# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Locally and Nationally Produced Periodical Price Indexes in Budget Preparation. Mary E. Clack and Sally F. Williams</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Selection and Preparation of Archives and Manuscripts for Microreproduction. Madeleine Perez, Andrew Raymond, and Ann Swartzell</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the WLN Authority Control System by an ARL Library. Ruth Patterson Funabiki, Ingrid Mifflin, and Karen Corlee</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AACR2 and the Level of Description Principle. Herbert H. Hoffman</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing European Automatic Acquisitions. Robert G. Sewell</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Mann Citation, 1983: Frances Hinton Frances Hinton. Edward Swanson</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther J. Piercy Award, 1983: Sue A. Dodd Sue A. Dodd. Marcia Tuttle</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources Section Blackwell North America Scholarship Award, 1983: The Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools: Concepts, Practices and Information Sources, by Phyllis Van Orden. Ruth Fraley</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Memoriam: Theodore Christian Hines</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide to Collection Evaluation Through Use and User Studies. Dorothy E. Christiansen, C. Roger Davis and Jutta Reed-Scott</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Annual Reports, 1982/1983</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to the Editor</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Locally and Nationally Produced Periodical Price Indexes In Budget Preparation

Mary E. Clack and Sally F. Williams

In the late 1970s, Widener Library compiled a periodical price index from its own payment records, compared it with some published indexes, and, while significant differences in average prices were found, there was also a very strong correlation with the rate of price changes over the period 1967 to 1977. Using regression, Widener predicted its 1977 average periodical prices with mixed results. This paper updates the Widener index with data from 1978 to 1982, compares the Widener index to two published indexes, finds justification for continuing to compile its own index, and concludes that because Widener’s average prices were predicted with good results for the last four years using a national index, it can reduce the staff effort needed to produce the index by testing for accuracy once every five years. To be useful in budget preparation, this scheme is dependent upon the continued timely publication of the national index as well as adherence to the present local budget preparation schedule.

Much has been written cautioning libraries to use the published library materials price indexes with care in preparing library materials budgets since the published indexes show national price trends which may differ from a specific library’s price trends in two ways. The scope of an individual library’s collection may differ from the scope of titles included in a national index, and this different selection of titles may affect the results. Then, too, the actual price paid by a library may differ from the annual subscription price recorded for the national indexes, and consequently the library’s average price may differ from the national average price.

For these reasons, Widener Library, the central research collection in the humanities and social sciences at Harvard University, questioned the validity of using published periodical price indexes in formulating its periodicals budget. Because of its large number of foreign periodical subscriptions and the exclusion at Widener of scientific and technologi-
cal titles, which figure significantly in the published indexes, it was thought that Widener price data would in actuality be substantially different from published price data. In addition, Widener’s policy of entering multイヤ subscriptions whenever possible was expected to result in lower actual prices paid than average periodical prices reported in the published literature.

In the late 1970s, Widener compiled a periodical price index of its own. The Widener index is a price index of periodicals published in the humanities and social sciences in the five countries that are the major sources of periodical titles acquired for the central research collection in the Harvard College Library. These countries are the United States, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy. The Widener index was designed with a country-of-origin approach because at Widener lines of responsibility for selection of materials, and thus budget responsibility, are principally delineated by language/country of publication within the humanities and social sciences. Periodical titles that met the criteria of American National Standard Criteria for Price Indexes for Library Materials ANSI Z39.20-1974 were selected from visible record tray numbers generated from a table of random permutations.

The Widener index results from the combination of the prices for each of the five countries and has a one-year base—1970. In addition, price information for United States titles was collected as far back as 1967 to allow construction of an index parallel to the price index for United States periodicals published annually in Library Journal.

Hereafter the part of the Widener index that is composed of U.S. periodicals is referred to as the Widener US Index and, where necessary distinguish between the U.S. portion and the whole, the sum of all of parts is referred to as the Widener Combined Index.

The average prices derived in the compilation of the Widener periodical price index were correlated with average prices from two published indexes, an international index and a domestic index. The international index, compiled by John B. Merriam of B. H. Blackwell Limited, is published in the Library Association Record. The specific component compared was the Humanities and Social Sciences category of All Prices, which was converted to dollars using the average annual rate of exchange quoted by the International Monetary Fund in its periodical International Financial Statistics. Hereafter this index is referred to as the Blackwell HSS Index. The domestic index, compiled by Norman B. Brown and Jane Phillips on behalf of the Library Materials Price Index Committee of the Resources Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association, is published in Library Journal. Hereafter this index is referred to as the ALA index.

Very strong correlation was found between the Widener Combined Index and the Blackwell HSS Index and between the Widener US Index and the ALA index. With the use of the regression method of least squares, Widener average prices for the year 1977 were predicted and compared to the actual average prices determined from the Widener sample. The Widener Combined price for 1977 predicted from the Blackwell HSS Index from data of the period 1970–76 was found to be 5.4 percent higher than the actual Widener Combined average price.
The Widener US average price predicted from the ALA index was found to be 1.8 percent lower than the actual price. The library was willing to accept a 1.8 percent loss in accuracy in predicting the U.S. average price, thus saving the staff time in compiling that price index component, but it found the 5.4 percent error in predicting the Widener Combined periodical price unacceptable because of the potential distortion of the annual rates of change. A strong possible explanation for the variance between predicted price and actual price was that too few data points were available to produce valid results. Since it was not possible to gather data for prior years, data for future years would be required to test the assumptions of validity.

The purpose of this paper is threefold: first, to update the Widener index with data for the period 1978 to 1982 (see table 1); second, to compare the Widener index, a local index, to published indexes to determine which is more useful in budget applications; and third, to report on results of using the statistical method of regression analysis of the national and local indexes for a certain period of years in order to predict the local price for subsequent years, a technique which reduces the staff effort in compiling data for the local index.

During the analysis of data through 1977, several questions arose: Does a library get less accurate annual budgeting using the published indexes? If so, does the loss of accuracy justify the effort of compiling a local price index which must be updated annually? If a library’s average prices differ greatly from the national average, does this materially affect the annual rate of change which is the prime budget factor of libraries such as Widener, which have mature, relatively stable periodical collections? Is there a consistently strong correlation between the national pattern and the local pattern which can be easily captured and used to derive the local pattern with less effort and with an acceptable error rate? Would adding more years of data to the period already sampled improve the results?

The answer to the first question is yes, the library would have experienced less accurate annual budgeting results using the published indexes. By comparing the average prices between the Widener Combined prices and Blackwell HSS prices over the twelve-year period 1970 to 1982, it is seen from table 2 that the Blackwell HSS prices were higher by a range of 19 percent to 40 percent. The annual percent change differed by more than 2 percent in eight of the twelve years. By comparing the Widener Combined and ALA average prices over the twelve-year period 1970 to 1982, it is seen that the ALA average price was lower in three years and higher in nine years. By comparing the Widener US Index to the ALA index over the thirteen-year period from 1967–69 to 1982, it is seen in table 3 that the average ALA price ranged from 2 percent lower to 54 percent higher than the Widener US average price. In nine of the thirteen years the annual percent change differed by more than 2 percent.

To answer the second and third questions, it does not necessarily follow that if a library can obtain more accurate budget estimates using its own periodical price index, it is clearly better to do so. Several factors should be considered. First, there is the staff effort in compiling an in-
TABLE 1
Widener Periodical Price Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combined Widener Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>$ 9.45</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>$10.13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>111.1</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>113.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>118.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>143.6</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>125.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>134.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>185.0</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>142.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>191.7</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>161.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>214.2</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>171.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>302.2</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>188.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>349.6</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>214.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>400.2</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>242.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>385.5</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>255.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>403.3</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>287.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>German Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$ 8.24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>$ 8.73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>135.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>186.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>170.9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>195.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>228.8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>230.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>247.9</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>248.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>21.46</td>
<td>260.4</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>299.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>326.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>500.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38.13</td>
<td>462.7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>48.59</td>
<td>556.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>484.6</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>51.67</td>
<td>591.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34.80</td>
<td>422.3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>45.90</td>
<td>525.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33.54</td>
<td>407.0</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>43.27</td>
<td>495.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Britain Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italian Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>$8.54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>$11.30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>112.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>106.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>131.3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>116.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>124.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>186.9</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>154.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>209.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>166.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>263.6</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>162.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>38.72</td>
<td>453.4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>231.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>549.4</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25.48</td>
<td>225.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>57.06</td>
<td>668.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>265.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>55.31</td>
<td>647.6</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>247.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>59.82</td>
<td>700.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>234.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2

Comparison of Average Prices and Annual Percent Change in Widener Combined, Blackwell HSS, and ALA Periodical Prices 1970-82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Widener Combined Average Price</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
<th>Blackwell HSS Average Price*</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
<th>ALA Average Price</th>
<th>Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>$9.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.96</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>$10.41</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.69</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>13.23</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>19.94</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>33.88</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>27.58</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>46.27</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>34.54</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>46.58</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Price in pounds sterling has been converted at the average annual rate quoted by the International Monetary Fund in its periodical *International Financial Statistics*.

TABLE 3

Comparison Between Widener US Periodical Price Index and ALA Periodical Price Index, Base Years, 1967-69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Widener US Periodicals</th>
<th>ALA Periodicals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-69</td>
<td>$8.83</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>114.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>130.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>136.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>143.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>153.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>163.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>184.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>196.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>216.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>245.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>278.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>293.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>329.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

dex, maintaining it annually, and analyzing the results in time to be useful in budget preparation. Second, there is the question of the use of an index for budget purposes. A price index measures the rate of change in prices over time and is an appropriate indicator of the percent change needed to maintain approximately the same number of titles in a fairly
stable periodical collection. An index in itself is not an appropriate indicator of the adequacy of the total budget needed if there are changes in scope and depth of collections. Average price in combination with title production or some other measure of quantity should be used to that end. However, in times of economic austerity, libraries frequently are forced by hard-pressed administrations into the unfortunate position of depending solely upon the inflation argument to provide the additional budgets to support expanding collections. In such circumstances, if a library’s objective is to advance the argument for the greatest annual increase, which index lends the most support, the local or the national?

The Widener Combined Index was compared to the Blackwell HSS Index and the ALA index, and the Widener US Index was compared to the ALA index and the difference in annual percent change noted.

![Annual percent change in Widener Combined subtracted from Blackwell HSS](image1)

![Annual percent change in Widener Combined subtracted from ALA](image2)

![Annual percent change in Widener US subtracted from ALA](image3)

Figure 1
Difference in Annual Percentage Change
Periodical Price Indexes

These differences are illustrated in figure 1. In six of the twelve years in which the Widener Combined prices and Blackwell HSS prices were compared, the Widener annual percent change was higher than the Blackwell HSS Index annual percent change. Half the higher rates were increases of less than 2 percent difference and half were more than 2 percent, but the Widener increases more than 2 percent higher than the Blackwell HSS in three years were significantly greater than the decreases in the other three years. The range of variances between the Widener rate and Blackwell HSS rates was from -4.9 percent to + 22.1 percent. In the period 1970 through 1982, the Widener or local index yielded the greatest annual percent increases.

On the other hand, comparison of the annual percent change in the Widener US component with that of the ALA index showed the opposite results. In ten of the thirteen years compared, the Widener, or local, increase was less than the ALA or national increase, and in six years the difference was more than 2 percent, ranging from -16.8 percent to + 3.3 percent. The ALA, or national, index showed the higher rate of increase for the period 1967-82.

Widener does not at present allocate its periodicals budget according to the various geographic delineations, but presents a total periodicals budget for approval. Since more than 50 percent of Widener’s collection is composed of foreign periodicals, it was thought that the more convincing of the published indexes was the international, or Blackwell HSS Index, rather than the domestic, or ALA index. Thus it is in Widener’s Library’s interest to continue the Widener Combined Index rather than to rely on the Blackwell HSS Index, which showed annual increases less than Widener’s annual increases. If Widener’s collection were composed of more domestic titles, then it would be appropriate and in Widener’s interest to rely on the ALA, or national, index.

At the same time, Widener must seek to produce its index in the most efficient and timely manner. It was hoped that regression analysis could be employed to produce an average Widener price acceptably close to the average price which would have resulted from actual compilation and that this predicted price could be substituted for the actual price in estimating the annual rate of change needed to support the periodicals budget. For this purpose both national indexes were candidates for testing, since what is sought is the index that most accurately predicts the Widener Combined average price. For the interest of libraries with principally domestic periodical collections, the results of the Widener US component are also given.

Correlation coefficients were calculated between the Widener Combined Index and Blackwell HSS Index for the period 1970 to 1982, and between the Widener Combined Index and the ALA index for the period 1970 to 1982, and between the Widener US Index and the ALA index for the period 1967 to 1982. The correlation coefficients found were:

- Widener Combined and Blackwell HSS: \( r = 0.9971 \)
- Widener Combined and ALA: \( r = 0.9662 \)
- Widener US and ALA: \( r = 0.9938 \)
The higher correlation coefficient .9971 indicated that better prediction of the Widener Combined average price would be obtained from the Blackwell HSS Index than from the ALA index. The relationships of the indexes can be more easily seen in figures 2 and 3.

In the four most recent years, 1979-82, the Widener Combined prices predicted from the Blackwell HSS Index differed from the actual price by 1.4 percent or less, as can be seen from the first six entries in table 4. In the years 1977, 1981, and 1982, the Widener US prices predicted from the ALA index differed from the actual price by 1.8 percent or less (see table 5). The annual percent changes in predicted prices for the same period (1977-82) were calculated and compared to Widener actual prices and those from the Blackwell HSS Index and the ALA index. The difference between the Widener rates and the rates of the two national indexes was assumed to be the expected budget deviation from the actual
situation represented by the Widener Combined Index. The question to be answered was which price produced the annual percent change with the lesser variation from the Widener rate—the Widener price predicted from the national index or the national price itself.

In both indexes the Widener price predicted from the national price resulted in the lesser range of difference (see table 6). With the ALA index, however, the greatest and most frequent variations were positive,
### TABLE 4

**Comparison of Predicted Price to Actual Price in the Widener Combined Periodical Price Index Using Blackwell HSS Index as Predictor, 1977–82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Predicted Price</th>
<th>Actual Price</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977 (7 years data)</td>
<td>$21.34</td>
<td>$20.24</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 (8 years data)</td>
<td>24.89</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>-3.67</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (9 years data)</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 (10 years data)</td>
<td>37.60</td>
<td>37.82</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (11 years data)</td>
<td>36.94</td>
<td>36.43</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 (12 years data)</td>
<td>37.58</td>
<td>38.11</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Difference Between Predicted Price and Actual Price, Widener Combined Periodical Price Index and Blackwell HSS Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data through 1976 (7 years)</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
<td>-6.0</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
<td>-6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 (8 years)</td>
<td>-12.8</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>-9.9</td>
<td>-8.4</td>
<td>-10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 (9 years)</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (10 years)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 (11 years)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5

**Comparison of Predicted Price to Actual Price in the Widener US Periodical Price Index Using ALA Periodical Prices as Predictor, 1977–82**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Predicted Price</th>
<th>Actual Price</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977 (8 years data)</td>
<td>$17.06</td>
<td>$17.37</td>
<td>$-0.31</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 (9 years data)</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (10 years data)</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 (11 years data)</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (12 years data)</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982 (13 years data)</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Difference Between Predicted Price and Actual Price, Widener U.S. Periodical Price Index and ALA Periodical Prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data through 1976 (8 years)</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-3.4</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>-11.0</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 (9 years)</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 (10 years)</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
<td>-8.7</td>
<td>-4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979 (11 years)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 (12 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 (13 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
indicating increases higher than those resulting from the Widener predicted prices. With the Blackwell HSS Index the greatest and most frequent variations were negative, indicating annual increases less than those resulting from Widener predicted prices.

The last remaining question was how many years can a library continue to predict prices within the acceptable margin of error? The task was to determine the optimum interval of time between compilations to bring the predicted price into line with the actual price. In the Widener Combined Index, data covering the nine-year period, 1970–78, predicted the 1979 price within 1.4 percent of the actual price and were selected to predict the prices for 1980 onward. The same was done using ten years data (1970–79), and so on through twelve years of data. (See second portion of table 4.)

For the last four years, Widener average prices predicted in this way ranged from -1.4 percent to 0.8 percent accuracy when compared to those predicted from data incorporating the prior years’ actual prices. Annual rates of change of the predicted prices ranged from -1.7 percent to 1.6 percent accuracy. The cumulative four-year change was 1 percent less than the actual.
With these results the library feels comfortable in using the linear regression method of least squares to determine the slope of the regression line of the Widener Combined Index on the Blackwell HSS Index for the period 1970 to 1982 to predict the Widener Combined average prices for the next five years. In the sixth year Widener should gather price information using the same tray numbers generated from the same table of random permutations and calculate the actual average price. This actual average price should be compared to the predicted average price. If the prices are close, the library may continue using this regression equation. If the prices are not acceptably close, the slope of the regression line should be recalculated incorporating current data to reestablish an acceptable price predictor.

The value of an accurate predictor of periodical price increases for budget preparation is obvious. It is equally advantageous to discover a less time-consuming method to obtain the necessary information. This method of prediction is practical (and less time-consuming) for Widener because it already had its own index, prepared for a period of seven years, which was expanded by adding new data for five succeeding years, giving a total period of twelve years data upon which to draw. A library that does not already have average price information will need to compile it for a period of time. If the Widener experience can be projected, the number of years needed to establish an accurate price predictor using linear regression is nine years.

As with any price index, it is the historical data of the past that are used to predict future trends. What makes the previously described procedure practical for the Widener Library is the fact that the Blackwell HSS average price is published in time to be incorporated into the budget preparations. If the publication of the index should be delayed or the due date of the library’s budget should be advanced, the library would need to seek another way to estimate its periodicals budget and submit other evidence in its defense. Until that time, Widener will continue to take advantage of the Blackwell HSS Index to predict its own average prices and annual rate of increase with greater precision than would have resulted from using the Blackwell HSS Index alone and with less effort than would have been required to continue compiling the Widener Combined Periodical Price Index annually.
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The Selection and Preparation of Archives and Manuscripts for Microreproduction

Madeleine Perez, Andrew Raymond, and Ann Swartzell

The following article outlines the basic steps in the identification and preparation of a wide variety of archival and library materials for microreproduction. No attempt has been made to introduce the reader to the language or technology of microfilm; that subject has been well covered elsewhere (an annotated bibliography is included for overview). Much of the information which follows is common sense in nature but perhaps for that reason is often casually applied or completely overlooked. The guidelines will mainly benefit the curator with no previous microfilming experience, but may also serve as a convenient checklist for the experienced processor or as a basis for development of a more detailed in-house manual. In each case, the goal is to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort and to facilitate the production of more accurate and usable microforms.

Custodians of archival and library materials share an important part of the responsibility for the production of high-quality microforms. It is not enough for archivists or librarians simply to know the materials in their custody; they must also understand enough about micrographics to select and prepare specific collections for microreproduction properly. Although these functions are crucial to the success of any microforms project, very few resources are readily available to those who must perform them. Given the integral role of microfilm in any program to preserve and disseminate information of research value, these problems can no longer be ignored.

Unfortunately, archivists and librarians often lack the necessary understanding of micrographics for several reasons. First, much of the published literature on the subject is oriented toward commercial, not library or archival, applications and tends to be either oversimplified or too technical in content. Second, the notion of microforms as a last resort that is quick, simple, and inexpensive is still widespread. Unfortunately, this misconception is responsible for the very casual attitude displayed by many custodians in the selection and preparation of materials for microreproduction.

Madeleine Perez is the Medical Center Archivist, Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Wake Forest University, in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Andrew Raymond is Assistant Director for Microform Services of the Northeast Document Conservation Center, Andover, Massachusetts. Ann Swartzell is Preservation Librarian for Preservation Microfilming Projects of the Harvard University Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
filming. Third, many researchers still avoid the use of microforms, which they consider inconvenient and aseptic, thereby inhibiting some librarians and archivists from employing microfilm or fiche as an appropriate means of preservation and access to their collections. The inevitable result is either no microforms at all or unusable microforms.

Regardless of the objections, microforms will continue to play an important role in preserving and making available materials of enduring value. How else can we hope to preserve the holdings of our libraries which, according to one estimate, are doubling in volume every sixteen years? How can we satisfy the growing demand for access to archival and manuscript materials which are virtually or absolutely unique and which are often too fragile to withstand more frequent handling? How else are we to contend with the exponential increase in the quantity of records produced by our mass culture? Traditional methods of paper conservation simply cannot cope with the problem of preserving and using such massive quantities of information. Without microforms, access to these materials can be provided only at the expense of their preservation.

**NATURE OF THE MATERIALS**

Preservation filming is often a slow and costly process largely because of the nature of the materials themselves. Much of the value of archival and manuscript collections, for example, is derived from a knowledge of their original order and function, but to research this information is frequently difficult and time-consuming. Irregularities in record keeping, missing issues, and title changes of publications are a few of the difficulties which often occur in older materials. Sometimes, as a result, it is necessary to create an order for an archival or manuscript collection to make it usable by researchers. This step is especially important for microfilming, which represents a fixed, linear system of information; it is impossible to compare two documents side by side or to shuffle them back and forth from one part of the collection to another. Accordingly, problems of arrangement must be confronted before filming begins.

The physical character and condition of most manuscript materials affect the microreproduction process as well. Even if the materials are very old, those which have deteriorated due to acid paper, dirt, poor storage conditions, or simple mishandling are likely to demand the most immediate attention. Older records are more likely to have been written on high-quality paper, but they are also more likely to be victims of earlier attempts at repair or restoration, which may have only hastened the process of deterioration. Records from different periods will show wide variations in script, writing instruments, or paper and, therefore, may require more frequent adjustments in lighting, focus, and image orientation during filming. Compared to documents of more recent vintage, which tend to be more uniform in size and contrast characteristics and in good condition, older manuscript materials make filming slower and less efficient. With careful preparation and filming, however, it is possible to reproduce all significant record detail in most collections.

Printed materials differ significantly from manuscripts in their editorial and physical characteristics. With the exception of rare books, fine
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Selection for Filming

There is no simple formula, only general guidelines to follow in choosing the materials to microfilm. Despite its advantages, copying can only preserve information, not the intrinsic value of a document. Materials that are extremely faded or have otherwise deteriorated can rarely be made more legible on microfilm. As a general rule, collections with complicated copyright restrictions or with extremely low research value also should not be filmed. In addition to the staff time required for the preparation of materials for filming and the inspection of film, microreproduction involves other hidden costs such as the purchase and maintenance of a reader as well as the long-term storage of the master negative under controlled environmental conditions. The latter is essential to ensuring the archival quality of the microfilm and should be considered before making a commitment to microfilm. Hidden costs and inconvenience aside, the age, condition, and bulk of materials needing preservation today often permit few alternatives. Most serial publications, for example, are printed on highly acidic paper and are so voluminous that traditional methods of conservation are impractical. Furthermore, the massive quantities of information being generated—and destroyed—through electronic data processing today can only be preserved for extended periods by transferring it directly onto microfilm, often without any intervening paper stage (e.g., computer output microfilm). At the other end of the spectrum, microfilm indirectly helps to preserve the intrinsic value of rare books and manuscripts by virtually eliminating the need to handle them. Clearly, the reasons for filming can vary widely depending on the materials and the intended use.

No decision to film should be made without first trying to determine whether or not the material has already been filmed. If so, purchasing a copy of the film is far less expensive than refilming. Unfortunately, there is no national register or other clearinghouse for archives and manuscript collections which have been filmed, so contacting the likely repositories of specific collections may be necessary. For monographs and serial publications, consult the National Register of Microform Masters (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1965-75, in 5v., annual 1976- ) or Newspapers in Microform (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress. In two parts: United States, 1948-72, 1973-77, annual 1978- ; Foreign Countries, 1948-72, 1973-77, annual 1978- ). Also consult the catalogs of various micropublishers as well as individual repositories that have strong collections in the subject area of the publications being considered for filming. The search should also help to determine the nature, organization, and extent of the publication and to
identify possible sources for borrowing materials to supplement the collection on hand.

**PHYSICAL PREPARATION**

After deciding to microfilm, remove the collection from use; this step will save hours of rechecking later, as researchers seldom leave a collection in order. Place a note saying that it is closed with an inventory or other finding aid, in the card catalog and at the shelf location, indicating the name of the processor and the date on which the collection was closed. If it is large or in constant use, try to give notice several months in advance of the closing date. The processor can make exceptions for researchers who know exactly what they need, provided they want only limited parts of the collection and provided they do not interfere with preparation for filming.

The actual preparation of the collection for filming is largely a matter of common sense, a fact that sometimes is—but should not be—used to justify inconsistent and haphazard preparation procedures. Work systematically from written guidelines outlined here or elsewhere with the idea that they will probably have to be adapted to meet individual requirements. The experienced microfilm processor will think simultaneously about editorial and physical preparation procedures, thereby avoiding the necessity of going through a collection several times. The beginning processor, however, should follow each step individually in the interest of accuracy; the ability to perform more than one function at the same time will develop with experience.

The material itself, together with the physical requirements for microfilming, will dictate many decisions. Paper so brittle that it disintegrates on touch, for example, may have to be discarded. In extreme cases, even basic arrangement preliminary to filming. However, where conservation of the originals can be justified by their intrinsic value, legibility of the microfilm copy may also be improved as a result. Where restoration of the original is not possible or practical, shortcuts can sometimes be used to good advantage (e.g., the use of Scotch brand cellulose tape on papers that are to be discarded).

Going through the collection folder by folder and item by item, remove all clips, staples, and other fasteners so that everything can be laid sufficiently flat for filming. Identify and list all items requiring cleaning, repair, or other special treatment. Make a note of potential problems that will require specific filming instructions. Examine bound books individually to determine whether disbinding is necessary. Microfilmers use a book box or cradle which helps to keep an open book flat enough for filming, usually without damage to the book. However, if the binding is too tight, a shadow appears in the gutter of the book obscuring the text. For volumes that are to be discarded after filming, guillotining (i.e., slicing off the spine) offers the most efficient means of complete disbinding. For volumes that are to be retained, the binding may be loosened or the inner threads of the sidesewing removed to allow sufficient flattening. Cut unopened or uncut pages. Oversize foldouts—maps, charts, and the like—must either be filmed at a higher reduction ratio to fit in one frame, or be filmed in sections.
EDITORIAL PREPARATION

The arrangement of all materials must be perfect before filming; rearrangement later on is impractical, and, of course, expensive. This step can be especially difficult when processing an unorganized archival or manuscript collection for which an order must be created. And, although microfilm can be adapted to any arrangement, the decision to film may provide a good opportunity to reprocess an older collection more in keeping with current professional standards. Collation of published material is usually easier, but resolving problems with misprints, issues bound out of order, title changes, and irregular publication can prove time-consuming. More than anything else, errors in the arrangement of the originals will undermine the research value of the microfilm copy.

Several basic steps are followed in preparing a collection of records, manuscripts, or publications for microfilming: arrangement, preparation of titles, targets and insert sheets, and compiling frame counts. The amount of time and difficulty involved will depend largely on the materials to be filmed. Initially, these steps should be followed separately in the above order. However, an experienced processor can combine them in whatever way is convenient, noting problems or questions while doing so. The seven steps in arranging materials for filming are as follows:

1. Do not film blank pages. If pages are numbered, an explanation concerning missing page numbers should be given on the target identifying the volume, or, if the problem recurs, in the general notes at the beginning of the reel.
2. Remove duplicates or target them as such so that they will not be filmed. Remove such memorabilia as handkerchiefs and dried flowers before filming. Explain your decision in the introduction or on the folder target.
3. Film endorsements on the backs of wills, deeds, letters, or contracts before the text of the document.
4. Film an enclosure immediately following its letter or following the pages of the book between which it was found. Envelopes, however, if kept, should precede their contents.
5. Film indexes immediately before the text to which they pertain. If this essential is not brought to the attention of the filmer in each case, the index is likely to be filmed at the end of the text, making it extremely awkward to use.
6. Film folder labels only when they contain identifying information, in which case they precede the contents of the folder. If the information is complete enough (as is rarely the case), the folder label can serve as the folder target.
7. Omit published material found in a manuscript collection and protected by copyright. Have the title page filmed along with a target explaining why the text was not included. Publications in the public domain found in the collection should be filmed.

Check every item to make sure all are accounted for and that all are in their proper sequence. Where entries in multipaged documents and volumes were regularly dated or clearly written in sequence, the order is
easy to follow. However, you must arrange unnumbered pages of bound volumes and of letter pages in order. Do they follow in the normal sequence? If not, pencil a page number enclosed in brackets in the upper-right-hand corner to help the microfilmer follow the pages in the correct order. Note missing parts of pages by adding a sheet of paper behind the page to draw the attention of the filmer and to mask the following page during filming.

Preparing newspaper clippings for filming often presents special problems. Whenever possible, they should be trimmed of extraneous information. Group large clippings or full pages of newspapers together so long as the resulting rearrangement does not seriously affect access to the information. This method will help to minimize changes in the reduction ratio, which slow down microfilming considerably. If possible, mount large groups of small clippings so that the filmer does not have to handle as many individual clippings. Use library glue or, if the filmed material is to be discarded, tape.

After going through the collection completely, check your notes to determine the problems that will be covered by the general instructions to the filmer and those that will require separate attention. Instructional targets are used to point out the latter to the filmer. They should be typed or handwritten legibly on colored paper, preferably the same color throughout the collection. Attach these targets directly to the item in question, using a safe fastener (e.g., plastic clips); they will not be filmed. Because unclipping, filming, and reclipping them takes considerable time, instructional targets should be kept to a minimum. Typical examples include: e.g., FILM BOTH SIDES; DO NOT FILM PICTURE SIDE OF POSTCARD; UNFOLD BOTTOM OF CLIPPING BEFORE FILMING.

Informational targets, unlike instructional ones, are for the benefit of the user of the microfilm. They will be filmed and, hence, should be typed with no erasures or strikeovers on white paper or card stock no smaller than three inches by five inches. A large typeface is easier to read on microfilm, but elite or pica is acceptable. These targets are usually placed to the side or at the top of the document being filmed. Title sheets, series notations, and longer notes are typed on individual sheets of paper and filmed in separate frames.

Each file unit (e.g., folder or volume) should have an informational target that includes its number and a title or short description of the contents. It may include the name of the collection, and the exact number of items if it is a folder, as well as special notes concerning physical condition, omitted information, and the like. This target is usually filmed with or immediately preceding the first page of the first item in the folder or with the first page of a volume. Full-page targets are added at the beginning of each series or other division and may be used to describe any folders not filmed.

Missing items must be indicated by informational targets. This problem occurs most commonly with serial publications. Identifying omissions and their possible availability elsewhere is part of the bibliographic search that should precede the filming decision. If practical, assemble the complete title or series for filming at one time. If you decide to film a
incomplete series, the processor must make appropriate targets and de-
cide where to place them. Issues missing from a quarterly journal, for
eexample, can be targeted exactly where they would appear. Frequent
gaps in daily newspapers, however, are better identified by targets in-
serted at monthly, quarterly, or even annual breaks. Any decision to
identify missing groups that appear out of sequence should be men-
tioned in the explanatory notes at the beginning of each reel.

Informational targets can also be used when the physical condition of
a document might affect its legibility on microfilm. The processor may
add such “quality” targets, especially in obvious cases, but they are
usually inserted by the filmer before making the exposure. Examples of
this type of informational target include: ACID DAMAGE; ADHE-
SIVE STAINS; PENCIL ON COLORED PAPER.

Certain information must appear at the beginning of each reel, some
of it provided by the processor and the rest by the filmer. The processor
is responsible for the following:

1. A title page giving all pertinent information identifying the collec-
tion, the name and address of the archival agency, and a statement
about publishing and copyright information. If the collection is be-
ing microfilmed with funds provided by a grant or other special
gift, be sure to say so.

2. An introduction that includes information about provenance, a bi-
ographical or historical sketch, and a brief description of the scope
and content of the collection.

3. Notes explaining any special problems or unique aspects of the mi-
crofilm.

4. An inventory, register, or folder listing for the collection.

Technical data about the microfilming (e.g., reduction ratio, image
placement, resolution targets, and dates of filming) are supplied by the
microfilmer and usually precede the bibliographic information provided
by the processor.

FRAME COUNT

Once the collection has been arranged and the targets and finding aids
prepared, the processor must count frames. This is a time-consuming
task, but is crucial to an accurate estimate of the cost of filming and for a
determination of roll breaks. Generally, a single sheet of paper measur-
ing 8½ by 11 inches or 8½ by 14 inches will fit into a single frame of
microfilm and, therefore, should be counted as one frame or exposure.
The same sheet of paper with writing on both sides will take two frames.
A folded letter measuring 8½ by 11 inches may require three or four
frames, depending on the arrangement of the two inside pages. It is here
that the penciled page number will be most helpful; it is not necessary to
reread an entire letter to determine the order of the pages.

Most bound volumes are filmed two pages to a frame. Loose inser-
tions and enclosures are filmed following the pages between which they
are found and require the addition of one frame (or more) to the count.
Attached enclosures that overlap the text are first filmed as is, then
folded back to reveal the text. This will add one or two additional frames,
depending on whether both sides of the insert are to be filmed.
Letters and documents with overwriting, writing in several directions, or multicolored inks and text with widely varying contrast characteristics may require more than one exposure to obtain a legible positive copy. In some cases, this requirement could double the frame count of a single letter. Scrapbooks may also present problems, such as overlapping newspaper clippings and multipaged pamphlets, that will increase the frame count. Include with the general instructions to the filmer the guidelines that you have followed in calculating the overall frame count and refer as necessary to scrapbook contents and other problem areas likely to increase the frame count.

Indicate frame counts in the upper-right-hand corner of each folder and/or by a slip of paper inserted in the front of each bound volume. The total number of frames required for the collection should also include targets and insert sheets that appear at the beginning and end of each reel. If necessary, specify any organizational unit of an archives or manuscript collection such as letters, folders, or volumes that should not be divided between more than one roll. Also, newspapers and serial publications requiring more than one roll must be divided systematically and in a bibliographically acceptable manner. The total number of reels, which is determined by the filmer, is a function of the number of frames and bibliographic guidelines for roll breaks as well as the size of the material and the reduction ratio at which it is filmed.

Once the frame count has been determined, make a final check of the collection before sending it to the filmer.

- Is each item in its proper place?
- Are the instructional and informational targets in the correct places?
- Has the total frame count, along with the guidelines used to calculate it, been included in the filming instructions?
- Are all the general problems that the filmer is likely to encounter noted in your instructions to the filmer?

The instructions should be typed on the same color paper as the instructional targets and placed at the beginning of the collection.

**INSPECTION**

Once the filming has been completed, inspect each frame on a microfilm reader. The more thorough the preparation, the easier checking the film should be and the smaller the number of errors. In sum, you must proofread the film against the originals to determine if everything was filmed correctly, but you must also watch carefully for any physical blemishes on the film (e.g., water spots, chemical stains, dirt), frames containing foreign objects, and unintended or illegible exposures that may have escaped detection by the filmer. If possible, use a positive copy for inspection, both to avoid the risk of scratching the master negative and to facilitate evaluation of overall image quality. Note carefully all problems, especially omissions, illegible frames, and other errors that will necessitate retakes. Splices represent potential weaknesses in the film, so it may be necessary to reshoot an entire roll if the total number of errors cannot be corrected with three splices or less. Finally, avoid the common temptation to delay or skip altogether this important stage of
the project. Without a frame-by-frame inspection, the library or archival agency cannot evaluate the quality of its preparation or of the filming, nor can it assure the researcher of the integrity of the film copy.

**CONCLUSION**

The success of microforms in preserving and facilitating access to a collection will be determined largely by what has been done to the material long before it reaches the camera. Responsibility for the selection and preparation of the material, as well as for proofreading the completed film, properly belongs to the archivist, librarian, or curator. In many cases, especially those involving extensive manuscript material, this work may prove to be more costly than the filming itself. The functions of selection, preparation, and inspection are by nature interdependent; to ignore one tends to negate the value of the others. Even the best of filmers cannot overcome the shortcomings that result from inadequate preparation. To be effective, the guidelines outlined above must be applied rigorously and flexibly and must be supplemented with liberal quantities of common sense. With that in mind, as Susan B. Anthony said, “Failure is impossible!”

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

This bibliography shows the variety of sources providing information on the many aspects of preservation microfilming, from initial program planning to storage of finished films. All are useful for particular strengths; none totally cover the subject. It is suggested that all be examined for a good overview of the subject.

Brief discussion of film manufacture, processing, and storage related to preservation of records of permanent value.

What you can expect and what you should look for in making arrangements for service-bureau filming of your materials.

A standard beginning article for overall planning; primarily discusses printed materials.

A good first source for planning records filming; especially note the bibliography, which is not duplicated here. Also issued as Technical Leaflet no. 96 by the American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tennessee.

The environmental conditions necessary for safe storage of master and service-copy films.

Currently out of print, but found in many libraries. A very technical description and explanation of all copying techniques, some of which are not in current use.

More technical than Dearstyne, yet not as technical as Hawken; a good overview of administering microform production and reader use.

Useful for basic terms and understanding of what to expect from a finished product that is purchased commercially or done for you by an agency.
Suggestions for the Cataloging of Machine-Readable Materials

Sheila S. Intner

There are machine-readable materials of various kinds that cannot be treated adequately under the rules of chapter 9 of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition. This article is concerned with the cataloging of materials known as floppy diskettes and used with Apple computers. In order to create temporary entries for the library of the Division of Library & Information Management at Emory University, the diskettes were analyzed in terms of each component of the bibliographic description, and comparisons were made between the existing rules and the materials in hand to see where they required modification. Suggestions emerged for different treatment of the Chief Source of Information, General Material Designation, Edition, Material Specific Details (not currently used at all for this type of material), Physical Description, and Access Points. Permitting catalogers greater flexibility with machine-readable materials may help accommodate the multiplicity of products, rapidly changing technologies, and varying needs of users.

Many librarians concerned with cataloging nonbook materials recognize that there are machine-readable materials of various kinds that cannot be treated adequately under the rules of chapter 9 of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition (AACR2). Even its appellation, machine-readable data files, prescribed by the rules for use as the General Material Designation (GMD), leaves much to be desired by software aficionados to whom the term data file cannot properly be applied to program files not designed to contain data.

The cataloging leadership is in the process of developing relevant rules to supersede chapter 9; however, this is a slow process leaving librarians in a holding pattern, forced to wait until it is complete. In the meanwhile, as libraries acquire computers and machine-readable materials to accompany them, pressure is building to accommodate the more popular of these materials so patrons can have access to them.

This article is concerned with the cataloging of materials known as floppy diskettes and used with Apple computers and other, similar brands of small computers. In a course in cataloging nonprint materials

Sheila S. Intner is Assistant Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University. Editor's note: Background information on the development of rules for cataloging machine-readable data files for the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules can be found in the "Final Report of the Catalog Code Revision Committee Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging MRDF," ERIC document ED 119 727.
taught by the author, one student elected to devise temporary entries for
the growing collection of diskettes being purchased by the library for Ap-
ple II Plus microcomputers in use by faculty and students of the Division
of Library & Information Management at Emory University. In order
to create the entries, the diskettes were analyzed carefully in terms of
each component of the bibliographic description, and comparisons were
made between the existing rules and the materials in hand to see where
they required adjustment or modification.

Diskettes are magnetized plastic surfaces encased in protective cases
measuring, for Apple microcomputers, 5 1/4 inches square, though they
are produced in larger and smaller sizes for other systems. They may
contain both programs, which direct the computer to operate in particu-
lar ways, and data in files, or only programs, or only data. One can pur-
chase blank diskettes for original use or diskettes on which material has
been previously recorded. In their looks, diskettes resemble sound re-
cordings, especially those 45 RPM singles of popular songs, but in their
content arrangement they are similar to larger sound disks that contain a
variety of pieces, songs, readings, or other musical or spoken units to-
gether on a single disk. Many of the adaptations made in the rules from
chapter 9 were taken from chapter 6, “Sound Recordings,” for this rea-
son. In fact, if one thinks of computer diskettes as recordings of com-
puter material instead of sound material, the analogy is quite apt.

For example, an important and useful limitation of chapter 6 was used
in the Physical Description area, area 5, in this project, as follows:

Extent: Number of items, qualified by compatible hardware system,
e.g., 2 diskettes (Apple)

Specific Material Designation: Use of the terms disk or diskette depend-
ing on the diameter of single disks, or disk pack for multiple platter units.
For items measuring 8 inches or less, diskette will be SMD; for those mea-
suring more than 8 inches, disk will be SMD.

Other Physical Details: Should include the disk operating system type
and version, the formatting and number of sides, e.g., DOS 3.2, soft
sectored, 1 s.

Dimensions: Given for size of diskette, e.g., 5 1/4 in.

**SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS**

Several suggestions emerged from the exercise. Among them is that
the cataloging leadership discard the word data from the title of the chap-
ter as well as from the General Material Designation used in area 1. If
the GMD were changed to “machine-readable materials,” “machine-
readable files,” or, perhaps, merely “machine-readable,” it would
more accurately reflect the general class of materials. Diskettes often
contain no data in the computer sense of the word. It is not that pro-
grams, or the computer instructions, are not data in the librarian’s sense
of the word, i.e., information, but rather that they are a special kind of
information with a specific function. To the naked eye, all diskettes ap-
pear the same no matter what kind of information is on them. To a user,
however, it makes quite a difference whether a diskette contains pro-
programs or data. It is seriously misleading to designate a diskette containing only utility programs a "machine-readable data file" even though the rules currently permit the specific designator "program file(s)" to be used in the File Description area of the entry. Since the purpose of the General Material Designation is to give the catalog user an early warning of the type of material the entry represents, it seems self-defeating to use a term that incorrectly identifies the material, possibly causing a user to ignore the more accurate description following a paragraph later. Perhaps "machine-readable" alone is enough to identify the medium generally. There certainly may be better terminology. This problem relates to the dual nature of computers themselves as both informational and communicational media and therefore to the software which sometimes operates as hardware-only related data, and sometimes as ordinary data not related to the communication system.

The next issue concerns the Chief Source of Information, which varies according to the publication. Commercially produced diskettes often have a great deal of cataloging information on their permanently affixed labels as well as on accompanying textual material, with some or all of the information also integral to the recording. When the diskette is loaded and booted, a title frame (or frames) may appear first, followed by a prompt or menus of options for the actual accessing of the balance of the recorded material. Since the relative importance of integral recorded data, label data, and accompanying text and/or nonintegral container data varies from one producer to another, the cataloger ought to have the flexibility to choose as the Chief Source of Information the one that is most complete and accurate. Also, locally produced, noncommercial diskettes are frequently a large proportion of many collections. In fact, many commercially produced diskettes are designed to help users create their own diskettes. Thus, the standards must take account of these diskettes and provide guidance for integrating them into the catalog along with published materials. There are no directions in AACR2 for handling them now. They really should not be treated in the minimal way that unprocessed sound recordings and raw footage of film or tape are treated.

Machine-readable materials, like their counterparts in sound, film, and video formats, quite often have multiple titles and conflicting title data. This problem is difficult to resolve and the only lasting solution may result from interaction of catalogers with commercial producers and reviewers of microcomputer software in the periodical literature. An alternative solution lies in directing catalogers to include as access points all possible titles and subtitles by which an item is identified. Selecting one of these as Title Proper for the body of the entry over the others because it appears on the screen in a title frame is necessary and proper, but mass marketing of diskettes makes alternate titles more important than they would otherwise be.

Edition problems occur with frequency in this format since both commercial and noncommercial productions are continually being improved, debugged, revised, and reissued. Furthermore, duplication of copies for backup purposes is typical, and adjustment or translation of programs between hardware items is constantly done. The current
chapter 9 rules and subsequent interpretations address these problems by telling the cataloger to ignore all but truly substantive changes, a solution that is probably the best alternative. It would be extremely helpful, however, if originals were distinguished from duplicates and language or format translations were identified not as variant editions, but as variant physical items, since they cannot be used interchangeably with originals.

Area 3, Material Specific Details, is not used with these materials. It is unfortunate, for this would be an ideal place for language version and formatting data to appear. It may also be a more suitable location for identifying compatible hardware on which the material should be used instead of area 5, the Physical Description area. Unlike sound recordings, physical description of diskettes is given in terms of the number of files under the current rules. This is analogous to describing a sound recording by the number of cuts or pieces on the disc. It seems more logical to describe the contents in a contents note, specific details relating to the material in area 3, and only the physical generalia in area 5. This organization retains the model of other media as much as possible.

Area 5, Physical Description, presents problems, touched on above, resulting from treating contents as physical attributes. True, the number of files is a characteristic which can be counted in terms of space, but so can chapters in a book. It seems more rational to follow the sound recording model and say "2 diskettes, 5⅛ in." or "1 disk pack (CDC 9876)" than to say "6 program files," etc. Much as an album is described as "3 sound discs" and a videorecording as "1 cassette (U-matic)," the physical aspect of machine-readable materials involves their storage medium rather than the number of discrete files recorded on it. The files are its contents and are better described through the use of notes, added entries, or subject headings.

Area 6, Series, is no more problematic for this medium than for others. One can question whether things like the Apple Tip Books and the diskettes that go with them are true series or not. They are not all numbered and do not have the same graphic treatment. In some respects, the books can stand alone, not relying on the diskette for all the operations in the text; yet, they could also be considered accompanying material for the diskettes. In this particular case, the Tip Books were considered a series and were traced for the benefit of users who see the name in software advertisements. Similarity of the name, subject matter, and use of all these seemed clear enough to justify the decision.

Area 7, Notes, also did not seem to pose any new problems, except that already noted about the language version and physical formatting. If these details have not appeared earlier in the entry, there is no question but that they be included here, since they are vital to the use of the material. In this author's opinion, however, these kinds of information should appear as early as possible in the entry, with area 3 as one choice, and area 5 as another possibility.

**SUMMARY**

To sum up, the major problems encountered in this library school exercise in cataloging Apple diskettes were:
1. Source of Information—varied from producer to producer as well as within the output of a single producer. Homemade products were more likely to have no documentation at all, even in the “title” frame analog, and duplicates and translations present similar problems.

2. General Material Designation—it is misleading to use the word data in the designation. It has a more specific meaning to computer people than to librarians, who use it in a general sense equivalent to the word information.

3. Edition—as has been pointed out for other types of materials, different versions of a work may not actually be variant editions, but they are certainly different enough to warrant recognition. It may be more accurate to treat them as different items altogether rather than as editions of one work.

4. Material Specific Details—it is suggested that information about language version and formatting be placed here to bring this essential information to a user’s attention early in the entry. These data are currently found in areas 5 or 7.

5. Physical Description—diskettes should be described in terms of their form as diskettes, not in terms of their contents, the files they contain in recorded form. In the whole range of machine-readable materials, the storage medium varies widely, and it is this that constitutes the physical element. It can be described in terms of the number of diskettes (or cassettes or disk packs or reels of tape), their size and composition, i.e., rigid or flexible, and other housing characteristics. Language version and formatting information may also be given here, if area 3 cannot be used. Related hardware may also be identified here as with videorecordings.

6. Access Points—these materials raised the same problems as many sound recordings in the choice of access points, e.g., whether or not to trace multiple titles, subtitles, do analytics, trace series, multiple authors, and producers. Should Apple be the filing element of an access point for a homemade diskette created on an Apple computer by a noncompany programmer? It may be useful for a small collection to identify the compatible hardware as an access point, or the company-sponsored software.

Catalogers will need to be allowed more flexibility for machine-readable materials than for more traditional media. The multiplicity of products, changing technologies, importance of self-produced materials, and highly individual needs of users make it clear that it will not be easy to create order out of the chaos.
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Decision Logic for Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Chapter 21: “Choice of Access Points”

Margaret E. Cockshutt, C. Donald Cook, and Ann H. Schabas

In contrast to the extensive discussion of the AACR2 provisions for bibliographic descriptions and for forms of headings, less attention has so far been given to its rules for the choice of access points. A flowchart approach, developed by the authors for teaching purposes, is presented as a means of analyzing the decision logic for selecting main entries. Suggestions are offered for ameliorating some problems of ambiguity, apparent inconsistencies, omissions, unnecessary inclusions, definitions, and sequencing of rules.

Until the advent of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition (AACR2), the value of the main entry concept was accepted with little question in catalog codes in the Anglo-American tradition. In AACR2, the concept itself is retained although it is questioned:

the rules are based on the proposition that one main entry is made for each item described, and that this is supplemented by added entries. . . . It is recognized, however, that many libraries do not distinguish between the main entry and other entries.

So long as the concept of main entry is retained, it is desirable to have the criteria for its choice presented as clearly as possible.

However, the authors have found that the internal logic of chapter 21, “Choice of Access Points,” and the criteria based on its rules are not always self-evident. Some of the problems inherent in the application of this chapter have been discussed by Gredley and by Shaw et al. The purpose of the present analysis is to identify further problems in the application of the rules and to clarify the decision-making logic required in the choice of main entries by AACR2. It is not the authors’ intention to restructure or to rewrite chapter 21 or to propose substantive changes in the rules and their results.

A flowchart approach has been used. Flowcharting can serve as a

Margaret E. Cockshutt and Ann H. Schabas are Professors, and C. Donald Cook is Associate Professor, Faculty of Library and Information Science, University of Toronto. Ann H. Schabas is principally responsible for the flowchart in this article. This paper considers AACR2 as published and the official revisions issued by the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (Chicago: American Library Assn., 1982); no agency rule interpretations are included.
powerful analytical tool for the determination of problem areas and logical paths. For example, a somewhat different application of the flowchart method for decision making in cataloging has been used by Packer and Schabas. The flowchart that forms the core of this paper was devised initially for use in basic and advanced cataloging courses and continuing-education workshops in the Faculty of Library and Information Science, University of Toronto. Although the flowchart has already gone through many revisions, it may not necessarily be definitive even yet. Nevertheless, on the basis of their experiences in its use, the authors believe that it may be helpful to other students, teachers, or catalogers (see figure 1).

The authors have concentrated on main entry rules of general applicability and principally on their application to print monographs. Consequently, on the flowchart some rules have been deliberately omitted, although some comments on these rules have been included in the discussion; the rules for headings for certain Religious, Legal, and Musical Works (columns C, D, and E on the flowchart) have received macro treatment only, in both the flowchart and the discussion. Within some flowchart symbols, additional rules have been presented in parentheses to point out links, e.g., the (cf. 21.1C4) at col. C, 2 or to help with decisions by presenting underlying criteria, e.g., the (cf. 21.8A) at col. H, 1.

The order of presentation of the rules from chapter 21, by means of the left-to-right horizontal line and the top-to-bottom vertical columns, results from the usefulness of this order for teaching purposes. Basically, these columns identify in turn, group by group, the rules for different types of works, permitting step-by-step progression through the appropriate rules by a process of elimination. Obviously, not every question posed in the flowchart need be asked for each item. Also, the main questions (col. B, 1 through col. Q, 1) represent a desirable though arbitrary sequence; their columns might have been displayed in some other equally effective order.

In this flowchart, the main horizontal row presents questions about the type of work and thus the problems to be solved in the choice of the main access point for each item to be cataloged. A “yes” answer to any one of these main line questions leads downward to further questions and rules for the case in point. For ease of location of symbols on the flowchart, a grid of coordinates (e.g., col. K, 5) is used. Each vertical column usually concludes with a diamond-shaped symbol (e.g., col. C, 3) which asks “Main entry chosen?” A “no” answer then leads arbitrarily and directly back to the main horizontal line at a point that precedes the next main line question, e.g., from col. C, 3 follow the arrow to col. D, 1. The cataloger is thus able to consult each main line decision symbol in turn. The same policy governs the connector 7, which branches from col. R, 8 in a horizontal extension from column N to precede the next main line decision symbol at col. P, 1. As a last resort, at column R, the cataloger must be able to consult rules 21.1 and/or 20.1 to achieve a general solution, if the specific rules have not offered sufficient guidance.
**RELATED WORKS**

The first question is for Related Works. It should be noted that the impact of rule 21.28 (col. B, 2) is largely in the choice of an added entry. Similarly, rules 21.11A and 21.14A serve chiefly to provide for added entries. The anomalous inclusion of such rules within the main part of the chapter is discussed below.

**RELIGIOUS, LEGAL, AND MUSICAL WORKS**

In the flowchart, the macro treatment of Religious, Legal, and Musical Works (columns C–E) reflects the authors’ de-emphasis of the Special Rules. Rules for these works have been sequenced first to allow the quick elimination of a large number of rules from further consideration.

**WORKS THAT EMANATE FROM CORPORATE BODIES**

Columns F–G are presented next so that the cataloger may identify corporate responsibility in a work and then may consider the choice of the body as a main entry. As indicated in column F, 1, the presence of a corporate body must first be established by rule 21.1B1. Then the type of work must fit one of the categories of rule 21.1B2 (col. F, 2). Rule 21.1B2b and its footnote 3 call attention to certain exceptions for “some legal and governmental works.” However, in rules 21.31–21.33, which are not included in this footnote, there are also other provisions for main entry that apply in specified cases. Surprisingly, there is no corresponding generalized treatment for religious works in 21.1B2, although main entry under corporate body is required in some situations within rules 21.38, 21.39A1, and 21.39B (column C).

In 21.1A2, and in the second paragraph of 21.1B2, there are parallel instructions concerning shared and mixed personal authorship and corporate responsibility. These provisions pose no inherent problems for works of personal authorship. However, if a work “emanating from” a corporate body, for example, falls clearly into one of the categories of the latter rule and is then abridged by a person (rule 21.12A), it is far from certain whether rule 21.1B2 (col. F, 2) overrides other considerations. Or should the cataloger begin with rule 21.1B2, go on to rules 21.8Aa, 21.9, and 21.12A (col. J, 1–J, 2) and then go back to 21.1B2 and 21.4B (col. F, 8 and col. G, 5)? Clearly, the resolution of this problem turns largely on the interpretation of the “some cases” mentioned in the second paragraph of 21.1B2. According to one of the editors of AACR2:

Where a corporate body and a person are involved, 21.1B2 would take precedence except in cases where, for instance, a work emanating from a corporate body is adapted or revised by a person to the point at which the provisions of, say, 21.10 or 21.12B apply. In short, 21.1B2 applies up to the point at which the work has become something to which other rules more properly apply.

The other critical phrase for the interpretation of 21.1B2 is “emanating from.” The three variant uses are:
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1. A work has “emanated from a corporate body if it is issued by that body.” Issue(d) is not defined in this sense in the AACR2 glossary, but one may assume that it means “to publish officially” as, for example, Unesco publications, which the organization issues and for which it is collectively responsible;

2. A work has also “emanated from” the body if the work “has been caused to be issued by that body,” i.e., the body has acted “as an entity” (21.1B1) in determining that the work should be issued on its behalf by another body or person;

3. A work has “emanated from” the body if the work “originated with that body.” In this sense, emanated seems to imply “intellectual or artistic” responsibility (cf. 21.1A1).

In each of these instances, the corporate body must be “identified by a particular name” (21.1B1), and, for certain types of bodies, be “prominently named in the item being catalogued” (21.1B2d).

Probable emanation “from a particular corporate body” (21.5B) may also result in entry under the heading for the body if the work meets a criterion of 21.1B2 (col. F, 2). Thus the situations that require at least the consideration of entry under a corporate body are manifold and complex. The situation of several nonhierarchically related bodies (col. F, 6) arises in works of shared or mixed authorship, and the cataloger must thus be brought back to the main flow line. Conversely, a corporate body that is a “named subordinate unit” (21.1B4a) leads to col. G, 7 or col. F, 8.

When it is clear that the categories for main entry under a corporate body by rule 21.1B2 do not apply (col. F, 2), the cataloger is led to rule 21.1B3 (col. G, 2). Part of the wording of that rule needs clarification: “treat them [works?, bodies?, categories?] as if no corporate body were involved” (emphasis added). It would be helpful if the word works were repeated and if the alternatives of the personal author or the title were explicitly stated in 21.1B3, or if references to 21.1A and 21.1C3 were inserted, as has been done, for example, elsewhere in rule 21.1.

The absence of a consistent helpful reference also hinders the cataloger at rule 21.1C3 (col. G, 3). Unlike the other sections of this rule, 21.1C3 is an apparent dead-end; it needs a link to or reciprocal references with rule 21.1B3 (col. G, 2). The problems of the relationships among 21.1A, 21.1B3, and 21.1C3 present the cataloger with unnecessary hurdles.

WORKS OF MIXED RESPONSIBILITY

Of all the problems in this chapter, the most difficult to untangle and to represent on a flowchart are those diagrammed in columns H–I. It is relatively easy to understand the apparent dichotomy of most of these rules, those for “a previously existing work that has been modified” (rule 21.8Aa) in column J, and those for “a new work to which different persons or bodies have made different kinds of contributions” (rule 21.8Ab) in columns K–L. However, the authors grappled unsuccessfully for some time with the various rules for writers versus artists or illustrators before the nature of the problems was identified and a separate solution could be flowcharted in columns H–I.
Writers, and Artists or Illustrators

Essentially, the specific rules that discuss the mixed responsibilities of writer versus artist/illustrator are distinguished by a basic time division established by rules 21.8Aa and 21.8Ab, but the related rules are not always linked. Variant terminology distorts the picture still more. For each of the following cases see the appropriate query in column H and the corresponding solution in column I. A "new work" to which an "artist" has contributed is discussed in rules 21.8Ab and 21.24. An "existing" work "illustrated" by an "artist" is discussed primarily in rules 21.8Aa and 21.9 and apparently in 21.11A. Rule 21.11B, which deals with "illustrations" by one "artist," published separately, rule 21.16A for "art works" modified by an "adapter," rule 21.16B for a "reproduction" modified by "the person or body responsible," and rule 21.17 for "reproductions of the works of an artist" all add to the complex problem of understanding and applying the appropriate rules. In its use of the terms illustrator and artist, the code seems to be implying a qualitative distinction. Only when the cataloger perceives that time is the determining factor can these scattered rules be isolated, analyzed, and linked.

In columns H-I the critical question is posed by rule 21.8A: Is the artistic or illustrated work to be cataloged "one to which different persons ... make intellectual or artistic contributions by performing different kinds of activity"? If the answer is "no" and the responsibility is not "mixed," the cataloger must proceed along the main flow line in columns J, 1–R, 1. In the end, the cataloger may be driven to rule 21.1A1 (col. P, 1) where "artists ... are the authors of the works they create."

In the rules presented in the H-I columns, there are additional problems to hamper the unwary. Rule 21.11, which has the heading Illustrated Texts, does indeed deal with such texts in its section 21.11A (col. I, 2); yet its other section 21.11B deals with "illustrations for a text ... published separately," so that the general heading for rule 21.11 is no longer applicable since there is no text. Neither is the time frame entirely clear. While the table of contents for chapter 21 makes it clear that rule 21.11 is subsumed under Modifications of Texts, it is not clear that illustrating an author's new manuscript before the initial publication of an illustrated text or that separately published new illustrations of a text are indeed modifications. Moreover, rule 21.11A is perhaps out of place among rules to determine main entry; since it never leads to main entry for the artist/illustrator the choice of the illustrator as an access point can be handled using only the criteria of rule 21.30K2.

The distinction between rules 21.11A (col. I, 2) and 21.24 (col. I, 4) is not always clear on a qualitative or even on a time basis. While 21.8Ab clearly categorizes 21.24 as applicable to "a new work," there is no such statement in the latter rule. The criterion stated in the rule is the "collaboration between an artist and a writer." Indeed, that rule is used as an example in the definition of collaborator in the glossary. Yet elements of doubt about the choice of entry remain in the wording of the rule: "a work that is, or appears to be ..." (emphasis added) and in the implication of close relationships by the reciprocal references between rules.
21.24 and 21.11A. The choice of main entry (under the writer) is often the same, whichever rule is applied, although rule 21.24 may instead result in entry under the name of the artist.

The distinction between an art "adaptation" in rule 21.16A (col. H, 5, col. I, 5) and an art "reproduction" in rules 21.16B and 21.17 (col. H, 6, col. I, 6) is not clear from the rules themselves, though the cataloger may deduce analogies and find discrepancies in their various examples. Neither word is defined in the glossary. The cataloger may seek guidance in rule 21.10 for adaptations but will find little help. No matter what terminology has been used, 21.16B appears to deal with an adaptation/reproduction of one artwork, apparently without text. On the other hand, 21.17 deals with reproductions of "two or more art works" by "an artist" (emphasis added), with or without text. The bewildered cataloger may well wonder how to cope with collected reproductions of the work of many artists, with or without text. Rule 21.7 (col. M, 2) would appear to offer the only escape from this dilemma.

Alternatively, the cataloger may conclude that the reproduction situation in 21.17A is sufficiently covered by 21.1A1 and 21.4A; that 21.16A is really dealt with by 21.10, which need not be seen as restricted to print materials despite its examples; that 21.16B is really another wording, in the singular, of the plurals in 21.17A; that both are distinguished from 21.17B solely by the presence or absence of text; and, finally, that 21.11B in its application may prove so similar to 21.17A that reciprocal references should be added to link them. One may feel considerable sympathy for the cataloger who replies "no" in response to the question at col. H, 7, only to be faced with additional problems of mixed responsibility at col. J, 1 and col. K, 1.

**Modified and New Works**

The problem of the nature of modification is inherent in much of column H and in the relationships of the various persons in rule 21.8A. The problem is compounded in the J column, where rules 21.8Aa and 21.9 govern other specific types of modification. The glossary does not provide a definition of modification; the rules themselves do not give a clear definition; and the examples of types of modification in rules 21.8A and 21.9 are not all-inclusive.

Rule 21.8A really leads to three categories of rules:

1. Rule 21.8Aa (column J) deals with the modification of previously existing works and thus is linked (without an explicit reference) to rule 21.9, and then explicitly to rules 21.10-21.23;
2. Rule 21.8Ab (columns K-L) deals with new works (perhaps involving specific instances of collaboration), is linked by explicit references to rules 21.24 and 21.25, and may also be linked (but without references) to 21.26 and 21.27; and
3. Rule 21.8A itself (column H) in its first paragraph must deal in general terms with material that does not fall clearly into either 21.8Aa or 21.8Ab, such as the first two examples in rule 21.11A, and perhaps Spirit Communications and Academic Disputations.

When the cataloger turns to the table of contents, there is no clear guid-
ance, since the indentions and typographic styles used to present rules 21.8-21.27 do not indicate precisely the contexts within which the specific rules should be subsumed.

The importance of the contents and structure of the rules to be subsumed under 21.8A becomes even more apparent in its last sentence: "The rules in this section are divided into these two categories" (emphasis added). Since the "section" has not been displayed adequately in the table of contents and the "two categories" of rules are not defined by complete references, the extent of the coverage by this "umbrella" rule remains puzzling.

In an attempt to display the apparent structure and contents more clearly for the rules that cover works of mixed responsibility, the authors have devised the schematic representation shown in figure 2. The dotted line joining 21.8Aa to 21.9 represents a link that must be understood in the code but which is not stated. Figure 2 also indicates that rule 21.9 acts as a further general rule interposed between rules 21.8Aa and 21.10-21.23, but that there is no corresponding general rule to stand between rules 21.8Ab and 21.24-21.27.

![Figure 2](image)

**Figure 2**
Relationships of AACR2 Rules 21.8-21.27

**Modified Works**

Rule 21.8A states that "a work of mixed responsibility is one to which different persons or bodies make . . . contributions" (emphasis added). The authors found this wording unclear. Could the mixture only be between one person and another person, between one corporate body and another corporate body? Or could the responsibility be mixed between a person and a corporate body? In other words, was the word or to be read literally, or did the editors really mean and/or? In response to the authors' inquiry, Gorman wrote:

In 21.8A, I believe that one should not read the "or" literally and that mixed responsibility can be between a person and a corporate body. For example one can imagine a theatrical work created by one person and extensively revised by a performing group or vice versa."
As a result, if rule 21.8Aa applies to a work such as Gorman describes and the specific rule to be applied, 21.12A or 21.12B (col. J, 2), requires a main entry under the corporate body, there is no provision for the entry of such a performing group in the very restricted categories of rule 21.1B2. Justification for such an entry would then presumably have to come from the general paragraphs of rule 21.1B2, together with its second footnote which contains the criterion of emanation.

In the flowchart symbol with the rule numbers to be applied to modified works of multiple responsibility (col. J, 2), the authors have sequenced first the numbers which state the rules for specific situations (21.10, 21.12–21.15) and then the more general rules (21.9 and 21.8Aa) to serve as fallback guidance if no specific rule exists to cover the modification situation presented by a given work. Within the specific rules presented in column J, 2, some problems of decision logic and/or application should be noted. Rules 21.12A and 21.12B seem to be precise in their wording, but in practice the distinction between them is not always easy to determine; an “in case of doubt” statement would be helpful. The same need is evident in the application of rules 21.15A and 21.15B. Also, just as rule 21.11A (discussed above) really serves principally as an added entry rule, so rule 21.14A never leads to a main entry under the translator, and the issue of an entry under translator may be handled solely on the basis of rule 21.30K1. Finally, rule 21.14B should be extended to include a collection of translations of various anonymous works; at present such a modification can be handled only by 21.1C1-2 and by analogy with rules 21.14A and 21.7.

At first glance, one application of the rules presented in column J, 2 would seem to be sufficient. In practice the cataloger will recognize that one work may present several different types of modification as, for example, a text by one writer, revised by a second person, and translated by a third. In the decision logic of the flowchart, it is therefore necessary to solve one problem at a time and to cycle back each time from column J, 3 into column J, 2 until all the modification issues have been resolved.

New Works

As noted above in the discussion of figure 2, for new works of mixed responsibility (columns K–L), there is no “umbrella” rule to correspond to rule 21.9. Therefore, rule 21.8Ab (col. K, 1 and K, 5) must be used for any new kind of mixed responsibility not covered by rule 21.24 (col. 1, 4) and rule 21.25–21.27 (col. L, 2–L, 4). While it is difficult to imagine such a new situation, the flowchart symbol at column K, 5 has been inserted so that the cataloger will realize that rule 21.8Ab offers the only solution to the problem.

Works of Multiple Responsibility

While the statements of the scope of rules 21.6 and 21.7 appear to separate them by precise criteria, in practice the authors have found the differentiation more difficult than the rules themselves might suggest. Therefore, these rules must be viewed together (columns M–N) as a single problem of multiple responsibility before the rules are viewed separately in their component parts.
Rule 21.7 frequently serves as a bridge between rule 21.6 and the rules which follow from rule 21.8. This bridge situation occurs whenever the presence of an editor introduces an additional function beyond that of the original writers or contributors. Although the responsibility is then “mixed” (see the definition of mixed responsibility in the glossary), the solution to the problem of the editor versus the writers lies in rules 21.7 and/or 21.30D, rather than in rule 21.8. Like illustrators and translators, editors are never candidates for main entry.

The overlap of rule 21.7 with rules 21.8-21.27 is apparent when the cataloger considers a collection of art reproductions. Rules 21.16B and 21.17, which deal with the mixed responsibilities of an artist, an adapter, and “the person or body responsible for the reproduction,” have no statement about such collections. Although in rule 21.6A the cataloger receives a clear directive: “For special types of collaboration, see the rules on mixed responsibility (21.8-21.27),” and some of the examples in 21.6B1 and 21.6C1-2 are of nonprint media, there is no such directive in rule 21.7A and the examples used throughout 21.7 are of printed works. In default of explicit statements, the cataloger must extend rule 21.7 to collections not covered by the rules for mixed responsibility.

The overlap between rules 21.6 and 21.7 is most apparent and most serious when one considers rules 21.6A2 versus 21.7A1 and 21.7A3 for a work in which two or three persons or corporate bodies are responsible for separate parts. When two or three persons or corporate bodies “have prepared separate contributions” (21.6A2) and there is no editor, the entry will be under the person or body principally responsible or named first (21.6B1, 21.6C1). When two or three persons or corporate bodies have prepared “independent works” or “contributions” (21.7A) and there is no named editor, the entry will be under the collective title (21.7B). These very similar situations, which are difficult to distinguish in practice, thus result in different main entries. There is no “in case of doubt” provision to resolve the dilemma. Furthermore, the “do not apply” directive in rule 21.6A with its explicit reference to rule 21.7 is not matched by a similar directive or reference in rule 21.7A. The authors’ desire for reciprocal references, which has already been stated at several places, occurs here as well.

**Collections**

When the rules for works of multiple responsibility are divided into their component types, rule 21.7 for Collections and Works Produced under Editorial Direction (column M) appears deceptively simple. Yet in 21.7A1-2 and in the glossary, there is no definition of independent works. Does the term mean “previously published,” which would indeed result in the use of rule 21.7? Or does the term mean “previously existing,” i.e., written but not published, which would result in the application of rule 21.6A? Only in rule 21.6A is the cataloger told that “previously existing” works are covered by rule 21.7; this oblique statement, separated from rule 21.7 where it is needed, does not constitute a definitive scope note to govern the contents of 21.7. Clearly an explicit definition is needed in rule 21.7 and in the glossary.

While rules 21.7A1-2 presumably include collections of anonymous
works, a doubt about the applicability of rule 21.7 to such works never becomes resolved unless the cataloger attempts to work by extrapolation, for the author of each separate item in the collection, from rule 21.5A ("a work of unknown . . . personal authorship"), a rule which cannot legitimately be applied to a collection. An explicit statement of the applicability of rule 21.7 to collections of anonymous works is needed.

In applying rule 21.7B (col. M, 2) the cataloger is faced with the bewildering limitation of collective title. The term is defined in the glossary as "a title proper that is an inclusive title for an item containing several works" (emphasis added). While this definition covers the materials contained in 21.7A1-2 and the first line of 21.7A4, it is not sufficient to cover the "contributions . . . produced under editorial direction" in 21.7A3 and the second line of 21.7A4. The paucity of the definition is glaringly evident when one attempts to apply it to the various dictionaries used as examples in rule 21.7B. An expanded definition is needed to cover both the examples which exist within the rule and the situation per se.

**Works of Shared Responsibility**

Works of shared responsibility (column N) are usually satisfactorily covered by rule 21.6, yet some annoying problems remain. In the scope rule, 21.6A2 (col. N, 1) appears to cover papers prepared by several persons and included in a work of conference proceedings. If the proceedings emanate from several corporate bodies, they are explicitly included within 21.6A4. Therefore, if the conference proceedings emanate from one corporate body, even though they are by several persons, they are excluded from 21.6A4 and included by explicit stipulation in 21.1B2d. It is uncertain at best whether such papers are covered by 21.6A5; and it is surprising to find the "papers or proceedings of named conferences" stated only in a reference from the last sentence in 21.7A back to 21.1B2, without a parallel statement in 21.6A.

In a technical problem of flowcharting, the authors debated whether the "no" branch out of the symbol at column O, 3 should lead the cataloger through the problems presented in the symbols at columns N, 5 and N, 6. Since only forced logic, rather than a concrete example, would require a return to the N column, the "no" branch out of the symbol column O, 3 was drawn back to the main flow line.

The situation of multiple principal responsibility by more than three persons or bodies at column O, 5 is omitted from the code. If principal responsibility is indicated in a work of shared responsibility, the rule to be applied depends on the number of persons and/or bodies involved. If there is one person/body principally responsible, the cataloger applies rule 21.6B1 (col. R, 5); if there are two or three persons/bodies principally responsible, the cataloger uses rule 21.6B2 (col. Q, 6). However, if there are more than three persons/bodies principally responsible, the cataloger is left without a specific rule, presumably because the situation had not been envisaged in the creation of AACR2. Faced with this situation, the cataloger must move along the column N, 5-R, 5 line in the flowchart and must presumably use rules 21.6C2 and 21.1C1 (col. P, 6).
for “diffuse” authorship or responsibility. Because this situation is not presented explicitly in the code and yet must be solved within it, the authors have inserted at column O, 5 a decision symbol and its “yes” branch with dotted lines.

WORKS OF SINGLE PERSONAL AUTHORSHIP

Works of single personal authorship require the use of the rules subsumed under 21.1A and of rules 21.4A and 21.5B (col. P, 1, col. P, 2). While the separation of rules 21.1A and 21.4A is logically and theoretically sound, the separation in practice raises some difficulties. The term personal author is defined in 21.1A1, with examples from various media, yet it is only in 21.4A that the cataloger is told of the application of the term to “a work, a collection of works, or selections . . . by one personal author (or any reprint, reissue, etc.)” and of the application to that person “whether named in the work or not.” The very close relationship which must exist in practice between rules 21.1A and 21.4A is obscured by the intervention of rules 21.2 and 21.3, each of which deals with very different problems.

The obscurity resulting from the separation of rules 21.1A and 21.4A for single personal authors also occurs in the parallel separation of rules 21.1B and 21.4B (col. F, 8, col. G, 7) for works of single corporate responsibility. At least a reference guides the cataloger from 21.1A2 to 21.4A; no such reference leads the cataloger from any section of 21.1B to 21.4B, although in the latter the cataloger is assisted by a reference back to 21.1B2. No such reference leads the cataloger from the parallel 21.4A back to 21.1A. The inconsistency is at best unhelpful.

WORKS OF UNKNOWN OR UNCERTAIN AUTHORSHIP

The problems present in the application of rule 21.5 (col. Q, 2) arise not only from difficulties in the rules but also from the nature of the works and their authorship conditions. There may well be difficulties for the cataloger in determining the degrees of certainty with which authorship has been attributed to persons or corporate bodies: “attributed to,” “variously attributed to,” “possibly by,” and “erroneously attributed to” (emphasis added) are all words used with the second part of rule 21.5A and its examples and result in entry under title with added entries for the persons or corporate bodies. “Probable author,” “generally attributed to,” and “generally thought to be” are characterizing words used with rule 21.5B and its examples and result in entry under the person or under the corporate body if it meets the criteria of rule 21.1B2. Such wordings should be contrasted with the phrase “erroneously . . . attributed to” (emphasis added) in rules 21.4C1–2 which result in entry “under the actual personal author or under title” “or under the actual corporate body.” In our present world of copy cataloging derived from national libraries and bibliographic agencies, and in our moves toward the abandonment of the concept of main entry, such subtle distinctions in the degrees of certainty and consequent entries may seem of only theoretical interest. Nevertheless, for retrospective and original cataloging and for records in single-entry files, such problems are far from academic. As in
the past, the onus will be on the cataloger's research ability and fine judgments in the resolution of these difficult cataloging problems.

**THE LAST RESORT**

In the end, the cataloger may reach column R-1 on the main flow line with the main entry still not chosen because no specific rule exists to cover the situation presented by the work. The solution of last resort lies in the second paragraph of 20.1 in the introduction to part 2:

In each chapter, general rules precede special rules. Where no specific rule exists for a specific problem, the more general rules should be applied.

In essence this means that the applicable subsections of 21.1, Basic Rule, must be used on their own. It is unfortunate that chapter 21 is not self-sufficient; while the location of this statement in the general introduction to part 2 is logical per se, it is easy for the cataloger to overlook these critically important sentences since they are not contained within the chapter.

**TERMINOLOGY IN CHAPTER 21**

In the course of their analysis of chapter 21, the authors became aware of terminological problems beyond those, such as collective title, which have already been noted. In particular, the words text, item, and work prove puzzling, since usage is not consistent.

Text is defined in the glossary but not in the senses in which it is used in chapter 21. In its usage in the heading of rule 21.10, Adaptations of Texts, for example, it appears to be synonymous with the word work which occurs within the rule itself. However, in the first line of rule 21.23A, “enter a sound recording of one work (music, text, etc.),” text clearly means words and is thus differentiated from the work to be entered, in this case presented in the medium of a sound recording. Similarly, in rules 21.11A-B text means words to which an artist has added illustrations; but in 21.12, Revisions of Texts, the word in the heading appears to be synonymous with work used within rules 21.12A–B. The use of text is thus inconsistent, though its meaning appears to be clear in each context.

Item is also defined in the glossary: “a document or set of documents ... treated as an entity.” It is used occasionally in chapter 21, usually as a synonym for work, as in rule 21.13, Texts Published with Commentary; in rule 21.13B, “the item as a commentary,” i.e., the work to be entered, is distinguished from “the text,” i.e., the original work to which the commentary pertains. However, in rule 21.7C, “the first work or contribution in the item” (emphasis added), work is used in the sense of the individual contribution within a collection, while item is used in the sense of the entire physical “entity.”

Work is not defined in the glossary. Unfortunately this word also is used with different meanings. In rule 21.7B, “enter a work” is used in the sense of entering the entire document; in rule 21.7C, as noted above, “the first work” has been used in the sense of a contribution within a document. Work has thus been used not only with two different meanings, but also at two different levels of analysis: the level of a document as
a whole, which is its most frequent usage in AACR2; and the level of a
part within a document. Such terminological imprecision presents un-
necessary hazards to the cataloger.

THE SEQUENCE OF CHAPTER 21

During the analysis of chapter 21, the authors have realized that the
very sequence and structure of the chapter present problems for the cata-
loger.

As its heading states, rule 21.1 is the basic rule upon which all the
other rules depend. The subsequent rules, 21.2–21.39, are presented as
if they were collaterals. In application, rules 21.4–21.7 are the equival-
ent of general rules, although they are not identified as such. Rules
21.8–21.28 and 21.31–21.39 deal with specific situations. Some of these
rules, e.g., 21.8 and 21.9, are more general than the rules subsumed
under them (see figure 2). Others, e.g., 21.31–21.39, are called “Speci-
cial Rules,” but they appear to be no more “special” than rules such as
21.18–21.22 for Musical Works that are not so designated.

The physical separation of rules 21.4–21.28 from rules 21.31–21.39
by the intervention of added entry rules is readily perceived but intellec-
tually unfortunate. Although AACR2 does not designate it as such, rule
21.28 functions as an added entry rule in that the work is invariably en-
tered “under its own heading,” with an added entry “for the work to
which it is related”; this direction essentially duplicates rule 21.30G.
Rules 21.28 and 21.29–21.30 are not of the same nature as the general
and specific rules for main entry. Rules 21.2–21.3 are also of a different
nature from and are not collateral with the main entry rules. They dis-
tort the logical structure of the chapter by their present placement be-

Throughout this analysis, the authors have already noted other rules
which really serve principally an added entry function: e.g., rules
21.11A for illustrator and 21.14A for translator. In addition, rule 21.4C
for erroneous or fictitious attribution provides essentially for added en-
tries only.

Finally, the various parts of rule 21.4D appear anomalous in chapter
21. While there are occasional references within it to main entry rules in
chapter 21 and directives about added entries, rule 21.4D deals mainly
with the forms for personal and corporate headings (i.e., chapters 22–24)
and even has an explicit reference to rule 26.3C1. At best, rule 21.4D
differs from rules 21.4A–B. The authors question its presence within
chapter 21.

While the authors have seen their present function to be the analysis of
the decision logic in the existing rules, they suggest that a preferable or-
der for the chapter might be: general rules that establish principles; spe-
cialized rules for “stable” conditions; rules for changes in persons,
odies, and titles; and rules for added entries.

CONCLUSION

Much has been written about AACR2 since its publication. With few
exceptions, the discussions in the literature thus far have centered
largely on the rules for the description of nonprint materials and on the
rules for the forms of headings for personal and corporate names. Nevertheless, chapter 21 represents the latest stage on a continuum which began with Panizzi, Jewett, and Cutter. The principles that underlie the choice of access points remain as important today as they were in the nineteenth century.

The authors present this analysis as a contribution to the continuing study of cataloging principles. Even as he issued the important fourth edition of his Rules for a Dictionary Catalog in 1904, Cutter wrote despairingly:

Still I cannot help thinking that the golden age of cataloging is over, and that the difficulties and discussions which have furnished an innocent pleasure to so many will interest them no more. Another lost art.

Those who created AACR2, even if not working in the context of a "golden age," have afforded the authors of this analysis "innocent pleasure."
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Use of the WLN Authority Control System by an ARL Library

Ruth Patterson Funabiki, Ingrid Mifflin, and Karen Corlee

The Washington Library Network online authority control system used for the COM catalog at Washington State University is an efficient tool for managing a research library catalog. The authority file maintenance work is accomplished through the cooperative efforts of librarians in participating network libraries and the staff of the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit. The link between the authority file and the bibliographic file facilitates catalog change for network libraries.

The Washington State University Libraries use the authority control system available through the Washington Library Network (WLN) for efficient management of catalog access points. A member of the Association for Research Libraries (ARL), the Washington State University (WSU) Libraries contain more than two million printed volumes in seven different locations. Concerns about staff, patron convenience, the role of the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit, and WSU's responsibility as a network participant have all been important in establishing priorities and procedures for the use of the WLN authority control system.

The WSU Libraries have been participating in the Washington Library Network since 1977. For current processing, WSU uses a computer output microfiche (COM) catalog produced directly from the WLN database. A retrospective conversion project, now in progress, has added more than 230,000 bibliographic records to the COM catalog since 1980 and is gradually replacing the WSU Libraries' card catalogs. Access points in the COM catalog are derived from the WLN authority files and reflect the most current form of an authority heading on the day that the COM catalog is produced.

HISTORY

Prior to 1979, the WSU Libraries Technical Services Division main-
tained four manual files either directly or indirectly related to authority control: a series authority file, a subject authority file, a name authority cross-reference file, and the general card catalog, which housed the bibliographic data on the holdings of the entire library system and functioned as a name authority file. The upkeep of these files required approximately eight full-time staff, varying in level from student assistants to professional librarians. Additional labor was necessary by other organizational units to maintain the card catalogs in the branch libraries and the serial record files.

Two decisions made in mid-1979 drastically reduced the amount of maintenance of manual authority files in the WSU Libraries. The first decision was to accept the form of heading found in the WLN authority files for series, subjects, and names, both personal and corporate. Technical services staff now use the Washington Library Network authority files, rather than the manual files, to authenticate the correct form of a heading. The manual series file has been removed, and the manual name and subject files are used only for the few items that will not appear in the WSU COM catalog.

Second, a COM catalog was started for current and retrospective processing of MARC-formatted materials. Updates, corrections, and cross-references added to the WLN authority file headings appear in all subsequent issues of the COM catalog. The capability of the WLN system to make large-scale authority file changes was especially helpful in 1981, when conversion to AACR2 required modification of many headings. The WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit staff, using the Library of Congress Cataloging Service Bulletin revised headings lists, changed many pre-AACR2 headings to the AACR2 form. These updated headings, with appropriate cross-references, appeared promptly in the WSU COM catalog.

**SYSTEM DESCRIPTION**

WLN authority control is achieved through online manipulation of vocabulary (or VOC) records attached to the bibliographic records in the database. As each new bibliographic record is entered into the database, its headings are compared, by the computer, to existing VOC records. In the case of a heading that is new to the database, a VOC record is created and is assigned an internal sequence number (ISN). The heading is then replaced in the stored bibliographic record by the ISN for the new VOC record. If a heading on a newly input bibliographic record matches an existing vocabulary record, the heading is replaced in the stored bibliographic record by the ISN for the existing vocabulary record. In this way, one VOC record can be attached to multiple bibliographic records; therefore, manipulation of a VOC record results in changes to the heading in each attached bibliographic record. Authority control and economy of database storage space are achieved through the same mechanism. Headings are, however, displayed in full form when called onto the terminal screen by an inquiry in the authority or bibliographic files.

At present, the WLN authority file contains three separate types of
authority records: authors, series titles, and subjects. The "authors" type is more comprehensive than the name implies, including headings for meetings, uniform titles, and series in the author/title form as well as for personal and corporate authors. A modification of an authority heading via a VOC record change affects all attached bibliographic records, but it is important to note that no other VOC records or record types will be changed. For example, updating the author form of "Michigan. University." to "University of Michigan." would not change the VOC record for "Michigan. University. Dept. of Chemistry." Also, since author and subject VOC records for the same entity are different authority types, the subject heading VOC record for "Michigan. University." would remain unchanged.

In addition to being attached to bibliographic records, VOC records may be controlled and linked to each other through the database cross-reference structure. Cross-references and explanatory notes such as "see," "see also," "former name," and "later name" are available to guide database users. Finally, these cross-references and notes appear in the COM catalogs of WLN participant libraries and in the WLN Resource Directory.

The cross-reference structure makes two very helpful database functions possible, namely, automatic online authority file searching and the automatic "return" of new bibliographic records containing unauthorized headings to the inputting library. The automatic online authority file searching function, known as "CHECK," first compares the headings on a bibliographic record ready for input to the authority file, then it highlights and identifies all new or unauthorized headings on the screen of the inputting library's terminal. The automatic "return" function actually prevents bibliographic records containing unauthorized headings from entering the database, and instead, automatically returns the bibliographic record to the online working files of the inputting library, with the incorrect headings highlighted and labeled as "unauthorized."

Modification or updating of WLN VOC records is initiated online, on a daily basis, either by the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit or by participating libraries. The WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit monitors a weekly printed list of newly created VOCs, checking for tagging, typographical errors, and correct application of the AACR2 rules for headings. (WLN requires the use of AACR2 for all new headings.) In addition to monitoring the weekly list, unit personnel correct and update headings systematically to conform with changed LC subject headings or revised name headings and on a case-by-case basis in response to requests from participating libraries. Participating libraries also may modify VOC records online, subject to review and final verification of proposed changes by the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit. At WSU, one librarian is assigned to spend approximately three to five hours per week initiating VOC changes for headings that will appear in the COM catalog.

In online WLN authority maintenance work, the need to consult printed sources for verification of the latest Library of Congress or AACR2 form of a heading is lessened by the link between the WLN au-
authority file and the bibliographic file. New headings appearing in the weekly MARC tapes are automatically added to the authority file and therefore the file contains the most up-to-date LC headings. The need to consult offline reference sources is not completely eliminated, however, specifically for older and more obscure headings and for headings that have changed.

**WSU Authority File Activity**

Since time and resources are limited, VOC record change priorities have been developed at WSU. When database headings needing improvement are encountered during routine cataloging activities, some VOC changes are made online at WSU, while others are reported to the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit for correction. In general, updates or corrections involving fifteen or more VOC records are referred to the WLN Bibliographic Maintenance Unit for change. In addition, special cases, such as those involving apparent conflict between LC-established forms of headings and forms established by the Name Authority Cooperative project (NACO), are referred to the unit.

VOC changes initiated at WSU tend to fall into several categories. Most common is correction of typographical or tagging errors that have resulted in multiple headings for a name. In the following example—Shaw, Bernard, 1865-1950. Shaw, Bernard, 1856-1950. Shaw, Bernard.—a reasonable assumption is that all of these headings are for the same person, although it is prudent to check the attached bibliographic records to confirm the assumption. After the incorrect headings have been corrected to match the authorized form, the WLN authority file programming will merge the corrected headings into a single, authorized heading.

A second typical kind of change involves maintaining consistency in the form of a name across the various authority files, or within heading “clusters” in a single file. It is important from the library patron’s point of view that “Washington (State). State University, Pullman” and all of its subordinate bodies have been changed to “Washington State University” in the subject and series files as well as the author file. In addition, as in the previous example, the cluster of author/title headings associated with Shaw’s name must be uniform to file properly in a COM catalog.

A third kind of change initiated at WSU involves the creation of appropriate cross-references and informational notes used within the WLN authority files and in COM catalogs produced from the WLN database.

**Final Comments**

The authority control system of the Washington Library Network has been demonstrated to be a reliable, powerful, and versatile tool, resulting in efficient and comprehensive heading changes for Washington State University's research library. The cross-reference structure inherent in the authority control system has also resulted in an improved library catalog, which in turn provides better patron access to the materials in the Washington State University Libraries.
AACR2 and the Level of Description Principle

Herbert H. Hoffman

To catalog an item means to describe it, to write a bibliographic description. Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR2), therefore, begins in part 1 with the question of item description.

The cataloger, however, cannot write an item description until the decision has been made as to what shall constitute the item to be cataloged. An item, according to the AACR2 Glossary, is “a document or set of documents in any physical form, published, issued, or treated as an entity, and as such forming the basis for a single bibliographic description.” The definition implies that some items are single documents, while other items are sets of two or more documents.

If the book or other media unit in hand is a single-document item (one physical object), there is no choice and the decision is very simple: the book is the item to be cataloged. But if the material consists of a set of two or more documents (if there are several physical objects that belong together bibliographically), it may be possible to describe them on two levels, and a choice must then be made: before writing the item description and before deciding on the entry principle, the cataloger must decide on what can be called the “level of description principle.”

As I have pointed out elsewhere, multidocument sets can be of several types. The entire set may have one overall title, yet the individual documents that form the set may have no titles of their own. In such a case the entire set constitutes the item. This item is described under what may be called the set description principle.

But it is also possible that a multidocument set not only has a set title, but that there is a distinct title for each of the documents that make up the set. In such a case two decisions are possible. The entire set can be kept together under the set description principle. This decision means that one main entry is constructed for the set as one item. The definition of main entry used here is that of the AACR2 Glossary. But it is also possible to split the set into its component parts and catalog each document as a separate item—to apply what can be called the document description principle. When that decision is made, a separate main entry is constructed for each document. Each volume in the set becomes one item to be cataloged.

Herbert H. Hoffman is Catalog Librarian, Santa Ana College, Santa Ana, California.
Multidocument sets, as is well known, can be finite sets or infinite sets. Finite sets, often called monographs, have a first and a last volume. Infinite sets are intended to be published indefinitely at intervals. They are referred to as serials. The level of description is a decision that enters into the cataloging of both types of multidocument sets, monographs as well as serials.

Since that decision determines what shall constitute the item to be catalogued, it must always be the first step in cataloging. The principle of level of description has never been specifically mentioned in textbooks or cataloging codes. In AACR2 there is a rule called Multilevel Description (rule 13.6). But this concept has nothing to do with the decision about treating a set as a unit or cataloging it as so many separate documents. Rule 13.6 only suggests how analytic notes can be given in the main entry for a multidocument set cataloged under the set description principle.

It should be pointed out that only the two principles mentioned above, the set description principle and the document description principle, are possible, and that every publication cataloged, in all types of media, must be treated according to one or the other. There are no exceptions. A principle so basic to cataloging should, therefore, find its way into AACR2. The level of description should be considered under subhead zero in the General Rules for chapters 1 through 12.
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Managing European Automatic Acquisitions

Robert G. Sewell

Automatic acquisition of library materials in the form of approval plans and blanket orders is now widespread throughout American libraries with more than 80 percent of university libraries using these methods. The impact of such programs for European materials on collection development policies and acquisition procedures is discussed. European blanket order programs faced many problems in the latter half of the 1970s, with the result that many academic libraries began to fear they had lost control of these programs and decided to reevaluate their effectiveness. Some libraries, such as the Memorial Library at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, have canceled about half of their programs, while others, such as the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library, have revamped and expanded them. The specific problems of returns, exclusion of government and research institute publications, duplication of automatic acquisitions with firm orders, serial orders and publications with multinational imprints are addressed. The careful construction of subject profiles, review of materials, and the imposition of spending limits are designated as key means to gain control over automatic acquisition of European materials as well as to aid in collection development planning.

Automatic acquisition of library materials is a concept that is now widespread throughout American libraries, and a good deal of ink has been devoted to it in library literature. Automatic acquisition appears in the form of approval plans, blanket orders, or gathering plans. The most famous and earliest of such plans were the Farmington Plan and Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Project (LACAP) for foreign-language materials, and the Greenaway Plan and the approval plan initiated by the Richard Abel Company for domestic books. All of these early programs have now gone out of existence, but more sophisticated and second or third generations of these programs are functioning at present. Researchers conducting the comprehensive survey of the use of approval plans in academic libraries discovered that ‘more than 80% of the libraries affiliated with universities and almost two thirds of the libraries in smaller schools in this survey have, or have had, approval plans.’ This form of acquisition has had a profound impact on acquisition procedures and collection development policies. In this paper, some

Robert G. Sewell is West European Acquisitions Coordinator, University of Illinois Library at Urbana-Champaign.
aspects of this impact will be explored with special comments on the acquisition of European materials.

**Characteristics of Automatic Acquisition Programs**

We must begin with some definitions. What does automatic acquisition mean? Basically this term refers to an agreement between a library and a vendor or publisher to supply current books in certain categories without individual orders for them. Three types of automatic acquisition programs can be distinguished: the approval plan, the blanket order, and the standing order. The approval plan is the most sophisticated of the three and involves the preselection of materials by a vendor based on a detailed profile which specifies subjects and formats to be covered. Books are sent “on approval,” meaning the books are approved and kept or rejected and returned by library personnel and teaching faculty members. The blanket order is similar to the approval plan but is less specific in terms of coverage—everything published in a given area—and return of material is discouraged because of the general nature of the instructions to the vendor. The standing order is for all publications in a series or of a single publisher and can be made either with a vendor or with the publisher directly. While these distinctions can be and are made, these terms are sometimes used practically interchangeably in the literature. In this paper, the terms will be used as defined above.

The advantages of the automatic acquisition programs are that the bibliographers or selectors are freed from going through endless publishers’ announcements and catalogs and trade and national bibliographies and can concentrate on retrospective materials and general collection development and management problems. The acquisition staff is liberated from searching and verification work and from typing out orders to be sent to the dealers. The most characteristic problems with these programs are unwanted duplicates, record keeping after the material arrives, effective reviewing of the books, and a general feeling of lack of control over collection development and acquisition because of the supposed “automatic” nature of the process.

A key concept in automatic acquisition is the “profile.” Developing a profile for an approval plan or blanket order program is a complex process. A library must begin with a careful review of its collection strengths and weaknesses, and of the teaching and research needs of the faculty, before constructing a subject outline or profile of current and future collection needs. In constructing such a profile, one must begin with some classification scheme, such as Library of Congress or Dewey decimal. Such systems, however, may be too detailed or not suitable for instructions to a vendor since works are not written to fit into any particular slot in a preconceived classification system. Approval plan dealers often develop their own subject outlines and classification schemes, which may be more accurate reflections of publication patterns. Both Otto Harrassowitz in Wiesbaden, West Germany, and Puvill Libros in Barcelona, Spain, have developed their own subject outlines. Profiles can be drawn up very specifically by a particular library and spending limits can be
imposed so that precise collection development and budgetary planning can be undertaken.

**WEAKNESSES OF AUTOMATIC ACQUISITION PROGRAMS**

Many European blanket order programs were established in American academic libraries after the demise of the Farmington Plan in 1973. These revised programs continued the blanket order concept, maintained some aspects, dropped and added subjects to the old Farmington profile, and in general were made with the former Farmington Plan agents. Since there was a great overlap in these blanket order programs and the same agents were being used, there was concern that American academic libraries were "mirror collecting." If, for instance, the Universities of Wisconsin and Illinois had blanket orders for German language and literature with the Otto Harrassowitz firm, it was very likely that they were receiving exactly the same things. This pattern of collecting has been viewed as wasteful in terms of the national collection efforts of American research libraries. One could certainly argue, however, that if fiscally possible, there is justification for major research libraries to acquire all relevant and important German materials regardless of duplication on a national level.

In the mid- and late-1970s these blanket order programs for European materials underwent close scrutiny. Most of these programs had not set spending limits and with inflation and the then unfavorable rate of exchange for the dollar, many of them were considerably overspent. In reassessing these programs, some universities decided to cancel them and others to revamp them. The University of Wisconsin-Madison Library, for instance, cut back on their blanket orders considerably, whereas the library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has increasingly relied on approval plans and blanket orders. Illinois has sought to refine its old European blanket order to make it more in line with the more flexible, but also more precise, approval plan concept, which has been implemented for domestic publications by Baker and Taylor and Blackwell North America. The remainder of this paper will focus on the problems encountered in European blanket order programs as enumerated by a member of the University of Wisconsin Library staff and the methods by which the University of Illinois has dealt with these and other related problems.

Erwin Welsch, social science bibliographer and European bibliographic expert at the Memorial Library of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, is skeptical about the usefulness and efficiency of such programs of automatic acquisition for European materials. Welsch suggests, "since the strength of blanket orders has been breadth, which may no longer be desirable, or possible, they may be vestiges of the past less able to meet realistic institutional needs. The old concept that a collection can best be built by librarians working in cooperation with faculty needs to be revitalized." His specific complaints about the shortcomings of European blanket orders are as follows: 1.) books are expensive and return is difficult; 2.) they do not include nontrade materials
such as government publications or those of research institutes which are
precisely the ones that are difficult to obtain; 3.) unless specified and a
means of avoiding duplication with serial orders can be found, they do
not include books in series; since most European scholarly books are part
of a series, this is a serious omission; 4.) the duplication problem is be-
coming more severe as publishing becomes multinational and an in-
creasing number of publishers open offices in other countries."

Welsch feels the only European countries where blanket orders are
still justified are East Germany and Italy—both countries because of the
small editions in which books are published, and Italy also because of the
poor distribution systems. In countries with good bibliographic control,
well-developed distribution systems, and where books do not go out of
print quickly, Welsch believes, the title-by-title method of selection and
acquisition is preferable.

Welsch has pointed out some, but certainly not all, of the problems
that can be encountered in blanket order programs. I do believe, how-
ever, that such plans should not be abandoned; they need to be tightened
up in the manner of approval plans with detailed profiles and right of
return.

METHODS OF USING AUTOMATIC
ACQUISITION PLANS ADVANTAGEOUSLY

Returns are difficult and expensive but not an overwhelming problem
and not unique to approval plans. Returns are sometimes necessary
when items are ordered individually. Often publishers’ advertisements
can be misleading and titles confusing. For instance, a few years ago,
several geology librarians ordered and subsequently returned a work en-
titled *The Rock Encyclopedia* when they discovered its true home was in the
music library. In approval plans, books are returned for strategic rea-
sons for the long-range improvement in the vendor’s selection. Return-
ing books is important when starting with a new dealer or when there is a
change in the profile. Returned books represent a problem for the ven-
dor, who, in order to keep the account, will take notice of the reason why
the book was returned and become more careful in selections. The rate
of returns will diminish to an insignificant amount. If not, a new vendor
should be found.

Welsch’s assertion that nontrade publications cannot be included in
these programs is not altogether true. Government publications and
some publications of universities and research institutes can only be ob-
tained directly and through exchange. The European vendors with
whom the University of Illinois deals, however, regularly include re-
search institute publications on the blanket order program. A library
can specify, in fact, the institutes that should be covered, or merely give
examples of the types to be included. It is more likely that a conscientious
vendor located in the country of the publication can track them down
more effectively than can a librarian on another continent.

The problem of monographic series is a bedeviling one for academic
libraries no matter what the method of acquisition. It is true that most
scholarly books in Europe are published in series and to exclude them
from an approval plan would defeat the purpose of the plan. Welsch’s
caveat, "unless specified and a means of avoiding duplication with serial orders can be found," is important. There are ways of specifying serials orders to avoid duplication. Libraries with automated acquisition systems can produce computer printouts of annual payments for continuations and standing orders for monographic series. Such lists can be sent to the approval plan vendor with instructions to avoid selecting monographs from these series for approval plan books. The process is much easier if a library’s standing orders for a particular country are primarily or exclusively with the same vendor who handles the approval plan. The vendor can block these standing orders from the approval plan selection. The whole issue of monographic series, however, should be reviewed. To some extent establishing numbered monographic series is a publisher’s device to make libraries feel compelled to place orders for the entire series. Monographic series sometimes vary in quality and subject matter and a library may not, or should not, make a long-standing commitment to a series. In Spain and Italy many scholarly series frequently include translations of works that a library may already have in the original. Approval plan vendors can make selections from these series on the basis of detailed profiles and exclude unwanted materials. Libraries may well cancel many of their standing orders and enter into new ones only with great care. Illinois, for instance, has made arrangements as described above with all of its European blanket order vendors—Harrassowitz in Germany, Touzot in France, Puvill in Spain, and Casalini in Italy.

Welsch’s last point, the possibility of duplication because of the multinational character of publishing, does pose some problems. Such publishers as Springer Verlag in Germany, North Holland in the Netherlands, and Oslo University Press in Norway publish books in the country of origin, England, and the United States. The duplication of effort by the publishers themselves can cause problems for any kind of acquisition program, but the automatic acquisition provision of the approval plan is especially vulnerable. A foreign vendor may select a book already ordered individually or picked up by a domestic approval plan vendor. One can always return a book to the approval plan vendor but this is time-consuming and wasteful. Librarians should attempt to identify such multinational publishers and inform the foreign vendor not to send any books from publishers that release books in the United States. Vendors may in fact be more aware of the possibility for duplication than are librarians. The vendor can examine a book’s imprint and determine all the locations in which it is being published. The librarian may have only a publisher’s announcement or advertisement which is not as detailed as the imprint.

In discussing Welsch’s four points against blanket orders, it should be clear that automatic acquisition programs are not or should not be as “automatic” as they sometimes are. They require a great deal of planning and monitoring. The approach to collection development and acquisition is different from selecting and ordering on a title-by-title basis. Many have argued that the collection development process is enhanced by establishing an approval plan.

The University of Illinois Library faced many of the problems with its
blanket order for European materials of which Welsch speaks. In fiscal year 1980–81, the European blanket order was considerably overspent by midyear, so it was suspended for six months. By July 1981, the program was reinstated after a general review of the situation—the procedures, the European scholarly output, the areas of coverage, and other factors. A coordinator was named to oversee the program; annual spending limits were assigned to each dealer for the first time; and a new profile and reviewing mechanism were established. While the old European blanket order has been transformed into an approval plan, it is still called by the same name. Much of what was discovered in this process has been confirmed by others in the literature.

Deciding on the guidelines for future acquisitions in a given field requires an analysis of the nature of publishing in that field and the institutional needs. The title-by-title selection of current materials is in a sense a passive reaction to a fait accompli. By articulating a profile and guidelines for an approval plan, one gains a certain degree of control over the future course of the acquisitions. Noreen Alldredge suggests that in designing a profile, “librarians are sometimes forced to come to an understanding of what they want to collect or to reexamine the written collection development policies which they already have. . . . The process of developing an approval plan profile helps the library to identify or refine its collection development priorities.” Peter Spyers-Duran asserts that “the exercise of developing a current imprint profile based on a major approval plan vendor product can help a library to arrive at a better understanding of its collection development program.”

This process of developing a profile can also involve and revitalize what Welsch refers to as that “old concept” that “a collection can best be built by librarians working in cooperation with faculty.” It is especially appropriate to seek the advice and expertise of faculty in European studies who may have useful insight into the publishing patterns and important research institutes in their fields. This interaction not only aids in the development of a profile, it can also facilitate communications in general between the faculty and the library.

Some librarians have resisted approval plans stating that they do not want to relinquish too much of their collection development and selection responsibilities to the vendor. As Doyle Pickett of Baker and Taylor points out, “A continuing criticism heard of the approval plan is that it usurps the librarian’s role in book selection. If the librarian believes this to be a bona fide criticism, then I submit that the profile is the place to begin exercising these prerogatives. Selection starts with the profile.” It may be that librarians have some fear of developing such profiles because they are far more significant and detailed than the often pious oaths of collection development statements. Collection development statements are internal and only vague outlines. The approval plan profile is immediately operational when in the hands of the vendor. If the profile is inadequate, the vendor’s selection will be inadequate. A profile can reveal a librarian’s lack of knowledge or inability to articulate the needs of the programs served or the nature of publishing in these areas. Many librarians have been able to develop such profiles and been able to
rely on the vendor as middleman between the publisher and the library.

The increasing role of the vendor in the selection process requires special expertise. Kathleen McCullough has described the approval plan vendor as one who "stands between the complexities of publishing and the complexities of academic library service. He also must mediate attempts to standardize the individual practices of thousands of publishers and attempt to standardize the individual practices and demands of thousands of libraries, at the same time allowing as much latitude for individual preferences as possible." The successful vendor must have a well-trained and knowledgeable staff to carry out this work. Milton Wolf suggests that "there is very little chance that the majority of America's libraries will ever have sufficient collection development staffs to rival what Baker and Taylor, Blackwell North America, and other profit-motivated enterprises are already offering. Because of economies of scale, they are providing services more cheaply than libraries could themselves."

This situation is especially true with European approval plans. The areas most heavily covered in the European blanket order at Illinois are language and literature, history, and social science. There are only six librarians responsible for these areas: two European language/literature librarians, one history librarian, and three social science librarians. While each of these individuals is highly qualified, it is impossible for them to go through all the relevant dealers' and publishers' catalogs and announcements and the trade and national bibliographies emanating from Europe in these fields, and at the same time do comprehensive selection of American and British publications. In addition to relieving local librarians of some of these chores, the speed of acquisitions is greatly enhanced. Instead of waiting for the various bibliographic paraphernalia of current imprints to arrive from Europe, selecting from them, preparing and sending out the orders to the vendors abroad, the vendor on the spot can select the books and send them directly to the library. Chances are that in most cases the books are in the library long before the scholar comes looking for specific titles after reading reviews of them.

Developing profiles, which guide the vendor in selection, is a way to gain control over automatic acquisitions as well as a way of involving teaching faculty in the collection development process. Another aspect of managing approval programs, which provides checks on the vendor's selections and can use teaching faculty participation, is the review of incoming books. Faculty members and librarians can review the quality of the materials being sent and weed out inappropriate books for return. A more important part of the review process is to make librarians and faculty members aware of what is coming in on the program. They are able to make decisions about where the books should be located and what should be fully cataloged immediately.

The development of profiles and the review process require the cooperation of many individuals, and ideally these activities should be coordinated by a single individual or a committee, which can take an overall view of the approval plan. The funds for the European blanket order are in a separate budget line not controlled by individual librarians, a bud-
getary arrangement Berkner considers suitable: "The best arrangement is not to allocate approval funds by subject or specific academic departments. Profiles should be built on a scale which reflects collection development priorities and includes a flexible pool of funds for purchase of interdisciplinary materials in new or overlapping subjects." This view is especially applicable to European materials where the readers' language competence is a factor in considering the need for books. A selector representing one subject area may have a different perception of the usefulness of a book to his or her constituency compared to someone in another discipline. For instance, the social science librarian may want to discontinue receiving materials in social science from Italy and Spain because the readers currently being served do not read the appropriate languages, and because the Italian and Spanish treatment of social science is not as scientific as is the American variety. But a historian or literature specialist may find these materials indispensable to his or her research, and they may also be indispensable to the future needs of the permanent collection. Individual selectors' points of view may be too parochial for the overall good of the collection. Such views should be mediated by a coordinator or committee.

**CONCLUSION**

The approval plan and blanket order concepts involve a broad view of collection needs for both the present and the future. The problem of exclusive reliance on title-by-title selection by teaching faculty or individual librarians with specifically defined interests and budgetary lines for particular fields is that current pressures and even scholarly fads may distort the collection development effort. It is the responsibility of large academic and research libraries to develop quality, and whenever possible, broadly based collections not subject to momentary whims. If approval plans for current domestic and foreign imprints continue to proliferate as librarians and vendors become more sophisticated in managing them, the implications for book fund allocations are far-reaching. The pool funds coming off the top of the budget for approval plans will increase and individual allocations to departmental librarians will shrink. Such funds will be needed primarily for retrospective purchases and for periodical subscriptions. The structure of the collection development and acquisition processes will require increasing cooperation and coordination. Librarians' subject expertise and bibliographic knowledge will be rigorously tested. The approval plan offers an attractive combination of sound planning and flexibility, resulting in automatic acquisition and dynamic collection development.
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Margaret Mann Citation, 1983: Frances Hinton

The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification for 1983 is awarded to Frances Hinton in recognition of her important and sustained contributions to the advancement of the field, particularly as a leader in both national and international professional associations in providing expertise, reason, and creativity toward the evolution of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the Dewey Decimal Classification, and other international bibliographic standards.
Frances Hinton

Edward Swanson

The thirty-third Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification was presented during the 1983 American Library Association Annual Conference in Los Angeles to Frances Hinton, chief of the Processing Department of the Free Library of Philadelphia, in recognition of her important and sustained contributions to the advancement of both cataloging and classification. During much of her professional career she has been involved in the development of the Dewey Decimal Classification and the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*, and it was especially for these activities that she was selected to receive the award.

Frances Hinton was born in Atlanta, Georgia, where her father, James Hinton, was professor of English and, from 1926 to 1929, director of libraries at Emory University. She earned a bachelor of arts degree in English at Agnes Scott College in Decatur, Georgia, in 1942 and a bachelor of science in library science degree from the University of North Carolina the following year.

Her first professional position was as a reference and young adults librarian at the New York Public Library from 1943 to 1945. For three years she was the head of the Loundes-Echols Regional Library, Valdosta, Georgia, and during 1948-49 she worked as young adults librarian at the South Bend Public Library.

It was an opportunity to work in Hawaii that was responsible for her entering the field for which she has become best known and for which she was honored with the Mann Citation. In 1949 she accepted a position as a cataloger at the Kauai Public Library, where she served until 1953.

That year Miss Hinton returned to the mainland—and to what at that time was her first love in library science, work with young adults—as head of the Central Library Young Adult Department at the Free Library of Philadelphia. Two years later she began a seven-year career as a cataloger at the Free Library, and in 1962 she was named head of the Catalog Department. She was promoted to chief of the Processing Department in 1975, the position she holds today.

Miss Hinton’s major activities in the American Library Association have been associated with the Cataloging and Classification Section. She was chair of the section in 1978-79, served on its Executive Committee from 1977 to 1980, and was a member of its Policy and Research Committee from 1969 to 1974.

In 1966 she was named a member of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee and continued on it until 1978, serving from 1969 to 1975 as the chair. It was during her service on the committee that the 18th and 19th editions of the Dewey Decimal Classification were prepared.

Edward Swanson is Head, Processing Department, Minnesota Historical Society.
Beginning in 1974 she was active in the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC), at the same time serving as the deputy representative from ALA to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (JSC). Colleagues who served with her on these committees speak of her commitment to achieving the best set of rules possible and of her positive, practical, tactful, and consistent approaches to the problems facing the committees. They give special note to the part she played in the development of the rules for corporate bodies, first in establishing a CCRC policy on the rules and then persuasively arguing the position before the JSC.

Following the publication of AACR2 in 1978, the JSC was reconstituted, and Miss Hinton was chosen as the ALA representative to it. In 1979 she was named chair of the JSC, a recognition of the esteem in which she is held in the Anglo-American cataloguing community. As the representative to the JSC, she also serves as an ex officio member of the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access.

On an international level, Miss Hinton has been active in the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). She was one of the founders of the Round Table on Classification (now the Section on Classification and Subject Cataloging). She also has worked with the IFLA committee reviewing the International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions and was a major contributor to the American review of the ISBDs.

In all her work Miss Hinton has served as a role model to other members of the profession, especially the younger ones. She has encouraged and welcomed newcomers, challenged them to become all that they can be, and provided opportunities for fresh contributions. She has given generously of her time and knowledge to provide leadership and guidance to others. Her wisdom and experience, having been used to train quality leaders for tomorrow, will continue beyond present issues and crises.

She is an avowed sports fan, and she is devoted to her friends, both those in the library community and those outside it, as well as to the two fur persons—her dog, Blaise, and her cat, Moki—with whom she shares her home in the historic Germantown section of Philadelphia.

All of her activities bear witness to a deep commitment to her profession and to its being of as high a quality as possible. She did, however, reveal an ulterior motive when she admitted that she had done all she has done because “it was fun.”
The Esther J. Piercy Award for 1983 is presented to Sue A. Dodd to recognize her foresight in identifying the need to bring machine-readable data files (MRDF) under bibliographic control, her skill in solving many highly technical problems, and her determination to see the problems through to a logical conclusion, aptly represented by her book: Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files: An Interpretive Manual (ALA, 1982). Her work in a new and challenging area within librarianship holds promise for continuing service to the profession.
Sue A. Dodd
Marcia Tuttle

Sue A. Dodd, recipient of the 1983 Esther J. Piercy Award, earned undergraduate and master’s degrees from the University of Kentucky. She came to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1966 as planning assistant with the Department of Sociology, and the following year began three years’ tenure as assistant director of the Louis Harris Political Data Center. In 1970, the Harris Center was merged with the Social Science Data Library, Institute for Research in Social Science at UNC-Chapel Hill, and Ms. Dodd served first as a research associate and later as the institute’s associate research librarian. Recognizing the need for formal library education, she entered the UNC School of Library Science and was awarded her graduate degree in 1977. The title of her master’s paper was “Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files—An Interpretation,” a topic directly related to her work at the Data Library. At the beginning of her library career, Ms. Dodd grasped the significance of the machine-readable data file (MRDF) to libraries and the importance of gaining bibliographic control of this new and elusive medium.

For the last several years, Sue Dodd has been increasingly active in the library and information science profession as advisor, consultant, organizer, and speaker. Among her professional memberships are the International Association for Social Science Information Services and Technology (IASSIST), American Library Association, Society of American Archivists, American Society for Information Science, and Special Libraries Association. Within these groups she has been active as officer, task force member, and program leader.

In addition to her work within professional associations, Ms. Dodd has worked on specific national projects related to MRDF, including the Library of Congress Committee to Establish a MARC (MACHINE READABLE CATALOGING) Format for Machine-Readable Data Files and American National Standards Committee Z39, Subcommittee J, Bibliographic Data Source File Identification. In 1978 she served as cochair of the national conference on “Cataloging and Information Services for Machine-Readable Data Files.” Ms. Dodd has published, at a steady rate, significant articles on her topic, and she is the author of a 1982 ALA publication, Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files: An Interpretive Manual. This work is the culmination—to this point—of a decade’s work with MRDF and is the latest contribution in her effort to educate members of the library profession concerning this new and increasingly visible form of material.

The letter nominating Ms. Dodd for the Esther J. Piercy Award summed up her value to the profession:

Marcia Tuttle is Head, Serials Department, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
One frequently hears in relation to machine-readable data files, the suggestion, "Get in touch with Sue Dodd..." I hope the Esther Piercy Award Committee will! It is with this hope of according recognition of hard work and achievement in a new and challenging area of librarianship that I recommend Sue Dodd for the 1983 Esther Piercy Award.

One after another, leaders of the library profession supported this nomination by citing personal examples of Ms. Dodd's knowledge of MRDF and, especially, of her ability to communicate with librarians and nonlibrarians, at different levels of sophistication, on the topic of machine-readable data files. Sue Dodd is a person who has made an extraordinary contribution to technical services in the few years since her degree was granted. However, her contribution thus far has been only the beginning of a career. The newest of her concerns is the urgent need in school and public libraries for a means of cataloging the program files that are used with microcomputers and video games. The evolution of the microcomputer and its software presents new challenges to the cataloger. Sue Dodd is alerting librarians to this fact and is educating them regarding the changes in their service to patrons resulting from the microcomputer revolution. One feels that if Esther J. Piercy were alive today, she would be in the thick of the campaign with Sue Dodd.
Resources Section
Blackwell North America Scholarship Award, 1983:
The Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools: Concepts, Practices and Information Sources
by Phyllis J. Van Orden

Phyllis J. Van Orden, award recipient (left), and Chris Von Hinckeldey, vice-president, Sales and Marketing, Blackwell North America.
The 1983 Resources Section Blackwell North America Scholarship Award was presented at the Resources Section annual meeting on Monday, June 27, 1983, to Phyllis Van Orden for her book *The Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools: Concepts, Practices and Information Sources*, illustrated by William Harper and published by Libraries Unlimited. The award, a citation and a $1,000 scholarship made available through the generosity of Blackwell North America, Inc., to the school of the recipient’s choice, is presented by the section annually for the best publication during the past year in the field of acquisitions, collection development, and related areas of resources development in libraries.

The book fills a major gap in the literature of collection development. The school library collection has not been treated as an entity for some time; instead, articles have discussed separate segments of the collection. This book pulls together concepts and practices treated separately as children’s literature, audiovisual materials, and school library administration. Sections on selection, acquisition, maintenance, and collection evaluation are particularly valuable. The realities of schools are recognized by discussions and illustrations of starting and closing collections. The *RTSD Guidelines for Collection Development* are applied to school collections in this book.

The *Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools* discusses the internal and external relationships which impact the libraries in elementary and middle schools. Divergent views and pressures are presented, and the reader is encouraged to apply professional decision-making techniques to select the option for the library to implement. There is support for the librarian facing a censorship issue. The emphasis is on active, responsive collection development which assigns a high priority to user needs. It discusses the special needs of users, teachers, and students and contains suggested policy models to deal with conflicting needs as well as routine operations.

The book is well written, well researched, and neatly organized, the illustrations are well done and contribute to the clarity of the text. When she accepted the award, Ms. Van Orden thanked William R. Harper, a former student who did the illustrations.

The scholarship has been awarded to the School of Library and Information Studies at Florida State University, where Phyllis Van Orden is professor and associate dean.

President-elect of the ALA Association for Library Service to Children, Ms. Van Orden has been active in ALA serving as a member of Council and the Committee for Accreditation. She has also served on the Newbery-Caldecott Committee and Notable Books Committee of ALSC. She has been a member of the editorial board for *School Media Quarterly* and has written, edited, and published in the areas of children’s literature and school libraries.—*Ruth Fraley, Chair, Blackwell North America Scholarship Award Jury.*
NOMINATIONS FOR 1984
MARGARET MANN CITATION

Nominations for the 1984 Margaret Mann Citation are now being accepted. They should be submitted by December 1, 1983, to LeRoy Ortopan, Chair, Margaret Mann Citation, Catalog Dept., General Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

The Margaret Mann Citation is awarded annually for outstanding achievement in cataloging or classification through:
- publication of significant professional literature;
- contributions to activities of professional cataloging organizations;
- technical improvements and/or introduction of new techniques of recognized importance;
- distinguished teaching in the area of cataloging and classification.

Renominations of nonrecipients are acceptable.

NOMINATIONS FOR 1984
ESTHER J. PIERCY AWARD

Nominations for the 1984 Esther J. Piercy Award are now being accepted. They should be submitted by December 1, 1983, to Don Lanier, Chair, Esther J. Piercy Award Jury, 613 Ball Ave., DeKalb, IL 60115.

The Piercy Award was first presented in 1969. Its purpose is to recognize contributions to librarianship in the field of technical services by a younger librarian—one who has no more than ten years of professional experience and who has shown outstanding promise for continuing contributions and leadership.

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

Renominations of nonrecipients are acceptable.

NOMINATIONS FOR 1984 RESOURCES SECTION
BLACKWELL NORTH AMERICA
SCHOLARSHIP AWARD

Nominations for the 1984 Resources Section Blackwell North America Scholarship Award are now being accepted. They should be submitted by December 1, 1983, to Mona East, Chair, RS/Blackwell North America Scholarship Award, P.O. Box 1688, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

This award is presented to honor the author or authors of the outstanding 1983 monograph, article, or original paper in the field of acquisitions, collection development, and related areas of resources development in libraries. Blackwell North America will donate a $1,000 scholarship to the U.S. or Canadian library school of the winning author's choice. The school will select a student concentrating in the acquisitions or collection development areas to receive the scholarship.
IN MEMORIAM: THEODORE CHRISTIAN HINES  
(1926–1983)

The death of Ted Hines in Greensboro, North Carolina, on June 25, 1983, came as a real shock to many of those who knew him, particularly those who were unaware of his battle with cancer. At 56, Ted seemed to be in the prime of his career—able to express his eclectic interests in computers, children’s literature, and indexing techniques, while teaching library and information students in the pleasant surroundings of the North Carolina Piedmont region. His competitive nature had apparently even mellowed a bit under the influence of the somewhat slower pace of life in the Carolinas, as compared with that of the New York area in which he had lived from 1957 until 1975.

Ted was born in Washington, D.C., on September 9, 1926. He completed programs both in English and in business administration at George Washington University and American University, after serving in the United States Army from 1944 to 1947, with tours of duty in Italy and Germany. Between 1947 and 1957, when he left Washington to attend library school, Ted rose through the ranks in the D.C. Public Library System to be chief of its Extension Department. In the fall of 1957, he entered the M.I.L.S. program at Rutgers’ Graduate School of Library Service, remaining there until 1961 when he completed his Ph.D. After a brief period as assistant professor of library service at Rutgers, Ted moved to the School of Library Service at Columbia University in New York in 1963, where he served as assistant professor and later as associate professor until 1975.

During the years at Columbia, Ted’s first wife, Ruth, died. Ted remarried, and he and Lois (Winkel) moved to Greensboro, where Ted became chairman of the Library Education/Instructional Media Program in the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. In 1978, he resigned the chairmanship of the program but continued, until his death, as professor of library science and educational technology at U. of N.C.–Greensboro. In recent years, students and colleagues observed Ted’s growing interest in microcomputers—several models of which he owned personally—and in the applications of computer techniques to indexing. He and Lois coauthored several articles on the topic, one of which appeared in the January/March 1983 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services, in conjunction with their work on the Children’s Media Data Bank.

During the Columbia years, Ted wrote extensively with Jessica Harris on the use of the computer to facilitate indexing and on the development of standardized terminology, especially in the library and information science field. Prior to that, he had stirred the library world with a piece in Library Journal called “The Crisis in Children’s Cataloging” (September 15, 1966). His concerns were always for efficiency of service (learned well from his mentor at Rutgers, Ralph R. Shaw) and, sometimes in contrast, the humanization of libraries. His interests were wide, his enthusiasm boundless, and his mind always probing.

While not consumed with activity in professional associations, Ted was always a participant and an avid critic of groups that had lost their direction or set wrong goals. He held committee posts in the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Information Science and Automation Division (now LITA), and the Resources and Technical Services Divi-
sion of ALA. He was also active in the American Society for Information Science and the Special Libraries Association, and at one time served as ALA's representative to the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He and Jessica Harris wrote *Computer Filing of Index, Bibliographic, and Catalog Entries* (BroDart, 1966) and *Terminology of Library and Information Science: A Selective Glossary* (Columbia University School of Library Service, 1971).

From the time of his first contribution to librarianship—a 1961 translation of Louise-Noëlle Malclès' *La Bibliographie*—to his final article in *LRTS* in January 1983, Ted Hines displayed the kind of active mind and sense of excitement about the possibilities of library and information service that the profession most prizes. His keen wit and probing criticisms will be missed. —Doraly J. Hickey, Professor, School of Library and Information Sciences, North Texas State University, Denton, Texas.
A Guide to Coordinated and Cooperative Collection Development

Paul H. Mosher and Marcia Pankake

1.0 INTRODUCTION

A May 1982 progress report on the Joint American Association of Universities-Council on Library Resources Study concluded that “cooperation (among libraries) is endorsed as the appropriate means to several ends, but the existing structures for cooperative action are not adequate.” The report also points out that existing institution-centered funding patterns and the high cost of new computer technology slow the development of new means of providing library materials and services.

Recognizing this set of problems, Patricia Battin, vice-president and university librarian at Columbia University has called on libraries to give up their “basic notion of . . . autonomous organization,” and joins with the Council on Library Resources in calling on librarians “to define their obligations and requirements within a much different environment, one in which each library is not a self-contained entity, but a component of an undefined whole.”

To that end, this draft “Guide” has been prepared by Paul Mosher and Marcia Pankake, with significant contributions by Carolyn Bucknall, Steve Marquardt, John Whaley, and John Ryland. It was submitted to the RTSD RS Collection Management and Development Committee at its meetings in New York in June 1980, in Washington in January 1981, in San Francisco in June 1981, in Philadelphia in July 1982, at the pilot RTSD Collection Management and Development Institute held at Stanford University in July 1981, and at a hearing on the “Guide” held in Philadelphia. Suggested revisions have been incorporated in this present draft, which was approved by the Resources Section of the American Library Association’s Resources and Technical Services Division on March 28, 1983.

1.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

This “Guide” is intended to help librarians who are responsible for planning or establishing coordinated or cooperative collection development and management or acquisitions components or arrangements between libraries. It is intended to suggest possible contexts, goals, methods, organizations, effects, and processes which should be investigated for their advantages and disadvantages while planning and establishing such programs. The “Guide” is published with...
the approval of our professional association to advance the development of cooperative programs by making it unnecessary to reinvent the wheel every time it is needed.

Users of the “Guide” should consider institutional goals and missions (of both the library and the parent institution), programs and needs of users, and local circumstances (such as budgetary constraints) at all stages of the planning process, and periodically throughout the life of any cooperative program.

1.2 NEED

Many collection development librarians—both administrative and at operational levels—find their institutions seeking cooperative arrangements. Three major factors contribute to this development: rising costs, changing research patterns, and improved access to information through automation. Patrick found that ten library consortia established between 1931 and 1960 were still operating in 1971. Between 1961 and 1970, the number had increased more than 11 times to 112. This process had continued during the present decade; the 1981 American Library Directory lists 330 active networks and consortia, of which 265 engage in some sort of resource sharing.

Increasingly sophisticated bibliographic retrieval systems available through computer technology permit distribution of resource sharing and collection development among a larger and larger group of institutions, promising to ameliorate problems stemming from rising costs and changing needs. All of these elements make resource sharing attractive.

Libraries both large and small are affected by these considerations; even the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library are participating in programs of distributed collecting responsibilities, and many smaller libraries—public, special, and college—are beginning to use coordinated collection development to handle the secondary or research needs of their users so that they can concentrate more of their shrinking resources on primary or curricular needs.

While distributed or coordinated collection development offers the promise of solving some of our most pressing problems, such programs demand wise planning and sound building to avoid mistakes that could have a profound negative impact on libraries and their users in the years to come.

1.3 SCOPE

This “Guide” treats cooperative, coordinated, and distributed collection development and management among libraries, as well as the collection management and development aspects of consortium, network, or sharing programs. Collection management includes four principal elements: (1) collection planning, (2) selection, (3) evaluation or analysis of collections, (4) review of collections for auxiliary storage, discard, or conservation/preservation decisions. In all of these cases, policy, planning, and decisions are made as collection development functions, but both public and technical services staff may contribute to or be affected by such activity.

Much has been written on the subject of library consortia and cooperation; and many consortia and cooperative ventures have been established. However, there is little substantial literature on the cooperative or coordinated collection development or management aspects of cooperative library programs. This “Guide” has been written to help fill this gap. From practice and documentation, we have derived a set of guidelines which:

a. indicate various ways of distributing and coordinating activities, and suggest circumstances in which these activities may or may not be helpful;

b. indicate the various elements which must be dealt with in distributing and coordinating collection development, and what is involved in each;
c. indicate considerations for setting up a distributed or coordinated collection development program.

The "Guide" describes various factors which should be considered by any library involved in network, consortium, or resource sharing efforts which involve coordinating acquisitions or collection development decisions. This document does not set forth in detail how every specific library should proceed; it is rather intended as a general guide.

1.4 AUDIENCE

The "Guide" is intended for collection development officers or coordinators; for acquisitions librarians, bibliographers, or other collection development librarians who are considering entering into coordinated or cooperative collection development arrangements, and for institutional and library administrators. Because of the relative complexity of large research collections, there is some emphasis on this mode of cooperative collection development; however, it is our belief that libraries of all types and sizes may adapt this "Guide" to their own purposes, and that it is easier for smaller libraries to derive useful information from a guide comprehensive enough for larger libraries than vice versa.

1.5 METHODOLOGY

The "Guide" has been prepared according to the form established for ALA guidelines to make it consistent with other collection development guides and guidelines, and was reviewed by members of a subcommittee and by the full Collection Management and Development Committee at a number of meetings. It was considered by the 180 librarians attending the pilot RTSD Collection Management and Development Institute held at Stanford in July 1981. A hearing held in Philadelphia at the 1982 ALA Annual Conference in conjunction with the committee's program, "Collection Management Decisions in a Resource Sharing Environment," allowed another audience the opportunity to recommend additions and changes to the document.

1.6 DEFINITIONS

Much of the terminology is new and does not appear in the ALA Glossary (1943), or other compendia of library terminology.

1. Agreement: Formal or informal protocols or agreements between two or more libraries which record conditions, terms, standards, or provisions of cooperative library services or arrangements.

2. Bibliographic Utility: The automated system supporting a shared or cooperative library network such as RLIN or OCLC.

3. Collection Development and Management: The process of acquiring materials, developing collections, managing the growth and maintenance of collections in a cost- and user-beneficial way. The functions of collection planning, analysis or evaluation, selection, effective procurement of materials, review of collections for preservation, storage, discard, and other functions designed to make library collections as useful and effective as possible are included.

4. Comprehensive Collection: A collection which contains every item on a given subject or topic in virtually every bibliographic format. (See also 3.1.2.6, level 5, below.)

5. Consortium: A community of two or more libraries which have formally agreed to coordinate, cooperate in, or consolidate certain functions. Consortia may be formed on a local, regional, or larger basis; on a functional, type, or format basis; or on a subject basis.

6. Conspectus: A comprehensive survey; a tabulation of particulars represent-
ing a general view of them. The term as used here means an overview or summary of existing collection strength and future collecting intensity, arranged by subject, class, or a combination of either, and containing standardized codes for languages of materials collected and for collection or collecting levels. Effectively, the term *conspectus* is here used to define the synopsis of a consortium's or network's coordinated collection development overview or policy.

7. **Cooperative or Coordinated Collection Development:** Cooperation, coordination, or sharing in the development and management of collections by two or more libraries entering into an agreement for this purpose.

8. **Core Collection:** Those essential reference, study, and basic research materials required by a library to carry out its essential mission and objective.

9. **Cost-effective:** This is a relative term used to imply consideration of use or importance as a ratio to cost. For example, a "cost-effective" way of developing a collection would be to avoid acquiring a title unless the selector knows who will use it, how, and for what end. Selectivity in acquisitions is a "cost-effective" function.

10. **Dependency:** Reliance of libraries on each other for materials not held locally.

11. **Distributed Collection Development:** Cooperative and coordinated collection development is normally achieved by the distribution of collection development responsibilities among libraries of a consortium, or among consortia, in a way that will provide greater coverage than is possible for any single library.

12. **Divestiture:** Giving up or canceling all or a substantial amount of collection development effort in a specified area or field.

13. **Library of Record:** A library which formally agrees to maintain, and loan items from, very intensive collections for the benefit of other libraries.

14. **Networks:** The linking of libraries through shared bibliographic utilities.

15. **Primary Collecting Responsibility:** Assignment and acceptance of responsibility for maintaining a specified collecting intensity for designated materials which will be made available to a consortium unless relieved of that responsibility.

16. **Resource Sharing:** This document purposely limits resource sharing to the bibliographic access and delivery of one library's materials to other libraries in an agreement or a consortium or network. Cooperative circulation policies, as a separate matter, are excluded here. Libraries can have circulation, loan, or other agreements without collection development agreements. However, it is desirable that libraries not have collection development agreements without adequate provision for the loan of materials.

17. **Shared Cataloging or Preservation:** Agreement among libraries to divide responsibility for cataloging or preserving library materials for the benefit of other members of a consortium.

18. **Undesirable Redundancy:** Within a consortium, unwanted duplication of library materials among participants.

1.7 ASSUMPTIONS

The cost of books and periodicals has risen more rapidly than any other major category of library expenditure other than energy during the last decade and seems likely to continue to do so during the decade ahead. Library acquisitions budgets now account for approximately 30 percent of most libraries' total expenditures and are unlikely to increase significantly in constant dollars over the next decade, while new sources of revenue are unlikely to become available for most libraries.

Many libraries, including some of the largest research libraries, have faced steady-state or reduced budgets during the last decade; thus, most libraries do
not have the economic resources to buy, house, and preserve everything they might want.

At the same time, major bibliographic utilities are developing acquisitions subsystems to complement their existing shared cataloging systems, and several other automated systems are being marketed by different vendors. Sue Martin has written that “more than 2000 libraries in North America have become involved in on-line bibliographic processing.” These combined systems will make possible more rapid access to greater amounts of bibliographic information in larger numbers of libraries than ever before. This information can be used to allow consortia or cooperating groups of libraries to devise plans for sharing or distributing collecting responsibilities among participants.

Cooperative collection development plans are usually intended to permit libraries to concentrate on the acquisition of a smaller universe of library materials, especially core materials most often needed by local users, and a smaller number of broader, deeper research collections. This effort will allow collecting of more lesser-used materials to take place elsewhere.

2.0 GUIDELINES

2.1 BENEFITS

Cooperative or coordinated collection development arrangements should provide for some or all of the following options:

2.1.1 Greater selectivity in some areas and the consequent ordering of fewer noncore titles because of more clearly articulated selection policies and added confidence that titles not purchased will be available elsewhere through resource sharing.

2.1.2 Encouragement and support of more economic and cost-effective patterns of collection development; reduction or divestiture of responsibility to acquire and preserve in some areas.

2.1.3 Planned, rather than haphazard or crisis-driven, cost reduction.

2.1.4 Coordination of pruning, canceling, or storing of library materials.

2.1.5 Coordination of preservation activities to reduce unwanted redundancy or unintended duplication of effort among libraries.

2.1.6 Elimination of undesirable redundancy in collection development activity among cooperating libraries.

2.1.7 Expeditious and regular communication with cooperating libraries and among staff at both administrative and operational levels.

2.1.8 Better understanding and monitoring of collection development performance—both locally and cooperatively.

2.1.9 The establishment of library of record status or primary collecting responsibility for specifically defined subject areas, formats, etc., of regional or national importance for which few or no other libraries collect.

2.1.10 Identification of a group of libraries committed to collecting for specific subject, format, or linguistic areas on which other libraries could rely in a coordinated collection development and resource sharing environment.

2.1.11 Coordination of planning for staffing of acquisitions, cataloging, preservation, and interlibrary loan operations.

2.1.12 Distribution among smaller or closely neighboring libraries of certain core or basic areas in order to reduce unwanted, or unsupportable, redundancy.

Ultimately, cooperative collection development should provide a national network of dependencies and distributed responsibilities. Through the online database capacities of the various utilities, and through faster and more efficient
borrowing and lending systems, large libraries will be able to provide a national research resource collection, available to any library, of any size or type, with a terminal capable of accessing the data.

2.2 Problems of Coordinated Collection Development

2.2.1 Policy Failures

2.2.1.1 Lack of collection development programs.
2.2.1.2 Lack of collection development statements.
2.2.1.3 Deficiencies in collection development policy statements (e.g., statements not comprehensible to librarians or to users. Statements may also not be standardized, comparable, cross-referenced, or arranged to show inter-reliance between libraries. Language in policy statements may be insufficiently precise).
2.2.1.4 Lack of understanding and support of programs within faculty, user, legislative, and other important groups.
2.2.1.5 Lack of coordinated collection development policies and statements.
2.2.1.6 Failure to reflect institutional program needs and to allow for change of those programs.
2.2.1.7 Academic libraries may not make use of existing state (or other political) bodies to help coordinate their institution's programs, curriculum, or degree offerings, thus making local collection development efforts more undefined.
2.2.1.8 Failure to realize that cooperative or coordinated activities, protocols or programs are likely to place restrictions or limitations on unilateral capacity to change or alter existing arrangements. A benefit in one area may imply a restriction or a limitation in another.
2.2.1.9 Policymaking for coordinated collection development was centralized while decisions had to be made in a decentralized way by staff who were sometimes uninformed or unsupportive of arrangements developed by administrators, or the reverse may have prevailed: the library's administration may have been uninterested in or uncommitted to initiatives undertaken by librarians at the operational level.
2.2.1.10 Possible negative budget implications in cooperation: administrators may "reward" successful cooperators by cutting their budgets.
2.2.1.11 Lack of institutional means or incentives, or too much self-interest, or not enough tangible benefit for libraries to collect marginal subjects for the sake of collective holdings.
2.2.1.12 Lack of faith in the ability or willingness of other libraries to carry out their collecting responsibilities.
2.2.1.13 Lack of contingency planning for libraries' failure to honor commitments.

2.2.2 Procedural Failures

2.2.2.1 Procedures for distributed and coordinated collection development were too cumbersome and detailed to be cost-effective.
2.2.2.2 Systems set up for hard times were abandoned during better times.
2.2.2.3 In vendor-reliant consortia, agreements were insufficiently specific or detailed, monitoring was insufficient, and some vendors failed to fulfill agreed-upon responsibilities.

2.2.3 Technical Failures
2.2.3.1 Libraries have never possessed adequate catalog and in-process file information to coordinate decisions.
2.2.3.2 Libraries have lacked simple and rapid message communication systems to query about orders or loans.
2.2.3.3 Libraries have lacked adequately rapid interlibrary delivery systems. Neither the U.S. Postal Service nor the United Parcel Service is entirely satisfactory, and many libraries lack efficient shipping departments.

If these are valid observations of past behavior, it would seem that any effective future coordinated collection development effort must develop policies, structures, or systems to avoid as many of these reasons for failure as possible.

2.3 Models for Cooperative or Coordinated Collection Development

The following are alternative large or "global" models for regional or national cooperative or coordinated collection development activity. Some of these have been tried, others have not, they suggest a variety of approaches that may be considered with profit by anyone considering cooperative collection development.

2.3.1 The Farmington Plan Approach
Under this method, a group of large research libraries divided up the world of book production by Library of Congress class. Materials were acquired through a variety of area or country agents who sent to responsible libraries materials they selected as being appropriate for scholarly use in a very broad sense. This plan was rational, and had the advantage of trying to distribute coverage of the world of knowledge, but had difficulty in adequately taking account of individual institution programs, of program changes over time, of institutional self-interest, or individual library budgetary restrictions.

2.3.2 The NPAC System
The Library of Congress, under its National Program for Acquisition and Cataloging, attempted to collect everything in certain areas chosen by LC in consultation with research libraries nationwide. Everything it collected it was committed to cataloging. This type of plan depends on the capacity of certain foreign book agents to acquire materials desirable for the future of scholarship by U.S. researchers. This plan is more a backup to the holdings of individual libraries than an active construction of collected responsibilities.

2.3.3 "Library of Congress"
This is a variation of the Farmington Plan approach, in which libraries, including the Library of Congress, would divest themselves of those subjects or areas in which its own interests were weak and those of another research library were strong. In areas where there is no interest, LC would either not collect or would agree to collect for the national research interest.

2.3.4 The Center for Research Libraries Approach
For both centralized storage of lesser-used and voluminous materials and for acquisition of materials they want access to but which do
not warrant purchase by most of the individual libraries, members join together to support a central storage facility. Members pay a fee annually, vote on titles purchased, and enjoy generous loan privileges.

2.3.5 A Mosaic Overlay of Collection Development Policies

In this pattern each library prepares a thorough and comparable collection development policy statement in a way that would reflect its current internal programs and strengths according to an agreed-upon conspectus. When the collection development policies are overlayed, the need and capacity for primary responsibility assignments would ostensibly become clear, along with those areas in which assignment would manifestly conflict with institutional or program interest or commitment. Experience has shown, however, that there would probably be a limited number of primary assignments made in any consortium of similar libraries because overlapping "core" collecting will predictably duplicate many fields, subjects, and formats by several participants. Unless each library's statement used standardized language and schemes for describing subjects, the policies would not be comparable.

2.3.6 The Status Quo Approach

This approach presumes that the total collecting activity of ARL and other major research libraries achieves, on a national scale, reasonable depth in every area of interest to research in the United States, both in the present and in the future. It is the total of the collections of research libraries which approaches comprehensiveness. To achieve this end, research libraries would ideally share both in-process and catalog files in an online mode. This would make it possible for participating libraries to ascertain whether or not any other library had acquired or was acquiring a given book, or whether other libraries were maintaining existing collection strengths, so that they could act, on the basis of current information, to duplicate or not as they wish.

2.3.7 The Combined Self-Interest Plan

In this mode, a significant number of libraries would combine with one or more major libraries. An acceptable comparable and coordinated pattern of collection development policy statement development would be desirable to help in the process of understanding and rationalization of collection strengths and weaknesses of institutions based on their own programs and self-interest. The pattern thus revealed would be used to rationalize former collecting levels and suggest the assignment of primary collecting responsibilities, which would be accepted only on the basis of an institution's substantial and historic commitment to certain programs. This plan takes into account a more rationalized and shaped version of 2.3.6 above.

For example, Library A or B might agree to cover those areas in the nation's or region's interest, or in their own interest, or on the basis of user need, but would feel free to divest themselves of certain areas where commitments were made by another library if they feel that in the long run it is in their best self-interest to do so. This latter plan also requires shared bibliographic data for purposes of location and borrowing, for the purpose of individual library collection development decisions, and to verify whether libraries which have agreed to accept responsibility are in fact developing their collections as agreed.

All of these approaches will depend on the capacity of libraries to agree on
definitions for national or regional collections. On the one hand, it will mean that certain libraries may have to make greater resource commitments to the development of certain collections in the collective interest than they did previously and, on the other hand, certain other libraries may have to compromise or be more realistic in terms of their definition of comprehensive collections. No such collection has ever been built in the United States by any library, including the New York Public Library or the Library of Congress, except in fields which are, in fact, highly limited. Terminology of this nature is often used by bibliographers, but in fact its meaning is subject to highly variable interpretation.

3.0 SUGGESTIONS FOR PLANNING COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT SYSTEMS

3.1 Preconditions

3.1.1 Policy

3.1.1.1 Library staff, and key staff in parent institutions or governing bodies, must be committed to achieving workable and feasible coordinated collection development and management goals. Libraries must have staff explicitly responsible for the collection's development, maintenance, and management who have time and resources to do the work.

3.1.1.2 The emphasis in discussion and planning should be on a period ten or twenty years in the future or further, even though many of the accomplishments will be realized much sooner. Members must be willing to live with some deferred rewards.

3.1.1.3 Emphasis should be on a model which presumes a fiscal climate of retrenchment and reduction, and with regard for the future as well as the present.

3.1.1.4 Programs must be responsive and minimally threatening to local priorities and programs. Emphasis should be on those members' programs which are maximally supportive and useful and minimally threatening to member institutions.

3.1.1.5 Emphasis should be on nonthreatening models which protect and recognize substantial and long-term institutional program commitments and seek to build on these, rather than emphasizing an enforced abdication of such local programs or commitment to expensive or varied programs which are not supported by local institutional self-interest or tradition.

3.1.1.6 Emphasis should be on an "insurance" model in terms of divestiture of programs. No institution should be obliged to give up anything it wants to keep. The program should seek to identify and establish solid islands of institutional commitment which can be depended on by other libraries when they are forced by financial or other circumstances to divest themselves of some types of material or aspects of subjects of low- or lower-priority programs. Usually, areas of primary commitment should be clear and limited in scope. Most general libraries or library systems will do some collecting on most subjects or areas.

3.1.1.7 Emphasis should be on possible avoidance of purchase as well as timely access to materials held elsewhere.
3.1.8 Policies and protocols should define acceptable collection standards and standard collecting levels.

3.1.9 Matters of reciprocity and the contributions of each participant should be carefully considered and agreed upon by all participants, including bibliographic access, delivery, and interlibrary communication.

3.1.10 There must be a commitment to the adequate funding and staffing of resource delivery operations to support the physical movement of material between libraries required by a cooperative effort (cf. 3.1.3).

3.1.11 Protocols, policies, and agreements should recognize the desirability of duplication in core collections. Reductions, limitations, and divestitures should be limited to lesser-used materials.

3.1.12 It will be in the nation’s interest to have more than one library of record in all but the most exotic subjects among the various major consortia or networks in the nation—or even internationally—to ensure adequate preservation against aging and decay, and against natural disasters and wars.

3.1.2 Procedures for Planning Should Consider the Following Factors:

3.1.2.1 Coordinated collection development activity may be greatly enhanced by the availability of shared processing, information, management and program accounting decision-making, and shared commitment information. These capacities help to demonstrate the effectiveness of cooperative effort.

3.1.2.2 Coordinated and cooperative collection management and development activity will require the allegiance of the people who must make it work; thus programs must provide for the education and further development of human beings as well as machinery.

3.1.2.3 It is difficult to develop cooperative mechanisms if discussion is continually restricted by local traditions or procedures; thus emphasis should be on arriving at and achieving common goals rather than dwelling on and describing differences. A useful motto is “think regionally—or nationally—but act locally.”

3.1.2.4 Representatives of each institution must meet periodically to review the structure and operation of policies and arrangements and to revise them to achieve greater effectiveness.

3.1.2.5 A good collection is a well-defined collection. Thus, coordinated collection and management will require co-ordinatable or mutually comprehensible collection development policy information which can be readily understood by key users, institutional administrators, and others, as well as by librarians or computer programmers.

3.1.2.6 Comparable indicators of future collecting intensity or current collecting strength are necessary in any coordinated collecting policy. Libraries may agree to use the codes specified in the ALA Guidelines for the Formation of Collection Development Policies, or they may use the follow-
ing; these are taken from the RLG Conspectus,1 and have been adapted from the ALA Guidelines as the result of practice and experience. They are being used by the Association of Research Libraries in its conspectus program. This code uses numbers instead of letters, progresses clearly from smaller to larger collections, and is recommended for use.

0. Out of Scope: The library does not collect in this area.
1. Minimal Level: A subject area in which few selections are made beyond very basic or introductory works.
2. Basic Information Level: A collection of up-to-date general materials that serve to introduce and define a subject and to indicate the varieties of information available elsewhere. It may include dictionaries, encyclopedias, selected editions of important works, historical surveys, bibliographies, handbooks, a few major periodicals, in the minimum number that will serve the purpose. A basic information collection is not sufficiently intensive to support any courses or independent study in the subject area involved.
3. Instructional Support Level: A collection which is adequate to support undergraduate and MOST graduate instruction, or sustained independent study; that is, adequate to maintain knowledge of a subject required for limited or generalized purposes of less than research intensity. It includes a wide range of basic monographs, complete collections of the works of more important writers, selections from the works of secondary writers, a selection of representative journals, and the reference tools and fundamental bibliographic apparatus pertaining to the subject.*
4. Research Level: A collection that includes the major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research, including materials containing research reporting, new findings, scientific experimental results, and other information useful to researchers. It is intended to include all important reference works and a wide selection of specialized monographs, as well as a very extensive collection of journals and major indexing and abstracting services in the field. Older material is retained for historical research.
5. Exhaustive Level: A collection in which a library endeavors, so far as is reasonably possible, to include all relevant works of recorded knowledge, manuscripts, in all applicable languages, and ephemera, including pamphlets, broadsides, reports, etc., for a necessarily defined and limited field. This level of collecting intensity is one that maintains a "special collection"; the aim, if not the achievement, is exhaustiveness. Older material is retained for historical research.

*Some libraries may wish to divide this level into subdivisions, e.g., (3a) initial study level and (3b) advanced study level, corresponding to lower division or undergraduate support and upper division or advanced undergraduate support.
3.1.2.7 Comparable codes for languages of material collected will also be needed. Here are examples, also taken from the RLG Conspectus, also modified slightly from the ALA Guidelines based on experience in use:

E—English-language material predominates; little or no foreign-language material in the collection.
F—Selected foreign-language material included, in addition to the English-language material.
W—Wide selection of foreign-language material in all applicable languages.
Y—Material is primarily in one foreign language.

3.1.3 Technology

3.1.3.1 Cooperative collection development and management presumes easy bibliographic access and delivery in a time frame rapid enough not to have detrimental effect on the work of institutional users.

3.1.3.2 Coordinated collection development activity will benefit from automated order and in-process file information (if available), as well as catalog data, since many libraries have substantial backlogs of uncataloged material. Often much of this material is low-use, noncore material intended for research use, and this is often the material least desirable to duplicate. It is desirable to have this information online because it will be uneconomic to search a variety of bibliographic tools in various formats in order to make rapid buy/not buy decisions on medium- and low-cost books.

3.1.3.3 Automated systems should be made available in ways that will make collection management and development systems feasible and economical.

3.2 Alternatives to Coordinated Collection Development

The following suggestions may be used instead of, or to complement, coordinated collection development:

3.2.1 Delivery of user to other libraries.

3.2.2 Development of a joint library guide for the use of users who may wish to use other libraries in a consortium.

3.2.3 Transfer of materials to another library.

3.3 Suggested Steps in Setting Up Cooperative Agreements for Collections

3.3.1 Find out whether your library has existing consortium or cooperative agreements with other libraries and determine if modification or addition to these agreements may serve your purposes.

3.3.2 Some cooperative collection agreements may be mandated by the library or institutional administration. In such cases, points 3.3.3 through 3.3.5 are the requirements most likely to need attention.

3.3.3 For a bilateral agreement, begin by selecting a library or a person within another library with whom you can work. For an agreement comprising more than two libraries, begin by identifying the group—the consortium or network—through which and with whose members you will work. Useful agreement can often be
reached between individual librarians at two or more libraries: grand schemes are not often required.

3.3.4 Define the subjects, areas, or issues of mutual concern or interest, based on your library’s mission, goals, and needs, and on your collection’s strengths and areas of deliberately small holdings. Draw upon your knowledge of the collection, collection evaluation or analysis results, shelflist measures, and use or user studies, when possible, to inform your judgments.

3.3.4.1 Preliminary discussions may reveal the need for standardized collection descriptions or assessments, such as a joint policy or conspectus, or you may simply decide to form an agreement distributing responsibility for future acquisitions.

3.3.5 Come to a joint decision about whether your cooperative agreement is to be restricted to acquisition, or whether it will also extend to retention, withdrawal, preservation, or processing of materials.

3.3.6 Choose methods of work that will allow all partners to the agreement to know what to expect and also to monitor that the agreement is being carried out in practice. For example, you may exchange or circulate copies of marked selection tools (such as national bibliographies) if you do not employ an online cooperative acquisitions system.

3.3.7 Write down the agreement, even if it is in a form as simple as a memorandum of understanding.

3.3.8 Satisfactory bibliographic and physical access to library materials has usually been found a necessary cornerstone to effective cooperative collection development. While these programs may not strictly be within the province of collection development, librarians entering into cooperative agreements will need to assure or obtain satisfactory levels of service in these areas.

3.3.9 Be sure that others who may be affected by the agreement have early and ample time to consider and respond to it. These may include users, technical processing librarians, interlibrary loan librarians, or others.

3.3.10 Submit the agreement for review and approval by the appropriate library manager and other administrators within your institution.

3.3.11 After the agreement has been in effect for a few years (and at least every three to five years), it should be reviewed by the appropriate parties. If the agreement has been modified in practice, if subjects and levels of purchase have changed, redraft the agreement to reflect those modifications and changes.

3.3.12 Librarians working on agreements or consortia should carefully consider the list of problems and benefits included in 2.0 above.
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REFERENCES
7. RLG, RLG Collection Development; ALA, Guidelines.
Guide to Collection Evaluation through Use and User Studies

Dorothy E. Christiansen, C. Roger Davis, and Jutta Reed-Scott

This document was prepared by the Subcommittee on Use and User Studies, Collection Management and Development Committee of RTSD, and aims to provide librarians and others with a summary of the types of methods available to determine the extent to which books, journals, and other library materials are used. It is not intended to equip librarians to do use or user studies for collection evaluation but rather to allow them to identify the kind of study best suited to their needs.

1.0. INTRODUCTION

In 1979, the Collection Management and Development Committee of the Resources Section, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association, published the Guidelines for Collection Development. The committee then addressed the need for expanding the evaluation section, and decided to focus on use and user studies.

At the 1980 ALA Annual Conference, a subcommittee was charged to develop use and user studies guidelines. To that end, this draft statement has been prepared by Dorothy E. Christiansen, C. Roger Davis, and Jutta Reed-Scott, with contributions by Bonita Bryant, Carolyn Bucknall, Martin Faigel, Marcia Pankake, Barbara Rice, John A. Ryland, and John Whaley. It was submitted to the RTSD RS Collection Management and Development Committee at its meetings in Washington, D.C., in 1981, in San Francisco in June 1981, in Denver in January 1982, and in Philadelphia in 1982. Comments were also solicited at the Pilot RTSD Collection Management and Development Institute in July 1981 and at an open hearing at the Philadelphia Conference. Suggested revisions and comments were incorporated into the fourth draft which was submitted for final review at the 1982 ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Antonio. With some minor revisions, reflected in this document, the fourth draft was approved by the Collection Management and Development Committee and the Executive Committee of the Resources Section.

This document will be incorporated into the proposed revision and expansion of the American Library Association, Collection Management and Development Committee's Guidelines for Collection Development.

On January 11, 1983, at the San Antonio Midwinter Meeting, the Resources Section Executive Committee approved these guidelines prepared by the three members of the Subcommittee on Use and User Studies: Dorothy E. Christiansen, Assistant Director for Reference Services Division, University Libraries, State University of New York at Albany, C. Roger Davis, Bibliographer, Smith College Library, and Jutta Reed-Scott, Collection Development Specialist, Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries.
1.1. **Purpose**

This document aims to provide librarians and others with a summary of the types of methods available to determine the extent to which books, journals, and other library materials are used. It is not intended to equip librarians to do use or user studies for collection evaluation but rather to allow them to identify the kind of study best suited to their needs.

1.2. **Objectives**

The immediate aims of this document are to identify methodologies for use and user studies as tools for collection evaluation and to list the advantages and disadvantages of these different methodologies.

1.3. **Need**

Every library collection should be established for one or more definite purposes. The collection may be developed for research, instruction, recreation, and other information needs of its user community. Use and user studies can help determine objectively and systematically specific aspects of how the collection is being used and by whom. The library administrator should not assume that the collection satisfies user needs. Rather, subjectivity of judgment should be reduced as much as possible by measuring the interaction between users, the collections, and the systems which the library has designed to facilitate the use of its materials. Analysis of these interactions will provide measures of the distribution and intensity of use, the diversity of purpose for which users seek materials, and the varying degrees of availability of materials. Evaluation of collections through use and user studies leads to a more objective understanding of the scope and depth of collections, including strengths and weaknesses. It may also provide a guide and basis for collection planning, budgeting, and decision making.

1.4. **Scope**

This document lists various methods of evaluating the library collection in terms of how it is used and by whom. For each method the advantages and disadvantages are indicated. Any of these approaches can be used by academic, research, special, or public libraries. This document is not intended to describe each method in detail, as this has already been done in the literature; it only sets forth a checklist to serve as a guide in considering the most appropriate method(s) of use and user studies. The appended list of "Selected References" provides citations to previous studies using various methodologies and to tools, guides, and texts for librarians involved in developing and implementing use and user studies.

1.5. **Audience**

This document is intended for library staff and administrators responsible for collection development and management.

1.6. **Methodology**

This document has been developed from review and study of the literature, from contribution and comment by members of and consultants to the ALA/RTSD/RS Collection Management and Development Committee, and from papers presented at the 1979 and 1980 ALA Annual Conferences. (See "Selected References.") In addition, suggested revi-
sessions received at and following the hearings in Philadelphia in 1982 have been incorporated into this revision.

1.7. Definitions

*Use* refers to whether and/or how often a book, periodical, or segment of the collection is used. A use study focuses on the material that is used. A use study may or may not differentiate between various forms of use in terms of importance.

*User* refers to the person using the book, periodical, or segment of the collection. Thus in a user study the individual person is the unit of analysis.

*Collection-centered* techniques refer to the examination of the collection. A collection-centered evaluation focuses on the size, scope, depth, and significance of the collection. Techniques include checking lists, catalogs, bibliographies; looking over materials on the shelf; and compiling statistics.

2.0 Study Design Procedures

2.1. Statement of Principles

Evaluation is an essential step in the collection development and management process. There are two basic approaches in collection evaluation: collection-centered and use-centered. Use and user studies are important tools for systematically gathering information about user expectations, a user's approach to the collections, and what materials library users actually select from those available. It also provides aggregate information about user behavior, such as which call numbers ranges are most heavily used. Generally, the more information sought, the more complex and costly the effort involved. Essential in the planning of every use and user study are the following steps:

A. Define the purposes of the study and the hypotheses to be tested. Every study contemplated should be subjected to the rigorous test of whether the information is really needed and exactly how it will be used.

B. Survey the previous studies and literature in general and learn about all aspects of use and user studies.

C. Determine what data are to be gathered and the methodology to be followed. Subject the choice of data to the same rigorous standards used in defining purposes, since each datum adds to the expense and complexity of the study.

D. Select the sample of the collection or population to be studied.

E. Determine the method of analysis of data or observations. If data analysis is to be done by computer, it is important that the data format be compatible with the computer program selected.

F. Determine the ways of presentation and utilization of results, including dissemination.

G. Document the development and implementation of the study to assist in replicating it and in providing supporting data.

2.2. Sampling Methodology

By necessity, in many use and user studies, evaluation will be based on a sample, either of units to be examined (shelflist cards, circulation records, physical volumes, etc.) or of patrons. Sampling is usually done for a selected period of time. The type of sample chosen will depend on the
objectives of the study. The sample and sampling technique must be carefully defined and constructed in order to obtain valid information. This information then can be extrapolated to the whole universe from which the sample was drawn. These guidelines are not intended to instruct librarians in sampling techniques but to acquaint them with basic approaches.

Some of the more common sampling methods are:
A. Random Sample. The units targeted for study are selected at random from the entire population.
B. Systematic Sample. In this type, a random interval is established and items selected at that interval.
C. Stratified Sample. The population is divided into subgroups and then the unit of study is selected at random from each subgroup.

Information on using sampling is available in the "Selected References."

3.0. TYPES OF USE AND USER STUDIES

3.1.0. CIRCULATION STUDIES

This type of study is an analysis of circulation data. These data can be examined for a part of or the total collection, by user group, by purchase date of book, or by subject class. Data of these kinds can be used to:
A. Identify little-used portions of the collections that can be retired to less accessible and less expensive storage areas.
B. Identify a “core” collection of items likely to satisfy some specified percentage (say 95 percent) of all circulation demands within the near future. These titles which are heavily used may therefore require duplication, or treatment in some other way, to improve their availability.
C. Identify use patterns of selected subject areas or types of books by comparing their representation in the collection (by examining the shelflist) to their circulation as a percentage of all circulations. The resulting information is helpful in adjusting collection development practices or fund allocations.
D. Identify user populations.

3.1.1. ADVANTAGES

A. Reflects “charged” circulation use and user patterns.
B. Data are easily arranged into categories for analysis.
C. Allows great flexibility as to duration of study and sample size.
D. Units of information are easily counted.
E. Information is objective.

3.1.2. DISADVANTAGES

A. Excludes in-house consultation and underrepresents actual use.
B. Reflects only successes and does not record user failures.
C. May be biased through inaccessibility of heavily used material.
D. Fails to identify low use due to obsolescence or low quality of collections.

3.2.0. SURVEY OF USER OPINIONS

The goal of a user survey is to determine how well the library’s collections meet the user’s information needs by gathering written, and/or oral, responses to specific questions. Information from user surveys can be used for:
A. Evaluating quantitatively and qualitatively the effectiveness of the collections and services in meeting users’ needs.
B. Providing information to help solve specific problems, modify particular programs, or assess the need for new services.
C. Defining the makeup of the actual community of library users.
D. Identifying user groups that need to be better served.
E. Providing feedback on successes as well as on deficiencies.
F. Improving public relations and assisting in the education of the user community.
G. Identifying changing trends and interests.

3.2.1. Advantages
A. It is not limited to existing data, such as circulation statistics.
B. Permits direct feedback from users.
C. Can be as simple or complex as desired.

3.2.2. Disadvantages
A. Designing a sophisticated survey is difficult, i.e., it is difficult to frame unambiguous questions that will yield quantifiable results.
B. Analyzing and interpreting data from an opinion survey to get usable information is difficult and imprecise.
C. Most users are likely to be passive about collections and so must be approached individually and polled one at a time, increasing the costs of conducting the survey.
D. Some users may not cooperate in the survey and thus results may be skewed.
E. Many users are not aware of what their library should reasonably be expected to do for them and therefore have difficulty in judging what is adequate.
F. User surveys may record perceptions, intentions, and recollections which do not always reflect actual experiences.
G. User interests may be focused more narrowly than collection development policies. This may introduce a negative bias in the survey results.
H. Surveys of user opinions by definition will miss valuable statements from and about the nonuser.

3.3.0. Document Delivery Tests
This type of study assesses the capability of a library to provide users with the items they need at the time they need them. The most frequent approach is to compile a list of citations that are presumed to reflect the information needs of the users of the library. The Document Delivery Test determines how many are owned by the library and how long it takes to locate a specific item. Essentially this technique simulates users walking into the library and each user looking for a particular item.

3.3.1. Advantages
A. Provides objective measurements of ability of collection to satisfy user needs.
B. Data can be compared between libraries if identical citation lists are used.

3.3.2. Disadvantages
A. It is difficult to compile a list of representative citations.
B. Since library staff performs the searches, the test understates the problems encountered by users, such as user error in locating materials.
C. To be meaningful, results require repeated tests or comparisons with studies conducted in other libraries.

3.4.0. SHELF AVAILABILITY STUDIES

This approach is used to determine whether or not an item presumed to be in the collection is actually available to the user. While other methodologies depend on simulation, this technique monitors user inquiries directly and measures how often the collection is deficient when a user cannot find an item and how often the user's error causes an item to be inaccessible. During a specified period, users are asked to name the titles that they failed to find in the library. This can be done by the use of interviews and questionnaires or "failure slips" handed to users as they enter the library. It can be done by asking all users of the library, or it can focus on a random sample of these users. The reasons why a user might fail to find a desired item may include: item not owned by the library; item not on shelf due to circulation; item missing or mis-shelved; lack of clear directions for location of materials; lack of correct or complete citation; and user's error in copying a call number or locating the item on the shelf. The information gathered will identify causes of user failures that should lead to corrective action and changes.

3.4.1. ADVANTAGES
A. Reports the failures of real users in finding materials.
B. As a by-product identifies non-collection development reasons for user failures and provides data on which changes in library policies and procedures may be based.
C. Can be readily repeated to measure changes in library performance.

3.4.2. DISADVANTAGES
A. Depends on the cooperation of users.
B. Designing and carrying out the study is time-consuming and difficult.
C. Does not identify the needs of nonusers.

3.5.0. IN-HOUSE USE STUDIES

Several techniques are available for recording the use of materials consulted in the library and re-shelved by library staff. This type of study can be approached from two directions: materials used and users of materials. The study can focus on the entire collection or a part of the collection and/or on all users or a sample of users. The definition of use must be clearly specified, i.e., at table, at shelf, etc. While some in-house use may appear casual and of minimal importance, such as at-the-shelf use, there is a potential danger in assigning values to different types of uses. The extent to which patterns of in-library use parallel patterns of at-home use remains controversial.

3.5.1. ADVANTAGES
A. User approach to in-house use gives a more complete picture of in-library use than study which focuses on materials. Can be used to correlate type of user with type of materials used.
B. Can be used in conjunction with circulation study focused on same
part of the collection to give more accurate information on use of the collection.

3.5.2. Disadvantages

A. Difficult to use in “uncontrolled” or open stack area because of need to rely on users’ cooperation. Probably have to supplement by direct observation to ascertain appropriate correction factor for non-cooperating users.
B. Timing of the study during the year, such as during a peak period or slack period, may bias results.
C. Materials “in circulation” not available for in-house use.
D. Reflects only successes; does not indicate user failure.

3.6.0. Citation Studies

The method of citation analysis consists of counting the number of times documents are cited in footnote references, bibliographies, or indexing and abstracting tools and comparing those figures. It is assumed that items that are relatively heavily cited are likely to be used more than those that are cited little or not at all. Citation studies may be used in a variety of situations. In most recent studies, the focus has been to develop core lists of primary journals and to identify candidates for cancellation or storage. Empirical data have repeatedly shown that, in many subjects, a relatively small number of “core” primary journals contain a substantial proportion of the journal literature bearing on that subject. The rest of the literature is scattered throughout a large number of secondary journals. Ranked lists of journals may be used in the development and management of journal collections. However, the number of articles published in each journal has an impact on frequency of citing and hence on the ranking.

3.6.1. Advantages

A. Data easily arranged into categories for analysis.
B. Method is sufficiently simple that it can be employed repeatedly.
C. Identifies changing trends in the published literature.
D. Lists can be compiled efficiently and rapidly utilizing online databases.

3.6.2. Disadvantages

A. It is difficult to select the source items that will reflect the subject studied or the local user needs.
B. Subareas of one discipline may have different citation patterns from the general subject.
C. Research patterns of some disciplines do not lend themselves to citation studies.
D. The inherent time lag in citations will not reflect changes of emphasis in disciplines and/or the emergence of new core journals.
E. Citation analysis in isolation is a questionable measurement for collection development decisions.

4.0. Conclusion

Use and user studies can be conducted for a variety of purposes in collection management. But before effective studies can be designed, there must be a clear understanding of the benefits and limitations of specific methodologies and of the anticipated results. It is also clear that use and user studies must be used in
combination with each other and with collection-centered techniques as part of an ongoing collection evaluation program.
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Report of the President

Norman J. Shaffer

The twenty-seventh year of the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD), as a unit of the American Library Association (ALA), was memorable in several ways—the core of the ALA Teleconference, presented in Los Angeles, was a RTSD/CCS program, regional institute programming reached a new high, and the membership approved the first dues increase for the division.

RTSD is the largest type-of-activity division and the second largest in membership (6,232, as compared to 5,874 last year) and budget of the eleven ALA divisions. RTSD is charged with addressing and monitoring activities in ALA in the areas of acquisition, identification, cataloging, classification, the preservation of library materials, and the development and coordination of the country’s library resources. To carry out this charge, RTSD uses the talents found in its eighteen division-level committees, twenty-one discussion groups, the Council of Regional Groups, and five sections. Complete reports on the activities of the sections—Cataloging and Classification (CCS), Preservation of Library Materials (PLMS), Reproduction of Library Materials (RLMS), Resources (RS), and Serials (SS)—follow this report.

As has been the custom, the divisional and sectional awards were given at the annual membership meeting in June. The Esther J. Piercy Award, given to a person with less than ten years experience who has made a substantial contribution in the area of technical services, was presented to Sue R. Dodd, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Frances Hinton, Free Library of Philadelphia, received the CCS Margaret Mann Citation for her outstanding accomplishments in the field of cataloging and classification. The RS/Blackwell North America Scholarship Award, given for the best publication of the past year in the field of acquisitions, collection development, and related areas of resource development, was presented to Phyllis J. Van Orden, Florida State University in Tallahassee, for her book Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools: Concepts, Practices and Information Sources (Libraries Unlimited, 1982).

A program as ambitious as the ALA/RTSD/CCS Teleconference, held on Tuesday, June 28 in Los Angeles, was well served by the division’s eighteen-month planning cycle. Work began at the Denver Midwinter Meeting with Judy Cannan, then incoming chair of CCS, outlining and presenting the program to the RTSD Los Angeles Program Committee. Frankly, at that stage of the game, there was great doubt that any program so complicated and costly could be brought to fruition. Skeptics underestimated the drive of Judy Cannan and the energy of the RTSD headquarters staff. As the program began to take shape, the ALA executive director became involved and made a policy decision that all teleconferencing would be an ALA rather than solely a divisional activ-
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RTSD sections and committees are urged to combine their efforts whenever possible to produce quality programming. This will work to improve programming and allow the membership to more fully participate in all divisional programs. The following policy statements define the maximum programming allowed and should not be construed as a desired number of programs:

1. Each divisional committee or section may sponsor one program in their own right. In addition, each divisional committee or section may cosponsor, in name or in fact, one program with another ALA unit outside of RTSD.

2. In no case will a divisional committee or section sponsor or cosponsor more than two programs.

3. Preconferences stand outside of this procedure and will be reviewed and approved by the RTSD Conference Program Committee.

4. Divisionwide sponsorship is a separate matter to be reviewed and approved by the RTSD Conference Program Committee.

Television is one means of bringing programs to persons unable to attend the Annual Conferences, but RTSD also had a record year in presenting programs in all regions of the country in the form of institutes on topics of great current interest. Twelve institutes—one sponsored by New York METRO with RTSD cosponsorship—were presented to more than 1,400 participants during the year. Library of Congress subject headings institutes were presented in Chicago, Los Angeles, San Antonio, and Washington, D.C.; authorities institutes were held in San Francisco, New Orleans, New York, and St. Louis; and collection management and development institutes were held in Washington, D.C., and Boston. The first Library Preservation Institute took place at the Library of Congress in April. Aimed at top-level administrators, the program concentrated on the appropriate administrative location, funding, and operation of
preservation activities in libraries. Two additional preservation institutes are planned for 1984 and 1985—one on implementing programs and the second on fundamental techniques. All of the institutes were well attended and, based upon participant evaluation, well received. Five additional institutes are scheduled for the latter part of 1983. Given the excellent reception of the institutes, present planning calls for an additional thirteen such programs during 1984–85. Included will be a new series on nonbook materials, which will address the acquisition and cataloging of nonbook materials in school, public, academic, and special libraries. Formats covered will include cartographic, sound and music, film, graphic, videorecording, microcomputer software, and three-dimensional materials.

The success of the institutes is due in large part to the excellent planning, advance work, and coordination by the RTSD headquarters staff in the persons of Bill Bunnell, Bill Drewett, and Ann Menendez. The division is grateful for their dedication and hard work. To assist the headquarters staff in keeping up with the flow of paperwork required for the institutes and other divisional activities, the RTSD Board in Los Angeles authorized the purchase of improved word processing equipment which is compatible with the system now being used at ALA headquarters.

The division’s journal, Library Resources & Technical Services (LRTS), continued to publish high-quality articles during the year. In Los Angeles, the RTSD Board authorized the executive director to take the necessary steps to discontinue the present advertising arrangements for LRTS and to establish a staff position of advertising promotion and sales for LRTS, RQ, and Top of the News—costs to be shared with the divisions as appropriate. It is anticipated that this new arrangement will increase advertising revenues. The RTSD Newsletter, which began in January 1976 as an information exchange among members, has evolved into a substantial publication containing short articles in addition to news of past and forthcoming RTSD events. The editors’ terms-of-office for these two publications expired at the conclusion of the Philadelphia Conference in 1982. Fortunately, both editors—Elizabeth Tate for LRTS and Arnold Hirshon for the Newsletter—have agreed to serve an additional three-year term. I greatly appreciate their continuing service.

During the past year, sectional efforts within the division resulted in the publication of Guidelines for Union Lists of Serials and a new edition of the Preservation Education Directory. In addition, work was completed in spring of 1983 on two new guidelines, “A Guide to Coordinated and Cooperative Collection Development” and “Guide to Collection Evaluation through Use and User Studies,” which appear elsewhere in this issue of LRTS. The RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee completed the second edition of Guidelines for Handling Library Orders for In-Print Monographic Publications. The PLMS Library Binders Relations Committee has been hard at work on a pamphlet series on binding which will begin to appear in the near future. In a related publishing matter, the division owes a special thanks to Janet Swan Hill and Nancy R. John for their many hours of work and intellectual contribution to the forthcoming revision of the ALA Glossary. Without their efforts, some of our technical terminology and jargon would have been defined in a less than satisfactory manner or omitted altogether.

A review of the division’s financial condition in Philadelphia forced the RTSD Board to consider a dues increase to maintain current program levels or, alternatively, curtailing services. To get some feeling from the membership on how such a proposal would be received, a membership survey, prepared by the Planning and Research Committee, was amended slightly to incorporate the dues question and published in the September-December 1982 issue of the
Responses to this questionnaire were evaluated in San Antonio and the board voted to put the dues-increase question on the spring ballot. The increase was approved, raising annual divisional dues from $15 to $25. This was the first dues increase for RTSD, which was the fifth division to take such action.

I thank the RTSD membership for giving me the opportunity to serve as your president for the past year. I'm grateful for the help given me by Charlotta Hensley, past-president, the section and divisional chairs, and committee members. No one could carry out the responsibilities of this position without an excellent headquarters staff. Let me assure you that RTSD has that.

Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS)

Judith P. Cannon, Chair

Throughout the year CCS and its members have worked hard to consolidate the activities of the section, while at the same time placing heavy emphasis on programs. CCS, together with LITA, sponsored a successful and well-attended one-day preconference in Los Angeles on microcomputers. It was designed to meet the special needs of technical service librarians and focused on the use of microcomputers and their software packages in technical services areas of libraries, along with the skills needed to evaluate and select microcomputers and software packages. A short program called "Video Teleconferencing: Planning, Marketing and Production" was held by CCS on the first night of the Annual Conference. The audience, while small, was keenly interested in the topic and asked thought-provoking questions. A three-and-a-half-hour program on bibliographic control now and in the future entitled "Blood, Toil, Tears, and Sweat: Rules and Formats" was sponsored by CCS and broadcast live to approximately 120 receiving sites and viewed by approximately 2,600 persons. Hosting a video teleconference was a major breakthrough and a pioneering effort for CCS. The program was divided into three topics, AACR2 and the ISBDs, MARC formats, and search strategies, with two speakers discussing each topic. By presenting this subject, CCS was endeavoring to encourage the entire library community to assume responsibility for the future direction of bibliographic control. The speakers focused on the adequacy of the tools that pertained to their chosen topic and their future in the world of automation. This naturally led into the area of national and international cooperation, along with its essential ingredient, standardization.

Another highlight for the section was the honoring of one of its long-standing active members, Frances Hinton. The Margaret Mann Citation was presented to her for her important and sustained contributions to the advancement of both cataloging and classification and for serving as a role model of public librarianship in technical services. In addition to awarding the citation, the Margaret Mann Citation Committee, chaired by Elizabeth Herman, also prepared two documents on procedural guidelines for the committee and on participation by the library community in the selection of a recipient. These documents were approved by the CCS Executive Committee and will be incorporated into the section's manual.

The Nominating Committee followed a similar pattern under the chair of Lois Hacker, for not only did it produce an excellent slate of candidates, but also
a couple of documents. These documents, covering the selection of candidates and a timetable of activities, will also be incorporated into the CCS manual. Once again Nancy John undertook the major assignment of chairing the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA). As usual this committee assumed responsibility for a wide variety of activities, such as the reviewing of the ALA Glossary. Janet Swan Hill devoted hours of concentrated effort to this assignment and so was able to prepare an extensive document outlining clearly and concisely the areas needing attention. During Midwinter, a task force on unique serial identifiers was established to respond to the Library of Congress (LC) proposal to bring the LC rule interpretation (LCRI) closer to the guidelines for qualifying of key titles. The LC proposal was approved after consideration of evidence presented by the task force. The primary means by which the LCRI will come closer to the ISDS guidelines is by deleting the criterion of subject words from the provision that calls for use of body. Thus place will be used instead, even if the title contains subject words. Another task force was established during the Midwinter Meeting to work on preparing guidelines for the cataloging of microcomputer software. In Los Angeles this task force briefed CC:DA on its work to date, while CC:DA in turn issued decisions for the task force to follow in continuing its work to develop cataloging guidelines. Some of these follow. The GMD "machine-readable file" may be used; whenever there is both internal and external data, the internal data may be first preference for a chief source; no added entries for the computer are to be given; and the guidelines are to contain a glossary. In addition CC:DA undertook to review the IFLA document "Guidelines for Authority and Reference Entries."

Several more major committee reports were received this year from the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) under the chair of Robert Holley. "Library of Congress Decimal Classification Division Priorities: A Final Report" provides guidance to the division as to what categories of materials should be assigned Dewey numbers. The report stresses among other things that greater emphasis should be given to classifying Spanish materials and serials. The other document, "Report of the SAC ad hoc Subcommittee on Concepts Denoted by the Term Primitive," made some specific recommendations plus a general one that the use of the term primitive in subject analysis be substantially reduced, but not completely eliminated at this time. Both these reports were endorsed in principle by RTSD. SAC was pleased to receive from Lucia Rather, director for Cataloging at LC, a detailed response to the recommendations presented in the "Report of the RTSD CCS SAC ad hoc Subcommittee on Library of Congress Subject Authority Control: Scope, Format, and Distribution," which was forwarded to LC this past year after the RTSD Board had endorsed it in principle.

The task of preparing guidelines for establishing uniform titles for constitutions, which is nearing completion, continues to be one of the major assignments of the Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials, chaired by Michael Fitzgerald. This committee also approved LC's proposed romanization table for classical Mongolian in the vertical script. During the Annual Conference, the committee held a lively and lengthy discussion on MARC language and geographic area codes. At its next meeting, the committee will continue to pursue these topics.

The Cataloging of Children's Material Committee concentrated on trying to get its "Guidelines for Standardized Cataloging of Children's Materials" published. In addition, the committee explored the possibility of requesting that LC make available on a separate file its list of subject headings for children's literature. During the Annual Conference, this committee operated for the first time in many years with full membership, for Gregory New has been officially named the LC liaison from the Decimal Classification Division.

Throughout the year the Policy and Research Committee under the leader-
ship of Doralyn Hickey attended to a wide variety of matters. Members of the committee are preparing surveys of particular topics by reviewing the literature issued in the last five years and preparing annotated bibliographies assessing the literature. They are also developing lists of new topics on which research is needed. This committee voiced its concern over the future of the IFLA Office for Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC), and the failure of RTSD publications to release the report of the ALA RTSD Representative to the Joint Steering Committee on the Revision of AACR2.

Because of the concerns expressed by the Policy and Research Committee, the CCS Executive Committee invited Peter Lewis, director general of the Bibliographic Service Division of the British Library, to brief the section on the future direction of the UBC. While the office is without a director for six months, Mr. Lewis has assumed responsibility for overseeing the completion of projects in hand. The CCS Executive Committee also heard reports from Lucia Rather on cataloging events and activities at the 1982 IFLA meeting in Montreal, and from Frances Hinton, who serves as the ALA RTSD JSC representative. Liz Bishoff, the ALA representative to the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (DCEPC), kept CCS well informed as to the activities of this committee. Areas of major concern were whether the practice of adding a time designation to a geographic designation on an optional basis should be resumed, whether countries should be able to request expansion of their historic time periods, and whether SAC can assist in establishing priorities for future phoenixes and revisions. Once again SAC sponsored a well-attended Dewey hearing held in Los Angeles entitled "The Future of Dewey Decimal Classification."

It was an active year for members of the CCS Executive Committee. A task force on CC:DA representation, comprising mainly CCS Executive Committee members, presented its report to the CCS Executive Committee at the Midwinter Meeting. Its many proposals were adopted unamended. During the Annual Conference, agreement was reached on how to implement these proposals, and the draft application to nominate representatives to CC:DA prepared by Marilyn McClaskey was accepted with minor modifications.

Because of complaints about the length of the CCS Executive Committee minutes and the numerous documents appended to them, CCS passed a motion in favor of abbreviated minutes with no appendixes and limited distribution. The secretary, Marilyn McClaskey, then drafted for CCS approval a detailed yet concise document outlining the responsibilities of the secretary including the agreed-upon format for the minutes. With some slight modifications, this excellent description of the CCS secretary's duties will be incorporated into the section's manual. Some members of the CCS Executive Committee commenced work on a document defining the role of representatives, consultants, liaisons, etc. When completed, this report will be incorporated in the CCS manual. Groups concerned with the cataloging of special materials were encouraged to establish closer ties with CCS, and the section was pleased by the opportunity to work more closely with the Map and Geography Round Table (MAGERT).

Planning for the CCS program during the 1984 Conference is under way. The Conference Program Committee has not yet decided on a title for the program, but the topic will be subject access in an online catalog.

Discussion groups continue to play an important role in the activities of the section. The Catalog Maintenance Discussion Group, chaired by Dennis Hamilton, was responsible for a well-attended discussion, "Catalog Management in the Online Environment." With the support of Policy and Research and the approval of the Executive Committee, this group will henceforth be known as the Catalog Management Discussion Group.

All representatives were encouraged this year to report to the CCS Executive
Committee on the activities of the committees on which they serve. The representative to the RTSD International Relations Committee, Lois Chan, provided CCS with considerable assistance as the section struggled, without adequate guidelines, to determine when to endorse nominations for funds for international travel. Through the course of the year, CCS Executive Committee endorsed three such nominations, all of which were approved by the RTSD Board.

For those devoted to subject analysis and classification, particularly the Dewey decimal system, 1983–84 promises to be your year as the chair of CCS is assumed by the section’s grass-roots spokesperson, Liz Bishoff, who is keenly interested in these topics. She will be ably assisted by her vice-chair, Nancy John.

Preservation of Library Materials Section

Gay Walker, Chair

The third full year of the Preservation of Library Materials Section (PLMS) was marked by lively activities in every area and a steady membership level of around 1,730.

Many preservation activities took place at the Los Angeles Conference and San Antonio Midwinter, along with the very well attended committee meetings:

- PLMS cosponsored a preconference on library binding with the Serials Section that took place June 23 and 24. Approximately eighty participants joined the twenty speakers and planners during the two-day preconference that encouraged the interaction between library binders and librarians. The evaluations were without exception positive, and the production of a manual and several regional workshops is being planned. Five of these talks were repeated during the conference as the PLMS/SS program. A tour to a bindery was also offered.

- PLMS cosponsored the LAMA-BES program on “Proper Building Environments for Books and People.”
- The PLMS Discussion Group activities at both Midwinter and Annual Conference were extended to some three hours each with many reports presented that brought the attendees up to date on many ongoing projects.

- PLMS again set up and staffed the RTSD booth in the exhibit area with many handouts and a library of new preservation publications for examinations by conference attendees.

Committee accomplishments during the past year have been equally lively and satisfying:

- The Subcommittee of the Education Committee cosponsored the first of three conferences with the Library of Congress on preservation topics on April 29, 1983, at LC. This one-day conference was directed at library directors urging the establishment and support of preservation programs on the local level, and it was considered a great success. The planning subcommittee is now well into the plans for the second conference in May of 1984 directed toward preservation administrators.

- The Library/Binders Relations Committee continues its work on several technical leaflets on binding. With support from the Barnard Foundation, representatives of PLMS, ALA, and the binding industry met at the Rochester In-
The Preservation of Library Materials Section has surely come of age over the last three years, providing a focus for those people primarily engaged in preservation activities in their own libraries and a forum for other library areas in which preservation naturally plays a part.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section

John Webb, Chair

The Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS) serves its members and the profession by providing a forum for the discussion and analysis of problems and issues in library reprographics. Through its working committees, RLMS sponsors programs of continuing education and publications; it represents ALA in providing library input in the development and revision of micrographics standards; it provides the liaison between ALA and the Association for Information and Image Management (formerly the National Micrographics Association); and it strives to keep the profession abreast of technological developments which affect reprographics.

During 1982-83, the committees and their chairs were: the Nominating Committee (Harriet Rebuldela); Policy and Research Committee (Lawrence
Information and Image Management, and Jeffrey Heynen was RLMS representative to the American National Standards Institute PH5 Committee, with Norman Shaffer as alternate.

The section sponsored two excellent programs at the 1983 Annual Conference in Los Angeles. The ARL Microform Project was the subject of the first, moderated by John Webb. The speakers were Grey Cole, University of Mississippi; Mary Ellen Jacob, OCLC; Linn Hamilton, Research Publications, Inc.; Marty Joachim, University of Indiana; Sue Tyner, University of Arizona; and Jeffrey Heynen, coordinator, ARL Microform Project. A lively question-and-answer session followed the presentations. The second program, moderated by David Remington, Library of Congress, presented the results from two optical and digital videodiscs projects. Joseph W. Price, Library of Congress, discussed the current project under way at LC, and Karen Hunter, Elsevier, the recently terminated ADONIS project by a consortium of European publishers. Susan K. Martin, Johns Hopkins, provided a reaction to these projects—and to this technology—from the viewpoint of the library administrator who must plan and manage library services. A lively discussion culminated this program sponsored by the Technology Committee.

The ad hoc Regional Programs Subcommittee agreed to plan a series of workshops on preservation microfilming. The first of these would be held within the year. In addition, the subcommittee agreed to pursue joint sponsorship of local programs on library microforms with local chapters of the Association for Information and Image Management.

The ad hoc Committee on Guidelines for Operating a Library Microforms Facility put the finishing touches on the “Guidelines” document. It will receive a final editing before formal approval by the committee at the 1984 Midwinter Meeting.

The Technology Committee remains one of the most active ALA committees, sponsoring programs at many consecutive Annual Conferences and reporting to the profession on the latest advances in telefacsimile and videodisc technology. Its 1984 program will include a joint exhibit with Library Technology Reports and will be based on the theme of “Orwellian Libraries.”

The Standards Committee continues to monitor the relevant standards activities of the American National Standards Institute and the Association for Information and Image Management. It has also contacted the latter about its proposed microforms user survey.

The Policy and Research Committee recommended and the section approved the formation of two new committees. The Bibliographic Control of Microforms Committee will study and disseminate information about the bibliographic control of microforms; present bibliographic control issues to micropublishers and monitor bibliographic control products and services provided by micropublishers and other agencies; and will coordinate its work with other appropriate committees and agencies. The Committee on Copying in a sense returns RLMS to its origins. The committee will study and disseminate information about the selection, the administration, and use of reprographic methodologies and equipment in libraries, primarily the reproduction of copies of library materials (excluding audiovisual materials) by or for library users.

As usual, the RLMS Discussion Group continued to provide no-holds-barred—but relaxed—sessions for the exploration of any issues of concern to the participants.
In 1983 ten committees worked to accomplish the function of the Resources Section (RS): to encourage, to promote, and to assume responsibility for activities “relating to collection development, including selection, acquisitions and evaluation of library materials in all types of institutions.”

The nine-member Acquisitions Committee (Gail Kennedy, chair), created in January 1983, is initiating plans to begin to fulfill its function:

To consider issues, problems, and developments in the acquisition of library materials.

To provide a forum for programs and communications related to library acquisitions.

To collect and disseminate information about automated acquisitions systems and to develop guidelines for system selection and evaluation.

The Blackwell North America Scholarship Award Jury (Ruth A. Fraley, chair) carefully reviewed 1982 library literature in order to select the publication considered best in the area of resources development. The 1983 award goes to Phyllis J. Van Orden for The Collection Program in Elementary and Middle Schools: Concepts, Practices and Information Sources (Libraries Unlimited, 1982). A major part of the award is the $1,000 scholarship which Blackwell North America contributes to the school of Ms. Van Orden’s choice, Florida State University. The scholarship will be given to a library school student specializing in the acquisitions or collection development area.

The Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee (Sara C. Heitshu, chair) completed a revision of Guidelines for Handling Library Orders for In-Print Monographic Publications, which is soon to be published by ALA, and began work on revising the Guidelines for Handling Library Orders for Serials and Periodicals. The committee continued to assist in solving library and book-dealer problems arising from the purchase and supply of library materials. It promoted RS and RTSD support of the University of Florida application to the [British] Publishers Association for a Library License to allow discounts on British net books.

The Collection Management and Development (CMD) Committee (Connie Kearns McCarthy, chair) completed two sets of guidelines: “Guide to Collection Evaluation through Use and User Studies” and “A Guide to Coordinated and Cooperative Collection Development,” which appear elsewhere in this issue of LRTS. At the request of the committee, RTSD established a clearinghouse for use and user studies in addition to the clearinghouse for collection evaluations established last summer. The committee sponsors regional collection development and management institutes developed on the model of the 1981 Stanford institute. The three presented this year took place at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., July 19-21, 1982, in cosponsorship with George Washington University, at MIT and the Boston Public Library, October 10-13, 1982, in cosponsorship with MIT and the Boston Library Consortium, and at the City University of New York, March 14-16, 1983, presented by METRO with RTSD as cosponsor. The next scheduled institute is to take place at the Westin Hotel in Cincinnati, November 6-9, 1983. Two CMD subcommittees continue work on guidelines for selection tools and vendor performance.

Efforts by the Conference Program Committee (Frederick C. Lynden and Nelson A. Piper, cochairs) culminated in the June 26 program “Financial Restraint in Academic Research Institutions: Effective Budgeting and Responsive Collection Management.” Keynote speaker Raymond F. Bacchetti, vice-provost for Budget and Planning at Stanford University, described the financial
climate for institutions. Dennis E. Smith, library planning and external relations officer for the University of California system, and Sally F. Williams, library budget and planning officer at Harvard College Library, offered budget forecasting and justification information. Noreen S. Alldredge, dean of the Montana State Libraries, David Farrell, associate dean for Collection Management and Development at Indiana University, and Jutta Reed Scott, collection development specialist, Association of Research Libraries, presented specific budget planning suggestions.

The Micropublishing Committee (Jack Pontius, chair) completed its “Guide for Evaluating the Quality of Library Microforms” and continued to serve as a coordinating agency for both libraries and publishers of microforms.

The Nominating Committee (Frederick C. Lynden, chair) selected the slate of officers for the spring election.

The Policy and Research Committee (Beth J. Shapiro, chair) completed a series of section policies and approved the revised draft of a Resources Section brochure. The policies, which will be included in the next RTSD Manual of Procedures are: role and responsibility of committee interns; role and responsibility of committee consultants; role of discussion groups; cosponsorship of programs; and review of committees.

The hub for all the committees cited above and the discussion groups listed below is the Executive Committee, which coordinates the activities of the others, acts on their recommendations, and forwards appropriate action items to the RTSD Board of Directors. In addition to reviewing, evaluating, and taking action on the work of the other RS committees, the Executive Committee established the Acquisitions Committee mentioned above, changed the status of the Gifts and Exchange Discussion Group from provisional to permanent, and in June approved the existence of two additional bodies on a provisional basis: the Canadian Studies Resources Committee (William A. Gosling, coordinator), which has for two years existed under the aegis of the ALA International Relations Committee as the U.S. Library Development of Canadian Studies Resources Subcommittee; and the Collection Management/Selection Librarians for Public Libraries Discussion Group (Judi Fouts, chair).

Resources Section discussion groups which provide grass-roots-level information exchanges at Midwinter and Annual Conference are: Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group (Jana K. Stevens, chair), Booksellers’ Discussion Group (Donald B. Satisky, chair), Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Groups (Florence Blakely, chair); Chief Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group (Jeanne Sohn, chair), and the Gifts and Exchange Discussion Group (Herbert Serious, chair).

The Resources Section relies on a great number of people in order to accomplish its function. I wish to thank everyone who has contributed to its work in the 1983 year—especially the committee and discussion group chairs mentioned above, the RTSD office staff, and the Executive Committee members: Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect Noreen S. Alldredge, Secretary Sally F. Williams, past-chair William J. Myrick, Jr., and members-at-large Wanda V. Dole, Thomas W. Leonhardt, Gail M. Nichols, Marcia Pankake, and William Z. Schenck.

REFERENCES

Serials Section

Dorothy J. Glasby, Chair

The Serials Section serves its membership and librarianship in general by providing a forum for the exchange of ideas on serials management, by gathering and publishing information about serials and serials matters, and through conference programs on serials topics. The committees and the discussion group of the section are often concerned with such diverse topics as collection management, bibliographic and item control, acquisitions, automation, and education—all as they relate, or can be related, to serials.

In 1982 the section's ad hoc Committee on Union Lists of Serials was made a standing committee in recognition of the ever-increasing interest among libraries and librarians in the topic of resource sharing. During 1982-83 the committee, with Marjorie Bloss as chair, saw the publication by RTSD of its Guidelines for Union Lists of Serials and began work to update and enlarge the directory of union lists it had prepared in 1981. At the 1983 Annual Conference, the committee devoted its meeting time to a discussion of online union lists which is, surely, the major topic of interest in the union listing field today.

The ad hoc Committee to Study the Feasibility of Creating Dynamic Lists of Core Serials asked for an extension of time and now does not plan to have its final report, which will feature a core list actually prepared by the committee, until Midwinter 1984. The committee, chaired by Suzanne Striedieck, has concerned itself primarily with the methodology which can be used to prepare core lists and will make an attempt to assess the validity of the sample list it has prepared by having it checked by experts in the subject field concerned.

The Policy and Research Committee, with Elizabeth Hofsas as chair, continued, in 1982-83, to study dual pricing, the practice whereby periodical subscriptions cost more for libraries than for individuals. In addition to making various recommendations to the Executive Committee regarding changes in status or function for specific SS committees, Policy and Research recommended that steps be taken to ensure that a new edition of International Subscription Agents, last published in 1978, is prepared.

Under Chair Sandra Card, the Committee to Study Serial Records continued to work on its listing of topics and problems to be considered when an institution wishes to move from a manual to an automated method of serials check-in and control. The Committee to Study Serials Cataloging, with Carolyn Mueller as chair, moved a bit away from its past total preoccupation with AACR2 and explored minimal-level cataloging for serials at the Midwinter Meeting and series authorities at the Annual Conference. As an indication, however, that there is still much to be considered regarding AACR2 as it applies to serials, the committee discussed differences between rule interpretations issued by the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada and, through the SS representative (Dea Szatkowski) to the CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, expressed its opinions regarding changes to the rules for the formulation of uniform titles for serials, which had been proposed by the Library of Congress.

During 1982-83 the Regional Serials Workshops Committee, chaired by Deana Astle, completed its third publication, Publicity Opportunities for Workshops, a listing of journals that will publish announcements of workshops. The committee is preparing new editions of the other two, the Directory of Speakers for Serials Workshops and A Manual for Serials Workshops. The Committee on Library
School Education (whose name was changed to Education Committee by action of the SS Executive Committee at the Annual Conference) carried on with its project to prepare and publish (in Serials Review) an annual bibliography of materials relating to serials. Under the leadership of Chair Joline Ezzell, the committee began to tabulate the results of its survey of practicing serials librarians. The survey was undertaken to determine what skills and knowledge are considered to be essential for new serials librarians, and the committee plans to publish an article about its findings as well as distribute them to library schools.

The SS Research Libraries Discussion Group, cochaired by Diane Harkins and Diane Stine, had meetings which were well attended and received at both conferences, most notably, perhaps, the one at Midwinter which dealt with the new MARC format for holdings and location information.

The SS program at the Annual Conference explored the topic of journal access, and the program committee (Marlene Heroux, chair, William Willmering, and Germaine Linkins) collected a group of seven speakers who were able to address the topic from the vantage point of a user, a publisher, a database vendor, etc. The speakers were particularly interesting as they did not confine themselves to the present but speculated freely and imaginatively about what the future might hold.

Also at the Annual Conference, Frank Sadowski presented, for the second year, the Worst Serial Title Change of the Year awards. The titles receiving awards were selected by an ad hoc committee chaired by Miriam Palm. Since the awards have become an expected part of the Annual Conference and provide a welcome humorous interlude between more serious undertakings, the SS Executive Committee decided to make the committee which selects the titles so honored a standing committee so that the awards can continue as an annual event. Speaking of awards, but this time more seriously, the SS Executive Committee decided that since there are individuals making outstanding contributions to serials librarianship and there is no formal method of recognition of these contributions, there should be a Serials Section award of some type. Consequently at the Midwinter Meeting, an ad hoc Committee to Establish a Serials Section Award was set up, and this committee will make recommendations to the Executive Committee during 1983–84 concerning such matters as the name of the award, the criteria for selection of the awardee, and the nature of the award.

The 1982–83 year, obviously, was a busy one for the Serials Section with some projects being completed, some moving a few more steps forward, and some just starting out. It is to be expected that 1983–84 will be a most interesting and productive year under the imaginative and capable leadership of Rex Bross and Jean Cook in the offices of chair and vice-chair, respectively.
From: Arthur H. Miller, Jr., College Librarian, Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Ill.—
In her article in the April/June issue entitled “The Last Frontier: Possibilities for Networking in the Small Academic Library,” Mary S. Dagold (Library Director of the Villa Julie College Library) recommends that small libraries not use online systems, i.e., OCLC, as a source for cataloging, but rather look to jobbers for card sets. Alas, small libraries using Dagold as a guide to the “last frontier” may find the trail ending up around the Little Bighorn.

The revolution in small academic libraries is not, in essence, one of cataloging, but one of networking in a larger sense. In this setting, online cataloging is a means to a larger end, resource sharing. For all libraries, and especially for small college libraries, it has become clear that the only way to meet patron needs is through unified activities, based on online bibliographic control. The small library facing the future without knowledge of the holdings of other libraries places its users at a disadvantage. They will be isolated, out on the “last frontier,” much as was Custer’s small band on the day it met its fate.

The small academic library should approach the question of networking not from a local cataloging perspective, but from the viewpoint of facilitating resource sharing with shared bibliographic information.

Response from: Mary S. Dagold, Library Director, Villa Julie College. — The State of Maryland has developed a microcatalog (MICROCAT), which presently lists about 1.4 million items held by some forty college and public libraries in the state. It has also funded a union list of Maryland’s serials. Villa Julie College subscribes to both, is a contributor to the serials project, and is a member of the Maryland Inter-Library Loan Association (MILO), through which it can daily send materials and information to and receive same from other members.

I firmly applaud and support such local networking efforts, which are very effectively utilized by students, staff, and the public.

To know local holdings is much more useful to the vast majority of library users, and my article recommends spending more money in support of such local networking efforts.

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.
From: Carolyn Harris, Head, Preservation Dept., Columbia University Libraries. — I was very interested in the work of John Rutledge and Willy Owen on the study of paper quality in French books. As they said, “in the absence of a national preservation policy for intellectual materials on paper,” individual efforts should be applauded, no matter how unscientific or little “interest in the chemistry and physics of paper technology” they show.

However, I would like to add that paper chemically deteriorates continuously and paper of “good” or “fair” quality today will very likely become “bad” in a very few years. Therefore, the acquisition of retrospective materials, especially in those places and periods of poor paper quality use, is shortsighted and will serve only to provide preservation problems for future librarians and library users. User or service copy microforms can be reproduced inexpensively from master negatives. Copylo from microform can be produced, or photoduplications on permanent paper made if a paper copy is desired. Microforms and photocopies are better solutions to the long term problem.

From: Michele V. Cloonan, Conservation Consultant, formerly of the Newberry Library Conservation Department. — The systematic approach described by Rutledge and Owen to assess the condition of older books is laudable. (“Changes in the Quality of Paper in French Books, 1860–1914 . . .” LRTS 27:177–188.) I would like to suggest, however, another dimension to the problem of assessing paper condition in books—the environmental conditions under which they have been stored. An example will illustrate my point.

Two years ago, a subject bibliographer asked me to replace a multi-volume history of Poland published in Cracow in the 1880’s that was in very poor condition. (Newberry Library, F 221.23.) The paper could have been classed under the Rutledge/Owen “bad” category; pages cracked when touched. Discovering that Regenstein Library at the University of Chicago had a copy of the same edition of the work (DK 419 .D398), I decided to compare them fully convinced that Regenstein’s copy would also be “bad.” Much to my surprise, Regenstein’s copy was in good condition. Further investigation revealed that the Newberry copy had been given to the library in 1900 by the Chicago Public Library whereas Regenstein’s copy was acquired directly from Europe in the 1960’s.

This informal observation suggested that being stored in an urban environment for almost one hundred years had caused the Newberry copy to deteriorate at a much faster rate than the Regenstein copy which had probably been stored in a less polluted environment prior to its arrival in Chicago. Further, since the Newberry wasn’t air conditioned until the 1950’s, the books may have been shelved near open windows or radiators for many years.

Environmental conditions are the single most important factor in paper deterioration. (See Richard D. Smith, “Paper Impermanence as a Consequence of pH and Storage Conditions,” Library Quarterly, 39 (1969): 153–95.) Therefore, it is not surprising that two copies of a given work could have deteriorated at such different rates.
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Research: in Great Britain: 142-43

Cataloging and Classification Section

Annual report: 1982/83, 444-47

Cataloging records: 144-55, 203-4
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“A Comparison of the OCLC database and New Serials Titles as an information resource for serials” 188-98
Computers: 35
Terminals: 206
Conference publications Cataloging: 221-24
CONSER: 232-54
Cook, C. Donald: 371-90
Copyright
Fair use: 284-86
Corlee, Karen: 391-94

D

Dagold, Mary S.: 132-41
Data storage: 206-7
Databases: 18-35, 94-104
Davis, C. Roger: 432-40
Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee Annual report: 1981/82, 108-10
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“The Last frontier” 132-41, 454 (c)
Library materials: 315-29
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Use: 319-20
Lipow, Anne Grodzins: 81-87
Lynden, Frederick C.: 156-62
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Machine-readable materials
Cataloging: 366-70
“Managing European automatic acquisitions” 397-405

Manuscripts
Microreproduction: 357-65
McGinnis, Callie B.: 226 (e)
Microreproduction: 357-65
Mifflin, Ingrid: 391-94
Miller, Arthur H. Jr.: 454 (e)
Mosher, Paul H.: 417-31
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Nadeski, Karen: 278-96
Networks: 18-35
“a New information access tool for children’s media” 94-104
New Serials Titles: 188-98
Nisonger, Thomas E.: 163-76
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OCLC: 132-41, 188-98, 252-54, 264-65
Duplicate records: 211-20
Online catalogs: 18-35, 67-75, 263-64, 270-72
Access to: 4-17
Characteristics of: 36-67
Classification in: 76-80
Subject access in: 81-87, 88-93, 204-5
Online Computer Library Center. See OCLC
Optical disks. See Videodiscs
Owen, Willy: 177-87
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Pankake, Marcia: 417-31
Paper quality: 177-87, 304-6
Patton, Neil: 107 (e)
Perez, Madeleine: 357-65
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Pontius, Jack: 278-96
“Practical considerations of the current capabilities of subject access in online public catalogs” 81-87, 331 (e)
Preservation of library materials: 252-54, 297-314
“Preservation of library materials: 1982” 297-314
Preservation of Library Materials Section
Annual report: 1982/83, 447-48
Prospects for the Online Catalog Preconference (1982): 4-75
Publishing: 316-17
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Raymond, Andrew: 357-65
Reed-Scott, Jutta: 432-40
Reid, Marion T.: 450-51
Reproduction of Library Materials Section
Annual report: 1982/83, 448-49
Research Libraries Network. See RLIN
Resources and Technical Services Division
Annual report: 1982/83, 441-53
President. Annual report: 1982/83, 441-44
Resources Section
Annual report: 1982/83, 450-51
Collection Management and Development Committee: 417-31
Subcommittee on Use and User Studies: 432-40
“Resources: the year’s work in 1982” 315-29
“Revising the Dewey music schedules” (Hassell, Apr./June 1982): 105-7 (e)
Richmond, Phyllis A.: 88-93
Rinehart, Constance: 269-77
RLIN: 264-65
Duplicate records: 211-20
Robotics: 207-8
Romero, Nancy: 188-98
“RTSD annual reports, 1982/83” 441-53
Rutledge, John: 177-87
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Salmon, Stephen R.: 36-67, 225 (e)
Schabas, Ann H.: 371-90
Seal, Alan: 144-55
“The Selection and preparation of archives and manuscripts for microreproduction” 357-65
Serial publications: 188-98, 243-58
Cataloging: 221-24, 247-51
Prices: 345-56
Publishing: 243-45
Union lists: 188-98, 252-54
Serials control: 205-6, 247-51, 255-56
Serials Section
Annual report: 1982/83, 452-53
Sewell, Robert G.: 397-405
Shaffer, Norman J.: 441-44
Stevenson, Gordon: 259-68
Subject Analysis in the Online Environment (Program: 1982): 76-93
Subject cataloging: 269-77
“Subject cataloging in 1982” 269-77
“Sue A. Dodd” 410-11
“Suggestions for the cataloging of machine-readable materials” 366-70
Svenonius, Elaine: 76-80
Swanson, Edward: 407-8, 456-59
Swartzell, Ann: 357-65
Sweeney, Russell: 105-7 (c)

T

Tate, Elizabeth L.: 3, 330
Technical services
Costs: 201-2
Research: 123-32, 199-210
"Technical services research needs for the 1990s" 199-210
"Technology and the online catalog" 18-35
"A Test of two citation checking techniques for evaluating political science collections in university libraries" 163-76
"Treating IEEE conference publications as serials" 221-24
Tuttle, Marcia: 410-11
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University of Bath Centre for Catalogue Research. See Centre for Catalogue Research
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Library: 188-98, 397-405
University of North Carolina, Wilson Library: 177-87
Unsworth, Michael E.: 221-24
"Use of classification in online retrieval" 76-80
"The Use of research" 123-31
"Use of the WLN authority control system by an ARL library" 391-94

V

"Using locally and nationally produced periodical price indexes in budget preparation"
345-56
Van Orden, Phyllis: 413 (abazl)
Veaner, Allen B.: 199-210
Videodiscs: 24-26, 288-90
Villa Julie College: 132-41

W

Walker, R. Gay: 447-48
Washington Library Network: 226 (c), 264-65, 391-94
Washington State University: 391-94
Webb, John: 448-49
Weber, Benita M.: 243-58
Weeg, James A.: 226 (c)
Welsch, Erwin K.: 315-29
Williams, Jim: 188-98
Williams, Sally F.: 345-56
Wilson, Patrick: 4-17
Winkel, Lois: 94-104
WLN, See Washington Library Network

Y

"The Year's work in serials: 1982" 243-58
While the original AACR2, published in 1979, is a formidable work—covering as it does all the bibliographic situations catalogers are likely to encounter—its very thoroughness limits its usefulness where the material to be cataloged is less complicated or where only the operative principles of the code must be grasped. The latter is the case in teaching, for example.

Without disregarding the importance of properly cataloging the more difficult material, catalogers will recognize that most of their questions can be answered by a simpler version of the Rules. The Concise AACR2 was designed for that purpose. It emphasizes essential principles, dropping separate treatment by medium and the less frequently used rules. In many cases it simplifies the wording of the rules while often giving additional explanation. The Concise AACR2 should be consulted first when problems occur; it follows the rule numbers of AACR2 so that if it cannot provide the answer the complete version may be used.
SPECIAL REPORT

Automated Circulation Control Systems

This 1982 survey by Richard W. Boss and Judy McQueen focuses on turnkey systems—those that include all hardware, software, installation, training, and ongoing support in a single package. Background material includes interesting observations on the economics of automation and discussion of major issues to be considered before purchasing a new system.

Major turnkey vendors and their products are evaluated, as are several software package systems. Glossary of terms included.

Only in Library Technology Reports* a unique bimonthly providing critical evaluations of products and services used in libraries, media centers, and other educational institutions.

*March/April 1982 $40.00
Annual subscription (6 issues) $145.00

Library Technology Reports
American Library Association
50 East Huron St., Chicago IL 60611

TPS Electronics announces
PC-300 Bar Code Reader for IBM PC

An addition to our standard readers and interfaces for OCLC and RLIN cataloging terminals

4047 Transport
Palo Alto
California
94303
415-856-6833

MULTIPRINT YOUR OWN BOOK CATALOG

Union List, Directory or Bibliography in fifteen working days. From computer photocomposition, line printer or other line copy ready for camera. Write with your specifications including number of copies, number of pages and page size for Quotation, free Production Guide and Sample Book Catalog. Mention LRTS for favorable price. Multiprint, Inc., 28 West 23rd Street, New York, NY 10010, (212) 924-1100.
Continuation/Standing Order Service
A new benchmark in...
Serials Data
Management and Control Systems
Tomorrow's Answer Today.
- Customer Reports
- History Reports
- Management Reports
- Automatic Claiming
- Collective Claiming
- Check-In Claiming

For additional details write or call:

Booksellers International, Inc.
66 Austin Boulevard,
Commack, New York 11725
New York State Toll-free WATS (800) 832-4552
Toll free WATS (800) 645-5237

Midwest Library Service

You won't find more
personal attention
...anywhere

College and university librarians: We have what you're looking for. While Midwest utilizes state-of-the-art computer systems, we realize machines can't do it all. So when you want to place an order, ask a question, or discuss a problem, you can call direct on Midwest's toll-free WATS line and conduct business on a name-to-name basis with your personal customer service representative. It's the kind of attention that Midwest has provided to college and university libraries for 24 years.

Midwest Library Service
11443 St. Charles Rock Road
Bridgeton, MO 63044

Call toll-free (800) 325-8833
Missouri librarians call toll-free (800) 392-5024
Canadian librarians call collect (314) 739-3100
LIBRARY/MEDIA CENTER SUPPLIES CATALOG

- LIBRARY SUPPLIES & FURNITURE
- ARCHIVAL & PRESERVATION MATERIALS
- MINI COMPUTER SUPPLIES

SPECIAL DISCOUNT PRICING

Write For Your FREE Copy.

UNIVERSITY PRODUCTS, INC.
P.O. BOX 101 SOUTH CANAL ST. HOLYOKE, MA 01041

Online Access to Some of the World's Greatest Libraries

RLIN

- More than 10 million bibliographic records
- Subject searching & free text retrieval
- Integrated cataloging & acquisitions system
- Search access using any standard terminal

Any library may have search or shared cataloging access to the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). Contact CLASS.

CLASS 1415 Koll Circle, Suite 101 San Jose, CA 95112-4698 (408) 289-1756
Good Directions from ALA

Cartographic Materials
A Manual of Interpretation for AACR2
Prepared by the Anglo-American Cataloguing Committee for Cartographic Materials
Hugo L.P. Stibbe, General Editor
Vivien Cartmell and Velma Parker, Editors

This manual contains everything necessary to give bibliographic descriptions of maps, globes, atlases, and other cartographic materials in accordance with AACR2. It indicates preferred applications of AACR2 together with the practices of the national libraries and archives of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Great Britain, and the United States.
x, 258 pages, illustrated 0363-0
$40.00 Cloth

The Bibliographic Record and Information Technology
Ronald Hagler and Peter Simmons

This innovative text aims to introduce novices to computer functions in the context of bibliography, to deal with manual and automated bibliographic databases as part of a single coordinated system of bibliographic control, and to analyze the technical, administrative, and economic aspects of a rapid transition from older rules and practices to newer ones.
xx, 346 pages 0376-2 $25.00 Cloth

Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files
An Interpretive Manual
Sue A. Dodd
Foreword by Judith S. Rowe

The only work of its kind, this manual provides the guidance which data producers, data archivists, and data librarians need to supply consistent bibliographic information for the machine-readable data files they service. Dodd explicates the rules for cataloging MRDF from the ninth chapter of AACR2, offering examples and revealing the "how and why" of cataloging. Included is an extremely valuable outline of the steps for cataloging the microcomputer programs that are now found in many public and school libraries.
xx, 248 pages, illustrated 0365-7
$35.00 Paper

AACR2 Decisions and Rule Interpretations
Second Edition
Compiled by C. Donald Cook with the assistance of Glenna E. Stevens

Published by the Canadian Library Association; distributed in the U.S. by ALA. This consolidation appears on loose-leaf pages so users may have the option of interleaving them in a copy of AACR2 or binding them as a separate volume.
3281-9 $50.00

American Library Association
50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611
ONLINE CATALOG
THE INSIDE STORY

A Planning and Implementation Guide

1ST IN-DEPTH STUDY!
BY and FOR librarians

Edited by W. Post and P. Watson

Ryan Research International
Educational Resources
1593 Filbert  Chico, CA. 95926

30 DAY FREE EXAMINATION

Introduction by Ronald Miller of CLASS
$14.95

RRI

$1.50 shipping/handling

LCCN 83-61853  ISBN 0-942158-02-4
Information management resources from the American Library Association

Online Searching Technique and Management
Edited by James J. Maloney
All facets of reference service using online searching, from the reference interview to financial management, are treated in this collection of seventeen papers.
0-8389-3285-1 vii, 195p.
$25.00 paper 1983

A Reader on Choosing an Automated Library System
Compiled and edited by Joseph R. Matthews
A series of forty key articles pertaining to the consideration, selection, and implementation of automated library systems.
0-8389-0383-5 Approx. 400p.
$35.00 paper November 1983

Directory of Information Management Software for Libraries, Information Centers, Record Centers
Compiled and edited by Pamela Cibbarelli, Carol Tenopir, and Edward John Kazlauskas
Basic information on available software options according to various criteria such as hardware, record format, size, and cost.
0-913203-00-9 133p. $45.00 paper 1983
(published by Cibbarelli and Associates, Inc., Studio City, Calif.).

Address orders and inquiries to American Library Association Publishing Services
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
DISCOVER McGregor
Where Customers Are Names—Not Numbers
"Personalized" Subscription Service—Since 1933

- All domestic and foreign titles
- Title Research
- Prepaid subscriptions
- Single billing
- Automatic renewal
- Personal customer account
- Representatives

Let an experienced McGregor "Home Office" representative simplify your complex problems of periodical procurement. Prompt and courteous service has been a tradition with McGregor since 1933. Our customers like it—we think you would, too!

Write for catalog or Phone 815/734-4183

DON'T WAIT—AUTOMATE

MARC II cataloging and on-line catalogs for books, journals, and private files.

Book, COM, and card catalogs; printed holdings and accessions lists.

Automate with Inforonics: we've been around the longest and we still cost the least.

Inforonics
550 Newtown Road, Littleton, MA 01460
(617) 486-8976
Our physical size and financial strength—necessary to make and honor commitments—indicate the successful working relationships we have with thousands of libraries worldwide.

But the plain truth is, simply, that it is our sensitivity to your unique requirements, and our flexibility in providing an exhaustive and relentless effort for total customer service that is our real strength.

We want to work with you—to help you provide exceptional patron service, which is your strength.

We can help. Write today—

**EBSCO SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES**

The Serials Professionals

P.O. Box 1943, Birmingham, AL 35201-1943,
(205) 991-6600  Telex 78-2661
B/NA AUTHORITY CONTROL

Improving patron access to your online catalog.

Loading MARC records into an online catalog? The B/NA automated authority control system can perform name and subject authority control on your MARC database and give you fully edited catalog tapes in the MARC II format. If your online catalog has an authority control module, the B/NA authority control system can also provide deblinded cross reference tapes in a format compatible with LC MARC for Authorities for loading into the system. Simply send us your catalog tape and we match your MARC records against current LC name and subject authority files to provide your library with the most up-to-date consistent headings available.

Why choose authority control from B/NA?
Quality. Sophistication. Leadership. Ten years experience with authority control. No other system equals ours. Drawing from our constantly updated authority files and the skills of our experienced editors, this unique B/NA service frees your staff from retrospective authority control tasks. For more information, write or call toll free, Dan Miller, Manager, Sales and Service, Technical Services Division.

BLACKWELL
North America, Inc.
6024 S.W. Jean Road,
Building G
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
Telephone (800) 547-6426
Encyclopedia of Associations

...A Guide to National and International Organizations, Including: Trade, Business, and Commercial; Agricultural and Commodity; Legal, Governmental, Public Administration, and Military; Scientific, Engineering and Technical; Educational; Cultural; Social Welfare; Health and Medical; Public Affairs; Fraternal, Foreign Interest, Nationality, and Ethnic; Religious; Veteran, Hereditary, and Patriotic; Hobby and Avocational; Athletic and Sports; Labor Unions, Associations, and Federations; Chambers of Commerce; and Greek Letter and Related Organizations. 18th ed. Edited by Denise Akey. The 1984 edition of the No. 1 guide to sources for current facts, figures, and opinions. Gale, 1983.

Vol. 1, National Organizations of the U.S. The basic volume provides over 17,750 full descriptions of active groups. 1,936pp. in 2 parts. ISBN 0-8103-1687-0. $170.00/set. (SO)


Telecommunications Systems and Services Directory

0-8103-1696-X. Sub., $150.00. (SO)

Consult this new directory for detailed descriptions and contact information on today's technology communications and services. Covering the gamut of modern telecommunications, the three-part work describe 800 organizations and provide 500 glossary terms.

Encyclopedia of Medical Organizations and Agencies


Furnishes current information on some 10,000 major public and private agencies in medicine and related fields that are concerned with information, funding, research, education, planning, advocacy, and service. The descriptive entries are arranged in 78 chapters covering specific areas of modern health care and medicine.

(SO) These titles are available on Gale's 5% Standing Order discount. Deduct 5% if you send check with order. Customers outside the U.S. and Canada add 10%.

GALE Research Co
Book Tower • Detroit, MI 482