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Editorial: “‘Catalogers: The People We Love to Hate’”

The Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) sponsored a new group at its conference during Midwinter: the Special Interest Group on Technical Services Education (SIGTSE). The group’s inaugural meeting took place in San Antonio on time, even though two of the scheduled speakers, Robert M. Hayes (dean, UCLA); Ben R. Tucker (Library of Congress); and many others were delayed by the Dallas storm. This editor was convener and moderator for the evening. Herbert S. White (dean, University of Indiana) and Elizabeth Futas (director, University of Rhode Island) were joined by Janet Swan Hill (head cataloger, Northwestern University) for a panel presentation—“‘Catalogers: The People We Love To Hate’”—conducted much like the presidential debates.

There were many familiar faces in the audience of about seventy-five, a large number for ALISE SIGs, and not only library educators but a good proportion of practitioners attended. Some librarians were alerted to the program by OCLC log-on messages; others were contacted directly by the SIG’s founders (Sheila S. Intner, Richard P. Smiraglia, Janet Swan Hill); and still others were recruited while en route to San Antonio for the ALA Midwinter Meeting. They were promised a chance to interact with the panel, and many took advantage of the opportunity.

What did the two library school deans tell us? First, they acknowledged that catalogers once had more eminence in the profession than they currently enjoy. Second, they agreed that catalogers’ work is (still) central to the fundamental professional goal of connecting people with information. Third, they warned that catalogers and other resources and technical service librarians had better do something about the present situation, because without profound changes in the perceptions of educators, administrators, and our own colleagues, it is likely to worsen.

Catalogers have turned inward for approval, White said, because they fail to receive any strokes from others—certainly not from the public, reference librarians, nor directors. And, Futas told us that although she began as a cataloger and loved her work, she was forced out into public service by fellow catalogers because she could not keep her mouth shut and follow the rules without argument. She offered this as concrete evidence that catalogers do not get high marks for having creative ideas or defending them effectively, even if their goal is to enhance the public-service value of the catalog.

Hill’s message, though similarly bleak, held some isolated glimmers of hope, e.g., recent cooperation among Northwestern’s public- and technical-service staff members and a more promising pool of applicants for a recently posted position in her cataloging department. She explained catalogers’ low esteem in real terms: low salaries, burdensome work loads to which extra jobs are added by library management, and immersion in detailed intellectual work that no one outside the group tries to understand. White agreed with this last-mentioned fact and exhorted the audience—both practitioners and educators—to “get up and fight!” The “fighting,” he suggested, was not barging into the director’s office demanding
raises or better working conditions but becoming knowledgeable about administrative/institutional goals and showing how the work done in technical services furthers them.

Futas added that, in her opinion, cataloging is not taught with much energy or drama, leading students to believe it is dull. She suggested more lively methods (such as team teaching, Socratic dialogues, and problem-solving exercises) that would enliven classes, pique interest, and encourage more students to “go into” cataloging. All the speakers urged that more and stronger links between educators and practitioners be forged.

Members of the audience questioned the three speakers intently about all these ideas, although not many addressed the issue most pertinent to library educators: dull classes. They expressed frustration with managements that expected catalogers to do public-service work but not the reverse; anger over salary discrepancies among staff in functional areas; and dismay at managers who could believe that the hard work of resources and technical service librarians was not enough.

Obviously, panel and audience were not on exactly the same wavelength. The dialogue, with full participation by practitioners, should be continued. Following the lively discussion, Richard P. Smiraglia was nominated convenor for the 1989 meeting.—Sheila S. Intner, Editor.
A Scope Statement for LRTS

Library Resources & Technical Services publishes original papers of a scholarly nature in a variety of formats on topics of interest to division members. Subject areas of interest to Resources and Technical Services Division members may include the following:

- development and management of information resources (including the selection, acquisition, evaluation, and review of collections);
- bibliographic access and control;
- preservation and reproduction of materials;
- education, standards, and technologies relating to these areas and their management strategies.

Acceptable formats include, but are not limited to, article-length reports of new research, analyses of problems and issues, descriptions of operational experimentation, and bibliographic compilations.

Research articles submitted to Library Resources & Technical Services are anonymously refereed by at least two experts in the appropriate subject field before being accepted for publication.

In addition to articles, features such as reviews of recent publications in the field, brief reports of research in progress, research notes, news of general interest, and certain reports of division activities are included. — LRTS Editorial Board.

CONSERVING AND PRESERVING MATERIALS IN NONBOOK FORMATS

The Thirtieth Allerton Institute will be held on November 6–9, 1988; the conference is sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign.

The conference, “Conserving and Preserving Materials in Nonbook Formats,” will address conservation and preservation issues related to the broad spectrum of nonbook materials—films, paintings, photographs, newspapers, sound recordings, maps, etc.—found in the collections of archives, libraries, museums, and other depositories. During the three-day conference, preservation specialists will give a series of presentations; there will be demonstrations and exhibits of preservation techniques and ample opportunities for formal and informal discussions.

Co-chairs of the Thirtieth Allerton Institute Conference are Kathryn Luther Henderson, professor, GSLIS and William T. Henderson, preservation librarian, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign. For more information, contact the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois, 410 David Kinley Hall, 1407 W. Gregory Dr., Urbana, IL 61801; (217) 333-3280.
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Interaction:
Letters to the Editor

From William Z. Schenck, Chair, RTSD Resources Section:

The "Year's Work" articles in the October/December issue provided an excellent overview of interest in RTSD. While the articles cannot be comprehensive, Ann Okerson's excellent article, "Periodical Prices: A History and Discussion" was not mentioned. This article, which appeared in Advances in Serials Management, V.1, pages 101–34, was awarded the Blackwell/North American Scholarship Annual Award for the best article in the area of collection development, acquisitions and related areas for 1986. In the article, Ms. Okerson described the various serials price indexes, as well as calling for further research. It is a timely article and a major contribution to the profession.
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The National Coordinated Cataloging Program

Henriette D. Avram and Beacher Wiggins

The National Coordinated Cataloging Program is a formal system in which selected research libraries follow agreed-upon practices for creating national-level bibliographic records. The resulting records will be contributed to the Library of Congress database and distributed, via the Linked Systems Project, to OCLC, Research Libraries Group, and Western Library Network member libraries and, on tape, to MARC Distribution Service subscribers. Details and implications of the program and the pilot project, planned to begin in 1988 to test its merits, are described.

Shared cataloging, as we know it today, has been commonplace for quite some time now. Many libraries across the nation participate in general shared cataloging as members of a bibliographic utility. A member searches the utility database to see whether another member has cataloged the item for which a record is needed. If the search uncovers an existing record, it is used as the basis for the member’s cataloging record. The record found on the utility may be at such a level of quality that it can be used unchanged. On the other hand, the quality of the cataloging record may require a considerable amount of improvement before it can be used by the member.

To build a national database in which all the records are of quality high enough to be accepted into a local database or library without any modification is the ideal, a cost-effective goal for these times of shrinking operating budgets. The aim of the National Coordinated Cataloging Program (NCCP), a formal system in which designated research libraries follow agreed-upon practices for creating national-level bibliographic records, is to build such a database. The Library of Congress’ (LC) database is to serve as its core.

This cooperative undertaking has been in the planning stages for well
over a year now, involving LC, members of both the Research Libraries Advisory Committee to OCLC (RLAC) and the Research Libraries Group (RLG) in the effort to implement a program for coordinated cataloging nationwide. Coordinated cataloging is much more ambitious than shared cataloging, and this paper describes how NCCP is being planned to achieve it.

**AIMS AND ASSUMPTIONS**

There is agreement on four objectives for the program:
- To increase the timeliness of cataloging copy;
- To extend cataloging coverage;
- To reduce duplication of effort; and
- To produce cataloging of national-level quality.

The program is predicated on several basic assumptions, some of which have been modified as planning proceeded. These are worth mentioning here to provide background and understanding of the program.
- NCCP would consist of LC and a group of selected research libraries working together.
- Participants would contribute authority records along with bibliographic records.
- Participants would supply subject headings and classification numbers and, where appropriate, submit new numbers and headings for inclusion in the *Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)* list and LC classification schedules.
- NCCP would follow LC procedures and *Rule Interpretations* as modified to produce national-level records.
- The program would operate through the Linked Systems Project (LSP).
- LC would distribute contributed records nationally and internationally without constraint.
- LC would maintain the records, i.e., make updates and revisions as needed.
- Participants would catalog books within their chosen areas of expertise on a priority basis.
- LC would assume responsibility for technical management, including quality control of contributed records.

Among several meetings at which details for implementation were worked out, an important gathering that included representatives from RLAC, RLG, and LC took place in May 1986. In discussing the concept of a coordinated cataloging project, some significant decisions were reached.

1) A small pilot project would be used to test the merits of the coordinated effort. Eight university libraries were identified as participants: Harvard, Indiana, Yale, Chicago, California at Berkeley, Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Michigan, and Texas at Austin.

2) A Steering Committee whose core membership consisted of the directors of the pilot libraries would meet to make policy decisions as necessary.

3) An Operations Planning Group, consisting primarily of technical services heads at the pilot libraries and LC’s cataloging director, would have responsibility for reviewing the procedures and *Rule In-*
terpretations and establishing guidelines as well as for making decisions at the detailed implementation level and making recommendations to the Steering Committee.

Once these two NCCP groups were created, the focus shifted to requirements for launching the pilot project. They then convened periodically to work out the necessary details.

**INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS**

Although use of LSP was agreed upon for NCCP, only the authorities application is currently operational. It seems unlikely that the bibliographic application will be ready by the time the pilot gears up, even though work on bringing it up is being expedited at an accelerated pace through intensive meetings at LC since February 1987. Nevertheless, it was felt that much could be gained by starting the pilot now. The insights concerning the best implementation of a cooperative undertaking of this magnitude would serve well when establishing a permanent program using LSP.

As an interim measure, before implementing the pilot project, it was decided that online cataloging to LC’s database (currently in place at Harvard and Chicago for their contributions of bibliographic and authority records via NACO—the National Coordinated Cataloging Operations) would be the method employed. Submission of records via tapes was ruled out because of inefficiency caused by lack of timeliness in mail service and problems in loading tapes expeditiously.

LC will supply two terminals to each library for creating and searching records directly on its database, exactly as if they were regular LC cataloging sections. Unfortunately, this arrangement presents some problems for the participants: if the institutions cannot wait until their records are returned via tape distribution to their utilities, this mode of operation will impose the need for double inputting of the small number of records they are expected to contribute during the pilot project. LC would be willing to provide participants with tapes of their own records (as it has done for Harvard’s contributed records), but this approach may also prove to be a problem by being less timely than desired.

Clearly, any interim solution will pose challenges for the participating libraries. The double input will cause a burden, effectively reducing the number of records they produce. It should be kept in mind, however, that the pilot project is an exercise for learning whether coordinated building of a national database is viable. The cost of two keyings of the small number of records to be contributed during the pilot project will not be prohibitive and will allow much to be learned. There will be constant review and reevaluation as the pilot proceeds, permitting the project to move toward eventual reduction of costs and adverse impacts on the institutions.

When full LSP is available, libraries will input records to their utilities, where they will be accepted by LC via the link and added to its database (contribution). LC will, in turn, send the records so contributed to the utilities for the benefit of other libraries on those and other utilities (distribution). Record Transfer is the component that will support these LSP transactions; changes made to records will cause them to be distributed to the
utilities. In addition, these records will be transmitted through LC’s MARC Distribution Service as currently done. The other component vital to NCCP in the LSP environment is Information Retrieval, which will be used to allow the intersystem searching necessary in some instances to determine the existence of a desired record. It will also be used by LC for searching the utilities’ databases to check records for quality-control purposes.

**CURRENT PLANS**

It now appears that requirements will be met for start-up of the pilot in early 1988. Details were ironed out concerning the model to be followed, which constitutes the working definition of a national-level bibliographic record. Cataloging records will be created according to *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, second edition; *LC Rule Interpretations* and classification schedules; and *LCSH*, reflecting LC’s authorized forms and series treatment decisions insofar as they can be ascertained from the LC authority and bibliographic files (whether mounted at LC or at a bibliographic utility). Subject cataloging will be performed, as far as possible, in compliance with LC cataloging practices exemplified in its *Subject Cataloging Manual*. The results of this portion of the pilot will be carefully examined to see if it is possible for participants to adhere to LC subject practice, not only in terms of correct application of LCSH but also in terms of the level of subject specificity.

During the pilot, contributed records will be restricted to current Western European language materials, i.e., confined to the past three years. Each participant, except for Harvard, will contribute 600 records the first year and increase this number to 900 the second year. In addition, Chicago will contribute records created as part of an ongoing funded project. Harvard, because of its experience in cataloging online to LC, will contribute 1,000 records the first year and 2,000 the second. These figures are approximate, based on experience with the number of name authorities NACO libraries have been able to submit and based on what the NACO libraries believe they can handle while following policies and practices for creating national-level records.

Areas of cataloging responsibility were agreed upon, although it is not mandatory that the individual library input everything it receives within its area of responsibility. This division of responsibility is also based on available cataloging expertise, i.e., staff competencies at particular institutions. Rigid allocations of responsibility have tended to cause problems in past cooperative efforts. For the pilot, some leeway for overlap is built in: if a library receives an item outside its normal scope, needs a cataloging record, and on searching the database finds that it has not been cataloged by the responsible institution, that library may input the item. Results of the pilot might cause the cataloging assignments to change.

Catalogers from participating libraries will be given intensive training at LC in its cataloging practices, procedures in descriptive and subject cataloging, and content designation used in its MARC Editorial Division.

Quality control will also be managed at LC. Initially, all contributed records will be reviewed for adherence to agreed-upon practices and policies.
After an institution becomes independent, only a sampling of records will be reviewed. Guidelines will be based on the model used for NACO libraries currently submitting authority records.

The Steering Committee feels strongly about proper evaluation of the pilot itself. To assist it in this important undertaking, the committee's consensus is that an outside consultant is highly desirable. A proposal to outline the evaluation criteria is being formulated so that the consultant can offer the best assistance possible. This work is being done in close alliance with the Council on Library Resources, which was generous in granting funding to help defray some costs of the pilot. This support has been earmarked expressly to cover costs of training, telecommunications, travel to planning meetings, and evaluation.

This cooperative venture is viewed as a grand opportunity to share resources in the building of a national database where every access point on each bibliographic record is in agreement with a verified authority record. The day is past when any library, no matter how large, can acquire and catalog comprehensively in every field. NCCP, because it fosters cataloging by different libraries using a single database into which the records they contribute will be integrated in a consistent manner, is viewed as a major step toward filling the need to share bibliographic products and items. The results of the pilot should reveal the viability of such a program. With full implementation of LSP, the U.S. library community will be on the threshold of realizing these goals for building cooperative databases.

**SAMUEL LAZEROW MEMORIAL LECTURE**

**AT SIMMONS COLLEGE**

On December 9, 1987, in Boston, Elizabeth Young, vice-president of INMARSAT Policy and Representation, delivered the Samuel Lazerow Memorial Lecture, sponsored by the Institute for Scientific Information, at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College. Young, a specialist in mass media communications, was formerly president of the Public Service Satellite Consortium and also led its subsidiary, Services by Satellite, Inc.

Her topic, "The Meaning of the Information Revolution for the Information Professional," included many thought-provoking ideas such as the following:

The information professional today is a person who is educated, experienced and paid with regard to shaping, manipulating, interpreting, moving, storing and controlling information. The rapid rate at which information is acquired, stored and manipulated today is causing an upheaval both for users and for professionals who act as "gatekeepers." Even though technology makes more information available more flexibly to a greater number of people, the role of the professional information manager will expand, not contract. Information professionals must become "change agents," seeking ways to enable innovations to be adopted regarding the ways we access and use information. The information professional may have at least two new roles: that of true professional partner with other professions who must rely increasingly on sophisticated information flow, and that of ethicist. The latter role entails decision-making about how mediation is needed in shaping information as well as how much information professionals should be involved in policy-making at a national or international level.
Automating Preservation Information in RLIN

Betsy Kruger

Efforts of the Research Libraries Group to use its automated bibliographic database, RLIN, to support both cooperative and individual member library preservation efforts are examined. Two areas are explored in depth: enhancements that made item-specific preservation information retrievable from RLIN records by highlighting microform information and facilitating searching; and proposals and efforts to code condition information in the database. Recent Library of Congress-sponsored efforts to develop preservation data elements for the MARC communications format are examined briefly.

Over the last fifteen years the concept of preserving library materials has broadened to include not just the care and restoration of rare books that have value as artifacts, but also the preservation of entire collections valued primarily for their intellectual content. Poorly controlled environmental conditions in older libraries, air pollution, deleterious agents introduced to paper during its manufacture, physical abuse, and general wear and tear have brought the condition of many materials in the stacks of our research libraries to a critical point. The extent of the problem is staggering: six million volumes in the collections of the Library of Congress (LC) are already so fragile that they can only be preserved by microfilming. The results of a large-scale survey of the physical condition of books in the Yale University Library provides, in its author’s words, “a sobering picture of book deterioration in a large research library” —37.1 percent of sampled books had brittle paper (i.e., broke after two double folds) and 82.6 percent had acidic paper (i.e., a pH below 5.4).

Preservation has become the concern of not just the conservator but of all library professionals. More research libraries are beginning to hire preservation officers and to develop collectionwide preservation programs. The information and research needs of such programs are enormous, and since preservation costs are high and dollars are chronically scarce, the need for cooperative efforts and for efficient collection and manipulation of data for managerial purposes is crucial. Automation, which
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has radically transformed the ways in which libraries process, manage, and provide access to their collections, presents many exciting possibilities for preservation activities. This paper examines efforts of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) to use its automated bibliographic database, the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), to support both cooperative preservation activities and those of individual member libraries. To date, RLG is the network most active in exploring this application of its bibliographic database. The MARC format developed by LC in the mid-1960s made it possible to standardize and share bibliographic data for cataloging and other purposes—an economic imperative for libraries in an era of escalating costs and shrinking financial resources. Since RLIN contains the records of many important and long-established collections, it is logical (especially in light of the problem’s scale) to explore the use of this database to support cooperative preservation activities.

**Preservation Focus**

RLG is a partnership of 36 research institutions; an additional 400 libraries purchase its bibliographic services. Founded for the purpose of promoting interinstitutional support for scholarship and research during a period of rising costs and dwindling financial resources, the partnership focuses its efforts in four areas: shared resources, collection management and development, preservation, and bibliographic and technical services. The RLIN system underpins all of these efforts. Many of the agreements developed by the partnership are recognized by members as binding so that their individual development plans can be based in part on RLG agreements. The collective holdings of RLG member libraries number more than 104 million volumes, 980,000 serials, 37 million microforms, and a rapidly growing number of nonprint materials.

RLG’s concern for preservation predates RLIN’s development. The draft of a 1975 Preservation Committee planning report, “Preservation in the Research Libraries Group,” presented a framework and an agenda for the newly formed committee, composed of representatives from the four original member institutions—Columbia, Harvard, New York Public Library (NYPL), and Yale. It was charged with recommending “procedures and methods to be used by the RLG institutions to assure, so far as possible, the systematic preservation of their collections.” Even at this early date, the committee foresaw “that many of the record-keeping elements of a joint decision and record-of-treatment program may eventually be incorporated into an automated RLG bibliographic system.”

RLG experienced some upheaval in those early years. It adopted Stanford University’s Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations (BALLOTS) as its automated technical processing system, which became the basis for RLIN. (When RLIN was formed, Harvard withdrew from the partnership, and Stanford joined.) In 1980 the original Preservation Committee was re-formed, and RLG applied to the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) for a $108,775 grant to support the initial planning of a formal preservation program. RLG strongly contended that its efforts to share the responsibility for acquiring and providing access to research materials would be futile if the physical condition of those resources made
them unusable. The proposal submitted to NEH cited the availability of RLIN as possibly the most important factor in RLG’s capacity to develop a plan for sharing preservation efforts and to assist its members in tackling their own preservation problems.

The structure of the RLIN database allows each member library to create and keep its own bibliographic records. This structure differs from that of OCLC, for example, where only one master record for each title is maintained online. RLG’s NEH proposal emphasized that “a library that manages its catalog in RLIN may also manage its collection in RLIN, including activities related to preservation, by indicating in the network record such information as when an item has been tagged for preservation, when it has been filmed, etc.” The NEH grant, approved in February 1981 for a two-year period, enabled RLG to add a senior program officer to its central staff and to hire technical consultants. In order to make item-specific preservation information retrievable, RLIN required certain enhancements that would highlight microform information and facilitate searching. These will be described here.

The funding for implementing these enhancements was provided by a related project at NYPL, which had been active in preservation microfilming since the 1930s. In 1979 NYPL received a $575,000 grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to fund a three-year microform master project. As Persky notes, NYPL had institutional as well as broader objectives when applying for the Mellon grant. The library could streamline its internal processing by consolidating disparate manual files and centralizing appropriate information in RLIN. Older microform master records in RLIN would be updated to take full advantage of the MARC 007 field, which contains a coded version of the physical description of microforms and the recommended RLIN preservation enhancements. New cataloging that also exploited these features would be added to the database. Two other institutional objectives included an update of holdings information for NYPL master microforms already recorded in RLIN and a physical inspection of films to assure their archival quality. One intent of this last objective was to inform other RLIN users about the condition of NYPL master microforms cataloged in the database. For the time being, NYPL decided to enter only archival-quality masters. Rare but less-than-archival quality films (made prior to the adoption of microfilming standards by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) in 1976, LC in 1964, and ALA in 1966) present a dilemma that will be discussed later: how to include information in bibliographic databases on the physical condition of library materials and do so in a standardized and useful manner.

Because of the extent of the preservation problem, NYPL and other RLG libraries were motivated to minimize duplicative filming. The cost of filming a deteriorating item is often much higher than purchasing a copy of a film from an institution (or commercial publisher) that has a master negative. The preservation enhancements to the RLIN system would enable libraries to share information not only about the existence of microfilms but also about the intent to film.

Prior to RLG’s interest in enhancing RLIN for the purpose of recording the existence of preservation microfilm masters in the database, the only
reference tool that could supply such information was the LC's National Register of Microform Masters (NRMM). Beginning in 1965, participating libraries and commercial publishers reported their master microforms for monographs and serials to NRMM, which, though a valuable research tool, has severe limitations. It is extremely time-consuming to search, since it consists of only one cumulation followed by several annual volumes. Delays between submission of reports and publication were lengthy, and in 1981, when RLG was designing microform enhancements for RLIN, NRMM had a large backlog of unpublished and unalphabetized reports due to funding and staffing shortages at LC. 13 Beginning in 1984, LC merged NRMM with the automated National Union Catalog in order to accept records in MARC form from libraries and publishers. In 1985 the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) received funding from NEH and the Mellon Foundation for converting into machine-readable form, through an outside contractor, the records for monographs that had been published in NRMM (the final volume covers 1983). When completed, these tapes will be available through the MARC distribution service for purchase by RLIN, OCLC, WLN, and other interested parties. This project will go a long way toward providing thorough, retrospective information about microform holdings. Once NRMM is in the RLIN database it will be very easy to locate preservation masters, since the RLIN enhancements highlight this information and facilitate searching.

**RLIN PRESERVATION ENHANCEMENTS**

In 1981 RLG hired Barbara Jones as a consultant. At that time she was head of cataloging at New York University (NYU) and coordinator of its preservation program; her task was to draft the initial system-design requirements that would support the inclusion of preservation information in RLIN. 14 In her first report to the RLG Preservation Committee, Jones outlined two preservation projects for which RLIN could be used as a managerial tool: bibliographic control of microform masters and item-specific information on the physical condition of library materials. 15 In order to support the Mellon project at NYPL, the committee decided to tackle the necessary enhancements for microform-related information first. The proposal outlining design requirements for these enhancements was formally approved by the committee at its June 1981 meeting. 16

Microform and master negative information was included in RLIN prior to that time but not in a systematic fashion allowing for easy retrieval. RLIN enhancements had to satisfy five important requirements: (1) the microform must be identifiable as a preservation master negative, and the record must provide technical information about the microform (i.e., polarity, dimension, reduction ratio, color, emulsion, and number of frames, feet, and/or reels); (2) the record for a single bibliographic item must include information about both microform service copies and preservation negatives; (3) the record must include a provision for indicating that an item has been scheduled for filming; (4) the system must be able to compile statistics on the number of items filmed; and (5) the system must be able to produce lists of items filmed. 17

The committee felt that in designing enhancements to meet these re-
quirements, it was important to consider the eventual possibility of sharing preservation information with non-RLG databases such as OCLC and WLN. As far as possible, RLIN enhancements had to be compatible with the USMARC format—the basis for all major utilities. If fields that could not be indexed or fields unique to RLIN were used to input local data, sharing of the preservation information would be restricted to RLIN users.

The USMARC 007 field for the physical description of microforms, which became available in fall 1981, plays an important role in RLIN’s preservation support features. The 007 contains information on the physical format of the microform (film, fiche, etc.) and on the generation of the microform, e.g., “printing master” or “first generation.” RLG proposed an expanded version of the definitions used in this field to LC, and this was approved by the Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI). These definitions for describing the generations of a microform made it possible “to distinguish true archival preservation master negatives that are produced and stored according to ANSI standards, from other kinds of printing masters and service copies.”

Unlike physical description information, information on “intent to film” is nonbibliographic and therefore was not designated in any USMARC field. To include this information in the bibliographic record, RLG had to design an RLIN-specific field—the Queuing Date (QD) field. RLIN’s powerful searching and indexing capabilities make it possible to retrieve specific records with stated values for various fields that can be indexed. For example, it is possible to produce a list of titles queued for filming, which should help reduce duplicative filming efforts. It is also possible to combine title searches with specific values for the GEN (generation of microform) code in byte eleven of the USMARC 007 field and determine if another library owns a preservation master (code a); a printing master (code b); or a service copy (code c) of the item in question. Several RLIN display formats were also revised so that when an item is searched in the database, the presence of a microform in a summary list of holdings is highlighted by asterisks that enclose the generation code. The microform enhancements, as well as searching and inputting instructions, are outlined in detail in the RLG Preservation Manual.

RLG AUTOMATED UNION CATALOG OF MICROFORM MASTERS

NYPL and many other RLG members have significant collections of master negatives that are particularly valuable sources for research in the humanities and social sciences. Coverage in NRMM is often inconsistent, since not all libraries regularly reported their microforms. Also, since many of these microforms were made or acquired prior to the availability of either NRMM or RLIN, their existence was completely undocumented outside the institutions that owned them. To fill in this gap and to extend coverage of microform-related preservation information in RLIN, RLG received another NEH grant in 1982 for development of an automated union catalog of microform masters. This $228,948 grant permitted ten RLG members (American Antiquarian Society, Columbia, Cornell, NYU,
Princeton, Rutgers, Stanford, Berkeley, University of Michigan, and Yale) to enter a total of 22,000 records of master microform negatives into the newly enhanced RLIN system.

Ten RLG members are currently participating in a major Cooperative Preservation Microfilming Project (CPMP) funded in equal parts by NEH and the Mellon Foundation. Each participant is concentrating its microfilming-plus-cataloging efforts on one or more LC classes of U.S. monographic imprints and Americana published between 1870 and 1920. (Paper in books printed during this period has reached a severely embrittled state.) Serials are also being done as part of phase II of the project, for which one of the goals is “to make information about these materials widely available to the scholarly community by using recently adapted capabilities of the RLIN online database to emphasize preservation information.” Together these projects will result in the addition of more than 45,000 records for master negatives to the RLIN database.

To make this information available to RLIN nonusers, RLG, in June 1984, produced a preservation union list for all retrospective and current microform cataloging added to RLIN between October 1981 and May 1984. Each entry in the first copy of the union list included (when present in the online record) bibliographic information on the original item, physical description of the microform, LC number, RLIN record ID, RLIN member and National Union Catalog identification codes, microform generation, and queuing date. To produce the union list, all RLIN records containing preservation or printing master microform information or queuing dates were saved in a separate file. These records were then processed through the RLIN reports system to produce a tape of print images that was converted to COM by a commercial contractor. The first list included more than 25,000 records (21,000 master negatives and printing masters and 4,600 records for titles scheduled for filming). RLG received eighty-five requests for the fiche during its first three weeks of availability, most of which came from the preservation or collection development departments of non-RLG academic libraries. A third edition of the list was published in July 1986.

In addition to preservation information entered into RLIN during these projects, all RLG members are committed, by action of the board of governors in March 1984, to share this type of information in a timely manner by adding queuing dates and newly created master-negative cataloging for all the preservation microfilms they produce.

**CONDITION INFORMATION IN RLIN: EXPLORING THE POSSIBILITIES**

Microfilming is a preservation solution that results in another bibliographic item, i.e., the microform itself. Perhaps this is the reason that inclusion of microform-related preservation information in bibliographic databases seems a more straightforward and objective task than adding information on the physical condition of books and other bibliographic items. The difficulties of such an endeavor quickly come to mind: Physical condition of bibliographic items changes with time—how would this information be kept current? How could such information be standardized so
that it can be consistently interpreted by others? What depth of description would be useful—"good," "poor," and "bad," or "brittle paper and mildew damage?" If we have not yet found the time and money to convert all our retrospective holdings to machine-readable form, how can we possibly find time to get the book in hand for the purpose of inspecting, describing, coding, and inputting condition information?

Yet the thought persists that the powerful indexing and information-retrieval capabilities of modern bibliographic databases can prove useful in collecting, managing, and sharing condition information for certain purposes. For instance, knowing the condition of a specific book in another library could influence interlibrary loan requests; or, knowing that another library has a certain valuable item in good condition could influence preservation-treatment decisions, particularly when so many books require treatment.

Barbara Jones' first report to the RLG Preservation Committee on possible uses of RLIN for support of preservation activities suggested two areas for exploration—the microform applications described here and item-specific level of condition information. Jones suggested that if the committee could formulate a scale describing the physical condition of an item, on the basis of an evaluation of paper, binding, pest damage, etc., it could prove useful for making interlibrary loan and local decisions and for assigning last-copy responsibility. If this information was input into local fields and these fields could be indexed, lists of books in various levels of condition could be retrieved and used to establish preservation treatment priorities.

Microform enhancements and associated projects took precedence over level-of-condition projects, but the committee returned to this concept several times. While none of the proposals is implemented yet, all are worth examining for their thoughtful consideration of ways that automated bibliographic databases could support local and cooperative preservation decisions.

In 1981, discussion of Jones' proposal led the committee to appoint John Dean (Johns Hopkins, now at Cornell) and John Baker (NYPL) to develop a level-of-condition scale. The numeric scale coded the condition of paper and binding as follows:

**Paper**
0. No treatment proposed/not applicable.
1. Excellent, paper sound and chemically stable.
2. Sound but damaged.
3. Acidic but still fairly secure.
4. Poor, breaks after four corner folds.
5. Brittle, breaks after two corner folds.

**Binding**
0. No treatment proposed/not applicable.
1. Sound.
2. Outer structure damaged, i.e., board(s) detached, spine loose.
3. Outer structure broken, i.e., board(s) detached, spine loose.
4. Outer structure damaged, pages loose.
5. Badly deteriorated/damaged, i.e., outer structure destroyed, sewing broken.29

The Dean/Baker scale was never implemented in an RLG-sponsored project; however, versions of it have been successfully used in at least two condition surveys since that time. Wesley Boomgaarden, a preservation intern at NYPL in 1982, now the preservation officer at Ohio State University, adapted the scale for a condition survey of the collections of World War I and World War II books within the NYPL Research Libraries. Based on survey results, which found 90 percent of the book paper in the World War I collection to be weak or brittle and 18 percent of the bindings to be considerably deteriorated, Boomgaarden was able to recommend appropriate treatment options and to estimate treatment costs.30 He used a considerably revised Dean/Baker scale for an entirely manual survey.

In contrast, a one-year retrospective conversion/conservation project at NYU used a version of the Dean/Baker scale to code the physical condition of paper and binding of titles in the fields of ancient art and archaeology for RLIN input in retrievable form.31 The ARCHON project (archaeology and ancient art retrospective conversion and conservation) illustrates the enormous potential of bibliographic databases for collecting, manipulating, and providing data for managerial purposes.

One objective of this project was to show that the work of inspecting the book and assigning a condition code could be done quickly by a staff with specific, though limited, training. The team, consisting of one full-time preservation specialist and one part-time clerical assistant, was able to examine and assign condition codes to 200 books per day. One could extrapolate these figures to calculate that it would take this same team approximately sixty-three years to survey an entire research collection of three million volumes. Obviously, such an effort is unthinkable and probably unnecessary, but nonetheless, such a survey could be quite appropriate for specific parts of a collection, i.e., a particular strength of an RLG primary collection responsibility (PCR) area. There is little point in mulling over the impossible; but if the scope is manageable, the application is more practical.

The ARCHON staff coded the information on paper and binding condition into RLIN’s local data field 035, which is repeatable and can be indexed. Separate 035 fields were used for paper and binding codes. DeCandido describes the variety of information retrieved through RLIN searching capabilities: “We could do a very sophisticated search and ask for a list of the books we had input for IFA (Institute of Fine Arts) with good paper (codes 1 and 2) but poor binding (codes 3 and 5) that would produce a working list of recommendations for binding. . . . A search could be done combining a call number with a condition code so that wear and tear on particular areas of the collection could be gauged.”32 Condition information in shared bibliographic databases may find its most useful application when input into local data fields and used to support local managerial decisions.

In April 1983 the RLG Preservation Steering Committee set priorities for the Preservation Committee’s agenda that included the following:
Expand definition of preservation copies from the present category of master negatives perhaps to include materials from the PCR’s, materials conserved and maintained for their artifactual value, unique resources and other items in all formats which might be held by only one member. RLIN could be used for reporting these preservation copies.

Two proposals addressing this agenda topic were drafted by a subcommittee for discussion by the full committee. The first proposal, “Identifying Books on Permanent Paper in RLIN,” suggested that books photocopied according to the RLG Preservation Manual guidelines and those reprinted or published on paper meeting ANSI standards for permanence be identified in the RLIN database as an aid to libraries making acquisition decisions and setting preservation priorities. RLIN enhancements would be required, and the proposal recommended that these items appear in summary holdings screens, as does information pertaining to master negatives and queuing dates for filming.

The second proposal, “RLG Preservation and Master Copies,” tied the identification of preservation copies (books to be kept in their original format) and master copies (books to be retained in any format) to cooperative RECON or microfilming projects among the membership. The proposal outlined the criteria that a book must meet to be designated a preservation or master copy. Identifying these items in RLIN would “increase the identified pool of titles upon which cooperative development decisions can be based, . . . help avoid duplication in expensive restoration or other preservation projects, and . . . serve as an acquisition and preservation aid in identifying books already in permanent formats.” Both proposals were tabled because the committee foresaw logistical problems and difficulties in standardizing such information usefully.

RLG has recognized the implications of a shared bibliographic database for collecting and sharing the managerial data needed to tackle preservation problems. In developing specific ways in which RLIN can be used to support these activities, the Preservation Committee appears to be guided by the prudent desire to distinguish between information that is technically possible to provide and information that will actually be useful. Future efforts by RLG in this important area no will doubt continue to reflect this concern.

In August 1986 a working group that was not sponsored by RLG took up the effort to explore more ways of exploiting the MARC format for preservation purposes. Composed of preservation officers from several research libraries and representatives from ARL and the Council on Library Resources (CLR), the group was brought together by the Network Development and MARC Standards Office at LC. Its objective was to identify data elements that would, if added to the MARC communications format, assist with both local and national preservation decisions. This group shared the RLG Preservation Committee’s concern for examining the cost benefits of inputting, updating, and manipulating such data as well as for including only that preservation data with long-term usefulness. The initial proposal developed later that fall included data elements for physical characteristics of the item (e.g., paper alkalinity, acidity, brittleness, and binding
condition); preservation action (e.g., reformatting, conservation, deacidification); review, queuing, and preservation completion dates; locally defined priority information; RLG primary collecting responsibility indicator; microform characteristics information (e.g., generation, emulsion, polarity); and item availability. The proposal was discussed by the MARBI Committee at the 1987 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Chicago, and suggestions were made regarding the arrangement and scope of certain elements. The Network Development and MARC Standards Office hoped to have the final proposal ready in summer 1987.18

CONCLUSION

In the 1970s there was much talk about a national library network, a concept that De Gennaro predicts will be realized in the 1980s as the “totality of the computer systems and the online catalogs of the nation’s libraries and networks.”39 Similarly, there is much discussion today of a national preservation plan. The preservation of research materials in our nation’s libraries is served well by direction from national groups such as CLR; however, a successful national plan will likely be the aggregate of efforts by groups of libraries to share information (via De Gennaro’s concept of the national library network) that will coordinate preservation activities. In 1986 this vision became even more of a reality when RLG and OCLC announced an ongoing, joint exchange of MARC tapes for catalog records of preservation master microfilms. The initial exchange alone doubled individual OCLC and RLG member libraries’ access to preservation microform information.40 In a time when rising preservation needs and costs are pitted against shrinking and overcommitted library dollars, the automation of preservation information offers a hopeful management strategy, but only if its cost is carefully and thoughtfully balanced against its long-term usefulness.
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Effective Collection Developers: Librarians or Faculty?

David L. Vidor and Elizabeth Futas

The 1977 and 1983 collection development activities for a professional school's library collection were analyzed to determine if faculty members or librarians were more effective book selectors. Emory University's School of Business Administration library collection was selected as the test site because the researchers believed that such a collection should contain the traditional academic materials as well as the more popular materials useful to the practitioner. Effectiveness was measured in two ways: by comparing the number of titles selected at Emory in each year with the titles on the Baker list published by the Harvard Business School and a list compiled from reviews in popular business journals; and, by comparing the circulation of the books purchased.

An important component of a library's collection management activities should be measuring the effectiveness of the selection process. Will the collection building process be more effective if librarians or faculty members are primarily responsible for selection?

An evaluation of collection development activities for the School of Business Administration, Emory University, was begun in 1985 under a librarian-educator cooperative research grant from the Council on Library Resources. An analysis of the business school collection was chosen because the researchers believed that the way in which collections are built and used in professional schools within academic settings is different than for more traditional disciplines in the same setting. Much work has been done on collection development in particular subject areas, but this practitioner-oriented area was of greater interest because of the essentially dichotomous nature of such a collection. The collection contains traditional scholarly material supporting a curriculum; but, since a business school graduates practitioners, the collection also contains a more practical, popular type of material.

Emory University's business collection is integrated into the Woodruff Library, which contains materials selected for Emory College, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, and the School of Business Administr-
tion. The School of Business Administration offers degree programs on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Juniors and seniors in Emory College are permitted to take courses in the business school after successfully completing their first two years of undergraduate work. In 1977, 70 people were graduated with a Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA) degree. The class of 1983 contained 144 BBA graduates. The Master of Business Administration (MBA) is a two-year degree received by 42 graduates in 1977 and 104 graduates in 1983.

The Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA) program, an intensive seventeen-month curriculum designed for middle-level executives with potential for senior management positions, was initiated in January 1979. In 1983 twenty-five students were graduated from the EMBA program with an MBA degree. Between 1977 and 1983, the faculty of the School of Business Administration grew from twenty-eight to forty-seven members. The Woodruff Library provides service to students, faculty members, and alumni/ae.

**METHODOLOGY**

The researchers began by studying acquisitions, selection, and users of the business school collection for 1977 and 1983. *New Books in Business and Economics: Recent Additions to Baker Library*, published by the Harvard Business School, was chosen to represent an ideal collection of traditional academic reading. An ideal practical/popular reading list was compiled, including books reviewed in the business journals most often read by students and professionals in the field. These journals were identified in a survey of the MBA graduates of 1977 and 1983 conducted by Futas and Vidor in 1985.

The researchers deliberately chose the years 1977 and 1983 because responsibility for selection, approval plans in use, and fiscal organization had changed between the two years. In 1977 faculty members of the School of Business Administration were primarily responsible for selecting library materials in the fields of business and economics; payment was applied to a line in the business school dean’s budget. That year the library used an approval plan for university press books only. By 1983 primary responsibility for the selection of materials had been assumed by two librarians with MBAs, and funds were transferred annually from the business school accounts to the library’s accounts. That year the library participated in approval plans for North American trade publishers, British trade publications, and university press books.

Selection methods in 1977 were relatively haphazard and not a particularly professional effort on the part of either the business school or the library. Results of collection development efforts for 1977 and 1983 were compared to determine if recent activities under the librarians’ aegis created a better collection. Better was defined as a greater number of titles purchased by Emory University from each of the lists used, i.e., the larger the percentage of titles purchased from either the Baker list or the list of books reviewed in business periodicals, the better the selection for that year. In later discussions the researchers called this assumption into question, but at the start of the study, they hypothesized that librarians were
more effective collection builders than faculty members.

If the researchers were correct, the library's subject specialists using approval plans would have provided a better collection than the one assembled from single orders generated by faculty members. Effectiveness of selection activities was measured first by comparison of the chosen titles with titles on the Baker list and in business periodical reviews. Then, since the ultimate purpose of collection building is patron use, it was measured also by examination of circulation records for a sample of materials.

The two measures of effectiveness used in this study were entirely quantitative and cannot determine the quality of the collection. Few purely quantitative methods are based on absolutes. If circulation records are checked to determine the popularity of an item and it has not circulated very much, how can it be determined whether an item not selected would have circulated more? It also is true that circulation records do not reflect in-house use.

**Selection of Academic Materials**

Since Harvard's business school is the top-rated graduate business institution in the country, the researchers assumed its library collection was worthy of emulation, an ideal model. The library needs of undergraduates and master's-level students at Emory, however, are not as scholarly as the combined research needs of doctoral and master's students at Harvard, so course offerings in the 1977-1979 catalog from Emory's business school were examined to determine locally strong subject fields that could be expected to be reflected in its collection. The following ten categories were selected from 1977 issues of *New Books in Business and Economics* as subjects in which comparisons could be made: Accounting and Control; Corporate and Business Finance; Economic and Social Conditions of the U.S.; Financial Institutions and Capital Markets; International Business; Management; Marketing; Organizational Behavior; Personnel; and Production Management.

All 1977 issues of *New Books in Business and Economics* were examined, and items appearing in any of the ten subject categories were checked for possible ownership by Emory University. In 1977 Baker Library added 1,046 titles in these categories, while Woodruff Library added 442 of the same titles. Thus, 42.3 percent of the titles added to Baker were also added to Woodruff. Comparisons of individual subjects ranged from a low of 16 percent in Organizational Behavior to a high of 59.3 percent in Economic and Social Conditions of the U.S. The books acquired within the selected categories by Emory in 1977 are enumerated in table 1.

Although the same list-checking methodology was used for both 1977 and 1983 books, direct comparison between these years is not possible because subject areas in the 1983 issues of *Recent Additions to Baker Library* differ slightly from those used in 1977. Eight subjects were selected for comparison in 1983: Accounting and Control; Finance; Human Resource Management; International Business; Management; Marketing; Production and Operations Management; and U.S. Economic and Social Conditions. During 1983, 1,663 titles in these subjects were added to the Baker
**TABLE 1**

**Emory Acquisitions of Baker List Titles, 1977**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Titles on Bibliography</th>
<th>Titles Acquired</th>
<th>% Acquired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accounting &amp; Control</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Corporate &amp; Business Finance</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economic &amp; Social Conditions of U.S.</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Financial Institutions &amp; Capital Markets</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. International Business</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marketing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Organizational Behavior</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Personnel</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Production Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,046</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 2**

**Emory Acquisitions of Baker List Titles, 1983**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of Titles on List</th>
<th>No. of Titles Acquired</th>
<th>% Acquired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Accounting &amp; Control</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finance</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Human Resource Management</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. International Business</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Management</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Marketing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Production &amp; Operations</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. U.S. Economic &amp; Social Conditions</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>610</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library, but only 36.7 percent of that total, or 610 of the same titles, were added at Woodruff Library. Within individual subjects, U.S. Economic and Social Conditions continued to have the highest correlation, with a 52.0 percent duplication of titles. Woodruff added only 29.1 percent of the titles on the Baker List in the area of Human Resource Management. Titles acquired by Emory University’s Woodruff Library appearing on the 1983 Baker List are shown in table 2.

**EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC MATERIALS SELECTION**

The proportion of new books included on the Baker list and purchased by Emory declined 5.6 percent from 1977 to 1983; however, the actual number of books that appeared on Harvard’s list and were purchased for Woodruff Library increased 38.0 percent, from 442 in 1977 to 610 in 1983. Using average prices for hardcover business books found in the
1985 Bowker Annual, actual dollar expenditures by Emory University rose from $7,956 in 1977 to $16,909 in 1983, an increase of 112.5 percent. While more titles were added to Woodruff Library and more money was spent in 1983 than in 1977, the percentage of items that appeared on the Baker list and were purchased by Emory declined from 42.3 to 36.7 percent. It seemed that Harvard was adding titles and spending additional monies at a faster rate than Emory. It would have been interesting to look at those items acquired by Emory that were not on the Baker list, but the way in which purchasing was done made that impossible. Perhaps in replicating the present study, this could be analyzed.

COMPARING ACADEMIC COLLECTIONS BY LIST CHECKING

Any comparison of academic libraries should account for differences in degree programs offered, student enrollment, and number of faculty members. Harvard’s business school offers a master’s degree and a doctorate, but no undergraduate business degree. Emory’s business school consists of undergraduates and master’s-level students. In 1977 Harvard had seven times more business school students than Emory. The Harvard Business School also had six times more faculty members in 1977 than Emory’s School of Business Administration.

The validity of evaluating academic materials in the business collection at Emory by means of a list-checking exercise using Harvard’s Baker Library as the paradigm was based on two assumptions: list checking is a valid measurement of collection development effectiveness, and, the better library collection is the larger library collection, i.e., “quantity eventually becomes quality.” When it is recognized that all business schools are not equal, it also must be recognized that all library collections need not be identical either.

The generally accepted practice of list checking as a means of collection evaluation should be questioned because, as demonstrated in this study, Emory’s student and faculty populations are not equivalent to Harvard’s, yet the list-checking procedure assumes comparability if the results are to be meaningful. A more accurate evaluation could be made if a list from a school of similar size, with similar academic programs, and a library of similar stature could be checked. Unfortunately, in this situation (and in most cases), the only list available to check was generated by a highly ranked institution that was both older and larger.

List checking in collection evaluation will become a more valuable technique when lists that differentiate quality from quantity can be generated, when a definition for an appropriately sized collection for each situation can be determined, and when more than one list is checked.

EVALUATION OF COLLECTION USE

The second measure of effectiveness used in this part of the survey was examination of the circulation records of a sample of selected materials. To determine patron use of the books from the Baker Library list owned by Emory University, a simple random sample of 20 percent was taken. Only
circulating books or those with potentially identifiable circulation statistics were included in the working population; thus noncirculating reference books and government documents for which a circulation record is not retained at Woodruff were not included.

The circulation system at Emory was not automated in any way, so each item in the sample was examined physically to determine if at least one due-date stamp appeared on the circulation record slip glued inside the cover. Of the seventy books comprising the 1977 sample, fifty-five, or 78.6 percent, had circulated at least once; eleven, or 15.7 percent, had never circulated; and four, or 5.7 percent, could not be located either on the shelf or in the circulation files. The sample for 1983 contained eighty-four books, of which fifty-six, or 66.7 percent, had circulated at least once; twenty-five, or 29.8 percent, had never circulated; and three, or 3.6 percent, could not be located.

When comparing the results, it must be taken into account that books purchased in 1977 had more time in which to circulate. An effort was made to identify the number of items from the 1977 sample that circulated in the first three years of shelf life so that a fairer comparison could be made with circulation data for 1983 materials. Since filled record slips are removed from books, actual circulation data cannot be determined for items with evidence of a removed slip; however, since evidence of a removed slip usually indicates circulation activity, books with such evidence as well as those with slips stamped 1977, 1978, or 1979 were counted as having circulated during a period of time comparable to the 1983 sample. This measurement indicated that 74.5 percent of the 1977 sample circulated during the first three years of shelf life, compared with 66.7 percent of the 1983 sample. The 1977 sample showed a 78.6 percent circulation rate during the full nine years of shelf life. Table 3 shows circulation rates.

The data gathered in this study on the selection and use of academic materials does not appear to support the expectation that librarians will perform better vis-à-vis their faculty counterparts in the area of collection building. The percentage of titles from the Baker list selected for Woodruff was higher by nearly 6 percent when faculty members had primary responsibility, but the absolute number of titles selected increased almost 40 percent when librarians had primary responsibility. An evaluator must decide which is more important, a change in the rate of selection or in the absolute numbers of titles selected.

**SELECTION OF PROFESSIONAL MATERIALS**

A survey of Emory’s 1977 and 1983 MBA graduates revealed that, both as students and professionals, they read the following six periodicals most frequently: *Barron’s, Business Week, Forbes, Fortune, Harvard Business Review*, and the *Wall Street Journal*. A list of the books reviewed in these sources during 1977 and 1983 was compiled to serve as a model for collections of practical, popular literature in these years. Since this study covered only the business collections, reviews were divided into two categories: business literature (determined by the business bibliographer) and “other.” When the reviews were examined, *Forbes* was excluded from
TABLE 3
CIRCULATION RATES FOR ACADEMIC MATERIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1977 Sample</th>
<th>1977 Sample</th>
<th>1983 Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Circulation during entire 9 years of shelf life)</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Probable circulation during first 3 years of shelf life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4
BOOKS REVIEWED IN SELECTED BUSINESS PERIODICALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Total Reviews No.</th>
<th>Business Reviews No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other Topics No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barron’s</td>
<td>1977 55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Week</td>
<td>1977 88</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td>1977 11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business Review</td>
<td>1977 77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>1977 193</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1977 424</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1983 423</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the study because of the disproportionate number of books on nonbusiness subjects present.

In 1977 the five remaining periodicals had 424 book reviews. Only 40.8 percent of these reviews (173 titles) were of business books, while 59.2 percent (251 titles) were on other topics. Six years later, 423 books were reviewed by the same five sources, 148 business titles (35 percent) and 275 on other subjects (65 percent), as shown in table 4.

Woodruff Library’s records were examined to determine how many of the reviewed books were purchased. It was found that they owned 109 (63 percent) of the business books reviewed in 1977 and 105 (70.9 percent) of those reviewed in 1983. Taking each periodical individually, the number of reviewed titles owned ranged from a low of nearly 53 percent to a high of 92.3 percent (see table 5).

The periodicals with the highest and lowest percentages of business titles owned by Woodruff Library changed during the period. In 1977 Emory owned 90 percent of the business titles reviewed in Business Week but only 53.2 percent of those reviewed in the Harvard Business Review. Six years later Fortune led the way: 92.3 percent of the business books reviewed there were found in the Woodruff Library, which contained, at the other end of the scale, only 52.9 percent of those reviewed in Barron’s. No attempt was made to determine which books, or even how many books, received favorable reviews. A high acquisition rate in this study was consid-
TABLE 5
WOODRUFF LIBRARY HOLDINGS OF BUSINESS BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Reviews</th>
<th>Owned by Emory</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron’s</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Week</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business Review</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Street Journal</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ened good, based on the assumption that the appearance of any review merits purchase of a title.

Some books were reviewed in more than one of the periodicals examined. In 1977, fifty titles were reviewed in two, three, or four of the periodicals examined (no book was reviewed in all five). Thirty-one of these (62 percent) were business titles. If a business book was reviewed in these periodicals, it was likely to receive multiple reviews. This was true also in 1983, when 57.6 percent of the books with multiple reviews were business books, while only 35 percent of all reviews were of business books.

When statistics for the purchase of business books with multiple reviews are compared to those for the purchase of business books in general, it is likely that books with multiple reviews will be purchased. Of the thirty-one business books with multiple reviews in 1977, twenty-three (74.2 percent) were purchased by Emory. In 1983 sixteen of the nineteen books (84.2 percent) with multiple reviews were purchased. For both 1977 and 1983, at least 10 percent more business books with multiple reviews were purchased than business books in general (see table 6).

**EVALUATION OF SELECTION AND USE OF PROFESSIONAL BOOKS**

The purchase of business books reviewed in the five studied periodicals increased 7.9 percent from 1977 to 1983, while the actual number of titles selected decreased slightly from 109 to 105. For professional materials, librarian’s collection development activities appeared to be more effective because the ratio of titles chosen to titles available was higher.

To find out how many of the business books identified by reviews in these periodicals and owned by Emory University had circulated, a random sample of 20 percent was taken. Because circulation is related to books and not their reviews, all books were included only once in the working population, eliminating multiple sampling of the same book because of multiple reviews. Samples of seventeen books were obtained for both 1977 and 1983. All books in the 1983 sample had circulated, but only
fifteen in the 1977 sample had circulated at least once (88.2 percent); one book (5.9 percent) had not circulated at all; and the remaining book was missing.

The researchers assumed that books receiving multiple reviews would have a greater tendency to circulate because more people could have read a review and be aware of the title’s existence. Any conclusions were impossible to validate, however, because of the small number of titles involved. Still, it is interesting to note the circulation frequency of books with multiple reviews: while 88.2 percent of the 1977 business books sample circulated at least once, only 87 percent of those receiving multiple reviews (and owned by Emory) circulated. The results were identical for the 1983 titles: all seventeen titles in the general sample circulated at least once, as had all sixteen of the business titles receiving multiple reviews in the five key business periodicals. The existence of multiple reviews did not increase the chances that a title would circulate, calling into question the requirement in many selection policies that two or more reviews must be obtained before acquiring a title.

The larger circulation rate of the selected 1983 titles and the higher acquisition rate of available 1983 titles appear to indicate that librarian collection developers were more effective than faculty members in building the collection of professional business materials.

### SUMMARY

Based upon the data gathered in this study, the researchers cannot state that librarians are appreciably more effective than faculty members in building a business library collection, although in certain areas they appeared to make better choices of material. The researchers’ inability to come to definitive conclusions matches conflicting results from other studies comparing the circulation rates of material selected by faculty and librarians. Sellen, summarizing the findings of three well-known studies, stated

Evans, in two related studies, examined which selector’s books (faculty, librarians, or approval plans) had the highest circulation. He found that librarians selected a greater number of titles that were used. Bingham, replicating Evans, found that books selected by faculty were circulated more frequently than those selected by librarians, except in the humanities. Geyer, however, found that there was no significant difference in the circulation patterns of books selected by faculty and those selected by librarians.18
Examining each of the two components needed in professional school collections—academic and practical materials—revealed that librarians who selected for this particular field at this particular time at Emory University created a stronger practical collection of materials, given the number of titles selected and patron use of selected titles. Applying the same criteria to the selection of academic materials gave ambiguous results concerning the relative effectiveness of faculty members and librarians as collection builders. The hypothesis that librarians are more effective collection developers than faculty members has not been upheld.
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Collection Development in Foreign Literatures at Medium-sized Academic Libraries

Rebecca Schreiner-Robles

A small body of research exists in the library literature on collection development of foreign literatures at large research libraries, but very little is found for medium-sized academic libraries. A study was conducted of collection development methods for French, German, and Spanish literatures at twenty-nine medium-sized university libraries. Results indicate that bibliographers at these libraries depend on inadequate reviewing sources and domestic approval plans for developing these literatures. A comparison of selection methods revealed that bibliographers depend on faculty requests for foreign literature purchases to a much greater extent than for domestic purchases. Increased awareness of foreign approval plans, reviewing sources and book-dealers as well as more active bibliographer participation in selection for foreign literatures is recommended.

The majority of research on collection development of foreign literature is conducted at large research libraries that support doctoral programs in world languages and literatures. Authors of these articles discuss issues specific to a comprehensive level of collection development such as problems with foreign bookdealers, ephemera, small presses, and control over approval and blanket order plans. Collection development of French, German, and Spanish literatures at medium-sized university libraries however, often involves a range of different problems that are not addressed in the library literature. This article and accompanying survey is an attempt to open up this area for further discussion and research at medium-sized academic libraries.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the 1970s, libraries were forced to cut back foreign literature acquisitions due to declining enrollment in foreign language classes, the demise of government and cooperative gathering plans for foreign literature, and the impact of inflation and smaller budgets on foreign literature collections. Foreign literature also came under increasing scrutiny because use statis-
tics revealed low circulation of material in the humanities compared to the sciences. In a review of use studies in the humanities, Perrault concludes that by the early 1980s, the "buy for use" mentality was moderated by the realization that impairment of the potential of research-level institutions could result. Since foreign literature materials rank at the low end of the use scale, even for the humanities, this area of collection development has recovered the least from the retrenchment of the seventies. Foreign literature bibliographers at major research libraries doubted their mission, e.g., Holley, a cataloger at Yale, claims that "the initial question remains as to whether we are spending wisely in an area [foreign literature] with such a small-use probability." On the other side of the debate, Rutledge warns against "collection policies that are determined by use defined as 'circulation,' [since] the library may end up with a research collection in which pulp novels vastly outweigh the serious literature." He advocates "purchases for 'long-range' use . . . which aids the discovery, evaluation and rediscovery of literary talents." At medium-sized academic libraries where subject specialists often must allocate money over many subject areas, the emphasis given foreign literatures is at greater risk than at large research libraries. One problem is that responsible librarians may not have the expertise for the job of working with foreign reviewing sources and book markets. Messick argues, "it would be inappropriate for subject specialists at smaller academic libraries to have their subject competence in a field represented in the university by a small and/or weak department" and that "one really has little choice but to use the optimum strategy of stressing the stronger and more library-oriented departments and subjects." Woodhead, in an argument against any subject specialization at all for librarians, found that British bibliographers can do a competent job by relying on their knowledge of the subject literature rather than formal academic training.

When librarians do not have the background to select materials methodically in the area of foreign literatures, one option is to enlist the assistance of foreign languages faculty. For foreign literature collection development, Rutledge, Welsch, and Sewell all advise combining faculty requests with author/poet standing order lists to build large research collections. At smaller institutions, large research collections are not feasible. In an article describing collection development in foreign literatures at one medium-sized academic library, Bousfield writes that low circulation and few course offerings have led her to "purchase foreign language publications at faculty request only." Since faculty selection is irregular at her institution, however, she confesses she is "by no means comfortable with the minimal support [she gives] to foreign language study." Bousfield does not mention any solutions and claims that a search for other articles on this topic turned up nothing.

Articles on collection development of foreign literatures are changing from defensive debates about use studies to more aggressive objections against cultural bias in North American book markets geared almost exclusively toward English-language materials. Easterbrook summarized problems regarding selection and acquisition of Third World materials. During the following discussion among bibliographers in attendance, some as-
asserted that the bias in U.S. reviewing sources amounted to no less than "cultural imperialism."" Some years earlier Freudenthal accused the editors of Encyclopedia Britannica, Books for College Libraries, Reader's Advisor, and Fiction Catalog of having policies for inclusion that were "arbitrary, directionless and intellectually narrow" and that librarians overlooked their responsibility to build well-rounded foreign literature collections. The rise of important new fiction and poetry from Third World countries and the universal perspective of literary theorists elicits surprisingly little notice in library literature about how to meet increasing demand for foreign language fiction, poetry and theory outside the mainstream of western literature.

William J. Bennett, while chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities, called on higher education to provide all students an essential knowledge of the humanities including "demonstrable proficiency in a foreign language . . . and the ability to view that language as an avenue into another culture." The call for action continued into 1986 as Eastman stated that "students and the American public are the most provincially educated people in the world" and that such ignorance assures America's "continual decline in the . . . intellectual markets of the world."

**SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

Finding a solution to the problem starts with an assessment of the status quo. To begin to gather data on collection development methods in foreign literatures at medium-sized university libraries, a questionnaire was mailed in April, 1986 to foreign languages/literatures bibliographers at twenty-nine academic libraries in public universities offering bachelor's or master's degrees in German, French, Spanish and English (see appendix 1). None of the institutions surveyed offered a Ph.D. in any foreign or English/American literatures. Book holdings of the surveyed libraries ranged from about 240,000 to 750,999 volumes. Eleven libraries had holdings of fewer than 400,000 volumes, fourteen had 400,000 to 600,000 volumes, and four had more than 600,000.

The survey asked for information in five areas: (1) language and academic background of the bibliographer; (2) bases of selection decisions for foreign literatures in English translation and original language; (3) annual acquisition rates for French, German, and Spanish literatures compared to English/American literature; (4) acquisition practices; and (5) library users. [The survey form is appended at end of this article.] The hypothesis was that lack of familiarity with the field of foreign literatures as well as ineffective collection development methods in this area led to passive dependence on faculty requests, domestic approval plans and selection tools culturally-biased against foreign literatures.

More than 70 percent of the librarians (twenty-one of twenty-nine) completed the survey, fourteen by mail and seven in telephone interviews during July 1986. These individuals, all of whom select or oversee faculty selection of foreign literatures at their libraries, hold a variety of positions. Seven (33 percent) are heads of collection development; five (23.8 percent) are reference librarians; five (23.8 percent) are acquisitions librarians; one is a cataloger; one is "executive assistant for library services"
and another is “head of Chicano Resource Center.” Only one librarian specialized in language/literature bibliography.

FINDINGS

These librarians are responsible for collection development in many subject areas. Nine respondents (42.8 percent) reported they collect in all areas of the curriculum, while another nine listed an average of seven subject fields in the humanities for which they select books. In three libraries, foreign literatures are lumped together with such diverse disciplines as physical education, business, computer science and mathematics.

Of fourteen librarians with additional graduate degrees beyond the MLS, six were in English. (Of these, four held second master’s degrees and two held Ph.Ds.) Only two out of fourteen did graduate work in a foreign language—one had a master’s degree in German and another, in Russian. Six out of the twenty-one respondents had bachelor’s degrees in a foreign language.

All but one librarian reported some degree of foreign language ability. Eight librarians had limited reading knowledge, seven had good reading knowledge with some proficiency in the spoken language, and four reported good reading, writing, and speaking skills.

All twenty-one respondents acquire foreign fiction, poetry, and criticism in their original languages. When asked what criteria were used in deciding to purchase foreign literature in English translation, faculty requests, use by students studying literature in translation, book reviews, popularity of author, and quality of work were the most common responses. A slight majority ranked curriculum as the most important factor used to make selection decisions for foreign literatures in both English translation and the original language.

When asked to assess collection strengths and weaknesses, strengths were given as coverage of main authors and relevancy to curriculum. Weaknesses included lack of comprehensiveness, insufficient literary criticism and contemporary literature, mediocrity of the collection as a whole, very small size of the collection, or an unbalanced collection resulting from reliance on faculty selection.

A little more than half (52 percent) of the respondents provided annual acquisition figures and two responded in dollar amounts. On average, ten libraries order 30 to 50 percent fewer book titles for all three degree programs in French, German, and Spanish than for one degree program in English. Of these institutions, two offer master’s degrees in both English and Spanish. Six offer the master’s in English as well as all three foreign literatures—French, German, and Spanish. Two offer a master’s in English and bachelor’s degrees in each of the other three foreign languages. One offers the bachelor’s in English, French, German and Spanish.

Twelve libraries (57 percent) use approval plans for English/American literature. Eight respondents (38 percent) claim that they also use approval plans for foreign literatures in the original language but, when asked which book dealers they use, seven of the eight responded “Blackwell North America” or “Baker & Taylor.” Both of these dealers have domestic programs and acquire very little fiction, poetry, or criticism in the original language.
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Methods for Fiction, Poetry, and Criticism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Approval Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Standing Order Author List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Standing Order Poet List</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Direct Orders from Librarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One library uses foreign book dealers who distribute fiction, poetry, and criticism in the original language.

All twenty-one librarians do their own selection for English/American literature yet only twelve (57 percent) select books for the foreign language departments (see table 1). Three of these respondents said their own ordering was “minimal” or “limited.” Of those who order foreign literature, six had educational background in literature. Nine librarians who turned selection over to faculty had degrees in a variety of disciplines, including architecture, history, anthropology, and education.

For foreign literature selection, all twenty-one respondents use publishers’ catalogs, jobber selection forms, and U.S. reviewing sources such as Choice and Library Journal. Only four (19 percent) use reviews from foreign literature journals and order slips from foreign book dealers.

Two universities in the survey recently lost their graduate programs in foreign languages and a third expects to lose its program in the near future. Several librarians interviewed on the telephone repeatedly emphasized that their foreign language departments were “very small.” Ten respondents (47 percent) said their schools have undergraduate majors in foreign fiction and poetry and need supporting literature in order for students to write research papers. Discouragingly, nine librarians (43 percent) said they did not know what their undergraduate majors in foreign languages needed in order to do research.

To summarize, only two of the twenty-one libraries surveyed have aggressive, systematic foreign literature collection development programs using a combination of methods such as approval plans through foreign book dealers, author/poet lists, and faculty/bibliographer selection.

CONCLUSIONS

Results of the survey indicate that medium-sized academic libraries rely on domestic approval plans and U.S. reviewing sources as collection development methods for foreign literatures. The original hypothesis for this study was that these methods are used due to lack of familiarity with the field of foreign literatures and collection development methods required. Although only one-third of the respondents had academic backgrounds in a foreign literature, many librarians will acquaint themselves with a discipline through their own reading and one cannot assume that the remaining two-thirds are totally unfamiliar with the study of foreign literatures. Li-
Library administrators should, however, make a greater effort to hire bibliographers for these positions with degrees in foreign literatures. Librarians accustomed to studying the literary cultures of other countries may be more aware of provincialism in a literature collection and more motivated to balance purchases for English and American literatures with material from other countries.

The survey results also indicate that librarians rely more on faculty selection for foreign literatures than for English/American literature. Since all but one respondent had some foreign-language skill, language should not be a major barrier to librarians' participation in selection. At smaller institutions with low foreign-language enrollments and relatively low circulation of foreign literatures, librarians may not feel it worth the extra effort to supplement faculty orders. However, faculty selection may be sporadic or one foreign language department may order more than another. Since literary scholars rely on books in the library as their primary tools for research, an unbalanced or non-existent library collection adds to the factors that keep foreign language departments small. Orders from faculty should be just one of many methods systematically used to build a representative, balanced collection for current and future scholars.

The surveyed libraries' lack of foreign approval plans and dependence on faculty selection reveals a marked lack of systematic control over foreign literatures collections. These practices may result in unbalanced selection in this area and the danger of exaggerated provincialism in collections at libraries of this size. Further empirical research needs to be done to learn about sources for foreign literature materials for libraries of this size and to enhance understanding of problems in this area of collection development.

**Recommendations**

For English and American literature, librarians in the survey who do not have approval plans use direct orders from both faculty and bibliographers. At the least, the same effort should be made by bibliographers to supplement faculty orders for foreign literatures. Librarians responsible for foreign literature collections need to familiarize themselves with reviewing sources that are not biased in favor of English-language materials. For example, only two respondents in the survey mentioned *World Literature Today* as a selection tool for foreign literatures. This excellent journal provides timely reviews of the most important literary criticism, fiction, poetry, and essays originating in France, Germany, Latin America, Spain, and elsewhere. *World Literature Today* is an ideal selection tool for librarians, since it specializes in English-language reviews of foreign literature in their original languages.

In addition, B.H. Blackwell's in England offers a tailor-made, foreign acquisitions approval plan for medium-sized academic libraries based on a living author/poet list. Faculty and librarians, working together, can arrive at a list of writers for which they need literary criticism and primary works in the original language, and they can revise the list at any time. Blackwell's will also supplement approval shipments with query sheets from the country's book publishing record that can be circulated among
faculty for more direct orders. The one weakness of this program is that it
does not provide direct-approval shipments from Latin America, although
some titles from those countries can be acquired in the Spanish shipment.
Blackwell’s Continental Literature Plan is used by the University of Wash-
ington (Seattle); University of Hawaii (Manoa); Trinity University (San
Antonio); and Syracuse University. As important criticism, fiction, and poetry from other countries goes out of
print, library collections will become increasingly provincial without
the reinforcement of adequate development methods. One way librarians
can work against insularity in American culture is to develop and preserve
foreign literature collections systematically, in order to give future
scholars and students in libraries of all sizes the opportunity to research
world literature.
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APPENDIX 1.
SURVEY OF BIBLIOGRAPHERS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

The following questions are designed to obtain information on collection development in foreign languages and literatures at medium-sized academic libraries. Complete confidentiality is guaranteed so please answer each question as frankly as possible.

A. PERSONAL

1. What is your position title?

2. What is your educational background? (Please circle all letters that apply).
   a. Bachelor's Major: ____________________________
   b. Master's in Library Science: ___________________
   c. Second Master's in __________________________
   d. Ph.D. Specialization: _________________________
   e. Other. Please Specify: _______________________

3. Do you have any of the following foreign language skills?
   a. None.
   b. Limited reading knowledge only.
   c. Good reading knowledge with some proficiency in the spoken language.
   d. Good reading, writing, speaking skills.

4. How many years of experience do you have in academic library collection development?
   a. One   d. Four
   b. Two   e. Five
   c. Three  f. More than five.

5. In what subject areas do you order books? [Please include all disciplines in addition to foreign languages and literatures.]

B. COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS

6. Does your library acquire works of foreign fiction, poetry and/or criticism in the original language?
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
   c. Other. Please comment: _______________________

7. On the basis of what criteria do you buy foreign literature and criticism in English translation?

8. Please rank the following in order of importance as factors you use to make selection decisions in foreign languages and literatures. [1 = most important; 6 = least important]
   — Use [How often you feel the book will be checked out]
   — Enrollment figures in the department(s) of foreign languages.
   — The curriculum offered in the department(s) of foreign languages.
   — The degree(s) your university offers in the book's subject areas.
   — Faculty research interests.
   — Book reviews.
   — Other. Please specify: _______________________

9. What do you think are the strengths of your current library collection in foreign languages and literatures?

10. What do you think are the weaknesses of your current library collection in foreign languages and literatures?

C. RATE OF COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

The questions below ask you to provide annual acquisition figures. If you do not have access to these figures, please forward these questions to the individual who could provide them. If your statistics do not break down by the language of the book, please combine questions number 12 and 13.
11. How many titles does your library order annually in all subject areas for which you are responsible for selection? [Please see Question 5].

12. How many titles in foreign languages and literatures in the original language does your library order annually? [LC ranges PC, PD, PQ and PT and, if possible, foreign literary theory—PN].

13. How many titles in foreign languages and literatures in English translation does your library order annually? [LC ranges PC, PD, PQ and PT, and, if possible, foreign literary theory—PN].

14. How many titles in English and American languages and literatures does your library order annually? [LC ranges PE, PR, PS].

D. ACQUISITION PRACTICES

15. Please circle the methods your library uses to acquire English and American fiction, poetry and criticism.
   a. Approval plan with ____________________________
   b. Standing order author list.
   c. Standing order poet list.
   d. Faculty requests.
   e. Orders from librarian/bibliographer.
   f. Other. Please specify: __________________________

16. Please circle the methods your library uses to acquire foreign fiction, poetry and criticism in English translation.
   a. Approval plan with ____________________________
   b. Standing order author list.
   c. Standing order poet list.
   d. Faculty requests.
   e. Orders from librarian/bibliographer.
   f. Other. Please specify: __________________________

17. Please circle the methods that your library uses to acquire foreign fiction, poetry, and criticism in the original language.
   a. Approval plan with ____________________________
   b. Standing order author list.
   c. Standing order poet list.
   d. Faculty requests.
   e. Orders from librarian/bibliographer.
   f. Other. Please specify: __________________________

18. What selection tools do you and/or faculty use for foreign languages and literatures?

E. USERS

19. Does your institution offer graduate degrees in the following languages? (Please circle all that apply).
   a. French
   b. German
   c. Spanish
   d. Other. Please specify: __________________________

20. Do the undergraduate majors in foreign languages at your institution need foreign fiction, poetry, and/or criticism in your library in order to write research papers? [At least 10 pages long with footnotes and bibliography of books and periodicals].
   a. Yes
   b. No.
   c. I don’t know
   d. Other. Please comment:

21. Where do the faculty from the foreign language departments rank in your interlibrary loan statistics on items borrowed?
Experience counts in authority control. And if your library is choosing a vendor to apply authority control to your MARC records before you put them online, consider the following:

Blackwell North America has 12 years experience performing retrospective automated authority control edits.

We have performed subject authority control on hundreds of MARC databases since LC began issuing machine readable subject authority data in 1973; and name authority control on over 150 MARC databases since LC began issuing machine readable name authority data in 1982. In addition, we were first to offer library specific authority files for loading into online systems. Our staff of authority control editors has combined experience of over 33 years, and applies manual corrections to your bibliographic records where the automated system stops.

Blackwell is interested in your project, and will deliver professional service on schedule.

For more information on authority control for your library, contact Blackwell's authorities on authority control at the address below.

Technical Services Division
BLACKWELL NORTH AMERICA, INC.
6024 S.W. Jean Road, Building G
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
Phone toll-free (800) 547-6426

© Blackwell North America, 1987
High-Tech Shopping for Serials Automation: Linking Public and Technical Services—an Introduction

Pamela Bluh and Will Hepfer, Editors

The four papers comprising this subsection of LRTS were originally presented at the RTSD Serials Section program on June 27, 1987, in San Francisco, California.

When the 1987 RTSD Serials Section Program Committee first convened in June 1986, cochairs Pamela Bluh and Will Hepfer and committee members Mary Elizabeth Clack, Elliot Kanter, Miriam Palm, and Martha Richardson were charged with developing a program that would support and enhance the Annual Conference theme "Linking the Services: Public and Technical." Serials automation was the focal point and, although no one disputed that serving the needs of library users must always be the primary concern, the committee had trouble settling on one direction that would encompass all the perceived needs and wants of staff in both branches of service. Clearly, the matter involved much more than agreement on a computerized serial record.

Eventual surrender on the task of defining a single approach was liberating. With it came the realization that serials automation is too complex to be addressed from only one point of view. Instead, many viewpoints emerged when committee members expanded their thinking. Four distinct areas were identified as mandatory considerations, in addition to the overarching objective of improving library service: (1) Technical aspects of serials processing, such as database creation, claiming, and fiscal control; (2) Public services perspectives, dealing with access to information, union listing, and user needs; (3) Relationship of technical specifications to user requirements; and (4) System capabilities, hardware, and performance.

Once these parameters were defined, the next step was to identify and
recruit speakers with the requisite expertise to address these issues. This was not a difficult mission because committee members were quick to suggest highly qualified persons who readily accepted the invitation to participate.

Drafts of all four presentations were collected one month before the conference and distributed among the participants. Some fine-tuning resulted, mainly by speakers conferring among themselves about how best to minimize some of the inevitable overlap that occurred.

Wilma Reid Cipolla was chosen to represent the public services perspective. Before becoming director of the Undergraduate Library, State University of New York at Buffalo, in 1983, Cipolla served as head of Serial Records and head of the Serials Department there. She is aware of the importance of merging technical requirements and public service needs in the process of automating. Her paper, “Finding a Way Out of the Serials Maze,” which follows, opens this series.

Jean Walter Farrington, head of the Serials Department at University of Pennsylvania, considers serials automation from the technical-service point of view. Farrington held a variety of serials positions at State University of New York at Albany before joining the Van Pelt Library staff. She also served as assistant head and acting head of Circulation at Penn, which has an automated circulation control system, and thus has experience with computer-based processes affecting the public. Her paper is “Selecting a Serials System: The Technical Services Perspective.”

Exploring the relationship between public and technical services in serials automation, Rian Miller-McIrvine offers a thoughtful paper: “Linking Public and Technical Services Perspectives: Challenges for Serials Automation.” Miller-McIrvine, manager of the OCLC Services Division of PALINET, has considerable experience evaluating and implementing computer-based serials control systems and has been actively involved with several union-listing projects.

James E. Rush, president of James E. Rush Associates (JERA), was chosen for his knowledge of hardware requirements. He worked with automation and information systems in a variety of capacities and for a number of years served as director of Research and Development at OCLC, Inc. JERA's Library Systems Evaluation Guides include a book on serials control systems offering essential information to selectors of such a system. His paper, “Hardware Considerations for Automated Serials Systems,” informs and educates in this critical area.

In keeping with the nature of its subject, “High-Tech Shopping for Serials Automation: Linking Public and Technical Services” is being published serially, with one paper in this issue and the others in subsequent issues of LRTS. We hope you will find them as illuminating as their San Francisco audience did.
Finding a Way Out of the Serials Maze

Wilma Reid Cipolla

Searching for information in the periodical literature is a multistep process, fraught with unexpected and seemingly endless frustrations. Users want to find information quickly and easily, but libraries frequently fail to meet their needs where serials are concerned. This paper presents seven suggestions for harnessing the power of the computer to find a way out of the 'serials maze.'

THE PROBLEM

Imagine, if you will, an ordinary undergraduate at a large university who must write a short paper on a subject of current interest, an assignment requiring citations to at least three periodical articles. The undergraduate, possessing little or no knowledge of search strategy, begins by browsing among current periodical issues but, finding that this approach produces few results, turns to the reference librarian for help. The ensuing search of periodical indexes is encouraging, because of the large number of relevant articles found, but hunting for the periodical volumes is not so easy. Another trip to the librarian reveals the codes to journal title abbreviations and leads to the library's union list of serials. By this time the first wave of enthusiasm has begun to wane, but real discouragement sets in with the discovery that half the magazines are located in other libraries on campus. The weary searcher decides to limit citations to articles in familiar titles such as *Time*, *Newsweek*, and *Rolling Stone*. Learning from experience, the undergraduate asks the librarian exact directions to earlier issues. Discouragement turns to disgust when, upon reaching the bound periodical shelves, the undergraduate finds that the *Newsweek* volume is not there, the article from *Time* has been ripped out, and there are no volumes at all of *Rolling Stone*!

This story is, unfortunately, all too familiar. As library users, all of us have similar experiences at one time or another. As librarians, we have a great deal of sympathy for users who encounter these problems, but we do very little about it. Looking at the situation from the public services point of view, the fact must be faced that frequently, if not regularly, we fail to meet the user's needs where serials are concerned.

What are those needs? In very simple terms, the user wants to (1) find an article on a given topic; (2) find the location of the periodical containing that article; (3) find the issue and find it immediately.

Wilma Reid Cipolla is Director of the Undergraduate Library, State University of New York at Buffalo.
Is this expectation reasonable? Judging from recent literature, it would seem so. A November 1986 article in *College & Research Libraries*, using the phrase “immediacy of access” to describe today’s “online culture,” pointed out that “users focus on results, not procedures.” Taking the same approach, this paper will focus on the result—finding a way out of the serials maze—and will suggest some ways that online systems can help.

**The Serials Maze**

In a 1982 article entitled “The Serials Maze,” Barbara Pinzelik identified twenty-four possible decision points in any given serials search, six being the minimum (see figure 1). Pinzelik has not painted an overly complex picture. In our hypothetical story, the typical undergraduate stopped after five separate, unsuccessful attempts to locate a periodical article and, in the process, found it necessary to consult a librarian three times, each request being for low-level, directional reference service.

Searching for information in the periodical literature is a multistep process, but for many users it is a process fraught with unexpected and seemingly endless frustrations. Analysis of serials users portrays a wide range of retrieval rates in unmediated searches: Hanson and Serebnick’s study recorded a 43 percent success; Murfin claimed 55 percent satisfaction; Adalian, Rockman, and Rodie found 80.6 percent success in their survey; Golden, Golden, and Lenzini’s sample reported 84 percent completed searches. Despite the lack of statistical correlation between these studies, they concur in attributing lack of success to three main factors—collection failure, catalog failure, and user failure.

Common instances of user failure include: not realizing that periodical articles cannot be searched in the card catalog; not understanding the meaning of the words current and bound; not knowing that current issues, bound volumes, and microforms may be shelved in different places; and not recognizing that periodical titles in index citations are abbreviations. Examples of catalog failure are attributable to filing rules (finding New York but not Newsweek); initialisms (locating a U.S. government publication but completely missing *U.S. News and World Report*); corporate authorship (overlooking the *Department of State Bulletin*); and index citations that give only chronological designators and omit volume and issue numbers linking citations to holdings statements. Another cause of failure, not mentioned in the literature, is the librarian, who often fails as mediator between the user and the technical system because of inability to deal with multiple holdings records in different parts of the library; differing levels of detail between various records; contradictory and incomplete data; and, worst of all, lack of control over theft and mutilation.

In this age of technological marvels, in which links to a great number of sources are provided through online circulation systems, public access catalogs, commercial databases, and the cooperative records of OCLC and RLIN, surely the power of the computer could be harnessed to find a way out of the serials maze. Seven possibilities are apparent: (1) integrated public access catalogs that include location and holdings data for serials; (2) natural language display in the catalog; (3) network access to area union lists; (4) automatic links between indexing and location tools; (5) ac-
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Figure 1. The Serials Maze
access to journal contents through the online catalog; (6) broadened search capabilities for serials; and (7) remote user access and document delivery service.

INTEGRATED PUBLIC ACCESS CATALOGS

On the most basic level users prefer to consult one finding tool that specifies whether the library has the periodical and which volumes and issues it owns, whether the needed item is in the library and if not, when it will be there, and where exactly the item is located. The ability to record such details already exists, but access to the information is often limited to technical services staff. Such restrictions should be eliminated when periodical titles are loaded into an online public access catalog (OPAC). Once holdings data for other types of materials are available, there will be a demand for detailed holdings records for periodicals as well. Users will want to have up-to-the-minute, item-by-item access to serials, including information about current and retrospective volumes, missing or mutilated issues, claim reports, binding schedules, new and not-yet-cataloged titles, and unprocessed title changes.

NATURAL LANGUAGE DISPLAY

A dramatic improvement in serials access could be achieved by displaying holdings and location data in natural language, rather than in coded format. In the online environment, users need “friendly” systems that are simple, direct, and easy to use—they tend to treat even the simplest and most basic of codes (location symbols are one example) as pure library jargon. A series of display screens, which demonstrate how instructional messages can aid the user in interpreting holdings data and finding the exact location of volumes without a mediator, are shown in figure 2.

The most basic element of a good serials system, from the standpoint of public services, is the ability to translate codes into readily understandable language and at the same time maintain detailed control over bibliographic and holdings data. Once that hurdle has been passed, we can move on to more exciting ways of using the computer to expand patron access to serials.

NETWORK ACCESS TO AREA UNION LISTS

If an institution already has consolidated access to all local library holdings in one finding tool, the next logical aid for users is information about holdings in other libraries in the neighborhood or region. Currently, when such data are made available, they are often not up-to-date or detailed enough. Consequently, most regional union-list users must still check with reporting libraries if they hope to avoid yet another case of retrieval failure. Access to detailed serials holdings records of all institutions in the immediate area, either through the interconnection of local systems or through networks would eliminate another barrier to good service. An example of such a system is CALLS Online, a union list accessible to thirty campuses participating in the California Academic Libraries List of Serials through MELVYL, the University of California online catalog.
Figure 2. NOTIS, Public Access Catalog Display Screens
ACCESS TO JOURNAL CONTENTS

Access to journal contents through OPACs was described provocatively by Barbara Quint, who presented this vision of the future: "As online public access catalogs burgeon forth in library after library, patrons turn ea-
gerly to the new technology thinking it a fun and friendly and complete way to access the library’s collection. The challenge of retrospective conversion . . . has already struck the technical services staff. The public services staff may shortly find itself challenged as to journal holdings coverage—not titles held but titles of articles available in the journals held.  

How can this be achieved? James Dwyer suggests that one approach might be through links between existing indexing services and local cataloging systems. \(^{30}\) A step along this path has already been taken by the Georgia Institute of Technology, the first university in the country to wire its entire campus fully for direct access to databases mounted on the university’s dedicated network. \(^{11}\) Students and faculty can use personal computers in dormitories and offices to search not only the library catalog, but also four periodical databases leased from Information Access Company, producers of the popular Magazine Index.

But access to periodical citations is not enough; users want online access to articles in full-text form. Users of online databases are beginning to find more and more articles stored in full text. At present 100 of the 435 titles included in Magazine Index are full-text sources. By searching the Magazine ASAP file on Dialog, the user can identify a relevant article and obtain a printout of the complete text for only $1 (plus connect time charges).

Full-text serials are also available for a local tape load under lease or licensing arrangements. Harvard Business Review is one example, Facts on File is another. Early in 1987, Carnegie-Mellon University announced its participation in Grolier’s Storage-on-Site licensing program, providing online access through the campus network to full-text versions of several reference works. \(^{12}\) This new service makes the last five years of Facts on File available on any terminal or microcomputer on the campus that is linked to the university’s mainframe. If Peter Cotton’s prediction is correct, the future will probably bring more such innovations, because “end-users have little interest in bibliographic data; they want the complete information.” \(^{13}\)

**BROADENED SEARCH CAPABILITIES**

The present level of subject access is much too general for users who have experienced the power of the computer in doing their own searches of commercial databases. They will expect to find similar sophistication in local systems, e.g., the ability to do keyword searching and qualify terms by language and place name. A serials system should be able to provide ready answers to such simple questions as “where are your psychology journals?” and “what French newspapers do you have?” There ought to be automatic cross-referencing mechanisms so that the user can search by incomplete or alternative titles and spellings, and by initialisms or abbreviations.

**REMOTE USER ACCESS WITH DOCUMENT DELIVERY**

The current trend toward scholar workstations and wired campuses may mean that in the future periodical users will no longer have to struggle
through the serials maze. They will become remote users who may not even go to the library building to get the items they want. As Bernard Sloan suggests, “patrons can’t be truly remote unless they can request items they’ve located through a search.” Users who find a full-text source while searching Dialog from a remote site can obtain the document now just by using the print command. Many commercial vendors accommodate online ordering of articles. But what about those students at Georgia Tech, who identify articles by searching Magazine Index from their rooms? Shouldn’t they be able to find out at the same time whether or not the library has the journal? Dwyer suggests that “the next logical step to integrating indexes and catalogs is to add links to an online union list and then ideally, the patron would be able to initiate his or her own interlibrary loan requests.”

SUMMARY

What kind of serials control system will be appropriate in the new age of online catalogs? The future is full of unknown possibilities, but the public service message is clear. A serials system must go beyond mere technical specifications and help the user find a way out of the serials maze. Information is the most important product the library offers and its delivery should be the goal of both technical and public service librarians.
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Collection development librarians are constantly in need of adequate price information in order to justify their requests for additional funding to library administrators, university deans, and even state legislators. Most commonly they have used, because the data are clear and relatively uniform, inflation rates and increases in book and serial prices derived from commonly available sources. For example, noting that there was a 156 percent increase in the average price of technology books, from $19.66 in 1975 to $50.37 in 1985 can be a persuasive argument. Since few libraries received increases at that level during the period, one result was that the number of volumes acquired by an average research library decreased annually from more than 100,000 to fewer than 80,000. Yet estimates about the impact of price increases on collections may have been, if anything, too low, particularly for materials in some fields, such as the professions and science and technology, or from areas, such as Europe, with strong currencies. This note examines the assumptions behind the use of book price increases in budget calculations and suggests a new measure of collection development needs that factors the change in percent of coverage and in size of the literature into funding cost.

One impetus for this examination has been the use of the Conspectus and related verification studies by the Research Libraries Group, the National Collection Inventory Project, and others that deal with the concept of percent of coverage as a means of measuring effectiveness. The Conspectus provides a system of numerical symbols indicating quality—from a high of 5, an extraordinarily comprehensive collection, to a low of 0, a subject not collected at all. In addition, there is provision for showing past and current collecting strength with two numbers, e.g., 4/4. These symbols are based in part on level of coverage, that is, the percentage of titles in a field that a
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library owns. In order to determine whether libraries are adequately representing their collections, some have conducted verification studies that compare holdings, most commonly by having several libraries search the same list. In theory, then, if one library holds a significantly higher percentage of titles from a standard list, its coverage of available works is greater and the collection more comprehensive. While there may be disagreement about the lists used, the principle of estimating a collection's research value by comparing the number of books and serials acquired to the total output of literature in a field has been widely accepted.

By extension, then, it is important to take into account the size of the literature, or volume of publication, in a field when determining collection development costs. If a library collects two fields at the same intensity and if rates of inflation, book costs, and other factors are comparable, it will be more expensive to provide the same level of coverage for a field with a larger volume of publication. Consequently, using only a measure of cost derived from price increases may not be incorrect but is potentially misleading in that it may misrepresent the total cost of developing a subject collection at a stated level.

A library's ability to support a field adequately is not best measured by isolating inflation rates or book costs but by using a formula that combines volume of publication, level of coverage, and price: (number of volumes published times percentage level of coverage) times (average price) equals total cost, or \((v \times c) \times (p) = t\). To use perhaps an oversimplified example, a library is seeking to develop a comprehensive collection on robotics. If two books were published on robotics last year and each costs $40, a collection aiming at 100 percent coverage would amount to $80. If four are published this year and publishers also double the price to $80, the total cost is not $160, because the price doubled, but $320—four times—because quantity doubled, coverage remained the same, and price doubled \((4 \times 1.00) \times ($80) = $320\). If the budget for the field, in this made-up example, were not quadrupled as well, degree of coverage would have to decline. This calculation would also need to be expanded to take into account the growth in quantity of serial titles, particularly for new fields that are at the cutting edges of disciplines—whether robotics, social history, or semiotics—for they will experience significant literature growth and resultant cost increases.

Figure 1 applies the formula to publishing data for 1975 and 1985. It shows differences in amounts, among disciplines, for acquiring all the books listed when calculated, first, only as percentage price increases and, second, by a formula that factors volume of publication into price to equal total cost. Using this method—each library can insert desired level of coverage as appropriate, for the principle will obtain as long as level of coverage is a constant—the more accurate cost of purchasing all technology books listed is shown to have increased 245 percent (from a total of $24,732 to $85,276), not 156 percent using price increases solely. Expenditures for business titles should have gone up almost 200 percent because the quantity and price both increased. In contrast, for some fields, even though average book prices have gone up substantially, a decrease in the number of titles published affects total cost. Using the formula, it
would cost about the same, in actual dollars, to buy all the poetry and
drama books listed in 1985 as it did in 1975 because the number of titles
listed was smaller by almost half. These data also tend to conform to librar-
ians' commonsense assumptions about changes in publishing trends re-
sponding to educational directions—a move away from the arts and toward
the professions.

The formula can also be amended to account for other factors, such as
the rise and fall of the dollar against foreign currencies. For example, it is
general knowledge that German books, when price and currency fluctua-
tions alone are considered, have increased significantly in cost. The fol-
lowing price data for three disparate fields in 1965 and 1985 were gener-
ated from tables in a standard source.²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>1965</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belles lettres</td>
<td>5038</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>16.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Between 1965 and 1985, book prices in German marks increased 85 per-

---

Figure 1. Cost Differentials among Disciplines—1975–1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VOLUMES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>4445.28</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>13531.36</td>
<td>168.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>20477.60</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>35.15</td>
<td>21916.20</td>
<td>96.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>14.09</td>
<td>21895.86</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>28815.60</td>
<td>57.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>10238.26</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>28.84</td>
<td>29993.60</td>
<td>74.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td>6972.45</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>27.28</td>
<td>16422.56</td>
<td>152.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICTION</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>14168.24</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>27522.00</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENL WORKS</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>19921.60</td>
<td>1632</td>
<td>37.91</td>
<td>61869.12</td>
<td>75.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>23664.05</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>27.02</td>
<td>40692.12</td>
<td>70.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME ECON</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>4313.40</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>10395.00</td>
<td>70.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>3997.40</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>9951.96</td>
<td>81.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>23.22</td>
<td>16834.05</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>41.76</td>
<td>39823.50</td>
<td>79.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>21277.81</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>24.53</td>
<td>28669.93</td>
<td>64.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>38142.34</td>
<td>2706</td>
<td>44.36</td>
<td>124119.28</td>
<td>100.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>3321.92</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>6852.82</td>
<td>94.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOS, PSYCH</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>11900.50</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>25109.45</td>
<td>120.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POETRY, DRAMA</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>11082.80</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>12464.82</td>
<td>105.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>10735.92</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>21241.90</td>
<td>73.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>22.81</td>
<td>52942.02</td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>51.19</td>
<td>130841.64</td>
<td>124.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIO, ECON</td>
<td>4667</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>101040.50</td>
<td>4761</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>138864.13</td>
<td>53.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS, REC</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>8271.38</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>12417.98</td>
<td>113.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>24732.28</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>50.37</td>
<td>85276.41</td>
<td>156.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAVEL</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>8455.64</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>51780.60</td>
<td>59.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|     | 1965 |      |      |      |      |            |           |
|     | 1985 |      |      |      |      |            |           |
| No. | DM Avg. | No. | DM Avg. |
recent decline are widely acknowledged. The consequences, when rate of coverage is included as a factor, have, if anything, been understated. Increase in the number of German publications, rise in book prices, and decline in the value of the dollar are multipliers that act in an exponential, not arithmetic, manner. Using this measure, the cost increase for belles lettres has been 400 percent, economics 1,049 percent, and technology an almost unbelievable 2,100 percent from 1965 to 1985. Any library indicating a 3/3, 4/4, or even more stringent 5/5 (symbolizing current/previous levels of coverage), based on the Conspectus, for these German fields must adequately take total cost factors into account. Since collection development funding in American research libraries has not been increasing at the rate needed to support—in the example used above—purchase of German books at steady levels, coverage may be seriously deteriorating.

While some may view results derived from these calculations as simply a confirmation of already suspected distress, this method might have secondary benefits. It helps make clearer that libraries have, sometimes without quite realizing it, been restricted in their purchasing in comparison to growth in intellectual resources and have thereby been losing the depth of collection quality that gives them their uniqueness. Access to subfields such as popular literature, local history (particularly non-American), journals of opinion, and new scientific disciplines has suffered, as libraries are no longer able to afford them. That may, in turn, lead to an even greater awareness of the need for planning and calculation of the impact on collection development. Perhaps libraries have too frequently followed collec-

| Belles lettres 1965 | (5038 × .25) × (6.20/4.0) | = $1,952 |
| Belles lettres 1985 | (6188 × .25) × (11.49/1.8) | = $9,875 |
| Economics 1965 | (1999 × .15) × (17.12/4.0) | = $1,283 |
| Economics 1985 | (4996 × .15) × (35.42/1.8) | = $14,746 |
| Technology 1965 | (1173 × .10) × (16.75/4.0) | = $491 |
| Technology 1985 | (3326 × .10) × (58.65/1.8) | = $10,837 |
tion development decisions that were not chosen but "just followed without design" and in some cases were unplanned and uncoordinated, as each acted to meet local needs. A more complete understanding of collection development costs caused by this multiplier effect can also help administrators become cognizant of the extent of need and help faculty members understand, more comprehensively than many do now, that the response to increases in collection development costs of this scale can only be met through extensions of present cooperative programs that provide access to diverse but planned collections through interlibrary loan.

While enlightening, this means of calculation needs to be supplemented by other quantitative and qualitative measures. This one quantitative measure of collection development, albeit an important one, cannot be allowed to obscure judgment and insight. For example, as the field of education has become more scientific in its approach, serial literature and such sources as ERIC have assumed greater levels of research importance. Volume, coverage, and cost of serial literature need to be included and calculated using the same formula. Literary fields have notably shifted to publication through venues such as little magazines or presses that are perhaps not satisfactorily represented in current statistical sources; social sciences, publishing through pressure groups, and organizations are not included either. Determining the true cost of collection development requires a sophisticated analysis that is combined with related factors: impact of currency upheavals; shelflife of materials in various disciplines; adequacy of statistical measures; size of the serial literature; and so on. But whatever the field, price and quantity act in combination, not in isolation, and must be considered together.
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This is a discussion of the puzzle presented to catalogers when a book by Kit Williams was deliberately published without a title. Subsequently, the title was disclosed. The changes that should be made in the cataloging record established at the time the book as published are considered. Responses by Sanford Berman, Carol Davis, Michael Gorman, and Ben Tucker, suggesting ways a cataloger should best deal, or not deal, with this puzzle are presented also.

In 1984 Kit Williams, an English author who delights in challenging his readers to solve puzzles, published a book without revealing its title. He offered a substantial prize to the reader who was able to decipher the title from the fascinating piece of marquetry featured on the cover and who sent him the true title in the most creative form. The title page had a single solid line, with a bee at either end, where the title would normally appear.

Both the British and American editions were duly cataloged by the Library of Congress and entered into various catalogs, including the OCLC database, in accordance with rule 1.1B7 of AACR2. That rule calls for a brief descriptive title to be supplied and enclosed in square brackets: "for an item lacking the prescribed chief source of information or its substitute from the rest of the item, or a reference source, or elsewhere." Lacking the imagination to solve the puzzle and win the prize, those who cataloged it shortly after publication opted for mundane solutions, for example, [Book without a title] and [Title undisclosed].

Subsequently, however, the puzzle was solved, the prize awarded, and the title disclosed. According to a note in Fine Woodworking, verified by Sanford Berman, a call to the American distributor, Alfred Knopf, revealed that the true title, The Bee on the Comb, was announced on May 28, 1985. A search of the OCLC database disclosed that the records still appear as originally produced and that no effort was made to respond to the availability of new information about the true title.

Intrigued by the puzzle presented by the title(s) of this book, the Molesworth Institute contacted several cataloging authorities for their views on how to deal with this puzzle. The responses are both fascinating and revealing.

Sanford Berman, head cataloger at Hennepin County Library, critic of established cataloging practices, and firm advocate of the user-oriented catalog, described the simple solution he instituted in his library's catalog. The record was updated, but not changed, noting the hitherto secret title and supplying two new added entries (Bee on the comb, and Williams, Kit.
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Bee on the comb). "What we didn't do, and I hope no one else does, is make 'Bee on the comb' the prime title. It may, indeed, be what the author intended. But it sure-as-hell didn't show up on the title page, or even the spine. What did appear was 'Kit Williams.' That's what we chose as the actual, printed title. If some, especially public, libraries now introduce 'Bee on the comb' as the prime title, they'll be forced—to avoid shelving and circulation confusion—to physically change book cards and pockets as well. Frankly I don't think it's worth the trouble. Just making the added entries and amplifying the bibliographic record itself, which are not costly activities, should suffice. That way the tome's curious history is clearly stated (for anyone interested) and catalog access expanded to include the 'revealed' title."

The Hennepin County Library's catalog entry, as supplied by Sanford Berman, now reads in part as follows:

```
Field  Data
100    Williams, Kit.
245    Kit Williams.
700    Williams, Kit.$t Book without a title.
700    Williams, Kit.$t The bee on the comb.
740    Book without a title.
740    The bee on the comb.
```

This is a pragmatic solution from a pragmatic cataloger.

While Michael Gorman, one of the chief architects of AACR2 and a theoretician, approached the problem in a slightly different fashion—displaying greater concern for the AACR2 rules than the practicalities of changing the title—he reached much the same conclusion. "The title page," Gorman indicated "is defined as 'A page at the beginning of the item bearing the title proper. . . .'. The latter is defined as 'The chief name of an item. . . .'. Does this book have a title page? Your invocation of 1.1B7. rests on the notion that it does not. I would suggest that it does. Before I go on, it is important to note that the description of an item is strictly confined to the physical object in hand. This book, when published and cataloged, did not lack a title casually, it was deliberately untitled. That last is reinforced by the fact that the space (which, in one sense, is the title) is clearly defined by a line below and the silhouettes of two bees on the left and right. If '[Untitled] is not the title proper, then perhaps '[Bee. Line. Bee]' (see 1.1B1., 4th paragraph, and tangentially, 3.2D1, third example) would do. In any event, it seems to me that subsequent disclosure of a title does not invalidate the prior descriptive cataloging.'" He goes on to say, "If one wished to introduce the real title, perhaps a uniform title (MARC 240, chapter 25 in AACR2) would suit. The published revised version of 25.2A states that, inter alia, the uniform title is used when ' . . . the title of the work (my emphasis) is obscured by the wording [sic] of the title proper.' Thus my record would read:

```
Field  Data
100    Williams, Kit
240    [Bee on the comb]
245    [Bee. Line. Bee] / Kit Williams . . .''"
This is a theoretical solution from a theoretician.

That individuals with a personal understanding of the fine points of cataloging practice and policy might be better able to deal with such puzzles than those charged with bureaucratic responsibility for cataloging is clearly demonstrated by the following responses.

Ben R. Tucker, chief of the Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy, indicated that the Library of Congress had taken the solution of this puzzle at face value. He wrote, "The record for it is being revised to substitute the known title, within brackets, for the previously used cataloger’s phrase. An appropriate note is also being made to give an indication of the source of the title." Berman should, one suspects, be pleased with the Library of Congress’ responsiveness to change in this instance, if not with change itself.

OCLC, on the other hand, through Carol Davis, manager of the Online Quality Control Section, dodged the issue altogether by relying on "OCLC’s policy that the library should correct its own record." These are bureaucratic solutions from bureaucratic institutions.

While cataloging, especially in today’s database environment, is often tedious it can, at times, be fun if one faces puzzles such as that presented by Kit Williams. Other solutions to this cataloger’s puzzle are welcome and can be addressed to Norman D. Stevens, Director, The Molesworth Institute, 143 Hanks Hill Rd., Storrs, CT 06268.
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The Form and Structure of a Subject Heading Code

William E. Studwell and Paule Rolland-Thomas

There is little doubt that it would be highly desirable. There are some signs of movement in that direction. It may even be "inevitable," although the inevitability of any intellectual, cultural, or social phenomenon justifiably can be doubted.

These statements all apply to a comprehensive theoretical code for LC subject headings. As far back as the mid-1940s, interest in such a code has been at least indirectly expressed. In 1946, Julia Pettee touched upon the need for a code when she related the complaint of library educators, "Subject headings! They are our despair! Frankly we don't know how to teach them." Since then, others have more directly and explicitly expressed the need. In addition, there have been limited efforts toward a subject code, including Henry van Hoesen's "Twelve Rules for Economy in Subject Headings," which was issued in 1944.

Recently there have been more and more indicators that a code may, indeed, be coming. There has been growing interest in subject access in professional literature for the past few years, and the Library of Congress has demonstrated increasing propensities toward codification through the many recent improvements in structure/logic, terminology/semantics, and specificity/details of its subject headings and in the publication of two editions of its Subject Cataloging Manual.

Now that the need to develop a comprehensive theoretical code to cover all situations of subject access is becoming evident, the question of what its form and structure should be becomes important. Such a code will need to represent the combined efforts of many individuals—both inside and outside of LC—as was the case for the two editions of AACR. The task is very large and complex. In a spirit of helpfulness for progress toward the realization of a subject code, a few general suggestions are offered.

The first is that the code should be organized into two major segments, one a bound, main volume similar to the AACR2 volume, the other a loose-leaf, supplementary volume somewhat similar to LC's Subject Cataloging Manual. The loose-leaf volume would contain many lists of headings and subdivisions along with instructions for their application and would be updated relatively frequently. It would be, in effect, a better-organized, more compact, and easier-to-use version of the Subject Cataloging Manual, and as complete as possible. The main volume would be the essence of the new code, divided into functional sections. The first would be a moderate-sized explication of the basic theory behind LC subject headings, including
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such essential elements as heading logic and structure, types, "grammar," and level of language as well as recommended methods for developing new headings or modifying existing ones. The second section, roughly analogous to chapter 1 of AACR2, would present specific rules or guidelines that apply to subject headings as a whole, e.g., the number of headings to be used and how and when to use secondary headings (i.e., those expressing topics other than the principal topic(s) of the item being cataloged). The third section would consist of a number of subsections specifically concerned with special subject areas, e.g., art, literature, music, or sciences. The special rules or guidelines that apply to various areas of knowledge would be given in these topical subsections, whose size and organization will vary considerably, depending on the requirements of each topic. Therefore, these subsections will not be analogous to chapters 2-12 of AACR2.

The second general suggestion is to give serious consideration to new terminology and concepts in the development of the subject code. One example of questionable terminology now in effect is the term subdivision as used by LC for—History,—California, and similar constructions. Subdivision really implies a hierarchical structure such as that developed in botany and zoology. Instead, a more accurate term might be subheading. One example of a new concept is the relational device suggested in a recent publication. By using a slash (or colon) between two subjects that have a relation to each other in the item being cataloged, e.g., Marriage/Alcoholism, the need for subjects in the forms "Parent and child" and "Cats in art" would be eliminated, and the ability to use such a structure in any subject situation would add considerable flexibility to the heading system. In such cases, a mirror heading, e.g., Alcoholism/Marriage would also be applied. This type of heading would function in the same way as current headings, e.g., a geographic area could be added to create a heading such as Marriage/Alcoholism—United States. With tags inserted in the proper places, this heading could be retrieved online as Marriage—United States and Alcoholism—United States, as well as in the form given.

The third suggestion is to remember that although the computer is an excellent tool and can greatly enhance subject access, such technology cannot repair or compensate for faculty theory or structure. Therefore, in the development of a subject code, the limitations of the computer should constantly be kept in mind.

The fourth is to emphasize that the new code should go beyond LC’s current subject heading system. What is now in place can serve as the foundation, but the provisions of the code should not be limited to the present realities of LC subject headings.

In conclusion, it would be in the best interests of the international library community to work collectively toward the realization of an all-purpose, theoretically based subject heading code whose effect would be similar to what AACR2 did for descriptive cataloging. Such a code can only be accomplished through widely disseminated discussion in professional literature, by professional organizations, and by direct contacts with LC’s Subject Cataloging Division. Except for this overworked division, there is now no really effective mechanism for handling matters relating to a sub-
ject code. To help coordinate input relating to a code until there may be an organization or structure in place to serve as a central point, the authors are willing to serve as a clearinghouse for comments, ideas, suggestions, etc. from the international community. Send communications in English, French, or Spanish to William E. Studwell, Principal Cataloger, Northern Illinois University Libraries, DeKalb, IL 60115-2868; or Paule Rolland-Thomas, Ecole de bibliothéconomie et des sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Québec H3C 3J7 Canada

Editor's note: RTSD’s Subject Analysis Committee, chaired by William Garrison, Northwestern University Library, Evanston, Illinois, is a viable alternative to the authors’ suggestion. We ask that readers consider the committee in relation to this issue and when responding to the authors’ request.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

2. The most explicit calls for a code can be found in William E. Studwell, “Why Not an ‘AACR’ for Subject Headings?” Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 6, no.1:3–9 (1985) and “Academic Libraries and a Subject Heading Code,” Journal of Academic Librarianship 12:372 (Jan. 1987). Several other concurring viewpoints can be found on page 5 of the first publication.
6. A series of specific “Subject Suggestions” by William E. Studwell will begin in Cataloging & Classification Quarterly 8, no.2 (Winter 1987).
Collection Development in the Electronic Age

A Preconference to the ALA Annual Conference
Sponsored by the Resources & Technical Services Division
New Orleans, Louisiana
July 8, 1988

Goals & Objectives: This preconference will assess the current and future impact of information technology on collection development and present the state-of-the-art in incorporating electronic media into the tradition of collection building.

Audience: Library administrators and collection development staff charged with determining the form and substance of library collections and allocating funds to develop an institution’s resources.

Location and Housing: The preconference will be held at the New Orleans Marriott. For housing information, see the January, 1988 issue of American Libraries.

Faculty: Sam Demas, Collection Development, Mann Library, Cornell University; Hendrik Edelman, Professor, School of Communication, Information, and Library Studies, Rutgers University; Robert Hayes, Dean, School of Library and Information Science, UCLA; Sheila Intner, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Simmons College; Ken King, President, EDUCOM; Robert Miranda, President, Pergamon Press, Inc.; Jan Kennedy Olsen, Director, Mann Library, Cornell University; Carol Risher, Director of Copyright and New Technology, Association of American Publishers; Barbara Robinson, Management Consultant, and adjunct faculty, Catholic University School of Library and Information Science; Linda Stewart, Reference, Mann Library, Cornell University.

Schedule

Part I: Framing the Issues
8:30 - 9:30 a.m. The Scholar & His Information: A Look at the 1990’s, K. King
9:30 - 10:30 a.m. Managing Scholarly Information: Implications & Strategies, R. Hayes
10:30 - 11:00 a.m. Coffee Break
11:00 - 12:00 p.m. Electronic Information: Public Policy Issues, C. Risher and B. Robinson
12:00 - 1:30 p.m. Lunch (On Your Own)

Part II: Meeting the Challenges
2:15 - 3:45 p.m. Mainstreaming Electronic Formats, S. Demas, S. Intner, R. Miranda, & L. Stewart
3:45 - 4:15 p.m. Coffee Break
4:15 - 5:00 p.m. A New Paradigm for Scholarly Information & The Research Library, J. K. Olsen
5:00 - 6:30 p.m. Wine and Cheese Reception

Registration: Registration fees are $90 for ALA/RTSD personal members, $100 for ALA personal members, and $110 for non-members of ALA. Fee covers registration, coffee breaks, and wine and cheese reception. Lunch is not included. Registrations postmarked before June 10, 1988 will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. (Limit is 150 persons.)

To register, contact RTSD Preconferences by phone or mail:
RTSD Preconferences/ALA
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611
312/944-6780 ext. 319
Research in Progress

Library Services and the Online Campus Gateway

Rich Hines and Candy Schwartz

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s (MIT) divisional libraries and their branches serve twenty-two academic departments and many interdepartmental laboratories, centers, and divisions spread over 142 acres along Boston’s Charles River. The institute is currently wiring its campus with fiber-optic telecommunications in an effort to provide an interactive link between all departments, laboratories and units. The goal of the MIT libraries is to provide access through this system to such online information as is available, and to provide details on library services and activities. The objective of this project is to take the initial steps in preparation for the online gateway between users of the library and its systems and services.

The project is designed as follows: The first stage of research will involve collecting and correlating information in three different areas: user groups, use patterns, and library services and systems. A survey will be taken to identify potential local and remote users of an online gateway and to determine their service needs, use patterns, and likely methods of system access. The results will form the basis for a model that will underlie development of a prototype online gateway.

In the second stage, this prototype will be developed and tested on a DEC MicroVax II. It will consist principally of a menu-driven interaction between the user and the array of library services and will incorporate a hierarchy of services, information on individual services, help screens, and simple representations of tutorials that might be more fully developed in implementation. Testing, which will be carried out against a sample from among the different user groups identified in stage 1, will include administration of a questionnaire, and online monitoring of user-system interaction.

Large numbers of academic libraries have put public access catalogs in place over the past several years, and many are now looking at ways to expand the range of services and sources made accessible through these
systems. Both the user survey and the development and testing of the prototype gateway are expected to provide insights applicable to similar projects in other academic settings.

To fund this study, the Council on Library Resources has awarded a grant to MIT under its Cooperative Research Grants Program for librarians and faculty members.

Editor's note: Brief descriptions (two to three pages) of research projects in progress are invited. They will appear as space allows.

**IN MEMORIAM: JANE E. STEVENS**

Jane E. Stevens, who succumbed to a brief illness December 1, 1987, was deeply interested in the many facets of subject analysis and classification, participated in the development of subject tools and standards, and conveyed her knowledge and her love for this work to her students and colleagues. She was an educator who understood practice, having had a rich background as a librarian before teaching, first, at Queens College, City University of New York, and, later, at Columbia University, from which she retired as associate professor in 1983.

Stevens was born in La Salle, New York, in 1917. She received degrees in English from the University of Rochester and Middlebury College and in library science from SUNY–Geneseo. She served as librarian at several New York state high schools, including Scarsdale High School, and was associate librarian and cataloger at the College of Education, SUNY–Brockport. In 1949 Stevens became editor of the H. W. Wilson Company's *Library Literature*, helping develop its effectiveness as a research tool. She remained at Wilson until 1963, when she began full-time lecturing in library science.

Stevens' influence was felt in a variety of professional activities. She was an active RTSD member; she served as president of the New York Technical Services Librarians and of the Resources and Technical Services Section of the New York Library Association; she was a board member for the American Society of Indexers; and she held memberships in the American Association of University Professors and the American Civil Liberties Union.

Stevens was a consummate mentor, ever-encouraging, always sure one could and would meet her expectations. She was kind without exception, calm in the face of the hottest debate, always firm in her knowledge of the field. She took the fear away from a novice's first encounter with cataloging arcana, and she guided the steps of many doctoral researchers, including this editor's. Jane E. Stevens will be missed by all who knew and loved her.—Sheila S. Intner, Editor.
James P. Danky, newspapers and periodicals librarian at the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, was awarded the 1987 Bowker/Ulrich’s Serials Librarianship Award. The Serials Section of the American Library Association’s Resources and Technical Services Division presented the award to him, recognizing especially his accomplishments in providing information regarding non-mainstream serials literature.

The citation awarded to him reads in part,

"He has shared his knowledge of alternative literature and alternative presses through anthologies, articles, handbooks and professional presentations. His guides to Native American and women’s periodicals and newspapers are invaluable tools for identifying and accessing these often-elusive serials."

In addition to his publications, Danky has served as a consultant on several projects including the U.S. Newspaper Project. He is a guest lecturer at two library schools in Wisconsin. He belongs to several professional organizations and he is actively involved in community service.

Based on his outstanding achievements and professional contributions in so many areas, the committee was pleased to present the award to James P. Danky. At the ceremony, the chair of the Award Committee presented him with a citation, and representatives from R.R. Bowker presented him with a check for $1,500.00.—Linda Lomker.
Resources & Technical Services News: Product Potpourri

Verna Urbanski

Quite a variety of materials have been coming our way. Some deal with the very newest technologies, such as CD-ROM, and some with continuing concerns such as labeling and preservation. They reflect the numerous issues and considerations that are simultaneously under discussion in our profession.

Three recent press releases address the need for efficient label-generating techniques. Two of the software programs are designed to be used with OCLC's M300 Micro-Enhancer software: IDEA MAN Label Print Utility Software and Islington Arbour Labelling System/II.

IDEA MAN Label Print Utility Software needs a version 2.0 (or later) M300 Workstation or Micro-Enhancer software. The Savescreen function is used to batch needed information for editing and label production with IDEA MAN software. Publicity releases indicate that ten different label formats are available. This software provides guidance for creating a more attractive label by adapting Gaylord's popular SE-LIN label-making system to a computer printer. The manufacturer predicts elimination of time-consuming errors resulting from typing SE-LIN labels by hand. A sixty-day free trial period is offered: users are invoiced after thirty days but have thirty days to make payment or return the product.

Islington Arbour Systems has two label-making packages available. The first requires individual input of label information, and the second is used with OCLC's M300 Savescreen function. Islington Arbour Labelling System/I allows data entry operators to enter call numbers (Dewey or LC) for spine and plate labels on the program input screen. The information then can be edited before printing. Call number lines 4–7 can be specified for autonumbering, which generates multiple, consecutively numbered labels in any continuous range. The program also boasts programmable function keys that the producers call "hot keys." Up to fifteen characters, including carriage returns and control codes, may be specified, allowing for entry of phrases, words, or call numbers with a single key stroke. When used

Verna Urbanski is Catalog Librarian at the Thomas G. Carpenter Library, University of North Florida, Jacksonville.
with an IBM-compatible dot matrix printer, the system can provide bold, 10-pitch characters on the spine label and print the plate label in 17-pitch characters for the main entry and title. The Islington Arbour Labelling System/II requires an OCLC M300 IBM PC/XT/AT or compatible computer with at least 256K RAM, two floppy disk drives or hard disk, and an IBM-compatible dot matrix printer. Standard SL-6 label sets are suggested.

Islington Arbour Labelling System/II derives information necessary for spine and plate labels from locally saved records collected by using OCLC M300 Micro-Enhancer Savescreen functions. Multiple Savescreens can generate individualized labels for multiple volumes and copies. Label records either can be appended to an existing file for batch production or produced immediately. Only those fields necessary for spine and plate labels are captured during the process, so up to 300 records can be stored on a single floppy disk. The software is limited to LC call numbers tagged 050 or 090. The program has built-in editing and correcting mechanisms so that label information derived directly from OCLC records needs much less final proofing. Call numbers with multiple $a$ are automatically edited, so that only the first call number is used. The system also eliminates unprintable diacritics in the plate label and closes up inappropriate empty spaces. Program producers say that label production can be performed by an unattended computer. Equipment requirements are the same as for the System/I, with the addition of M300 Micro-Enhancer software.

Microlytics, Inc. is marketing a new “search-and-find” software package of interest to those who fill their hard disks with files that are difficult to identify retrospectively. GOfer text-retrieval program needs 79K of RAM and operates with IBM PCs, compatibles, and PS/2s using PC/MS-DOS, version 2.0 or higher. It starts a search with a word, phrase, date, or number clue and can perform searches including AND/OR/NOT logic and “how close?” parameters. GOfer operates with other RAM resident software, telecommunications software, and local area networks. Data can be copied and pasted into the current document or collected in a separate file. The program works with all the leading word processors and utilities, including WordStar and WordStar 2000, WordPerfect, Microsoft Word, Q&A, Q&A Write, Multimate; and DisplayWrite III/IV, Sidekick, and Ready. It also works with Lotus 1,2,3, Symphony, and dBASE III. The producers claim that GOfer searches any number of files at the rate of more than one megabyte a minute. It is a comfort to know that, in an increasingly cluttered world, such help is available.

The Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) of the Library of Congress announces a new current-awareness service. Within a week after a bibliographic record for a monograph or serial enters the MARC database, Alert Service can send a 3-by-5-inch catalog card to a customer profiled for that subject interest area. The Cataloging in Publication (CIP) program makes information available to LC three to six months before titles are published. Alert Service is designed to exploit this early warning system for the benefit of collection development librarians. CDS indicates that information on the latest sound recordings, music scores, libretti, and sheet music is also available sans CIP information. The Service provides titles in 1,800 sub-
ject categories ranging from an entire classification schedule to a narrow, special-interest area, selecting records for titles published currently or within the last two years.

Blackwell North America, a leader in catalog entry conversion, has recently completed an agreement that allows NELINET to broker Blackwell’s authority control services to its New England members; NELINET members will be able to receive services by working directly with network offices. Blackwell and NELINET are aiming at a program of high-quality, rapid, project-delivery schedules. Currently Blackwell provides authority control for name (1xx, 6xx, 7xx); uniform title (130,730); series (4xx, 8xx); and subject heading (6xx) fields.

Blackwell North America also recently announced successful implementation of MARC with Books, its “cataloging enhancement” system. Under this arrangement, Blackwell North America and B.H. Blackwell provide subscribers standard, taped cataloging records with their books. The MARC with Books option includes LC MARC records for titles purchased from Blackwell North America, while books from B.H. Blackwell are represented by UKMARC records, all of which are in the MARC II Communications format and are delivered to subscribers on 9-track magnetic tapes. Blackwell emphasizes the timeliness of MARC with Books and the cost-effectiveness of getting MARC records without the need for an online source such as a bibliographic utility.

The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and LC are cooperating on a project to convert the National Register of Microform Masters to machine-readable form. The Computer Company of Richmond, Virginia, has been selected to conduct the conversion over the next two years. ARL indicates that 30 to 40 percent of these bibliographic records were not previously available in machine-readable form. Consistent quality of the data will be ensured by a review process, during which staff from the MARC Editorial Division, Cataloging Management Division, and Publications Division will check the records for conformance to guidelines. LC’s CDS will compile tapes of converted records and distribute them to libraries, networks, and other organizations to use as they wish, without constraints.

ARL is hopeful that this distribution will prevent unnecessary microfilming of materials already preserved in that medium. In its continuing search for both quality preservation and cost-effectiveness, ARL sees this project as a way to make unique information available to a wider audience with a reasonable investment of time and money. (See p.116–26.)

Pursuing other recent activities in preservation, ARL has been working with the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC) on a manual for assisting administrators in carrying out preservation microfilming projects. Preservation Microfilming: A Guide for Librarians and Archivists (Nancy E. Gwinn, ed., 1987) documents each step in the preservation process, including planning, materials selection and preparation, bibliographic control of the microfilmed product, and storage/care of the master negatives. Publicity releases indicate that sections on materials identification, staff decisions, and cost estimates will be helpful to agencies seeking funding for a microfilming project. The guide is available from the American Library Association.
NEDCC recently announced that it received $117,000 from the Getty Grant Program of the J. Paul Getty Trust to support three internships in paper conservation. The interns will be graduate paper conservators who need "bench experience" to be fully qualified for advanced work. The two-year internships will be supervised by Mary Todd Glaser, NEDCC's senior conservator, and the object of the program is to help interns develop flexibility, confidence, and judgment in determining appropriate treatment for a variety of materials. Interested parties should contact NEDCC.

NEDCC will continue its program of subsidized preservation surveys underwritten by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Organizations in New England, New York, and New Jersey with collections of books, photographs, documents, or works of art on paper are eligible to apply for a survey. These one-day site visits examine building conditions, collections, and the storage and handling of materials; the cost of a subsidized survey is $250 plus travel expenses. Steps needed to implement preservation measures are outlined based on short-, medium, and long-term goals. Surveys are carried out by a member of NEDCC's field team service. Selections for recipients of the subsidized surveys are made periodically; applications are kept on file and regularly reviewed.

As a side note to this survey effort, NEDCC announced one-to-one matching funds for collection care and management projects by the Institute of Museum Services as part of their Conservation Project Support (CP). The projects may start with one of NEDCC's surveys and be followed by a specialized conservator's review of individual objects and collections. The emphasis of both of these efforts is on helping an institution, no matter what its size, to determine how well it is doing and to plan for improving its conservation abilities. Another major benefit of such activities is that they furnish strong evidence of organizational commitment to superior collection management.

For further information about the products mentioned, contact

IDEA MAN
7751 Treadmill Circle
Liverpool, NY 13090
(315) 622-9241
Contact: Joseph C. Holzer

Islington Arbour Systems
P.O. Box 1324
Denton, TX 76202-1324
(817) 387-1703
Contact: Sharon G. Almquist

Microlytics, Inc.
300 Main St.
East Rochester, NY 14445
(800) 828-6293 nationwide
(716) 377-0130 in New York
Contact: Michael Riedlinger

Cataloging Distribution Service
Custom Services Section
Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20541
Contact: Pat Gray

Blackwell North America, Inc.
6024 S.W. Jean Road, Building G
Lake Oswego, OR 97034
(800) 547-6426
Contact: Dan Miller

Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 232-2466
Contact: Nicola Daval
FINALLY! A Complete PC-Based Label Production System for Libraries...

LABELLING SYSTEM / I - Quick, on-demand label production $75.00

LABELLING SYSTEM / II - Spine and plate labels directly from your OCLC records $99.95

Registered Users Receive...

- Enhanced, SL-6 style label format
- Fast and easy to use
- Full support, low cost updates and a subscription to our Technical Bulletin

A demo disk is available for $2.50 (shipping and handling)
For more information or to order the demo disk, write to:

Islington Arbour Systems
P.O. Box 1324
Denton, TX 76202-1324
Book Reviews


These two publications are sources of quick and solid reports to publishers and librarians who are interested in the CD-ROM (Compact Disk-Read Only Memory) and optical publishing systems.

The ninety-eight-page volume by Patti Myers reviews state-of-the-art of CD-ROM as a new technology in publishing services. This volume gives a concise, relevant introduction to CD-ROM and optical publishing. It provides the basics one needs to know: what CD-ROM is all about and how publishers are integrating this new technology into their own plans. Although short and interesting enough to be read in one sitting, many readers who are struggling to stay current with this new publishing technology will be more likely to browse through this volume.

There are five major sections. Section one defines optical storage and compares its various forms. Section two describes how CD-ROMs are used to distribute large amounts of data and for what types of applications CD-ROMs have been produced. Section three explores the process of publishing via CD-ROM. Section four provides a perspective on the future of CD-ROMs and its implications. Section five includes a reading list on CD-ROM, a listing of companies involved in various CD-ROM activities, and a glossary.

There is no index, but the good structure of the table of contents and the use of bold prints for headings more than compensates. Many of the technical descriptions about CD-ROM and optical storage can be found in figure captions and information boxes. This is a useful and practical guide to understanding the technical details of the systems. The writing is clear and direct.

The second volume, by Tony Hendley, emphasizes the potential applications of CD-ROM in the commercial and technical publishing area. This 150-page volume is published by CIMTECH and sponsored by the British National Bibliography Research Fund. It consists of ten comprehensive chapters on the strengths and limitations of CD-ROM; a comparison of CD-ROM and the other optical media; the standardization issue; the major stages involved in planning a CD-ROM; the CD-ROM workstation design; the key application areas; a comparison of CD-ROM with paper, microfilm, and online distribution systems; a comparison of CD-ROM with other optical publishing media; a list of companies involved with the technology; a listing of commercially available CD-ROM products; and the key issues raised by CD-ROM products and optical publishing systems.

Chapter six, which provides a comparison of CD-ROM with traditional
publishing media and systems, is excellent. It highlights the key qualities of each medium and defines their application areas. Unfortunately, the typography is not easy to read, and the lack of indexing is a handicap. There are bibliographical references at the end of each chapter for further reading. However, this volume is one of the most up-to-date reports on CD-ROM technology. Each individual chapter is sufficiently comprehensive in its coverage of the subject.

Both of these volumes intend to reach small commercial publishers, corporate publishers, librarians, and information science specialists. Reading both will yield a good understanding of the promise of CD-ROM and its impact on the optical publishing industry. These volumes appeal to a wide spectrum of readers getting started on the CD-ROM technology, and I recommend them for use by library staff members in academic and large public libraries.—Francisca Co, Memphis State University, Tennessee.


Among the many books and articles written about CD-ROM over the past few years, Microsoft Press’ CD-ROM, The New Papyrus has been widely praised for its clarity and comprehension in presenting the history, the technical details, and the possible futures for this new medium. This current work is a companion volume to The New Papyrus, but with a much more focused purpose. It is intended to be a handbook for publishers, librarians, authors, and others who are involved in, or wish to be involved in, actually publishing a work in CD-ROM.

Bill Zoellick, in the introductory chapter, points out that even though computers are used extensively in the publication of books today, the computer files used to generate typeset pages are not organized or indexed for publication in an electronic or optical format. For a book to be published electronically or on optical disk, it must be recoded and reorganized. It must be converted from a book to a database suitable for manipulation by a computer for the benefit of a reader. The solution, Zoellick says, is to reverse the process and for authors and publishers to orient themselves to the electronic or optical publication by building the database first and producing the printed version, if necessary, from that database. The underlying theme of this book is how to make this fundamental change.

There are sixteen chapters by different authors. The first three describe the current state of CD-ROM and are excellent background reading. The next eleven chapters describe, in considerable detail, the various stages of preparing a CD-ROM publication; preparing the text; establishing document and text retrieval routines; using sound and images, producing the disc; protecting author and publisher rights; and updating a publication. These chapters are uniformly well written and informative. The chapter on the High Sierra Group proposal for a standard format for placing files and directories on CD-ROM is especially well done.

The last two chapters provide case studies of two CD-ROM products that have made it to market. The first is the story of Library Corporation’s BibliOFile. The second describes a medical information system that was transferred from microfiche to CD-ROM. Both chapters are detailed and provide a good dose of reality to balance any heady optimism one might feel about CD-ROM.

A thirty-five-page glossary of terms used in CD-ROM production is included, as well as a list of many of the companies now involved in this field.

This book certainly lives up to the promise of its subtitle A Practical Approach to Developing CD-ROM Appli-
cations. A thorough familiarity with the issues and problems outlined here would be invaluable to anyone involved in CD-ROM production or in any other form of electronic publication. The book also delivers a sound briefing on theories behind document retrieval and display and raises questions about how publishing should go about its fundamental role of communicating between an author and a reader. While it rarely addressed issues specific to libraries, it is a useful book for any librarian who is interested in the role of electronic and optical publishing.—William Gray Potter, Arizona State University, Tempe.


The implementation of AACR2 was a massive project for most research libraries in the United States. Although much was written about AACR2 before libraries actually started to use it, little appeared subsequently to document the trials and tribulations involved in making it work in individual institutions. This work begins to remedy this deficiency, “lest we forget.”

The major portion of the work consists of case studies written by staff at fourteen representative ARL libraries, ten of which integrated AACR2 cataloging into existing card catalogs, and four of which closed their card catalogs and started new, “pure,” catalogs containing only AACR2 cataloging. An introduction covers the development of AACR2, comparison to earlier cataloging codes, results of a survey of ARL libraries about their implementation decisions, and a general analysis of the case studies.

The work meticulously documents a challenging, even traumatic, period in the history of research libraries. The sheer wealth of detail makes it difficult to read. The cumulative effect of all the
accounts of task forces, catalog samples to predict conflicts, etc., becomes repetitive. However, the staggering amounts of time invested by each library in making AACR2 work come across very clearly. Perhaps the very repetition that makes the work so difficult to read is the only way to portray this time investment in a convincing way.

Six years after the adoption of AACR2, why should we read this book? Are the issues that seemed so burning then, ancient history by now? Catalogers will be fascinated by what can be learned about bibliographic control processes in large research libraries. Academic library administrators should read the book for different reasons, some of them to be found between the lines. The editors express the hope that “some value will be found by librarians in research institutions when at some future date they plan for the implementation of still another cataloging code” (p.xiii).

Before that happens, decision makers should take a good, hard look at what happened the last time. As the book reveals, some of it was positive: longtime catalog problems were addressed, technical services librarians and public services librarians engaged in substantive discussions about issues in bibliographic control, quality control emerged as an important issue. But the book also reveals that libraries paid a high price for AACR2 in terms of staff time for planning and reorganization, elaborate new maintenance procedures, and temporarily reduced productivity. Although the question of whether AACR2 was “worthwhile” may be academic by now, this work contains the evidence that the profession must be prepared to ask some difficult questions up front before another cataloging code comes along. For this reason alone, the effort required to read and understand this book will be amply repaid. — Alice J. Allen, University of Oregon, Eugene.


This issue of Library Trends is a compilation of articles by some well-known authors in the library field who reveal their insights into the world of OPACs (online public access catalogs). Several of the studies included here were funded by the Council on Library Resources. Although there already exists a plethora of articles, books, etc. addressing this topic, there is still a lot of good commentary to be made about this work.

The first article is a history of the development of the online catalog at the University of Guelph and its effect on the staffing, organization, and role of that library in the university community. The second article describes the development of one of the first online public access catalogs in the U.S., the Library Control System (LCS) at the Ohio State University, providing special emphasis on subject access. Subject access in the OPAC is also addressed by Lipetz and Paulson in “Impact of an Online Subject Catalog.”

Joseph Matthews offers some preliminary guidelines for the design and layout of CRT displays. He presents these as preliminary only in hope that they will spark an interest in a much needed standardization of OPAC designs. He also provides a very healthy bibliography, something readers will find helpful for looking further into screen designs and layouts.

Also included in this issue is an article highlighting British OPAC research and progress in the past three years. The article which follows describes one institution’s attempt at determining “whether it is possible to make an online catalog that satisfies the usability criteria while providing a high degree of effectiveness.” I’m afraid you’ll have to read the article to find out if they succeeded or not.

This reviewer’s favorite article of the lot is Sally Wayman Kallin’s “The In-
visible Users of Online Catalogs: A Public Services Perspective." This timely contribution describes the concerns of a public services librarian in her pursuit of the ever-distant, hopefully not ever-confused, remote access user. She addresses the need for providing support for these users and includes suggestions for doing so through her experiences as the OPAC coordinator in a much remotely-used system.

Charles Hildreth finishes off the work with a look at "the second generation catalog" which represents "a marriage of the library catalog and conventional online information retrieval (IR) systems" and focuses on enhancements to this generation as well. All in all, this is an interesting and informative issue, though not one of which a library would need more than one circulating copy.—Rosanna M. O’Neil, OCLC, Inc., Dublin, Ohio.


In this volume Crawford presents exactly what the title promises: issues, not answers, relating to patron interaction with online catalogs. As Crawford says in the preface, this book is not a scholarly survey of opinion on online catalogs but is rather a very thorough examination of issues which should be considered in their design and implementation.

Each chapter of the book focuses on one aspect of the interaction between patron and online catalog. The relevant issues are presented as assertions or assumptions made by Crawford, and he follows these with discussions of possible alternatives and their relative merits, often providing unusual insight into each problem. Some of the issues/assertions are obvious, such as "Online catalogs should serve patrons at least as well as card catalogs do. The best online catalogs will provide each patron with access that suits his or her needs" (p.2). Some are controversial: "Where authority files are available and a patron has searched for an alternate form, the system should prompt for the form used by the library but should not automatically search that form and display the result" (p.141). Some appear straightforward but contain ramifications easily overlooked: "The main entry should appear together with other names in a labeled display, but displays should not put all names above the title. Clarity can be increased by repeating the main entry once at the beginning of the display and once in a group with any other names" (p.231).

The book presents an exhaustive survey of issues relating to patron access: defining the online catalog and the particular strengths of card versus online catalogs; the database engine including information content and various files and indexes to be included; search session boundaries and signposts; learning the system and user control of the search session; terminals, function keys, and hardware display options; printers, workstations, and dial access; commands and menus, with comparisons of command driven and menu driven systems; feedback, help and prompting for "most likely action," authorized forms, and displays of related works; searching by subject, Boolean logic, known item searches, and discussion of issues and suggestions relating to failed searches; and, finally, display issues such as the design of the screen display, information to include, labels, card formats, citation formats, and issues relating to single and multiple item displays.

Crawford’s style is clear and concise, scholarly yet very easy to follow and understand. The text is divided into relatively short, clearly defined, and labeled sections with illustrations in support of the arguments presented. He cites authors who have presented ideas conflicting with his own, provides notes at the end of each chapter, and includes a glossary, index, and bibliography with annotations for especially important works.

This is an excellent book, well written and presenting some important
Managing the Catalog Department.

Like its predecessors, this third edition opens with the caveat that this "is not a how-to catalog but a how-to-manage-it book," and indeed, those seeking the former are advised to look elsewhere. Only two chapters delve with any specificity into the daily nuts-and-bolts routines of a catalog department. Of these two, "The Department," which attempts to describe the routines and work flow of a medium-sized, nonautomated catalog department, covers its subject in a most general fashion, which seems appropriate for a book of this kind, given its expressed aim; still, some librarians, depending on their level of experience, may feel either disappointed or patronized by this once-over treatment. Only "Current Issues" poses any real problem in that many librarians will no doubt find most of the issues under discussion (e.g., brief cataloging, card reproduction) no longer very current; their inclusion here basically just serves as a reminder that many libraries still grapple with these questions. The remaining chapters, however, form a concise, lucidly written, commonsense introduction to catalog department management.

This edition continues the second edition's emphasis on personnel management and management tools and techniques. The chapter titles themselves are indicative of this emphasis: "Effective Staffing"; "Orientation, Training, Evaluation"; "Staff Relationships." Sections have been added on time management, career development, workshops, performance standards, mutual problem solving, and attitude surveys. Thanks to Foster's judicious use of the literature on general management theory and practice—of the seventy-four sources listed in the bibliography, over one-third are of just such a general nature—much of the advice he has to offer will be of interest to other department heads beyond the catalog department.

This edition introduces a major organizational change with the consolidation of the sections on networking and other aspects of computer technology into a final chapter, "The Computer." Whether this consolidation represents an improvement is open for debate: while a separate chapter on computer technology helps to emphasize the impact of this extremely important topic, previous editions did a better job of placing these aspects of automation within the context of everyday departmental functions.

This is not a deeply theoretical tract. It is instead an eminently practical handbook to which catalogers with varying degrees of experience can turn for guidance when unfamiliar situations arise. As such it belongs in every catalog department.—Lonnie Beene, West Texas State University, Canyon.

Selection of Library Materials in Applied and Interdisciplinary Fields.

In the preface to this work, the second of three volumes to be published by the American Library Association on the selection of library materials, the editors state their purpose as attempting "to offer advice and guidance to selectors who lack experience developing collections in an assigned field." Not only have they accomplished that goal but they have also succeeded in compiling a work that will be a valuable, standard reference tool for more seasoned
selectors. There is something for everyone in this volume, and it easily lives up to the promise of its predecessor, which covered the selection of library materials in the social sciences and humanities.

The work is divided into eighteen chapters, each written by a bibliographer with ample experience in the field under scrutiny. Coverage ranges from agriculture to women's studies, with stops in between at business and management, communication arts and sciences, criminal justice, education, engineering, environmental studies, geography and maps, health sciences, home economics, law, public administration and policy sciences, race and ethnic studies, the radical left and right, social work, sports and recreation, and urban planning.

A major feature of this book is the excellent organization of its component parts. Each chapter follows basically the same model, beginning with a definition of the field, an exploration of the likely clientele for these materials and ways that a library's particular patron pool might determine the depth of collecting, a discussion of specific bibliographic problems of a given discipline, and detailed information on selection sources for monographic, serial, retrospective, and current materials. The relative merits of certain types of materials, e.g., newsletters and free publications, are discussed, and authors provide addresses of associations, out-of-print dealers, and other potential sources of information and materials. The writers also include special formats unique or common to a discipline, and some discuss databases that can prove helpful in collection development. Each chapter highlights annotated entries of sources basic to that discipline (e.g., Criminal Justice Periodical Index, Business Information Sources, A Comprehensive Bibliography for the Study of American Minorities) as well as listing relevant periodicals and their dates. At the end of each chapter is found a lengthy list of selection sources for the field discussed.

This is a practical guide that provides a wealth of information on disciplines which are among the most difficult for selection. It can profitably and easily be used by bibliographers regardless of the size or scope of the collections under their stewardship. The contributions are of a consistently high quality, due in large part to the expertise and enthusiasm of the authors. I look forward to the third volume, which will focus on the selection of materials in support of area studies.—Deborah Jakubs, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Wilsondisc. New York: Wilson, 1987-

Wilsondisc is the latest component of the Wilsonline information system, which was introduced two years ago by the H. W. Wilson Company. The system also includes Wilsonline, its online retrieval system, and Wilsearch, a microcomputer software package designed for end-user access to Wilsonline. Twelve databases, which correspond to the Wilson Company's printed subject indexes, are currently available through Wilsondisc: Applied Science and Technology Index, Art Index, Biography Index, Business Periodicals Index, Cumulative Book Index, Education Index, General Science Index, Humanities Index, Index to Legal Periodicals, Library Literature, Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, and Social Sciences Index.

Wilsondisc provides local access to the Wilson indexes by means of optical disks, one for each database, which are updated and cumulated quarterly. Coverage of the databases begins in the 1980s. Wilsondisc also provides the opportunity to retrieve the most current information by going online.

The system employs four search modes tailored to different levels of searching experience. The Browse mode presents an alphabetical list of subject terms, indicating the number of postings for each. When the searcher has highlighted the desired term, citations are displayed one by one in reverse chronological order. Cross-
references and related terms can also be accessed by the use of a function key.

The Wilsearch mode, based on the Wilsearch software package, displays a menu where terms can be input for any or all of the basic citation fields. It then supplies implicit truncation and implicit Boolean logic. Wilsearch also provides the ability to save a search so that it can be performed in any other database. This feature is also available in the next two modes.

The Wilsonline mode, which is similar to its online namesake, Wilsonline, utilizes a search screen and prompts to formulate a search using the following capabilities: free text or controlled vocabulary, Boolean logic, proximity, ranging, truncation, and browsing or expanding of terms from the subject thesaurus. The Expert mode offers these same features but with expanded screen handling and windowing functions as well as a continuous view of search strategy development on a log screen.

Wilsondisc makes use of the various function keys to print individual or all citations; to call up a help screen which explains the characteristics of whichever mode is being searched; to page back and forth between screens; and to go online for the most current information.

Unlike the printed indexes, each record found on Wilsondisc includes all assigned subject headings in addition to the basic bibliographic citation. All data elements of the record can be searched, either as free text or by the use of qualifiers. These include: author, title, subject headings, physical description, record type, article contents, country name, publisher, date of publication, journal title, Library of Congress card number, ISSN, ISBN, language, names of statutes and cases, company names and accession numbers. To ensure more efficient searching, the system employs a stopword list. Use of truncation symbols on a particular word will override this feature.

All entries that appear in both the printed indexes and their online equivalents are controlled by name and subject authority files established by the Wilson Company. These files cover authors, corporate names, series, uniform titles, and subject descriptors. Descriptors are strung together to create subject and subject subheading hierarchies.

The authority files are utilized on Wilsondisc through the Browse mode, which is a strict subject thesaurus search, and in the Wilsonline and Expert modes through the neighbor and expand commands. The neighbor command retrieves an alphabetical list of index entries which appear above and below a specified term. The searcher can page up and down to choose the term(s) which best suits the needs of the search. The display includes a line number (for retrieval purposes), number of postings for a term, the term itself, and the search category qualifiers that may accompany a term. The neighbor command can be used to review the exact format and spelling of authors, subject headings and other index terms. The expand command displays broader, narrower, and related terms for a heading as it appears in an alphabetical list and lists the number of postings as well.

Wilsondisc is designed to serve a range of users, from the novice to the sophisticate. The Browse and Wilsearch modes are tailored for the end-user, such as an undergraduate writing a term paper on an easily definable topic. The Wilsonline and Expert modes are intended for experienced searchers or those with curiosity and persistence, who with the aid of the help screens and the manual can retrieve material on more complex subject matter. What makes the system most attractive is its ability to pull up citations to articles on a particular subject in a relatively short period of time and print the results, all for no charge, except for going online to update the last four months.

The professional librarian will also find Wilsondisc useful because the
structure of the system allows access to every element in the bibliographic record, including those that are of little interest to the general public. Searches of publisher or journal title fields would be helpful for collection development purposes, and the authority files could be used by catalogers or indexers to create in-house files.

Wilsondisc will operate on any IBM-PC with 640K of memory and a fixed disk drive. Although the use of a color monitor is optional, it helps to enhance the system's features. A Hayes modem is necessary for online access. There is a very thorough guide to Wilsonline, which includes separate sections for Wilsearch and Wilsondisc.—Carla M. Weiss, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.


Haworth Press has developed an interesting and at times annoying habit of offering issues of its various journals as monographs, including separate advertising that clearly refers to the original journal only in the fine print; this item is another of that species. The Introduction notes that "the issue is an attempt to focus attention on the problems inherent in proper care and handling of sci-tech materials as well as actual examples of what projects and studies have been made on this topic." The six papers that follow do in a general manner fill this description but not as well as other works nor as specifically as might be appropriate.

Mary Genett offers a very good overview of preservation concerns and program activities of the American Museum of Natural History, especially noting the differences between "spe-
cial" and "general" collection materials and how different activities are appropriate to each. Joan Warnow-Blewett's article focuses on the problem of selection(') for preservation, but from a new viewpoint: the American Institute of Physics seeks to coordinate records appraisal to ensure preservation of documentation of an entire field of study. This is a broader perspective on preservation than most have been able to take, and may be very important consciousness raising for sci-tech librarians, as well as an interesting thought paper for hard core preservation people. A brief discussion of preservation problems in the tropics raises more questions than it answers: it is a starting point for research in this area, but not answers for those with problems. Nancy Schrock documents the development of a comprehensive preservation program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology libraries, as well as offering good advice relative to initiating a program in any other institution.

With pages 1–79 devoted to the six papers on preservation topics, and the remaining 90 pages covering the "regular features" of the journal issue, it hardly seems worth the effort to produce this issue as a separate contribution: the sci-tech people would read the special articles as they read the regular journal, preservation minded people could profit more from other material, and it's doubtful that in this day of proliferating journals others would even look twice at the title. —Ann G. Swartzell, New York State Library, Albany.


One of the thorniest problems in designing an online public access catalog is matching the subject terms entered by users to the subject headings in relevant bibliographic records. The problem is compounded if the catalog contains records with subject headings from more than one thesaurus, for example, medical (MeSH) headings as well as those of the Library of Congress (LCSH). Consider the user who enters the subject "medical psychology" into a state-of-the-art online catalog which contains some relevant records indexed under the LCSH "Clinical psychology" and other relevant records indexed under the MeSH "Psychology, clinical." What is the probability of a successful interaction between user and catalog?

The probability is very low, if not zero, concludes Carol A. Mandel, author of *Multiple Thesauri in Online Library Bibliographic Systems: A Report Prepared for Library of Congress Processing Services*. The plight of users who interact with multiple thesauri is only one of several issues addressed in the report. Mandel also summarizes the desirable features of a thesaurus management system and describes the complex situation facing staff at the Library of Congress, who must plan for computer support of no less than six different thesauri, including LCSH.

Readers not associated with LC will be most interested in Mandel's detailed analysis of subject authority control in seven online systems, including ORION, WLN, DOBIS, UTLAS, Geac BPS, NOTIS, and Carlyle TOMUS. The illustrations of terminal displays are especially useful.

The author packs a great many facts about multiple thesauri and online catalogs into less than 100 pages. Most of the information is published here for the first time. Only one caveat is in order. Mandel is quite sparing of definitions and omits a glossary and index. Her report is aimed for readers already familiar with the vocabulary of thesaurus construction and the content designation of the MARC bibliographic and authority formats. For readers thus prepared, *Multiple Thesauri in Online Library Bibliographic Systems* is an indispensable addition to the literature on the design of online public-access
catalogs.—David Gleim, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.


It is a fairly safe bet that tucked away in the files of many librarians are copies of at least several articles or annual reports written by Richard De Gennaro. For the past twenty years his writings have been an unfailing source of good judgment on the directions of librarianship and technology in libraries. More than that, De Gennaro has managed to synthesize large scale, complex situations before they divulged their full evidence to most of the profession, so that his statements helped mold thinking in a way almost unique in our profession. Consistently, he has distinguished the real issues from the perceived issues, brought them into focus, and rendered them productively debatable.

The present volume places conveniently at hand reprints of thirty-three essays by Richard De Gennaro published since 1965. The collection of reprints is preceded by six essays written expressly for this volume by De Gennaro to summarize his assessment of the present and likely future status of librarianship. It is comforting reading because its straightforward reason and clarity are reassuring, and because De Gennaro does not believe at all that the sky is falling on librarianship. As represented in this collection of essays, Richard De Gennaro's primary interest is the changing environment of the library, especially as it has been affected by the influx of technology. The larger section of the book containing the reprinted essays is arranged in reverse chronological order, which presents a useful perspective on the evolution of the library's environment throughout the past quarter century in the form of retrospective snapshot analyses along the way. Many of these essays are introduced by the author by way of explaining the background of the issue in question and, in some cases, relating the essay to the evolution of his own thinking. Consequently, we have an unusual history of American librarianship during the past quarter century along with glimpses into the mind of an informed practitioner during that period.

Richard De Gennaro has an exceptionally keen sense of balance. He listens carefully to the laments and cheers of the crowd as it judges technology and as it speculates on the future of librarianship, but tempers both with wisdom drawn from successful experience. While certain of his views may have appeared mildly radical when they were first published, reading them in this collection makes it more evident that, far from being radical, the author's opinions and expression are rooted with extraordinary firmness in practicality and common sense. Because De Gennaro has the ability in his writings to relate the specific to the general and the general to the specific, he has helped practitioners and theorists alike understand the most important challenges of librarianship in their most significant contexts.

Given the author's careers at Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, and now the New York Public Library, it is to be expected that the emphasis of his writings would be on research librarianship, especially academic research librarianship. But the value of Richard De Gennaro's written contributions to the profession goes far beyond those arenas. This collection of essays forms an intellectual whole that demonstrates in clear terms and with quiet sophistication that the library profession has arrived not at an impasse but at a threshold.—Charles B. Osburn, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa.

**Authority Control Symposium: Papers Presented during the 14th Annual ARLIS/NA Conference, New York, N.Y., February 10, 1986.** Ed. by Karen Muller. Occasional Papers,
This interesting symposium resulted from a perceived need which surfaced at the annual conference of the Art Librarians Society of North America. For some time, art librarians have wanted better control of their bibliographic media. Early in 1986, a special Authority Control Symposium took place in conjunction with the 14th Annual Conference of the Society held in New York. The symposium was sponsored by the society’s Cataloging and Indexing Special Interest Group and its Cataloging Advisory Committee.

It set for itself an ambitious agenda, which, judging by the result, must have been highly successful. Experimental studies of users and usage of online catalogs have demonstrated the need for improved usage of authorities. For purposes of clarity, wherever possible, the examples in this publication have been taken from actual cases relating to the visual arts.

The symposium began with a summary of what authority involves, followed by a description of national features of such control at present. The problems of multiple authorities in library systems, plus those users of online catalogs, are especially well-represented. Examples were selected from existing online catalogs and depicted actual situations encountered. They illustrate the advantages involved in automation, solutions to specific difficulties, and also the application of methods for new problems which have arisen as a result of the process of moving from card or printed catalogs to online situations.

As one might expect, the longest chapter, written by Karen Markey, covers the vital topic of the use of subject authority in online catalogs. Footnotes are at the bottom of pages of text, while examples from OCLC (Online Computer Library Center) and RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) have been depicted in a special section called “Figures.”

Librarians who attended the symposium must have gone home inspired to try out what they learned. It will be interesting to see what happens in this area for the next decade, as old problems are resolved and new ones, based specifically on the results of this meeting are encountered. Similar follow-up conferences will be needed for the next decade. An excellent document like this deserves wide circulation.—Phyllis A. Richmond, Professor Emeritus, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS

Please follow these procedures for manuscripts to be submitted to Library Resources & Technical Services:

1. Submit original, unpublished articles only. Do not submit manuscripts being considered for publication elsewhere. Articles of four to six thousand words on subjects of interest to technical services librarians are preferred.

2. Write the article in a grammatically correct, simple, readable style. Remember that the author is responsible for the accuracy of all statements in the article.

3. Give the article a brief title; if the title is not descriptive of the content, add a brief subtitle. On a separate page give the title, the name(s) of the author(s), and the title and affiliation of each. If the paper has been presented at a conference (the proceedings of which will not be published), identify the conference by name and date on the cover page.

4. On a separate page, type the title and subtitle, followed by a brief abstract, typed doubled-spaced. Do not identify the author(s) here or elsewhere in the manuscript.

5. Type the manuscript, double-spaced, on 8½-by-11-inch nonerasable paper. Use fresh, bright typewriter or computer printer ribbons. Please TYPE ALL QUOTED TEXT DOUBLE-SPACED.

6. Consult Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, supplemented by Webster’s Third International, for spelling and usage; prefer the first spelling. Verify the spelling and accuracy of names in an appropriate reference; don’t rely solely on your memory.

7. Consult The Chicago Manual of Style, 13th ed., revised and expanded (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1982) for capitalization, abbreviations, etc.

8. Follow the examples and suggestions in chapter 12 of The Chicago Manual in designing tables. Submit each table on a separate page at the end of the paper. Indicate the preferred placement in the text with an instruction in brackets. Use tables sparingly and provide each with a brief, meaningful caption. TYPE TABLES DOUBLE-SPACED THROUGHOUT.

9. Be prepared to supply camera-ready copy for each illustration, if your paper is accepted. Accompany the manuscript with a photocopy of each and a brief, meaningful caption noted on the verso.

10. Submit all bibliographic citations on separate pages at the end of the article. PLEASE TYPE ALL “REFERENCES” DOUBLE-SPACED. Use superscript numbers throughout the text, but do not type the numbers as superscripts in the “References,” and do not indent the first line. Use “References” to document the text, not to amplify it. Note that a shortened form (not op. cit. or loc. cit.) is used for subsequent references to a previously cited work. If no other reference intervenes, use “Ibid.” to take the place of the elements of the previous reference that apply. Do not underline “Ibid.” A reference to another article from a previously cited collection can be shortened by means of a cross-reference. VERIFY EACH CITATION CAREFULLY.

The fictitious examples below illustrate the preferred style.


2. Neville A. Fisher and others, Publishing Patterns of the Next Decade,

3. Ibid., p.194.


11. Send three complete copies of your manuscript, including copies of the illustrative material (see also instruction #9) to: Dr. Sheila S. Intner, Editor, LRTS, Simmons College Graduate School of Library & Information Science, 300 The Fenway, Boston, MA 02115. Overseas contributors may send one copy only. Allow approximately ten weeks for the referees' and editor's review. Manuscripts will be returned only if accompanied by a self-addressed envelope, large enough and with sufficient postage for the return of all copies. An IBM-PC diskette with WordStar files may be sent for one copy of the manuscript.

The LRTS editorial office in general follows the Guidelines for Authors, Editors and Publishers of Literature in the Library and Information Field, adopted by the American Library Association Council in 1983 and available from the ALA Executive Offices. Information about copyright policies also is available at ALA Headquarters.
Since 1981, the *MLA International Bibliography* has indexed approximately 250,000 articles and books on literature and language. Now the H. W. Wilson Company is offering all seven years' worth of data on a single compact disc.

The CD-ROM version of the *Bibliography* provides the same extensive cross-referencing available in the printed subject index but eliminates the hours necessary to thumb through the fourteen books published since 1981. The disc version offers many additional timesaving devices; for example, a user who wishes to find materials on the theme of racism in Eudora Welty's fiction would simply enter "Welty, Eudora" and "racism."

For a nominal telecommunications charge, WILSONDISC™ users also enjoy unlimited searching of the *Bibliography* on WISONLINE®, which is updated monthly from November to June, so that information added to the file between quarterly updates of WILSONDISC is easily and inexpensively available. With one keystroke, users switch from searching the CD to searching online.

For a free brochure about the *MLA International Bibliography* on WILSONDISC, write to Online and Special Services, Modern Language Association, 10 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003-6981. Or call David Cloyce Smith at (212) 614-6304.
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