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Collection Development, Collection Management, and Preservation

Dan C. Hazen

Preservation is one of the urgent issues of contemporary librarianship. Thus far relatively little has been written on decision making for preservation. This article first delineates the types of decisions implied by preservation activity and then suggests structures and criteria for each. The consideration most relevant to decision-making structures appears to be the scale of activity, and criteria analogous to those for collection management and collection development are suggested for the two main types of decision. The article highlights also the information gaps that limit our current ability to make intelligent preservation decisions.

Preservation ranks high among librarianship's critical issues. The problem incorporates elements of scope and magnitude, cost, psychology, logistics, technology, organization, ethics, philosophy, and administration. This essay will examine the relationships among collection development, collection management, and preservation. By focusing on decisions, we will attempt to join a better understanding of the implications of different kinds of preservation activity with possible structures for the decisions relevant to each.

First, though, we must clarify whether conservation should in any way be linked to collection development or collection management. Much of the preservation literature is couched in the highly technical idioms of physical stress and tolerances, and chemical and photochemical reactions. The vocabulary is replete with terms like pH levels, molecular degradation, photochemical sensitivity ranges, acid hydrolysis, and gas-phase deacidification. Taken at face value, this literature suggests that preservation is properly—and uniquely—the bailiwick of chemists, physicists, and like-minded scientists and technicians.

Conversely, and given the immense costs of preservation, one might argue that the whole matter should lie with those who define general library policy and then allocate resources to implement it. This inclin-
tion would be reinforced by the announced intention of the Research Libraries Group and other consortia to address preservation as a primary concern. Only the highest administrators can purport to speak with authority on an entire system’s preservation policies and commitments.

By either of these interpretations, preservation lies outside the province of both bibliographer and collection manager. Are there even initial grounds for associating these functions? In answering affirmatively, I propose to begin by probing a bit further into what preservation may entail. I will then outline a preservation model, first in terms of the activities involved and subsequently with reference to the factors affecting decisions. The result should join a closer understanding of how collection development, collection management, and conservation actually occur with a better appreciation of the connections among them, and observations on how we might increase the effectiveness of preservation decisions.

**The Nature of Preservation**

Preservation may be understood as subsuming three main kinds of activity. The first focuses on library environments and ways to make them more congenial to their contents. The second incorporates efforts to extend the physical life of documents through such means as deacidification, restoration, and binding. The third involves the transfer of intellectual or informational contents from one format or matrix to another.

In none of these cases can preservation be a once-and-for-all activity: deterioration may be slowed, but permanence is impossible. Long-term preservation thus requires either a repetition of similar operations—periodic deacidification and rebinding, for instance—or a sequence of distinct activities—microfilming the decaying published transcription of a long-since disintegrated manuscript.

Each of our three preservation categories encompasses numerous specific activities. Environmental improvements may include temperature and humidity controls, filters to purify the air, screens and shields to minimize light damage, specialized maintenance procedures, and disaster plans. All these activities affect large masses of material and thereby short-circuit the need for choosing among individual preservation candidates. It is for this very reason that improved environmental controls are usually an immediate preservation option. Most of these activities also overlap with building maintenance.

Preservation activities to extend the physical life of documents, our second broad category, may overlap with collection management. Collection management subsumes all operations affecting the maintenance and accessibility of materials after they are acquired. Most such operations are applied on a mass basis. Circulation policies, binding practices, security measures, and storage criteria all tend to involve the application of standardized procedures to an entire system.

Collection management policies, like environmental improvements, may only peripherally involve preservation. Circulation policies may serve as much to maximize the use of materials in high demand as to shield fragile volumes from unnecessary wear. Similarly, air condition-
ing and other environmental controls may be provided for employees and users, and only incidentally afford better conditions for books.

Other activities to conserve physical documents center on individual items; as before, the importance of preservation may range from predominant, to subsidiary, to merely incidental. The very act of acquiring a book may serve a preservation function in the sense of prolonging the life of the physical entity. The subsequent in-house processing sequence from binding through shelving, to deacidification and restoration, implies a shifting reliance on technical skills and exotic equipment and a parallel reduction in scale from mass processes to individualized operations. The activities resulting in the preservation of physical entities or artifacts involve variations in scope and complexity, as well as in primary motivations.

Preservation may, alternatively, center on changed physical formats, in which information is transferred from one matrix to another. The prototype for such transfers may lie in the copyists of antiquity and the Middle Ages. The more recent vogue of published transcriptions of manuscript materials, facsimile editions, and reprints has reflected the greater reproductive capacity engendered by technological change. Microfilming is now probably the most intensively utilized technique for transferring written information from one medium to another. Microfilming also provides a marvelous example of preservation's variable significance in cross-media translations.

Microfilming may serve an explicit preservation function, as in the Library of Congress' Preservation Microfilming Program or any number of similar efforts. At the opposite extreme, COM catalogs and in-process lists respond to the publishing economies inherent in this throw-away format: film serves transience as well as permanence. Filming may also facilitate storage for newspapers and other bulky materials. Conservation is only incidental to many of these operations. As with microfilm, so with other procedures for translating information from one matrix to another: preservation is neither predictable nor consistent as a motivating concern.

It has been fairly easy to distinguish three basic categories of preservation activity, but our attempts to delineate the corresponding library operations have only brought confusion. Overlaps with other library functions are both inevitable and ubiquitous, and they preclude unilateral preservation decisions. A few activities, such as binding, restoration, and repair, appear unique to preservation—but settling for such a limited definition would rule out some of our most promising approaches to the problem of disintegrating documents. In other words, our discussion has demonstrated some of the complexities of preservation, but has not yet led us to features immediately relevant to decision making.

Considerations of scale, however, do suggest a significant difference between the kinds of preservation activity. Environmental controls and collection management policies involving binding, circulation, and the like all affect large masses of material. Restoration, deacidification, and microfilming focus on single items. These and similar activities thus require special mechanisms and criteria for selecting appropriate docu-
ments. Much of the current interest in gas deacidification techniques derives from the prospect of applying them to many items at once and thereby bypassing a selection stage.

Two distinct decision-making scenarios thus seem to emerge. One concerns policies that apply equally to all materials, and the other involves those whose implementation requires a choice among specific items. Once we have considered the respective decision-making structures, we can look more closely at the criteria that affect the substance of decisions.

**The Two Types of Preservation Decisions**

Preservation decisions affecting masses of material involve collection management and environmental control. Organizational structures and staffs already exist, and much of the information upon which preservation policy decisions would be based is already available. Preservation specialists should provide full and formal data on preservation costs and cost-effectiveness, for example, by reporting on the costs and benefits associated with properly shielded lights. Both decision making and implementation would nonetheless remain where they are.

This kind of structure applies only to decisions that affect all materials equally. Item-by-item preservation involves more complex considerations, and a more complicated decision mechanism. Decisions here resemble those of collection development insofar as they involve individual items selected from an overwhelmingly large base. In collection development, librarians must decide which materials are most important to acquire. In item-by-item preservation, they must determine which documents least deserve destruction. A closer look at collection development decisions should allow us to propose an analogous structure for preservation.

Collection development structures reflect a functional division among planning for collection growth, implementing collection development plans through the selection of appropriate documents, and implementing selection decisions by actually acquiring specific materials. Administrators, advised by subject specialists, formulate a system’s general collection development plans. Selectors identify the universe of resources appropriate to a particular field and choose what to acquire from within it. Acquisitions staffs employ a wide range of specific mechanisms to secure these items.

Bibliographers might become unnecessary if an administration’s collection development plan successfully delineated a discrete body of literature, and allocations then permitted its unthinking and comprehensive acquisition. Item-by-item preservation might be similarly relegated to a technical staff if an administration’s commitment of funds and facilities were adequate to prevent the loss of even one document. This happy circumstance would obtain if funds were plentiful. It would also obtain if endangered books were easily identified and relatively scarce. Even if resources were inadequate, reliance on a technical staff might be possible if decisions could be based on technical criteria alone. However, item-by-item preservation decisions are choices between what is preserved
and what is allowed to deteriorate or, possibly, self-destruct. These decisions affect the basic nature of subject collections; those subject specialists responsible for the collections must make them.

Item-by-item preservation thus suggests a three-tiered decision process parallel to that for collection development. Preservation plans and priorities are developed by the library administration, in response to specialized information on costs and cost-effectiveness and input from subject selectors.

Thus, the preservation structure is analogous to that for collection development. Perhaps the greatest difference comes at the next level, where preservation specialists must supply technical information on endangered items and blocks of material. Such data will affect decisions on what to preserve, though they cannot determine the decisions. The other relevant criteria which subject specialists will use will be suggested below.

Finally, preservation decisions must be implemented. Here technical expertise comes directly into play. Despite perhaps exotic qualifications and the concomitant high salaries, the preservation staff is at this point analogous to that of the acquisitions department.

The crucial variable for preservation decision-making structures is the scale of activity. Policies affecting masses of material eliminate the need to choose among particular items and are thus relatively easy to formulate and execute. Policies demanding repeated choices among specific items are more complex; the appropriate decision-making framework appears analogous to that used in collection development. Let us now look more closely at the considerations that enter into item-by-item conservation decisions.

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR INDIVIDUAL PRESERVATION DECISIONS

Library collection development, within a given resource base and allocation structure, responds to five distinct but interrelated factors. The same considerations, sometimes in slightly different guise, apply to item-by-item preservation. In collection development, the relevant factors fall under the headings of academic activity or user demand, historical precedent and tradition, the volume and cost of materials, the availability of alternatives to purchase, and discipline-specific models of access to information. Much of the ensuing discussion is framed in terms most obviously applicable to academic and research libraries. Nonetheless, the models suggested and the needs examined can be adapted to all libraries for which preservation is a problem. And deteriorating collections pose a challenge to everyone.

Academic activity can be expressed in such terms as degrees granted, student enrollment per field, courses offered, and citation counts. Academic activity is thus an indicator of the immediate, local demand for information resources within a particular field. Other things being equal, one expects an area of intensive academic activity to be reflected in a more pronounced collection development effort than a field peripheral to an institution’s interests.
Historical precedent and tradition are quite different. Collections of
efficiency do not necessarily correspond to areas of high current de-
mand, and the decision to sustain them implies a library's long-term
commitment regardless of the vagaries of academic fashion or immediate
demand. A strong collection, perhaps one recognized as a national schol-
larly resource, normally merits exceptional support on those grounds
alone.

Information on publishing output, in terms of both volume and cost, is
a relatively accessible quantity which selectors balance against available
resources and the levels of demand established through measures of
academic activity and historical commitment. Obviously, the realities of
low budgets and high costs limit most collecting efforts.

Alternatives to purchase may increase a collection's effective scope.
Cooperative collection development buttressed by efficient interlibrary
loan may, for instance, alleviate the pressure to buy certain materials —
albeit at the cost of somewhat reduced accessibility. For items both
expensive and esoteric, the reliance on cooperative acquisitions may be
substantial.

The analysis of discipline-specific models of access to information is
somewhat more impressionistic. Every field expects certain data to be
readily available. As circumstances change within the discipline, and
within the world of information resources, these expectations likewise
change. Legal scholarship has altered significantly now that LEXIS
provides online, full-text access to court decisions. Computerized data-
bases in the physical sciences are regarded as essential to serious re-
search. Changes in information resources, or in access to them, can
significantly alter a discipline's research expectations and strategies. By
the same token, changing research paradigms will affect the types of
information perceived as useful.

Preservation specialists are best suited to identify the endangered
materials within a particular collection, but subject specialists must then
delineate priorities among those items. In so doing, they weigh factors
analogous to those just posited for collection development.

Much as measures of academic activity signal areas requiring support
as collections are built, so do these levels suggest areas in which — other
things being equal — collections should be maintained. One can certainly
argue that all materials deserve to be preserved. When choices have to be
made, some priority should be attached to the materials people actually
use.

The influence of traditional collecting strengths is likewise apparent in
decisions for both collection development and preservation. Historically
strong collections often incorporate a certain number of rarities, so pres-
ervation of artifacts as well as information may be sought. As a general
rule, areas of strength deserve special efforts for their maintenance.

Information on publishing output and cost may be conceptualized as
data on the expense of implementing a collection development plan. In
the preservation context, cost is a similar consideration, though one
phrased in terms of specific preservation operations and their results.
Changing technology will continue to affect these figures. Even basic
cost information on preservation alternatives is not, however, readily available to either selectors or policy makers. More adequate data are essential if we are to make intelligent preservation decisions.

Alternatives to purchase, in the collection development model, are analogous to alternatives to local preservation in our present discussion. In each case, we require two kinds of information: knowledge of the availability of a particular document, in original or changed format, and knowledge of the cost, in both dollars and user energy, of access to such resources. Here our current grasp is sadly deficient. If a particular physical document is widely held, even if each copy is deteriorating, one might conclude that the urgency of preservation is less than that for a unique item in a similar state of decay. At present, aggregate North American holdings of a particular book can be roughly assessed by combining information from the printed NUC (and the various registers of additional locations) with the main computerized bibliographic databases. Conducting such assessments for a large number of items would require a substantial investment of staff time.

The situation is even more difficult when it comes to identifying items which have already been preserved in reprint editions or on microfilm. Bibliographic control for microforms is generally inadequate. Many filmed sets lack clear and accessible title-by-title bibliographies. Numerous completed efforts, in this country as well as abroad, lack coverage in the National Register of Microform Masters or any other single source. Documentation generated by the Preservation Committee of the Research Libraries Group indicates a current backlog of approximately two hundred eighty thousand filming reports at the National Register of Microform Masters, without even considering unreported projects. Information on the quality of individual films is almost entirely absent. Data on projects now under way, but not yet complete, are also inadequate. And cost and acquisition information for available film is often unclear. For both microfilms and reprints, commercial lists often amount to no more than subscription offers: a document will be filmed or reprinted only when enough orders appear. Intelligent preservation decisions require knowledge of what has already been preserved. At present, that kind of information is simply unusable.

A number of national efforts are beginning to address some of these problems; a presentation by Pamela Darling at the May 1979 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries summarized a few of the most noteworthy. Our computerized bibliographic databases may also be able to help us. An added field in these databases could, for instance, allow libraries to report the existence of reprint or microform editions of a particular hard-copy document. The nature of the reproduction might be indicated through a tagging system, and other symbols could specify the location of microform negatives and holdings information for serials. At the start, this field would carry only potential value, rather like the CONSER field, which indicates the indexing tools applicable to particular journals. With time, current information could be made available by library and commercial microform publishers as well as by the catalog departments of consumer libraries. The files of the Research Libraries
Group Preservation Committee reveal preliminary discussions to implement this kind of system.

The analysis of discipline-specific models of access to information suggests entire fields in which the need for preservation may be low. Chemistry textbooks from thirty years ago, for instance, have little practical use. In other fields, and particularly in the humanities, dated materials constitute the backbone of research, and preservation should enjoy a higher priority. Analyzing the literature needs and information utilization of different fields should affect decisions on both what to keep and whether to preserve original physical entities or information contents alone. Such analyses should also help us move toward more accurate cost assessments for a comprehensive conservation program.

These five factors affecting preservation—academic activity, the strength of historical collections, the cost and cost-effectiveness of specific preservation activities, knowledge of alternatives to in-house preservation, and an understanding of disciplinary patterns of information use—all inform the manner in which choices are made among preservation candidates. All these considerations will be balanced against a particular administrative allocation for conservation programs. Clearly, the level of need indicated by the composite impact of all these factors should feed back into administrative decision making, as should information on possible improvements in environmental control and collection management.

**SUMMARY**

Preservation is a concept inherent in many library operations. Specific preservation activities fall into three principal categories involving either activities to improve storage environments, steps to extend the physical life spans of documents, or efforts to transfer information from one format to another. We can also conceptualize preservation in terms of the scale of decisions: some affect masses of material, while others involve only individual items. Finally, there is significant overlap between preservation and such functions as building maintenance, collection management, and collection development.

Structures for conservation decisions seem to divide in accord with the scale of decisions. For policies that can be applied en masse, specialized preservation information and advice can merely be injected into existing mechanisms for decision making and policy implementation. For decisions affecting individual items, a three-tiered framework analogous to that for collection development seems most appropriate. Preservation expertise is utilized in identifying items needing attention and in providing this attention, but subject specialists actually make the choices.

In analyzing the bases for such specific choices, the same five considerations that affect collection development decisions—academic activity, historical strengths, data on costs and cost-effectiveness, knowledge of alternatives to in-house preservation, and an appreciation of disciplinary patterns of information use—appear most relevant. This is not really surprising, if we look on item-by-item preservation as involving decisions about which materials to sacrifice.
Our discussion has also highlighted some specific areas in which we need better information. We need to know more about the cost and cost-effectiveness of specific preservation activities. Each library collection should also have ready information on which of its holdings are most susceptible to deterioration or destruction, and on life expectancies both with and without treatment. Perhaps most significantly, we need to systematize the existing welter of information on materials either already available, or in preparation, in reprint, or in microform editions. Without such information, we cannot effectively implement item-by-item preservation on any significant scale, even if we have the staff and facilities. In such circumstances, improved environmental controls and more sensitive policies for collection management may well prove our only effective outlet.
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AACR2, OCLC, and the Card Catalog in the Medium-Sized Library

John Hostage

The impact of AACR2 on the card catalog in a medium-sized library was analyzed in a study using a random sample from a year's cataloging. Rates of conflict, amount of corrections, and creation of split files were considered under different scenarios.

The changes in AACR2 that are having the greatest impact on library catalogs, and those that have been the most controversial, are the form of entry changes. While it is generally agreed that the new code results in headings that are more sensible for the library user, some of these headings create conflicts with headings already in the catalog, often due to incomplete implementation of AACR1. The great technical difficulties this presents for most libraries were a major cause of the postponement of implementation from 1980 to 1981.

Since the publication of the code late in 1978, various libraries have attempted to determine its impact on their catalogs. The results of these studies are difficult to compare because of differences in methodology, size of sample, assumptions about implementation strategies, and other factors. Not every study made a distinction between the rate of difference (headings that would be constructed differently under AACR2) and the rate of conflict (AACR2 headings for names already entered in the catalog under a different form). Some of these findings include a study at Johns Hopkins University, which took a sample of 295 records and 541 headings and found a rate of difference of 17.3 percent and a rate of conflict of 11 percent.\textsuperscript{1} Duke University had a 15.5 percent conflict rate in a sample of 484 records. With a cutoff point of fifteen entries, it would create ninety-six split files per week in the first year and change 205 files or 916 cards per week.\textsuperscript{2} Hamilton College found a 30 percent conflict rate.\textsuperscript{3} At Emory University, the difference rate was 15 percent in a sample of 330 titles and 577 headings.\textsuperscript{4} The College of Wooster in Ohio.
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reported a conflict rate of only 5.3 percent. The lowest rate of difference reported was 3 percent at the University of Minnesota in a sample of 300 titles and 447 headings. The highest was at the University of Washington, which reported 30 percent of 258 headings. Sixty-three percent of the differences were considered interfileable. At Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, the difference rate was 20.3 percent in a sample of 325 titles and 644 entries.

The most thorough study to date was the one conducted by Arlene Taylor Dowell in three North Carolina academic libraries. She took random samples from a year’s cataloging in a small, a medium, and a large library and did detailed analyses of rates of conflict and projections of amounts of corrections.

The present study was begun in late 1980 with three objectives. The first was to do a partial replication of Dowell’s study. The second was to determine the extent of impact on the catalog for the purposes of the library where the study was conducted. The third was to determine what added impact was attributable to OCLC’s conversion of its database in December 1980.

The study was more limited than Dowell’s in that it included only one size library (medium) and was restricted to the first year of implementation of AACR2, rather than attempting projections over five years. At the time Dowell was doing her research, it was, of course, impossible for her to take the effects of OCLC’s machine conversion into account. The library in this study is an urban university library with a cataloged collection of approximately seven hundred forty thousand volumes. It catalogs approximately sixteen thousand titles and thirty thousand volumes each year. Since 1978 it has been engaged in an in-house retrospective conversion project via OCLC. The medium-sized library in Dowell’s study used for comparison has a collection of approximately six hundred thirty thousand volumes, and catalogs some twenty-one thousand titles and thirty thousand volumes per year.

**METHOD**

An attempt was made to follow Dowell’s procedures as much as possible. The library’s OCLC archival tapes were used as the basis for selecting a sample from one year’s cataloging. It was intended to take calendar year 1978 as the sample year, but due to a mix-up in the labeling of the tapes, the sample actually represented the second half of both 1977 and 1978. Since there were no major differences in the kind of cataloging done, it is doubtful that this change had any impact on the results of the study. During the period in question the library was cataloging books, theses, and serials on OCLC. Automated cataloging of recordings and microforms began in November 1978, while scores were not included until after the period under study. The library does not catalog periodicals, maps, government documents, or other materials not mentioned above. A random sample of 909 records was selected using the formula in Dowell’s study for a confidence interval of 95 percent and an “allowable error” of 2 percent. The sample included 205 records in the 1978 portion representing updates from the retrospective conversion, since these up-
dates are included on the archival tapes. In most cases, nearly identical results were obtained by analyses including these retrospective conversion records and analyses including only new cataloging. In any case, the inclusion of these retrospective conversion records should be relevant to many libraries in the midst of retrospective conversion projects.

After selecting the sample records, the next step was to photocopy the corresponding shelflist cards and then to record information from each on data sheets. The following information was recorded: whether the title was a monograph or a serial, whether it was a foreign or U.S. publication, the number of headings controlled by AACR2, the number of subject headings controlled by AACR2 (i.e., nontopical), the number of personal name, corporate name, geographic, uniform title and series headings, the month of cataloging, type of cataloging (original or LC), and the letters of the LC classification.

Next, all headings that might differ under AACR2 were copied and searched in LC's name authority file on OCLC. When no AACR2 heading was found, the heading was established in AACR2 form. LC's options and interpretations were followed in this procedure, including the rules for "compatible" headings outlined in Cataloging Service Bulletin 6. The revisions in Cataloging Service Bulletin 11, which appeared while this research was in progress, were taken into account to the extent possible. There were 239 headings that were determined to be different under AACR2; 217 of these were unique, representing 12.7 percent of the 1,714 headings in the sample. Forty-three percent of the "different" headings could be verified in the online name authority file as of January 1981.

These headings were then searched in the library's card catalog and the following information was recorded on data sheets: type of heading (personal, corporate, etc.), type of difference (first word different, change in qualifier, etc.), number of main, added, and subject entries in conflict, number of the sample record on which the heading was found, and an indication of whether the heading would have been affected by OCLC's machine conversion. This category included headings for which there was an AACR2 heading in the online authority file as well as certain categories which were converted by machine manipulation, such as conferences and form subheadings. In counting the number of entries in conflict, it was usually impossible to eliminate those added since the time the sample records were cataloged. For very large files, the number of entries was estimated. The data that had been collected were entered into a computer and analyzed using SAS (Statistical Analysis System).

RESULTS

Table 1 compares the distribution of kinds of headings found in this study with that found by Dowell in the comparable, medium-sized library. The pattern is basically the same in each, although a t-test of the proportions of personal and corporate headings found the differences to be significant at the .05 level. However, it is interesting that these two types together represent about 80 percent of each sample. Table 1 also shows the percentage of each kind of heading found to be different under
AACR2. The greatest difference is in the rate for uniform titles. It can be attributed to the fact that Dowell's sample included music scores, while the sample for this study included no music. Almost all of the uniform titles in the latter were for books. Otherwise the pattern is the same, with personal name headings making up a large majority of all headings, but only a small amount of those changing under the new rules, while corporate headings and series headings represent small percentages of all headings but a large proportion of the changes. More than half (53 percent) of the differences in corporate headings were due to a change in qualifier, while the same percentage of personal name differences resulted from a change in the first forename.

Of course, not every heading that would be constructed differently under AACR2 represents an actual conflict. If the heading was not previously represented in the catalog, there is no conflict. In Dowell's study, only 50 percent of the differences were also conflicts, but the rate was 78 percent in the present study. Only a small part of this difference could be attributed to the fact that conflicts arising since 1977-78 (the base period of the sample) could not be weeded out. Table 2 shows the proportion of each type of heading in conflict and the distribution of conflicts by type of heading.

Again, the pattern was similar in the two libraries. The overall conflict rate of 9.9 percent in the first year assumes that a library would change every heading on current cataloging to AACR2, including headings on

### TABLE 1
**Distribution of Headings in Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Heading</th>
<th>Number and Percentage of Headings in Sample</th>
<th>Number and Percentage of Each Kind Different under AACR2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowell</td>
<td>Hostage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>(66.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>(12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform title</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Difference Rate</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 2
**Distribution of Conflicts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kind of Heading</th>
<th>Number of Conflicts</th>
<th>Percentage of Each Kind of Heading in Conflict</th>
<th>Kind of Heading as Percentage of Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowell</td>
<td>Hostage</td>
<td>Dowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform title</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Conflict Rate</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See table 1 for totals of each kind of heading in sample.*
slightly. The differences in the rates of conflict between the two libraries were not significant at the .05 level. However, for a library using OCLC, the effect of the conversion of the database in December 1980 was to more than double the rate of conflict to 5.5 percent in the first year. This figure was determined by adding the headings that were affected by OCLC's changeover, as explained earlier, to the headings described above. It can be expected that this high rate of conflict in the first year will be compensated by a more rapid drop in conflicts in following years.

If all cataloging were done with AACR2 headings and corrections done for all conflicts, there would be about forty-one hundred conflicts and two hundred ninety-three thousand card changes in the first year (average over twenty-four thousand cards per month). If LC copy were accepted as it came, there would be approximately one thousand conflicts and nearly seventy-one thousand card changes (average fifty-nine hundred) in the first year. A library with OCLC would have twenty-three hundred conflicts and one hundred sixty-two thousand card changes (average about thirteen thousand five hundred).

Even when accepting LC copy, most libraries will still find these rates of conflict too high to deal with on an economical basis. However, the fact that many conflicts involve changes that are slight enough to be interfiled without correcting the old cards effectively reduces the number of conflicts requiring card corrections. Table 3 gives a breakdown of the conflicts by type of difference involved.

Different libraries will adopt different strategies for interfiling, depending on their filing rules, the level of consistency they require in their catalog, and other factors. Dowell assumed that the first five kinds of difference (punctuation, abbreviation, spelling, qualifier, and forename) could be interfiled. Libraries that ignore the period in headings like "Indiana University" can easily interfile headings where the period is dropped. A library following this procedure and also interfiling the first four kinds of differences would be able to interfile 31.8 percent of conflicts, compared to 47.2 percent in Dowell's study. The difference is due to the fact that forename differences, which were treated as interfilable in Dowell's study, account for nearly a quarter of all conflicts. The calculations in this study were based on interfiling of categories 1-4 and 6.
Dowell found that after interfiling, the average number of cards per conflict changed significantly. In the sample for this study, there was an average of 70.6 cards for all conflicts, but only 41.3 for those remaining after interfiling using the filing options described above, and 44.2 using Dowell’s options. The difference after interfiling can probably be attributed to one or two headings in the sample with very large files. Interfiling and accepting LC copy as is would leave about six hundred eighty conflicts and twenty-eight thousand cards to change in the first year (over twenty-three hundred per month); an OCLC library would have fifteen hundred seventy conflicts and some sixty-five thousand cards (fifty-four hundred per month).

Even after interfiling some conflicts, many libraries will want to split some files to reduce the cost of corrections. Four possible cutoff points were studied, with files split if they had at least six, eleven, sixteen, or twenty-one entries respectively. Dowell’s study presented figures for a dictionary catalog; the results shown in table 4 for the library in this study treat the catalog as a dictionary catalog for the sake of comparison, even though it actually is a divided catalog. The figures for a divided catalog are shown in table 5. Both tables are based on an estimate of twenty-two thousand titles cataloged or retrospectively converted in the first year. Data for the sample library are given under two sets of conditions in each table. In the first part are the expected results if OCLC had not converted its database or if the library did not use OCLC. In the second, that conversion is taken into account.

In table 4 it can be seen that the figures for the libraries in the two studies are very close. The numbers for the library in this study happen to be the same at the cutoff points of eleven and sixteen cards because the few headings in the sample that fell in this range would not have been first-year conflicts. The impact of OCLC’s conversion of its database in December 1980 is very dramatic. It approximately doubles the number of card changes required, and increases the number of split files by an even greater amount. However, the situation can probably still be handled by most libraries of this size. One can take heart in the fact that things can only improve after the first year.
### TABLE 4

effects of AACR2 ON A DICTIONARY CATALOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cutoff Point</th>
<th>Avg. Cards per Heading</th>
<th>LC Copy Accepted as Is – No OCLC Conversion</th>
<th>LC Copy Accepted as Is – After OCLC Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Cards Changed First Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LC Copy Accepted as Is – After OCLC Conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cutoff Point</th>
<th>Avg. Cards per Heading</th>
<th>LC Copy Accepted as Is – After OCLC Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: D = Dowell; H = Hostage.

### TABLE 5

effects of AACR2 ON A DIVIDED CATALOG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cutoff Point</th>
<th>Avg. Cards Changed per Heading</th>
<th>Without OCLC Conversion</th>
<th>With OCLC Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With OCLC Conversion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cutoff Point</th>
<th>Avg. Cards Changed per Heading</th>
<th>Without OCLC Conversion</th>
<th>With OCLC Conversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AT</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: AT = author/title catalog; SC = subject catalog.
DISCUSSION

The assumptions used in this study about implementation strategies are likely to be modified by any library on the basis of its practical experience with AACR2. It is possible to keep the number of split files at a minimum while avoiding the most time-consuming corrections, i.e., those involving erasures. If a library uses a cutoff point for creating split files, it can be applied to some kinds of changes and not others. For example, when a file can be corrected by lining out one or more words in the heading, the whole file can be corrected rather than split. An example is “Shaw, George Bernard” changing to “Shaw, Bernard.” An exception might be made when the change is in the entry element, to avoid massive shifts of cards among drawers. When the change involves inserting initials before forenames, as in the case of D. H. Lawrence, these corrections can be done by hand for the entire file. The makeshift appearance of the old cards is arguably preferable to having two nearly adjacent files for the same person. A library with a divided catalog which uses guide cards for every subject heading could eliminate split files in the subject catalog altogether. It would only be necessary to change the guide cards to the AACR2 entry and interfile subject cards carrying the old and new headings behind these guides, using appropriate references. No changes would be needed on the subject cards themselves.

The results of this study and of Dowell’s study show that a medium-sized library can implement AACR2 without closing the catalog and without an unbearable amount of additional work, if it is willing to make some accommodations such as split files and interfiling. These practices may detract somewhat from the internal integrity of the catalog, but this deficiency is probably more than compensated by the fact that many headings will be changed to more commonly known and less artificial forms of names, and as time goes by, an increasing proportion of entries added to the catalog will be in AACR2 form. The amount of corrections required will gradually decrease as the most commonly occurring headings will be encountered early on.

Libraries that use OCLC are having a greater initial burden of authority work and corrections than other libraries, but this can be seen as an opportunity to make more rapid improvements in the patron’s ability to use the catalog than would otherwise be the case.

CONCLUSION

While it is expensive to implement new standards in a manual environment, it is even more expensive in a partially automated environment. When AACR1 was introduced in 1967, libraries had only to contend with the card catalog. In the eleven years prior to publication of AACR2, the files of superimposed headings continued to swell. Two more years passed before the code was implemented. At the same time, libraries were making their first attempts at automation. Many now have one system for automated cataloging, which is often no more than automated card production, another system for automated circulation, and possibly another for acquisitions, while still maintaining the old card catalog. OCLC’s conversion of its database was in many ways a great
achievement, but it did nothing for the archival tapes of its member libraries, which still carry superimposed headings. Moreover, libraries were generally in a stronger position financially in the sixties than they are today. Clearly, research into the effects of new standards is needed as the basis for sound management decisions. Shortsighted decisions that delay the full implementation of standards can lead to greater costs in the future. But libraries must also have the flexibility to apply these standards in a cost-effective manner. In order to achieve more easily accessible headings for bibliographic records and to facilitate national and international sharing of those records, libraries must improve the environment for implementing progressive change. Policies based on thorough studies of the impact of change will make this possible.
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The principal objective of this study is to determine the bibliographic control requirements of a small to medium-sized public library from the point of view of the expressed needs of the library patron through telephone and catalog reference. Bibliographic elements in addition to author, title, and subject are identified. All elements are measured as to the extent and use of each for retrieval. The results of the study of users’ requests and the nature of their bibliographic structure indicated that present bibliographic data in a catalog record provide sufficient information to support users’ needs and that there is no immediate need for expanding access beyond the present levels provided in a library catalog.

BACKGROUND

Useful data on the bibliographic information requirements of users can be obtained from collecting and analyzing users’ reference questions. A survey of published use studies revealed various methods and techniques for analyzing and evaluating reference services in libraries. While these studies differ in purpose and approach, most investigations take the form of examining the question-answer process in libraries, employing either classification of questions by subject content or type of question. The latter technique of classifying questions by type (i.e., how-to-do-it type, fact type, trend type, list-of-references type, etc.) seems to be the more favored approach. The findings of these studies offer little help in analyzing user requirements for bibliographic information.

The trend in information retrieval is to increase the number of access
points to a bibliographic record beyond the conventional author, title, and subject entries. These requirements would radically cut across the traditional bibliographic record, which is the card catalog entry. Such requirements necessitate transcribing data elements not only as they would appear on the prescribed primary sources of information, but also take into consideration data elements (whether supplied or not on the prescribed sources) likely to be used as retrieval handles. Moreover, not only are the commonly known elements of a record identified, but it is necessary to identify explicitly latent elements in a catalog record that are only implied or innate in the record form.

The application of computer techniques to library operations has provided opportunities for increasing the effectiveness of library bibliographic files. However, present library data files tend to be designed to fit the needs of a given situation within a library. An increasing concern about the problem involving the identification and description of data elements recorded on document surrogates has been generated within the last decade.

Corollary to the studies on the identification of data elements in bibliographic records are studies relating to types of bibliographic data elements users are most likely to use in fulfilling their information requirements.

While much has been said in the literature about the need for various access points to a record, or the need to consider logical sums, products, differences, in the search strategy, Herner and Herner pose this question: Do users actually present reference questions involving such complexities or are such questions more in the realm of hypothesis than reality?

If indeed such a need exists for various access points to a record, are there further bibliographic data elements to be identified in order to satisfy users' requirements for bibliographic information? How is each element used for retrieval and to what extent would each element be used if there were access to the record by any other element?

The study reported in this paper was formulated in the light of these questions. The study in essence examined the bibliographic control requirements of a small to medium-sized public library to define and identify the needs of library patrons in terms of bibliographic data elements.

The study was primarily concerned with the data elements in a bibliographic record rather than in a work. Both the data elements that described the subject content (index terms) and the descriptive elements of a document surrogate were considered. Thus, the study was concerned only with the information stated on the requests and not with the information contained in the document or with the document itself. This paper will discuss the technique used in determining bibliographic requirements from reference questions.

**THE SAMPLE**

'Two sequential samplings of reference questions were collected over a
seven-month period. A form was developed to facilitate the survey of characteristics of reference questions. The library staff in public service areas were asked to record all questions verbatim. The sample included requests for information from the general public as well as queries of the library staff. However, the number of questions recorded from the latter constituted only about 1 to 2 percent. Some of the questions received were so routine and handled on such a casual basis that about 9-10 percent of the questions involving telephone reference or quick, fact-type answers may not have been recorded.

This method of data gathering accumulated a total of 2,656 questions, of which 1,347 (50.7 percent) were requests for bibliographic information and 923 (34.7 percent) were requests for subject information. Of the total, 386 (14.5 percent) were questions excluded from the analysis because they were requests for spelling, pronunciation, word definition, quotation identification, etc. Of the 2,270 bibliographic and subject questions, 1,416 (62.4 percent) were asked by patrons or staff in the library, 817 (35.9 percent) were telephone requests, and 37 (1.7 percent) came via the TWX.

At first it seemed easy to determine whether a request was for bibliographic or subject information. However, as the analysis progressed, it became evident that categories of requests were not mutually exclusive. There were requests wherein both bibliographic and subject data elements were present, and there were also requests that could pass for either bibliographic or subject information. Where categories were not mutually exclusive, the request was counted in both categories; hence the total number of requests for each category of questions is more than the actual volume of return because of multiple counting.

ANALYSIS OF REQUESTS

Working on the assumption that information requirements of users may be determined and expressed in terms of the bibliographic and subject data elements in reference questions and their relationships, the writer set out to categorize the questions in the sample on the basis of their data element content. Although it is a truism that requests for information or materials in a library would generally contain elements of author, title, subject, or a combination of any of these elements, it is not known to what degree or to what proportion these exist or the relative combination of such data elements.

The technique used in the analysis of questions in this study is a statistical inference of data element content. It will attempt to characterize quantitatively the data element content of requests for bibliographic

*Reference questions were collected from the Monroe County Public Library (Bloomington, Indiana) during the months of October, November, December 1968, and January 1969 (fall/winter sample) and May, June, and July 1969 (spring/summer sample). These months were selected so that any seasonal variations in the type of users of the library and the categories of reference questions can be detected. The results of a chi-square measurement indicated that there was no significant difference in the trends of category proportions of requests between the two sample periods.
and subject information in a library as a basis for identifying requirements for bibliographic information, and for determining improvements in bibliographic control.

To determine the data element content it was necessary to analyze reference questions statistically so that the probable different bibliographic structures of reference questions could be ascertained. Such statistical analysis involved noting down the proportion of time a data element was expected to occur in the long run in a number of trials. The probability of occurrence of a bibliographic structure in a reference question might be called a “bibliographic possibility set.”

For purposes of counting the data elements in each question, it was decided that, insofar as possible, the questions would be taken at face value even though different people recorded them. It was also decided that only those data elements expressed explicitly in each question would be considered so as to avoid conceptual difficulties underlying semantic analysis of questions.

The analysis of data elements in requests for subject information presented problems, one of which is related to distinguishing between a main term and a subdivision term. For example, in a request for information on the Russian educational system, possible subject entries relating to this query could either be RUSSIA—EDUCATION, or EDUCATION—RUSSIA. In this case either term could take the form of a main or a subdivision term. In cases where subject data elements fall into the aforementioned category, the subject heading list used by the library was used as the authority for determining whether the subject data element was a main term or a subdivision term.

After the data elements in each reference question had been identified, each question was further analyzed and categorized as to the number of data elements present. Under each category, a further subclassification by data items was made. Within the one data element category, each data item content was enumerated, and for those requests with two or more data elements, the combination within each request was identified. The frequency of occurrence of each subclass was tallied. Table 1 displays the bibliographic structure categories and the relative proportions of the various combinations of data elements identified from reference questions in the sample.

THE NATURE OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC STRUCTURE

Assuming that the four major categories tabulated in table 1 constitute the probable bibliographic structure of reference questions, we proceed to extrapolate the frequency ratio of each category as a measure of probability of the bibliographic structure that reference questions would most likely take if tallies were made indefinitely. However, it should be made clear that any mathematical calculation of probabilities is made on the basis of empirical probabilities since a priori probabilities could only be obtained by an idealized experiment and no experiment can be repeated indefinitely. With a reasonably sufficient number of trials (in this case 2,270 questions), however, a probability can be estimated to a degree of accuracy.
### TABLE 1

**DISTRIBUTION OF DATA ELEMENTS IN REFERENCE QUESTIONS ANALYZED**

(N = 2270)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Elements</th>
<th>Number of Reference Questions</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walk-in</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One Data Element Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>851</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Two Data Elements Category** |         |           |     |       |         |
| AU/TI          | 290     | 64        |    | 354   | 15.59  |
| SU/FO          | 100     | 19        |    | 119   | 5.24   |
| SU/TW          | 33      | 14        |    | 47    | 2.07   |
| TI/ID          | 27      | 19        |    | 46    | 2.03   |
| SU/LA          | 21      |           |    | 21    | 0.93   |
| AU/FO          | 17      | 3         |    | 20    | 0.88   |
| AU/SU          | 6       | 5         |    | 11    | 0.48   |
| TI/TW          | 9       | 1         |    | 10    | 0.44   |
| TI/FO          | 8       | 2         |    | 10    | 0.44   |
| TI/DA          | 8       |           |    | 8     | 0.35   |
| SU/DA          | 4       | 3         |    | 7     | 0.31   |
| SU/SA          | 6       |           |    | 6     | 0.26   |
| FO/LA          | 4       |           |    | 4     | 0.18   |
| TI/DA          | 2       | 2         |    | 4     | 0.18   |
| FO/TW          | 2       |           |    | 2     | 0.09   |
| FO/ID          | 1       | 1         |    | 2     | 0.09   |
| TI/CO          | 1       | 1         |    | 2     | 0.09   |
| AU/SA          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| TI/PU          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| SU/TI          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| TI/ED          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| LA/TW          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| LA/SA          | 1       |           |    | 1     | 0.04   |
| **Total**      | 543     | 136       | 0  | 679   | 29.89  |

**Key:**
- AU - Author
- CN - Class Notation
- CO - Collation
- DA - Date
- ED - Edition
- FO - Format
- ID - Issue Designation
- IS - In-statement
- LA - Level of Approach
- NC - Number of Copies
- OR - On Order
- PL - Place of Publication
- PU - Publisher
- SA - Shelf Arrangement
- SC - Summary of Contents
- SE - Series
- SU - Subject
- SV - Source Verified
- TI - Title
- TW - Type of Work
TABLE 1 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Elements</th>
<th>Number of Reference Questions</th>
<th>Walk-in</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>TWX</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Data Elements Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/DA</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/FO</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/CN</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/NC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU/TW/LA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/TW</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/ED</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI/DA/FO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI/PU/DA</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four and More Data Elements Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU/PL/DA/SV</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU/DA/SV</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU/PL/FO/SV</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU/PL/DA/SV/CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/PU/SV</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU/TI/DA/IS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1416</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>99.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To ask the question “What is the probability of reference questions having only one data element present?” is essentially the same as asking “What fraction of all requests contain one data element only?” And this same question could very well be asked of requests in which two or more data elements occur. To answer the above questions it would be necessary to express the frequency of each bibliographic structure category as a proportion of reference questions by all possible combinations identified in table 1 expressed as:

\[ P(E) = \frac{n}{n+m} \]

in which

\[ P(E) = \text{the probability of a given event } E \]

\[ n = \text{the frequency of occurrence of the given event} \]

\[ m = \text{the frequency of all other events in the set} \]

Thus, applying the above frequency ratio formula to the data in table 1, we could conclude that 57.7 percent (2,270 requests analyzed) of all requests would fall under the one data element category if one continued to examine reference questions. Some 42.3 percent (959 cases) belonged to the two or more data elements group. Of this latter group, 29.89 percent (679 cases) consisted of two data elements, 1.83 percent (42
cases) consisted of three data elements, and 10.47 percent (238 cases) had four or more data elements.

Conversely, we can ask the question "What is the probability of any one of these aforementioned categories not occurring?" To answer this question we would use the following equation in calculating the probability of a given event not occurring:

\[
1 - P(A) = P(B) + P(C) + P(D)
\]

in which

\[
P(A) = \text{the one data element bibliographic structure}
\]
\[
P(B) = \text{the two data elements bibliographic structure}
\]
\[
P(C) = \text{the three data elements bibliographic structure}
\]
\[
P(D) = \text{the four and more data elements bibliographic structure.}
\]

Thus, the probability of A not occurring is .42, since

\[
\frac{2270 - 1311}{2270} = \frac{959}{2270} = .42
\]

and that of \( P(B) \) is equal to .70, \( P(C) \) equals .98, and \( P(D) \) equals .89. This indicates that requests are most likely to take a one data element bibliographic structure, since there is only a 42 percent chance that a reference question would not take a single data element structure. It is least likely that requests would have more than two data elements present since statistically their chances of occurrence are less than 15 percent.

The most striking characteristic of the bibliographic structure set is the sharp falling off after the first two categories. As might be expected, the one and two data element bibliographic structure categories are most likely to occur in reference questions. Taken together both these categories account for almost 87 percent of the total reference questions analyzed. In comparing the three data elements group and six data elements group in table 1 we find that the latter group occurs more frequently than the former. This is not surprising in view of the fact that reference questions classified under the six data element group were for the most part telephone requests for interlibrary loan, which required a complete bibliographic citation, i.e., author, title, imprint, source verified, etc. In addition, table 1 reflects the fact that the number of requests having a one data element bibliographic structure is almost twice as many as the two data element category, and thirty-one times more than the three data element group.

Within each bibliographic structure category in table 1, the specific data elements identified in reference questions are arranged according to frequency of occurrence. There are ten data elements identified as occurring independently of each other under the first category. For requests involving two or more data elements, forty-one combinations are identified. Of this group, twenty-three are combinations of two data elements, twelve have three data elements content, and six belong to the four and more data elements category.

These figures indicate that search clues in more than one-half (57.7 percent) of the requests are limited to single elements. Requests of this nature present no major difficulties either in the formulation of search
strategies or the need to design a sophisticated system. A simple look-up type of search is all that is necessary, particularly for queries wherein bibliographic elements such as author or title are given. Nonetheless, this does not quite work out with requests involving subject concepts. Requests falling under the one data element group have one major drawback in the sense that the search key is restricted to a single concept, and in the event that no match is made between query and database, subsequent search strategies are formulated with terms extrinsic to the request; whereas in requests consisting of two or more data elements, the presence of multiple key elements allows a degree of flexibility in the formulation of the search strategy.

It is an observable fact that retrieval elements in a system are not always compatible with user terminology. Conversely, users are not always conversant with the retrieval vocabulary in a system—a condition that often presents a serious problem in requests for subject information. Further, the probability of a successful retrieval involving requests with a one data element content tends to be less than one with a multiple data element content. For these reasons it cannot be underscored that in libraries where one data element bibliographic structure constitutes the bulk of requests, it is of practical importance that a better cross-referencing structure be built into the system to facilitate alternative paths of searching. This calls for the establishment of a feedback loop to the indexing process that allows the inclusion of the user's own terminology in the vocabulary list used for indexing materials, thus developing a system control oriented to an operating system. Techniques are needed to incorporate these user terms into the input process so that searching in the user's own terms can be accomplished.

A percentage ranking of bibliographic structure by frequency of occurrence is shown in table 2. The result reveals that requests for purely subject information account for at least 30 percent of the total set. Ranking closely in second and third positions are requests specifying the title of a work (16.2 percent) and those that identify both author and title (15.6 percent). In combination the latter two are slightly larger than the total of the subject structure. The author/title/publisher/place/data/source verified structure, which ranks in fourth position, cannot be considered a typical structure for requests since all were interlibrary loan requests.

Requests that give both subject and format are more than double the number of those giving subject and type of work or title and issue designation. The remaining forty-five bibliographic structures identified in the set fall below the 5 percent frequency of occurrence.

Of the fifty-one bibliographic structure sets identified in the requests examined, twelve do not include author, title, or subject elements. These three elements constitute the major access points in library files and, indeed, it is impossible to do a search if all of these elements are absent in a request. However, requests with none of these essentials total 100 and constitute only 4.4 percent of the sample. The question now arises—should provisions be made to facilitate response to this type of bibliographic structure?
### TABLE 2
PERCENT RANKING OF DATA ELEMENTS
IN QUESTIONS (N = 2270)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Element Content</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>31.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TI</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>16.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AU/TI</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>15.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>AU/TI/PU/PL/DA/SV</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AU</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SU/FO</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SU/TW</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TI/ID</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>AU/TI/PU/DA/SV</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>SU/LA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>AU/FO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>AU/TI/DA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AU/SU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TI/TW</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TI/FO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TI/LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>SU/DA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>SU/SU</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>SU/TI/FO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FO/LA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>TI/DA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>AU/TI/PU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>AU/TI/CN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SU/TW/LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>AU/TI/NC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FO/TW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>FO/ID</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>TI/CO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AU/TI/TW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>AU/TI/OR</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>AU/SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>TI/PU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>SU/TI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>TI/ED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- **AU**: Author
- **CN**: Class Notation
- **CO**: Collation
- **DA**: Date
- **ED**: Edition
- **FO**: Format
- **ID**: Issue Designation
- **IS**: In-statement
- **LA**: Level of Approach
- **NC**: Number of Copies
- **OR**: On Order
- **PL**: Place of Publication
- **PU**: Publisher
- **SA**: Shelf Arrangement
- **SC**: Summary of Contents
- **SE**: Series
- **SU**: Subject
- **SV**: Source Verified
- **TI**: Title
- **TW**: Type of Work
TABLE 2 (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Element Content</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LA/TW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>LA/SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/EI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TI/DA/FO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TI/PU/DA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/PU/SV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/PA/DA/IS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/PA/PL/PA/SV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AU/TA/PA/PL/DA/SV/CO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2270</td>
<td>99.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price made a dramatic remark on this issue:

Given that no library is ever absolutely complete we must weigh uniform increases in excellence, not against uniform increases in cost or size, but against doublings of those factors. Conversely one can economize by a factor of two for only linear decreases in utility. An information system has to be doubled in size — perhaps by more in cost — for every 5 percent increase in “value” of scholarship.  

Likewise Bourne stated that one can efficiently and economically satisfy some 90 percent of the user requirements, but to satisfy the remaining 10 percent would require a disproportionate increase in costs and efforts. Needless to say, with this approach there is a real need to determine specific retrieval elements and to establish a set of priorities in terms of what could be a workable approach. Lipetz addressed this issue in a study of users’ requirements in identifying desired works in a large library:

Data elements other than author, title, and subject are of definite value in resolving many searches in which the entry clues are ambiguous or inaccurate. Such data elements should probably not be abandoned entirely, even in a computerized catalog where data storage is very expensive. Further study is warranted on the costs and benefits of acquiring, storing and retrieving such data elements in order to determine their relative values or expendability.

A further examination of the frequency of occurrence of data elements in reference questions in table 2 suggest that it might be a Bradford-type data. This hypothesis was tested as follows:

(a) If a nucleus of 1 (number of types of questions) consisting of 708 questions represents the first zone, the result is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Types of Questions</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Zone</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Zone</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Zone</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Zone</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) If a nucleus of 2 (number of types of questions) consisting of 1,076
questions represents the first zone, the result is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>$2 \cdot x$</td>
<td>1,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>$13 \cdot bm$</td>
<td>1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>$169 \cdot (bm)^2$</td>
<td>beyond the table</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the first two zones in each case exhibit a Bradford-type data the subsequent zones do not quite fit into the Bradford phenomena. The data elements in these zones number more than would be predicted by the Bradford law of distribution. However, the above findings support to a certain extent the observation reported by Marulli and Koenig on the “Bradford phenomena in yet another bibliographic area.”

An examination of discrete constituent elements within categories consisting of two or more data elements, indicates that there are data elements that occur over and over in requests. To pinpoint more precisely which of these elements occur more frequently than others, a count was made of the total number of concurrences. As might be expected, the title data element is found to be present in twenty-seven of the forty-one combinations identified in the possibility sets, followed in frequency by the author data element. These two elements seem to comprise the ones most likely to be jointly mentioned with other elements in requests. The remaining aggregate rank of data elements is distributed among format (nine combinations), subject (eight combinations), type of work (six combinations), etc. Although the elements of date, publisher, and source verified rank as three, four, and six, respectively, it should be noted that these data elements were mostly cited in interlibrary loan requests, which required complete bibliographic citation. The remainder of the data elements received a variety of lesser combinations, with two (series and summary of contents) having no combinations at all. This information is tabulated in table 3.

A total count of the frequency of occurrence of each data element was also made with the purpose of determining the overall ranking of each regardless of the bibliographic structure a request took. Table 4 shows the result of this count. As shown in table 4, the title data element still ranks in first position. However, in this ranking the subject rather than the author element appears in second position.

The outcome of these various counts indicates that the three most known data elements in their order of frequency of occurrence as identified in requests addressed to a reference department in a small to medium-sized public library are: title, subject, and author. In general the findings concur with those in a number of studies undertaken during the past decade. Nelson Associates reported that 58 percent of the patrons had a specific title or author in mind while 39 percent were looking for materials on a particular subject. Lipetz’s study of users’ requirements undertaken for Yale University Library found that 62 percent sought the item through the author, 28.5 percent through the title, and 4.5 percent through the subject, and 4 percent through the editor. Title and author information were found to predominate over other clues as to their availability and accuracy. Palmer’s investigation of users’ requirements in using the card catalog at the University of Michigan General
TABLE 3
NUMERICAL RANKING OF THE NUMBER OF TIMES
A DATA ELEMENT OCCURS WITH OTHER ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Element</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Source Verified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Level of Approach</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Place of Publication</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shelf Arrangement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Issue Designation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Class Notation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>In-statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of Copies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>On Order</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Series</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Summary of Contents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
NUMERICAL RANKING OF OCCURRENCE OF
DATA ELEMENTS IN REFERENCE QUESTIONS (N = 4186)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Data Elements</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>1,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Source Verified</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Place of Publication</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Type of Work</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Issue Designation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shelf Arrangement</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Level of Approach</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Class Notation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Collation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Series</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Number of Copies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>On Order</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>In-statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summary of Contents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library found that almost 70 percent of the users were seeking a specific work. Less than 30 percent were searching for information on a subject, about 11 percent for bibliographical data, and less than 2 percent for other information.* In Marcus, Kugel, and Benenfeld's experiments in the use of catalog information (under Project Intrex), a catalog containing fifty different fields of information was set up for use in an interactive retrieval system. The actual use of the catalog in the operational environment tended to be concentrated in a few common fields. An analysis of the fifty fields indicated the "fact that title was requested most frequently explicitly, or implicitly with other short fields" suggested users' preference for titlelike entries.

It has been previously postulated that one can design a system capable of satisfying efficiently and economically only 90 percent of user requirements, but to satisfy the remaining 10 percent would require a disproportionate increase in costs and efforts. Using the numerical ranking of elements in table 4 as an index in determining the retrieval elements that should be included in the system to satisfy the 90 percent requirement, one discovers that the title, subject, and/or author constituted 67 percent of the data elements appearing in these requests. The 90 percent goal can be achieved with the addition of imprint information and source verified or format. An examination of table 1 shows that the format elements tend to combine with any one of the three common elements in .56 percent of the requests, occurs alone in 1.54 percent, and combines with five other elements in .04 percent of the requests. These results indicate that the conventional access points by author, title, and subject found in library files, imperfect as they are, satisfy user specifications reasonably well in terms of the retrieval of known items.

**Format of Material or Information Specified in Requests**

When requests were examined to determine the type of format specified by users, a majority of requests specified the book as the kind of material wanted. However, as the analysis progressed it seemed that patrons use the term "book" to mean any printed material. Since most patrons may not have made a distinction between "book" and other types of material, for purposes of the count the term "book" was disregarded. Of the total number of requests (2,270) only 259 (11 percent) of the requests made any reference to a specified format or type of work desired. Of note is the fact that users tend to be more aware in specifying the format of audiovisual materials. As might be expected—reviews and bibliographies rank high in table 5. This can likely be attributed to the fact that many students use the resources of the public library to do their school assignments. Within the other classes of materials and type of work, the variations are slight with a range of 6 percent or less.

In an attempt to determine further the format of material and infor-

---

*About 5 percent of the users surveyed in the Palmer study indicated that they were seeking both a specific work and information on a subject. Thus, the percentage adds up to more than a 100 percent.
TABLE 5
RANKING OF FORMAT OF MATERIAL OR INFORMATION
SPECIFIED IN REQUESTS EXCEPT FOR “BOOK”* (N = 259)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Format or Type of Material</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disc (Recorded Sound)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Picture</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Review</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Motion Picture</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Periodical</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>List or Catalog</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Journal Article</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Art Reproduction</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Map</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Newspaper Article</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Microfilm</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Large Print</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Music Score</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Tape (Recorded Sound)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Encyclopedia article</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Turtox Cards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A reference question may have more than one data element present, hence, the total number of data elements will add up to more than 259. It must also be emphasized that data elements are not mutually exclusive. For example, a question may specify more than one type of format, i.e., a newspaper article in microfilm.

In summary, the three most known data elements identified in reference requests (subject, title, and/or author) are found in nine-tenths (95 percent) of the requests in a sample of 2,270 requests for materials in a small to medium-sized public library. The three are the retrieval elements found in a library catalog. Insofar as retrieval elements are concerned, theoretically, the library catalog would be capable of satisfying more than 80 percent of the requests. The high percentage values of one data and two data element bibliographic structure sets indicate that user demands on the system in a small to medium-sized public library require
a simple file structure rather than a system that requires a complex matching operation of terms. If other retrieval elements are to be considered, imprint data, format, and type of work elements are potential candidates for addition.

The results of the study of requests and the nature of their bibliographic structure indicated two characteristics that have significance for the design of a bibliographic control system, namely, (1) the majority of requests are of a one data element structure, and (2) the title and subject elements are somewhat more likely to be present in requests than the author element. These characteristics of bibliographic structure present no major difficulties in the formulation of search strategies nor do they bespeak the need to design a sophisticated system for small to medium-sized public libraries. On the other hand these characteristics demonstrate the need to challenge the present emphasis on author access as the prime entry point to library files. Title access to files would come closer to user approach since the title element is found to be present in a significant number of requests for information.

From the viewpoint of the general user, present bibliographic information in a catalog entry provides sufficient information to support his or her needs. There is no immediate need for expanding access beyond the present levels provided in a library catalog, i.e., author, title, and subject elements.

It should be noted in closing that the methodology used in conducting the study itself constitutes one of the findings. The study has demonstrated that it is possible to determine user requirements for bibliographic information through the analysis of data elements present in user requests. It has also shown that users' past requests could be a primary source of feedback to the system.

On the basis of the results of the findings in the application of Bradford's law of distribution to data elements in bibliographic structure sets it is recommended that such relationships need to be further explored.

**References**
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Core Collection Development in a Medium-Sized Public Library

Carolyn Moore

This paper reports on a procedure built on the research of Trueswell and McGrath and based on the analysis of shelf and circulation samples of fiction and nonfiction according to subject, last circulation date, and publication date and supported by a user questionnaire. Two null hypotheses are considered: (1) When the 80/20 rule is tested, there will be no difference between fiction and nonfiction; (2) restructuring through weeding and adding will have no effect on the circulation to holdings ratio. To date, experience with the procedure at the Clearwater Public Library indicates that both hypotheses are false. The core collection in the public library is much larger than those reported by Trueswell, but fiction seems to have a somewhat smaller core than nonfiction. Restructuring has had little effect on low use sections of the nonfiction collection. Implications in public libraries are for priorities in the selection of areas of the collection for development and/or weeding.

The continuing goal of libraries in the late seventies and now into the eighties is to meet the challenge of heightened accountability for expenditure of public funds and to recognize the importance of user dynamics in decision making. In that spirit, a collection analysis was undertaken in 1979/80 to establish priorities and develop procedures for collection development for the main library in Clearwater, Florida, a medium-sized public library serving a population of about eighty-nine thousand with a book collection of some two hundred thousand volumes. An analysis of adult fiction and nonfiction, children’s fiction and nonfiction, young adult paperbacks, 16mm films, and recordings was undertaken. This paper will describe the methodology and results only of the adult fiction and nonfiction study.

Collection studies have been more frequently reported in academic libraries than in public libraries and reports on collection studies, in general, have increased in the past two years.

Various methods of evaluation have been used in the past—either alone or in combination, such as standard lists, subject experts, and
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quantitative measurements along with comparison to standards published by the American Library Association. The present trend is toward recognition of the use factor as most significant for collection evaluation.

American Library Association guidelines for the review of library collections suggest as criteria for assessment such variables as use, language, publication, or accession date. It is pointed out that the importance of each factor is relative to local situations. Katz affirms that evaluation falls into two parts: evaluating the collection itself quantitatively or qualitatively, and evaluation on the basis of how well the collection meets the needs of the community.

While Rose Mary Magrill cautions that circulation alone is too narrow a definition of use, most researchers suggest it is the strongest single factor upon which to base decisions. William McGrath has reported that a measure of circulation will reflect in-house use patterns. McGrath also addressed the question of how well the distribution of books in the shelflist agrees with the distribution of books used within Dewey divisions. He used Spearman's rank order correlation formula to correlate distribution of books in the shelflist with the distribution of circulation.

Bonn asserts that proportionate circulation statistics by subject class, compiled over a definite period of time, are excellent checks on selection policies and acquisitions rates when compared with proportionate holdings statistics by subject class. Ratio of use to holdings in specific subject classes, both expressed as percentage of respective totals, is the "use factor" for that subject class. "Use factors" can measure the intensity of use of all or part of the main collection — "what users think comes closest to evaluation in terms of goals."

Ann Basart, referring to a university music library, says that circulation activity and subject area profiles are the most important factors for weeding. Use as reflected by circulation activity is a better predictor of vitality than any other factor. Bedsole found circulation history to be most important in a special library as a method of evaluating a collection for weeding purposes; and Eggers has worked with circulation records analysis at Iowa City Public Library.

In a public library, a special library, and several academic libraries, Trueswell developed his "80/20 rule"; that is, 80 percent of the circulation is satisfied by 20 percent of the holdings. Other parameters also may be appropriate; for example, 99 percent of the circulation is satisfied by 50 percent of the holdings. The small number of books that circulate very frequently comprise a "core collection." Turner has proposed that the circulation core may be larger in public than in academic libraries. Much has been said about Trueswell's approach; Turner as well as Trueswell himself insists that many of those who have attempted to base work on Trueswell's research are guilty of serious misinterpretation. It is hoped such misinterpretation has been avoided in the present work, which involves identifying the parameters of certain selected divisions of the collection according to the 80/20 rule.

The relationship of circulation to holdings and the opinions of users are two elements that previous research indicates would be important in
evaluating effectiveness and in setting up priorities and procedures for improving service. Sloate, in his "Five Library Study," states "little is known about the relationship between holdings and use"; and Altman emphasizes that use is the significant factor in evaluation and declares that methods measuring user demands and how well these demands are satisfied are still in the process of refinement. The Clearwater study is an effort to refine further procedures for determining and improving user satisfaction relative to the public library collection.

The major portion of this project was accomplished from March 1979 to September 1980; but the project is ongoing. The library is not automated, and the project was the work of two people, the librarian in charge of collection development and a CETA library assistant I, hired especially for the project.

The fiction and nonfiction components were analyzed at separate times and will be discussed separately. However, the questionnaire distributed during the first three weeks of the nonfiction project contained questions on fiction as well as nonfiction.

In the analysis, two hypotheses were tested; each is stated as a null hypothesis: (1) when the 80/20 rule is tested, there will be no difference between fiction and nonfiction; (2) restructuring through weeding and adding will have no effect on the circulation to shelflist ratio.

**NONFICTION**

The first phase of the project was conducted for three weeks in March 1979, and three segments were done concurrently. First, the number of volumes of nonfiction were counted in each of the one hundred divisions of the Dewey system. The count was achieved by measuring the shelflist and assuming that one inch of cards equals one hundred volumes. The holdings were ranked from 1 to 100. Second, circulation data on all nonfiction circulated during a three-week period were collected, and the distribution of circulation among the one hundred divisions of Dewey was noted. The circulated nonfiction during the three-week period was 5,212 volumes or 10 percent of the holdings in nonfiction. All circulation was counted daily. Circulation was ranked from 1 to 100; nonfiction holdings and circulation were compared in terms of numbers of volumes held and numbers of volumes circulated.

Rank order was determined for use in ascertaining the strength of association according to Spearman's correlation formula: \( r_s = 1 - \frac{6 \cdot (D^2)}{n(n^2 - 1)} \)

This computation reveals a correlation of +.92, where the range of possibilities is from −1 to +1. The correlation is extremely high, but it is uncertain whether this is due to judicious selection or simply because circulation reflects what is available to be used. A test to determine which alternative may be true would involve selecting, building, and studying a subject area that appears to be in heavy demand according to the questionnaire but that did not appear high in circulation rank.
The third segment of the first three-week study involved a user questionnaire. It was anticipated that some areas of the collection would not show use by circulation due to lack of representation in the collection. Therefore, a questionnaire was used to elicit from patrons information that would help identify such weak but important areas. The first week, the questionnaire was given to everyone entering the library between 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m.; the second week, between 1:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m.; the third week, between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m. This arrangement covered 32 percent of the library’s open hours during the three-week period; allowed the same person to distribute questionnaires, give instructions, and answer questions; and covered the range of hours the library is open. The number of returned questionnaires was 2,193 out of 5,400 distributed. It was designed to yield information about what adult users of the nonfiction collection are looking for and whether they are finding it. A question concerning fiction preferences was included for use in the fiction study. The reliability of the patrons’ search was examined by questions concerning use of the card catalog and assistance from the reference librarian. The questionnaire data were summarized in tabular form according to fiction/nonfiction demand, type of nonfiction in demand, use of card catalog, use of reference service, and success/failure of search for material needed.

While questionnaires were being distributed and processed, additional work with circulation and holdings data was continuing. The ratio of circulation to holdings was computed for each category. The percentage of circulation and holdings distribution among larger categories was calculated: among fiction and nonfiction; and among the Dewey 100s.

Table 1 shows the percentage of holdings circulating in each subject category that was observed.

A null hypothesis under consideration is that restructuring through weeding and adding would have no effect on the circulation to holdings ratio, but it was expected that the lower the ratio the greater would be the benefit of assessment and restructuring. Similarly it was expected that the categories with the highest circulation to holdings ratios would respond the least to restructuring.

Priorities for detailed study in terms of the 80/20 rule and restructuring were assigned on the basis of the data and discussion above. An example of one such study is 610–619, seen in table 2. Last circulation date and publication date were obtained for a sample of circulation and holdings. A second ratio was also calculated at this time and compared with the ratio obtained in the first study. Some of the categories (see 610s, 770s, 820s, and 910s on table 3) were heavily developed and/or weeded between the two studies, and it was determined what effect this restructuring had upon circulation/holdings ratio. While the results so far are inconclusive, restructuring seems to have more effect on well-used divisions than on little-used divisions.

As shown in table 2 last circulation date and publication date information for each division were determined. Table 3 provides key interpretation, allowing comparison of the nine divisions as to size of core collection and—for those categories restructured by weeding and/or building
since the 79/80 study and questionnaire—the variation in circulation/holdings ratio between the two studies.

The division 770–779 (photography) had a 25 percent use factor in the early study and high demand on the questionnaire results. Consequently, it was heavily infused with new material. In the later study, the percentage of books borrowed increased to 33 percent. Eighty-five percent of the books on the shelf were last circulated in 1979 or 1980, while 94 percent of circulation had a last circulation date of 1979 or 1980. Therefore, 85 percent of the holdings is satisfying 94 percent of the circulation. The 770s are characterized by an extremely large core collection—far from Trueswell's 80/20 relationship.

A change in quality effected by weeding did not appear to affect significantly the large 910–919 section. Hundreds of outdated travel books were weeded, while new materials were added, but use remained at 9 percent. The core collection figure indicates that more weeding is needed: 69 percent of the holdings account for 90 percent of the circulation, and only 32 percent of the holdings have 1970–80 publication dates.

**FICTION**

The total number of fiction volumes was ascertained by shelflist measurement, the same method as was used with the nonfiction study. Then a 10 percent random sample of holdings was identified by subject. The subject designations are indicated on table 4. Certain of the categories were carefully defined; and the same individual classified each title, so that application of the subject designations would be consistent throughout. Each book received only one designation; and the more general categories of “best seller,” “classic,” “serious contemporary,” and “short stories” were considered first when assignments were made. Three types of data were collected for each volume: subject, publication date, and the last circulation date.

During the three-week period of data collection 6,260 titles or 20 percent of the fiction collection circulated. Again, subject, publication date, and last circulation date were noted for each volume.

Correlation between circulation and holdings was calculated using the Spearman formula, and circulation/holdings ratio was computed for each of the nineteen subject areas. Correlation between circulation and holdings was +.78 on a scale of −1 to +1, a very high positive correlation—though not as high as in the case of nonfiction.

Table 4 shows circulation/holdings ratio as well as percentages by subject of total fiction holdings and of total fiction circulation. The category of mystery is virtually without competition in its status as most popular fiction subject. It accounts for 47 percent of fiction circulation, and represents 30 percent of the fiction collection. A list of popular mystery authors has been compiled for use by librarians and patrons as a result of the survey.

Publication dates for the circulation sample and shelf sample are included in table 5. Significantly, only 21 percent of the holdings sample had publication dates in the 1970s or 1980s, while 57 percent of the circulation sample did so. Recency is not so important a factor for fiction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>000</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>300</th>
<th>Dewey Decimal Division</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>600</th>
<th>700</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320-329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>030-039</td>
<td>140-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>490-499</td>
<td>840-849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400-409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670-679</td>
<td>820-829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>410-419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>870-879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>020-029</td>
<td>270-279</td>
<td>340-349</td>
<td></td>
<td>570-579</td>
<td>600-609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>070-079</td>
<td></td>
<td>380-389</td>
<td></td>
<td>390-399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>160-169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>510-519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>540-549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>050-059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>580-589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>660-669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>810-819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>110-119</td>
<td>280-289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>700-709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>440-449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>220-229</td>
<td>330-339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500-509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240-249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>520-529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>170-179</td>
<td>200-209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550-559</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>720-729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250-259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>260-269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>080-089</td>
<td>130-139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230-239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>680-689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>290-299</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430-439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>710-719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>620-629</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>480-489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800-809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>150-159</td>
<td>590-599</td>
<td>610-619</td>
<td>730-739</td>
<td>920-929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>000-009</td>
<td>100-109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120-129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180-189</td>
<td></td>
<td>630-639</td>
<td>690-699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460-469</td>
<td>640-649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>770-779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2**

**Distribution of Last Circulation Date and Publication Date in Shelf and Circulation Sample (610-619)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Shelf</th>
<th>Circ.</th>
<th>Last Circulation Date</th>
<th>Shelf</th>
<th>Last Circulation Date</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>613</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>615</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>616</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>1970-79</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1960-69</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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circulation as for nonfiction circulation. In table 5 circulation is distributed from 1880 to 1980.

Most books circulating during the period of data collection had previously circulated during 1979/80. Ninety-four percent of the sample circulated previously in 1979/80; 6 percent had not circulated since 1978; the remaining 2 percent had a last circulation date ranging from 1969 to

### TABLE 3

**Comparison of Nine Divisions as to Size of Core Collection and Circulation/Holdings Ratio**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dewey Decimal Division</th>
<th>Percent of Titles</th>
<th>On Shelf LCD 79/80</th>
<th>Pub. Date</th>
<th>In Circulation LCD 79/80</th>
<th>Pub. Date</th>
<th>Circulation/Holdings Ratio (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restructured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610-619</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>770-779</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>820-829</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>910-919</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Restructured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-189</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190-199</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290-299</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570-579</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790-799</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the Shelf column LCD 79/80 refers to cases in which the last circulation date was in 1979-80; in the Circulation column it refers to cases in which the last circulation date prior to the three-week period of the study was in 1979-80. In both columns pub date denotes cases where the publication date is 1970-1980.

### TABLE 4

**Circulation/Holdings Ratio and Subject Distribution among Total Fiction Collection and Circulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Circulation/Holdings Ratio (Percent)</th>
<th>Percent of Fiction Collection</th>
<th>Percent of Fiction Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Best Sellers</td>
<td>103/68</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Contemporary</td>
<td>22/24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery</td>
<td>593/1938</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War</td>
<td>17/62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>4/20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Fiction</td>
<td>92/262</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>106/764</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>50/396</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>96/780</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topical</td>
<td>26/216</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stories</td>
<td>17/146</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>147/1326</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea</td>
<td>5/44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>8/80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>8/134</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>2/92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>2/93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>0/14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1977—with the majority in 1977. Forty-nine percent of the holdings is satisfying 92 percent of fiction circulation. In the case of nonfiction, 60 percent of the holdings is satisfying 94 percent of the nonfiction circulation. Therefore, it is likely that the hypotheses (when the 80/20 rule is tested, there is no difference between nonfiction and fiction core collections) is false. There is a difference between fiction and nonfiction in that the core collection of fiction is smaller. Use of last circulation date would seem to be a very effective method of weeding fiction, while publication date is not as reliable an indicator of potential use.

**CONCLUSION**

This project demonstrated (1) the importance of last circulation date and publication date in evaluation of materials and (2) the large size of the core collection in this public library. Continued testing will perhaps be conclusive in indicating that restructuring improves rate of use in well-used sections but has little effect on little-used sections.

In public libraries during budget-conscious times, the more appropriate use of funds would seem to be for materials in classes already well used. Employing the time and funds to build poorer quality, little-used sections is perhaps professionally desirable, but will not result in the desired increase in circulation nor, presumably, better satisfy the needs of patrons.
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Variant Edition Cataloging on OCLC: Input or Adapt?

Douglas A. Cargille

The question of whether to input a new record or to adapt an existing record when cataloging variant editions is addressed. In the OCLC environment, arguments from the standpoint of both economy and interlibrary loan service appear to favor the use of the NEW command for the input of a new record.

In TECHNICAL SERVICES the increasing availability of machine-readable catalog information from various national sources has led to widespread use of shared cataloging data among network members. The overall effects of the changeover to an automated system have been widely documented, but some of the subtler effects also deserve our attention. The introduction of an automated cataloging system changes the background against which cataloging decisions are made and a failure to reexamine the premises behind our decisions can result not only in increased costs but also in poorer service to our patrons.

The decision whether to adapt an existing record in a database or to input a new record when cataloging a variant edition can serve as an example. Too frequently in a postautomation environment this key decision has been equated with the preautomation decision of whether to use “original cataloging” or to use “copy cataloging” based upon data generated by the Library of Congress. When we look at the basis of the preautomation decision, we can see how conditions have changed. As financial pressures mounted on libraries over the past decade, many instituted dual-track cataloging systems. Typically, this procedure has meant that materials for which LC copy was available were routed to a copy cataloging unit generally staffed by paraprofessionals, and materials for which no LC copy was available were sent to an original cataloging unit usually staffed by professional librarians. Naturally, the exact definition of “LC copy” was critical under such a framework as it determined the path any individual book would take. Since the copy cataloging pathway was considered to be less costly, there was continuous pressure for a broad and inclusive definition of “LC copy.” In many libraries, a book was considered to have LC copy (and thus be destined for copy cataloging) if LC copy was available for any edition of the work. Thus, if
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the edition in hand contained a London imprint and LC copy was available for the New York imprint of the same work, the paraprofessional would alter the copy to reflect the edition in hand and perhaps add a date to the call number or a letter to that date. The effect of such policies was to reserve subject and classification decisions to the professional librarians while allowing paraprofessionals broad discretion to alter descriptive cataloging. The financial advantages of such policies were obvious and may have resulted in the changing ratio of paraprofessionals to professionals in many libraries.

With the advent of automated cataloging networks, such dual-track systems would seem easy to adapt to the new environment. The paraprofessionals operate the terminals and catalog those books for which LC copy is available and the professional librarians prepare the necessary input forms for those items for which no copy is available in the database. Items for which exact, but non-LC, "submitted" copy is available tend to be handled in different ways by different libraries, depending on the degree of responsibility allotted to the paraprofessionals, the level of commitment to LC practices, and various other criteria.3

At first it would appear that no major change in preautomation instructions and areas of responsibility is required, but let us look at the same problem of the London versus the New York imprint under the new automated environment. The paraprofessional has the London imprint of a work in hand but is able to locate LC copy for the New York edition only. There is no record for the London imprint. The natural tendency here can be to alter the imprint of the existing record, add a date or letter to the date in the call number, and catalog the item on the existing record. In a preautomation setting, the book clearly would have fallen within the area of responsibility of the paraprofessional and without an explicit change in instructions could continue to be cataloged in an automated system in much the same manner. Given the widespread assumption that it is less time-consuming to adapt an existing record (something a paraprofessional can do) than to prepare an input form for a new record (something a professional librarian must do), the continuance of the old pattern can go unchallenged. But let us take a closer look at the effects of this practice. First, from a cost standpoint, the library has avoided the time expenditure necessary to input a new record but it has expended some time in altering the existing record and it has incurred a "first-time use" charge in addition. Second, from a service standpoint, the library has added its holding symbol to an item in a national database when, in fact, the library does not have that item.

As to the first point, are we in fact using the most economical way of cataloging the book? Since the most widely used cataloging network, OCLC, Inc., offers a way of adding a new record to the database built up from an existing record (the NEW command), the economic advantages of copy cataloging may have changed.4 A simple study was conducted in our library in the summer of 1979 to test the advantages of altering an existing record versus adding a new record and the results were surprising. The time required to alter an existing record was defined as the period from the decision to alter the record until the decision to produce.
The time required to add a new record based upon an existing record via the NEW command was defined as the period from the decision to add a new record until the completed new record was placed in the SAVE file. In addition, the time required by a librarian to proofread the new record after its addition to the SAVE file was added to the total. This proofreading period was felt to be essential and reflects the library's commitment to minimize the errors in records added to the online database. The sample consisted of twenty English language books for which no exact matching copy was available in the online catalog but for which records for related editions were present. The records were divided into two groups of ten books each: A, where the record for the related edition was an LC MARC record and B, where the related edition was represented by an OCLC member-library submitted record. It soon became apparent that the degree of "relatedness" of the existing record to the item in hand was the most important factor affecting the time required either to modify the existing record or to form a new record via the NEW command. The path selected was clearly of less significance. Records that required extensive modification to add via the NEW command, also required extensive modification to catalog using the existing records. Whichever path was selected, records closely resembling the item in hand required much less time.

As remarked above, the results of the test were surprising. The time required to alter an existing record was an average six minutes per book while the time required to add a new record was eight minutes per book with an additional three minutes required to proofread the new record. There was no significant time difference between group A books and group B books. * When considering these times, remember that all of the processes common to both paths, e.g., search time, were excluded from the time measured. One question immediately presents itself: Does a time savings of five minutes per item justify the incurrence of a first-time-use charge of circa $1.36? The answer, of course, depends upon the salary scale in the individual library, but any financial savings would appear to be marginal at best.

Those records requiring extensive modification presented another, perhaps more important choice. Several of the paraprofessional terminal operators, when faced with a record needing extensive changes, preferred to construct a new record on a blank workform rather than to use the existing record as a basis for a new one. Despite some effort, it has so far proven difficult to develop a set of guidelines to aid in this choice. Given the wide range of variation among items considered related, perhaps allowing idiosyncratic preference by the terminal operator will prove to be the best, if not the most strictly efficient, choice. As is shown above, the use of the NEW command is not without problems. The

*In actual cataloging practice, member-submitted records require significantly more time. In our library a printout of the related record is sent with the book to a librarian who checks and/or modifies the call number, entries, and subject headings. The book is then returned to the terminal operator for input. This time was excluded from the study as not pertinent to the question of whether to catalog on an existing record or to add a new record via the NEW command.
requirement to add ISBD punctuation to the new record when the existing record is in pre-ISBD format is a case in point. Punctuation has not, however, proven to be particularly difficult or time-consuming. The changes are usually limited to three areas of description, the 245, 260, and 300 fields, and two of these, the imprint and collation, frequently require modification when dealing with variant editions. In any case, the problem should ease as the percentage of records in ISBD format in the online catalog continually increases.

The second point—the addition of a library's holdings symbol to an item it does not actually have—has obvious implications for interlibrary loan. As a higher and higher percentage of the holdings of the nation's libraries becomes accessible through the various automated cataloging networks, interlibrary loan staffs will increasingly turn to the network databases as their first recourse in locating an item. It is difficult to say what percentage of loan requests can be satisfied by any edition of a work rather than the particular edition requested, but in our library over one-third of the requests specify an edition. The amount of time wasted, not only by interlibrary loan staffs but also by users, in sending requests for materials not actually held by the library receiving the request is a powerful argument for assuring that national tools for locating materials accurately reflect the participating libraries' holdings.

Given the above conditions, just when should a new record be entered? While all networks have fairly stringent regulations to prevent the proliferation of duplicate records, duplication is defined in very strict terms. These restrictions generally allow a new record to be input if there is any variation from the existing record with the exception of different printing dates. While the distinction between variant printings and variant editions is not always easy to make, the problem at least has the virtue of familiarity. Given the wide latitude allowed, the arguments from both economic grounds and from a service standpoint would seem to favor the addition of a new record whenever the standards permit it. The real choice in an automated environment is not when to add a new record but rather whether the new record should be built from scratch on a blank workform or whether an existing record can serve, via the NEW command, as the basis for the new record. If the funding pressures on libraries continue, as it appears they will, and the needs of our patrons for accurate bibliographic tools are to be met, a unique record for each unique edition appears to be the only choice.
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Incredible Past, Incredible Future

Allen B. Veaner

In reviewing the impact of document reproduction and micrographic technology on librarianship and scholarship, the question is how to begin. I thought it would be appropriate and useful to try to combine a number of brief scenarios along with some chronicling of events—in order not to get into a dull recitation of facts. I also thought I ought to go back more than twenty-five years into the past but I am most reluctant to go forward even that much, as I am extremely conscious of the hazards of predicting the future. David Sarnoff, when he was chairman of the board of RCA, forecast in 1966 that the home computer would by the end of the century revolutionize people’s life-styles and enable them to experience a succession of careers in their lifetimes. Multiple careers have become a commonplace even without the home computer and the latter has burst forth like so many spring flowers—“Apple” blossoms, some would say. But let me try to begin with a look at the world of micrographics and reprography approximately fifty years ago, say from 1930 forward.

Yesterday

The only practical device for photocopying scholarly materials in 1930 was the Photostat, the first of which was installed at the New York Public Library about 1912 I believe. A manually operated machine, the type most common in libraries, might produce some dozen to twenty copies per hour, depending upon the originals and the skill of the operator. It was a messy, wet process. Even during Depression days the cheapest print was five times as costly as is currently paid for a Xerox or other electrostatic copy. At that time a few hardy souls were doing their own document photography with 35mm cameras—with the Leica, then the world’s only precision 35mm camera, the first of which came off the production lines in 1925. Those people used motion-picture film, usually on an inflammable nitrate base, and more than likely they developed their own films in an improvised darkroom in the bathroom. There were no professional microfilm cameras capable of production work. We didn’t have those in the U.S. until about 1936.
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It was not until 1956, that xerography came into libraries with some very clumsy manual equipment that nevertheless began slowly to revolutionize the ugly, unpleasant job of reproducing catalog cards. Xerography made good offset masters; Treyz, then at Yale, and now director of libraries at the University of Wisconsin, pioneered this application.

Three years later, in 1959, Xerox introduced the 914 copier which at last began to automate library photocopying. A production rate of seven prints a minute was regarded as a staggering feat—and it was when compared with the Photostat process. From then on Xerox and competing manufacturers improved and perfected their machines so that today no one thinks any more about getting a photocopy than about using a typewriter or a coin-operated telephone.

In micrographics there was additional progress too: late in the 1930s publishing companies were formed to reissue in microform rare books and works long out of print and to publish doctoral dissertations. A few of the early pioneers became millionaires in that business. Since that time millions of bibliographic items previously available only in remote archives or hard-to-get-to libraries at home or abroad suddenly became available in the country's major research libraries. Of course, nobody knew they were there—because the microform publishing industry was more intent on sales than on bibliographical control. Yet today, the pressures of many, many years are beginning to bear fruit and it seems that it will not be long before catalog entries for the full contents of massive microform projects will enter the computerized files of the major bibliographic utilities. We have the persistence of both the American Library Association and the Association of Research Libraries to thank for this.

In the 1960s the microfiche came into prominence as a microform publishing medium, not so much from industry enterprise as from government pressure. The government sought a single, unified format for fiches, which until then came out in numerous incompatible sizes all of which generally required incompatible equipment for reading. Some people, by the way, still think the microfiche is a modern invention or even something that originated from the need to distribute reports of government-sponsored research, especially those related to aerospace. Few people know that the microfiche was conceived early in the twentieth century by a Belgian archivist, Paul Otlet, who published a proposal for the microfiche some years before the First World War.¹

Also in the 1960s and early 1970s several commercial organizations began to explore the idea of using super-reduced microfiches—ultrafiches—to republish entire libraries. The idea was to sell "package libraries" to the many new colleges that were being established to accommodate the huge expansion of higher education. The whole ultrafiche experience was a good example of a solution in search of a problem—cures for which there are no diseases. Even if higher education had not undergone a severe and sudden contraction, it is doubtful whether the "package library" was the right application of ultrafiche. One of the things we have learned about technology is that the existence of a certain technical capability is no reason in and of itself to apply it.
Several other events of the past quarter century might also be worth mentioning. This was the period of dramatic growth of the National Microfilm Association, founded about 1952 and later renamed the National Micrographics Association. A trade and professional organization, the NMA fostered a major expansion of micrographics in business and industry but contributed only modestly to library applications. The library market was then and still is insignificantly small and is not likely to become a dominant force. So, I would not forecast a growing relationship between the library community and micrographics although obviously microforms will continue to be very useful for a long time to come.

Another area in which librarians made significant contributions to reprography and micrographics is standards. The Library of Congress very early—about 1950—developed some guidelines for microfilming scholarly and research materials. These were further amplified by the predecessor of the Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS), the RTSD's Copying Methods Section, which produced Microfilm Norms in the early 1960s. The Library of Congress also refined its own guidelines and produced a set of specifications for their own microfilming—LC specs later became more or less a de facto national standard. Librarians also contributed extensively to the publication of standards for microfilming newspapers.

A third area where librarians have been extremely active pertains to preservation, permanence, and durability. The appearance of “microfilm measles” some twenty years ago challenged earlier claims about the longevity of microforms, many of which had been utilized in the interest of preserving deteriorating materials. That issue is of course still very much alive and is by no means near solution. You are all undoubtedly aware that the U.S. National Archives has challenged afresh its own microfilming program and that the government is at last beginning to take a closer interest in the durability of its own archival materials. The now well-known history surrounding an unfortunate first attempt to apply vesicular film to library materials need not be repeated. Suffice it to say that we still lack standard test methods to determine whether nonsilver films have been processed adequately to assure their durability even within the claims made by the manufacturers. But at least the public’s level of consciousness has been raised on a national level now. For many years RTSD/RLMS has played an important and persistent leadership role in maintaining an awareness of the preservation problems of microforms, has played a devil’s advocate role, and has been an invaluable “thorn in the side” of those who care little about product durability.

We also have made notable progress in the design and production of microform reading equipment. Though much remains to be done, today’s machines are in general a vast improvement over their predecessors. We have a few good motorized readers, an abundance of reader/printers, and a few devices that are completely under program control with a handheld command module enabling immediate access to selected frames.

Microforms have also earned a good reputation as backup facilities for
online databases; the more we become dependent upon online facilities, the greater the need for backup.

**TODAY**

In the 1980s, photocopy equipment is now becoming so compact and inexpensive that purchase of a private photocopy device is well within the reach of many; several manufacturers now offer such devices at less than $1,000. We have an abundance of relatively low-cost, high-precision single lens reflex cameras and computer calculated lenses especially suited to individual microphotography for those persons willing to go to the trouble of doing their own microcopying. Even film development has become partially automated for the private individual; there are now some devices that are easier to use than traditional hand-loaded reels and tanks. This application remains very useful for that collection of manuscripts in the remote monastery or those inscriptions in the faraway desert.

An important new technological development is the electrostatic photocopier employed as a computer output device—it prints computer output at high speed directly onto paper. Cousins of these machines print computer output directly onto microfilm; these are the COM devices that have made it so easy for public and small academic libraries to substitute microform catalogs for card catalogs.

Another development of the past generation has been the high production photocopy machine that is virtually a complete, self-contained printing plant. Several manufacturers now offer equipment that exceeds the wildest fantasies of the scholars and publishers of twenty-five years ago. Under the control of the microcomputer—itself a device conceivable only to the comic-strip artist of yesterday—the devices not only copy, they enlarge or reduce, they collate and staple, and they employ forms projection devices to tailor documents according to some existing graphic design. We must concede that in terms of the 1930s and even the 1950s these devices are truly fantastic.

**TOMORROW**

The foremost challenge to current technology is undoubtedly the videodisc. But we probably need to be wary of the promises made for the new system—promises about indestructibility and permanence. We have been bitten by that bug before and it’s not the bite that hurts but the inflammation that comes later. Currently, videodisc is suitable only for edition publishing; its technology is so complex and specialized that it will be a long time, if ever, before the videodisc can be copied by an individual. I ought to add that if a copying method for the videodisc is ever devised, we can be sure that it will incorporate a metering or authorization device that will assure payment of appropriate copyright royalties—the technology exists today to accomplish this. It would be done with the microprocessor.

Despite the vast technological progress of the past generation, there remain a few areas where conditions are not much different from what they were seventy-five years ago. I refer to the almost complete absence
of devices suitable for copying from bound volumes without destructive impact on bindings. Since so much of our paper is of poor quality, perhaps this problem is now of less consequence, with the danger that the paper may deteriorate before the binding. The only system in which books are held more or less properly is that in use for microfilming when a book holder or book cradle is used. Even those devices are not of the best. It is to be hoped that when facsimile devices are further developed they could be adapted to copy from bound volumes held in the upright position.

I have spoken elsewhere about the potential of digitizing systems as a tool for preservation. It would be a formidable challenge to develop systems for digitizing civilization's existing store of print and graphic materials. These materials come in all shapes, sizes, colors, and designs. Yet we have seen in the digitized photographs from space probes what digitizing can do for high-precision storage and transmission of information. The possibility of reducing much of our printed and graphic heritage to digitized form cannot be ignored, even though it would be very costly. Let us not forget that it was not very long ago—I remember hearing it in 1968—that people were saying online systems for libraries were totally impractical and the computer had very little place in the library. Nowadays—returning to this issue of digitizing graphic data—even the highly advanced centers which apply the computer to mapping and satellite imagery already have the capability of digitizing and manipulating photographic and mapping data of extraordinary complexity. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology does this routinely and the Map and Imagery Laboratory at the University of California at Santa Barbara Library is planning to offer this facility at some future time. Much depends upon costs—digital systems are still extraordinarily expensive. But prices keep coming down. The great advantage of the digital system is that is has redundancy built into it and this offers the potential of protection against ultimate destruction or damage, a potential that may offset its costs or at least make its use worth investigating if we are to stand any chance to preserve our past. There is now very little time left to conserve, restore, and preserve the record of the past 150 years. In the century to come, we risk knowing a lot about the era before 1800 and not much at all about the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. These risks and dangers are tremendous challenges to research and investigation. I hope they produce successful and useful results for future generations of scholars.
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From: A. J. Edwards, law librarian, University of Otago Library, Dunedin, New Zealand. — In her article, “Sources for Determining Citation Practice for Court Reports Throughout the World” (LRTS 25: 139-48 (April/June 1981) Phyllis C. Marion laments that “there are very few source materials that baldly state that ‘such and such’ is the citation practice applicable to a given country.”

As far as the British Isles and the British Commonwealth (interpreted in its widest sense) are concerned, salvation is at hand! The two volume Manual of legal citations (London; Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, University of London, 1959-60) gives authoritative statements of citation practice, not only for court reports but also for all forms of legislation. Lists of accepted abbreviations, which demonstrate citation practice more accurately than bibliographical lists, are included.

For succinct bibliographic information on the legislation of all parts of the Commonwealth, from Africa to the Caribbean, the Manual is an essential acquisition for academic law libraries.

Editor's note: Letters sent to the editor for publication in this column cannot be acknowledged, answered individually, or returned to the authors. Whenever space is available in an issue, selected letters will be published, with little or no editing, though abridgment may be required. Letters intended for publication should be typed double-spaced.
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Report of the President

Karen Horny

1980/81 has been a year of challenge, occasional perplexity, and constant stimulation in activities focused on resources and technical services. As RTSD, the largest type of activity division, reached its silver anniversary, membership grew to over six thousand and an impressive variety of projects were brought to fruition or newly launched. In the twenty-five years since the Cataloging and Classification Division joined with the Board on Acquisition of Library Materials and the Serials Round Table to form the Resources & Technical Services Division, development has proceeded in a steady and responsive manner, exemplified by the inauguration of the new Preservation of Library Materials Section (PLMS) in 1980/81. Under the leadership of its first chair, Nina Root, PLMS has most successfully established itself as a full-fledged section, already fourth largest in membership of the division’s five sections.

Membership promotion received considerable attention as the anniversary approached and a new brochure, emphasizing the “nuts and bolts” practicality that members can find in RTSD activities and accomplishments, has just been printed. The Membership Committee, chaired by Murray Martin, also developed an “RTSD Committee Member” ribbon to be worn on conference badges and a silver anniversary button which tied in with the San Francisco Conference site, “RTSD, the Information Bridge.” The slogan, suggested by Mary Ann Robinson, was the winner in a contest announced through the RTSD Newsletter. A twenty-fifth anniversary “Bash and Bay Cruise” and a major program, “Looking toward the 21st Century” were also part of the celebration. Other divisional programs for 1981 included: “Collection Development: Are We Preaching What We’re Practicing? A Dialogue between Practitioners and Educators” cosponsored by the Resources Section and the RTSD Education Committee, “Cataloging Audiovisual Materials Using AACR2” cosponsored by the RTSD Audiovisual Committee and the Music Library Association Cataloging Committee, “Authorities: Persons, Corporate Bodies, and Series” cosponsored by the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS), the Serials Section, and the LITA Information Science and Automation Section, “In Order to Form a More Perfect Union . . . List of Serials” cosponsored by the RTSD Serials Section Ad Hoc Committee on Union Lists of Serials and the RTSD Council of Regional Groups, “Tough Questions for Tight Times: The Economics of Children’s Books” cosponsored by the RTSD Resources Section and the Association for Library Service to Children, “Adult Literacy: Programs and Materials” cosponsored by the RTSD/Association of American Publishers Joint Committee and the PLA Alternative Education Programs Section, “Video Disc: State of the Art

The prevalence and notable range of program cosponsorship speaks well for the communication among groups sharing common interests. Special attention to program planning has occurred as RTSD formally adopted an eighteen-month cycle with contact requirements for potential cosponsors. Program planning has also benefited substantially from the excellent work of Bill Drewett, RTSD program officer, who recently completed his second year in this new position. Future program plans now under way include a preconference on the online catalog and a "conference within the conference" on research for Philadelphia in 1982.

A new program feature for San Francisco was a postconference, the pilot institute on "Collection Management and Development," which RTSD has designed to be replicated as regional programs. A grant from the Council on Library Resources has assisted in this effort.

Outreach via regional RTSD institutes established an impressive precedent with this year's fourteen highly successful RTSD/LC AACR2 training institutes which reached over twenty-two hundred librarians. The outstanding participation of staff of the Library of Congress was recognized by presentation of a citation plaque and certificates at the San Francisco RTSD Membership Meeting. The division's Council of Regional Groups also played a major role in the AACR2 programs, enlisting the assistance of eighteen of its thirty-one affiliates. CRG has recently produced an excellent brochure to inform other prospective member groups of its important activities and services.

A major occurrence of 1980/81 was the publication of the ALA Filing Rules, developed by RTSD's Ad Hoc Filing Committee, chaired by Joseph Rosenthal. These rules have been extremely well received and the RTSD Board has passed a resolution of thanks to the committee members for their outstanding accomplishment. Other new publications of the division include the Directory of Speakers for Serials Workshops, Directory of Union Lists of Serials, First Annual Bibliography of Articles and Monographs on Serials, and the Preservation Education Directory: Educational Opportunities in the Preservation of Library Materials.

The division's journal, Library Resources & Technical Services, under the editorship of Elizabeth Tate, has marked the anniversary year with a special silver cover with a prominent "25" for the Volume 25 issues. Content includes special features, from invited papers on the sources for determining citation practice for court reports and a twenty-five-year retrospective review of preservation activities in the USA to the winners of a competition for papers by master's degree students at ALA-accredited library schools.

The RTSD Newsletter completed its first volume in its expanded format on a six issue per year schedule. Both the Newsletter and LRTS are now available on a separate subscription basis as well as via divisional membership. Continuing to provide innovative leadership, Arnold Hirshon, RTSD Newsletter editor, recently announced the introduction of two new columns as regular features; a "Research" column will be edited by Daniel O'Connor and a "Library Exchange" column concerned with special projects and activities will be edited by Colleen Bednar.

Of course the recent second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules has received much attention. A substantial debate arose over application of the rules to microform and other reproductions of previously existing works and the
RTSD CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) held hearings and formed a task force to address these concerns. Frances Hinton, the ALA RTSD representative on the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR has been chosen by that committee as its chair.

In other international activities, RTSD, acting upon the report recommendations of its Ad Hoc International Cataloging Consultation Committee, chaired by John Byrum, established a new International Relations Committee. E. Dale Cluff has accepted appointment as the committee's first chair. The RTSD Board acted upon additional recommendations by endorsing divisional representation at international meetings, exploring the possibility of ALA's again becoming U.S. distributor for IFLA and International Office for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC) publications, and directing the division president to feature international activities prominently in the annual report. The board also forwarded to ALA Council a resolution in support of an "open meeting" policy for international meetings, which Council in turn endorsed during its San Francisco meetings. In addition, the RTSD CCS CC:DA established a task force to respond to the IFLA UBC call for comments on international standard bibliographic description texts as part of its five-year review program. At Midwinter 1981, the appropriate RTSD section executive committees made recommendations, resulting in subsequent election, for members of the IFLA Sections on Cataloguing, Classification and Subject Headings, Exchange and Acquisition, and Serial Publications. During 1980/81 RTSD also sent Norman Shaffer to participate in the meeting of the International Organization for Standardization Micrographics Committee.

RTSD involvement in standards work includes representation on the American National Standards Committee Z39, Library Work, Documentation, and Related Publishing Practices. On behalf of RTSD, Susan Vita has been active in the reviewing and voting on a variety of standards, including those for a single title order form and guidelines for the format and production of scientific and technical reports.

Recognizing the financial impact of the development and adoption of codes and standards, and following upon a discussion with James Govan, chair of the Association of Research Libraries Task Force on Bibliographic Control, the RTSD Board requested that the RTSD Technical Services Costs Committee, chaired by Peter Graham, review its function statement and provide recommendations about responsibility for impact studies of changes in codes and standards related to RTSD's areas of interest.

At Midwinter the RTSD Board reviewed and endorsed in principle the several GODORT "Guidelines Adopted by the State and Local Documents Task Force." Other Board action expressed support and appreciation for the work of MARBI (the joint RTSD/RASD/LITA Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information) which has resulted in its excellent working relationship with LC and the networks. The board also endorsed the matter of a class-action suit by ALA against Frank and Michael Gille to recover damages for publications prepaid but never published, expressed support for exemption of publishers backlists from the IRS ruling on the Thor Power Tool decision, and passed a resolution of support for the Library of Congress and the Government Printing Office at the time of the congressional budgetary review.

Also at Midwinter, the RTSD Board endorsed in principle the statements of interpretation of the "Library Bill of Rights" and voted to forward to Council the Report of the RTSD CCS Subject Analysis Committee Racism and Sexism in Subject Analysis Subcommittee (ad hoc) in response to the 1977 Council directive that RTSD "develop a coordinated plan for the reform of cataloging prac-
tics that now perpetuate prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination because of race, sex, creed, color and national origin." The Board continued to recognize broad professional priorities by again including a contribution to the Freedom to Read Foundation in the coming year's budget.

During its Midwinter 1981 sessions, ALA Council adopted a resolution initiated by the RTSD Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group, approved by the Board and presented by RTSD Councilor Elizabeth Herman, which urges the establishment of an electronic interconnection between networks to enhance CONSER participation. This resolution has been forwarded to the CONSER Advisory Group. The RTSD Councilor also called an informal meeting of all divisional councilors at the Midwinter Council Breakfast to share ideas as to how to make their role most effective.

In a similar spirit of cooperation, the RTSD and LITA Boards met jointly to discuss common interests. As a result of that meeting, the RTSD Board gave the member-at-large of the Organization and Bylaws Committee the additional charge of serving as liaison to the LITA Bylaws and Organization Committee and charged a member-at-large of the RTSD Planning and Research Committee to serve as liaison to the LITA Program Planning Committee. These ties are intended to facilitate continued regular communication on matters of mutual concern.

In recent discussions of the draft "Operating Agreement among ALA and Its Divisions," RTSD's broad professional concerns have led the Board to strongly support unity and advocate strength for ALA as vital to its divisions, chapters, and members.

During the past year, individuals too numerous to mention in the brief space of this report have carried out the work of the various divisional and sectional committees and contributed to the effectiveness of the twenty-one discussion groups. Two new division level committees held their first meetings, Preservation Microfilming, chaired by Norman Shaffer, with representatives from each section, and Commercial Technical Services, chaired by Mary Ghikas, which includes two appointees from commercial organizations and a liaison from the RASD Catalog Use Committee.

Also in the planning stages is an interdivisional Catalog Form, Function and Use Committee. RTSD's proposal has received expressions of interest in participation from eight of the ten other divisions. Official establishment of the Committee has just been recommended by ALA's Committee on Organization.

The division's three awards committees were successful in identifying appropriate and notable recipients. For the Esther J. Piercy Award, which identifies outstanding promise in the work of a librarian with no more than ten years of professional experience, the 1981 winner is Sally H. McCallum. The CCS Margaret Mann Citation, which recognizes outstanding achievement in cataloging or classification was awarded to Sanford Berman, and the Resources Section's award for the year's most significant publication in the area of resources development recognized Collection Development in Libraries: A Treatise, edited by Robert D. Stueart and George B. Miller, Jr. The division is most grateful to Blackwell/North America for offering support for the Resources Section's award, which provides a $1,000 scholarship to be donated to a library school designated by the author(s) of the winning publication. This year the scholarship goes to Simmons. The award will now be known as the Resources Section Blackwell/North America Scholarship Award. All RTSD awards were announced and presented at the Annual Membership Meeting.

Outstanding contributions to RTSD must also be recognized from the division's headquarters personnel. William Bunnell, RTSD Executive Director,
has met all of the year's many challenges with remarkable efficiency, excellence, and good humor. The fourteen regional institutes have created heavy extra demands upon Mr. Bunnell, our Program Officer, Bill Drewett, and our exceptionally fine Administrative Assistant, Katherine Brodesser. They all merit our highest praise.

Speaking personally, my work during my presidential year has been made infinitely easier not only by the quality of headquarters assistance but also by the notable accomplishments of my predecessor, William Gosling, who, due to unusual circumstances, served as RTSD's President for two years. It would be difficult to find a person more advantageous for such double service. In addition, the incoming president, Charlotte Hensley, is already making the kind of valuable contributions that promise an excellent year ahead and will help to assure RTSD's continued success in meeting the challenges of its second 25 years.

Cataloging and Classification Section

Nancy J. Williamson, Chairperson

For CCS and its members the year 1980/81 will be memorable. Not only was it the year of RTSD's silver anniversary, but it also heralded, finally, the launching of AACR2 into the world of cataloging practice. From the inevitable aftermath of rule interpretations and demands for revisions, it was abundantly clear that the debate on AACR2 was far from over. Nevertheless, by the time conference delegates arrived in San Francisco, there was a sense that the section’s activities had reached a threshold and turning point, and the search was on for new initiatives to pursue and new worlds to conquer. Springboards in this process were two program meetings which brought CCS and its members closer to the approaching electronic age.

"Is there a Catalog in Your Future? Access to Information in the Year 2000?" the CCS contribution to the RTSD Silver Anniversary Program, was an attempt to peer through the haze of the next twenty-five years and to identify some of the questions that need to be addressed during that period, with respect to library catalogs, their nature and role in the information world of the future. At the same time, with a sense of the practical for which catalogers have always been noted, CCS cosponsored, with the Serials Section of RTSD and the Information Science and Automation Section of LITA, a program on "Authorities: Persons, Corporate Bodies and Series." Abundant evidence of the need for such a program was an audience of some 1,100 delegates. It seems probable that a new topic for continuing education in RTSD has emerged from this program.

In the course of the year the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), under the capable leadership of Nancy John, continued to debate AACR2 matters, often with intensity and emotion. The committee conducted a review of the ISBDs as a basis for comments requested by IFLA, and several task forces were at work. One such task force is still in the process of identifying problems related to the application of the rules for uniform titles. However, without doubt, the most contentious cataloging issue of 1980/81 was the descriptive cataloging of microforms. With strong arguments on two sides of the issue, much discussion took place both inside and outside of the committee. After lengthy consideration at the Midwinter Meeting in Washington, CC:DA
appointed a Task Force on Description of Previously Existing Works to try to identify principles which might address the broader issue of descriptive cataloging of works reissued in a different physical form and which would be generally acceptable to a majority of librarians. However, an easy solution was not forthcoming. For ALA, divided opinion eventually led to a decision to support the practical solution put forth by the Library of Congress as opposed to the philosophical approach of AACR2. Much intellectual and emotional energy was expended in the decision. However, there is to be no rule revision at present. Whether the test of application will reopen the debate, only time will tell.

However momentous the year has been, CC:DA has continued its consolidation as a committee and has developed a meeting format which appears to be providing a forum for debate both expeditious and fruitful for both voting and nonvoting members. Clearly, much that is related to the implementation and interpretation of AACR2 directly affects budgets and personnel in most of the nation's libraries. In any controversy, it is inevitable that there will be some losers, while in some instances there may even be no winners. When faced with this kind of situation, any committee can only strive to carry out its charge responsibly and to act in the best interests of the majority; CC:DA is to be congratulated on having achieved just that.

Other CCS committees have been no less active. The Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee, under Alex Bloss as chairperson, has been working intensively on "Guidelines for Cataloging Children's Materials." A final draft of these guidelines is expected to be considered by the committee during 1981/82 and should be ready for approval by CCS Executive Committee by the time that ALA meets at Midwinter in 1983. Other concerns of this committee relate to subject headings for children's materials in foreign languages and for fantasy animal stories, both of which present unique problems in subject representation.

In contrast, the Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials has interests of a very different kind. Topics considered over the past year, by Chairperson Thomas Lee and his committee, have included the computerization of East Asian and Arabic scripts, LC acquisitions and cataloging priorities in Asian and African language materials, and the examination of romanization tables. The committee, which has been in existence only two years, serves a very specialized but very real need.

In keeping with the long tradition of honoring persons who have made outstanding professional contributions in cataloging and classification, the Margaret Mann Citation was presented to Sanford Berman for his contribution to the improvement of subject cataloging. Through his critical approach to subject headings, Berman has done much to encourage librarians to strive for more effective subject access in library catalogs.

The CCS Nominating Committee, under Chairperson Doris Clack, produced a slate of six candidates for three vacant positions in the CCS Executive Committee for 1981/82. Elected were Judith Cannan, as vice-chairperson/elect, and Judith Hopkins and Kathleen Bales as members-at-large.

Chaired by Laurence Auld, the CCS Policy and Research Committee has continued its involvement in several long-term projects, some of which are now nearing completion. The Conference-within-a-Conference on Research, which will take place at the 1982 Annual Conference in Philadelphia, had its origins in this committee and two recent members of the Policy and Research Committee, Richard Johnson and Eleanor Payne, have been heavily involved in the organization of that program. Another project that was fostered in the committee's
discussions was the identification of needed research. It resulted in a paper on
the "Directions for Research in Indexing, Classification and Cataloging," pre-
pared by Elaine Svenonius and published in *Library Resources & Technical Services*,
January/March 1981. Over the past few years this committee's activities have
increased in momentum, and it is to be hoped that this will be sustained.

Over the past ten years, the work of the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
has been perpetually vigorous and diversified. This was no less true in 1980/81,
under the leadership of Jessica Milstead as chairperson. During this year,
reports from two SAC subcommittees were endorsed by CCS and subsequently
endorsed in principle by RTSD. These were the "Final Report on Racism and
Sexism in Subject Analysis" received at the Midwinter Conference and the
"Final Report on Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture
and Analogous Artifacts and Structures" endorsed at the Annual Conference in
San Francisco. Moreover, this type of activity is continuing in the work of
subcommittees on Dewey Classification Priorities, Library of Congress Subject
Authority Control, and Subject Access to Concepts Denoting the Term Primi-
tive. SAC has also had a major commitment to program planning and presenta-
tion. At Midwinter in Washington, SAC held a highly successful hearing on the
nineteenth edition of the *Dewey Decimal Classification*. The meeting, which
featured a panel of experts, was constructive and informative and established an
important forum of communication among the profession, the Dewey editor,
and the Dewey Classification Editorial Policy Committee which has implica-
tions for future editions. Not resting on its laurels, SAC has also been hard at
work on plans for a program for the Philadelphia Conference on the topic of
"Subject Access in the On-line Environment." It will be an ambitious program
on a very timely topic.

Formal contact with other committees and organizations with similar inter-
ests is a very important part of successful committee work. CCS has been very
fortunate in valuable links with the Dewey Classification Editorial Policy Com-
mittee and with units of ALA including the RASD Catalog Use Committee, the
PLA Cataloging Needs of Public Libraries Committee, and the newly formed
International Relations and Preservation Microfilming Committees. Of partic-
ular interest to CCS has been the work done by the RASD Catalog Use Com-
mittee on a manual on AACR2 for public service librarians.

Another facet of CCS activities takes place in the discussion groups. In CCS,
such groups have been organized in the areas of cataloging norms, copy catalog-
ing, catalog maintenance, and heads of cataloging. The forum for communica-
tion and interaction of cataloging matters at the grass-roots level is an important
one. With AACR2 now in use, discussion topics have been substantial, debate
has been lively, and the attendance large in all cases. In some groups a formal
structure has been provided with speakers. The groups are fulfilling a need
which other committees, as working units, are unable to provide.

During 1980/81 the CCS Executive Committee continued to coordinate the
activities of the Section and its units and to support and sustain the work of those
units. Substantial progress was made on a "Manual of Procedures" for CCS
Committee Chairs and it should be ready for use sometime during the coming
year. Program planning and organization was expedited by the appointment of
a subcommittee, with Judith Cannan as chairperson, to develop and plan the
program on "Authority Files" for San Francisco. This proved to be an excellent
method of relieving the Executive Committee of some of the planning details,
thus freeing it to deal with matters which could not be delegated. Members of
the CCS Executive Committee for 1980/81 were Julieann Nilson, past chair-
person, Nancy Williamson, chairperson, Kaye Gapen, vice-chairperson, Marilyn
McClaskey, secretary, and Arlene Dowell, Barbara Gates, Patricia Oyler,
Preservation of Library Materials Section

Nina J. Root, Chairperson

The inaugural year of the Preservation of Library Materials Section (PLMS) has been exciting as we tried to organize ourselves and planned programs and projects. The extraordinary growth in one year to almost seventeen hundred members is a strong indication that there is a need for such a section within ALA. PLMS consists of the Executive, Policy and Research, Library/Binders Relations, Physical Quality of Library Materials, and Education committees, and a Discussion Group. Early in the year the chair of one committee resigned and a new chair was promptly appointed and the committee's work proceeded without interruption. Another committee that had gotten off to a strong start began to disintegrate after Midwinter Conference, until only one member was present at Annual Conference. But the work of even this committee did not suffer as Gay Walker (PLMS chair-elect) valiantly held a productive planning meeting with the assistance of loyal PLMS members. The composition of the committee will be reconstituted shortly. If these are the worst problems that PLMS ever faces, it will always be productive and successful.

In just one year PLMS has accomplished much: Pamela Darling (then chair-elect) represented PLMS at the RTSD Silver Anniversary Program with a paper entitled, "Will Anything Be Left? New Responses to the Preservation Challenge"; a conference program, "Toward a North American Program of Preservation Microfilming," was cosponsored with RLMS and RS and was well attended; plans for a program in 1982 on the quality of book paper, to be cosponsored with the ALA/AAP Joint Committee were approved; and PLMS will also participate in the 1982 Conference-within-a Conference.

The Education Committee, chaired by Robert Patterson, published the Preservation Education Directory, edited by Susan Swarzburn and Susan White; designed an attractive PLMS flier; and helped stock the RTSD booth with preservation materials. Work on a list of preservation AV resources continued and will be completed by Midwinter, and a poster on the proper handling of books during photocopying will be designed.

The Policy and Research Committee, whose chairpersonship fell to Gay Walker, had lively meetings and made plans to investigate the possibility of improved photocopying equipment for making copies from bound volumes; to gather information on library conservation budgets; to identify unit costs and/or time averages for individual conservation techniques; and to foster the testing of the permanence of electrostatic copying as a preservation technique; progress on these topics will be presented at Midwinter. Ten additional topics were identified for future discussion and action. The formation of a committee of preservation of nonbook library materials was recommended and the Executive Committee charged the P and R Committee to formulate a charge at Midwinter.
The Library/Binders Relations Committee, chaired by John Baker, heard an overview by John Dean on ALA’s activities in the field of library binding since 1905; the RTSD Newsletter indicated an interest in publishing the report, as did Library Scene. The new Library Binding Institute Standard for Library Binding was presented and discussed; a press release for distribution to the RTSD Newsletter, American Libraries, and Library Scene announcing the new standard, but stating that ALA does not endorse the standard, and announcing the committee's future formulation and distribution of guidelines and standards for all types of library binding was drawn up. The news release was approved by the PLMS Executive Committee and given to Bill Bunnell at the RTSD Directors Board meeting. Plans for a series of pamphlets, under the editorship of Carolyn Morrow, were continued and expanded.

The Physical Quality of Library Materials Committee, chaired by Sally Buchanan, heard reports on the Longevity of the Book conference; on standards for polyester film; on standards for conservation supplies; and on the change from pyroxylin-coated to acrylic book cloth. Further reports and discussions will be heard at Midwinter and plans for publishing several guidelines and standards on the physical quality of materials used in library books and in preservation will be made at that time.

For a new section, PLMS has certainly shown signs of early maturation, with many projects in full swing and numerous projects and topics identified for discussion and proposed action in the future. This year as the first chair of PLMS has been most exciting and rewarding for me, as I worked with committed hardworking librarians. I was privileged to have the support of fine committee chairs who led and inspired their members to produce such excellent work.

Robin Gay Walker has been elected vice-chair, chair-elect.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section

Harriet K. Rebuldelo, Chairperson

During the past year, RLMS continued to devote its energy in assisting libraries and library users in areas concerning the production, use, and storage of reproductions of library materials through its active involvement in ALA and other professional organizations.

With Francis Spreitzer as chair of the Standards Committee, RLMS encouraged and participated in the development of standards pertinent to libraries. Section members (Norman Shaffer, Lawrence Robinson, and Jeffrey Heynen) served on ANSI and NMA committees. RLMS was instrumental in the enactment of ANSI Standard Z39.32-1981 (Information on Microfiche Heads) and ANSI Standard Z39.26-1981 (Advertising of Micropublications). The Standards Committee works continually to identify areas where standards are needed.

RLMS provided continuing education to librarians through its conference programs and publications efforts. At the annual conference Allen Veener addressed what the future holds for the profession and the section in his presentation, "Incredible Past, Incredible Future," and the Committee on Technology, chaired by Max Willocks, presented a program on videotapes. The Ad Hoc Committee on Guidelines for Operating a Microforms Facility with Margaret Byrnes as chair spent many hours working on these guidelines, which they hope
to publish in the near future. Use of guidelines in conjunction with a series of regional institutes on library micrographics is being considered. The publications activity of the Section is funded by royalties generated by Joseph Nitecki's *Directory of Library Reprographic Services*; the directory is published by Microform Review. The Discussion Group, chaired by Imre Járomy, continued to provide a forum for members to bring their concerns and to share their knowledge of current developments in the field.

Members also participated in other section and divisional activities. Charles Willard represented RLMS on CCS's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access; he carried RLMS's recommendation that this committee support the Library of Congress proposal for the cataloging of microform publications. Francis Spreitzer and Norman Shaffer served as section representatives on RTSD's Preservation Microfilming Committee; Shaffer also served as its chair.

**Resources Section**

**Paul H. Mosher, Chairperson**

The Resources Section exists in order to serve librarians through continuing education, useful products, exchange of ideas and procedures, conference programs, and consumer advocacy, in the areas of collection development and management, and the acquisition of library materials.

The missions and activities of the association are carried out through a number of committees and discussion groups; the committees and their chairpersons for 1980–81 were: Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee (Marion Reid); Collection Management and Development Committee (Jutta Reed-Scott); Library Materials Price Index Committee (Sally Williams); Micropublishing Committee (John Webb); Policy and Research Committee (John Kaiser); and the Resources Section Blackwell/North America Scholarship Award (Sheila Dowd). The Nominating Committee of the section, chaired by Noreen Allredge, also did an outstanding job in providing continuity to the work of the section. The section's discussion groups are vital for purposes of information and procedure exchange and help substantially in upgrading service and by providing a vital link between the grass roots of the profession and the activities of the more formally structured committees. These groups and their chairs were: Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group (Charles Willett); Booksellers Discussion Group (Don Surratt); Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group (Carolyn F. Bucknall); and Chief Collection Development Officers of Medium-sized Research Libraries Discussion Group (Anna H. Perrault).

The organization of the section changed this year, to accommodate changing needs, and the change did not always mean growth. The National Union Catalog Committee, which was established in 1954 to investigate problems concerning the preparation and publication of the National Union Catalog, has achieved its mission and was formally disbanded. A recently formed discussion group for Chief Collection Development Officers of College Libraries was dissolved after its organizers discovered that the small professional staff size of most college libraries meant that collection development or acquisitions librarians had too many meetings to attend. A member of the group was heard to lighten the occasion by referring to it as "the Demise of the Pinheads." A new discussion
group, the Gift and Exchange Librarians Discussion Group, was organized and
recognized by the Resources Section Executive Committee. The chairperson of
this new discussion group is Denise Ridard.

The program activities of the Resources Section, as usual, comprised its most
visible aspect. A series of regional Collection Management and Development
Institutes was planned by a subcommittee of the Collection Management and
Development Committee, and the pilot institute was conducted at Stanford
University as a postconference of the ALA Annual Meeting. The pilot institute,
which has received favorable response both from those in attendance and from
critics, was given by a faculty drawn primarily from the section and its Collec-
tion Management and Development Committee. Improved, shorter versions of
the institute are planned for Washington, D.C., immediately after the summer
1982 Annual Conference in Philadelphia, for October 1982 in Boston, and for
1983 in Omaha. Other sites are currently being chosen, and those interested
should keep in touch with plans as they appear in the RTSD Newsletter. This
program, which originated at the 1977 Collection Development Committee's
Preconference on Collection Development, is a major effort by RS and RTSD
to move divisional programs beyond annual conferences to local areas where
they will be accessible to librarians who cannot afford to travel to national
meetings.

RS also cosponsored and participated in other programs of vital interest to its
members, including “Collection Development: Are We Preaching What We're
Practicing?” with the RTSD Education Committee, and “Toward a North
American Program of Preservation of Microfilming” with the RTSD Preserva-
tion of Library Materials Section. Norman Dudley presented an excellent pa-
per on the history and challenging future of the Resources Section as the sec-
tion's contribution to the Silver Anniversary Program of RTSD.

We were fortunate in obtaining funding again for the Resources Section
Scholarship Award through the generosity and interest of Blackwell/North
America, Inc. This award, which is given annually to the best publication in the
field of library resources, was made to Robert Stueart and George Miller, Jr.,
coeditors of Collection Development in Libraries: A Treatise, published by JAI
Press, which was coauthored by a number of experts in the field of library resources,
most of whom are members of RS. A thousand-dollar scholarship, in memory of
the late Richard Blackwell, will be given to a student in librarianship at Sim-
mons College.

The Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee continued its vigorous pro-
gram of consumer advocacy, alerting librarians to serious and questionable
activity on the part of certain publishers including the infamous Gille family.

The Collection Management and Development Committee moved forward
the efforts of the RTSD Regional Collection Management and Development
institutes to upgrade practice, and to carry on a program of continuing educa-
tion, in the areas of collection management and development. The committee
also has three new ALA guidelines in draft. Two of these, on coordinated
collection development and use and user studies, are in advanced stages of
preparation and were used at the pilot Collection Management and Develop-
ment institute. A new subcommittee has been appointed to draft guidelines for
vendor performance studies, as requested by the Acquisitions Discussion
Group. It is hoped that these new guidelines will be completed and published in
the near future. The committee also resumed work on the Guide to Selection Tools
draft that was referred to METRO a few years ago but has remained unfin-
ished. Collection Management and Development Committee is planning a
1982 conference program on collection development in a resource-sharing envi-
ronment.
Several products resulted from the work of the Library Materials Price Index Committee during the year. Chair Sally Williams published an article on the prices of U.S. and foreign published materials in the 1981 Bowker Annual. Library Journal is publishing the U.S. nonprint media index compiled by David Walch, and the RTSD Newsletter will publish the preliminary survey of the 1981 U.S. subscription prices compiled by Norman Brown and Jane Phillips as well as the index of German and British books compiled by Tom Leonhardt.

The Micropublishing Committee continued its oversight of microform standards and of microform publishing. The committee and its members have been involved in reviewing work on an ANSI Z-39 Standard and on implications of micropublishing on AACR2.

The Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussed Group who, out of envy of the Technical Services Chiefs, were heard to call themselves the "Big Bottoms," discussed many issues of significance including the analysis of both collections and collection development organization, training of collection development librarians, budget and storage pressures, and the national shelfist count project. The Medium-sized Research Libraries Group discussed organizational patterns for collection development, performance evaluations, and other matters of organizational concern for collection management and development processes in their libraries. The group also discussed collection development for microforms. The Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group discussed, inter alia, publishers' pricing plans, the prices of British versus U.S. publications, and the very considerable price increase brought about by the change from production of the LC proof slips to the catalog alert service of the Library of Congress.

A lively and well-attended first meeting of the new Gift and Exchange Discussion Group was held including the acceptance and discard of gift books, documentation of gift and exchange procedures, the relationship between gifts and exchanges and collection development policy, automation, the problems of exchanges with certain difficult areas of publication, and the starting and stopping of exchange programs.

Serials Section

Marcia Tuttle, Chairperson

During 1980-81 the Serials Section concentrated on programs and publications. At the Midwinter Meeting of the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging, in response to a strong expression of need for clarification, members held an open forum on the question of uniform title for serials, attended by 129 persons. In San Francisco the section presented a well-received full-day workshop entitled "In Order to Form a More Perfect Union . . . List of Serials," coordinated by Marjorie Bloss. Participants received the Directory of Union Lists of Serials, which is available from RTSD. This guide contains information about nine vendors of union listing services and sixty union lists, each with address, telephone number, contact person, and a brief description. The section also contributed to the RTSD 25th Anniversary Program, at which Susan Brynteson represented Serials with a thoughtful and entertaining look at future developments in the field. Finally, the Serials Section cosponsored, with CCS and LITA-ISAS, a program on name authority files. It has been determined that
attending programs is a high priority for most conference attendees, and the Serials Section tried to do its part to provide them an opportunity this year.

The Directory of Speakers for Serials Workshops, compiled by the Regional Serials Workshops Committee, includes more than one hundred sixty names, addresses, and telephone numbers of persons, from thirty-nine states and all types of libraries, who have agreed to be listed. The directory is indexed by state, type of library/activity, and subject. The committee is planning to keep the list up-to-date, perhaps through the RTSD Newsletter. The second publication by a Serials Section committee this year is the First Annual Bibliography of Articles and Monographs on Serials, produced by the Library School Education Committee. This first edition of the bibliography is not limited to 1980, but includes selected books and articles from throughout the 1970s. Subsequent editions are to be published annually in the July/September issue of Serials Review. Both of these committee publications are available from the RTSD office for a small charge to cover the costs of printing and mailing.

Two other committees are preparing documents to be published in the near future. The Ad Hoc Committee on Union Lists of Serials has made significant progress toward completing the guide to techniques and methods used in union listing of serials. Work should be finished before the 1982 Annual Conference. The Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Feasibility of Creating Dynamic Lists of Core Serials submitted its final report to the Executive Committee and was given a new charge: to construct a sample core list or lists of serials to test the methodology for compiling such lists and assessing their utility.

Upon the imminent death of Title Varies and, presumably, of Librarians United to Fight Costly, Silly, Unnecessary Serial Title Changes (LUTFC-SUSTC), the SS Executive Committee, at David Taylor's request, established an ad hoc committee to determine the worst serial title changes of the year for the next two years and to present the awards at the annual RTSD membership meeting. After the 1983 conference the committee will either become a standing committee or be disbanded.

The Serial Records Study Committee has been concerned about the effect on various kinds of serial records of the ANSC Z39 standard for summary holdings statements and about the problems encountered by libraries changing from manual to automated serial records. The committee, to compensate for a perceived lack of direction in this area, is devising a self-study form to be used to evaluate an existing serial file to determine what can and cannot be done to automate the file.

The Policy and Research Committee, in addition to bringing the Executive Committee resolutions about the Core Lists and Title Change committees, heard reports on various matters of concern, such as CONSER, NSDP, and ANSC Z39 subcommittees. The P and R chair presented a motion to the Executive Committee to increase the number of members-at-large. This change, which was approved, gave the committee an uneven number of voting members, in accordance with the by-laws. Policy and Research also serves as the section's planning committee for the Philadelphia 1982 Conference-within-a-Conference on Research. The change in pricing policy by the Institute for Scientific Information for its Science Citation Index had been brought to the attention of the committee, and it decided to work with the RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee in drafting a letter to ISI expressing extreme displeasure with the enormous increase in price. This procedure was approved by the Executive Committee.

Both SS discussion groups, Large Research Libraries and Medium-sized Research Libraries, attracted crowded audiences to a total of four meetings at the two conferences. In the past few years the same persons have attended both
discussion groups so, in the interest of reducing the number of meetings, the chairs have agreed to meet jointly for one year and then decide whether a single discussion group is sufficient for the section. Topics covered in 1980–1981 included serial staffing patterns, AACR2, serials activities at the Library of Congress, USBE, and subscription agency services.

At the end of the San Francisco Conference, John James, University of Washington, became the new chair of the Serials Section; Dorothy Glasby, Library of Congress, was elected vice-chair/chair-elect; Ruth Carter, University of Pittsburgh, is the new member-at-large. Linda Sapp, Emory University, has replaced Dorothy Glasby as the section’s assistant editor of *Library Resources & Technical Services*. 
Bylaws of the Division

Article I. Name

The name of this body shall be the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

Article II. Object

The object of this Division shall be to contribute to the professional welfare of its members and to librarianship generally as the Division of the American Library Association responsible for activities related to the acquisition, identification, cataloging, classification, and preservation of library materials in all types of institutions and to the development and coordination of the country's library resources.

Article III. Relationship to the American Library Association

This body shall be a division of the American Library Association. The Constitution and Bylaws of that association, to the extent to which they are applicable, take precedence over these bylaws.

Article IV. Membership

Sec. 1. Members. Any member of the American Library Association who elects membership in this Division according to the provisions of the Bylaws of the American Library Association thereupon shall become a member of this Division.

Sec. 2. Classification. Membership classes of the Division shall consist of the same classes as those of the American Library Association.

Sec. 3. Honorary members. Honorary members shall be those honorary members of the American Library Association nominated to such membership in this Division by the Board of Directors and elected for life by the membership. Honorary members of the former Division of Cataloging and Classification of the American Library Association shall be honorary members of this Division.

Sec. 4. Dues, rights, and privileges. All members of the Division shall be eligible for membership in any one or more of the sections. Only personal members shall have the right to vote and to hold office. Dues paid to the American Library Association shall constitute the dues of the members. The date of payment of dues to the American Library Association shall be considered the date of payment of dues to this Division. The designation by a member of the American Library Association, on its membership form, of this Division as a division to which the member wishes to belong shall be considered as election of membership in this Division.

Sec. 5. Membership, fiscal, and conference years. The membership, fiscal, and conference years shall be the same as those of the American Library Association.

Article V. Meetings

Sec. 1. Annual meetings. The regular meeting of the Division shall be held at the time and place of the annual conference of the American Library Association.

Sec. 2. Special meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Board of Directors and shall be called by the president upon the written request of fifty members of the Division. At least thirty days notice shall be given and only business specified in the call shall be transacted.

Sec. 3. Regional meetings. Regional meetings may be called by the Board of
Directors at the time and place of regional meetings of the American Library Association.

Sec. 4. Votes by mail. Votes by mail may be authorized by the Board of Directors between meetings, or when, for reasons beyond the control of the Division, no meeting is held during any one year. When no meeting is held during any one year, votes by mail shall be submitted at the written request of fifty members. Whenever an action is submitted to a mail ballot, each ballot shall be accompanied by a written report stating the purpose of each specific proposal and the principal arguments for and against its adoption.

Mail ballots shall be conducted by the Executive Director, RTSD, in such manner as the Board of Directors shall determine. A copy of the ballot shall be mailed by the Executive Director, RTSD, to each member. A period of at least thirty days from the date of mailing shall be allowed for the return of ballots to the Executive Director, RTSD. A proposal shall be carried if it receives the same proportion of affirmative votes from among all votes cast as would be required to carry the same proposal if voted upon at a meeting. Unless otherwise specified in the proposal, if carried, it shall become effective upon publication of the result of the ballot.

In the case of a vote by mail the Board of Directors may designate publication of the ballot or questions submitted in the RTSD Newsletter or in the official journal of the Division as the appropriate method of submitting the matter to the members for their determination.

Sec. 5. Quorum. Fifty members shall constitute a quorum.

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 1. Nominations. The Nominating Committee shall present candidates for the positions of vice-president (president-elect), vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect) of the Council of Regional Groups, Division Councilor to the American Library Association Council, and directors-at-large when required. Other nominations for these offices may be submitted in writing by any ten members and shall be filed with the Executive Director, RTSD. Any such nominations shall be included on the official ballot.

No candidate shall be presented whose written consent has not been filed with the Executive Director, RTSD. No candidate shall be presented who at the time of nomination is not a personal member in good standing of the Division.

Sec. 2. Nominating Committee. (a) Composition. The Nominating Committee shall consist of the chairperson of each section’s Nominating Committee ex officio and two members-at-large. No member of the Board of Directors shall be appointed to the Nominating Committee. (b) Terms of office. The Nominating Committee shall be appointed for a one-year term, to begin deliberations during the next Annual Conference after its appointment, ending with its final report to the membership, by the vice-president (president-elect) under whose term of office as president its final report will be made, and with the approval of the Board of Directors. Members of the Nominating Committee, upon expiration of their terms, shall not be eligible for immediate reappointment. (c) Duties. The Nominating Committee shall present at least two candidates for each office to be filled at the next election. It shall select the candidates in such manner as to assure as broad a representation as possible of different types and sizes of libraries, types of service, and of the geographic distribution of the membership.

The Nominating Committee shall report nominations to the Executive Director, RTSD, and the Executive Director, RTSD, shall notify each member by mail of the nominations for elective office in the Division at such time as is prescribed by the Bylaws of the American Library Association.

Sec. 3. Elections. (a) Ballot. Elections shall be held by mail ballot. The Executive Director, RTSD, shall mail a copy of the ballot to each member of the Division. The ballot shall be returned to the Executive Director, RTSD, at such time as is prescribed by the Bylaws of the American Library Association. (b) Election results. Candidates receiving a plurality of the votes cast shall be elected and shall be so reported at the next regular meeting. In case of a tie vote, the Election Committee of the American Library Association shall decide the election by lot.
Sec. 4. Extraordinary circumstances. If, for reasons beyond the control of the Division, no regular meeting is held in any one year, terms based on the date of the regular meetings shall be determined by the anniversary of the last regular meeting at which an election was reported, unless a different date is authorized by the American Library Association. The election results shall be mailed to each member.

Article VII. Officers

Sec. 1. Titles. The officers of this Division shall be a president, a president-elect who shall serve as vice-president, a chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups, a divisional Councilor of the American Library Association Council, and an Executive Director, RTSD.

Sec. 2. Duties. Except as otherwise provided in the bylaws, the duties of the officers shall be such as are specified in the parliamentary authority adopted by the Division.

(a) President. In addition to the regular duties of this office, the president shall see that the bylaws are observed by the officers and members of the Board of Directors and that the orders of the Board of Directors and of the Division are carried out, shall recommend to the Board of Directors any action deemed to be in the interest of the Division, and shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to this office.

(b) Vice-president. In addition to the regular duties of this office, the vice-president shall perform such duties as the Board of Directors may assign to the office.

(c) Chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups. The chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups shall serve for two years.

(d) Councilor at the American Library Association Council. The Councilor shall serve for four years, and may be reelected for one additional four-year term.

(e) Executive Director, RTSD. The Executive Director, RTSD, shall submit an annual report to the Division and other reports as required to the Board of Directors, and shall perform such other duties as the Board of Directors may assign to the office.

Sec. 3. Terms of office. All officers of the Board of Directors shall serve until the adjournment of the Annual Conference at which their successors are announced:

(a) President. The president shall serve for one year and shall not be eligible for the office of president or president-elect for a period of at least one year following completion of service as immediate past president.

(b) Vice-president. The president-elect shall serve for the first year after election as vice-president, the second year as president, and third year as immediate past president. In case of a vacancy in the office of president, the vice-president shall succeed to that office and shall serve in that capacity until replaced in the normal succession by the president-elect.

(c) Chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups. The chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups shall serve for two years.

(d) Councilor at the American Library Association Council. The Councilor shall serve for four years, and may be reelected for one additional four-year term.

(e) Executive Director, RTSD. The Executive Director, RTSD, shall be appointed by the Executive Director of the American Library Association, with the concurrence of the Board of Directors, of this Division, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Executive Director.

Article VIII. Board of Directors

Sec. 1. Composition. The Board of Directors shall consist of the officers of the Division, the immediate past president of the Division, the vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect) of the Council of Regional Groups, the editor of the Division's journal, the presiding officer of each section of the Division, two directors-at-large, and other ex-officio members as shall be from time to time so designated by action of the Board. The vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect) of the Council of Regional Groups, the Executive Director, RTSD, and the editor of the Division's journal shall not
have the right to vote. The Executive Committee of the Board of Directors shall consist of the president, vice-president (president-elect), and the past president.

Sec. 2. Vacancies. Vacancies in the elected membership of the Board of Directors shall be filled as follows:

(a) President. If the offices of both president and vice-president become vacant within the same year, the Board of Directors shall appoint one of its members to act as president until a president is duly elected. At the next election two candidates shall be elected, one to take the office of president immediately and to serve for one year, the other to serve as vice-president (president-elect).

If the vice-president (president-elect) resigns between the close of nominations and the adjournment of the Annual Conference, the president chosen in the previous election will remain president until after the Midwinter Meeting of the Association; following the Midwinter Meeting, the newly elected vice-president (president-elect) will assume responsibilities as president. If the previous president dies or otherwise does not choose to serve for this extended period, the vice-president (president-elect) will immediately assume responsibilities as president.

(b) Vice-president. If the office of vice-president becomes vacant, two candidates shall be elected at the next election, one to take the office of president immediately and to serve for one year, the other to serve as vice-president (president-elect) to serve until a president is duly elected. At the next election two candidates shall be elected, one to take the office of chairperson immediately and to serve two years, the other to serve as vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect).

(d) Chairperson-elect of the Council of Regional Groups. If the office of chairperson-elect of the Council of Regional Groups becomes vacant, two candidates shall be elected at the next election, one to take the office of chairperson immediately and to serve for two years, the other to serve as vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect). If the vacancy occurs between the close of nominations and the adjournment of the Annual Conference, the vacancy shall be considered as having occurred in the office of chairperson in the coming year.

(e) Councilor to the American Library Association Council. If the office becomes vacant, a Councilor shall be elected at the next election to complete the unexpired term.

(f) Directors-at-large. If the office of a director-at-large becomes vacant, a director-at-large shall be elected at the next election to complete the unexpired term.

(g) General provisions. If the successful candidate (other than for the vice-president/president-elect) dies or withdraws between the close of nominations and the adjournment of the Annual Conference, the resulting situation shall be considered as a vacancy having occurred during the term for which that candidate was elected.

Sec. 3. Terms of office. Directors-at-large shall serve for three years. They shall be elected for terms expiring in different years. Directors shall not be eligible for consecutive terms.

The vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect) of the Council of Regional Groups shall serve for the first and second years after election as vice-chairperson, the third and fourth years as chairperson, and also as an officer of the Division.

Sec. 4. Officers. The officers of the Division shall ex officio be the officers of the Board of Directors.

Sec. 5. Powers and duties. The Board of Directors shall have authority over the affairs of the Division during the period between meetings of the Division, provided however that none of its acts shall conflict with or modify any actions taken by the Division. The annual and any other budget requests shall be sub-
ject to the approval of the Board of Directors, prior to submission to the American Library Association. The Board of Directors shall perform such other duties as are specified in these bylaws, and shall report upon its work at the regular meeting of the Division.

Sec. 6. Meetings. The Board of Directors shall meet in conjunction with each regular meeting of the Division and of the American Library Association. Special meetings may be called by the president, and shall be called upon the written request of a majority of the members of the Board. In addition, at the discretion of the president, the Executive Committee may meet to consider emergency measures and to carry out action based on previous Board action or preliminary to future Board action.

Sec. 7. Quorum. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum of the Board of Directors.

Sec. 8. Votes by mail. Votes may be taken by mail or by electronic device with confirmation by mail vote.

Sec. 9. Rules of order. The Board of Directors may adopt rules for the transaction of its business, provided they shall not conflict with the bylaws of the Division.

Sec. 10. Duties of members. Each member of the Board of Directors shall perform the duties attached to representative membership in the Board. In the case of continued failure of a director to participate in the deliberations of the Board, the Board may, by vote of three-fourths of its members, declare the office of such director vacant.

Article IX. Committees

Sec. 1. Standing and annual committees.
(a) Organization and Bylaws Committee. The Organization and Bylaws Committee shall consist of the immediate past president as chairperson, one member-at-large, and one representative from each of the five sections, to advise the Board of Directors and through it the Division on the establishment, functions, and discontinuance of sections, committees, and other groups, as the needs of the Division may require.
(b) Establishment. The Division may establish other standing and annual committees to consider affairs of the Division which require continuous or repeated attention by the members. The Organization and Bylaws Committee shall recommend the name and size of each such committee, and may recommend special regulations for its appointment, composition, and term of office of members.
(c) Composition. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Division, each standing and annual committee shall be composed of an odd number of not less than three members, each of whom shall be an active member in good standing of the Division.
(d) Terms of office. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Division, members of standing committees shall be appointed for terms of two years, and may be appointed for a second term, but in no case shall a person serve on a committee for more than four consecutive years. The terms of approximately one-half the members shall expire each year. Members of annual committees shall be appointed for terms of one year.

Sec. 2. Special committees. Committees not authorized as standing or annual committees shall be special committees. Special committees may be authorized by the Division or by the Board of Directors. Each special committee shall continue in existence until its purpose is accomplished or it is discharged by the Division or by the Board of Directors.

Sec. 3. Intersectional committees. Intersectional committees of sections within the Division and other intra-Division committees may be established as required by the groups concerned upon notification of the Organization and Bylaws Committee of the Division.

Interdivisional committees and other committees formed with units that are outside the Division and that are within the Association may be established only as provided for in Article IX, Sec. 5, of the Bylaws of the American Library Association.

Sec. 4. Joint committees. The Division may recommend to the Committee on Organization of the American Library Association that joint committees, either standing or special, be established with other organizations when the functions of the proposed committee cannot appropriately be delegated to a single Division or section committee. Joint committees with organizations outside the American Library Association shall be established only as provided for in the Bylaws of the American Library Associ-
ation. The Division may authorize representation of the Division in outside organizations with the approval of the American Library Association.

Sec. 5. Notification. The Executive Director, RTSD, shall inform the Committee on Organization of the American Library Association annually of the establishment and functions, or discontinuance, of any standing, annual, special, or joint committee of the Division and of its sections; and shall cause to be published annually a complete list of existing committees, together with their functions and membership, for the information of the Division.

Sec. 6. Appointments. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Division, each committee member and representative shall be appointed, with the approval of the Board of Directors, by the vice-president (president-elect), or the president, under whose term of office as president the member shall commence this service and shall serve until the adjournment of the meeting at which the member's successor takes office.

Vacancies on committees shall be filled by the president with the approval of the Board of Directors.

Sec. 7. Votes by mail. Committee votes may be taken by mail, provided all members shall be canvassed simultaneously. In case of dissent among members, a second vote shall be taken after each member has been acquainted with the views of every other. Each committee shall have the authority to set a time limit within which the votes of its members shall be recorded, but if no such time limit is set, no vote shall be counted unless received within thirty days from the day the text of the matter voted upon was mailed properly addressed to those entitled to vote.

Sec. 8. Reports. Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, or in the act authorizing a committee, each committee shall report on its work at the regular meeting of the Division in the following manner:

Committees shall transmit their reports to the Executive Director, RTSD, not later than thirty days before the regular meeting of the Division.

Reports containing recommendations for action by the Division shall be presented at the regular meeting. If a copy of a report was distributed to the membership either before or at the beginning of the meeting, and unless a majority of the members present and voting demand a reading of the report, its presentation may be limited to a summary of the findings and a reading of the recommendations.

Other reports shall be published in full or in summary or be transmitted otherwise to the membership not later than four months after the regular meeting. Such reports shall be cited, and their disposition announced, at the regular meeting.

Article X. Sections

Sec. 1. Establishment. Any group of fifty or more members of the Division or of the American Library Association whose special field of interest falls within the Division but is distinct from that of any existing section, may be established as a section upon written petition, and upon approval by the Division. Members of a group in the American Library Association who are not members of the Division and who are newly affiliating with the Division must become members of the Division within three months after such affiliation or lose their membership in the section.

The name of the section shall clearly indicate its field of activity.

Sec. 2. Membership. Any member of the Division may affiliate with as many sections as desired, and shall enjoy all privileges of membership in each section joined. The designation by a member of this Division, on the American Library Association membership form, of any section as a section to which the member wishes to belong, shall be considered as election to membership in that section by such member.

Sec. 3. Relation to the Division.

(a) Autonomy. Each section shall define its own functions, subject to the approval of the Division, and shall manage its own affairs, provided, however, that no section shall adopt bylaws or other rules for the transaction of its business which are inconsistent with those of the Division, or engage in any activity in conflict with the program of the Division.

(b) Representation on the Board of Directors. The president officer of each section shall be a voting member of the Board of Directors of the Division. If the presiding officer of a section is unable to
attend a meeting of the Board of Directors, the Executive Director, RTSD, shall be notified promptly, and the presiding officer-elect of that section shall become a voting member of the Board of Directors for that meeting. If the presiding officer-elect of the section is unable to attend a Board of Directors meeting as a substitute voting member for the presiding officer of the section, that presiding officer and the Executive Director, RTSD, shall be notified promptly; under these circumstances the section presiding officer may designate a substitute voting member from the governing body of that section.

Sec. 4. Finance. Each section shall receive allotments made on the basis of need as approved by the Board of Directors and as determined by the Executive Board of the American Library Association.

Sec. 5. Jurisdiction. The Organization and Bylaws Committee shall decide conflicts between sections and rule upon the jurisdiction of each section, subject to the approval of the Division.

Sec. 6. Discontinuance. The Organization and Bylaws Committee shall recommend that a section be dissolved when, in its opinion, the usefulness of that section has ceased. If the recommendation is adopted by the Division, the section shall be dissolved.

Article XI. Regional Groups

Sec. 1. Composition. Regional groups of librarians and other persons interested in the objectives of the Division may be affiliated with it in accordance with these bylaws.

Sec. 2. Affiliation. Any regional group with a membership of ten or more persons, the activities of which fall within the object of this Division, may be affiliated with this Division upon written petition from the group, and upon approval by the Division. Affiliated regional groups shall conform to the conditions noted below; exceptions may be granted to individual groups in specific cases, upon written petition from the group.

(a) Membership. Membership shall be open to anyone within the region of a group who is interested in problems of library resources and technical services or related fields, provided, however, that a regional group which is part of a state or regional library association may limit its membership to members of the parent association.

(b) Bylaws. Each group shall have bylaws, a copy of which shall be filed with the Executive Director, RTSD. No group shall adopt bylaws inconsistent with those of the Division, or engage in any activity in conflict with the program of the Division.

(c) Officers. The officers of each group shall be elected by its members.

(d) Meetings. At least one meeting shall be held each biennium.

(e) Reports. Within one month after any meeting, a report on the meeting shall be sent to the chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups and a copy of it to the Executive Director, RTSD. A copy of each paper presented at the meeting shall be sent, if available, to the chairperson of the Council of Regional Groups.

Sec. 3. Discontinuance. The Organization and Bylaws Committee may recommend that the affiliation of a regional group be terminated when the group has become inactive or its usefulness, in the opinion of the committee, has ceased. If the recommendation is adopted by the Division, the affiliation of the regional group with the Division shall be discontinued.

Sec. 4. Finance.

(a) Dues. Regional groups may assess their own dues.

(b) Expenditures. The Board of Directors may, with the approval of the American Library Association, authorize the expenditure of funds for activities of the regional groups in general or of individual groups.

Sec. 5. Council of Regional Groups.

(a) Composition. The Council of Regional Groups shall consist of its chairperson, its vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect), and the chairperson of each group. Chairpersons of groups may appoint substitute delegates. Each member of the Council or each substitute delegate shall be a member of this Division.

(b) Meetings. The Council shall meet at the time and place of the annual conference of the American Library Association. Special meetings may be called by the chairperson and shall be called upon the written request of a majority of its members. The annual meeting shall be open to members of the Board of Direc-
tors, the members of the governing bodies of the several sections, and to the chairpersons of such committees of the Division, of its sections, and of the American Library Association as, in the opinion of the Council, deal with matters affecting the work of the regional groups as such, provided, however, that the Council may meet in closed session for part of any meeting.

(c) Duties. The Council shall encourage activities of the groups and assist them with information and advice relevant to their programs. The Council shall consider problems common to or affecting the work of regional groups and shall recommend to the Division such action as it deems to be in the interest of group activities.

(d) Committees. The chairperson of the Council may appoint, from members of the Council, such committees as are deemed necessary for the performance of the Council's duties.

(e) Reports. The chairperson of the Council shall report to the Division at its regular meetings on the work of the Council and on the work of the groups.

Article XII. Discussion Groups

Sec. 1. Establishment. Any group of ten or more members interested in discussing common problems which fall within the object of the Division, but which are not within the responsibility of a single section, may form a discussion group upon written petition from the group, and upon approval by the Board of Directors. The petition shall include the purpose of the group and the requirements for membership, if any.

Sec. 2. Membership. Membership shall be open to members of the Division who are interested in the purpose of the group and who fulfill the requirements for membership in the group.

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the chairperson shall see that the group's activities are limited to discussion of common problems within the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Division or its sections, and that the Division bylaws are observed by the group.

Sec. 4. Discontinuance. The Organization and Bylaws Committee shall recommend that a discussion group be dissolved when the usefulness of that group has ceased. If the recommendation is adopted by the Board of Directors, the group shall be dissolved.

Article XIII. Publications

Sec. 1. Publications may be authorized by the Board of Directors subject to the approval of the membership and of the Executive Board of the American Library Association. The Board of Directors shall determine the policy and manner of their distribution, and exercise financial control over them. The Division's journal shall be Library Resources & Technical Services.

Sec. 2. Editors. The editors of Library Resources & Technical Services and of the RTSD Newsletter shall each be appointed by the Board for a three-year term. The appointment of each is renewable for a second three-year term.

Article XIV. Notice by Mail

Publication of notices in the RTSD Newsletter or in the journal of the Division or the Association shall be considered sufficient to fulfill the requirement of notice by mail.

Article XV. Parliamentary Authority

Robert's Rules of Order (Revised), in the latest edition, shall govern the Division in all cases to which it can be applied and in which it is not inconsistent with these bylaws or special rules of order of the Division, or with the Constitution and Bylaws of the American Library Association. A parliamentarian shall be appointed by the vice-president (president-elect) for a two-year term, renewable for one additional two-year term, the term of office to follow the regular appointment cycle.

Article XVI. Amendments to Bylaws

Sec. 1. Proposals. Amendments to the bylaws may be proposed by the Board of Directors, or in writing to the Board of Directors, by any Division committee, by the governing body of any section of the Division, or by petition signed by ten members of the Division. Proposed amendments shall be presented in writing to the Executive Director, RTSD, at least three months prior to the meeting at which they are to be acted upon; they shall then be referred to the Organization and Bylaws Committee, which shall
Cataloging and Classification Section Bylaws

Article I. Name

The name of this body shall be the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

Article II. Object

The object of this Section shall be to contribute to library service and librarianship through encouragement, promotion of, and responsibility for those activities of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association relating to the cataloging and classification of library materials in all types of institutions.

Article III. Relationship to the Resources and Technical Services Division

This body shall be a section of the Resources and Technical Services Division. The Bylaws of that Division and the Constitution and Bylaws of the American Library Association, to the extent to which they are applicable, take precedence over these bylaws.

Article IV. Membership

Sec. 1. Members. Any member of the Division who elects membership in this Section according to the provisions of the Bylaws of the Division thereupon shall become a member of this Section.

Sec. 2. Classification. Membership classes of the Section shall consist of the same classes as those of the American Library Association.

Sec. 3. Dues, rights, and privileges. Only personal members of the Section shall have the right to vote and to hold office. Dues paid to the American Library Association shall constitute the dues of members. The date of payment of dues to the American Library Association shall be considered the date of payment of dues to this Section.

Sec. 4. Membership, fiscal, and conference years. The membership, fiscal, and conference years shall be the same as those of the American Library Association.

Article V. Meetings

Sec. 1. Annual meetings. The regular meeting of the Section shall be held at the time and place of the regular meeting of the Division.

Sec. 2. Special meetings. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee and shall be called by the chairperson upon the written request of twenty-five members of the Section. At least thirty days notice shall be given and only business specified in the call shall be transacted.

Sec. 3. Regional meetings. Regional meetings may be called by the Executive Committee at the time and place of regional meetings of the Division.

Sec. 4. Votes by mail. Votes by mail may be authorized by the Executive Committee between meetings, or when, for reasons beyond the control of the Section, no meeting is held during any one year. When no meeting is held during any one year, votes by mail shall be submitted at the written request of twenty-five members. Whenever an action is submitted to a mail ballot, each ballot shall be accompanied by a written report stating the purpose of each specific proposal and the principal arguments for and against its adoption.

Mail ballots shall be conducted in
such manner as the Executive Committee shall determine. A copy of the ballot shall be mailed to each member of the Section. A period of at least thirty days from the date of mailing shall be allowed for the return of ballots. A proposal shall be carried if it receives the same proportion of affirmative votes from all the votes cast as would be required to carry the same proposal at a meeting. Unless otherwise specified in the proposal, if carried, it shall become effective upon publication of the result of the ballot.

In the case of a vote by mail, the Executive Committee may designate publication of the ballot or questions submitted in the RTSD Newsletter or the official journal of the Division as the appropriate method for submitting the matter to the members for their determination.

Sec. 5. Quorum. Twenty-five members shall constitute a quorum.

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 1. Nominations. The Nominating Committee shall present candidates for the positions of vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect), secretary, and member-at-large of the Executive Committee. Other nominations for these offices may be submitted in writing by any ten members and shall be filed with the chairperson of the Section and with the Executive Director, RTSD. Any such nomination shall be included on the official ballot.

No candidate shall be presented whose written consent has not been filed with the Executive Director, RTSD. No candidate shall be presented who at the time of the nomination is not a personal member in good standing.

Sec. 2. Nominating Committee

(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee shall consist of five members-at-large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

(b) Terms of office. The Nominating Committee shall be appointed for a one-year term, to begin deliberations during the next Annual Conference after its appointment, ending with its final report to the membership, by the vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect) under whose term of office as chairperson its final report will be made, and with approval of the Executive Committee. Members of the Nominating Committee, upon expiration of their terms, shall not be eligible for immediate reappointment.

(c) Duties. The duties of the Nominating Committee shall be those specified in the Bylaws of the Division. In addition, the Nominating Committee shall report nominations to the chairperson of the Section and to the Executive Director, RTSD, simultaneously and the Executive Director, RTSD, shall notify each member by mail of the nominations for elective offices in the Section at such time as is prescribed by the Bylaws of the American Library Association.

Sec. 3. Elections. Elections shall be conducted in accordance with the Bylaws of the Division and the American Library Association.

Sec. 4. Extraordinary circumstances. If, for reasons beyond the control of the Section, no regular meeting is held in any one year, terms based on the date of the regular meeting shall be determined by the anniversary of the last regular meeting at which an election was reported, unless a different date is authorized by the American Library Association. The election results shall be mailed to each member.

Article VII. Officers

Sec. 1. Titles. The officers of this Section shall be a chairperson, a chairperson-elect who shall serve as vice-chairperson, and a secretary.

Sec. 2. Duties. Except as otherwise provided in the bylaws, the duties of the officers shall be such as are specified in the parliamentary authority adopted by the Section, and such other duties as may be approved by the Executive Committee.

Sec. 3. Terms of Office. All officers shall serve until the adjournment of the Annual Conference at which their successors are announced.

(a) Chairperson. The chairperson shall serve for one year and shall not be eligible for the office of chairperson or chairperson-elect for a period of at least one year following completion of service as immediate past chairperson.

(b) Vice-chairperson. The vice-chairperson shall serve for the first year after election as vice-chairperson, and the second year as chairperson, and the third year as immediate past chairperson. In case of a vacancy in the office of chairperson, the vice-chairperson shall
succeed to the office of chairperson and shall serve in that capacity until replaced in the normal succession by the vice-chairperson.

c) Secretary. The secretary shall serve for three years.

Article VIII. Executive Committee

Sec. 1. Composition. The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the Section, the immediate past chairperson of the Section, and five (5) members-at-large. The Executive Director, RTSD, and the representative of the Section on the editorial board of the Division's journal shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee, without the right to vote.

Sec. 2. Vacancies. Vacancies in the elected membership of the Executive Committee shall be filled as follows:
(a) Chairperson. If the offices of both chairperson and vice-chairperson become vacant within the same year, the Executive Committee shall appoint one of its members to act as chairperson until a chairperson is duly elected. At the next election two candidates shall be elected, one to take the office of chairperson immediately and to serve for one year, the other to serve as vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect).

(b) Vice-chairperson. If the office of vice-chairperson becomes vacant, two candidates shall be elected at the next election, one to take the office of chairperson immediately and to serve for one year, the other to serve as vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect). If the vacancy occurs between the close of nominations and the adjournment of the Annual Conference, the vacancy shall be considered as having occurred in the office of chairperson in the following year.

(c) Secretary and members-at-large of the Executive Committee. If the office of secretary or member-at-large becomes vacant, a secretary or member-at-large, as the case may be, shall be appointed by the Executive Committee to serve until a replacement is elected at the next election to complete the unexpired term.

(d) General provisions. If the successful candidate for an elective office dies or withdraws between the close of nominations and the adjournment of the Annual Conference, the resulting situation shall be considered as a vacancy having occurred during the term for which that candidate was elected.

Sec. 3. Terms of office. Members-at-large of the Executive Committee shall serve for three (3) years. They shall be elected for terms expiring in different years, or in case of more than three members-at-large, so that the terms of no more than two shall expire each year. They shall serve until the adjournment of the Annual Conference at which their successors are announced.

Sec. 4. Officers. The officers of the Section shall ex officio be the officers of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 5. Powers and duties. The Executive Committee shall have authority over the affairs of the Section during the period between meetings of the Section, provided however that none of its acts shall conflict with or modify any actions taken by the Section. The Executive Committee shall perform such other duties as are specified in these bylaws, and shall report upon its work at the regular meeting of the Section.

Sec. 6. Meetings. The Executive Committee shall meet in conjunction with each regular meeting of the Section. Special meetings may be called by the chairperson and shall be called upon the written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

Sec. 7. Quorum. A majority of voting members shall constitute a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 8. Votes by mail. Votes may be taken by mail as provided in the Bylaws of the Division.

Article IX. Other Committees

Sec. 1. Standing and annual committees.
(a) Establishment. The Section may establish standing and annual committees to consider affairs of the Section which require continuous or repeated attention by the members. The Executive Committee shall recommend the name and size of each such committee, and may recommend special regulations for its appointment, composition, and term of office of members.

(b) Composition. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Section, each standing and annual committee shall be composed of an odd number of not less than three (3) members, each of whom shall be an active member in good standing of the Section.

c) Terms of office. Unless otherwise
provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Section, members of standing committees shall be appointed for terms of two years, and may be appointed for a second term, but in no case shall a person serve on a committee for more than four consecutive years. The terms of approximately one-half the members shall expire each year. Members of annual committees shall be appointed for terms of one year.

Sec. 2. Special Committees. Committees not authorized as standing or annual committees shall be special committees. Special committees may be authorized by the Section or by the Executive Committee. Each special committee shall continue in existence until its purpose is accomplished or it is discharged by the Section or by the Executive Committee.

Sec. 3. Intersectional Committees. Intersectional committees with sections within the Division and other intra-division committees may be established by the Section upon notification of the Organization and Bylaws Committee of the Division.

Intersectional committees and other committees formed with units that are outside the Division and that are within the Association may be established only as provided for in Article IX, Sec. 5, of the Bylaws of the American Library Association.

Sec. 4. Joint committees. The Section may recommend to the Division that joint committees, either standing or special, be established with other organizations when the functions of the proposed committee cannot appropriately be delegated to a single Division or Section committee. Joint committees with organizations outside the American Library Association shall be established only as provided for in the Bylaws of the American Library Association.

Representation of the Section in organizations outside the Association may be authorized by the Section, with the approval of the Division and the American Library Association.

Sec. 5. Notification. The secretary shall inform the Executive Director, RTSD, annually of the establishment and functions, or discontinuance, of all committees of the Section.

Sec. 6. Appointments. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Section, each committee member and representative shall be appointed, with the approval of the Executive Committee, by the vice-chairperson (chairperson-elect), or the chairperson of the Section, under whose term of office as chairperson the member shall commence service and shall serve until the adjournment of the meeting at which the member's successor is appointed.

Vacancies on committees shall be filled by the chairperson of the Section with the approval of the Executive Committee.

Sec. 7. Votes by mail. Committee votes may be taken by mail as provided in the Bylaws of the Division.

Sec. 8. Reports. Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, or in the act authorizing a committee, each committee shall report on its work at least once annually. Copies of the report shall be transmitted to the chairperson of the Section and to the Executive Director, RTSD, at least 30 days prior to the regular meeting of the Section.

Article X. Discussion Groups

Sec. 1. Establishment. Any group of ten or more members of the Section interested in discussing common problems which fall within the object of the Section may form a discussion group upon written petition from the group, and upon approval of the Executive Committee. The petition shall include the purpose of the group and the requirements for membership, if any.

Sec. 2. Membership. Membership shall be open to members of the Section who are interested in the purpose of the group and who fulfill the requirements for membership in the group.

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the chairperson shall see that a group's activities are limited to discussion of common problems within the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Section, and that the Section bylaws are observed by the group.

Sec. 4. Discontinuance. Each group shall continue in existence until its usefulness has ceased when it shall be dissolved by action of the Executive Committee.

Article XI. Notice by Mail

Publication of notices in the RTSD Newsletter or the journal of the Division or
the Association shall be considered sufficient to fulfill the requirement of notice by mail.

Article XII. Parliamentary Authority

Robert’s Rules of Order (Revised) in the latest edition shall govern the Section in all cases to which it can be applied, and in which it is not inconsistent with these bylaws or special rules of order of the Section.

Article XIII. Amendments

Sec. 1. Proposals. Amendments to the bylaws may be proposed by the Executive Committee, by any other Section committee, or by petition signed by ten members of the Section. Proposed amendments shall be presented in writing to the chairperson of the Section and to the Executive Director, RTSD, at least three months prior to the meeting at which they are to be acted upon; they shall then be referred to the chairperson of the Organization and Bylaws Committee of the Division, which shall report upon them at a meeting of the Section.

Sec. 2. Notice. The text of any proposed amendment shall be mailed to each member of the Section at least thirty days prior to the meeting at which it is to be acted upon.

Sec. 3. Voting. The bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds majority vote of those members present and voting at the regular meeting of the Section.

Sec. 4. Adoption. A proposed amendment or new bylaw shall become effective when it has been approved.

Preservation of Library Materials Section Bylaws

Article I. Name

The name of this body is the Preservation of Library Materials Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

Article II. Object

The object of this section is to recommend and encourage educational and research programs and advise in the conduct of such programs in all aspects of the preservation of library materials, including preventive measures, preservation by duplication, and emergency preservation procedures; to advise and assist the library profession in the solution of preservation problems and to disseminate information concerning preservation techniques, supplies, and programs; to cooperate with paper manufacturers, publishers, binders, and other organizations interested in preservation, in achieving solutions to problems of mutual interest and concern.

Articles III through XIII are identical with those articles in the Bylaws of the Cataloging and Classification Section, except:

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 2. Nominating Committee.

(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee consists of three (3) members-at-large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

Article VIII. Executive Committee

Sec. 1. Composition. The Executive Committee consists of the officers of the Section, the immediate past chairperson of the Section, and one (1) member-at-large. The Executive Director, RTSD, the chairpersons of all standing committees and discussion groups of this Section, and the representative of the Section on the editorial board of the Division’s journal shall be ex officio members of the Executive Committee, without the right to vote.

Article X. Discussion Groups

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the chairperson shall see that a group’s activities are limited to discussion of matters of common interest and concern in accord with the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Section, and that the Section Bylaws are observed by the group.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section Bylaws

Article I. Name

The name of this body is the Reproduction of Library Materials Section of the
Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

Article II. Object

The object of this Section is to assist libraries by providing an organization for (1) the discussion of problems in the dissemination of information about the production, storage, and use of reproductions of library materials; and (2) the fostering of studies and research and the promotion of uniform practices and policies in this field.

Articles III through XIII are identical with those articles in the Bylaws of the Cataloging and Classification Section, except:

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 2. Nominating Committee.
(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee consists of three members-at-large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

Article VII. Executive Committee

Sec. 1. Composition. The Executive Committee consists of the officers of the Section, the immediate past chairperson of the Section, and one (1) member-at-large. The Executive Director, RTSD, and the representative of the Section on the editorial board of the Division's journal shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee, without the right to vote.

Article X. Discussion Groups

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the chairperson shall see that group's activities are limited to discussion of matters of common interest and concern in accord with the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Section, and that the Section Bylaws are observed by the group.

Serials Section Bylaws

Article I. Name

The name of this body is the Serials Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

Article II. Object

The object of this Section is to contribute to library service and librarianship through encouragement, promotion of, and responsibility for those activities of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association relating to collection development including selection, acquisition, and evaluation of library materials in all types of institutions.

Articles III through XIII are identical with those articles in the Bylaws of the Cataloging and Classification Section, except:

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 2. Nominating Committee.
(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee consists of three members-at-large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

Article X. Discussion Groups

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties of the office, the chairperson shall see that group's activities are limited to discussion of matters of common interest and concern in accord with the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Section, and that the Section Bylaws are observed by the group.
Services Division and within the American Library Association with respect to serials.

Articles III through XIII are identical with those articles in the Bylaws of Cataloging and Classification Section, except:

Article VI. Nominations and Elections

Sec. 2. Nominations Committee.
(a) Composition. The Nominating Committee consists of three members-at-large of the Section, no one of whom shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

Article VIII. Executive Committee

Sec. 1. Composition. The Executive Committee consists of the officers of the Section, the immediate past chairperson of the Section, and three (3) members-at-large. The Executive Director, RTSD, and the representative of the Section on the editorial board of the Division's journal shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee, without the right to vote.

Sec. 3. Terms of office. Members-at-large of the Executive Committee shall serve for three (3) years. They shall be elected for terms expiring in different years. They shall serve until the adjournment of the Annual Conference at which their successors are announced.

Article IX. Other Committees

Sec. 1. Standing and annual committees.
(c) Terms of office. Unless otherwise provided for by these bylaws or by action of the Section, members of standing committees shall be appointed for terms of two years, and may be appointed for a second term, but in no case shall a person serve on a committee for more than four consecutive years. The terms of approximately one-half the members shall expire each year. Members of annual committees shall be appointed for terms of one year.

Article X. Discussion Groups

Sec. 3. Officers. Each group shall elect a chairperson annually. In addition to the regular duties, the chairperson shall see that a group’s activities are limited to discussion of matters of common interest and concern in accord with the purpose of the group, that the group engages in no activity in conflict with the program of the Section, and that the Section Bylaws are observed by the group.
For the Record

Annual Report of the Decimal Classification
Editorial Policy Committee
July 1, 1980–June 30, 1981

Margaret E. Cockshutt, Chairperson

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (EPC) held its 80th meeting at the Library of Congress on April 9–10, 1981. The following members were present: Lizbeth Bishoff, Barbara Branson, Lois M. Chan, Margaret E. Cockshutt, Betty M. E. Croft, Joel C. Downing, John A. Humphry, and Donald J. Lehnus. Others attending were: John P. Comaromi (Editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification), Margaret J. Warren (Assistant Editor), Lucia J. Rather (Director for Cataloging, Library of Congress) and Judith K. Greene (Secretary). Mr. Anthony Croghan (Senior Lecturer, School of Librarianship, the Polytechnic of North London) and staff members of the Decimal Classification Division (DCD), Library of Congress were present, by invitation, as observers.

The Committee acted on the following matters:

1. It recommended to the Forest Press Committee that the new draft schedule expansion of Sociology, 301–307 of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) by accepted, subject to editorial refinement by the DCD; that the resulting publication should include an index, as well as Manual notes on the schedule's application; and that the publication be issued as a separate as soon as possible.

2. The EPC reviewed drafts of various sections of the Manual on the application of the DDC being prepared by John P. Comaromi, with the assistance of DCD staff. The Committee recommended to the Forest Press Committee that the editorial work on the Manual completed to date be approved, with completion and early publication to be a high priority.

3. The Committee considered a paper by Gregory R. New (DCD staff) proposing methods by which some major subject revisions might be relocalized in vacant numbers (as in the Edition 19 DDC use of the vacant 302–307), rather than reusing existing and thus conflicting notations with different meanings (as in the Edition 19 DDC phoenix revisions of 329 and geographic areas 41-42). Such relocations to vacant numbers would be considerably easier for libraries to implement. The EPC asked that the feasibility and effects of New's proposal be studied further by the Division.

4. A resolution was passed in thanks to Joel Downing who resigned from the EPC following his retirement from the British Library. The Committee recognized with gratitude his dedication and commitment to the DDC and to all forms of international library cooperation, and paid tribute to his distinguished service as the first international member of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee.
There was extensive discussion without action on other matters:

1. The EPC continued its discussions on the future of the DDC: the nature, extent, and impact of possible schedule changes; the real need for phoenix revisions when a schedule has a poor intellectual structure, which thus causes many practical problems in application, or when extensive changes in a subject make a schedule obsolete; and the strong preference expressed by many librarians in several countries for changes to be presented in small amounts over a long period of time, by continuous revision, rather than by cataclysmic changes in new editions.

2. The Committee discussed various format patterns for the dissemination of new, expanded, or revised schedules and tables; new editions versus supplements (with or without cumulations) to a basic edition; publication in Decimal Classification Additions, Notes and Decisions (DC&F) versus publication as separates; and one-time purchase costs for a new edition of the DDC together with the free distribution of DC&F versus subscription rates with perhaps an additional charge for separates which would present new or extensively revised schedules. The general consensus was that the basic question (yet to be answered) was the frequency of issue; DC&F should be published regularly and should include smaller revisions and corrections to the schedules and tables; and larger, extensive revisions should be produced according to the demands of users or the requirements of literary warrant.

3. The EPC discussed the serious concomitant problem of time-of-implementation of new and revised schedules issued as supplements between editions. Interim implementation by national bibliographic agencies in various countries would have a ripple effect through networks and bibliographic utilities to individual libraries. It was also recognized that there would be a loss of the intellectual unity of the DDC.

In committee business, Lois M. Chan was reelected as Vice-Chairperson to October 1982. The EPC accepted the recommendations of its Subcommittee established in 1980 to revise and update the Regulations for the Conduct of Committee Business. The next EPC meeting was scheduled for October 15-16, 1981.
INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

In preparing articles to be submitted for publication in Library Resources & Technical Services, please follow these procedures:

1. Submit original, unpublished articles only. Articles of less than 5,000 words are preferred. Write the article in a grammatically correct, simple, readable style. Remember that the author is responsible for the accuracy of the statements in his or her article.

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

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

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

5. Consult the University of Chicago Press A Manual of Style, 12th ed., rev., as your authority for capitalization, punctuation, quotations, tables, and captions. (ALA style includes a few exceptions, which editors will mark.)

6. Type the manuscript, double spaced, on 8 1/2-by 11-inch nonerasable paper. Type quoted text double spaced also. Use the customary superscript numbers throughout the text for bibliographic references but do not type the reference itself on the same page. Submit all references separately, at the end of the paper. Type the references double spaced.

7. In general follow the practices recommended by A Manual of Style with these exceptions:
   Cite journal articles according to this pattern: author's first name or initials, author's surname, title of article, title of journal volume: page references (issue date). For example:
      Note the punctuation and spacing pattern. Note also that the volume, but not the issue number, is given and that the names of the months are abbreviated and not separated from the year by a comma.
      Note that the first line is not indented.
      For subsequent references to a previously cited work, the surname(s) of the author(s), a shortened form of the title, and the page reference are enough. Do not use op. cit. or loc. cit. For example:
      If no other reference intervenes, use “Ibid.” to take the place of the elements of the previous reference that apply. Do not underline “Ibid.”
      Do underline or quote all titles in both references and bibliographies.
      Number items as 1., 2., etc., but do not use superscript numbers.
      Use p. 726-30, not pp. 726-730, for citations to a book or journal.
      Abbreviate volume as V.2 or 2v. However, it is not necessary to give total number of pages or volumes when a footnote reference cites an entire work.
      VERIFY ALL CITATIONS CAREFULLY.

8. Submit all tables and illustrations at the end of the paper, each on a separate page. Indicate the desired placement in the text by adding an instruction in brackets, e.g., [Insert Table 2]. Provide a brief, meaningful caption for each illustration and for each table. TYPE THE TABLES DOUBLE SPACED and follow the examples in A Manual of Style in constructing them.
omitting the vertical lines to indicate columns. Use tables sparingly.

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

10. If you have presented your paper at a conference, identify the conference by name and date in your cover letter. Send your original, ribbon copy, and two photocopies to Elizabeth L. Tate, Editor, LRTS, 11415 Farmland Dr., Rockville, MD 20852. Please include an addressed envelope, large enough and with sufficient postage to return the manuscript to you during the editorial review. Contributors outside the U.S.A. need not send the two photocopies or the envelope.
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Statement of Ownership and Management

Library Resources & Technical Services is published quarterly by the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. American Library Association, owner; Elizabeth L. Tate, editor. Second-class postage paid at Chicago, Illinois. Printed in U.S.A. A nonprofit organization authorized to mail at special rates (Section 132.122 Postal Services Manual), the purposes, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for federal income tax purposes have not changed during the preceding twelve months.

Extent and Nature of Circulation

("Average" figures denote the number of copies printed each issue during the preceding twelve months; "Actual" figures denote number of copies for single issues published nearest to filing date—the July/September 1981 issue.) Total number of copies printed: Average, 9,613; Actual, 9,537. Paid Circulation: not applicable (i.e., no sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales). Mail subscriptions: Average, 8,278; Actual, 8,394. Free distribution by mail, carrier or other means, samples, complimentary, and other free copies: Average, 889; Actual, 893. Total Distribution: Average, 9,167; Actual, 9,287. Copies not distributed: office use, leftover, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: Average 448; Actual, 250. Returns from news agents: not applicable. Total (sum previous three entries): Average, 9,613; Actual, 9,537.

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation

Reputations are built on service...

People of accomplishment give their names to libraries. Dwight Foster is one of them. Commissioned to supervise the digging of a canal to link the Great Lakes with the Mississippi, he was never able to finish the project. Railroads made the idea obsolete in its infancy. Foster stayed in the wilderness. He named an island and maintained the community's first postoffice.

People really forget service. Dwight Foster's home is maintained by the local historical society and the community library proudly bears his name.

The Highsmith Company Inc. knows the importance of service too, we stake our reputation on it...

For a free copy of our new 1981-82 Library and Audiovisual Equipment and Supplies catalog featuring over 20,000 items write to: Catalog 24, The Highsmith Co., Inc., P.O. Box 25 LNS, Fort Atkinson, WI 53538

---

Only Faxon could have created LINX

The superior serials management system that evolves with your changing needs.

- DATALINX for direct access to computerized Faxon data bases and files.
- LINX SC-10 for on-line check-in and claiming.
- LINX for instantaneous electronic messages and comprehensive on-line training.

Get the complete story on LINX.

There's no competition!

Mail coupon to:

Faxon
15 Southwest Park
Westwood, Massachusetts 02090 USA
Tel: 800-225-6055 (toll-free)
617-529-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library/Information Center:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City:</td>
<td>State:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ] please send me more information on LINX and how it would work for my library.

[ ] please contact me to schedule a free no-obligation LINX demonstration.
This manual provides, for the first time, a style for citations of all the nonprint media. It is designed to be a companion to such works as Campbell's Form and Style: Theses, Reports, Term Papers; The MLA Style Sheet for Reports and Theses; and Turabian's A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations. It includes models and rules for citations of the full range of nonprint media—micropublications and nonprint periodicals, charts, filmstrips, globes, kits, maps, microscope slides, models, motion pictures, realia, sound recordings, and video recordings. Brief and complete forms are furnished with many examples arranged for convenient reference.

74 pages Paper LC 78-9375

Order Department -
American Library Association
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
When you switch from microfilm to microfiche do you have to switch reader-printers?

Not if your library has the incredibly versatile Minolta RP 405E or its larger 11" x 17" screen version, the RP 407E.

They both handle virtually any microformat made. The quick-change film carriers put 16/35mm roll film, cartridge, jacket and fiche capabilities right at your fingertips.

Unlike any other reader-printers, Minolta's have an advanced automatic exposure control system for clean, detailed copies from either positive or negative film the very first time. So you save paper, time and money.

Librarians appreciate other Minolta advantages, too. Like prints that can be written on. And the long shelf life of RP 405E and RP 407E supplies. So you can load your Minolta with paper and toner and practically forget about it. They also appreciate how incredibly easy these reader-printers are to use.

So now you can switch formats to your heart's content. But first you have to switch to Minolta.

I'm interested in seeing the Minolta reader-printers in action.
I'm interested in more information.

| Name: | [ ] |
| Title: | [ ] |
| Library: | [ ] |
| Street: | [ ] |
| City: | [ ] |
| State: | [ ] Zip: [ ] |
| Phone: | [ ] |

Mail to: Minolta Corporation, Micrographics Division, 121 Williams Drive, Ramsey, N.J. 07446. (201) 825-4000

©1981 Minolta Corporation
Every customer is assigned an experienced "Home Office" representative. You correspond direct; any title needs, changes, cancellations or problems can be handled promptly by letter or phone. This makes your job easier and keeps you abreast of your subscription needs at all times.

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

TEACHING MATERIALS
FOR THE LEARNING DISABLED
A Selected List for Grades 6-12
Bernice Kemler Wise

A selected bibliography that permits special education teachers, reading teachers, and classroom teachers to identify learning materials—both print and nonprint—written at a reading level that learning disabled students can master. The book is in two parts. The first is a list of professional materials giving background knowledge. The second contains listings of both curricular and non-curricular materials. The curricular materials are arranged by subject; the recreational by interest. Following each entry are notes on reading and grade level, and a short annotation giving an idea of the theme of each book.

Great strides have been made in the identification of the learning disabled while at the same time resources have become available to help them. Because of recent legislation emphasizing mainstreaming, teachers will need to become familiar with these resources. This book will become an important tool for teachers in planning their instructional programs.


Order Department
American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611
When it comes to library supplies, Gaylord has everything you need...and then some! From audio-visual to archival, labels to laminates, stamp pads to staplers, we've got it, and you can get it—exactly as you ordered it, precisely when you need it.

Because whatever you need for your library, you can be sure Gaylord has it!

Consult your 1981-82 catalog, or call TOLL FREE 800 448-6160 for more information on our extensive supply line and many new products.
Midwest Library Service
Is Pleased To Announce An Expanded
BOOK CONTINUATION
AND
STANDING ORDER SERVICE

In order to meet the growing needs of the academic library community, Midwest Library Service has recently enlarged its activities in this area of book acquisitions. We invite you to submit your Continuations List to us for prompt, efficient processing. Our publisher base includes approximately 500 selected publishers. We also offer binding services on paperback continuations.

Excellent service is the backbone of any good Continuations Service and we provide exactly that by assigning you a Personal Customer Service Representative and offering you the use of our Toll-Free WATS line: 1-800-325-8833. So for a copy of our new brochure on "CONTINUATION & STANDING ORDER SERVICE" call us right now, using the toll-free number, or else please fill in the reply coupon.

Yes, I would like more information about your Continuation & Standing Order Service:

[ ] Please mail me your new Brochure on this subject.
[ ] Please have a member of your staff call me.

(Name) (Title)

Address

City State Zip Code

Telephone Number

Please Mail Coupon To: Mr. Howard Lesser, President
Midwest Library Service
11443 St. Charles Rock Road
Bridgeton, Mo. 63044

"20 Years of Service to College and University Libraries"

MIDWEST LIBRARY SERVICE
11443 St. Charles Rock Road
Bridgeton, Mo. 63044
Learn How Libraries Acquire, Organize, and Maintain Their Resources

Introduction to Library Technical Services

BY
FRANCES SIMONSEN BERNHARDT

This comprehensive examination of library technical services is an exploration of the library world, principles of acquisitions and cataloging, the physical preparation of books and their repair, and special collections, including audiovisual materials, serials, and the vertical file.

Originally designed as a textbook for a course in technical services in a two-year library/media technology program, *Introduction to Library Technical Services* is an effective resource for anyone who wants to learn how books and other materials are acquired, organized, and maintained by libraries.

Those who will find *Introduction to Library Technical Services* useful include librarians and others who work in libraries, students enrolled in courses of study leading to library careers, and those who need to know more about library technical services before making a career decision. Exercises and activities for students of library technical services are included, as well as a glossary and an annotated bibliography.

Trade Names Dictionary
3rd Edition
A guide to trade names, brand names, product names, coined names, model names, and design names. Entries provide trade name, product description, name of manufacturer or distributor, and key to source of information. Manufacturers' addresses appear in the regular alphabetic sequence. 160,000 entries. Edited by Donna Wood. 1,000pp. in 2 vols. 1982. $160.00/set. (SO) Also available: New Trade Names. 1982 and 1983 supplements. $140.00/both. (SO)

Trade Names Dictionary: Company Index
3rd Edition
Lists all 36,000 companies recorded in TND-3, together with the trade names of their products. 950pp. 1982. $185.00. (SO)

Research Centers Directory
7th Edition
Contains 5,000 listings of university-related and other nonprofit research groups throughout the U.S. and Canada. Edited by Robert C. Thomas. Indexes. 900pp. 1982. $170.00. (SO) Also available: New Research Centers: Supplements. Inter-edition subscription, $150.00 (SO)

Government Research Centers Directory
2nd Edition
Fully describes 1,600 research and development facilities operated by or for the U.S. government. Edited by Anthony T. Kruzas and Kay Gill. Indexes. 425pp. 1982. $160.00. (SO)

Statistics Sources
7th Edition
Designed to identify primary sources of statistical data, especially in American publications, of national rather than regional scope. The new edition contains over 22,000 citations to sources of statistics on over 12,000 subjects. Edited by Paul Wasserman and Jacqueline O'Brien. 1,100pp. 1982. $120.00. (SO)

All Gale books are sent on 90-day approval. (SO) These titles are available at Gale's 5% standing order discount. Customers outside the U.S. and Canada add 10%.