced into collection development discussions with the alternative means of acquiring documents and information available today, "since buying and borrowing will be seen as complementary functions."34 Wadsworth also briefly reviews the variety of decisions that selectors must make, emphasizing the importance of the people who make the decisions with the comment that "the salvation of the library as an effective instrument for research depends upon the judgment that goes into this selection."35 Papers from the 1977 Resources and Technical Services Division Preconference Institute on Collection Development were finally published in 1979. Those who did not attend the conference can now read Osburn's and Feng's arguments for the value of collection development policies,36,37 Edelman's discussion of his attempts to develop a selection decision model,38 and Dudley's summary of the preconference workshop discussions.39

Federal Government Activities

The most publicized library event of the year was the White House Conference on Library and Information Services (WHCLIS), which convened in Washington, D.C., November 15–19. Although the goal concerning resource development and preservation was the only one of ALA's six major goals for consideration by the conference which did not find expression in a WHCLIS resolution, some of the twenty-five resolutions passed by the delegates could—if they are implemented—have implications for resources.40-43 Implementation, however, is the key, or, as Wedgeworth described it before WHCLIS met, the "hidden question."44 Wedgeworth noted that governance, service, and finance will remain key problems in carrying out any nationally coordinated projects "in a society where decision-making is not centered entirely within government."45

In January, President Carter presented a FY 1980 budget that eliminated all Higher Education Act (HEA) funding under Title II-A (basic resources development grants) and Title II-B (library training, research, and demonstration) and kept Title II-C (the research library program) at $6 million, the same amount as the FY 1979 appropriation. Librarians, quickly becoming aware of Congress' new budget-cutting mood and the relative vulnerability of federal library pro-
grams, stirred themselves to do some serious lobbying, particularly for Title II-A. A survey prepared by the Association of College and Research Libraries Legislative Committee and the ALA Washington Office documented the importance of the Title II-A grants to small and medium-size academic libraries. Fourteen librarians, most of them from smaller libraries, contributed their views on the importance of Title II-A to a symposium published in the *Journal of Academic Librarianship.*

The introduction to that symposium warned: “If the Title II-A program is terminated, more than likely some small libraries will suffer budget cuts on the order of 10 to 30 percent . . . It is the responsibility of college and junior college librarians to inform their congressmen of how Title II-A has benefited their library.”

In June, the House Appropriations Committee approved $9,975,000 for Title II-A (the FY 1979 level), but in July the Senate Appropriations Committee approved a subcommittee recommendation that no funding be provided for Title II-A. Late in July the House-Senate Conference Committee reported on the FY 1980 Labor-HEW appropriations bill and set the Title II-A appropriation at $4.9 million, an amount which would provide an average individual basic grant of about $2,000, the lowest level since funding began in FY 1966. At the same time Title II-C funding was set at $6 million, the amount recommended by the president.

The Higher Education Act actually presented librarians with two concerns in 1979—(1) the need to get FY 1980 appropriations passed at an acceptable level and (2) the need to secure an extension of the HEA, scheduled to expire on September 30, 1979. Late in July, the House and Senate approved a one-year extension for HEA, and, on September 6, a five-year extension bill was introduced in the House. The bill, as submitted, would increase the HEA Title II-A basic grants to $10,000, eliminate the Title II-A supplemental grants, move the currently unfunded special purpose grants of Title II-A to Title II-B, keep the research library program of Title II-C basically unchanged, and add a Title II-D, authorizing $15 million for a national periodicals center. Title II-D, however, would be funded only if Title II-A, II-B, and II-C are funded at the FY 1979 level.

Two other bills introduced in Congress in 1979 could have a direct impact on library collections. One would reinstate tax deductions for donations of manuscripts or papers to a library or museum (the condition existing before 1969); librarians concerned about the sharp decrease in donations of personal papers since 1969 will follow the progress of this bill with interest. The second bill with implications for library resources is the proposal to revise Title 44 of the *U.S. Code* concerning government printing and distribution of documents. Lockwood of the ALA Washington Office warns that “the current review of Title 44 may lead to the single biggest change in federal publishing laws since their inception in 1895.” A number of important issues have arisen during consideration of the revision: questions concerning the federal government’s role in producing and disseminating in-
formation, questions of who shall pay for information, and the support and organization of the Depository Library System are all open for discussion.

**RESOURCE SHARING**

The feasibility of a National Periodicals Center (NPC) continues to be the subject of intense debate, but the implementation of such a center does not appear any nearer than it was a year ago. 1979 began with discussion of the Council on Library Resource’s (CRL) technical plan, issued in 1978. An “open forum” was held in March by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) to bring together librarians, publishers, and others with a vested interest in the success or failure of an NPC. Reports from the meeting stressed the mixed reactions to the plan which surfaced in all public debate. One session of the ALA Dallas Conference in June was devoted to a presentation on the NPC plan by CRL program officers with reactions from a panel of librarians and a question-and-answer period. Lulled into apathy by much talk and little action, some librarians were confused and excited by the news that on September 6, when the Higher Education Act extension bill was introduced in the House, a National Periodicals Center appeared as a new Title II-D of HEA. The bill proposes that the NPC be organized as a nonprofit, nongovernmental corporation with authority to maintain and provide access to a dedicated collection of current and retrospective periodicals. The corporation could also enter into cooperative agreements with agencies of government at all levels, private libraries, and other appropriate organizations as necessary to carry out its purposes. (The bill would authorize $15 million per year for FY 1981 through FY 1985 for such an NPC, but the funding would only go into effect if HEA Titles II-A, II-B, and II-C are funded at the FY 1979 level.) In general, the proposed Title II-D follows the draft NPC legislation prepared by NCLIS in May.

Meanwhile, before legislation was introduced in Congress, NCLIS received a commissioned report from Arthur D. Little, Inc., which considered three possible systems for providing better access to periodicals. The report concluded that, due to on-line interlibrary loan and private document delivery systems, periodical access would be improved by 1985, even without an NPC. This was not the only negative note to be heard concerning the NPC. Representatives of the private sector had always been less than enthusiastic about an NPC, but now librarians began to speak against it. Donald Sager, from the perspective of a public librarian, criticized the NPC proposal for catering to a “scholarly elite.” From another point of view, the Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center announced its opposition to the NPC, while endorsing the regional approach to resource sharing. The year of 1979 ended much as it began, with the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science announcing another meeting for the discussion of an NPC proposal—this time the meeting was set for Chicago in January 1980, and the topics were the Arthur D. Little re-
One of the most prominent developments in resource sharing during 1979 was the aggressive membership drive of the Research Libraries Group, Inc. (RLG). At least ten university libraries had joined Columbia, New York Public Library, Stanford, and Yale in RLG membership by the end of the year. Although most of the public attention has been directed toward RLIN, RLG's on-line bibliographic component, the four primary programs of RLG include shared access to materials, collection management and development, and preservation of research materials. RLG stresses, in its various publications, that it is an organization "based on the realization that the environment of research is changing dramatically and that existing programs and practices may not be adequate to meet the demands of change." In the 1979 R. R. Bowker Memorial Lecture, DeGennaro devoted much attention to RLG and predicted "eventually, the separate collections of the member libraries will be viewed by users in the various libraries as a single large distributed collection to which they can gain efficient access via online searching and the rapid delivery of requested items, as well as by personal visits."

The 1979 literature on resource sharing may generally be divided into two broad groups—the reports describing how a specific network or resource sharing scheme operates, and the studies, some highly quantitative in their presentations, which consider resource sharing arrangements in the abstract. From the "applied" group we have reports on cooperative collection development in the Illinois Library and Information Network (ILLINET), cooperation between ILLINET and the Midwest Health Science Library Network, activities of the Center for Research Libraries, and two articles reporting on analyses of ILLINET loan requests. PITERNICK reviews the University of British Columbia's experiences with service to the community outside the university; KRONICK describes a cooperative acquisitions program for medical monographs; HAERTLE explains procedures and activities of the Milwaukee-area Coordinated Collection Committee; and GALLOWAY gives two accounts of how California State College, Stanislaus, fared as a member of a regional intertype network. European resource sharing projects have also been reviewed during 1979. RASMUSSEN describes the operation of a storage library for public libraries in Denmark and BURKETT provides information on all the nationally important networks of the United Kingdom.

The more theoretical studies of resource sharing include SHAW'S strategy for journal resource sharing; STANFEL'S consideration of the proportion of the average user's requests that should be filled at the local level and at the regional level; SALTON'S discussion of library network design; and SANDRA and WILLIAM ROUSE'S management information system for interlibrary loan networks. (Those who find discussions of mathematical modeling of library activities to be less intelligible than the average piece of library literature may find WILLIAM ROUSE'S "tutorial" on the subject helpful.) The amount of duplication found among individual library collections is of importance in plan-
ning cooperative ventures. Two studies, one by Dingle-Cliff and Davis and the other by Davis and Shaw, compare a set of Canadian and American public libraries and a set of Canadian special libraries dealing with addiction materials and conclude that collection overlap is to a great extent a function of library size.\(^84,85\) In another view of resource sharing systems, Pings considers the potential stresses in a network organization and argues that network leadership will always be in conflict with member organizations.\(^86\) School library media centers receive attention in Bender's discussion of planning cooperative activities.\(^87\) Holley makes what he calls a "modest proposal" for a central deposit collection of modern literature and receives a quick rebuttal from Larson.\(^88,89\) Last, but not least, the proceedings of the 1978 Pittsburgh conference on networks were published in 1979 under the title *The Structure and Governance of Library Networks.*\(^90\) As Warren Haas observed at the 1978 ACRL Conference, "few topics in library annals can match 'cooperation' for staying power as a subject for study and discussion."\(^91\)

**Use Studies and Collection Analysis**

Quantitative techniques for analyzing the collection and its use continue to be applied and reported in the literature. The approaches tried in 1979 varied from a study of the economics of collection size\(^92\) and an estimation of size and composition of humanities collections in public libraries\(^93\) to attempts to establish the variables which most closely predict circulation patterns\(^94\) and to determine the theoretical probability distributions certain circulation data most nearly approximate.\(^95-98\) A number of library use studies or broader collection evaluation projects were reported. Library of Congress use patterns were summarized in two studies—one using data collected in 1977 on use of the general collection and the other reporting on a sample of interlibrary loan requests from 1975.\(^99,100\) A large special library was the scene of an evaluation project to determine circulation/inventory ratios for each subject in the monograph collection, and another report features collection evaluation in a college library.\(^101,102\) In addition, two 1978 reviews of collection evaluation methods became available to a wider audience in 1979.\(^103,104\)

Continuing the trend of recent years, serials collections drew the most applications of quantitative techniques. In a theoretical paper Alabi discusses Bradford's law in terms of its possible contribution to a universally acceptable policy for the acquisition of periodicals.\(^105\) Stenstrom and McBride report on serials use by social science faculty members;\(^106\) Maher and Shearer observe undergraduate use of newspapers;\(^107\) Rice looks at science periodical use in a university;\(^108\) Wender counts journal title usage in the health sciences;\(^109\) Maxin gives results of a use study at a technical college;\(^110\) and Alabi supplies data from Ibadan University.\(^111\) Other projects using quantitative data for purposes of making decisions about serial subscriptions include Koenig's procedure for gathering data to make acquisition, binding, and weeding decisions;\(^112\) Usdin's study of core lists of medical
Goehlert's reanalysis of previous use data to determine cost per use of journals which ranked high on number of requests by users; and the report of a science journal collection evaluation by Amir and Newman. How to determine when to retain and when to deselect journals in the collection was the subject of reports by Broude, Wood and Coppel, and Schloman and Ahl.

The idea of making collection decisions on the basis of data from library use studies generated much discussion during 1979, but the use study most often chosen to illustrate the value or worthlessness of such an approach was one which originally made its public appearance in 1977. This study, conducted at the University of Pittsburgh and generally referred to as the Pittsburgh Study, was a source of controversy even before the final report was issued in 1978. In 1979, the commercially published version appeared and more people had access to the findings and conclusions. Since the Pittsburgh study devoted much attention to the cost-effectiveness of serials collections in large academic libraries, it is not surprising that the Journal of Academic Librarianship published a collection of reactions to the study by Schad, Borkowski, MacLeod, Voigt, Massman, and Trueswell, along with a rebuttal from Kent, and the Serials Librarian devoted space in the fall 1979 issue for a summary report by Flynn. The faculty senate of the University of Pittsburgh adopted resolutions condemning the study and, through its Senate Library Committee, issued a critical review. Borkowski and MacLeod, faculty members at Pittsburgh, in addition to their contribution to the Journal of Academic Librarianship, also commented on the study and its implications in an article for Scholarly Publishing.

Many of the objections to studies that try to measure use of library resources come from the fact that such studies typically use circulation counts, and librarians generally are uncomfortable with such a narrow definition of use. Of course, there are other problems with the definitions and measurements that appear in some studies. Kaske contrasts the results of the Pittsburgh Study with data on the use of part of the collection at the University of California at Berkeley. He concludes that "a pressing need exists for standardization of data definitions, data collection techniques, and analysis procedures used to assess the utilization of library collections." Bentley looks at certain available statistics on academic libraries and argues that none are as useful for evaluation as a user satisfaction survey based on actual users' requests. Kronick, however, probably sums up the views of many librarians about use studies: "The principal point . . . is not that use studies are useless but that they are unprofitable, if not improper, as the basis for management decisions, if the other issues surrounding them are not considered."

In other collection analysis developments, the Association of Research Libraries Collection Analysis Project (CAP) continued during 1979. CAP studies were completed during the year at Brigham Young University, the University of California at San Diego, and Case Western Reserve University, and begun at the University of Illinois.
ARL also reported that Paul Kantor has been working with their staff to develop a CAP component that will take a user-centered approach to collection assessment. The workbook is described as including a section on availability analysis, a simple methodology for determining availability rate, and a section on delay analysis. The papers on CAP experiences presented at the ACRL Conference in Boston in 1978 were published in 1979 in *New Horizons for Academic Libraries*.

**Acquisitions Methods and Procedures**

Relations between librarians and dealers came in for a fair share of attention in 1979. The perennial problem of maintaining effective communication was a concern of both Berkner and Safran. Eaglen, on the other hand, took up the question of wholesalers who pass on too much information about previous customers' opinions of certain books in her discussion of "the warning bookmark." Follett responded with his company's side of that 1979 story. The pricing and discounting of U.S. publications are explained by Fast and taken apart in two articles by Eaglen. Choosing dealers and evaluating their performance is an important aspect of acquisitions work, and the 1979 literature reflects the concern librarians have for this problem. Fraley reviews the difficulties one community college library encountered in its dealings with both publishers and wholesalers. Eaglen discusses the implications for libraries of the 1979 demise of several medium-sized general wholesalers, while two Canadian public librarians offer opposing views of the practice of "buying around," or choosing the most economical dealer, whether foreign or domestic. Those librarians who want to know how well their vendors are doing should be helped by Davis' step-by-step plan for collecting and analyzing data on vendor performance.

Approval plans are still a major acquisitions channel in many libraries, and they continue to receive attention in the literature. The Fourth International Conference on Approval Plans and Collection Development, convened in October 1979, indicates that the subject is still very much alive. According to one 1979 survey, Ohio university librarians are more satisfied than ever with approval plans, although the rising costs of doing business with the British are causing reconsideration of British plans. For those libraries with approval plans, the monitoring of these plans is an important way to improve understanding and performance by the vendor. McDonald and others describe this process at Kansas State University. A comprehensive work on approval plan management by Cargill and Alley covers many of the specific points of operating a plan, such as developing profiles, interfacing with standing orders and other plans, and processing. It also includes examples of forms, contracts, letters, etc.

Automated acquisitions systems are becoming available to increasing numbers of libraries of all types and sizes. Hogan reviews the state of the art, examining networks which have or soon will have acquisitions subsystems (UTLAS, OCLC, RLIN, WLN) and commercial systems.
with acquisitions capabilities. Another description of the Washington Library Network (WLN) acquisitions subsystem can be found in Woods’ review of WLN’s computer system. The Second Institute on American Book Publishing, held at Emory University in March, concentrated on book distribution, including on-line ordering systems, and the ALA Library and Information Technology Association sponsored a conference in December on automated acquisitions.

Interest in gifts and exchanges as ways of acquiring materials seems to be increasing slightly as resources budgets become ever tighter. Tiberio offers hints on how to stretch a map library budget through requesting gifts and arranging exchanges. Practical suggestions for handling various aspects of the gift program appear in several articles. Uncomplicated ways of appraising ordinary gift books are listed in two articles, while the various ways of obtaining firm title to a gift are discussed in another. One interesting historical note speculates on the motives behind rejection of a gift collection with many materials on women’s rights. Gift and exchange programs are not without costs, as two papers on the economics of duplicate exchange explain. Wood, reviewing the involvement of the British Library in current serials exchanges, calls international current exchange both necessary, because it is the only way to build a comprehensive, worldwide collection of serials, and undesirable, because the procedure involves so many difficulties and the materials which come are infrequently used. Infrequently used exchange materials have prompted Bandara to propose “dormant exchange” agreements—a “dormant exchange” would not operate regularly, but only when material really needed became available.

International publications and their acquisition for U.S. collections received a modest amount of attention in 1979. LC Acquisitions Trends continues to report on the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, special foreign acquisition programs, and the book trade in selected foreign countries. However, the Association of Research Libraries has announced that its Foreign Acquisitions Newsletter will suspend publication upon completion of the 1979 volume, “pending the outcome of a survey of subscribers to determine the future of the publication.” Several 1979 articles recount the problems of acquiring publications in other countries. Two Nigerian librarians discuss the problems of purchasing materials within and outside their country; Tjarks offers suggestions for handling Latin American serials; Gordon warns of the pitfalls in acquiring international legal materials; and Matsumoto describes the book market in Japan. Taking the historical view, Tsuen-Hsui Tsien discusses trends in the building of East Asian collections in U.S. libraries. To remind us that the problems are not all ours, the British have published proceedings of a conference called to discuss the difficulties they have in acquiring materials for American Studies programs. That U.S. librarians have not been neglecting European publications is evidenced by the fact that the Association of College and Research Libraries has
proposed bylaws for a new Western European Specialists Section, which will join the sections already existing for Asian, African, Slavic, and East European specialists.¹⁷⁰

**PRICE TRENDS, COLLECTION FUNDING, AND BUDGETING**

The price of the average hardcover volume published in the United States in 1979, according to the 1979 preliminary figures in *Publishers Weekly*, was $22.80, representing an increase of 13.4 percent over those for 1978.¹⁷¹ Average prices varied widely among subject categories: business books averaged $23.11 (up 16.4 percent from 1978), while sociology and economics, the largest category, averaged $41.73 a volume, an increase of 28.5 percent. A British report published in December, giving average prices of new publications through May–August 1979, shows a 25 percent increase for all categories combined in comparison with the same reporting period for 1978.¹⁷² British publications on business management cost more than 50 percent more in the 1979 period, and books on librarianship went up more than 250 percent during the same period. These figures do not, of course, take into consideration the strength of the pound against the dollar. Faced by such prices, many librarians must have turned eagerly to Verrone’s article in *School Library Journal* titled “Why Books Cost So Much.”¹⁷³

The interrelated financial problems of scholarly publishers and research libraries were the subject of a study officially begun in January 1976 and concluded in 1979.¹⁷⁴ The National Enquiry into Scholarly Communication was concerned particularly with university presses and scholarly journals in the humanities and social sciences. The report notes that conflicts between authors and publishers, faculty members and librarians, and publishers and foundations are inevitable, but, “despite these inevitable conflicts, the binding forces, the common interests, are ultimately stronger. Each group, each activity, is essential to all others; should one part fail, the others could not function.”¹⁷⁵ Twelve recommendations are emphasized in the report, including recommendations for a national bibliographic system, a national periodicals center, and a national library agency. Other recommendations concern ways to strengthen university presses and scholarly journals, but August Frugé expresses the views of some who think the Enquiry is biased toward libraries.¹⁷⁶ A more comprehensive statistical survey of book and journal publishing and library purchasing patterns was released in 1978, but did not become widely available until early 1979. This study by Machlup, Leeson, and Associates experienced some difficulties in its attempts to collect quantitative data that had not been consistently kept in a detailed manner by publishers or librarians.¹⁷⁷ However, it is the most comprehensive survey yet available on its subject and full of interesting information for the person who has time to dig it out.

In a paper on sources and uses of funds in academic libraries, Cohen and Leeson use data from a sample of large academic libraries to document certain trends—one of which is a decline since 1970 in the number of books purchased by the average academic library.¹⁷⁸
Reports on how well materials budgets kept up with inflated materials prices in 1979 are fragmented and mixed. Many libraries apparently received larger budgets than in 1978, but the ways libraries chose to allocate funds to various types of resources and services make comparisons between years and identification of trends difficult. The Association of College and Research Libraries surveyed twenty-seven community college libraries and found that book expenditures were keeping ahead of inflation, but expenditures for such budget categories as periodicals, audiovisual materials, microforms, and binding did not. On the average the 1979 budgets for these libraries provided approximately 52 percent for books, 21 percent for periodicals, 21 percent for audiovisual materials, 5 percent for microforms, and 1 percent for binding.

The federal government and private foundations continue to be important sources of funds for special projects. In July, the Higher Education Act Title II-C grants for FY 1979 were announced. Thirty-four research libraries shared in the grants in some way. Awards totaling nearly $2 million were given to support special collections, and five other grants went to support the development of area studies programs. Resource sharing projects of one type or another also received favorable consideration. The largest single grant, $750,000, went to the University of California at Berkeley, the University of California at Los Angeles, and Stanford University to enable them to convert serial titles to machine-readable form and improve resource sharing capabilities. The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) continues to support the strengthening and preservation of library collections; Rochell gives specific examples of how the Research Collections Program of NEH has assisted such diverse institutions as Hampton Institute, the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, Cornell University, the University of Pittsburgh, Northwestern University, and the Committee for the Preservation of Architectural Records of New York City.

Budget allocation is still a concern, and experiences with various approaches continue to be revealed in the literature. Bender's report on allocation in public libraries, presented at the 1977 RTSD Preconference Institute on Collection Development, has now been published. Late in 1978, another report was issued on the work by Evans and others to develop an acquisition formula for the SUNY System. McGrath continues his work with budget allocation formulas, presenting another analysis of variables that seem to show promise as predictors of circulation. Two studies—one by Borlase and the other by Snowball and Cohen—look at another part of the resources budgeting and propose models for monitoring the status of various funds during the year and regulating the flow of purchases. Warner and Anker explain how faculty members' perceptions of their needs for journal titles may be brought into the allocation procedure, and Myers describes the advantages of allocating subscription costs by subject. In a slightly unusual approach to funding of serials purchases, Campese outlines how medical staff members
were persuaded to "sponsor" certain journals in a hospital library.

**SPECIAL COLLECTIONS**

The tightening economy and increasing emphasis on accountability have forced many librarians to view their special collections in a more critical light. The problem of justifying upkeep of a nationally important collection with little local use led the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) to survey ARL libraries on the roles and functions of their special collections, as well as on how they handled bibliographic control, preservation and security, and user services. Strategies for gaining financial and general public support for such collections are also covered in the SPEC Kit on Special Collections. While some kinds of special collections were being questioned, others were being encouraged. Temple University's Alternative Acquisitions Project is focusing on the publications of small and alternative presses and establishing contact with others who are trying to improve the acquisition of this type of publications. Archives and historical collections generally appear to be receiving attention in libraries. Strauss reviews the recent development of college and university archives. The History Section of the Reference and Adult Services Division, reflecting the current interest, issued "Guidelines for Establishing Local History Collections." Access to original research materials, archives, manuscripts, etc., is the subject of a joint statement by the American Library Association and the Society of American Archivists. Film study collections are covered in detail in a new book by Nancy Allen.

In addition to literature reflecting concern with the current organization and operation of special collections, several articles have appeared that describe the development and, to some extent, the present holdings of notable special collections—the Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas, the Schomburg Collection in New York City, and the trade literature collection of the National Museum of History and Technology. An issue of Library Trends edited by Selma Richardson reviews a number of special collections of historical children's books.

**PRESERVATION**

Concern for the preservation from decay, theft, or natural disaster of the resources that we already have in our collections continued to gain momentum during 1979. Whether librarians attended meetings or stayed home and read their journals, they found the subject of preservation always before them. Library Journal published a series of six articles on preservation, introduced by Pamela Darling, who explains that individual articles in the series address needs identified at the 1976 National Preservation Program Planning Conference, called by the Library of Congress with the support of the Council on Library Resources. Banks leads off the series with proposals concerning the training required of conservators of library and archival materials; Patterson outlines a model charge to a conservation committee;
Berger presents the case for developing staff skills in making minor repairs; Harris reviews developments in mass deacidification processes; Bohem discusses regional conservation services; and Koda offers some thoughts on the interrelationships of the analytical bibliographer and the conservator. Darling concludes the series by outlining some of the hopeful signs in the preservation picture—the establishment of conservation officer positions in libraries, the federal funds being made available for preservation projects, the workshops being held on preservation topics, the regional planning efforts, the activities of library associations, and the great increase in the availability of information on preservation needs and techniques.

Library Journal is not the only library publication giving coverage to preservation of resources; Library Scene has been publishing a four-part series on the subject, while articles on such topics as preservation in public libraries, mass deacidification in public archives, and identifying books in need of preservation have appeared in other journals. In fact, a new quarterly publication devoted solely to preservation topics began publication in 1979. Conservation Administration Newsletter is intended to provide current awareness of the activities of conservation organizations, the literature on the subject, and upcoming educational opportunities, as well as occasional feature articles. A new bibliography of conservation literature also appeared in 1979, compiled by Morrow and Schoenly.

Program plans and policy statements for conservation of resources are being discussed around the country, and some are being shared outside the library or system preparing the plan. The California Library Authority for Systems and Services plan for a conservation program, prepared by Bruer, became generally available in 1979. Morrow produced a model policy statement "designed to provide logical guidelines and outline optimum conditions for the conservation of a research library collection."

Disaster planning is often a part of general conservation plans, but the subject receives separate attention also. The 1978 flood that caused extensive water damage at Stanford University is reviewed in two articles that outline the procedures followed. A statement on disaster preparedness from the Task Group on the Preservation of Library Materials of the University of California made its way to a wider audience during 1979, and Wright shares advice on disaster planning, along with a checklist of the University of Toronto's emergency procedures. A new edition of Managing the Library Fire Risk was also published in 1979.

As noted earlier, some money for preservation projects was made available through federal government agencies. The National Endowment for the Humanities awarded slightly more than $150,000 to the ARL Office of Management Studies to support "A Proposal to Design and Test a Self-Study Procedure to Enable Academic Libraries to Identify and Address Preservation Problems." The National Historical Publication and Records Commission also invited grant proposals dealing with cooperative conservation programs providing training,
consulting, and other services for the conservation of historical records.\textsuperscript{222}

Although it is not a new phenomenon, the theft of library materials by those knowledgeable enough to pick the rarest, most valuable items from a collection is receiving renewed attention. Lampe argues that "libraries and archives have always suffered thefts, but never before on the scale of the past few years," and he gives a number of specific cases to illustrate his point—thefts of maps, documents, and rare volumes from notable special collections.\textsuperscript{223} One of the losses discovered and reported during 1979 was the disappearance from both Duke University and the University of North Carolina of their collections of Civil War regimental histories and personal narratives.\textsuperscript{224} Wheelock warns that "the new piracy is not a piece of hooliganism.... The new piracy is even more rapacious. It removes that which is costly, and not easily replaced, especially at a time when tax-supported library budgets are under scrutiny."\textsuperscript{225}

GUIDELINES AND STANDARDS

During the year, various units of the American Library Association issued a number of official documents that have some relation to how library collections are built and evaluated. The most pertinent new publication is *Guidelines for Collection Development*, prepared by the Collection Development Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division and edited by David Perkins.\textsuperscript{226} All of the guidelines included have been previously available in drafts or earlier versions, but the official guidelines on formulation of collection development policies, evaluating library collections, reviewing for relegation, preservation, or discard, and allocating budgets have now been brought together in one convenient manual. Library standards and related documents always give some consideration to resources, and 1979 was a year when several statements were issued. ACRL published "The Mission of an Undergraduate Library (Model Statement)," "An Evaluative Checklist for Reviewing a College Library Program," and "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Program."\textsuperscript{227-229} Through a joint committee, ARL and ACRL produced "Standards for University Libraries."\textsuperscript{230}

CONTINUING EDUCATION

Conferences, institutes, seminars, workshops, colloquia, etc., on resources topics abounded during 1979. Almost any aspect of the field could be found listed as the theme of one meeting or another. Collection policies and practices, retrospective collection development, out-of-print and antiquarian books, selecting nonexistent and multicultural materials, book distribution practices, approval plans, and automated acquisitions systems were all subjects of at least one meeting. Conference organizers gave most attention to cooperative arrangements, particularly the proposed National Periodicals Center, and to preservation/conservation topics. Although it is probably impossible (and certainly not worth the effort now) to produce a complete list of 1979
continuing education opportunities for those who select, acquire, and maintain library collections, the sample available from listings in the national library journals indicates that preservation/conservation was far and away the favorite topic. With the quickly rising costs of travel and tight personal and institutional travel budgets, the number of meetings organized for librarians is beginning to be questioned. In their article “We Can’t Go On Meeting This Way,” Neely and Demos attempt to document how the number of meetings aimed at academic librarians has increased since 1970. Those dealing with library resources have surely made their contribution to the total.

CONCLUSION

The average librarian with collection development responsibilities will probably not remember 1979 as one of the most rewarding times in his/her career. It was a year when even librarians from major research libraries acknowledged that selectors must pay more attention to immediate and expressed needs of their users and much less to possible future research needs; when prices of library materials rose, the buying power of slightly increased budgets actually went down, and the average federal grant for library resources was reduced; when the acquisition and maintenance of collections of little-used materials received ever more serious challenges; when librarians proclaimed the values of resource sharing but seemed unable to decide about the most appropriate ways to organize such projects; and when more and more librarians became aware of the serious physical condition of many of the materials in their collections.

Reactions to these conditions have not all been discouraging, however, as collection development librarians continue to search for ways to rationalize their collecting practices and demonstrate a willingness to try quantitative and other methods of collection assessment in order to evaluate their performance in building useful collections. The acceptance of use studies and other similar methods is not uncritical, and that, too, is an encouraging sign. Those who know intuitively and from experience how our great collections have been developed in the past must take a leading part in our attempts to identify, understand, and justify to the public the most effective collection development procedures for the future.
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Serials in 1979

Dorothy J. Glasby

COLLECTIONS

It is not news to anyone who works with serials to learn that prices continued to rise in 1979. One cannot, of course, make a blanket statement that every price of every serial rose; some serials simply maintained their already inflated 1978 costs. Reports of serials which decreased in price in 1979 are scant. Investigation of these few usually disclosed the fact that the seeming decrease did not really exist since prices quoted for 1978 and 1979 were not comparable because elements, such as the inclusion or exclusion of postage in the rates or the number of issues for the year, varied.

Brown and Phillips calculated that the average subscription price of an American periodical was $30.37, a 10.1 percent increase over the 1978 figure. Although journals in science and technology (particularly those in chemistry, physics, and medicine) continued to show the highest average subscription prices, for the first time in many years the most expensive journals did not evidence the greatest percentage of increase. Many, however, did increase in price and Clasquin and Cohen, reporting on prices of physics and chemistry journals over the years, pointed out that the sustained rate of inflation in the prices of scientific journals has led to a continuing acquisitions crisis in academic libraries. They went so far as to suggest that it was time for national officials to urge Congress to provide federal aid so subscriptions and collections could be maintained.

The oftentimes indispensable serial services (the periodical publications which cumulate, abstract, or index information) had an average cost, in 1979, of $171.06. This figure was 11.1 percent higher than the 1978 average and represented the largest percentage of increase since 1970.

Over a period of ten or more years, as prices of serials have climbed and budgets for acquisition have failed to keep pace, librarians have had to reexamine their serial subscriptions and serial collections with a view toward paring both to the smallest size they thought they could maintain without markedly reducing service to their users. The literature in 1979 again was filled with reports and papers concerning attempts made by individual libraries or librarians to accomplish this. With the exception, perhaps, of some of the larger research libraries
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with a commitment to preserve publications for anticipated but as yet unidentified future needs or as a record of the time for later generations, many libraries must try to measure present-day usage of their materials and weed their collections or cancel their subscriptions accordingly.

Usage of serials, however, particularly of periodicals, is difficult to measure with any feeling of great confidence that the measurement has been either accurate or revealing. Since serials, again periodicals in particular, do not circulate in many libraries, circulation records, even those maintained in a manner which identifies the publications involved, are of little value. Most use studies, therefore, must be conducted, as was the one documented by Weil, by asking users to mark on lists the publications they use regularly, by asking users to sign slips attached to unbound issues after they have finished with them, or by asking users to refrain from reshuffling bound serials so that a count or observation of titles consulted can be made by the library staff. Another type of survey sometimes undertaken in combination with those already mentioned is an examination of interlibrary loan requests, those going out from a particular library as well as those coming in to it. If a library must often borrow a particular publication or request photocopies of articles it may be possible that, despite the tightness of the budget, the serial should be added to the library's subscription lists or be represented among its back files. Figures on titles frequently lent can be added to figures obtained through "in-house" surveys since they are, in a way, indicative of the "use" of a particular publication.

Those who report on periodical use in libraries seem to agree that a small core of journals accounts for the largest percentage of use, and that greater usage of more recently published materials can be expected. The core of journals receiving the most use varies from library to library and changes from time to time within a particular library when changes in curriculum or class schedules alter the demands made upon academic libraries or when new investigations undertaken by researchers or other users of specialized libraries turn journals once eagerly sought into dust catchers. Maxim suggested that use studies must, therefore, be continuous or at least undertaken at reasonable intervals to catch these changing patterns. She reported that the Clarkson College of Technology used a computer for its information on periodical usage so that the figures could be updated and tabulated and new printouts prepared in which titles are ranked by use.

Use studies are conducted not only to determine which current serials should be continued and which should be canceled but also to make decisions regarding the acquisition, retention, binding, and shelving of back files. Scholman and Ahl, applying the results of a survey made of users of the Biochemistry Library of Purdue University, found that the number of feet of journals shelved in the library could be reduced by 19 percent, that many volumes could be moved to storage or discarded entirely, and that it was possible to assign to each
title an appropriate class of binding (from long-lasting but costly to least serviceable but cheapest) based on an expected period of retention of the journal by the library.9

In considering the costs of purchasing and binding serials, librarians must also consider the cost and availability of the space to shelve them. Although long runs or complete back files of certain publications may be desirable in a particular library because surveys indicate that the serial is used, there is a point at which the amount of room available runs out. Feinman, writing from Adelphi University Library, noted that student seating space had been cut to a "ridiculous" minimum in order to accommodate the publications and yet the periodical proliferation had filled the stacks.10 At one time the only possible solutions to such a problem might have involved either the provision of more space or the ruthless reduction in the volume or numbers of the publications. The librarians at Adelphi, however, decided to purchase microforms for many of their longer runs, converting about 250 titles a year until 25 to 30 percent of the collection, the maximum amount they consider desirable, is in that format. A similar solution to a space problem was reported by Zamora and Adamson, working in the technical library of a physics and nuclear science laboratory.11 There the most recent five years of each publication were kept in hard copy while 3,365 bound journal volumes have been replaced with cartridges since 1976, in a program that will continue as commercial microfilm cartridges become available.

Before leaving the question of serials costs, it is interesting to note that initial production costs are a primary factor in high subscription rates. Lea indicated that the journals of the future may be different because publishers cannot afford to continue their present patterns.12 He suggested that economic and other considerations will produce "synoptic" journals which give short, summary papers backed up by archival records of the full-length papers on microforms. These journals would be cheaper to produce and he did not anticipate any great demand for the full texts. He mentioned, also, the electronic or "paperless" journal and the journal produced from a text-processing typewriter so that text editing could take place without rekeyboarding and copies of the journal could be "printed" by phototypesetting. His fourth type of "new" journal is the microform, that in the future will become the original and only publication format for some serials.

IDENTIFICATION AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

In 1979 as some serials catalogers were already applying the provisions of the second edition of the Anglo American Cataloguing Rules (AACR 2) and others were examining or studying the rules while awaiting the date of application selected by their library, Byrum and Coe issued the results of a 1975 survey of the research library community concerning the use of the first edition of AACR for serials cataloging.13 A number of the libraries surveyed were dissatisfied with the rules as written and chose to deviate from them in various ways. Some libraries particularly disliked the provisions requiring that cer-
tain serials be entered under the issuing corporate body while other libraries preferred a simpler bibliographic description than that mandated by AACR 1. If libraries in adopting AACR 2 depart from the rules in this manner one may again wonder, as did Byrum and Coe, "about the consequences of this deviation... especially the extent to which it may have an adverse impact on the exchange of bibliographic data in the context of cooperative on-line catalogs."14

Sadowski wrote of a persistent problem in serials cataloging not addressed by either edition of AACR, the question of "what is the title" of the serial.15 He examined a number of periodicals each of which had an initialism that would have been considered part of the title by many serials catalogers and found, upon questioning the publishers, that in most cases they regarded the initialism as decoration for the cover rather than as part of the title. Sadowski suggested that all libraries might agree on and use the same title for a serial with an initialism if the spelled-out version of the title (without the initialism) were always preferred or, alternatively, if pages inside the publication, where initialisms occur less frequently, were selected, in preference to the cover, as the chief source from which information could be taken.

In mid-1979 the Library of Congress (LC) issued guidelines for a "unique serial identifier" in answer to the question of uniquely identifying main, linking, and added entries, especially series-added entries, for the many serials that probably will be entered under title under AACR 2.16 The concept, developed by LC and the National Library of Canada (NLC), provides for the use of a unique title as a heading for some serials entered under title or the insertion of a unique title before the title proper of some serials entered under a main entry heading. The unique title would be the title proper of the serial plus qualifying elements such as place of publication or name of the corporate body associated with the serial. The unique title provides a means of distinguishing among serials, entered under title, which have the same title proper or among serials, entered under the name of a corporate body or person, which have the same combination of name heading and title proper. NLC and LC submitted their statement on the unique serial identifier to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR 2, which approved it in principle. It is hoped that some of the guidelines for the formulation of the unique serial title may be adopted by the International Serials Data System (ISDS) so that revisions to Guidelines for ISDS will allow for greater compatibility among the ISDS key title, the title associated with the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), and the NLC/LC unique identifier for serials.

As of January 1979 the United States Postal Service (USPS) requirement that serials mailed at second class rates carry an identifying number went into effect. Since, under an agreement worked out between LC and USPS, this number was to be the ISSN whenever it was available, more U.S. periodicals began displaying ISSN in 1979. The National Serials Data Program (NSDP) at LC, which assigns ISSN for U.S. imprints, extended its work through USPS to include publications
Recognizing the value of the ISSN as a means of serials identification, the Policy and Research Committee of the American Library Association's Serials Section, at a meeting in Dallas in August, urged the section's Executive Committee to encourage the Government Printing Office and LC to cooperate in the matter of the use of ISSN on federal documents. Although serials librarians may have accepted the concept of the ISSN as an “identifying” number, it is clear to many of them that the number may prove to have little practical value in libraries unless the number appears on the publications it identifies. The ISSN can be, and is, used as an easy direct access to some automated check-in records and one can conceive of a similar use in manual check-in systems although published reports of this latter use do not seem to exist. Unless the ISSN is printed on the serial, however, such access becomes a two- or even a three-step process. According to an informal survey of serials coming in to the Library of Congress during a two-week period in 1979, there did not appear to be enough serials carrying an ISSN in a relatively prominent position on each issue to warrant LC's undertaking an experimental project within its extremely large manual system to provide access to check-in records via ISSN.

In May 1979 Indiana University was accepted into membership in the CONSER (CONversion of SERials) project, becoming the first new participant since 1976. By the end of the year applications had been received from several other institutions wishing to join. As CONSER members continued to input their serials cataloging records to the OCLC system, it was estimated that the entire CONSER file (authenticated and unauthenticated records), which the Library of Congress was planning to make available for the first time in early 1980, would run to more than 250,000 records. A new product of CONSER, the CONSER Microfiche, appeared during 1979. It was published by the National Library of Canada, funded by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, with distribution in the U.S. handled by LC. The fiche included a listing of the 75,000-plus CONSER records which had been authenticated by NLC or LC, the centers of responsibility for the bibliographic quality and integrity of the CONSER data base.

Over the years of its existence there have been a number of reports concerning the benefits of the CONSER project both to libraries participating in it and to those that do not. In 1979 the Library of Congress described ways in which it had been able to use records input by other CONSER participants as a basis for its own serials cataloging. LC had decided early in the project to accept data contributed by others and to modify its cataloging practices so that records for serials appearing on its printed cards and in its MARC-S distribution would be the equivalent of national bibliographic records rather than a reflection of LC's own holdings of the serial. By 1979 an estimated 25 percent of LC's newly received serials were represented on the CONSER data base, allowing LC to catalog these serials by merely updating or adding to existing records. In other words, CONSER had elimi-
nated the need for LC to do purely original cataloging for one-fourth of the new serials it received. Anderson and Melby tried to demonstrate statistically the extent to which cataloging copy input to OCLC by selected CONSER participants or by the Library of Congress could be accepted without modification at the library of the University of Illinois, which is not a CONSER participant. Although the actual purpose of their study was to determine whether LC copy or that of the CONSER participants required more modification by Illinois, they concluded, among other things, that “to the extent that the individual library conforms in internal policies to the standards and practices of the Library of Congress, records can be accepted without modification” and that an individual library must “weigh the speed of cataloging against what . . . [it] must accept without checking and the possible problems thereof.”

UNION LISTS

There was much interest in union listing during 1979 as well as some announcements of grants or other funding to enable various institutions to begin or continue projects in this area. The term “union list,” with all its connections to the past that cause us to think of laboriously gathered information displayed on printed pages in oftentimes massive volumes, does not adequately express the scope and breadth or even the nature of the “products” of projects in various places using the technology presently available. Although the union list of serials in Missouri does appear in printed form (under the title Missouri Union List of Serial Publications Representing Holdings of Libraries in Missouri and Adjacent States), it is prepared by means of direct on-line input of holdings by participating libraries. St. Louis Public Library handles all of the new title verification and entry functions and the other libraries have available to them, at all times, the ability to use the data base for interlibrary loan purposes. Indiana University, with Title II-C funds and the cooperation of the INCOLSA (Indiana Cooperative Library Services Authority) network, is developing a union list capability for OCLC as a foundation for a union list for the state of Indiana. The capability will upgrade the OCLC system with a component that will give libraries the ability to maintain union lists of holdings on-line. Testing of the component will begin in early 1980, and it is assumed that it will be available for libraries or union listing agencies to use during the last quarter of that year. Another project funded by Title II-C is that involving the University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Los Angeles, and Stanford, where the grant is to be used to convert serial titles to machine-readable form so that resource-sharing activities will be possible; a grant went, also, to the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Wayne State University for a similar purpose.

Because of the rapid proliferation of union list projects, concern was expressed in some quarters that a desirable uniformity among the projects might be lacking. A resolution recommending that the American Library Association Serials Section create a committee to study
union lists of serials projects was presented at the meeting of the section's Policy and Research Committee in Dallas. It was suggested that such a committee might assemble data and guidelines which could be followed by libraries or other agencies creating union lists. Action on the resolution was deferred. The Section on Serials Publications, International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA), had, meanwhile, commissioned the joint UNESCO/IFLA Guidelines for the compilation of Union Lists of Serials Project with the hope that "guidelines for union lists would contribute to needed standardization and compatibility [sic] of serials control across national boundaries." A report on this project, given at the IFLA meeting in Copenhagen in August, indicated that data were being collected from seventy countries with special attention being given to holdings statements. Sample bibliographies will be studied, focusing on such matters as method of updating, physical format, geographic coverage, bibliographic completeness, and policy on changes.

In November, at the invitation of the Office of Education and the Council on Library Resources, a group made up of representatives from institutions which had received Title II-C funds, CONSER participants, representatives from utilities (OCLC, RLIN, WLN), and others assembled in Washington for a two-day meeting to discuss their present activities and how these activities might be related toward the building of a "national serials data base." The CONSER project, for example, began as an attempt to build a bibliographic data base, but the feeling is now that holdings and location data are also desirable. The group expressed concern that conversion projects now under way, or projected, follow consistent standards and that records prepared be made available, in some manner, to all involved in building the as yet incompletely defined "national" data base. A number of recommendations were approved by the group, which considered them as steps to be taken toward such a data base. At this writing, reports or information on these recommendations have not been published.

National Periodicals Center

A number of hearings, forums, and assorted meetings were held during 1979 to discuss the question of the creation of a National Periodicals Center. Although the majority opinion seemed to favor the concept of the center, the majority did not always support the details of the technical development plan for the center issued by the Council on Library Resources in 1978. It became clear as a result of the meetings that there was no possibility that the Library of Congress would run the center as had, at one time, been suggested. LC withdrew itself from any further consideration on the grounds that there was no way it could get foundation funding and that it could not provide space without cutting into its own budget.

Toward the end of the year a report of a study, commissioned by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, made by Arthur D. Little, Inc., indicated that the time for a centralized National Periodicals Center "has come—and it also appears to have
The study suggested that instead of starting from scratch the center could build on dedicated collections such as that at University Microfilms and collect only unique items not covered by private document suppliers. Meanwhile, the proposal to establish the center was incorporated as a new Part D of Title II of the Higher Education Act.

FINAL NOTE

Thus ends a summary of what happened in serials in 1979 according to one person’s observations and perusal of the literature published during that year. There were undoubtedly many events not reported here which may have far-reaching consequences in the years ahead. It is unfortunate, but true, that the first hesitant beginnings of major projects and movements are rarely publicized or even recognized as portents of the future. We will have to wait, therefore, until 1980, 1981, and other years of the decade to see and understand what really happened in 1979 in serials.
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Micrographics, Reprography, and Graphic Communications in 1979

William Saffady

While not characterized by particularly dramatic product announcements or singularly significant events, 1979 was an important year in micrographics, reprography, and graphic communications. It was a year of growth in which the various reprographic technologies—especially micrographics and facsimile—enjoyed significantly improved acceptance. Most important, 1979 marked the clear emergence of a new direction in product and application development, a direction that the industry hopes will provide the basis for continued growth in the decade ahead.

The year ended a decade which saw a continuation and refinement of a trend toward simple equipment operable by nontechnical personnel in an office environment. During the 1970s, copiers became faster and more versatile, the customer benefiting from increased competition, improved performance, and lower prices in the plain-paper segment of the market. Micrographics equipment vendors sought and found new markets with small-office-microfilm (SOM) products, which extended micrographics applications to customers with budgetary constraints; with updateable microfiche systems, which permitted the conversion of active and growing files; with vastly improved, attractively priced fiche readers which helped overcome user resistance to microforms; and, most important, with computer output microfilm (COM). By 1976–77, after what seemed like a decade of downtime, facsimile had gained acceptance as a reliable technology in business applications.

At the same time, however, a rapid increase in the number and variety of computer applications, coupled with significant and continuing improvements in the price/performance ratio of electronic information-processing equipment, posed a long-term threat to the continued viability of reprographic technologies based on paper documents. In business applications, computer systems analysts, who are generally unfamiliar with alternative information-processing technologies and methodologies, increasingly contended that such paper docu-
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ments, or microform representations of them, would eventually be made obsolete by on-line systems based on massive amounts of increasingly cheaper disk storage. The trend toward the conversion and storage of information in machine-readable form intensified with the rapid acceptance of word-processing systems and the growing interest in electronic mail that characterized the late 1970s.

Rather than competing with this trend toward increasing computerization, the reprographics industry has recently begun to identify itself with it. A resulting emphasis on the integration of reprographic and computer technologies was, thus, the dominant theme in 1979. The remaining sections of this article survey the year's most significant developments in micrographics, reprography, and graphic communications, emphasizing products, applications, and events of importance to libraries.

COM AND CAR

During 1979, the integration of micrographics and computer technology manifested itself in two ways: (1) in the design of information systems and applications that employed micrographics in combination with computers and/or word processing; and (2) in the incorporation of computerlike components, notably microprocessors, within micrographics equipment.

The continuing popularity of COM is the most obvious and pervasive example of the attractiveness of a computer/micrographics interface. COM technology has matured considerably in the past five years, and the implementation of COM applications is now easily accomplished and well understood. From the standpoint of COM technology, 1979 saw an intensification of the trend toward dry-process recording as Bell and Howell added a dry silver COM recorder to its product line, following the earlier example of 3M and Kodak. In terms of marketing, COM vendors sought the closer identification of their products with high-speed, nonimpact paper printers (the IBM 3800 and Xerox 9700, for example) which, like dry silver COM recorders, use laser-beam technology. As an example, Kodak advertisements for its KOMSTAR product line, which appeared in 1979 issues of Datamation and other data-processing periodicals, emphasized the device as an impactless laser-printer, with microforms mentioned seemingly incidentally. To gain acceptance for COM in applications requiring both microform and paper output, DatagraphiX, the industry leader in the placement of COM recorders, introduced its 9800 Laser Printing System, a high-speed, nonimpact paper printer which can operate in conjunction with a COM recorder. Similarly, Xerox introduced a microfiche subsystem for its Model 9700 Electronic Printing System, a high-speed, nonimpact printer.1

In libraries, computer-output-microfilm applications, especially as alternatives to card or printed book catalogs, are now so commonplace that their implementation is no longer routinely reported in the literature. The few case studies published in 1979 provided further confirmation of the potential for savings and improved performance in-
The year's most interesting and innovative article related to COM, however, was a report by Aframe on the direct conversion of word-processing output to microfiche at the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress. The Congressional Research Service makes extensive use of Lexitron word-processing equipment to prepare its typewritten reports. The resulting machine-readable text is stored on tape cassettes which, for purposes of producing microfiche output, are converted to a computer-compatible magnetic tape using a Mitron MDRS-9 magnetic tape terminal located in the Congressional Research Service offices. The word-processing equipment operates online to the Mitron unit and the resulting magnetic tape is then taken to an off-line COM recorder. In other applications involving the recording of text generated by a word processor onto microfilm or fiche, the text must first be transmitted to an intermediary mainframe computer. The Congressional Research Service describes its methodology as word processing output microfilm (WPOM) because a computer is not involved. There is an additional interesting twist to this application that provides a circuitous form of computer input microfilm (CIM). The COM recorder used by the Congressional Research Service employs an OCR-B type font. If text recorded on fiche must be reprocessed, the appropriate pages are printed onto paper via a Xerox 970 enlarger/printer and input again via an OCR scanner operating online to a word processor.

In addition to continued growth in COM applications, 1979 saw a return to popularity of computer-assisted microfilm retrieval, an approach to information management that recently has acquired its own acronym—CAR. As a concept, CAR is hardly new. In a typical CAR system, document images, generated by source document microphotography or COM, are stored on 16mm microfilm or microfiche and are accessed via a computer-stored index which returns a microform address (cartridge number and frame number or microfiche number and frame number) in response to search statements entered at an on-line terminal. In the simplest configurations, the searcher then goes to a manual file, removes the indicated microform, and inserts it in a reader or other appropriate display device.
Typically, however, some measure of automated retrieval is provided. In cartridge applications, for example, the document images are encoded with opaque marks called *blips* which permit automatic frame location. 3M, Kodak, Bell and Howell, and others have long manufactured cartridge readers and reader/printers designed for such applications. In 1979, there was considerable emphasis placed on the ability of these devices to operate on-line to a computer that initiates and controls film movement in response to search and retrieval commands entered at an interactive terminal. Two devices, the Kodak IMT-150 and IMT-250, attracted considerable attention in on-line CAR applications. They are described in a later section of this article. While Kodak itself does not offer information retrieval software, the IMT units can be used with microform indexing and retrieval programs made available through time-sharing computer service bureaus, such as I. P. Sharpe. Similarly, Warner-Eddison Associates announced the availability of a microform and document indexing package called INMAGIC which is written in FORTRAN IV for operation on a customer-owned DEC PDP-11 minicomputer. The 3M Company announced the addition of communications capability to its Micrapoint retrieval system. Introduced in 1978, Micrapoint is a preconfigured turnkey system which provides access to randomly filmed document images stored in 16mm microfilm cartridges. An index to the cartridge file is maintained on floppy disks and searched via a preprogrammed intelligent terminal. Because floppy disk capacity is limited, the communications enhancement allows the Micrapoint system to access more extensive index files maintained by a remote computer.

For CAR systems employing fiche, Image Systems Incorporated introduced its ISI 2000 and ISI 5000 retrieval units, which are essentially enhanced versions of the same vendor's earlier CARD system. Up to 750 fiche, stored in an interior carousel, can be displayed on instructions entered at an operator keyboard or received from an on-line computer. Similarly, the Bruning Division of AM International (the former Addressograph-Multigraph) introduced a computer interface for its Model 95 and 96 microfiche retrieval units.

If the CAR concept sounds familiar to librarians, the reason is that it dates from the 1960s when it was used in MIT's Project Intrex. It has subsequently been employed in a number of information retrieval applications in technical libraries, several of which were reported in 1979. McDonnell, for example, described a system for searching a large file of patents and related technical documents at the U.S. Patent Office. Conversion of the file to microfiche was motivated by problems of space and file integrity. Access to individual patents is controlled by a minicomputer-based turnkey system called Questicon, a product of Image Systems Incorporated. The CAR application that attracted the most attention in 1979, however, involved the use of micrographics, computers, and video technology to store, retrieve, and disseminate technical information at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As described by Felton, the system, implemented by the high-technology firm TERA, features a computer-based on-line index, a
specially designed microfiche retriever, and a video transmission system which provides rapid dissemination of document images to users at remote CRT terminals.\(^9\)

**NEW MICROGRAPHICS EQUIPMENT**

Among micrographic products introduced in 1979, several incorporated computer-like circuitry in the form of microprocessors designed to function as equipment controllers. Among microfilm cameras for source document applications, a product group that experienced something of a resurgence in 1979, Bell and Howell introduced a very compact rotary microfilmer called the Classic. Designed for the recording of card- and check-size documents, it is microprocessor-controlled, as is the Bell and Howell ABR-100, which received several enhancements in 1979. It remains the only available automatic-feed planetary microfilmer capable of producing 16mm microfilm. The California Technology Group announced its CTG 8000, a microprocessor-controlled step-and-repeat camera that allows users to alternate between several microfiche formats with only a simple lens change. Older step-and-repeat cameras with hardwired controllers required a complete replacement of film movement mechanisms in order to accomplish format changes.

The Kodak IMT-150 and IMT-250, mentioned briefly above, unquestionably were the most publicized microprocessor-controlled micrographics products of 1979. Marketed as “intelligent microfilm terminals,” the two models are designed for use in computer-assisted retrieval applications where they can function on-line, in the manner described earlier. Each of the devices also features a small internal memory capable of storing a group of microform addresses to be sequentially accessed within one or more cartridges. It is expected that the trend toward microprocessor control will continue in 1980, with more and more micrographics equipment taking advantage of the flexibility, power, and reliability of integrated electronic circuitry.

While the integration of micrographics and computers was the year’s dominant theme, 1979 saw the introduction of a number of other useful micrographics products. Bell and Howell, for example, introduced its Microx updateable microfiche system in the Washington and Boston areas. It competes with the System 200 Record Processor marketed by A. B. Dick Systems (formerly A. B. Dick/Scott), but is designed for somewhat smaller applications and is, consequently, lower priced. A unique feature of the Microx system is that the film used to create fiche is not only updateable but erasable as well.

As a remedy for problems of cartridge incompatibility, Kodak announced its Ektamate-A cartridge which conforms to the standard developed jointly in 1977 by the National Micrographics Association (NMA) and the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) but not previously observed. It is designed for use in Kodak Starnvue and Oracle readers and reader/printers. Tuscan Industries introduced a dual cartridge suitable for use with both Kodak and 3M reader/printers. Newly introduced microfiche readers demonstrated a continuation of
the trend toward relatively low-cost, modular product families with interchangeable lenses and screens designed to accommodate changes in application requirements. Micro Design, for example, expanded its popular 900 series with new rear and front projection models, both of which offer interchangeable lenses with magnifications in the range 18× to 66×. Washington Scientific Industries announced the latest improved versions of its Minicat Series readers. Dubbed the TNR product line, the several models feature rear-projection screens and modular hoods that share a common base. Realist and DatagraphiX both introduced large-screen, dual-page fiche readers. MAP International Microfilm introduced two automatic fiche readers that display the indicated frame on key-entry of a row and column indicator. Visidyne, Topper Manufacturing, Savemo, and Washington Scientific Industries all announced new portable microfiche readers. Micro Design announced an improved version of its highly successful Portable reader.

Although microfiche are now the focus of industry interest, Bell and Howell announced two readers for roll microfilm applications: the ABR-600 Autoload which will accept either 16mm reels or cartridges, and an improved version of its 16.35 reader designed for library applications. Dukane announced that its MMR 16+35 Motorized Microfilm Reader will accept cartridges. As welcome relief for a long neglected type of microform, Readex Microprint announced its Model 7, a greatly improved reader for opaque microforms. It features a twelve-by-sixteen-inch screen, magnifications in the range 18× to 23×, and image rotation.

Among reader/printers, the most important news involved three machines that produce plain-paper output: the Xerox 740, a microfiche reader/printer based on the older Xerox 660 copier; the Canon NP-Matic 200M, which accepts 16mm microforms; and the Canon NP-Matic 450II, which accepts 35mm aperture cards. The last two products are based on the Canon NP line of plain-paper office copiers.

Among published sources dealing with micrographics products, Micrographics Equipment Review devoted its 1979 semiannual issues to microfiche duplicators and planetary cameras;10 Library Technology Reports reviewed microform readers;11 and the National Reprographic Centre for Documentation issued four reports dealing with microform readers and reader/printers.12 The National Micrographics Association published an updated version of its Guide to Micrographics Equipment, in two volumes instead of three.13 Microform Review, Incorporated, published the 1979–80 edition of The International File of Micrographics Equipment and Accessories, a compilation of the entire texts of vendor catalogs on fiche with access provided by a series of printed indexes.14

MICROPUBLISHING

Two articles by Adamson and Zamora confirmed the eventual acceptance of micropublications by users in a government technical library,15 while Harlan and Johnson examined micropublishing within the context of a discussion of innovative publishing trends.16 On a less
optimistic note, however, a survey of acquisition budgets in community colleges indicated little projected growth in the percentage of total expenditures allocated to micropublications.\textsuperscript{17} In the meantime, micropublishers continued to add to their product lines. A complete review of the year's micropublications is beyond the scope of this article, but a few important titles of library interest are described briefly below.

Microforms remain a viable medium for the economical publication of voluminous national and trade bibliographies. In 1979, University Microfilms International announced its microfiche edition of the 6.8 million cards in the Library of Congress Shelflist. The set, which can be purchased complete or in classification segments, is accompanied by a printed guide. Meckler Books, a Microform Review-associated company, introduced its Publishers' Catalogs Annual, a compilation of the catalogs of U.S. publishers on 24× microfiche that extends bibliographic control to many publishers not covered in the PTLA or other sources.\textsuperscript{18} The initial set, published in 1979, provides coverage of 5,000 catalogs and is expected to increase to 9,000 by 1981. A companion micropublication entitled British and European Publishers' Catalogs Annual extends coverage to the foreign book market.\textsuperscript{19}

In other micropublishing activity, Finch, Copa, and Magesos assessed the impact of converting a research publication, the Journal of Vocational Education Research, to microfiche form.\textsuperscript{20} The American Chemical Society tested color microfiche for its monthly magazine Chemtech. Bell and Howell continued to add to its line of micropublications with Monarch Notes and periodicals like the American Banker. Microfilming Corporation of America announced a comprehensive collection of genealogical materials which will comprise one thousand titles annually. Updata Publications, Incorporated, arranged with the Library of Congress to distribute every item in its Document Expediting Program (DOCEX) on fiche. The Foundation Center COMSEARCH program provided COM-generated listings of foundation grants in fifty-nine subject categories.

Carroll presented a review of past and current activities pertaining to the bibliographic control of microforms, stressing the importance of the subject for libraries.\textsuperscript{21} Vandenburgh described a survey used to produce an overview of microform collections at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.\textsuperscript{22} Mann described a system for the processing and shelving of microforms and other nonprint media.\textsuperscript{23} Research Publications Incorporated announced a large microform collection to deal with immigration which can be ordered with standard AACR catalog cards bearing Library of Congress subject headings. Government documents librarians, concerned about bibliographic control, asked the public printer to provide standardized placement of filing indicators in microfiche heading areas.

**Other Micrographics Developments**

In the area of standards, the National Micrographics Association established a Library Standards Committee with Carl Spaulding as chairperson. As the name implies, the committee will deal with various
aspects of microform standardization for library applications. Jeffrey Heynen, current chair of the RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section, was appointed to the NMA Standards Board. The Public Records and Archives Committee of the National Micrographics Association is reportedly working on standards for the microfilming of public records. American national standards issued in 1979 include PH1.43-1979, Storage; PH1.51-1979, Film Dimensions; and PH1.60-1979, Diazo Stability. The NMA combined two of its most useful recommended practice publications into a single publication entitled Practice for Operational Procedures/Inspection and Quality Control of First-Generation Silver Gelatin Microfilm of Documents (NMA MS23-1979). NMA MS22-1979, Practice for Uniform Product Disclosure for Unitized Microform Readers, attempts to assist purchasers by prescribing the important descriptive information to appear on specification sheets for such products. These and other NMA and ANSI standards can be obtained from the National Micrographics Association, 8719 Colesville Road, Silver Spring, MD 20910.

The acceptance of microforms as legal substitutes for paper documents is the subject of The Legality of Microfilm. Prepared by Robert F. Williams in cooperation with the Rochester, New York, law firm of Nixon, Hargrave, Divans, and Doyle, it is an updated and greatly expanded version of an earlier Eastman Kodak publication entitled Admissibility in Evidence of Microfilm Records.

Finally, the growing interest in micrographics was in evidence at the well-attended meeting of the National Micrographics Association in Atlanta and at the Library Microform Conference sponsored by Microform Review and held in Boston. Attendance was likewise up in micrographics seminars offered by the Continuing Engineering Education Division of the George Washington University, the NMA Institute, the Records Management Institute of the American University, the American Management Association, and others.

PHOTOCOPYING

A 1979 survey by Nitecki again confirmed the relative dominance of full-size reproduction as opposed to microforms in American libraries. Yet, this review, like its predecessors, will devote comparatively few paragraphs to photocopiers—the reason being that, while copiers are of recognized significance in library applications, there is little to say about them other than that they are used. Compared to other types of reprographic equipment, copiers have generated little formal literature and the copier/duplicator market is itself mature.

There were, however, several interesting product and market developments in 1979. A Predicasts study indicated that copiers rather than duplicators will offer the best prospects for market growth in the 1980s, as xerographic-type plain-paper equipment erodes the market share of offset presses. In 1979, the most interesting new products were designed for relatively low-volume applications where Japanese-manufactured plain-paper copiers gained increased acceptance by users seeking a combination of low cost, high quality, and compact
equipment size. As with micrographics equipment, copiers increasingly incorporated integrated circuitry to improve versatility and reliability. Even low-cost machines now provide small internal memories which can be used to store job parameters, as well as self-diagnosing programs designed to minimize service calls for those problems which are operator-correctable. In the first significant change in machine design in a number of years, Minolta and the 3M Company each introduced a compact low-volume copier which substitutes fiber optics for the conventional lens and light source used in other equipment. There were relatively few product announcements for high-volume applications. The major vendors, Xerox, IBM, and Kodak, continued to emphasize previously introduced equipment with accessories (sorters, staplers, and feeders) designed to speed work throughput and reduce labor.

INTELLIGENT COPIERS

In 1979, there was a lot of talk about a new reprographic product group called "intelligent copiers" accompanied by apparent confusion about its definition and even its existence. Briefly, the intelligent copier is a reprographic device capable of making single or multiple paper copies from either paper documents or from machine-readable data prepared by a computer or word processor. Some industry analysts include nonimpact printers like the IBM 3800 and Xerox 9700 in discussions of intelligent copiers. Although such devices are incapable of reproducing paper documents, they do employ the xerographic process in conjunction with laser beams to generate various typefaces and fonts on plain paper. The Library of Congress CARDS system uses such a device to fulfill orders for printed catalog cards. Before the implementation of the CARDS system, the Library of Congress used a combination of phototypesetting and offset printing, maintaining a voluminous and expensive inventory of card sets printed in anticipation of orders. The new system is used to print cards only as orders are received. The IBM 6670 Information Distributor is perhaps a better representative of this emerging product group. Introduced in 1979, it can reproduce either paper documents or machine-readable output from computers or word processors. Similar products from other vendors are expected in 1980.

IMAGE TRANSMISSION

The late 1970s were characterized by a growing interest in electronic alternatives to conventional message delivery services. It is expected that this so-called "electronic mail" will be the information-processing attraction of the 1980s, just as word processing was in the 1970s and computers were in the 1960s. Electronic mail products and services are typically divided into two broad groups: keyboard-oriented systems and image-oriented systems. The keyboard-oriented systems—TWX, Telex, communicating word processing, and computerized message systems—are beyond the scope of this article. Image transmission systems, notably facsimile, are, however, reprography-
based in that they send a reproduction of a document to a designated remote location electronically.

Facsimile and related image-oriented transmission technologies were the subject of Daniel M. Costigan's *Electronic Delivery of Documents and Graphics*, a revision of the same author's 1971 monograph entitled *FAX-The Principles and Practice of Facsimile Communication*. Among equipment vendors, the emphasis was on speed of operation as Xerox, Qwip, Telautograph, and others introduced machines capable of two-to-three-minute transmission rather than the four to six minutes characteristic of the equipment which dominated the facsimile market in the mid-1970s. ITT introduced its FAXPAK service as a facsimile communication network alternative to the conventional telephone network. FAXPAK rates are, in most cases, lower than their Bell System counterparts and the network itself resolves incompatibilities among the equipment of the various manufacturers. Compression Laboratories announced a device which would allow facsimile terminals to interface with TWX, Telex, and communicating word-processing terminals, thus providing an important link between the keyboard- and image-oriented electronic mail systems. In the still uncertain area of microfacsimile, Planning Research Corporation announced additional enhancements for its Telefiche system, which was introduced in 1978.

**CONCLUSION**

In retrospect, 1979 probably will be viewed as the first year of the 1980s in reprographic-related activities. Early 1980 product announcements confirmed a continuation of the trend toward the integration of micrographics, reprography, and facsimile with computers and word-processing technology. As the year ended, the National Micrographics Association announced plans for a conference on Integrated Information Systems to be held in Washington in the fall of 1980. The year 1979 saw the clear emergence of what is likely to prove to be the dominant information-processing theme of the next decade.
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From: Mary K. Pietris, chief, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress.—In the article “Treatment of People and Peoples in Subject Analysis” by Jessica Harris and Doris Clack in the Fall 1979 LRTS (23:374–390), the reader may be left with mistaken impressions about some aspects of Library of Congress classification and subject headings that have already been changed. Specifically, the captions related to handicapped persons in classes HV and LC and to homosexuality in HQ were updated before 1974, the captions related to child study in HQ and the evacuation of the Japanese Americans during World War II in D were updated by 1978.

The research relating to subject headings is much more up to date. Two minor corrections should be noted, however. The authors claim that the heading “Education of the mentally retarded” would be less objectionable if it were constructed as “Mentally handicapped—Education.” This may be true. The heading in question, however, is a MeSH term, which is not the responsibility of the Library of Congress; the LC term is “Mentally handicapped—Education.” Second, “Mongolism” was replaced by “Down’s syndrome” in the 1977 supplement to LCSH, which may not have been available when the study was conducted.

These defects should not detract from the basic usefulness of a study that in some ways supports a conservative approach to subject heading changes. In the titles of books appearing in the sample, the authors discovered that the term “Chicano” was less used than “Mexican American,” that “homosexual” and “gay” were used equally and that neither “Senior citizens” nor “Seniors” appeared at all. These facts support the position that our language has not yet changed sufficiently to warrant replacing the established terms with terms less frequently found in titles of books being cataloged.

Gregor A. Preston’s article “Coping with Subject Heading Changes” in the Winter 1980 issue of LRTS (24:64–68) contains some misinformation about Library of Congress subject headings. Of several changes in subject headings that he gives as examples, two have not taken place as of this writing: (1) “Climate” continues to be a legitimate subdivision under countries, states, cities, etc; “Pennsylvania—Climate” has not and would not become “Climatology—

Editor’s Note: Letters sent to the editor for publication in this journal cannot be acknowledged, answered individually, or returned to the authors. Letters may be edited for clarity or abridged to save space. Selected letters will be published whenever space is available in an issue.
Pennsylvania.” (2) “Crime and criminals” continues to be a legitimate heading; it has not been changed to “Criminals and Criminology.”

Preston’s statement about our policies of making see references when changing headings is inaccurate. Our present practice is as follows: If a heading is changed, we consider the desirability of making a see reference from the canceled form. In the majority of cases, a see reference is made. If we do not make a see reference, we may provide a temporary explanatory note such as: “This heading has been replaced by the heading . . . .” or “this heading has been replaced by the heading . . . , a heading not printed because it uses a free-floating subdivision,” or similar notes. These notes are retained in the annual print supplements but are eliminated when the supplements are merged into the master data base. As a result, none of the explanations will appear in the ninth edition of LCSH. Finally, in some cases a general change is described in the introductory matter to the supplements to LCSH, and explanatory notes under specific headings may then be reduced in number or eliminated. Those interested in a full explanation of cancellations should refer to Cataloging Service, bulletin 129, p.20–22.

Preston suggests that a subscription to the Cataloging Service Bulletin (free from the Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, Building 159, Navy Yard Annex, Washington, DC 20541) is a good way to keep current on changes in subject heading policies. In addition, the introductory matter to the LCSH supplements should be studied carefully, because important changes in each issue are described there.

Preston describes the problems of patron use of LCSH, specifically the problems of interpreting changed and canceled headings in the supplements. This problem would be reduced if a library made the microform version of LCSH available to the public. Since each quarterly microform is a cumulation to date of all supplements integrated into the basic list, there are references to changes for the current quarter only. Cancellations are carried in the list for a full year.

Finally, an announcement appeared in the Spring 1979 Cataloging Service Bulletin (4:11–19), which was not yet available when Preston wrote his article, that subject heading changes will be made continuously throughout 1979 and 1980, instead of the previously announced plan to defer all changes until 1981. This should spread the impact of subject heading changes more evenly through the years than Preston suggested. The Library of Congress will not “adopt numerous new subject headings” in 1981.

In spite of the errors in describing LC policies and practices, Preston’s basic thesis—that it is not only desirable but also possible to prepare for coping with subject heading changes—remains valid.

From: Hans H. Wellisch, associate professor, College of Library and Information Services, University of Maryland.—In her article “The Essentials or Desiderata of the Bibliographic Record as Discovered by Research” (Library Resources & Technical Services 23, Fall 1979) Weintraub states: “The differences between these types of system [LC subject headings and PRECIS] are well known, but there are no studies that relate these differences to the needs of catalog users (p.401).” For the benefit of the readers of this journal I wish to draw attention to the large-scale comparative study undertaken at the University of Wollongong Library\(^1\) in which LCSH, PRECIS, and a KWOC index were subjected to actual searches of more than 2,000 books by undergraduates, faculty, and library staff, all of whom also gave their opinions on the merits of these retrieval systems. Among the major findings were the following: LCSH was judged to be difficult to use and had the highest maintenance costs; a simple
From: Herbert H. Hoffman, catalog librarian, Santa Ana College. [Abridged].—
In "False Economy; or, Sabotage at the Catalog!" (Winter 1980 [24:69-70])
Elisabeth Norie deplores unnecessary changes advocated by enthusiasts who
"forget the purpose of the card catalog."...

What is the purpose of the card catalog: to tell prospective readers
"whether the library contains a particular book" (Paris Principles, 2.1)? Certain-
ly that. Each book, therefore, should be listed in the catalog by the most
accurate, most complete, and most unequivocal bibliographic description
possible. Any watering down of cataloguing standards, for any reason, is in-
deed an act of sabotage.

But what else should the card catalog do: tell readers "which works by a
particular author" the library has (Paris Principles, 2.2.a)? If that is truly one
of its purposes, then I think all catalogs have failed so far. For they list only
books. ...

What the library needs is a catalog of the contents of books, work by work.
Only the computer ... can help us bring this about. ... To automate any-
thing as complex as a library catalog requires rather more precision and con-
sistency than it does to do the job by hand. Therefore I say "Amen" to
Norie's plea. ... The library catalog of the future ... must be a fully analytic
catalog. ...
IN MEMORIAM:
WYLLIS E. WRIGHT, 1903–1979

It is with deep regret that members of the Resources and Technical Services Division take note of the death on October 2, 1979, in Portola Valley, California, of Wyllis E. Wright, one of the most versatile and most talented individuals ever to grace our profession.

A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Williams College in philosophy and Greek, with a degree also from the Columbia University School of Library Service, Wright was, at various times in his career, librarian of the American Academy in Rome, cataloger, chief classifier, and chief cataloger at the New York Public Library, librarian of the Army Medical Library, librarian of Williams College, and, following his official retirement from Williams, rare books cataloger at Stanford University.

Throughout his career Bill was involved intensively in numerous extracurricular activities; among the titles he held were secretary of the American Book Center for War-Devastated Libraries, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, chairman of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, U.S. delegate to the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, chairman of the Catalog Code Revision Committee, president of the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification (one of the forerunners of RTSD), president of the Association of College and Research Libraries, president of the New York Library Club, chairman of the Council of National Library Associations, and trustee of the Williamstown Public Library.

Wright translated the Vatican cataloging rules and edited various publications, including the Catalogers’ and Classifiers’ Yearbook and the Bowker Annual.

Recognition for his professional accomplishments came to Bill in many forms, including the Melvil Dewey Medal for creative professional achievement and the Margaret Mann Citation.

Bill was a warm and friendly person with a pervasive sense of humor, who had thousands of friends, but never an enemy. He was a man who knew how to get people to work together; it was, in fact, a delight to watch him chair a meeting and keep in line its sometimes unruly participants. He could sum up in a few brief sentences the substance of a long and complicated discussion or exposition and make it clear exactly whither a debate was heading.

If the author of these lines may interject a personal note here, he will always remember Bill as mentor and guide, beginning in New York in the early 1930s, to a green and innocent neophyte in whom, apparently, he detected promise. Bill encouraged and cajoled, and made cataloging and classification so exciting that this young librarian never forsook them. Not quite old enough to be a father, Bill was for nearly fifty years an inspiring old brother.

Of the profession of librarianship he was more than an individual; he was a compendious human multitude.

Benjamin A. Custer
Editor Emeritus
Dewey Decimal Classification
IN MEMORIAM: CAROLYN SMALL

It should not surprise Carolyn Small’s friends in RTSD to know that she was at work the day before she died on September 18, 1979. Although her struggle against cancer had forced her resignation from the Descriptive Cataloging Committee the previous summer, she had continued her work at Yale, treating the disease as a minor irritant that interfered with her teaching, revising, and planning for the future.

Building on her undergraduate degree from the University of Maine and library degrees from Simmons and Michigan, Carolyn began her career at the University of Washington and continued at the Midwest Library Center, where she advanced to become assistant head. The move to Yale followed, where she was a very effective head of descriptive cataloging.

Carolyn’s contributions to the work of RTSD included service as a member of the RTSD Nominating Committee, 1969–70, the CCS Executive Committee, 1972–75, and the CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee, first in 1966–68 and again from 1975 to 1979.

In the memorial service conducted by her friends at Yale, she was described as a professional’s professional, always maintaining the highest standards for herself and for those who worked with her. We shall miss her wisdom, laced with the common sense and practicality of her Maine heritage.

Frances B. Woods
Catalog Librarian
Yale Law School
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During the past year, the Company, with the help of an advisory committee of librarians, completed a study of *Book Review Digest*.
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