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Editorial: Censorship and Librarians

Censorship is on the rise across the country, in the form of challenges and subsequent removal of books from library shelves, as well as throughout the world in more explosive forms, such as the Salman Rushdie death threat. But there also are more subtle forms of censorship involving the erection of barriers to access that stem the free flow of ideas and their incorporation, for better or worse, by individuals.

The relationship of censorship and librarians probably is clearest and most immediate to those whose responsibilities lie in collection development, especially in selection of materials. The lead article in this issue, Fujimoto's "Representing a Document's Viewpoint in Library Collections: A Theme of Obligation and Resistance," addresses the tensions inherent among conflicting professional goals and ideals that ask librarians to be simultaneously neutral and proactive, objective and subjective.

Other papers in this issue investigate less-visible barriers to dissemination of ideas attributable to cataloging, indexing, and classification practices. Knutson's "Comparison of Online and Card Catalog Accuracy" and Wilson's "Form Subdivision and Genre" evaluate the implications for bibliographic/intellectual access to materials of catalog accuracy and subject heading design, respectively; while McGarry and Yee's "Cataloging of Conference Proceedings," Markham's "LCC, DDC and Algae," and Maccaferri's "Cataloging Ottoman Turkish Personal Names" examine the impact on the lay public of specific practices in the descriptive cataloging of conference proceedings, classification of literature on algae, and establishment of name headings. Two other papers discuss topics in cataloging, Rapp's "Personnel Selection for Cataloging," and Glasby's "Historical Background and Review of Serials Cataloging Rules." Rapp offers insights into a major management problem of today, while Glasby gives us a context in which to understand current efforts to provide access to serials. When library practices create systematic barriers to access, they constitute a kind of censorship. And isn't this kind of censorship more insidious when it affects the most vulnerable sectors of the library's public—children and youth, or casual or novice searchers?

Walker offers a practical outline for formulating the basic information needed for a library's preservation program in "Assessing Preservation Needs." If materials disintegrate on our shelves due to less-than-careful physical management, librarians might be held responsible for failing to fulfill their function of guarding humanity's intellectual and cultural heritage.

Censorship—the purposeful, systematic denial of access to certain works or ideas—is repugnant to our profession. This group of papers prods us all to remember our special obligations as collections and technical service librarians to consider the impact of our decisions on access to informa-
tion. This issue may challenge us, but that should pose no problem. To be meaningful, librarians' vigilance against censorship can embrace even discomforting ideas. In this editor's opinion, moving readers beyond the plane of comfort to a plane of professional open-mindedness and understanding is part of the mind-stretching function of the scholarly journal. I hope you agree.—Sheila S. Intner, Editor.
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Interaction:
Letters to the Editor

From Bonnie Juergens (Executive Director, AMIGOS), Dallas, Texas:

“In the article entitled “Networks and School Library Media Centers,” [LRFS, 33:123-33] an error was made in the name of our organization. . . . The AMIGOS Bibliographic Council, Inc., is our full name. The article attempted to expand AMIGOS as if it were an acronym [Access Method for Indexed Data Generalized for Operating System]. However, AMIGOS is not an acronym. The term was chosen from the Spanish word for ‘friends.’ . . .”

Sheila S. Intner replies:
We are sorry for the error and hope your letter clarifies the point for all of our readers.

From Marvin Scilken, Orange, New Jersey:

“I don’t claim that ‘no one’ will reclassify [from one edition of Dewey classification to another] but rather that only a minuscule number of public libraries will. I called my colleagues. . . . None of them reclassified and they had never encountered any library that did.

“They were reluctant to use scarce, expensive library labor on such a project.

“Would you change your view [on changing class numbers] if it turned out that almost no public libraries reclassify?”

Sheila S. Intner replies:
No. But I would try harder to educate librarians about classification. Knowledge changes, sometimes in fundamental ways. Classifications must respond by rearranging the numbers in order to maintain meaningful relationships among subjects. Otherwise, the real purpose of classification cannot be fulfilled: to arrange materials in a meaningful order (for browsers). Isn’t this a service to patrons, too?
Representing a Document's Viewpoint in Library Collections: A Theme of Obligation and Resistance

Jan Dee Fujimoto

In public and academic libraries, the professional librarian has an obligation to represent fairly the values and viewpoints of all segments of society. This has been a difficult obligation to fulfill due to conflicts existing within our own professional value system—conflicts that affect decision making and our degree of commitment to any stated goal. Professional goals and ideals that demonstrate such conflicts are presented in this paper with suggestions for a possible means to their resolution.

Viewpoint or perspective is a necessary phenomenon because any view we have of the world must be partial: "The world is too large and complex to be seen whole... people use ideas to pare reality down to manageable size, so they can take it in and do something with it. Now we can call those particularizing ideas 'perspectives.'"

Each particularizing idea may present a quite different version of reality from others, and we are faced with the problem of building from a conglomeration of partial perspectives a conceptual whole upon which to base our decision making and conceptual business. We cannot experience every possible point of view. Therefore we must rely on "second-hand" accounts for most of what we know and gauge the correctness of competing views according to what we know of the qualifications and trustworthiness of the view-bearer(s).

Librarians are responsible for a great collection of "second-hand" accounts. Yet there is conflict in professional philosophy concerning the librarian's responsibility toward the book and its viewpoint. Professional statements place an obligation upon the librarian to recognize the many sides to any issue and represent them fairly in the library's collection. The 1938 Code of Ethics for Librarians stated: "Provision should be made for as wide a range of publications and as varied a representation of viewpoints..."
as is consistent with the policies of the library and with the funds available.

In 1939 the American Library Association (ALA) Library Bill of Rights was adopted with some revisions from a statement composed by Forrest Spaulding, librarian of Des Moines Public Library. It was revised completely in 1948 and 1967 and amended in 1980. Beginning as: "There should be the fullest practicable provision of material presenting all points of view concerning the problems and issues of our times, international, national, and local; and books or other reading matter of sound factual authority should not be proscribed or removed from library shelves because of partisan or doctrinal disapproval," the statement gained in force: "Libraries should provide materials and information presenting all [emphasis added] points of view on current and historical issues."

These statements indicate the awareness librarians feel for representing viewpoint. However, they are reluctant to indicate explicitly and systematically the differences in viewpoint to their library users. It is customary for librarians engaged in book selection to consult the catalog to see how many items are already owned on a given subject or by a certain author, but they cannot readily determine which viewpoints are represented in the collection and which must be added. Given the strength of the profession's commitment to represent viewpoints fairly and its view that the catalog is the mechanism of access to its collection, this discrepancy seems inconsistent. There seems to be an inherent lack of harmony between certain professional goals and ideals. This lack of harmony cripples practical attempts of librarians to fulfill their responsibility toward the expression of varied viewpoints in collections. This paper considers the goals and ideals that demonstrate the conflict in values inherent in our profession and suggests a possible means to their resolution. The ideals considered are those of comprehensiveness, balance, and neutrality. Each of these ideals demands actions and attitudes that are inconsistent with the achievement of other goals.

**THE IDEAL OF COMPREHENSIVENESS**

There is an immediate tension between the urge to collect "all" and the practical necessity of excluding titles. Choices and responsible decisions must be made regarding what should be collected and preserved. Unfortunately, selectivity implies the exclusion of certain items.

The desire for comprehensiveness in collection development, especially in large research libraries, is a well-established professional goal. Anything written was important by definition and possessed, by reason of being in print, an objective value meriting preservation. There need be no attempt to scale between most and least valuable and no need to select or discriminate between items. Discrimination between information items assumes a secondary role. Access to world resources is primary.

*Access* is the equivalent modern expression of the ingrained ideal of comprehensiveness. *Information* is a theme of this age and access to information is the librarian's response to the theme. Providing access involves keeping up with published output. It leads to increased library activities of networking, interlibrary loans, and multitype library agreements. Much
energy is channeled into linking information systems so that the individual library user need not be restricted to the limitations of a particular institution. The librarian’s dedication to comprehensive collection is apparent in these modern trends.

The tension between the ideal of comprehensiveness and the necessity for selectivity has caused the librarian to be very cautious about the treatment of viewpoint. Even though texts might have been selected on the basis of their stand on particular issues, there is a reluctance to point out their differences. The result is a denial for viewpoint of explicit and systematic indication in the library’s catalog.

**The Ideal of Balance**

The necessity for selection of one title over another leads to a direct problem of proportion: To what extent should certain titles and certain viewpoints be given priority? One guideline tying professional idealism with day-to-day reality can be summed up in the theme of balance. It is deeply ingrained in most librarians although there is some disagreement about what balance really means. To some it means coverage of all sides of a question and all points of view, i.e., a well-rounded collection. To others it means buying for minority interests in addition to majority interests. For some, it means maintaining a collection that reflects in due proportion the interests of the library’s community. In academic libraries, the departmental type budget defines balance functionally by determining how much money is spent in each department. In the absence of guidelines, however, the librarian must develop a policy that conforms to his or her own definition of balance. Decisions usually are made on some value base provided by the community, the publishing world, or the profession. There may be conflict with these adopted value bases and certain independently held values.

**Community Demand or “Give 'em What They Want”**

One criterion by which choices may be made for exclusion or inclusion of a viewpoint in the library collection is community demand. Value can be attributed to a book according to ideals espoused within the community. For a long time one of the constants of librarianship has been its orientation toward community service. Ascribing to community demand can seemingly release the librarian from selection responsibility and insure community support. It is not so straightforward, however. The definition of community alters the balance. Different library types serve different communities even while sharing the same location. Corporate or denominational libraries, for example, are designed to serve the interests of the institution that supports them. Their purpose is to aid in the survival of the institutional view. Alternate views are collected only to a degree allowed by the sponsoring institution, and there is no obligation to provide access to alternate views unless doing so would advance the cause of their institutions.

The public library, in contrast, serves a geographic/political region usually quite diverse in constituency. This is the source of much difficulty in collection development. Should the community to be given exactly what it
asks for? What if different segments of the same community are at odds in what they demand of the library? It may be impossible to buy everything “they” want assuming it is possible to determine what it is. “Community profiling” became a popular method for determining the makeup of a community in order to predict its needs and wants. Decisions still must be made concerning priorities whenever there is a conflict. Will only the loudest requests be heard? What about those unable to attend the library or those who are unaware of all the services available to them? Reflecting the predominant community views might leave no room for the expression of minority interests. The selection of each alternate must reduce the overall depth to which the predominant view can be explored or some minority views may be edged out completely.

In fact, even though the demand-driven model has prevailed in public libraries, it continues to be tempered by the librarian’s judgment of what constitutes a basic or balanced collection and by the librarian’s notion of “quality” literature. The librarian reserves the right to ignore the desires of pressure groups or special interest groups. The librarian considers it an obligation to make the community aware of views it does not know about, to increase the number of choices available. Desire to accede to community request and yet make available the unorthodox deepens the tension felt in professional practice. Some librarians have solved the dilemma for themselves by interpreting the difference as between actual demand (for best sellers usually) and potential demand (for the “quality” classics). Others substitute a notion of community need for community demand. The substitution raises further complication. Need is tricky to define. It may sometimes be expressed in demands and then measured in circulation statistics. But if it remains unexpressed, then the responsibility falls upon the librarian to know what is needed. The responsibility assumed here by the librarian is tremendous.

**PUBLISHING TRENDS**

As an alternative basis for selection, balance might be weighed against the realities of what authors and publishers are putting onto the market. What is the librarian’s responsibility when all sides of an issue are not reflected equally in the literature? Publishers do not publish equally on every side of an issue. What should the librarian do when some views are more available than others? There is considerable disagreement. A recent issue has to do with the feminist movement. Some librarians are strongly committed feminists engaged actively in the effort to remove sexist language from books and subject headings. They find much of what is being published offensive and there is an attempt by some to place pressure on publishers to respect the goals of feminism and publish works that place women in a more positive light. As an attempt by some librarians to alter the images and views of society, this action has generated much fire in professional correspondence columns.

**THE NEUTRAL LIBRARIAN**

Librarianship is a philosophically independent profession. As professionals, librarians disaffirm explicitly allegiance with any particular interest group, so as to serve all groups equally.
Much of the noted tension between the idealism of selection policy and the attempt to apply it practically can be summed up by the librarian’s express wish to avoid judgment of value. Berninghausen suggests that professional statements are geared toward developing a “view of the librarian as a neutral professional functioning in a neutral institution.” A refusal to assess value is in line with an “open door” policy for selection: everything has a place in the library. One librarian has expressed the hope that “objective” views of an issue should be collected: “We can and must see that the public is provided with unbiased materials on the subject.”

This is different from collecting biased materials from every side of an issue. It is a biased approach itself and would, if interpreted accurately, probably lead to the exclusion of every item in the library! The necessary alternative, however, is to prioritize between all the choices, to decide what merits a place. Balance in any sense does not just happen; it requires choice. And despite claims to neutrality, there are professionally ingrained values that conflict with values provided by the community and publishing world.

**QUALITY AS A PROFESSIONAL VALUE**

Librarians must and do prioritize by their continuing concern for quality. Balance may be sacrificed for quality. Librarians in the past were concerned with a basic collection of quality literature. As community support became increasingly important for the survival of the library as an institution, its demands came to determine much of library selection policy. But even today, the librarian might decide to build a quality book collection regardless of community demand. One says, “We do want to balance our collection, but we won’t accept schlock just to even the score!” This may be seen as an imposition of the librarian’s own standards for goodness since “quality” must be defined according to some subjective set of values. Community demand tends to favor the latest fiction best sellers, often considered outside the bounds of quality literature. The constant dilemma is: Can literature be selected as having value in itself, or as having value only through the use it receives by the community? The librarian must decide what quality is and risk assuming an unjustified superior intellectual or moral position.

**DIVERSITY AS A PROFESSIONAL VALUE**

“A balanced collection reflects a diversity of materials, not equality of numbers.” There are indications that the practicing librarian resolves the question of deciding quality vs. remaining neutral by making novelty and diversity a value base. An item is added to the collection if it expresses a new or alternative way of looking at something. It is easy to recognize when something is new. No librarian need apologize for including any item that (s)he has merely claimed is different. When pressed, every item can become unique and necessary or exclusion of an item can be justified quite easily if “we already have quite enough of that kind of literature!” Novelty as a value base provides a way out for the librarian trapped between the quality vs. community demand issue.
SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AS A PROFESSIONAL VALUE

A sense of social responsibility has long been assumed as an element of collection development. One of the stated purposes of the library in earlier times was to provide uplifting literature. The librarian was the "apostle of culture" or the "missionary of literature." His/her chief reason for being was to uplift the masses beyond their narrow, daily perspective, to "better" them. The library was viewed as a stabilizing agency amid much social unrest. The fight against fiction was largely a recognition of the librarian's duty not to provide books that might incite to crime or immorality. The librarian was to provide wholesome literature and preserve the social norm. The library was a reforming agency. Its role in cultural development was one of inculcating positive social attitudes, communicating cultural values, socializing the young, Americanizing, and more recently rehabilitating the handicapped. Books were selected as examples of how readers ought to think—and that expressed opinions geared toward the betterment of society.

A second role assumed by the library in the past was one of protection of the state. Threats of subversion sometimes have challenged firmly held principles against censorship. Though suppression of dissident views is not sanctioned, public libraries in the U.S. are partisan in their open support of democracy as the form of the nation's government. In this sense, American library philosophy is not radically different from the partisan philosophy of Soviet librarianship. Libraries see their function as one of building an informed citizenry to strengthen the basis of democracy. ALA's Council declared, "We are then, anti-communist, but we are also opposed to any other group which aims at closing any path to knowledge."

Where U.S. library philosophy differs is in claiming to provide places for all views, even those that would suppress freedom of expression for other views.

The protection of society against propaganda and immorality is another theme of social responsibility. Protect means that any item viewed either as obscene or as propaganda would not be selected for inclusion in the library. There is debate whether this is really part of the library's function. Most libraries will not add tracts or anything that is proselytizing. A sample collection development statement reads: "Represent all religions and denominations including their sacred scriptures. With regard to sectarian books, add only those that are truly representative and of interest to the general reader. Do not add religious books that have as their sole purpose proselytism. Do not add tract-type material. Do not add materials that are intended primarily for the indoctrination of members of a particular sect or denomination."

Whether the library should protect youth from materials of a sexual nature is another issue of the same sort. The modern library claims a leadership role in seeing that information is available for children, adolescents, parents, and professionals on the subject of sex education for youth. Regardless of controversy among parents concerning the availability of sex education materials for youth, the library profession has decided it will al-
low youth access to such materials.

There also is a strong trend in the modern library toward the active support of the civil rights movement (primarily rights of women and minorities). Incidents such as ALA's boycott of Chicago as a convention site when the State of Illinois did not ratify the Equal Rights Amendment show the tension between professional neutrality and a motivation toward certain social causes. Should the librarian reflect predominant social views or attempt to alter those that conflict with some privately or professionally held ideal?

It has been suggested that in the fulfillment of the library's goals, the librarian assumes the role of educator. Emptying a diversity of viewpoints into the library pool, for example, does not create access to them. Access is only partly a physical mechanism. It is also a strategy, one that does not come naturally to human inquiry but one that must be taught. The librarian cannot merely be an informer but naturally is an educator as well. An educator must evaluate and make decisions unswayed by community interest. Contrary to the self-image as neutral transmitter, the librarian/educator must use some independent system of value upon which to base decisions. Desire for neutrality yet necessity for evaluation causes tension between practice and policy decisions.

Librarians have an urge to listen sometimes to their own voices and not necessarily to the most popular views. They aim to help create an intellectually and socially aware community by offering a wide diversity of choices. They feel a responsibility for actively disseminating different views, for making the community aware of its choices. Some librarians have interpreted this to include an aggressive policy in seeking out views to balance their collections. Some feel that the duty of the librarian is to be a gadfly, and the library a center of controversy. Case says, "The library clinging to supposedly objective and authoritative materials is boring and has an artificially limited clientele. Libraries can be and should be controversial, inspiring, and infuriating. . ."9 The American Library Association announced goals that include "ameliorating or solving the critical problems of society."10 This means making decisions regarding the level of the library's involvement in particular social causes. Intense professional debate revolves around the major themes of social responsibility. The outcome affects the bias with which librarians decide which views are important for their library collections.

It is hard to reconcile some of the goals and policies expressed professionally with the view of the librarian as a neutral transmitter of information. The library takes no official position on the ideas it protects and refuses to claim favoritism among the views it collects. Yet there is evidence that the profession asserts on the one hand what it denies on the other. Two ALA statements appear to oppose each other: "Intellectual freedom, the essence of equitable library services, promotes no causes, furthers no movements, and favors no viewpoints. It only provides for free access to all expressions of ideas through which any and all sides of a question, cause, or movement may be explored."21 But the ALA should be willing to take a position on current critical issues with the relationship to libraries and library service set forth in the position statement."22
As of 1983/4, ALA supports the Equal Rights Amendment, gay rights, and women’s rights causes; supports elimination of sex-stereotyping terminology; supports affirmative action; supports nuclear disarmament; and does not support racist institutions. The direct relationship of some of these positions to library services and functions seems tenuous. One might argue that the library profession or individual librarian can maintain a commitment to free expression of all viewpoints while supporting or disclaiming particular one(s), but this might provoke suspicion on the part of library users that neutrality has been compromised.

Each selection decision is in fact an uneasy composite of an author’s expressed view, the aim toward the balanced collection, priorities set by professional standard, and the librarian’s personal values, which form a part of professional judgment despite the injunction for librarians to “distinguish clearly in their actions and statements between their personal philosophies and attitudes and those of an institution or professional body.”

**ENDORSEMENT AND CENSORSHIP**

The obligation of the librarian to represent alternate views in the library expresses itself also in the negative sense, i.e., refusal to deny certain views their place in the library. Dislike of censorship has been one of the strongest concerns expressed by librarians. Professional literature has produced volumes on the sensitive differentiation between censorship and selection. This may account at least in part for an apparent dislike of the need for selectivity in library processes, because selectivity strongly implies its counterpart, censorship. Censors claim there are some individual issues on which alternate views should not be heard and that there are circumstances under which freedom of expression should be set aside. These censors claim also the right to determine which issues are undebatable. They say that young and impressionable minds must be protected from wrong impressions and that within particular instances, exceptions should be made to the principle of free expression.

In making choices, a librarian fails to select a great many books. (S)he is bound by budget and space restraints to do so. This is not an act of censorship in and of itself. It is censorship only when there is a deliberate attempt to suppress alternate views. Censorship can be taken to mean removal of a book from the library’s collection; locking it away in a vault for safekeeping; failure to select it for professionally unjustifiable reasons; or hiding access to it through incomplete or poor indexing. Although the library profession upholds strongly the principle of free expression, sometimes difficulties arise when individuals or groups of individuals within the profession do not wish to seem to endorse the views expressed in the books they select. The Freedom to Read Foundation, an organization technically separate yet associated with the Intellectual Freedom Committee of the American Library Association, produced the *Freedom to Read Statement*. The most relevant of its statements are: “Publishers, librarians, and booksellers do not need to endorse every idea or presentation contained in the books they make available. It would conflict with the public interest for them to establish their own political, moral, or aesthetic views as the sole standard for determining what books should be published or circulated.
Authors of the statement trusted that Americans could recognize propaganda and would reject obscenity, and freed the librarian from the responsibility for protecting or making judgments of quality.

Yet many professionals still fear that the presence of certain material in their libraries constitutes a kind of endorsement of its contents. Several well-publicized controversies illustrate this fear, the most famous being the production by ALA of the 1978 film *The Speaker.* The film appeared to some to advocate the theory of black racial inferiority and aroused a furor of protest in professional ranks. It tested the openness of library philosophy to all points of view, even those personally objectionable to many librarians. Reactions indicated that some librarians believed that giving the users of the library access to this film legitimized the racist theory and made the library its advocate, and, in this particular instance, they favored censorship.

Librarians wish to de-emphasize the tendency for groups to see the presence of a particular book in the library as a mark of approval upon its contents. Despite claims that purchase does not constitute endorsement there are clear evidences that librarians do feel it to be endorsement of a kind. Perhaps due to a desire not to aggravate a fragile situation by pointing out the books that generate controversy, a set of books, chosen for their different views on a topic are rarely deliberately distinguished as such.

**LABELLING**

The conflicts described above make it difficult for librarians to be forthright about which viewpoints are represented in the library collection. One particular historical event intensified the situation out of proportion: In the 1950s, during the McCarthy era, libraries came under increasing pressure from patriotic groups to label the contents of potentially subversive (primarily Communist-inspired) materials. Librarians resisted on the grounds that doing so would bias library readers to the materials before they had a chance to read and judge for themselves. The response came in 1950 in the *Statement on Labelling*: "Labelling certain library materials by affixing a prejudicial label on them or segregating by a prejudicial system is a practice which seeks to close paths to knowledge; such practices violate the Library Bill of Rights."

Labelling was regarded as a form of censorship, and professional statements in opposition continued to emerge: "It is contrary to the public interest for publishers or librarians to determine the acceptability of a book solely on the basis of the personal history or political affiliations of the author. . . . It is not in the public interest to force a reader to accept with any book the prejudgment of a label characterizing the book or author as subversive or dangerous." Libraries apply names (in the general sense of applying term descriptions) to books all the time as part of the indexing process. What is the essential difference between the usual naming process and labelling? The difference seems to be one of connotation rather than denotation. Either one can be used in negative or positive senses. But, a label in the library sense seems to be equivalent to a name plus a negative evaluation of that which is being named. Whereas a name is chosen on the basis of the entire character of that which is being named, a label often
singles out one negative attribute and places emphasis upon it. It may be an abbreviated judgment formed out of an intent to dismiss summarily or to censure. It definitely tends to be emotive and prejudicial. Indexers are cautioned against name-calling. The fact that authors of the Statement on Labelling feared the real possibility of librarians being sued for libel indicates the strength of their reaction against the labelling technique. The force of the events of those times has come to be rooted deeply within the modern professional attitude toward indicating the different viewpoints.

Many of the names that describe viewpoint are indeed highly charged with emotion. A viewpoint by its nature indicates a rift in thought between two or more groups. The very statement of it can provoke counterstatement. Many authors object to tags attached to their books and even more to tags attached to themselves.

An intense dislike for the practice of “labelling” adds to the list of professional ideals that conflict with the librarian’s obligation to be clear about differing viewpoints in the collection. With such conflicting messages regarding the support of a variety of views, it is little wonder that the librarian is reticent to state clearly exactly what is going into the collection and where each choice fits into the overall balance of the picture.

**RESOLUTION OF THE CONFLICT**

There is no intrinsic reason why librarians should continue to operate with conflicting half-expressed values. To improve accountability for selection decisions, the tension created by the conflict must be resolved. Resolution of this tension may be attained by the librarian’s release from the self-image of neutrality, a neutrality that seems to consist of an unbiased selection policy plus unlabelled access. A large step has already been taken in this direction.

In 1979 the Public Library Association put forward a revised mission statement for public libraries. The Public Library Mission Statement (PLMS) is an important document in redefining the library and librarian’s function in the overall information process. It outlines access not just as subject access but also, "... from myriad of directions allowing not only the facts but also the wisdom in the record to be retrieved. The agency [i.e., the library] would facilitate cross connections within the record, among many disciplines, literary forms, and periods of history."

The catalogue as “the” mechanism of access has an even more demanding job to perform. The indexer is to indicate whatever about a book is significant, representative, and relevant; shows its character, wisdom, or subject usefulness. Access to information has evolved into access to wisdom. Whereas any pocket of facts and data can be considered information, it requires judgment to determine what is wisdom. This is a call for many steps beyond current professional responsibility. Yet, as if in compensation for the increased load the librarian must bear, the long-term goal of comprehensiveness in collection development is set to rest. The library is to house “authentic information” of “sound factual authority,” and to help people “to separate ecological truth from the accelerating currents of propaganda and special interests.” Authors of the Public Library Mission Statement cite as the motivator of this change in mission the modern glut of
information and the "growing mass of trivial and redundant material which threatens to engulf the information seeker." Selection, according to the authors of the mission statement, now includes responsible decisions about what must be preserved and discarded "based upon principles of free access to ideas and free flow of ideas on all sides of controversial questions." In light of the information professional's special position and abilities, his or her responsibilities are expanded officially through the mission statement to include erasure of trivia. What is preserved is that which is significant, relevant, and representative. These are intriguing words because they bank steeply against the open door, nondiscriminating trend of the traditional library. Significant, representative, and relevant all require selectivity and alter the overall balance of the collection. A minority view may be significant, for example, in its opposition to the main view or in being indicative of a new trend.

In short the requirements of the new Public Library Mission Statement call for the librarian to judge merit and make selection decisions based on this. The librarian is mediator and popularizer, respectful of the total record but selecting the best on every side of an issue. Though at no time is the librarian released from the responsibility of fair treatment to all differences in view, yet (s)he is released from the troublesome notion that (s)he must be neutral.

CONCLUSION

The responsibility of librarians is greater than ever before, because in order to select representative portions of the overall picture of knowledge, they must be aware of the total available picture.

The Public Library Mission Statement can be seen as a big step toward the resolution of value conflicts in the profession and specifically in the task of collection development. Considerably more thought must now be given to establishing a firm professional value base. This measure is not only essential to our decision making process but also provides a firm stand from which to assess equitably the fair representation of the diverse value systems vying for expression in our collections. Other value systems can be represented fairly if we are open in our understanding of our own professional values.
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A Comparison of Online and Card Catalog Accuracy

Gunnar Knutson

Many libraries have not yet completed retrospective conversion of their catalogs. Users must therefore search both manual and online files to access an entire collection; thus the relative accuracy of these files is an important issue. In this study, a new online catalog and an existing card catalog were compared to detect levels and types of errors, and to determine if the online catalog needed extensive upgrading. Results indicated the online catalog was more accurate, and the card catalog was apt to present progressively more problems for users.

Libraries with online catalogs have found that retrospective conversion projects are easier to begin than to complete. Libraries end up with two catalogs: an online catalog plus a card catalog containing records for older, unconverted materials. The card catalog still is an important information source in many libraries and can pose problems for users.

This situation has the disadvantage of necessitating searching different files to locate all cataloged holdings. The new and old catalogs may present different obstacles to users, so that at times they will fail to find cataloged materials. Many factors come into play in the user’s interaction with an online or card catalog, such as the degree of persistence a patron exhibits in searching or the completeness of a citation. One basic factor crucial to the success of a search is the comparative accuracy of online and card files.

Search success depends in part on error rates in a catalog. Accuracy may vary considerably. When a library switches to an online catalog, it is reasonable to expect that the bibliographic records will be at least as high in quality as they were in the card catalog. Online cataloging and retrospective conversion are areas where there is potential for introducing errors that did not exist in the corresponding manual records. A single faulty keystroke may make an author or subject entry nonretrievable. Changing forms of entry, particularly in the subject catalog, also may affect search success.

This report is an attempt to answer the following questions: (1) How accurate is a library’s online catalog as compared to the card catalog? (2) What types of errors most often occur in each catalog? (3) Would a library be doing a disservice to patrons by making an online catalog publicly avail-
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able without extensive cleanup work and heading verification? (4) Do the answers to the first three questions indicate how a library should deal with its nonconverted records? To provide answers for one library, a research project was initiated that compared the accuracy of a newly installed online catalog to the card catalog still in place.

**BACKGROUND**

This investigation was conducted in an academic research library with about 450,000 cataloged titles. The library was founded in the late 1940s and grew rapidly when a new campus opened in 1965. In 1976 the library became a member of OCLC. Two years later a large-scale in-house retrospective conversion project began. In 1983 a decision was made to purchase the NOTIS integrated online local system. Subsequently the library’s OCLC tapes, which contained both post-1976 cataloging plus retrospective conversion of the majority of the library’s monographic holdings, were sent to a vendor for updating and authority file creation.

The library’s processed tapes were returned and loaded into the local online system in mid-1985. At first the system was available only to library staff and to users of the university’s academic computing center. Prior to the installation of public terminals in the spring of 1986, the retrieval accuracy of the new system was tested. Library staff found problems such as filing indicator errors and outdated subject headings, and it seemed wise to determine if the errors were pervasive or merely isolated occurrences.

During this period the catalog department continued to maintain the card catalog while adjusting to the use of the new system for cataloging and authority work. There was no question of not instituting the online public catalog as soon as practical. The popularity and flexibility of an online system is widely acknowledged, and the institution’s card catalog—with about two million cards—was at the point of near-maximum expansion in existing cabinets. The question was how much immediate effort should be diverted to online file corrections. In order to make a more meaningful evaluation of the online catalog, it was necessary to learn more about the soon-to-be-obsolete card catalog, specifically, how accurate the filing was in that catalog, and how up-to-date its subject headings were.

At the point that the study began the last cards were being filed in the card catalog and limited maintenance was still being done. The online catalog, by contrast, had undergone little in-house correction and updating. A project to update holdings information and call numbers (based on changes already made to the card catalog) was being carried out, but no systematic bibliographic corrections had been made. The online catalog was the unrefined combination of regular OCLC cataloging and retrospective conversion, plus a vendor cleanup.

Since a retrospective conversion project typically attempts to correct many archaic forms of subject headings, one might expect the online catalog to be more up-to-date than the card file. On the other hand, the card catalog is maintained in a more systematic fashion than the corrections made during retrospective conversion and so may be more current in many areas. In this study, the matter was further complicated because the library’s tapes were sent to a vendor for updating and the creation of an on-
line authority file. The vendor's subject tapes were current only through
the ninth edition of *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (LCSH), plus
some of its later "significant changes" (mostly from the 1979–81 lists),
but the library's subject cards also were not completely current. The li-
brary made corrections to its files as new cards with a given heading were
added, rather than updating at the time LC issued subject changes. Thus,
there was no reason to suppose that either form of the subject catalog was
superior to the other; the question was whether the online catalog was cur-
cent and accurate enough in its subject headings to cause a minimum
amount of confusion to patrons. Users had to refer to the new tenth edition
of LCSH for guidance for proper subject entry forms, since there was no
online subject authority file.

**METHODOLOGY**

A presample of 80 records with 323 access points was taken to verify
that the local filing error rate was within the parameters of published re-
ports. Then the most conservative figures were used to compute sample
size. (Details of the sampling formula and procedure are given in appendix
A.) For the first part of the study a systematic random sample of 200 bibli-
ographic records was drawn, with 884 access points in the card catalog and
905 in the online file. (The discrepancy is largely because not all titles are
traced in the card catalog.)

The search for errors focused on access points: names, titles, series, and
subjects. In addition, call numbers and locations were compared for ac-
ruracy. Descriptive aspects of the catalog record were not examined. The
guiding principle behind all the comparisons was whether or not a particu-
lar error was likely to lead to user failure. Certain categories of error are
sure to frustrate a user. A missing title card, for instance, means a search is
certain to fail. An incorrect MARC title filing indicator also means the on-
line searcher cannot access a particular title.

Other cases are not parallel, e.g., mispellings that lead to user failure in
one catalog but not another. An author entry for "Hemingway, Earnest"
might be interfiler with correctly spelled entries in the card catalog, while
the same heading would not be retrieved in a correctly spelled-out online
search. Or a correctly spelled card entry may be misfiled under a similar
word—something that cannot occur in the online catalog.

It was not the intent to count every small, technical card filing error since
this might seriously distort the findings. For instance, if a library has a
policy of filing latest editions first, the publication date has a significance
for filers that it does not have for most persons searching the catalog. Most
patrons would be as likely to find the related edition whether it files first or
last, even if a library is not completely consistent in its filing practices.
Therefore such filing errors were not recorded in this study. Nor was it
considered an error if the use of subtitles was not consistent on similar title
added entries, provided the card sought was filed correctly by whatever
choice the cataloger had made, even though this might split editions of a
work.

Guidelines were as follows: For the card catalog, missing cards; cards
filed under a wrong heading (author or subject); cards filed out of sequence
Table: The Changing Subject Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Card Catalog Only</th>
<th>Subjects in Both Catalogs</th>
<th>Subjects in Online Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ca 100,000)</td>
<td>(ca 700,000)</td>
<td>(ca 65,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will shrink</td>
<td>[Will remain fairly]</td>
<td>[Will grow rapidly]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradually, by ca.</td>
<td>Constant, growing</td>
<td>Only at recon rate</td>
<td>Current recon rate minus a few discarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000/year at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All estimates from 4/87

Figure 1. The Changing Subject Catalog

(with a few exceptions); spelling errors or other erroneous information in a heading, if it resulted in the card being misfiled; files confused by the placing of erroneous entries immediately before the card being sought (no error was charged if an erroneous entry appeared after the card sought); and double sequences of cards, if the card sought were in the minor, incorrect sequence. For the online catalog, any spelling error affecting the search key; incorrect title indicators; incorrect series form affecting searching; and word omissions or transpositions in searchable fields. In addition, call numbers and locations were compared for both records, and errors were charged for the affected entries. These guidelines were designed to give an objective basis to error definition, as well as to avoid charging marginal errors, particularly to the card catalog.

While doing online subject searches for this project it became clear that there was no way to design exact comparability between searching the two catalog forms. The term used to enter a computer file becomes the beginning of that file, whereas in a card file the user may be led astray by a few misfiled cards somewhat removed from the actual beginning of the file being sought. An online subject search beginning with a common heading such as “United States” will retrieve several thousand subject guides for various subdivisions, while another search may display a single heading. The card catalog user always starts with the same relative amount of information before him, and the presence of these cards often helps to compensate for spelling errors and other ambiguities. Despite these differences, however, most searches would succeed or fail based on the quality and order of the data in the two catalogs.
After errors were defined, a printout of the MARC-formatted bibliographic record was made for each item sampled, and all access points on this record were searched in the card catalog. The card catalog record was also checked to see if additional or variant access points were present. The search was done on the access point as it appeared on the catalog record (not always on the latest AACR2 form). Errors were tallied by category. On every card the call number was checked for accuracy. Finally, in the card file a routine search was made of approximately ten cards before and after the entry sought. These cards were scanned to see if the card might be correctly filed within a pocket of misfiled cards. Depending on where a searcher enters a file, such situations may lead to considerable confusion.

For the online system, all access points on the MARC bibliographic record were examined for accuracy. All records also were searched by title or author in the public online catalog as a check for call number and location errors. In addition, any headings with unusual punctuation or features that had not appeared in the presample were specifically searched.

**FINDINGS**

Table 1 lists major error rates for the two catalogs in the first sample. The overall error rate for the card catalog is 3.85% as compared to 2.54% for the online catalog. The figures are broken down by type of entry as well, and in all but one area (series) the card catalog figures are higher.

Interpretation of these figures calls for some caution. They should not be viewed as simple one-to-one comparisons. For research purposes it was assumed that users would be approaching both catalogs with citations matching the catalog entry term, and that they would have a basic understanding of searching. Since this is not always the case, the purpose of the statistics is to provide a comparative measure of catalog accuracy; it is not claimed that in a real-life situation users would always proceed in the same manner as did the researcher. Indeed, it seems likely that a number of users would fare significantly better, or worse, than the figures indicate, depending on their skills, needs, and persistence.

The most serious catalog error is a missing entry, particularly an author or title entry. If such entries are missing a user may conclude that the library does not own the book. Other research has shown that catalog users frequently make only a single known-item search, with almost half giving up after one failure. The methodology used assured that missing as well as misfiled cards would be noted. Without such a precaution a survey may give a false sense of accuracy by only counting observed errors.

The total number of personal name and title errors in the card catalog sample were thirteen (2.98%), with most of these being misfiled rather than missing. Although some were so badly misfiled one might assume no one could find them, they might have been found by a very persistent user. In most cases, if the user cross-checked the title or author he or she should have found the card also. Nevertheless, the figures revealed a definite problem, with 3 out of 100 author or title cards badly misfiled or missing. A searcher of the online catalog would have had approximately 2 failures in 100 with similar searches.

Corporate names, series, and uniform titles presented more of a card
filing problem with error rates of 6.12%, 5.41%, and 25%, respectively. These also were the areas with fewest entries (a combined 90 out of a total of 526 for the author/title catalog), a fact that should be taken into account in evaluating the figures. The lower percentage of errors for most of these categories in the online catalog did not mean that they were always easy to search, or that some of the uniform titles were even likely to be searched, but only that the entries were more error-free.

The subject card file had an error rate of 4.19%, compared to 3.61% for the author/title section. This may be accounted for in part by the different physical arrangement of the catalog. In the separate subject section raised guide cards are used to display the subject entry terms, with the cards filed in alphabetical order behind these guides. This arrangement makes subject corrections much simpler, since only one guide card has to be changed for each subject no matter how many entries are present, but it seems that it may have complicated filing. Some of these guide cards were observed out of order, with the result that users would likely have been confused in their subject searches. Another problem is that filers sometimes put cards behind the wrong guide card.

The figures for this part of the study led to the conclusion that the online catalog was in relatively good condition, even before the beginning of a project to locate and correct errors and outdated headings. Although it had a subject retrieval error rate of 3.09%, compared to 2.19% for non-subjects, most of these errors were caused by faulty call numbers or location symbols and these were being corrected.

Nevertheless, any errors to the subjects themselves were a cause for concern. A characteristic of an online catalog is that typographical errors seem to stand out more than in a card catalog, a problem accentuated by the fact that the online catalog did not indicate how many records were attached to a subject guide screen heading. Thus an erroneous entry for one bibliographic record appeared as prominently as a correct entry representing 100 records.

**Retesting the Subject Files**

The observed percentage of serious errors in the subject file led to part two of the project. Accurate filing may be particularly important in the subject catalog because of what Bates terms the "low-redundancy subject
access system” employed by LC. A user is not likely to find another subject for a misfiled or missing entry because there are so few subjects assigned to most books. (This study found an average of 1.86 subjects per title.)

Shortly after the first part of the sample had been taken, the catalog department filed the last of its subject cards. These cards dated back to December 31, 1985, and were filed by the end of June 1986. During the summer a cleanup of the online subject file began. Because the vendor’s subject authority tapes were not completely up-to-date, a considerable number of corrections still had to be made locally. In addition, various errors and inconsistencies that were not caught by the vendor or had subsequently entered the file now had to be corrected. By the end of 1986 it seemed worthwhile to retest the subject files. At this point the card catalog still should have been quite current, since the standard of comparison was the tenth edition of LCSH, current only through 1984. There was reason to expect that the subject catalog was in somewhat better order after the final filing and corrections had been completed. Approximately one year after the last card had been ordered, and seven months after the last filing had taken place, during which time several thousand subject headings also had been updated in the online system, a second comparison of the online and subject card files was made.

Part two involved a sample of 413 bibliographic records containing 783 subjects from online records and 780 on the corresponding card catalog records. The procedure was similar to part one, but only the subject file was tested and the data were examined in more detail. Split files were noted, and outdated subject entry terms were also tabulated separately.

Subject searches in the online public access catalog were carried out on the entry element (the subject term minus any subdivisions) because it was observed that most patrons search in this manner. It is possible to do a subject plus subdivision search in the system, but the help screens do not explain this capability, and it is unlikely that many users are familiar enough with LC subdivision practice to carry out such searches successfully in the online catalog. Searching on the subject entry element seemed the best way to emulate the card catalog file searching.

The subject survey confirmed earlier findings regarding card catalog problems and also indicated that progress was being made in updating the online catalog. Table 2 summarizes these findings.

It appears that the card catalog was not affected importantly by the final filing and revising done by mid-1986. An error rate of 4.49% indicates that missing cards and misfilings will continue to hamper users. (Over half of the serious errors involved missing cards, but given some of the improbable misfilings found there is no way to know how many of them are truly not in the file.) In addition, all card catalog subjects were checked against the tenth edition of LCSH, and it was observed that a growing number of subject entry terms were becoming outdated. When these are added to the misfiles, the error rate climbs to 6.54%. By contrast, the online error rate for the same two categories was 1.53%. Some implications of these figures, plus speculation on the future of the subject catalog, are given in the next section.
TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF SUBJECT SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Card Catalog</th>
<th>Online Catalog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total subjects</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major retrieval errors*</td>
<td>35 = 4.49%</td>
<td>9 = 1.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject form errors</td>
<td>16 = 2.05%</td>
<td>3 = 0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on entry term†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieval + form errors</td>
<td>51 = 6.54%</td>
<td>12 = 1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed split files</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Misfiled and missing cards; online headings with spelling or indicator errors; call number or location errors, etc.
†Forms not matching LCSH, 10th ed.

Total identical subjects in card catalog and online system (excluding major and minor form differences and excluding missing cards) = 700 out of 780 subject entries in the card catalog. Only 90% of the entries are currently exact matches, due mainly to changes in LC subject, subdivision, and qualifier practice since online records were first locally created in 1976.

CONCLUSION

This research project may be summed up by referring to the questions posed at the beginning:

1. How accurate is an online catalog as compared to a card catalog? Both samples showed that the online catalog exceeded expectations for retrieval accuracy. There were fewer serious errors overall in the online catalog in part one of the study, and only a fourth as many in the later subject-only comparison.

2. What types of errors most often occur in each catalog? In the online system, most errors were caused by a small number of faulty call numbers or location symbols. In the card catalog, errors were divided between missing and misfiled cards. Typographical errors that led to access points being nonretrievable were uncommon in either catalog.

3. Would a library be doing a disservice to patrons by making an online catalog publicly available without extensive cleanup work and verification of subject headings? For the library surveyed, the answer is no. Despite obvious shortcomings in certain areas, the online catalog was actually cleaner and more current than the card catalog even before extensive online maintenance was in effect.

4. Do the answers to the first three questions indicate how a library should deal with its nonconverted records? Libraries would obviously prefer to have all records online, but if this is not possible serious consideration should be given to weeding and compacting the card catalog. This was particularly true for the subject catalog. The relatively poorer condition of that file, plus the fact that subject headings change over time, leads to the conclusion that it is of less service to patrons than might be supposed.

These conclusions must be qualified with the acknowledgment that for a number of users the online catalog may present special problems. The ease of learning basic computer search procedures may mask more serious
problems in understanding how the catalog works, and certain types of searches are currently more cumbersome in the online catalog. User training and online assistance are vital to achieve the potential of the new catalog. However, accuracy is the foundation on which catalog improvements are built, and the study shows that in this case the manual file had a higher error rate than its online counterpart.

**SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE SUBJECT CATALOG**

Particular attention was given to the subject portion of each catalog because of the higher overall error rates there, plus the fact that patrons had access to a printed thesaurus of valid entries and would expect the subjects to match these forms.

In the manual catalog it often was impossible to know whether a card was missing or badly misfiled. The high percentage of "missing" subject cards may reflect a persistent card file problem. At any given time, some cards are out of the file for corrections, and as the time approaches to close the catalog there may be less incentive (and perhaps less available staff) to resolve these problems. Card filing can also be delayed. The extent of such problems in a very large catalog can be appreciated by considering that when the New York Public Library phased out its card catalogs, "thirteen experienced filers were occupied for a period of two years in filing accumulated backlogs of cards and resolving clerical ‘snags.’" While this was exceptional, it is probably safe to state that the average library will have a number of unfiled cards and unresolved entry problems that affect access in the frozen catalog. Yet it does not seem profitable to divert resources from the online catalog to deal with these problems unless the library plans to keep its manual file indefinitely.

The consistently better results obtained in online subject searching, as opposed to the card catalog, should be seen in context. For many new users the online catalog may present special difficulties. Dickson has presented a variety of examples of search problems peculiar to the online environment. Librarians must realize that technical superiority does not insure better user access. User training, online assistance, and ongoing search enhancements are vital to achieve the potential of the new catalog. Research has shown that users of online subject catalogs tend to be more persistent than card catalog users, a trait that could compensate for lack of search skills.

The online catalog presents a special kind of search pitfall: the computer split file. Malinconico referred to this in his remark that "machine logic is of the most literal variety." These splits are created whenever a slight variation occurs in entries for the same subject. Often these mistakes are harmless or amusing, as when a file for "Mailer, Norman" contains one misspelled entry for "Mailer, Normal." However, a user searching under the precise and full heading will inevitably miss these erroneous entries. They may become real search barriers in such cases as inconsistent use of hyphens ("Trade-unions" and "Trade unions"), common misspellings ("Vietnam" for "Vietnam"), or inconsistent subdivision practice (notably the use of both indirect and direct geographic subdivisions for the same
topical heading, so that entries such as “Art—Italy—Venice” are far removed from the older entries for “Art—Venice”).

Such split subject files were noted as all 783 subjects were searched online, but no attempt was made to locate each possible occurrence. It would be impossible to guess the varieties of misspellings and other errors that can produce such files. Split file figures are included in Table 2.

A further consideration is the rate at which the two catalogs are diverging. An untended card catalog can only deteriorate. The cataloger’s nightmare—a card drawer which has been dropped and the spilled contents stuffed back in disarray by a patron—is a reality that was encountered on one occasion during the study. In the future librarians are not likely to notice and correct such problems.

Catalog divergence depends in large part on change in subject headings. Although only 2% of the sampled card catalog subjects had obsolete entry terms, this is a considerable number considering that the subject catalog contains about 800,000 entries. An attempt was made to estimate the overall rate of change in LC subjects that might affect this particular catalog by checking the 1985 LC “Significant Changes” subject list against the card catalog. Headings on that list that showed a change in the entry term were checked in the card catalog. Only about 400 cards would have been so affected. (Some changes on the list may already have been made, since the catalog was not closed until mid-1986.) However, major subject changes are difficult to predict. The late 1986 change from “Near East” to “Middle East,” for instance, would affect about 650 entries in the card catalog of the study library. While it appears that subject obsolescence is not a major factor in the short-term future of the frozen card catalog, in the long run it may be much more than a minor inconvenience.

The study library is fortunate in that most of its collection is online. Figure 1 illustrates the approximate breakdown of the subject catalog at the time of completion of this study. The number of subject entries available only in the online system was rapidly overtaking the number of subjects that remain exclusively in card form. Of the approximately 700,000 subjects supposed to exist both online and in card format, an estimated 10% are no longer exact matches due to missing cards, changed subjects (including subdivisions), and various minor discrepancies. This creates a potential search hindrance. If users of the card catalog were to transfer exact subject forms to an online search, they would sometimes retrieve nothing.

The estimated 100,000 subjects still in the card catalog but not online represent a special problem. Many are difficult remainders of the library’s conversion project and are not likely to be locally converted in the near future. How useful these are to patrons is debatable. Since the library converts all older items on demand as they are checked out, it appears that none of these books has circulated since 1976. How many are missing is unknown. An extensive in-house collection examination done in 1981 found that missing titles in three subject areas varied from 7 to 12%.

**Recommendations**

A possible approach to the future of the subject card catalog is to weed it of converted cards, compact it, and free the space it currently occupies.
Many of the unconverted books may also be candidates for withdrawal from the collection. It would certainly be useful, though perhaps not practical, to inventory the unconverted holdings and remove cards for all missing books. The alternative of microfilming this specific catalog would be complicated by the library's use of subject guide cards rather than typed headings on each card.

Major reasons for retaining the subject card catalog are that it still represents a popular mode of searching for a number of users, that it contains records for many unconverted items, and that it has an elaborate cross-reference structure altogether lacking in the current version of the library's online system. Little can be done about the first of these issues, except to make the online catalog easier to use. The problem of unconverted titles can be dealt with given adequate resources; it also appears that these older materials have a very low use rate and do not represent a major shortcoming in the online subject catalog, where known-item searching is rare.

The last problem—lack of cross-references—will be eliminated with the completion of an index redesign project. This, combined with the new availability of the LCSH tapes online, will provide a far more current reference structure than was ever possible in the card catalog. The increasingly outmoded references in the card catalog may eventually prove more hindrance than help, as they sometimes will conflict with updated online headings.

A final consideration on the future of the frozen subject catalog has to do with the search skills required to use it successfully. Successful catalog searching seems to depend on the familiarity gained by frequent use. Since there will be less and less reason for patrons to refer to the old catalog, and because subject terminology will evolve and further outdate it, card catalog users may find that what once seemed relatively simple to use will prove more and more frustrating.

Retrospective conversion is proceeding at a rapid rate. A comprehensive report has estimated, perhaps optimistically, that "by 1990 all but the largest research libraries will have completed the retrospective conversion of their collections." Other information shows that large proportions of major academic collections remain unconverted. The continued presence of the card catalog is particularly problematical for such libraries.

One thing that has not always been clear is the price that users must pay for having large files of unconverted materials. In addition to the space that card catalogs take, such files are likely to contain more errors and problems than might be supposed. Even patrons with good search skills are losing access to materials because of these shortcomings. There are many compelling reasons to make complete retrospective conversion a library priority. This study reinforces earlier criticisms of manual files and adds to the rationale to supplant them as soon as possible.
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The sample size was determined based on a standard formula:

\[
    n = \frac{z^2 Npq}{N \epsilon^2 + z^2 pq}
\]

where:
- \( z^2 = (2.58)^2 \) for a 99% confidence coefficient
- \( N = 2,000,000 \) (estimated number of card catalog access points)
- \( pq = p(1-p) \) or .05 (1-.05) with .05 being the estimated proportion of filing errors
- \( \epsilon^2 = (.02)^2 \) for an allowable error of 2%

The estimated proportion of filing errors was taken from the highest figure found in the literature, a 5% estimate by the Library of Congress. When the formula was figured on this basis, total sample size required came to 790 access points.

Since the easiest way to proceed was with a systematic sample based on sequential online record number, and because even intervals would lead to less chance of error, it was decided to start with a random number and sample every 2,000th record. (The online records were already in a random order due to the mixture of new and retrospective cataloging.) This resulted in a somewhat larger-than-necessary sample size—884 access points in the card catalog and 905 in the online system.

For the second part of the project only the subject catalog was examined. Sample size was determined on the basis of the same formula, only this time the proportion of filing errors (4.8%) was taken from the subject section of the original sample. The number of cards in the subject catalog was estimated at 800,000. Using these figures, the subject-only sample was determined to require 760 access points.

(When part two of the sample was completed the two sections were compared for consistent error definition, and the number of serious card catalog errors in part one was revised downward to 4.2%, the figure used in table 1.)

Form Subdivisions and Genre

Patrick Wilson and Nick Robinson

Form subdivisions should be recognized as descriptions of genres or kinds of books; nonliterary works fall into genres as often as literary works. The LC subject cataloging practice of adding form subdivisions to topical headings amounts to a useful rule of description in terms of topic and kind. LC's scheme of genre description is incomplete and could be extended usefully. These general claims are illustrated by the case of the subdivision "Addresses, essays, lectures," which was dropped properly from LCSH but left improperly without a replacement.

In 1986 the Library of Congress announced cancellation of the form subdivision "Addresses, essays, lectures." There must have been many librarians and cataloging teachers who welcomed this move; a cumbersome, awkward, and old-fashioned-sounding heading had at last been retired. But that reaction was mistaken. The right reaction would have been this: the old subdivision should have been replaced with a better one, not simply dropped from the list of headings. A small question about one subdivision raises larger questions about an unduly neglected area of cataloging practice.

The Library of Congress's subject cataloging vocabulary includes four kinds of subdivision: geographical, temporal, topical, and "form." What exactly is a form subdivision? The phrase is well entrenched in library usage, but it is not obvious what it means. Haykin defines a form subdivision as an "extension of a subject heading based on the form or arrangement of the subject matter in the book," but then proceeds to give the heading "Early works to 1800" as an example, which throws his explanation into doubt. And while we might expect that "form or arrangement" would mean visible structure or layout, Haykin goes on to add examples of works calling for "form" subdivision because they "present a particular approach, a particular type of data, a particular function or use," for instance the subdivision "History" (approach? type of data?), "Juvenile literature" (function or use?), "Maps" (type of data?). Rather than being matters of visible structure or layout, these examples appear to reflect the old distinction between "inner" and "outer" form, as found for instance in Sayer's A Manual of Classification: "Outer form is physical, as it were, the literary shape in which things are presented; inner form is subjective,"
the method by which a thing is presented,” or the “special standpoint” from which the thing is viewed. But the terminology of “inner form” is obscure; why a method or a standpoint should be considered a form is not obvious, except in order to square practice with the classifier’s maxim to “classify by topic and then by form.”

Haykin suggests a better way by continuing, “In other words, it [the form subdivision] represents what the book is, rather than what it is about.” This can fairly be rephrased in this way: it represents what kind of book it is, rather than what it is about. In literary studies, the term for “kinds of literature” is genre: poems, plays, novels are various genres of literary work, each divisible into many subdivisions or sub-genres. The idea of genre in literary studies is sometimes thought to have been completely discredited, but this seems to be a mistake, and genre studies are flourishing. What is and deserves to be discredited is the idea that genres are fixed, unchangeable forms governed by strict rules. The kinds change over time, the same work can belong to several different kinds (kinds are not mutually exclusive), there are no exact conditions on membership in a kind, kinds are not definable precisely (they are not governed by necessary and sufficient conditions). A set of categories does not have to be “hard-edged” (strictly defined, mutually exclusive, all inclusive) to be useful, and literary studies cannot do without the idea of genres, categories intermediate between the individual work and the whole of literature.

If the original “home” of the genre idea is in literary studies, it is increasingly clear that there is nothing special about literature that makes its works fall into kinds while nonliterary works do not. Any field of human activity is likely to develop a repertory of “definite and relatively stable typical forms of construction” characterizing linguistic communication in the field; “A particular function (scientific, technical, commentarial, business, everyday) and the particular conditions of speech communication specific for each sphere give rise to particular genres, that is, certain relatively stable thematic, compositional, and stylistic types of utterances.” (One thinks at once of the scientific research paper, a highly conventionalized form of communication.) Nonliterary genres have not been the subject of much serious study, but it becomes clear on reflection that more or less well-settled conventional types are to be found throughout the world of text production, not merely in the literary section of that world. And it is a reasonable suspicion that what we call form subdivisions are exactly labels for such conventional types. In the case of works of literature, it is already clear that many form headings correspond to names of genres; suspicion that all of them may do so follows from recognition that there are nonliterary as well as literary genres.

The suspicion grows stronger when one examines Genre Terms: A Thesaurus for Use in Rare Book and Special Collections Cataloguing. This is a list of headings for “intellectual genres of textual materials,” genre being defined as “a recognized category of works (not their physical manifestations) characterized by a particular form, purpose, or content.” Genre headings are to be added to MARC records in a special field, field 655, though it is recognized explicitly that “many terms on this list will repeat information given elsewhere in the cataloguing record, especially in
the fixed fields . . . and in subject headings . . . .” In many cases, that is, genre descriptions are already given routinely; use of MARC field 655 is optional, but some use of genre description is already mandatory. The question is, how far does and should such description go?

“. . . LC subject catalogers have been instructed to designate always the form of a work by assigning the appropriate existing form subdivision.” (Emphasis added.) If we substitute “kind” or “genre” for “form,” it looks as if LC recognizes a rule of this sort: Always add, to a topical subject heading, a subdivision describing the kind of work in hand. The rule might be called the Rule of Topic and Kind. This seems a plausible rule on the face of it; a standard content description might well be taken to consist of a description of topic and a description of genre or kind. Catalog users are never indifferent to genre, though they might not themselves put it that way. One never really wants just any kind of book on a topic, though one may not be able to say just what kind one does want. Providing content descriptions in terms both of topic and of kind is simply recognizing the ordinary relevance of information about kinds of books.

But of course not all subject headings contain a form or genre component. This might be enough to show that LC does not follow its own rule, or that the rule it does follow resists the substitution of “kind” for “form,” but this is not so. There are at least four different ways in which following the Rule of Topic and Kind might result in a large category of works unlabelled for kind. If a work were nondescript, belonging to no recognizable kind, it would get no genre description. Next, there might be works of kinds that were recognizable but had no conventional name; or kinds with conventional names that LC thought it not useful or appropriate to recognize (coffee-table books form a recognizable category, for instance). In either of these cases, following the rule could yield a large unmarked category since approved terminology would not be available to describe its members. Finally, there might be a default genre, an unmarked kind, a particular recognizable kind to which works are to be assumed to belong if nothing is said to the contrary. Following the Rule of Topic and Kind, one would add no form subdivision to a topical heading if the work being described belonged to the default genre. Lack of an explicit form indicator would allow the inference that the work was of the unmarked kind.

Consider this last alternative. There are not many easily imaginable candidates for the status of the default genre; the one most likely to occur to a librarian is the “general work.” The instructions for use of the subheading “Miscellanea” say that it is to be used, among other things, for “certain monographic works which because of their special nature should not be entered under general works (i.e., the undivided subject heading) . . . “ This sounds as if there was a type of work of no “special nature,” a type of work that had only a “general nature.” This sounds like a very peculiar sort of work, but it should not be rejected as a possibility. Unless there is a suitable candidate for the status of default genre, works not assigned form subdivisions must be seen as constituting a catch-all residual category, a dumping ground for works of recognizable but “unestablished” kinds. Is that what it is?

An answer to this question might be found simply by looking at the list of
available form subdivisions and calculating what could be left over after all items on the list had been rejected as descriptions of a particular work. But there are so many of them that it is hard to grasp just what one is excluding when one says the residuals are those that are not of this or that form. To simplify the task, a rough classification of the existing form divisions can be made to see if a more perspicuous way of describing the residual works might be found. To do this, a list of those form divisions is needed. How do we know which subdivisions are form divisions? Consider just the free-floating subdivisions given in Hudson’s convenient guide that have the words “use as a form subdivision” in their scope notes.18

(a) Some form divisions identify works that are not, or not primarily, linguistic or symbolic works, but rather aerial photographs, drawings, maps, songs and music, and the like. After these are excluded, works remaining are linguistic in nature. (This is the copyright category of “literary works,”2 of works “expressed in words, numbers, or other verbal or numerical symbols or indicia.” Mathematics is treated as linguistic but musical notation is not.) The category of linguistic works is the most inclusive one, contrasting with other kinds of performance or production, such as music, cartography, and so on.

(b) Some form divisions identify works that are linguistic but not written, not works of writing, but rather collections of formatted data. Included here are subdivisions for abbreviations, bibliographies, catalogs, directories, indexes, rates, registers, statistics, and the like. Producing these is not a job of writing in the way producing a report or a novel is. One “compiles” bibliographies, for instance; one does not “write” them. After these are excluded, works remaining are works of discourse, or discursive prose.

(c) Some form divisions identify works that are discursive but not designed for consecutive reading: “arranged for ready reference and consultation rather than for continuous reading and study,” in LC’s words.20 Included here are familiar reference works like encyclopedias and dictionaries (unless one prefers to classify dictionaries in category (b), handbooks, manuals, guidebooks, outlines and syllabi, and the like. One can read these from cover to cover, but that is unusual. This and the previous category together cover approximately the general category of reference works, though that is not a well-defined category. After these are excluded, works remaining are works of discourse designed for consecutive reading.

(d) Some form divisions identify works of discourse intended for consecutive reading that are works of fiction in a large sense (including poetry and drama). Of course most works of fiction are excluded from the subject catalog entirely (and those that are included would be eliminated in these divisions if the next division was applied before this one). Works remaining after exclusion of fictional works are those of nonfiction: “fact” or pretended fact, but also speculation, criticism, argument, instruction, propaganda, etc.

(e) Some form divisions identify what can be called composite works: that is, works consisting of other works selected on some principle.
Subdivisions like Collected works, Collections, Literary collections, Periodicals, and Texts have in common that they indicate the copresence in a single bibliographical unit of numerous independent works, new (as generally in Periodicals) or old (as in Collected works). So do the subdivisions for "History, Local" and (collected) Biography. (This category corresponds approximately to the copyright law category of "Collective Works.") Somewhat like the works in category (b), they are not themselves products of writing; they are edited, not written, though they consist of writings. The editing may be trivial or very taxing. Works remaining after exclusion of composite works are "single" works.

(f) A mixed group of remaining subdivisions identify single nonfictional works as case studies, comparative studies, comic history, interviews, juvenile literature, meditations, popular works, sermons, and of course "Early works to 1800." Except for the last one, these can all be seen as describing recognizable kinds or genres ("early works" is not a kind of work); but they share no common character other than in one way or another relating to the kind of writing that can be expected of works to which they are assigned.

So far only subheadings stated explicitly to be form subdivisions have been considered. But there are other subheadings that should be considered form subdivisions though not described explicitly as such. If "Case study" is a form subdivision, why not also "Longitudinal study" and "Social surveys"? "History" was one of Haykin's examples of form subdivision. "Philosophy" was one of Sayers' examples of "inner form." "Criticism, interpretation, etc." is given as an example of form subdivision in the LC Subject Cataloging Manual (H1435); by analogy "History and criticism" may be taken to be the same. Evidently there are many subdivisions to add to category (f) despite their not being explicitly labelled as such in LC scope notes.

What distinguishes members of the various categories is in some cases "form or arrangement," in other cases type of production (verbal, musical, etc.), factual status, compositeness, intended audience, type of subject matter, relation to other works. Still other features characterize recognizable subcategories within these large categories: if subdivisions identifying collections of laws and regulations are put in category (c), for example, they still form a recognizable genre of public prescriptive works. Genres can be characterized not simply in terms of "form or arrangement" but seemingly in almost any terms. But this should not be surprising; Fowler lists fifteen different kinds of variables that enter into the typical characterization of a literary genre, including external structure, size, scale, type of subject, occasion, style, reader's task, but stresses that "almost any feature, however minor, however elusive, may become genre-linked." One should not expect that nonliterary genres would require fewer variables for comprehensive description.

What is left over? If a book is assigned a topical heading without form subdivision, what if anything can one expect it will be? It will be, approximately, a single complete factual discursive work not falling into one of the categories enumerated above, at least if the inventory of subdivisions
available for each of the categories is complete. But the inventory is not complete. It is easy to see that the category of leftovers, the residual category, includes a recognizable kind of composite work that is now not describable as such: the category of nonliterary collections, anthologies, or readers. Abandonment of that old heading “Addresses, essays, lectures” left subject catalogers without a means of labelling such works. If LC had abandoned that heading but had introduced simultaneously a new form division such as, perhaps, “Anthologies and collections,” or had redefined the already available heading “Collections” for general use, it would have recognized what is surely a distinct, easily recognizable category of publications. The subdivision was dropped because “the opinion has been expressed that this distinction [between collections and “works that consist of continuous text”] is not sufficiently useful to warrant continuing to assign this form subdivision.” But there is no need to take “discontinuance of text” as what distinguishes an anthology from other kinds of work. A more prominent feature is that of consisting of preexisting independent works, being a work made up of other works. Anthologies represent someone’s idea of the best available readings for some audience and some topic; this is the most significant feature of the genre.

There is, however, a much better reason for dropping the old heading, namely that it is not a socially recognized name of a socially recognized kind of publication. No one but a cataloger could think there was a conventional kind of intellectual product that was customarily referred to as an “Address, essay, lecture”; three genre names strung together do not constitute a good genre name. On the other hand, everyone would understand what was meant if one said he or she was preparing an anthology, or looking for a good collection of readings on, say, subjectcataloging. The old heading was not useful in a system of genre descriptions because it does not identify a recognizable genre; but it was applied, among other things, to members of an easily recognizable kind of production, the anthology or reader. The thing to have done was to supply a good genre description to replace the bad old one.

Are there other distinguishable kinds of works unprovided with form subdivisions in the current vocabulary? Surely there must be. In particular, category (f) looks suspiciously like a partial inventory that could be greatly enlarged. For example: the subheading “Introductions” is available under some topical headings, and can plausibly be argued to describe a kind of book, the introductory work; but it is not generally available, not free floating, so unavailable to describe all the members of the genre available in a collection. (It is a “bound” subheading that calls out to be freed.) Or again, there is no generally available label for works of criticism; is there no criticism of anything but literature, music, and film? And one would think that writing a practical how-to-do-it book was a special kind of task with results falling into a recognizable genre, but there is no available designation if the result is not in the form of a “Handbook, manual, etc.” And if history and philosophy are admitted as kinds of examples of forms, “inner forms,” how could any work fail to have some sort of “inner form”? But then the inventory of kinds must be seriously incomplete.

The earlier question has been answered, whether works with topical
headings and no form subheading belonged to a single default kind, or constituted a miscellany of distinguishable but unlabelled kinds. The General work, the work that belongs to none of the labelled kinds and cannot be further specified, is a myth. There is no such thing as a “standard, ordinary book, of no special kind”; there is no “generic book.” A book must have some character: perhaps a complex mixture with no conventional name, but some distinguishable character nevertheless. One might choose not to identify further kinds of work, but then one must recognize that the residual works remaining after available form subdivisions have been assigned do not constitute a single recognizable kind at all, but a miscellany.

Does it matter? It depends on what the subject catalog should do. If topic and kind-descriptions should be paired wherever possible, the incompleteness of the vocabulary of kind-description is a concern. One might be content with continuing to supply kind-descriptions for categories already recognized and simply ignore genres other than those already recognized. Or a policy of extending the list whenever it appeared that there were describable kinds not currently allowed for by the list of approved subheadings might be recognized. The kinds of interest to such a policy would not be “artificial” kinds, not “made-up” kinds, but socially recognized kinds.

As with topical description, the ambition would be to discover new categories before anyone else does, but to add to one’s vocabulary categories likely to be of service because they are likely to be known to the users. One would want to require that a candidate genre description be “authenticated” by appeal to actual usage. (The language of book reviewers, for instance, is a rich source for such authentication.) Not all of the socially recognized kinds would need to be officially recognized: “evaluative” categories might, for example, be excluded on principle (no adoption of the term “pot-boilers,” even if it is well entrenched in ordinary usage). But if the aim is to pair topic descriptions with genre descriptions whenever possible, then one would want to add, for instance, a subheading to recognize the category of nonliterary anthologies, not because one had proof of the special utility of that particular category, but because one was committed to describing the describable genres of texts in a collection.

Description of genre or kind is important because the idea of genre or kind is the idea of a range of conventional procedure that guides both the performance of producers (if only in the direction of deliberate flouting of convention) and the expectations of users. Form subdivisions are part of a more or less systematic scheme of genre description already available in the LC subject cataloging vocabulary, the other main part being the inventory of form headings used as “main” headings. Genre terms in LCSH are not “anomalous,” as was claimed in the proposal to add field 655 to the MARC record, but part of a long-established and intelligible practice. The scheme of genre description is not perfectly consistent, and not complete. It is also not very visible, not a conspicuous part of the subject cataloging system. Recognition that what have traditionally been called form headings are just as appropriately called genre or kind headings could be practically useful, if it led to a change of emphasis: a more conscious policy of systematic provision of means of describing the kinds of works represented by subject headings. Adoption of the Rule of Topic and Kind as
backed by such a policy, systematic review of the scheme of genre description as a whole, recognition of new kinds, freeing of some "bound" form subdivisions for general applicability, could lead to helpful clarification of practice. An authorized classified inventory of the vocabulary for genre description would give useful visibility to the system; an inventory in which one would hope to find a replacement for the retired heading "Addresses, essays, lectures."
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Cataloging Conference Proceedings: A Survey and Comments

Dorothy McGarry and Martha M. Yee

The creation of bibliographic records for conference publications is difficult for catalogers and the records are difficult for reference librarians and patrons to use. Those identified only by a generic term for a meeting and the name of the corporate body holding the meeting present special problems. This study examines user behavior and preferences when searching for meetings identified by a generic term for meeting and the name of a corporate body holding the meeting. Current cataloging practice is evaluated in the light of the findings.

The creation of bibliographic records for conference publications is difficult for catalogers and resulting records are difficult for reference librarians and patrons to use. Within the range of conference publications, those identified only by a generic term for a meeting and the name of the sponsoring body present special problems.

Conference proceedings consist frequently of collections of papers presented at a meeting organized or sponsored by a corporate body. Titles of these works often are either “weak,” consisting of generic titles such as “proceedings,” or nonexistent, e.g., when the title page identifies the work as “the eleventh meeting of the such-and-such corporate body.” It is usual for particular meetings to be held on a periodic basis; they may or may not be numbered; and the title frequently fails to remain the same from one meeting to the next.

Theoretically, there are four ways to provide main entry for a meeting such as this:
1. consider it a named meeting, and eligible for entry under its own name directly, e.g., Winter Meeting of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers [direct entry];
2. consider it a named meeting, and eligible for entry under its own name subordinately under the name of the holding body, e.g., Amer-
ican Society of Mechanical Engineers. Winter Meeting [subordinate entry];

3. consider that it has no distinctive name of its own, with entry directly under the name of the holding body, e.g., American Society of Mechanical Engineers [entry under holding body];

4. consider it unnamed and therefore not eligible for corporate body entry. The entry would then be under title, e.g., Proceedings of the 11th annual meeting of the X Body [entry under title].

How will application of each of these theories affect searching, from the users’ viewpoint?

**Direct entry:** Direct entry for a conference such as the “11th meeting of the Society for . . .” would be the name of the meeting as it appears on the title page, or that name minus the number or frequency at the beginning of the phrase, e.g., Meeting of the Society for Neuroscience. Meetings considered to be named distinctively, e.g., the Meeting on Compressor Technology are entered directly. It could be argued also that the trend for the other kinds of corporate entry in AACR2 is to prefer direct entry rather than entry under forms manipulated or constructed by the cataloger. However, readers may not notice word order on title pages. Also, word order has been observed to be unstable from one publication to the next. It is also unstable in citations. Users may know of the conference in other ways than by seeing title pages, e.g., attendance at the meeting or from references in professional journals.

**Subordinate entry:** Another method for treating the proceedings of a meeting identified by a generic term and the name of a society is to enter it under the holding body, subdivided by the generic term, e.g., Society for Neuroscience. Meeting. This would be equivalent to using a subordinate entry for “Class of 1968” under the university that had that class, as is currently done. This convention has to be learned by catalog users who might or might not notice a pattern among the names. It is questionable how likely users are to consider meetings as subdivisions in the same way as committees of a society or departments of a university are subdivisions of the parent body. It may be desirable to bring meetings in a series together, but will the user find his or her way to the kind of collocation provided by subordinate entry?

On the other hand, if a corporate body holds meetings regularly, use of the term for meeting as a subdivision would allow libraries that create book numbers from main entries to assign the same basic number to each year’s meeting, changing the dates as needed. If the proceedings were entered under title and the title was “Third conference of the xyz Society” one year and “Fourth congress of the xyz Society” the next, these two works would be widely separated on the shelf, because one would be cuttered for “Third” and the next for “Fourth.”

**Entry under holding body:** Entry under the name of the sponsoring body would allow access to meetings first by corporate name and then by title the way other meetings sponsored by the body are found through an added entry for the corporate name. This could simplify searching, rather than requiring a different approach for one type of bibliographic condition. It also could scatter a numbered sequence of meetings among other publications by the same corporate body.
Entry under title: Conferences considered to be unnamed would be entered under title, but since the sponsoring body would be traced, access would be provided in a name-title combination. Two disadvantages to the user might be subarrangements under subject headings appearing under terms such as "Proceedings," "Transactions," or "Fourth Conference of..." and meetings would be separated on the shelf even if on the same subject, because cutting would be done for the main entry. The main entries would tend to have certain words in common that would make shelf-listing difficult and lead to large cutter numbers at common titles such as these, and there is no logical arrangement on the shelf.

The Library of Congress issued rule interpretations for rules 21.1B1 and 24.13, type 6 in AACR2 which deal with names for meetings. Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 22 states "When a generic-term name of a meeting designates a meeting of a body (as opposed to one merely sponsored by a body), the meeting may be considered as named, whether or not the generic term is strengthened by the name or abbreviation of the body... On the other hand, such generic-term designation for sponsored meetings are considered as named only if the name, the abbreviation of the name, or some other distinctive noun or adjective strengthens the generic term." CSB no. 15 states that "If a named meeting... contains the entire name of a corporate body..., enter the meeting subordinately to the heading for the body if the name contains, in addition to the name of the body, no more than a generic term for the meeting or no more than a generic term plus one or more of the following elements: the venue of the meeting; number, date, or other sequencing element."

HISTORY

Before the 1949 cataloging rules, conference proceedings generally were entered under the names of the corporate bodies which held the meetings. The 1949 rules moved toward entry under distinctive names of meetings, although in practice many conferences were entered under corporate body even if they had distinctive names; some entries had generic terms as subordinate elements. AACR1 (North American text) explicitly excluded considering meetings as named if they were described only by the name of a sponsoring organization and a word or phrase denoting the meeting in general terms. Meetings of a body could be entered under the body; otherwise title was used as main entry. The British text of AACR1 considered these meetings to be named and entered them subordinately under the higher body. Eva Verona wrote a very good review of international practices related to conferences.

QUESTIONS REGARDING CURRENT PRACTICE

Certain fundamental questions can be raised by this treatment.

1. What is the nature of the relationship between the corporate body and proceedings of the meeting sponsored by that body?

A cataloger looking at the first, second, and third meetings of a particular society would recognize that these three works are related in some way and that a user looking for the first meeting might find it useful to be told about the existence of proceedings of the second and third meetings. The question is, what is the nature of this relationship? Are they all works of a single emanator? If so, is that the sponsoring corporate body or a named
conference? And, what is the most useful arrangement of the entries for these works in the catalog? The conference may include information on the body itself, and warrant entry under the body in terms of its internal operations under 21.1B2a. When the proceedings, and the meeting itself, consist of scientific papers or topical papers, however, the relationship of the body may be only that its members or officers called the meeting and arranged to have it held. The corporate body did not write the proceedings; the individual authors did. The body may or may not have acted in the capacity of editor. The body did not necessarily sponsor the publication, although the authors’ permissions had to be obtained to have the papers published.

2. Are conferences an exception to the trend away from corporate entry?

In general, corporate entry for conferences is more common than other types of corporate entry in AACR2; other types have been severely restricted. It is not clear why it was considered more important to have main entry accorded to this type of corporate body than to other types. Difficulty of working with conference titles, or collocating conferences with the same names but different numbers in single entry lists or in online displays may have motivated it.

3. Is there a desire to avoid title main entry for conferences?

Would the many “Proceedings” or “Proceedings of the . . .” main entries in the file cause the file to be almost useless for subarrangement or for single entry lists?

If the types of conferences under consideration here were deemed not to be named, each would be entered under title. In single entry lists they would be extremely difficult to find. In multiple entry displays, secondary filing elements under subjects would be the titles, and again the entries would be hard to find. Conference proceedings of the body would be brought together only at the corporate body access point. But, if conferences of this type were entered either under sponsoring body or the generic term for a meeting as a subdivision, it would allow for a usable arrangement under subjects as well as some collocation in a single entry list, on the shelf, or in a shelflist, or in a main entry display on an online screen. This would alleviate some of the problems caused by AACR2’s restriction to entry under corporate body.

4. Why is it important that a conference is named or unnamed?

The issue of what is a name is crucial to the handling of conference proceedings, because of the effect on choice of entry. If catalogers construct names where existence of a name is ambiguous, each cataloger could construct a different form of name. Users would, as a result, have difficulty predicting and finding them.

Designing criteria for determining whether a meeting is named can be more difficult than designing such criteria for corporate bodies in general. Between “a meeting held April 14, 1987,” which is clearly not named, and “the 12th Meeting on Compressor Technology,” which is clearly named, lies a spectrum of possibilities, including many ambiguous cases. The situation is complicated further by the fact that while catalogers make judgments on whether a particular meeting is named on the basis of the title page, cover, etc. of the publication, users seeking the publication may never have seen it, but, instead, have attended the meeting, seen it an-
nounced in professional journals, or heard oral reports from colleagues. The meeting may be referred to in other terms than those used eventually on the title page.

Because a title page of an item indicates it contains the proceedings of the annual meeting of a given society, does this mean that “annual meeting” is indeed a name? Or, is it a name only if the publication capitalizes the words? Under what circumstances do any people attending or looking for proceedings from meetings think of them as “named”? AACR1, at the instigation of Seymour Lubetzky (see, e.g., CCR), was the first code to require that a corporate body have a name before it could be considered a corporate body, and thus eligible for entry. Prior to AACR1 catalogers were allowed to make up names for corporate bodies. Dunkin points out: “If catalogers were free to construct names for groups designated ambiguously in publications, there might be infinite variation among catalogers as to method of constructing names.” The corollary to this is that users are likely to have difficulty predicting and finding these constructed names.

The LC rule interpretations for AACR2 attempt to describe what is to be treated as a “name” for a conference. The generic term must be in conjunction with the name of the body. For example, when the International Astronomical Union put the name of the organization toward the top of the page and the words “symposium no. xxx” several lines below, the “symposium” was not treated as a name. When, however, they changed the wording on the title page to read “proceedings of the xxth Symposium of the International Astronomical Union,” “symposium” could be treated as a corporate subdivision, and access could be provided for the number of the meeting. Is “symposium” a name, however? The IAU has held over 100 symposia, but do they consider these to be named? Would a patron look in the catalog for International Astronomical Union. Symposium (no. : date : place) without a good deal of training? If the IAU had committees and working groups, these would file between those that are given names, although they would appear to have different relationships to the IAU. Do the people who go to the 168th meeting of the American Chemical Society think of “meeting” as a name? If they have attended the “national meeting,” or “annual meeting,” would they look under whichever of the three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry under Holding Body</th>
<th>Subordinate Entry</th>
<th>Direct Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look</td>
<td>Prefer</td>
<td>Look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Editor's note: Additional statistical tables and copies of sample title pages were omitted due to space constraints.
forms was chosen as the corporate subdivision?

5. Why is there a need for a name to be prominent?

Main entry is accorded to conferences in AACR2 only when a name is presented "prominently," i.e., on the title page or preliminaries. This is a broader problem than the subset of conference publications being considered in this paper. It is not clear why entry under conference name is allowed only when that name appears in designated locations within the item. If users are looking for publications they have never seen, they have no way of knowing if the conference is named prominently in the publication or not.

6. Should a sponsoring body be traced in any case?

When a conference has a name, such as "International Conference on Superconductors," and a sponsor is named prominently, that sponsor is traced. With the treatment of conferences containing a generic term for a meeting and the name of a corporate body leading to entry under corporate body/subdivision, the sponsoring body is not traced by itself. This does not allow the librarian to find the conference if he/she looks under the sponsoring body without knowing the content of the generic term for meeting or whether such a combination appeared on the title page or the cover. If the sponsoring body were also traced by itself, most librarians would be able to locate the proceedings of the conferences.

**RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

In order to see if there was empirical evidence warranting one method of entry over another, a small survey was undertaken. Reference librarians in large libraries were sent a questionnaire designed with the following objectives:

1. to determine whether reference librarians in large libraries tend to look for proceedings identified by the name of the holding body and a generic term for a meeting where they would be found based on present cataloging rules and rule interpretations.

2. to determine whether there is a clear preference among reference librarians in large libraries for one of four alternative cataloging practices for the materials in question.

The questionnaire consisted of six examples of citations to this type of conference proceedings. For each example, respondents were asked to indicate where they would look first for the publication and where they would prefer to find it. Citations were imaginary to discourage respondents from looking in their own catalogs to see how the conferences were cataloged before replying. (A copy of the questionnaire appears in the appendix A.)

Copies of the questionnaire, with cover letters explaining the purpose of the study, were sent to the head reference librarians at the 363 libraries on the R.R. Bowker mailing list of libraries with materials budgets over $200,000 per year. This included 238 university and college libraries and 125 public libraries. It was hoped that a large collection budget would be an adequate index for identifying libraries likely to collect and provide access to conference publications. Data from 240 responses (66 percent) were analyzed using SPSSX.
FINDINGS

Respondents looked under and preferred entries under the holding body and holding body/subdivision for the type of conference publications in question: 44.7% to 67.9% of respondents said they would look first under holding body alone, and 30.8% to 39.5% said they would look first under holding body with the meeting treated as a subdivision. There was no significant difference between the proportion looking under one form of heading and the proportion looking under the other. It was clear that direct entry under the name of the conference was rarely used or desired: 0.4% to 20% of the respondents would look first under direct entry, and 0.4% to 21.2% would prefer direct entry. It appears that the general trend toward direct entry for corporate bodies embodied in the rules of AACR2 is not desired by respondents in this study for this type of citation.

There was no correlation between respondents searching practices or preferences and type and size of library, availability of an online catalog, or degree of experience of the respondent. Most of the responding libraries were general libraries (69 percent). Nearly all used AACR2 (97 percent) and about one-third (36 percent) had online catalogs.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study show strong preference for entering conference publications of the type considered here under the corporate body holding the meeting, either entered directly under its own name or subordinately, under the name of a higher body.

The current practice of entry for conferences of the type in question appears to be useful until and unless the rules for corporate body entry are expanded to allow for main entry under the name of the body alone. Access provided also under the sponsoring body without the subdivision would add to the usefulness of the catalog for reference librarians and patrons, and at the same time provide access similar to that which would have been provided under AACR1. A different solution would be to change the rules to enter conferences considered generally as named under their names as long as the name appears anywhere in the volume, eliminating the requirement for prominence. If unnamed, the title could be the main entry, except for nondistinctive titles, which could be under the name of the body/subdivision if a sequential number were attached to the generic term and under the body by itself if not. This would be useful in single entry lists and for providing a citation element for related works.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

3. CSB 22:22 (Fall 1983).
4. CSB 15:27 (Winter 1982); latest appearance 32:34 (Spring 1986).
10. This statement is based on observations of LC practice. A rule interpretation in CSB 13:26 (Summer 1981) says: 21.30E. If a corporate body is a sponsor of a conference, make an added entry for the body in the following cases: (1) when the work is entered under the heading for the conference . . . and the body is prominently named, (2) when the work is entered under title and the body is named anywhere in the item.
11. The assumption was made that preferences of reference librarians could be substituted for direct research on user needs and behavior with regard to the type of conference publications in question. A reference librarian is in a situation similar to that of a user, in that he or she will not have the sought publication in hand as catalogers do when cataloging the publication. Reference librarians conduct searches on behalf of users, which allow the assumption that they have insight into user needs to be made.

**APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE**

A patron inquires whether your library has each of the following conference publications. (These are imaginary references.)

Under each citation, please indicate the first place you would look for the publication when doing a nonsubject search in a card or microform catalog by placing an “x” next to the appropriate heading. Please do this quickly as if you were on duty and helping a user find a citation in your catalog.

There is no “right” answer to these questions.


1. ____ Meeting of the American Sociological Association (1981 : San Francisco, Calif.)
2. ____ American Sociological Association (subarranged by title)
3. ____ American Sociological Association. Meeting (1981 : San Francisco, Calif.) (Note: This would be filed as a corporate subdivision, after all entries under the Association alone, e.g., between “American Sociological Association. Joint Commission on Sociology” and “American Sociological Association. Research Committee.”)
4. ____ Other (please specify): ____________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (02)

Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ____________________________

Request no. 2. National Association for Search and Rescue Communications Meeting, Sept. 18, 1982, Portland, Ore. (03)

1. ____ Meeting of the National Association for Search and Rescue Communications (1982 : Portland, Or.)
2. ____ National Association for Search and Rescue Communications. Meeting (1982 : Portland, Or.) (filed as a corporate subdivision)
3. ____ National Association for Search and Rescue Communications. (subarranged by title)
4. Other (please specify): ____________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (04)
Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ____________________________

Request no. 3. Proceedings, IEEE 1981 Region 6 Conference. (05)
1. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Region 6. Conference (1981: place)
   (filed as a corporate subdivision)
2. IEEE Region 6 Conference (1981: place)
3. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Region 6.
   (subarranged by title)
4. Other (please specify): ____________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (06)
Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ____________________________

Request no. 4. Soc. Fine Arts. 11th Annual Meeting, Abst. 30.1, p. 91. (07)
1. Society for Fine Arts.
   (subarranged by title)
   (filed as a corporate subdivision)
4. Other (please specify): ____________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (08)
Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ____________________________

   (filed as a corporate subdivision)
   (subarranged by title)
4. Other (please specify): ____________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (10)
Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ____________________________

   (filed as a corporate subdivision)
2. _____ Conference of the Canadian Medical Society (2nd : 1981 : Ottawa, Ont.)

3. _____ Canadian Medical Society (subarranged by title)

4. _____ Other (please specify): ________________________________

Which form do you prefer (without regard to any existing rules)? (12)
Circle one: 1 2 3 other: ________________________________

Please answer the following questions about your library:

1. In what type of library do you work? (13)
   1. _____ public  2. _____ academic

2. In what subject field is your library or branch? (14)
   1. _____ engineering/science/medical
   2. _____ social sciences/humanities
   3. _____ general (including science/technology and social sciences/humanities)
   4. _____ other (please specify): ________________________________

3. Are your most current catalog records based on AACR2? (15)
   1. _____ yes  2. _____ no

4. What type(s) of catalog(s) does your library have? (choose all that apply)
   _____ card (16)  _____ microform (17)  _____ online (18)  other (19) (please specify) ________________________________

5. If you have an online catalog, can you retrieve records using a “key word” which is not necessarily the first word in a corporate name or title? (20)
   1. _____ yes  2. _____ no

6. How often would a reference librarian in your library have to answer questions about meetings of corporate bodies in which the meeting is identified by the name of the body and a generic term for the meeting (such as those in the question above)? (21)
   1. _____ 1 or more times per day
   2. _____ 1-4 times per week
   3. _____ less than once a week

7. How many reference librarians do you have on the staff at your institution? (22-24)

   How many are science specialists (e.g., medicine, engineering, life sciences, physical sciences)? (25-27)

8. Who answered the questionnaire? (please choose one of the following) (28)
   1. _____ engineering/science/medical specialist
   2. _____ social sciences/humanities specialist
   3. _____ general
   4. _____ other (please specify)

   Length of employment as a reference librarian? (29-30)
   Length of employment in current position as a reference librarian? (31-32)

Please attach additional pages with comments you have which are too long for the questionnaire form.
Thank you very much for your help!
LCC, DDC, and Algae

James W. Markham

Algae comprise a much more diverse group of organisms than do the flowering plants, but this is ignored by Library of Congress Classification (LCC). Using the family as the basic unit of classification for algae, LCC puts all families together alphabetically, as for flowering plants. However, all flowering plant families are in the same botanical division, whereas algal families fall into many fundamentally different divisions. Alphabetical arrangement of families, mixed with higher taxa, results in very peculiar groupings of unlike subjects. Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) uses divisions rather than families for algal literature and follows a hierarchical arrangement that corresponds to botanical classification. DDC’s hierarchy is superior to LCC’s alphabetical arrangement of habitats, but for applied science aspects, LCC allows for better specificity than DDC.

A large amount of material deals with algae, ranging from comprehensive treatises on algae in general to specific aspects of single species. Both the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) have schedules for classifying these materials. This paper compares and contrasts the analysis and arrangement provided by the two systems. Others have touched on this as part of a more general commentary (and one rejected both LCC and DDC for botanical materials), but algal literature has not been dealt with in depth.

The term “algae” applies to a large and diverse group of organisms occurring in virtually all habitats, including fresh water, seawater, hot springs, snow, and deserts; and ranging in size from microscopic phytoplankton to giant kelps over 50m long. The only common features distinguishing algae from all other organisms are that they are plants and that they have reproductive features unlike those found in other plants. Within this large group there is great diversity. The plant kingdom has been divided into twenty-eight or twenty-four divisions, equivalent to phyla in other kingdoms. All flowering plants, despite their apparent diversity, are placed in a single division, the Anthophyta or angiosperms. The algae, by contrast, comprise eight to nine of the total plant divisions, indicating the fundamental differences between organisms loosely called algae. Some re-
Recent classifications reduce the number of divisions of all plants other than algae to two, but still recognize seven algal divisions. In all there are some 20,000 species of algae in 176 families in 67 orders in nine divisions. In the angiosperms there are 300,000 species in 411 families in 111 orders in one division. These features are important in considering how library classification schemes deal with algae.

Literature on algae covers many aspects, from general to specific. A general classification that is useful in considering the range of literature on algae is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of algae</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Algae in general</td>
<td>1. General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Phytoplankton</td>
<td>2. Anatomy, morphology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Marine algae</td>
<td>3. Cytology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Freshwater algae</td>
<td>4. Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Specific divisions</td>
<td>5. Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Specific orders</td>
<td>6. Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Specific genera</td>
<td>7. Taxonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Geographical treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Economic aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A term from the type column together with a term from the discipline column should describe most publications and a combination like this or its equivalent should be possible in any workable library classification.

**CLASSIFICATION OF ALGAE**

In LCC, under QK (Botany), algae begin at QK 564 and go through QK 580.5 (see figure 1). The disciplines for algae in general are presented first. The LCC arrangement does not allow for indication of specific disciplines with specific algal groups below the general algae level, e.g., genetics of Rhodophyta would be under algae-genetics (QK 565.5) or Rhodophyta (QK 569.R4). Then a list of systematic divisions follows, arranged alphabetically. Using the same pattern as that followed for angiosperms (QK 495) these divisions are primarily families, although the list contains some orders (e.g., .C496 Chlorococcales, .L34 Laminariales, .U6 Ulvales) and some divisions (.C6 Chlorophyta, .C96 Cyanophyta, .P5 Phaeophyta, .R4 Rhodophyta).

Reducing classification to alphabetical arrangement results in unnatural groupings. Mixing taxonomic levels further confuses the arrangement. Thus, in the examples presented here, of two orders of the division Chlorophyta, one, Chlorococcales, is with the division, while another, Ulvales, is isolated at the end of the alphabet behind taxa from totally different groups, and the respective families of these orders are scattered throughout. The use of different taxonomic levels in one alphabetical arrangement is not a reasonable approach. A further problem with alphabetical arrangements results from taxonomic revisions by botanists producing new names for groups, which put the groups in a new alphabetical position separated from earlier writings on the same subject.

Another problem results when new LC numbers are added. *Macrocystis* (division Phaeophyta), a giant kelp of economic importance in California,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dewey Decimal Classification</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Algae. Algology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3</td>
<td>QK564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algae (Class here phycology)</td>
<td>Periodicals, societies, serials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. &amp; geog. treatment</td>
<td>Congresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.31–38</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General principles</td>
<td>Anatomy, physiology, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical treatment</td>
<td>Genetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific types of algae</td>
<td>Classification. Systematic works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.41</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodophyta (Red algae)</td>
<td>Systematic divisions, A–Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramiales, Cryptonemiales,</td>
<td>.A27 Acrochaetiaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>.B2 Bangiaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.C37 Caulerpaceae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrrophyta (Dinoflagellates)</td>
<td>(cutter numbers for 71 more divisions follow in this listing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.44</td>
<td>Geographical distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euglenophyta (Euglenoids)</td>
<td>(For particular taxa, see QK569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.45</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phaeophyta (Brown algae)</td>
<td>General works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>Physiographic divisions (General)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyanophyta (Blue-green algae)</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.47</td>
<td>Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorophyta (Green algae)</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysophyta (Golden algae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacillariophyta (Diatoms)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthophyceae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yellow-green algae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysophyceae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1

Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress Classifications for Algae

has a large volume of literature. Works on this kelp have been classified under QK 569.L2 Laminariaceae, not the family to which Macrocystis belongs, but the closest LC classification available. More recently a new number was added, QK 569.L53, for Lessoniaceae, the family to which Macrocystis belongs. New works on Macrocystis are classified under this number. But, between the two numbers, and thus between old and new works on this topic, is QK 569.L5, for Lemaneaceae, a freshwater family of the division Rhodophyta.

The level of analysis is deceptive. The choice of family as the basic taxonomic level for arrangement follows the pattern used for flowering plants, but cannot be justified in the same manner. There is justification for using families for flowering plants because many treatises discuss individual families and the family level is the most commonly used grouping in botanical discussions above the genus level. This is not true for algae. Algae comprise several divisions, each as different fundamentally from each other as flowering plants are from all other plants. Putting all algal families together in one list mixes very unlike subjects together. There are fewer
families per order in the algae than in flowering plants, and because of the
greater differences between orders and divisions, families are seldom dis-
cussed or referred to in literature on algae. Above the genus level, most
writings on algae are about orders or divisions. On the basis of literary
warrant as well as botanical principles, then, a higher level grouping for
library classification should be used. Analyzing to family is further than is
justified and necessitates moving up to a higher level and regrouping be-
fore a coherent picture emerges.

The DDC arrangement looks very different (See figure 1). It is hierar-
chical and resembles the general classification shown at the start of this
paper. Algae begin at 589.3 and run through 589.487. Unlike LCC, it is
possible to classify both algae in general and specific groups with specific
disciplines. Unlike the principles followed in much of DDC, studies in-
volving disciplines with regard to specific plants or groups of plants are
classed with the plants or groups, not with the discipline, e.g., genetics of
algae is under algae, not under genetics. The important point is that DDC
allows for indication of both plant group and discipline at all levels.

Beginning at 589.4, specific types of algae are classed. Phytoplankton
are put in the general class, which seems reasonable, since phytoplankton
may include species from several divisions. (LCC places phytoplankton in
QK 933–934 under plant ecology of specific physiographic regions, rather
than with a taxonomic group). The algae are then divided by divisions,
with common orders listed under each division.

The principle of proceeding through the plants from complex to simple,
which results in algae being last in DDC, is not followed within the algae.
The particular order of divisions appears to be completely random and
does not correspond to any botanical treatment. Thus the most structurally
complex algae, the Phaeophyta, are in the middle, while the algae most
closely related physiologically to higher plants, the Chlorophyta, are next
to the end. The inclusion of common names is very useful.

Listing orders rather than families under each division corresponds to
practice in algal literature, although the schedule does not allow for classi-
fication to order and families are not mentioned. DDC does not allow for
analysis to as fine a degree as LCC; however, classification below division
level for algal literature usually is not justified and may lead to confusion
and unreasonable groupings. Using a hierarchical rather than an alphabeti-
cal arrangement results in a logical order and is preferable to the LCC sys-
tem. It also can accommodate new classifications produced by botanists,
since a change at any level below the division will not require moving
items around or result in new literature on particular algae being classed
apart from earlier literature on the same subject. Hierarchical arrangement
already has been devised by botanists, and librarians need only adapt it
rather than work at devising a new system.

To summarize, DDC is superior to LCC on two main points: DDC
avoids the incongruities of alphabetical arrangement and uses a natural ar-
rangement. This natural arrangement separates divisions and avoids un-
natural groupings. Secondly, DDC allows the linking of discipline with
type of algae, not just at the level of algae in general, but also at the division
level. For this part of the classification scheme, DDC is quite workable as
it is. LCC could be greatly improved by using divisions rather than families as the basic taxonomic level for classification and then allowing for a linkage of discipline with each division, as well as with algae in general.

**ECOLOGY AND ALGAE**

Thus far, ecology has not been considered. General ecology in LCC falls in QH 540+ and in DDC in 574. Under types of environment, DDC follows a hierarchical structure that puts related environments together, whereas LCC uses an alphabetical arrangement that scatters related environments and puts unlikely things together (See figure 2). Aquatic environments such as Estuaries, Fresh water, Kelp beds, Ponds, Sea, and Water are scattered among land habitats in one alphabet. For works on algae, this general classification cannot be used for plants, even though one category here is Kelp Beds (QK 541.5 .K4). Algae, being plants, would fall in Plant Ecology (QK 901-977.5) (See figure 3) without any indication of the algal aspect of the ecology, or under geographic distribution of algae in general (QK 570.2-25). In either schedule, aquatic environments are classed only as Marine or Freshwater and all further analysis is lost. A new book, *The Physiological Ecology of Seaweeds* is classed by LC in QK 570.2. LC also classed the same book in DDC under 589.45041219, i.e., physiology of Phaeophyta (without ecology). In DDC it is possible to indicate specific aspects of ecology for specific groups of algae and class these under algae.

For ecology then, the same conclusions as for systematics apply. DDC allows more logical arrangement and better linkage of discipline with type of algae than does LCC. LCC would be more logical if QH 540.5 were divided into major environmental subdivisions. The divisions should be at least into aquatic and terrestrial environments, and preferably further into marine and freshwater aquatic environments. Further alphabetical subdivision could then fall under the appropriate major environmental category.

**ECONOMIC ASPECTS**

There are important applied science or economic aspects of algae. The most important topics are algae as food for humans or animals; algal products; and aquaculture of algae for any purpose. These are classed in LCC in three different schedules—HD, TP, and SH. The HD schedule (agricultural products) lists only common names, of which two (HD 9469.K4 = Kelp, HD 9469.N65 = Nori) apply to algae. Algal products are placed in chemical technology (TP) under food processing and technology in a section labeled algae and algae products (TP 445-445.5) with three products listed: .A35, agar; .A45, algin; and .C35 carrageenan. (Algin also may be classed in QK 898.A3 under plant physiology: special plant constituents.) The SH schedule (agriculture) covers culture of both animals and plants in the same schedule and mixes common and scientific names, including, for example, two species of *Laminaria* (a genus of kelp) and also kelps and giant kelp (*Macrocystis pyriforma*). The choice of items is peculiar, but includes most of the common economically valuable algae and allows for an indication of which alga is grown. Marine algae as animal feed are classed in SF 99.M33, with the cutter for marine algae.
### Dewey Decimal Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>574.526</th>
<th>Specific kinds of environments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.526 2</td>
<td>Zonal environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 21</td>
<td>Arctic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 23</td>
<td>Tropical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 3</td>
<td>Aquatic environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 32</td>
<td>Fresh-water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 322</td>
<td>Lakes, ponds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 323</td>
<td>Rivers and other streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 325</td>
<td>Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bogs, marshes, swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 36</td>
<td>Salt-water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 365</td>
<td>Estuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 367</td>
<td>Reefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 38</td>
<td>Seashores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 4</td>
<td>Land environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 404</td>
<td>Soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 42</td>
<td>Forest, jungles, woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 43</td>
<td>Grasslands, meadows, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 44</td>
<td>Tundras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 5</td>
<td>Alkaline, arid, semi-arid environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 52</td>
<td>Deserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 7</td>
<td>Island environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.526 8</td>
<td>Urban environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Library of Congress Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QH</th>
<th>Ecology By type of environment, A–Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>540.5</td>
<td>.A84 Arid zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.B63 Bogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C24 Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C3 Caves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C5 Chaparral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C6 Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C65 Coasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C7 Coral reefs and islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.C95 Cypress swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.D35 Deep-sea zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.D4 Deserts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.E8 Estuaries. Brackish waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.F6 Forests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.F7 Fresh water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.G37 Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.H65 Hot springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.H67 Household ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cutter numbers for 33 more environ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ments follow)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2**

Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress Classifications of Environments

In DDC, algin is dealt with under gelatins of animal or vegetable origin (664.26). Aquaculture of algae is separated from culture of animals, but remains rather vague. Culture of algae falls under 635.9393 (agriculture-garden-crops-flowers and ornamental plants). Algae are not indicated specifically. Algae as animal feed fall apparently under 636.087 (Algae-edible plants). Thus LCC allows an indication, albeit by alphabetical term, that the topic involves algae or something like marine algae. DDC mostly relegates economic applications to a general “other” category under the specific topic, without identifying algae as a component.

**CONCLUSION**

At the level of algae in general, the two systems seem equally good. Neither LCC or DDC has devised an ideal scheme for analysis and arrangement of materials with algae, but DDC comes closer. For pure science in general, DDC is superior to LCC in indicating relationships and a desired
level of specificity. For applied science aspects, on the other hand, LCC is superior to DDC because it allows for better specificity, in particular, that it allows an indication that the material in question involves algae.
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Cataloging Ottoman Turkish Personal Names

James Tilio Maccaferri

Poor bibliographic access to materials in Ottoman Turkish has impeded the study of the Ottoman Empire and its civilization. A major reason for this poor access has been the inadequate treatment of Ottoman Turkish personal names in American cataloging codes. Correcting this situation requires attention both to the unique nature of Ottoman names and to the guiding principles and specific provisions of AACR2. This can be accomplished through consistent romanization of Ottoman names, by basing Ottoman headings on all available sources of information, and by entering the resultant name in direct order with references from the other elements of the name.

Scholars may know who the Ottomans were, but they have been known to wail at the prospect of searching an Ottoman name in a library catalog. The source of their displeasure is the poor bibliographic access to materials in the Ottoman Turkish language; and one reason for this is the inadequate treatment of Ottoman personal names in American cataloging codes. While librarians might be tempted to accept this situation on the grounds that the Ottomans and Ottomanists are not very important, professional responsibility would argue otherwise. More now than ever, libraries should play a pivotal role in facilitating the study of other peoples and cultures, but they can do so only if they provide full access to materials in languages such as Ottoman Turkish. If a university elects to offer degrees in exotic disciplines, the library is obliged to support the faculty and students involved just as it does those in more prosaic fields. A number of American universities do support Ottoman studies, and the libraries of such institutions have collected vernacular material to support these programs; but the response of the cataloging community to these developments has been muted. This is changing. The Library of Congress (LC) began cataloging its Ottoman collection in 1984 and is developing guidelines for the treatment of Ottoman personal names. This being the case, it is worth considering what special problems Ottoman names present, how these names have been dealt with in previous cataloging codes, and how they can best be accommodated within the present code.

James Tilio Maccaferri is Visiting Lecturer at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles.
Depending on whether a geographic, sectarian, alphabetic, or ethnic/linguistic approach was followed, Ottoman names have been described variously as Oriental, Muslim, Arabic, Arabic alphabet, or Turkish. Each of these terms has a slightly different meaning. The term "Oriental names" comprehends the entire spectrum of names found in the Middle and Far East. Muslim or Islamic names are the names borne by Muslims, that is, by adherents to Islam. Arabic names, on the other hand, are strictly speaking the names of Arabs. Arabic alphabet names are names written in the Arabic alphabet regardless of the language spoken by the bearer. This term therefore encompasses Persian and Ottoman names as well as Arabic names. Turkish or Turkic names are the names used by any of the Turkic peoples.

Muslim names are based on Arabic usage and were written originally in the Arabic alphabet; but as different peoples adopted Islam they retained some of their own traditions regarding names and adapted the Arabic forms to their own languages. This is what happened to the Turks, a Central Asian people unrelated to the Persians and Arabs who dominated the Muslim Middle East when the Turks arrived on the scene in the tenth century. The conversion of the Turks to Islam was a long process, and Turkish names did not disappear immediately or completely. At the same time, the Turks were influenced by Persian as well as Arabic traditions. In time, the Turks became a major force in the Middle East, and in the late thirteenth century a group of Turkic nomads founded what would become the Ottoman Empire. From its origins in northwestern Anatolia, the Ottoman Empire developed into a multinational state encompassing the Balkans, Anatolia, and much of the Middle East and North Africa. As it expanded, it adopted the forms of classical Islamic civilization. The court language, Ottoman Turkish, developed as a mixture of Turkish, Persian, and Arabic; and this same combination can be found in Ottoman names. The Ottoman Empire disintegrated after World War I to be replaced in Anatolia by the Republic of Turkey. Since Turkish remained the language of the new state, Ottoman name practices continued more or less until 1928, when the Arabic alphabet was abandoned in favor of a modified roman alphabet. Starting in 1935, all Turks were required to adopt surnames, placing modern Turkish names in the tradition of Western names.

It is important to note that not all Ottoman subjects bore Ottoman names. The Arabs, Greeks, Armenians, and other minorities of the Ottoman Empire preserved their own onomastic traditions. Ottoman names, then, are the personal names of people who were associated with the Ottoman Empire, whose primary language was Ottoman Turkish, and whose names were written originally in the Arabic alphabet and reflected Turco-Islamic conventions. Included in this definition are similar names used in the Turkish Republic until the alphabet reform of 1928. Excluded are names from other Turkic languages of southeastern Europe, the Middle East, and Central Asia. One need not have been ethnically Turkish to have had an Ottoman name.

Muslim names are different from Western names in several key respects. Family names have been common in Western Europe for several centuries, but Muslims only started to adopt them during this century. In
the West, a person is named at birth and in most cases retains the same name throughout life except for changes of family name occasioned by marriage or divorce. Muslim names are otherwise.

A person might receive a name in his infancy and to this might be added a patronymic, or a name expressive of his paternal or family relations. He might then receive a title expressive of his zeal for the faith, and sobriquets descriptive of his personal qualities or appearance, or the country or town in which he was born or had settled, or the religious sect to which he belonged; and if he played a part in public life, to all these might be added as in Europe, a title or titles of dignity; and if he had acquired a reputation as an author, he might assume some name of fancy. These various names or titles might never be united in the same individual, but the combinations are numerous and shifting. Certain rules are observed in their formation or application, but it was a matter of accident by which of these designations a person might be known to his contemporaries, or his name transmitted to modern times.

It is this organic nature of Muslim names and, by extension, Ottoman names that makes them so variable and so difficult to deal with.

The different elements comprising a Muslim name are all based on Arabic practice. The major elements are described in detail below under the Arabic terms by which they are usually identified in American cataloging codes. It is worth noting that a degree of controversy surrounds the precise definition of these terms, especially as regards their equivalent forms in Western usage.

**Isim.** Muslim names include at least one given name, or isim, selected from a relatively short list of religiously acceptable names. These include names based on the ninety-nine names of God (e.g., 'Abd al-Ḥamīd), names associated with the prophet Muḥammad (e.g., ʿAḥmad) and his early followers (e.g., ʿUṯmān), and the names of other prophets mentioned in the Koran (e.g., Mūsā). Even among this limited number of names, certain names have been more popular than others. For instance, in a sample of 832 names of Arabic authors, 42 percent of the first names were either Muḥammad or ʿAḥmad, with nine other names accounting for a further 27 percent of the total. Under these conditions, the given name lost its ability to identify adequately the bearer. This in turn encouraged the addition of other elements to Muslim names to make them more distinctive.

**Kunyah.** Among these other elements was the kunyah, a compound of which Abū (‘‘father of’’) is usually the first word (e.g., Abū Ḥayyān). One might adopt a kunyah to express pride in one’s offspring, but kunyahs were also used in a figurative sense and were at times assigned by rulers as honorific titles, although this practice had ceased before the advent of the Ottomans.

**Nasab.** Blood relationships were also expressed through a patronymic or pedigree (nasab) naming one’s Muslim ancestors. The nasab is typically a compound of which the first word is ibn (‘‘son of’’). Some Muslims became best known by a particular part of their nasab, albeit not always by the part identifying their father. The nasab follows immediately the isim in Arabic usage.

**Takhallus.** It was not uncommon for a Muslim author to adopt one or more pen names. An author’s pen name, or takhallus, tended to be quite fanciful, and sometimes became the primary name by which he or she was known.

**Laqab.** The term laqab identifies collectively a number of different grammatical forms used as descriptive epithets. Laqabs might be flattering or abusive; they
might be adopted by a person or assigned to him by a grateful sovereign or by his enemies; they might even become associated with a person’s name posthumously. They might refer to a personal quality, or an association with a profession, place, ethnic group, or school of Islamic jurisprudence. Words commonly used as given names could also serve as laqabs, except that, as a laqab, the word’s literal meaning was intended. Two types of laqab requiring particular attention are the khitab and nisbah.

Khitab. The khitab, a compound of which the last part is al-Dtn (e.g., Rashid al-Dtn), was originally honorific in nature, with different compounds reserved for different classes of officials. In time, however, khitabs lost their honorific nature and came to be used as given names. Khitabs normally precede the isim.

Nisbah. A particularly fertile source of laqabs has been the Arabic attributive adjective, or nisbah. This is formed by adding -7 to nouns indicating origin, residence, profession, or some other circumstance (e.g., al-Baghdadi, someone associated with Baghdad). In general, nisbahs follow all other elements in a person’s name, and, if a name includes more than one nisbah, they are arranged in order of increasing specificity.

Ottoman names could include any of the elements described above, but often in a uniquely Ottoman form. Ottoman-given names included names of Turkish (e.g., Orhan) as well as Arabic origin. When used, khitabs seem always to have functioned as given names. Ottoman names might also include a kunyah (Ebu instead of Abn in Ottoman), although such names were less common among the Ottomans than among the Arabs. Patronymics might reflect Arabic practice (bin instead of ibn in Ottoman) and follow the given name (e.g., Mehmet bin Osman); or they might follow Persian practice (using the suffix -zade) or Turkish practice (using the suffix -oglu) and precede the given name (e.g., Osmanzade Mehmet, Osmanoglu Mehmet). Ottoman poets often adopted a pen name; but an especially common practice among Ottomans was the use of laqabs of one sort or another. There were practical reasons for this. With thousands of soldiers and officials on the payroll, the Ottoman bureaucracy needed to identify positively people for pay and record purposes. Patronymics might have been used for this, but in the early centuries of the Empire many Ottomans were first-generation Muslims and did not have a proper Islamic pedigree. Laqabs were therefore substituted and became a common feature of Ottoman names. Laqabs of the nisbah type were used widely, but so were the equivalent Turkish grammatical forms using the -li and -ci suffixes (e.g., Bursali, “someone from Bursa,” instead of the Arabic Bursavi) and preceding as opposed to following the given name. The Ottomans were also quite fond of titles of honor and rank. Four basic types can be distinguished: (a) Turco-Islamic titles which always follow the given name (e.g., reis, pasa, bey, efendi); (b) Turco-Islamic titles which always precede the given name (e.g., seyh, hacı, hafiz, seyyid); (c) Turco-Islamic titles which may either precede or follow the given name (e.g., celebi); and (d) titles based on Western models and preceding the given name (e.g., prens). As noted previously, Ottoman names reflected Turkish as well as Perso-Islamic traditions, and this made for great variety in the names borne by Ottomans. The Ottomans were notably casual with regard to the order of elements in a name. Not only do similar elements appear in differ-
ent orders in different names, but some authors varied the order of elements in their names.5

The foregoing discussion of Muslim names in general and Ottoman names in particular reveals their complexity and variability. Dealing with Muslim names as a single undifferentiated mass would ignore the linguistic, historical, and cultural traditions that affected the construction of names among different groups of Muslims. This raises the question of whether previous American cataloging codes recognized these problems in their treatment of Muslim names. As a practical illustration of the differences among these codes, table 1 shows how a particular name would have been entered under the different codes.

Charles Ammi Cutter’s 1876 Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue dealt with “Oriental authors” in rule 13, which called for entry under “the Christian or first name,” except for “writers who are better known under some other part of their name or under an appellation.”6 The vernacular form of name was preferred if it occurred in the author’s printed publications. Rule 23 of Cutter’s 1904 rules was virtually identical, but it did include a brief justification for including words of relationship (such as Abū and ibn) in Muslim names.7 Neither of these two codes mentioned explicitly Ottoman names or included any examples of them. In fact, Cutter’s treatment of Muslim names was so brief that it is impossible to determine how he would have handled complex names of the type featured in table 1.

Rule 52 of the 1908 Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries did mention “Turkish writers” and provided a fuller discussion of the elements of Muslim names than was found in Cutter’s rules, although the treatment was similar to what Cutter recommended.8 As before, exception was made in cases where a name other than the personal name distinguished more readily an author or where a particular form of the name had become established in Western literature. Despite the mention of Turkish authors, no examples of Ottoman names were given nor was there recognition that Ottoman practice might differ from Arabic practice.

The preliminary A.L.A. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries of 1941 had a somewhat fuller discussion of Arabic names and introduced 1900 as the dividing point between early and modern names. Why 1900 was chosen as the dividing point was not stated. Pre-twentieth-century names received the same treatment as that specified in the 1908 code. Twentieth-century authors were to be entered “under such shortened forms of name as they habitually use, surname, followed by forename, providing, of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1</th>
<th>COMPARISON OF THE TREATMENT OF MUSLIM NAMES IN AMERICAN CATALOGING CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cutter 1876</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutter 1904</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA 1908</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf, Abū ūmar, al-Kindī, 897–961.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA 1941</td>
<td>Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf, Abū ūmar, al-Kindī, 897–961.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
course, that the second element of the name is really a family name and not merely an additional name." Ottoman names were not differentiated from Arabic and Persian names; nor was there mention of either the change of orthography or the adoption of surnames in Turkey.

Rule 64 of the definitive 1949 A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries followed closely the 1941 draft with respect to Muslim names, but provided the first specific treatment of Turkish names in any of the American codes. Rule 64E stipulated entry under surname for twentieth-century Turkish writers, with the following proviso.

Prior to the adoption of family names, Turkish names ordinarily consisted either of a personal name or a personal name in combination with a distinguishing name (epithet, nickname, name denoting locality of author's birth or residence, etc.). When it is impossible to learn the family name, enter under the distinguishing name whenever one is used, otherwise under the personal name.\footnote{Rule 64E confused the treatment of Ottoman names, since twentieth-century Ottoman authors would be entered under the distinguishing name or given name, while their pre-twentieth-century colleagues would come under the general provisions of rule 64 and be entered "under the given name compounded with the patronymic . . . as well as with the surname and nickname. . . ."} It is obvious that there was only limited development in the treatment of Muslim names in American cataloging codes between 1876 and 1949. Muslim names were entered under the given name, followed by any elements preceding the given name. Laqabs were italicized and set off from the rest of the heading by a comma. Entry under an element other than the given name was possible, but the codes provided little guidance in determining when this was appropriate. To the extent that this exception was applied, similar names might be entered under different elements. Ottoman names as such received very little attention; nor was there any effort to differentiate among the name usages of other Muslim peoples. This monolithic approach was clearly inadequate. That no one complained was probably due to the fact that few Americans were interested in the languages and peoples of the modern Middle East. This situation began to change after World War II. The United States' global role underscored the need for greater expertise in non-Western areas and led to increased federal funding for area studies programs. As American scholars turned their attention to the Middle East, it became apparent that bibliographic access to the needed vernacular materials was far from ideal.

While the first Middle East studies centers were being established in the United States, the course of Anglo-American cataloging was itself undergoing change as a result of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles held in Paris in 1961. The Paris Principles placed the treatment of personal names on a new basis. Previous codes had emphasized the collocating function of the catalogue by basing headings on the full and proper form of name instead of the form of name by which a person was best known. The Paris Principles placed greater emphasis on the finding function of the catalog by stipulating that headings should be "the most frequently used name (or form of name) . . . appearing in editions of the works catalogued or in reference to them by accepted authorities."\footnote{Simi-}
larly, the entry word for personal names was to be "determined as far as possible by agreed usage in the country of which the author is a citizen, or, if this is not possible, by agreed usage in the language which he generally uses." This principle was implemented with respect to Arabic names in a report prepared by Mahmud Shenit. Shenit found the treatment of Arabic names in existing cataloging codes inadequate, particularly with respect to uniform entry under a prescribed element (i.e., under the given name), the tendency to treat all Middle Eastern names alike regardless of linguistic and other differences, and the choice of 1900 as dividing point between "old" and "modern" names. Shenit set the demarcation line between old and modern Arabic authors at 1800, with authors in both groups being entered under their best-known name. He did not specify what should be done if an old Arabic author's best-known name could not be determined, but in the case of modern authors entry was made under the last element in the name.

Shenit's recommendations were embodied in Names of Persons: National Usage for Entry in Catalogues, published by the International Federation of Library Associations in 1967. Ottoman names were not considered at the Conference, and they were given only cursory treatment in Names of Persons, which called for entry of persons who died before 1934 under forename. The complexities of Ottoman names were not discussed, an omission that subsequent editions of Names of Persons have not rectified.

The influence of the Paris Principles was apparent in the first edition of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR), which appeared in 1967. This code paid greater attention than previous American codes to national practices regarding names and to the need to base headings on the form by which a person was most commonly known. The Paris Principles influenced also the treatment of what AACR called Arabic alphabet names. Whereas previous codes had specified entry under given name in all but exceptional cases, AACR rule 54 called for entry under "the element or combination of elements by which the person is best known as determined from reference sources." In case of doubt as to the best-known element, entry was under the last element of the name instead of the given name. There was a fuller discussion of the different elements of Arabic alphabet names and more specific guidance on how to treat each element. Given names and patronymics derived from the father's name were to be included in the heading unless not used customarily by the person, while additional names, descriptive epithets, and titles of honor could be included if they helped to identify the individual. The order of elements was specified as entry element followed by the remaining elements of the name in the order of khitab, kunyah, isim, nasab, and any other name. If the entry element was not the first element in the name, a comma separated the entry element from the rest of the name. This meant that laqabs would no longer be italicized or separated from the rest of the name by a comma.

AACR represented a radical departure in the treatment of Arabic alphabet names, but it still prescribed a single treatment for all names "originally written in, or romanized from, the Arabic alphabet, borne by persons of the Mediterranean basin, the Middle East, or the Indian subcontinent.
... and to Islamic names written in the Arabic alphabet and borne by persons outside this area. At the same time, however, AACR rule 54 excluded specifically the names of persons "whose language is Turkish or Turkish-related." The result was a complete lack of guidance on the treatment of Ottoman Turkish names. This may have been an oversight, but it is also possible that AACR's framers thought that Ottoman names could be dealt with under the code's general provisions. An Ottoman name (Omer Seyfettin) was included among the examples illustrating rule 49A1, which called for entry of a person "whose name does not include a surname and who is not primarily identified by a title of nobility under the part of his name by which he is primarily identified in reference sources, normally the first of the names that he uses."

The nontreatment of Ottoman Turkish names in AACR was corrected in the second edition of this code, published in 1978. Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition (AACR2), rule 22.22 covers "names (regardless of their origin) originally written in the Arabic alphabet that do not contain a surname or a name performing the function of a surname." Ottoman names are clearly comprehended by this definition; and reference sources for Ottoman names are included in the accompanying list of major reference sources for names written in the Arabic alphabet. There is, however, no discussion of Ottoman names as such and no examples illustrating the application of AACR2 rule 22.22 to Ottoman names.

While AACR and AACR2 showed that the American library community was paying more attention to Arabic alphabet names, the treatment of these names was still imperfect. The failure to differentiate among different linguistic and cultural traditions was particularly glaring; and both codes were criticized on this point. Ottoman names clearly were in this category. These shortcomings and the increasing interest in Ottoman studies led to the first proposals for the treatment of Ottoman names in international cataloging.

The first of two proposals for the treatment of Ottoman names appeared in 1968. Its author, Eleazar Birnbaum, had been struck by the inconsistency in the treatment of Ottoman names in both Turkish and Western sources. Modern Turkish cataloging codes, he found, covered Ottoman names vaguely, disagreed with one another, and were diluted in their effectiveness through constant exceptions in theory and practice. Reference sources were no better in this respect. In combating this problem, Birnbaum sought "not to establish a theoretical system of 'correct' or official names, but quite simply to attempt to make the entry word for an Ottoman ... name predictable without research (or with as little as possible), so that cataloguers, indexers, scholars, writers, and readers, people who may be in quite different places, will choose the same entry word for a Turkish name quite independently of one another." Although Birnbaum's basic rule called for entry under the part of the name by which an author is best known, his own research called this approach into question, since it showed that reference sources often disagreed on choice of name as well as entry element. Birnbaum himself gave no guidance on how to determine by which part of the name an author was best known, but he did call for various exceptions to this approach. For example, names consisting of...
more Islamic names juxtaposed” were to be entered under the final element. Contrary to AAGCR rule 49A1, Birnbaum would therefore have entered Ömer Seyfettin under the Seyfettin instead of Ömer. In sum, Birnbaum’s approach required the cataloger and the catalog user to make subtle distinctions in selecting the entry element. This made for a relatively complex set of rules.

Eight years after Birnbaum’s pioneering effort, Leman Çankaya proposed a somewhat different solution to the problem of Ottoman Turkish names. Çankaya, who was affiliated with the Turkish National Library, also proposed entering Ottoman names under the most well-known element, be it given name, family or father’s name, laqab, pen name, or name of birthplace. There were exceptions: names consisting of one or two given names were to be entered in direct order, and entry was to be preferred under “family names” of the -oğlu or -zade type unless the person was better known under his or her given name. Like Birnbaum, Çankaya gave no guidance on how to determine the best known element.

Although the approaches espoused by Çankaya and Birnbaum were in part mutually exclusive, they both adhered to the concept of entry under best-known element.

Developing better rules for the treatment of Ottoman names in cataloging should do justice to the unique nature of Ottoman names. Specifically, they must recognize that the composition of an Ottoman name could vary over the lifetime of its bearer, that it is often difficult to determine the exact function of each element in such a name, and that it is difficult if not impossible to determine the element or combination of elements by which an Ottoman is best known. As far as AAGCR2 is concerned, the treatment of Ottoman names must reflect this code’s concern with the finding function of the catalog. Since AAGCR2 does not address the problems inherent in Ottoman names explicitly, it is necessary to determine if the code’s treatment of analogous situations is applicable to Ottoman names. This is not always easy, since AAGCR2 does not anticipate all of the usages found in Ottoman names. Nevertheless, adhering to the existing provisions of AAGCR2 as closely as possible is desirable, since it should result in fewer rules and concepts for both the cataloger and catalog user to master and apply. Finally, dealing with Ottoman names should not place an undue burden on the cataloger. While a certain amount of research is unavoidable in the case of Ottoman names, the cataloger should not be required to make distinctions which do not improve bibliographic access.

The first question to consider is romanization. By definition, all Ottoman names were written originally in the Arabic alphabet. Since few United States libraries provide access to Arabic script names in their original form, such names must be romanized in order to serve as access points. AAGCR2 22.3C1 follows a dual approach by prescribing “the form of name that has become well established in English-language reference sources for a person entered under given name, etc . . . . whose name is in a language written in a non-roman script”; but, in the absence of a generally accepted English romanization, this rule stipulates systematic romanization “according to the table for the language adopted by the cataloguing agency. . . .” In this context, the Library of Congress has defined “well established” as
meaning that the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (15th edition), the *Encyclopaedia Americana*, and the *Academic American Encyclopedia* each devote an article to the person in question. If the person is listed in all three but under varying romanizations, the form found in the *Britannica* is preferred. In the rule interpretation (RI) for *AARC2 22.22*, LC addresses the question of headings based on non-Arabic script sources (except those established under 22.3C1) by requiring systematic romanization of Arabic personal names "if the Arabic script form of the name is known." In practice, the Arabic-script form of Ottoman names is readily determinable, since the LC romanization scheme for Ottoman Turkish prescribes "conversion" of Ottoman words into modern Turkish, that is, the adoption of the modern Turkish spelling as indicated in modern Turkish dictionaries. Based on *AARC2* and LC's treatment of Arabic names, a simple rule for the romanization of Ottoman names is as follows:

1. **Romanization.** Romanize Ottoman personal names according to the Library of Congress romanization scheme for Ottoman Turkish unless a well-established English romanization exists, as defined by RI 22.3C.

Romanization aside, choosing the form of name upon which to base an Ottoman heading raises a number of questions. As noted above, Ottoman names developed along with the person's career and sometimes even after the person's death. An Ottoman author's works might therefore not be the best indication of how he or she is now commonly known. This suggests greater reliance on reference sources in establishing Ottoman names than is generally allowed under *AARC2*. LC has decided that the form of name found in modern reference sources in the person's language should be preferred for pre-1801 authors when chief sources of information show a different form from that found in reference sources. The notion here seems to be that reference works are a better indication of how such authors are commonly known today. This RI obviously covers pre-1801 Ottoman authors; and, given the end of Ottoman name usage in 1928, it would be apt to extend this definition to include all Ottoman authors. In the case of Arabic authors, LC has decided to "determine the elements that belong to the name from the universe of reference sources." Finally, *AARC2* 22.1B already requires that headings for persons working in nonverbal contexts or not known primarily as authors be based on reference sources, while *AARC2* 22.3C1 requires that English-language reference sources be taken into account when the name in question is written in a nonroman alphabet and is to be entered "under given name, etc." Basing Ottoman headings on reference sources as well as chief sources of information has its merits, but it cannot solve all of the problems associated with Ottoman names. As Birnbaum has noted, not even reference sources agree consistently on the elements to be included in an Ottoman name. It is in fact questionable whether many Ottomans are known commonly by any particular name, although the selective inspection of reference works can give the illusion that they are. The many variables involved suggest that it would be difficult for any two catalogers to establish a complex Ottoman name under exactly the same form. What catalogers can do is exercise judgment in determining the elements most commonly included
in a given person's name. With this in mind, the following rules can be advanced for determining the elements belonging to an Ottoman name.

2. Choice of name.

2.1 Persons likely to be found in English-language reference sources. Apply RI 22.3C.

2.2 Persons not likely to be found in English-language reference sources.

2.2A Authors. Determine the elements belonging to an Ottoman author's name from the chief sources of information of his or her works issued during or after his or her lifetime and from the universe of reference sources. "Reference sources" here means books and articles written about the person in any language.

2.2B. Nonauthors. Determine the elements belonging to the name of a person who works in a nonverbal context or who is not known primarily as an author from the universe of reference sources as defined in 2.2A above.

2.2C. Fullness. If the forms of a name vary in fullness, exercise judgment in determining which elements are commonly associated with a given person's name in the sources upon which the heading is based. If no one form clearly predominates, choose the fuller or fullest form.

Another area of potential difficulty with Ottoman names involves the treatment of commonly associated words and phrases. AARC2 22.1C mandates the inclusion of "any titles of nobility or honour . . . or words or phrases . . . that commonly appear in association with the name either wholly or in part"; and AARC2 22.8A further requires that names lacking a surname include "any words or phrases denoting place of origin, domicile, occupation, or other characteristics that are commonly associated with the name in works by the person or in reference sources." This rule also requires that such words or phrases be preceded by a comma. The words and phrases specified by 22.8A suggest the types of usage found in Ottoman laqabs; but the examples illustrating this rule only show words or phrases that follow the given name in normal usage (e.g., John, the Baptist). AARC2 22.8A does not anticipate cases, such as are common with Ottoman names, where the word or phrase precedes the given name (e.g., Bursali Mehmet Tahir). The general rule 22.4A, however, does make it clear that any element that is part of the person's designation may be the entry element. More pertinent for the treatment of Ottoman names, therefore, is LC RI 22.8A, which provides for the omission of the comma in cases where the name "cannot be broken down into components 'name' and phrase."

Examples given include John of the Cross. AARC2 22.22 makes no distinction between laqabs and other elements of Arabic names in terms of treatment or punctuation, all elements being regarded as integral parts of the name. This seems the proper approach for Ottoman names as well. The only remaining question, then, is determining when such elements are in fact part of the name. RI 22.8A cautions against including such terms if they "appear only in complex statements that contain other elements." This seems to anticipate narrative statements describing the author, a practice not uncommon on Ottoman title pages. The solution to this problem is, once again, to be found in basing the heading for an author on reference works as well as on chief sources of information. If the questionable word or phrase is also associated with the name in reference sources, it should be regarded as part of the name.
2.3 Commonly associated words and phrases. Regard all commonly associated words and phrases as integral parts of the name. Do not separate them from the rest of the name by a comma. Determine whether a word or phrase is commonly associated from reference sources as well as from the chief sources of information of works by the person issued during or after his or her lifetime.

Having determined the elements that make up a person’s name and how to romanize the name, it remains to select the entry element. AACR2 22.22B requires entering the name “under the element or combination of elements by which the person is best known” as determined from reference sources. This is consistent with AACR2 22.8A: “Enter a name that does not include a surname and that is borne by a person who is not identified by a title of nobility under the part of name under which the person is listed in reference sources.” The problem, again, is that reference sources often disagree on the entry element for Ottoman names. As Birnbaum demonstrated conclusively, particular reference sources follow particular patterns, but not without variations. Attempting to base the entry element on reference sources would always be time-consuming; it would rarely be to any avail. AACR2 also has a clear prejudice against basing decisions on reference sources which enter names uniformly regardless of a person’s preference or usage. Reference sources dealing with Ottoman names would seem to fall into this category. Given the great variability in the treatment of Ottoman names in reference sources and in authors’ works, it is unlikely that catalog users have preconceptions as to how a particular name will be entered.

If reference works are of little help in determining the entry element, the finding function of the catalog can still be enhanced through the consistent treatment of Ottoman names. Consistent application of a simple rule for determining the entry element would allow catalog users to develop expectations based on their use of the catalog and would save catalogers the difficulty of trying to determine the best-known element in cases where there probably is none. This approach could be applied to Ottoman names through consistent entry under the first element of the name, that is, without inversion. Precedent for this is found in AACR2 22.22B, which calls for entry of Arabic alphabet names under the first element of the name when there is insufficient evidence to determine the part of the name by which a person is best known. Support for this approach can also be found in the way AACR2, as interpreted by LC, treats names consisting of a forename preceded by a “phrase or other appellation” (i.e., by a laqab). LC RI 22.11A calls for entry of headings of this type under the first element. The accompanying examples, such as Poor Richard, are clearly analogous to Ottoman names such as Küçük Mehmet (“Little Mehmet”). Finally, RI 22.8 requires specifically entry of Ethiopian, Somali, and Zairian personal names, which, like Ottoman names, do not include family names, under the first element of the name.

This approach has advantages in addition to simplicity. Since the distinctive part of an Ottoman name often precedes the given name, direct entry will tend to result in entry under a distinctive element, lessening the problem of numerous persons entered under a common given name. It will insure that those authors who only use given names will be entered the same
way as modern Turkish authors who do not use their family names, thus introducing another element of consistency into the catalog. It also means that some names will be entered under what may be titles of honor, such as şeyh and hacı, or even under terms of address. AACR2 apparently does not exclude the possibility of entry under title, but the general tendency (apparent also in the treatment of Muslim honorific titles in Indonesian names under AACR2 22.26G and Malay names under AACR2 22.27D) is to add titles and honorific words to names (e.g., Abdul Majid bin Zainuddin, Haji). Modern Turkish reference works, on the other hand, do sometimes enter Ottoman names under titles such as şeyh, hacı, and çelebi. Indeed, in some cases titles become so closely associated with an Ottoman name that they become, in effect, laqabs (e.g., Şeyh Galip). Matters are not simplified by the fact that Ottoman titles of honor sometimes precede immediately the given name but are not the first element in the name (e.g., Hasirizade Şeyh Mehmet Elif). Trying to determine when a title or term of address is so closely associated as to be regarded as a laqab instead of a separable part of the name is difficult if not impossible. For the sake of simplicity, it is preferable to treat such words like any other part of the name. If the first element in the name happens to be a title or term of address, the name is entered under it.

3. Entry element. Enter Ottoman names in direct order, that is, under the first element of the name regardless of its nature. If the heading is based on reference sources that enter the name in inverted order, transpose the elements of the name into direct order.

Abdüllatif Subhi Paşa, 1818–1886.
Ahmet Ziya.
Ali İrfan Ağribozi.
Amâ Yusuf Garibi, d. ca. 1795.
Çelebi Ahmet Cemaeddin.
Doktor Kâmil.
Florina Nâzım 1883–1939.
Hoca Şakir.
Mahmut Cevat bin eş-Şeyh Nafi.
Niyazi, d. 1693 or 4.
Okçuzade Mehmet Şahi, d. 1629.
Şeyh Galip, 1757 or 8–1799.

Despite the best research efforts, a number of Ottoman name headings will consist of only one or more given names without even birth or death dates to distinguish them. Such headings are woefully inadequate due to the limited number of Muslim given names. AACR2 22.19A does allow for the addition of parenthetical qualifiers to names entered under given name, but only in cases of direct conflict between two or more identical names. Given the general inadequacy of Ottoman headings consisting solely of given names and the likelihood of eventual conflicts, it is desirable to qualify such headings, when possible, with a "suitable brief term" added in parentheses. The examples that accompany AACR2 22.12A imply that this brief term be in English; but LC RI 22.19, which covers terms of address for pre-twentieth-century persons, allows the use of terms, titles, and so
forth that appear anywhere in works by the person or in reference sources. This suggests that vernacular terms are acceptable. This is especially desirable when dealing with Ottoman names, since it is often difficult to find meaningful English equivalents for Ottoman titles and offices.

4. Distinguishing terms.

4.1. Identical names. If dates are not available to distinguish between two or more identical names, devise a suitable brief term and add it in parentheses. Prefer a term found in the chief source of information upon which the heading is based.

4.2 Inadequate headings. If the heading consists solely of common given names, devise a suitable brief term and add it in parentheses even if no conflict exists. Prefer a term found in the chief source of information upon which the heading is based.

İhsan (İzmir mebusu)
Refik (Mezahib Odası hulafasından)
Reşit (Vefa Mektebi müdürü)

The variability of Ottoman names and the many ways in which they appear in reference sources make adequate references essential. This problem, which is shared by other Arabic alphabet names, is recognized by AACR2 22.22B, which calls for references "from any part of the name not used as entry element if there is reason to believe that the person's name may be sought under that part." In the case of Ottoman names, this means any part of the name except titles that follow the given name. AACR2 22.22B also echoes 22.3C in calling for references "as necessary from variant romanizations." This too is clearly required in the case of Ottoman names, especially where the LC romanization scheme for Ottoman requires the unvoiced form of what would be a voiced consonant in Ottoman orthography (e.g., modern Turkish Mehmet versus Ottoman Mehmed). Also required (and mandated by AACR2 26.2A2) are references from different forms of name used by the person or found in reference sources—a common occurrence in the case of Ottoman names.

The possibilities for references from different elements of the heading, different romanizations, and different forms of the name are so numerous in the case of Ottoman names that the real problem is knowing when to stop making references. AACR2 26.1, the basic rule for references, cautions against making a reference "if the reference is so similar to the name heading or uniform title or another reference as to be unnecessary." Where one draws the line depends in part on the nature of the individual catalog: an online catalog with keyword searching is not sensitive to different entry elements, while a system, such as OCLC, which uses structured searches, is. This is a question that has not received very much attention thus far, but needs to be considered. In the meantime, the best that can be done is to follow AACR2 as interpreted by LC.

5. References.

5.1. Refer from any part of the name not used as entry element except for titles which follow the given name or names.

Ahmet Cevdet Paşa, 1822–1895.
xCevdet Paşa, Ahmet, 1822–1895
not
x Paşa, Ahmet Cevdet, 1822–1895
Arpaeminizade Mustafa Paşa, d. 1733.
x Mustafa Paşa, Arpaeminizade, d. 1733
not
x Mustafa Paşa, Arpaeminizade, d. 1733

5.2. Refer from different romanizations found in reference sources or in works by the person. If an element of the name includes the unvoiced form of what would be a voiced consonant in the original orthography, refer also from the form of name with the unvoiced consonant.

Ahmet Ziya.
x Ahmed Ziya
Osman Hayri Müşit.
x Hayri Müşit, Osman.
x Müşit, Osman Hayri
x Müşid, Osman Hayri

5.3. Refer from different forms of name found in reference sources or in works by the person. Generally, refer from the form, including entry element, found in the reference work unless the purpose of the reference is to bring out some other part of the name not chosen as the entry element.

Abdüllatif Subhi Paşa, 1818–1886.
x Subhi Paşa bin Abdullahiman Sami, 1818–1886
x Subhi Bey, 1818–1886

The challenge presented by Ottoman names lies not only in their complexity but also in the absence of any generally accepted way of dealing with them inside or outside of Turkey. It is therefore impossible to follow the Paris Principles and base Ottoman name headings on national or linguistic usage. It is not even possible to identify the best-known element of an Ottoman name in most cases. It is nevertheless feasible and appropriate to advance the finding function of the catalog through the consistent treatment of Ottoman names under the general provisions of AACR2 as interpreted by the Library of Congress.
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I would like to explore the past with you—what I call the "fashions" in serials cataloging—to see how we got where we are now. I looked at a number of sets of cataloging rules made and apparently used in the United States. It is clear that these rules had some influence on the practice of serials cataloging in this country and certainly influenced each other in the sense that the persons, committees, and institutions preparing them looked backward always to see what had been done or recommended before.

I will talk about only two things: the entry of serials, and what is suggested if the serial changes its title or the person or corporate body under which it is entered changes.

There are three possibilities for the main entry of a serial. A serial may be entered under its title, under the name of the person who "authored" it, or under the name of a corporate body, whether that body is called an author, the body responsible for the intellectual content, or the body from which the serial "emanates." There are also three possibilities for handling changes: (a) the main entry can be whatever is appropriate for the earliest issues of the serial with differences on later issues explained in notes; (b) the main entry can be whatever is appropriate for the latest issues of the serial with differences on earlier issues explained in notes; (c) or there can be successive entries where each differing main entry (whether title, corporate body, or person) has its own record and the records are linked with notes in the manner of "Continues..." and "Continued by."

The earliest rules I examined were those of Charles Ammi Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog*, which appeared in four editions from 1876 to 1904.

As I'm sure most of you know, Cutter is one of the great names in librarianship. For twenty-five years he was the librarian of the Boston Athenaeum where one of his major accomplishments was the production of a printed dictionary catalog of the Athenaeum's collections. This catalog, issued in five volumes from 1874 to 1882, has been called the first successful attempt in this country to indicate what material was available in a large library in alphabetic arrangement by author, by title, by subject, and by form heading. In 1876 Cutter was one of the founding fathers of the Ameri-
can Library Association. He developed, although never completely fin-
ished, an expansive classification which greatly influenced the Library of
Congress classification. One of his better known achievements was the de-
velopment of a scheme for arranging books alphabetically by author, the
Cutter tables or numbers, which is still in use in most libraries today.

Cutter’s cataloging rules were, of course, an outgrowth of his work on
the preparation of the catalog of the Athenaeum’s collections. In 1876 in
celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the United States, the Bu-
reau of Education issued a comprehensive report on the status of libraries
in this country. Cutter contributed a complete statement on the status of
library cataloging, and the first edition of his rule was published as part 2 of
the report.

Cutter’s rules are brief—the 1876 edition is only 89 pages long. Later
editions were larger because they included appendices showing other
codes of rules. Cutter says that the size increased because he broke up long
paragraphs into separate rules. In spite of the size, Cutter’s rules cover just
about everything: entry, some information on description and fullness of
various types of entries, subject headings, filing, a brief mention about
printing format. He says that although the rules are designed for a printed
book catalog he can see no reason why they could not be used for a card
catalog.

I looked at the first and fourth editions of his rules, the second and third
editions not being readily available at the Library of Congress. What does
Cutter say about serials? He indicates that periodicals are to be treated as
anonymous works, and entered under the first word of the title. Almanacs
and other annuals are to be treated as periodicals and then he cautions “do
not confound periodicals with serials.” Interestingly enough “serial” is
finally defined in the fourth edition but never mentioned or referred to any-
where in the first and the fourth editions except in this statement that pe-
riodicals and serials are not to be confused.

Cutter says that periodicals have four characteristics: (a) they are pub-
lished at intervals usually but not necessarily regular; (b) they are intended
to continue indefinitely; (c) they are written by a number of contributors;
and (d) they are made up of articles on various subjects so a set of the work
does not form an organic whole. He points out that some of the publica-
tions of societies (e.g., memoria, proceedings, transactions) are like peri-
odicals except that they lack the variety of authorship as they may be con-
idered to be the society acting through its members. Therefore, the
society is the author and the entry is under the name of the society. But
there are some that are published by or for the society that are really peri-
odicals as the society is editor, not author, and these can be entered under
title. There are some that are borderline and Cutter indicates “the puzzled
cataloger should remember that it is not of much importance which way he
decides provided he makes all necessary references.”

Although Cutter does not say so, I must assume from a careful reading of
his rules that serials other than the periodicals, newspapers, and almanacs
that he mentions specifically should be under title are covered by his gen-
eral rule of entry: enter publications under the author whether personal or
corporate body.

What does Cutter suggest for changes? He indicates that if title entry has
been used and the title changes, the whole may be cataloged under the original title with an explanatory note and a reference from the new title to the old (earliest entry) or each part may be cataloged under its own title with references forth and back (successive entry). Cutter does not address the question of what to do if the body under which the serial is entered changes its name although he indicates that corporate bodies that change names are given generally under their latest name with a reference from the earlier. He does not address directly the question of what to do if the body or person under which the serial is entered changes to another body or person, or if the title of a serial entered under body or person changes but I assume that his suggestion that entries be done either “earliest” or “successive” would apply in all cases.

I was curious to know whether Cutter had a preference for earliest or successive so I looked at the Catalogue of the Library of the Boston Athenaeum to see what had been used there. I found some successive entries and some earliest and was unable to determine that there were more of one than the other.

While looking at the catalog I decided to see whether I could find an example of what was done when a serial entered under a corporate body changed its title. Under the heading for the Library of Congress I found an entry for a Catalogue of Additions that indicated that the Athenaeum had volumes for 1862 to 1875. On this entry was a note that the title from 1866 to 1872 was Catalogue of Books Added to the Library and that the 1875 volume had the title: Catalogue of Recently Added Books. Therefore Cutter was using the earliest title in the entry. It may interest you to know that the Library of Congress has this publication cataloged as separate monographs. So much for agreement on “What is a serial?”

Before leaving Cutter I cannot resist sharing with you something he wrote in the preface to his fourth edition (which was published after his death):

“On seeing the great success of the Library of Congress cataloging, I doubted whether it was worthwhile to prepare and issue this fourth edition of my rules; but I reflected that it would be a considerable time before all libraries would use the cards of that library, and a long time before the Library of Congress could furnish cards for all books. . . . Still I cannot help thinking that the golden age of cataloging is over, and that the difficulties and discussions which have furnished an innocent pleasure to so many will interest them no more. Another lost art.”

All of the rest of the cataloging rules that I will be talking about are not of personal authorship but are products of American Library Association (ALA) units or committees and all of them have the deep involvement of the Library of Congress (LC), either because LC staff were on the committees or, later, LC became one of the several corporate authors. All of them, too, were used at the Library of Congress with, I am sure, sets of rule interpretations more or less voluminous.

The first of these rules is Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries published by ALA in 1908. These rules are a revision and expansion of the Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog prepared by a committee of the American Library Association and presented at the ALA conference in Buffalo in 1883.
In terms of entry for serials, these rules are much like those of Cutter. Works, including serials, are to be entered under author, whether individual or corporate. Periodicals, almanacs, yearbooks, etc., are to be entered under title. These rules deal rather differently with the publications of societies and indicate that a regular periodical issued by a society is ordinarily to be entered under title, especially if this is distinctive in character. However, when the parts appear at long intervals such as annually or biennially, or contain only the regular proceedings, transactions, or annual reports of the society, the publication is to be entered under the name of the society. In cases in which the cataloger is not sure what the entry should be, entry under society is preferred.

These rules differ greatly from Cutter in terms of what should be done about changes of title for works entered under title. They indicate that if a periodical changes its name it should be entered under the latest form of its name. Brief entries under the earlier names should be made referring to those that immediately precede and follow in notes introduced by the phrases "preceded by" or "continued as."

When I first read this I made the quick assumption that both latest entry and successive entry were being recommended. But on a second reading I realized that the brief entries for earlier titles were really a substitute for cross references or added entries for these titles and that their preparation was an ingenious method of avoiding the necessity of removing and changing a lot of cards in a catalog whenever a title changed. With this latest title cataloging the full main entry could be changed easily by moving a title down from the top of a card into the notes as an earlier title and putting a new, latest title on the top of the card. Then a brief entry could be made for what had now become an earlier title, the brief entry referring to the new latest title with a "continued as" note. Brief entries for other earlier titles would not have to be changed or touched at all.

In any case, this 1908 set of rules recommends latest entry for serials entered under title. However, there is a note that the British edition recommends earliest entry with brief records for the later titles. As with Cutter there are no specific directions in the 1908 rules for handling changes if the serial is entered under a person or corporate body. As with Cutter, also, these rules indicate that bodies are given under their latest names with references from earlier names.

The next rules are the *A.L.A. Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entries* published in 1941. This is a preliminary edition of what was planned to be an expansion of the 1908 rules as there were strong feelings that the 1908 rules, being brief, did not meet the needs of catalogers in large scholarly or
specialized collections. Work began on the expansion in 1930 and this pre-
liminary edition was published about ten years later as pressure was felt by
committees and subcommittees to produce some tangible result of their
long labors even though agreement had not been reached on all points.

In regard to serials, these rules do not differ particularly from the 1908
rules as they again called for entry of certain serials (such as periodicals
and newspapers) under title and the others, presumably, under the appro-
priate corporate body or person. I found it rather interesting, however, that
there was a special rule for telephone directories that indicated that tele-
phone directories issued by a telephone company should be entered under
title if issued serially and under compiler or title if not issued serially, the
choice of compiler or title entry being made according to the "prominence"
of the name of the compiler on the publication. I wonder whether
this rule might be the first instance of the practice so prevalent in the Anglo-
American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed. (AACR2) of using prominence as the
basis for making decisions in regard to entry, description, or form of name
used by a corporate body?

The 1941 rules, too, call for latest entry of serials as well as entry of a
corporate body under the latest form of its name.

Now we come to the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries
(the "red book") and Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of
Congress (the "green book") both published in 1949. These volumes are,
effect, the "final" edition of the preliminary rules of 1941 I have just
been talking about. In the 1941 rules there is a publisher's note that there
"has been considerable disagreement between some catalogers and some
administrators, the administrators feeling that there is too much elabora-
tion in the rules and the expense involved in following them would be,
in many cases, unjustified. A special committee of administrators and cata-
logers has been appointed to consider this view and report its conclu-
sions." This committee duly reported in 1944 and its recommendations
(presumably to simplify the rules of 1941) were accepted. An ALA group
therefore revised "Part 1: Entry and Heading" of the 1941 rules and the
revision became the "red book." Meanwhile LC took over responsibility
for "Part 2: Description of a Book" and LC's revision and simplification,
after acceptance by ALA, became the "green book."

For serials these rules of 1949 are similar to the rules of 1941. Certain
types of serials are entered under title and others under corporate body or
person. Latest entry is called for with the single exception that for a period-
ical that has ceased publication the entry may be made under an earlier title
that was used for a longer period than the later title.

When I became a serials cataloger at the Library of Congress in 1960, it
was these rules of 1949 that were in use at LC and it is these rules that are
the earliest I have had any experience in using.

The success of the "simpler" rules for description as issued by the Li-
brary of Congress in 1949 led to a demand for equally simple rules for
author-title entry, so ALA started this work about 1954. As with many
cases of revision, the task somehow became larger and larger and groups
began exploring the very basic principles of cataloging as well as questions
concerning the whole idea of corporate authorship. After a number of
years, and much cooperation between the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association (of Britain), and the Canadian Library Association, the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) of 1967 emerged in two editions, the North American text and the British text, which differed on many small points and a few major ones.

Concerning serials, this is the first of the codes that had a single rule of entry, rule 6, for all serials. Rule 6 is rather elaborate and seemed to be moving very much in the direction of putting more serials under title, i.e., fewer under corporate body. I can remember, as a serials cataloger at LC, how much "soul searching" was going on among those involved in framing rule 6 as some versions were tried on the serials catalogers to see whether they thought they would be easy to apply. One of the amusing statements, in an early version of rule 6 was "Enter a well-known reference work under title regardless of the fact that it is issued by or under the authority of a corporate body." Needless to say we serials catalogers turned "thumbs down" on that one as being impossible to apply.

Rule 6 called for serials by a person to be entered under the person and serials not by a person and not by a corporate body to be entered under title. But then the rule got complicated. Serials issued by or under the authority of a corporate body were to be entered under the corporate body unless they were periodicals, bibliographies, indexes, directories, biographical dictionaries, almanacs, or yearbooks, in which case they went under title. But there was an exception here that they went under the corporate body if the title included the name of the corporate body or consisted only of a generic term that required the name of the body for identification. As some of you may remember this rule for entry of serials issued by a corporate body was most difficult to apply as one was trying continually to determine whether something was a directory and could go under title or whether some titles were, indeed, generic terms so could go under corporate body.

At LC, after we received numerous complaints concerning our lack of consistency in what we called generic terms we started to keep lists and later a card file of titles such as Monthly Bulletin which we regarded as generic and Monthly Bulletin of Statistics which we, usually, did not. By adding to this file generic titles in all languages we suddenly realized that the same title could be generic in one language and not in another, or at least it seemed so. Eventually we gave up on the file as it became impossible to manage. However, I suspect I still have, somewhere in my office, remnants of this file if anyone is interested in a memento of AACR.

AACR comes down, rather clearly and specifically, on the side of successive entry for serials. If the title changes, if the corporate body changes or undergoes a change of name, or if the person under whom the serial is entered ceases to be its author, it calls for a separate entry. However, much to the chagrin of the serials catalogers at the Library of Congress there were footnotes throughout the rules indicating that LC would continue to do latest entry cataloging of serials. LC did not apply the "rules as written," that is use successive entry, until early 1970s when its serials cataloging operation had become backlogged so seriously with titles awaiting recataloging to the latest title or body that there was little time to handle serials that had never been cataloged at all. It is interesting to note that
AACR was the first set of rules that did not require a corporate body to be given under the latest name of the body. When a corporate body changed names, the new name could be used for new publications and main or added entries for the earlier name could remain a sort of successive entry for names. If you remember AACR was stated as an attempt to simplify the 1949 rules and, as you can imagine, its lack of requirement for the use of the latest name of a corporate body cut down, considerably, on cataloging and changing of main and added entries.

Returning to serials, there were, of course, minor exceptions that were major headaches to the requirement of successive entry. New entries did not have to be made for minor (undefined) title changes or title changes of short (undefined) duration. These two words “minor” and “short” caused a certain amount of havoc in the early years of the CONSER (Conversion of Serials) project; for example, as each institution had its own ideas of what was minor and what period of time was short, so it made cooperative cataloging difficult.

The successive entry called for in AACR was successive entry with what I would call a latest entry slant since the description of the publication (the body of the record) was to be based on the latest piece with differences on earlier pieces noted.

Finally we come to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed. (AACR2) published in 1978. AACR2 started, as many rules do, as a modest attempt to revise or change rules in AACR (such as rule 6 for serials) which were causing difficulties. As you may know, at one time the “authors” of AACR2 considered seriously having a rule that would indicate that all serials should be entered under title. However, it was decided, eventually, that it was undesirable to have a special rule for the entry of serials and that whatever rules of entry were decided upon should apply to all materials.

Again, during the preparation of AACR2 the whole question of corporate “authorship” was raised, debated, discussed, and documented in numerous appeals and papers. So in AACR2 entry of all materials including serials is under corporate body in only a limited number of cases, when the publication “emanates” from the body and expresses the “thought” of the body, and so forth. Materials “authored” by a person are under the person but materials edited or compiled by a person usually are not.

The rules for entry in AACR2 tend to put many more serials under title than had been true of rules in the past and critics of AACR2 have said that the rules for entry were devised, as they were, in order to make this so.

AACR2 is even more firmly in the fold of successive entry than was AACR as it has more rigid specifications for determining when a title has changed and has no exceptions such as the title of short duration rule which was so hard to apply in AACR.

AACR2’s successive entry can be called, however, a successive entry with an earliest entry slant as the description of the publication (the body of the record) is based on the earliest piece with differences on later pieces noted.

We have looked at the “fashions” in serials cataloging, seeing that in something over 100 years Cutter’s suggestion for earliest or successive entry was replaced in American rules by latest entry and, with AACR and
AACR2, latest entry was replaced by successive entry again. One wonders where and whether the pendulum will swing next.

Some libraries in the United States have never entirely abandoned latest entry cataloging for serials and others are experimenting with it anew. The Library of Congress has been accused, because of some of its rule interpretations for AACR2, of moving in the direction of earliest entry.

But we don’t need to worry about trends or speculate on what new cataloging rules might bring for serials as this institute is concerned with AACR2 and successive entry the “fashion” of today.
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Notes on Research and Operations

The RTSD Preservation Microfilming Committee: Looking to the 1990s

Nancy E. Gwinn

Established in 1980, the RTSD Preservation Microfilming Committee’s primary goal was to collect and disseminate information and to improve communication on relevant issues among all RTSD sections. At that time, only a few institutions and vendors were participating in preservation microfilming programs. A more active committee role soon seemed desirable because of burgeoning interest in preservation microfilming and a desire to find practical ways for the committee and RTSD to assist the growing number of members who were participating in filming programs. In 1987 a strategic planning session identified issues and problems where investigation or action was needed and stimulated changes in the committee’s composition to add members with necessary experience. Today the committee is well poised to take action on important and pressing issues in the 1990s.

The interest of libraries in reprography, and in particular microreproduction, can be traced to the 1930s, when the New York Public Library, Harvard University, and the Library of Congress began to photograph bulky collections of fast-deteriorating newspapers. The events of World War II stimulated interest in the medium for filming valuable foreign archives, manuscripts, and rare books and bringing that information back to American repositories in order to increase its chance of survival.1 Within the American Library Association, professional interest in reproduction methods led to the establishment of the Copying Methods Section and its successor, the Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS), of the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD). The section’s major concern in the early years was the archival quality of film. Librarians pressed for the promulgation and acceptance of industry standards relating to archival film production and processing, and such standards are now widely employed for microfilming of library materials.2

As librarians assimilated the results of research carried out by the W. J.
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Barrow Laboratory on causes of paper deterioration, the profession grew increasingly concerned about the longevity of library collections. The idea of using microform as a preservation tool, in addition to its value as a way of saving space or of adding unique materials to a collection, began to flourish in the late 1960s and early 1970s, although the costs and labor requirements were recognized as significant. The past two decades have also seen the slow but steady growth of systematic preservation programs in libraries, programs that broadly address the preservation needs of collections, which include reformatting publications that can be salvaged no other way. In 1979 RTSD added the Preservation of Library Materials (PLMS) section to house this broader interest and provide a forum for a growing number of librarians who have responsibilities as preservation officers or administrators. To the natural interests of RLMS and PLMS in microfilming could be added those of selectors, bibliographers, acquisitions staff, and others involved in decisions of selecting microforms or deciding to replace items in that format. The RTSD focus for these librarians is grounded in yet another group, the Resources Section (RS).

Perhaps no other topic has required such close communication among librarians involved in different library functions. Rather than aligning the new committee to any one section, the executive committees of RLMS, PLMS, and RS asked the RTSD Board to establish a joint Preservation Microfilming Committee (PMC). The board approved the suggestion at the 1980 Annual Conference, and the first meeting was held at Midwinter in 1981, with Norman J. Shaffer of the Library of Congress as the first chair. Initially the committee was composed of representatives from the five RTSD sections—the initial three plus the Cataloging and Classification Section (CCS) and the Serials Section (SS).

The initial charge of the committee was “to encourage the microfilming of deteriorated and deteriorating materials as a preservation technique; to foster coordinated filming programs among libraries as a means of reducing costly duplication and encouraging responsible sharing of resources; to collect and disseminate information about preservation microfilming activities, including information concerning selection criteria, cooperative approaches, production methods, storage, record control, and use of master microforms; to report to cooperating sections on significant developments in this area and propose jointly sponsored educational programs and other projects as appropriate.”

COMMITTEE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Information collecting, sharing, and disseminating quickly became the committee’s principal activities in its early years. There were several solid accomplishments. Committee member Helga Borck, at that time Head of the Preservation Program Office at the New York Public Library, served as the principal compiler of a bibliography of information sources concerning preparing materials for microfilming, which was revised and updated and made generally available. It eventually served as the basis for an article in Microform Review. At the 1984 ALA Annual Conference in Dallas the committee sponsored a program entitled “Cooperative Preservation Microfilming: Past, Present, and Future” and published the papers.
Earlier, at the January 1984 Midwinter Meeting, the committee began to hear regular reports from organizations involved in various preservation microfilming activities, such as the Library of Congress, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), the Research Libraries Group (RLG), the Northeast Document Conservation Center (NEDCC), the evolving Mid-Atlantic Preservation Service (MAPS), and the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET). Some of these groups were working on ideas that had been discussed by the committee. For example, at the first committee meeting in 1981, the committee had "agreed that a manual on how to prepare files for preservation microfilming would be a desirable long-term project." Jeffrey Heynen, committee chair from 1983 to 1985 and at that time a staff member of the Association of Research Libraries, was able to guide this idea into an association-sponsored publication, assisted by the NEDCC and using funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission.

Prior to 1987 the minutes show that the committee played a role as a sounding board for various ideas about the needs of those involved in preservation microfilming. In addition to the idea of the manual, there were expressions of need for microfilming workshops or institutes to help train staff members involved in filming activities, for improving bibliographic tools listing the availability of microform masters, for standardizing forms and agreements for lending materials for preservation microfilming, and for guidelines for negotiating with microform service bureaus. The committee served as a forum for discussion of these ideas and endorsed them, but it seldom took a leadership role in resolving them. Instead, often the same people who brought the ideas up at the committee were then encouraged to carry them to fruition via another mechanism. For example, the committee sponsored a program at the 1988 ALA Annual Conference on "Preservation Microfilming: The Art of Contracting for Services." Attendance at this event was testimony to the growth of interest in the topic. Whereas the 1984 program attracted a small audience of no more than 50 persons, this one drew a standing-room-only crowd of over 150 persons, despite its lateness in the conference schedule.

The committee's role prior to 1987 was largely a passive one of collecting and sharing information, but the value of this function within the ALA framework must be recognized. For one thing, it allows professionals who are widely dispersed geographically to verify, possibly modify, and certainly solidify their views based on discussion; to find support and encouragement for taking action locally or in other environments; and for learning of new activities or the ideas of others. The composition of the committee (by this time two at-large members had been added to the five
prevented it from effectively focusing RTSD energies in areas of increasing concern to the growing number of institutions beginning to plan for preservation microfilming programs.

**CHANGE IN FOCUS**

A quiet revolution began at the 1987 ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco, when the incoming committee chair asked the assembled group, committee members and audience, to participate in a collective brain-storming session to identify topics for possible committee investigation. The general outpouring of ideas and problems presented an agenda that begged for action. Technical matters centered on archival qualities of microfiche and color microfilm, but most concern focused on availability of information about microforms, prefilming or postfilming practices of libraries, and the relationships between preservation units and other parts of the library.

The committee chair determined that two things were needed if the committee was to respond to any of the issues raised: (1) more committee members, especially experienced people able to tackle the issues, and (2) a clear definition of areas where committee investigation might be profitable. At the next conference, ALA Midwinter 1988, the chair conducted a mini-strategic planning session with a large audience of members, former members, and guests. From that meeting came a list of eleven major topics, ranked in order of importance to the group (although not necessarily in amenability to action) as follows:

1. Microfiche as a preservation format
2. Distribution of preservation microforms (timeliness of order fulfillment, copyflow availability, centralized storage of masters and distribution of copies, access to foreign microfilms, copyright)
3. Targets (use of microcomputers to make targets, international standards for targets)
4. Interconnection between selection of materials for preservation microfilming and “queuing” (the procedure developed by RLG for members to flag bibliographic records in RLIN system for titles to
be filmed and to add to the record the date of the decision, in order to alert other members)
5. Color microfilm and its permanence
6. Interlibrary loan—its use for borrowing items for microfilming purposes
7. Preservation microfilming outside the U.S.
8. Use of MARC 583 field for preservation purposes, including microfilming
9. Expansion of a pool of reviewers for preservation microfilming proposals submitted to the National Endowment for the Humanities
10. The preparation by the Association for Information and Image Management of a "package" of microfilming standards relevant to preservation microfilming programs
11. Cooperative preservation microfilming projects

The committee authorized the chair to ask the RTSD Board to consider adding several more at-large members, selected for their experience with preservation microfilming programs. Knowing that such a proposal would take some time to process, the RTSD officers appointed two interns and a consultant to the committee; the chair also solicited volunteers to begin work on some of the issues.

Thus the foundation for the quiet revolution was put into place. Now in 1989 it is clear that without a lot of fanfare, but with the hard work and goodwill of numerous RTSD members, there is a climate for action. In the last two years, the committee has continued to hear reports from outside bodies, but they vary from meeting to meeting and are not a set routine. By far the greatest amount of time is given over to activities relating to the issues. The committee has not been able to tackle every item on the list, but it has made progress in several areas.

AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEES

To capitalize on the large number of interested, committed, and eager professionals who attend committee meetings, in 1988 the PMC chair appointed several ad hoc subcommittees, each headed by a committee member. The first addressed the issue of microfiche. Determining that it requires broad discussion, the subcommittee planned a program for the 1989 ALA Annual Conference, entitled "Preservation Microfilming: Does Microfiche Have a Place?" Programs such as this, and the earlier one on contracting, provide both information to the library community and visibility for the committee.

A second subcommittee, this time on Management for Access to Microforms, proposed a one-day preconference for the 1991 ALA Annual Conference on preparation of materials for microfilming and quality control. (A new subcommittee will take over planning the event.) It is also working on several position papers that will recommend committee action on such issues as centralized/decentralized storage of microform master negatives and quality and availability of commercially produced microforms.

A third subcommittee has conducted a survey of targeting practices in libraries with preservation microfilming programs and is preparing an ar-
article to publicize the results. The subcommittee is also assembling a package of "standard" targets for possible distribution.

LIAISONS

The Preservation Microfilming Committee can continue to serve as a facilitator, to ensure that issues of concern are tackled by the more appropriate groups within RTSD. One aspect of the issue of whether microfiche can be a successful preservation medium is the lack of standards. The PMC successfully stimulated the appointment of an ad hoc subcommittee to the RLMS Standards Committee, the more directly relevant body to deal with such matters, and appointed a PMC member as liaison to that subcommittee to ensure direct communication. Bibliographic control of microforms is another fundamental issue, central to helping institution avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. The PMC chair appointed a member as liaison to the RLMS Bibliographic Control of Microforms Committee to provide a channel for encouragement of its consideration of issues of interest to the PMC and to track progress. This led to a joint support of the establishment of an RTSD Task Force to consider the appropriate amount of information to be included in records for microforms to meet scholarly needs.

Liaisons to organizations outside of ALA are also possible. The suggestion about the production of a package of preservation microfilming standards was reported to the Association for Information and Image Management (AIIM), which now markets such a package. Likewise, a committee member has worked with the National Endowment for the Humanities to publicize the need for qualified reviewers of proposals received by NEH for microfilming projects.

ORGANIZATION

Not all matters of concern could be dealt with at once, of course. Coincidental with its proposal to the RTSD Board for expansion, the PMC's number came up on the list of units to be reviewed by the RTSD Planning and Research Committee. The board tabled the expansion proposal to await the review, which was concluded at the 1989 ALA Midwinter conference with a recommendation in favor of the expansion and a slight revision in the PMC charge, but also requesting another review of the charge and structure when the committee investigated the PLMS and RLMS sections. At its January 1989 meeting, the Board voted to add four members-at-large to the Preservation Microfilming Committee, thus bringing its total to eleven members, and to accept the revised charge, which now reads:

To encourage the microfilming of deteriorated and deteriorating materials as a preservation technique; to collect and disseminate information about preservation microfilming activities, including selection criteria, cooperative approaches, production methods, storage, record control, and use of master microforms; to assist in ensuring the successful conduct of preservation microfilming programs by highlighting issues that impede or hamper activities and suggesting steps for RTSD to take to focus attention on them or resolve them; to propose educational programs and other projects as appropriate.
It is not a major revision, but the charge more directly mandates action to promote and assist the responsible application of preservation microfilming to the deteriorating collections of libraries. The past two years have shown that the Preservation Microfilming Committee can assume a more active posture; its expanded membership will provide the means, as the committee heads toward its second decade.

REFERENCES AND NOTES
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12. The subcommittee was initially titled Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Distribution of Microforms, but it determined the issues were broader than that and requested a name change, which the committee approved.
13. Preservation Standards Set. MS801. This is a collection of eighteen standards related to microfilming, issued by AIIM and/or the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The set is available from the AIIM Publications Department, 1100 Wayne Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20910.
Shall We Throw Out the Technical Services—and Then What?

D. Kathryn Weintraub, Editor

Kaye Gapen argued in her keynote address that new paradigms of thought are needed for the changing environment of our libraries. Joan Rapp responds with suggestions on how to recruit the synergetic catalogers that are needed for the solution of the problems posed in the changing environment.

Personnel Selection for Cataloging

Joan Rapp

Good catalogers are hard to find. So say a number of recent studies that have focused on the difficulty of recruiting educated and trained catalogers and cataloging managers. For instance, a recent issue of the RTSD Newsletter reports the results of a CCS Task Force study indicating a shortage of well-qualified applicants for catalog positions.

However, there is a flip side to recruiting new and experienced librarians into cataloging areas. The process of recruitment and selection should be studied carefully from both sides: We need to make cataloging positions more attractive, viable career paths—that is, we need to make cataloging jobs fit librarians’ needs—but we should not forget that in these times of shortages, it may be more important that the person we recruit fit the job we try to fill.

Two points speak to the importance of this fit. First, a shortage of applicants means that, from the applicant’s viewpoint, the market is strong. Demand far exceeds supply. In such an environment, dissatisfaction with a specific job can be easily corrected by moving to another job. In most urban locations, demand is currently such that job changes can often be made without even the need for geographic relocation. From an employer’s viewpoint, this translates into a buyer’s market, potentially high turnover,
and challenges for administrators in filling cataloging vacancies.

Second, the importance of automation, the need for high-quality bibliographic databases, and the need for knowledgeable manipulation and maintenance of these databases have significantly increased the visibility of technical services, particularly cataloging. As the back room of cataloging becomes the public foyer of the online catalog, mistakes in personnel selection become more evident and costly. At best, the mistakes once diffused on scattered catalog cards are merely prominently displayed in machine records and indexes. At worst, ineffective cataloging requires expensive reworking of projects, reconversion of databases, and gross inefficiencies in the meshing of various card and paper files into machine-readable databases.

To understand our dilemma, we need to look a little more closely at the current working environment in technical services. Virtually our only certainty today is that we are uncertain what this environment will be tomorrow. We talk confidently about our ability to accept change, as if it were a single phenomenon with a beginning and an end. We hold to the notion of change as happening once and for all, after which we can breathe a sigh of relief that normalcy has returned. But today’s change is different from yesterday’s. There is no foreseeable tomorrow when we will have mastered once and for all the appropriate skills for our jobs. Organizational structures are fluid. Lines of communication shift as new advances in automation cause work groups to relate to each other in very different ways and force traditional library hierarchies aside. Organization charts are outdated as the ink is drying, as new systems and new projects require groups of people who have had little to do with each other in the past to work closely together. The lines between professionals and paraprofessionals become blurred as expertise is called upon from wherever source is appropriate.

What are the implications of this scenario for our recruitment of personnel? From both organizational and personal viewpoints, it may be that the minimum criterion for success will have to be that obsolescence is minimized. Given a library’s goals, what must its employees be like, in order to ensure its adaptability to change, hence its vitality and even its survival? In the past, we have usually talked of filling a particular job or of replacing a particular person. We have traditionally tried to fill vacancies with applicants whose credentials and experience mirror those they are replacing. We can get out of this “status quo” mentality only by carefully reflecting on the organization’s goals before making recruitment and hiring decisions. Effective management of libraries demands that goals direct actions. Since goals of libraries have become more dynamic, hiring criteria must change to reflect this dynamic state.

In recruitment and selection, we need to make a fundamental shift of perspective, concentrating on what I would call outputs rather than on inputs. Most advertisements for vacancies continue to emphasize inputs: What has the candidate done in the past? What education and training has he or she had? What skills has he or she developed? Given the dramatically changing environment of libraries, selection should be redirected to outputs, such as what we expect candidates to do and how we expect them to fit into the organization.
I suggest that the following steps be taken before you try to fill a cataloging vacancy:

1. Review your institutional goals. You need a good fix on where your library is going.
2. Assess your organization’s culture. Every organization is somewhat unique, and a good performer in one organization is not necessarily a good performer in another. Your organization’s culture helps define what characterizes good and bad performance.
3. Recognize and integrate the changes you expect in your library into your job analysis.
4. Analyze the job on the outputs you expect. Identify performance criteria using specific behaviors or objectives.
5. Design your recruitment and selection practices to identify individuals who can meet these performance criteria.

Thinking through hiring processes in this way should make it apparent that in many cases—particularly in the selection of managerial personnel—effectiveness on the job may be determined more by the presence or absence of certain personal characteristics than by technical abilities and theoretical knowledge.

I propose that several personal skills are likely to be indispensable in the new library environment:

1. **Flexibility** will be required in an employee’s concept of his or her role, in defining “territory,” and in defining on-the-job relationships. Reliance on teams of “experts” for meeting new challenges in automation will require individuals who can work around hierarchical structures and who can move quickly from one work team to another.
2. **Tolerance for ambiguity** will be required, as a natural result of interacting in new ways. The ability to see the long-term value of a project and not be impeded by clinging to old ways of doing things or by territoriality is crucial. The ability to accept “fuzzy roles” and to understand that success in automation-related projects is often measured in years rather than months helps to alleviate on-the-job frustration of both managers and employees.
3. **The ability to grow on one’s own** becomes increasingly important. In today’s dynamic world of cataloging, viable career paths are less definite. The increasing complexity of technical services puts a greater burden on the individual employee to keep up with the profession and to be intellectually curious about a host of information-related issues.
4. **A synectic orientation** allows one to look at the familiar and consider it in new ways. The synectic cataloger can perceive unique solutions to traditional problems. Advances in automation and the appearance of new formats for data storage and access require that catalogers have the ability to look at old problems in new ways. Options for the long run have to be considered much more carefully and creatively.
5. Often overlooked is the reality that organizational success is, to a large degree, determined by the quality of the employee-organizational culture fit. Though much has been written about organizational culture in recent years, it is a topic that is difficult to define in any specific form. Essentially, it refers to a system of shared
meaning held by an organization’s members that distinguishes the organization from other organizations. Such specifics as the organization’s degree of tolerance for innovation, its tolerance for conflict, the degree to which rewards are based on performance, the extent of managerial support, the amount of control used in supervision, and the degree of individual autonomy on the job define the key dimensions of organizational culture. To a large extent, libraries have not analyzed and defined their separate organizational cultures or climates. Yet this is a key factor in identifying those employees who will perform successfully and integrate well.

How do we go about selecting employees with the qualities we want? Perhaps a good start would be to shift our emphasis in the recruitment process to relate more closely to our criteria for success:

1. Ask the candidate’s references for specific information about how the candidate is likely to respond to problems or issues facing your organization. What specific past behaviors are the basis for this conclusion?

2. Sample and give greater weight to the candidate’s current behaviors as predictors of job success. Many American corporations have attempted to do this through the use of assessment centers for hiring and promotion decisions. In these centers, current employees or job candidates are placed in situations that simulate those likely to be encountered on the job. The ability to exhibit desired behaviors in these situations is evaluated, and the candidates are rated on specific job-related characteristics. Based on dozens of studies, assessment centers have been found to be effective predictors of later job performance. The conceptual model underlying the use of assessment centers seems appropriate to libraries. Already, in many libraries, tests of performance in worklike situations are an important assessment tool in hiring of paraprofessionals. Why should they be less so far for librarians and managers?

3. Write job advertisements and position descriptions in terms of expectations. “Experience in . . .”, “knowledge of . . .”, or “familiarity with . . .” should be only threshold expectations. If we expect a new employee to perform such activities as coordination, analyzing, teaching, or organizing, we should clearly state our expectations and then test for the ability to fulfill these criteria.

In a dynamic and changing environment, such as that currently facing technical services, the past is a poor prologue to the future. Practices that were effective in the 1970s are likely to fall short in the 1990s. Library administrators, facing the challenge of finding qualified catalogers capable of growing and adjusting to changing conditions, are advised to focus on modifying their recruitment and selection practices to reflect a new set of rules.
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Cataloging and Classification Section
1988–89 Annual Report

CCS Executive Committee: The CCS Executive Committee was composed of Sheila Intner (chair); Joan Mitchell (vice-chair); Robert Holley (past-chair); Alice Allen (secretary); and Judith Fenly, Judith Hudson, Olivia Madison, Karen Markey, Marilyn McClaskey, Barbara Tillet, Beacher Wiggins, and Karen Muller (members). Important actions included: (1) identifying the section’s top priorities of standards, access, and education to the division’s Strategic Long Range Planning Committee; (2) planning and implementing the section program at the Dallas Conference, “Subject Analysis Tools Online,” for an SRO audience of 800+ (thanks to Julianne Beall, Liz Bishoff, and Ron Vasaturo), a preconference on the twentieth edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification (thanks to Liz Bishoff and Peter Paulson), and an institute on the 1988 revision of AACR2, an expansion of the successful New Orleans program (thanks to Carlen Ruschoff and Richard Smiraglia); (3) considering better ways to disseminate information about CC:DA and SAC activities; (4) preparing a section brochure (thanks to Judith Hudson); (5) writing to Librarian of Congress James Billington describing LC’s role as a cataloging/classification leader and urging that this role be enhanced; and (6) offering resolutions later passed by ALA Council to express appreciation for their service to Michael Gorman (editor, AACR2), Liz Bishoff (ALA representative to Dewey Decimal Classification’s Editorial Policy Committee), and Helen Schmierer (ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR) and to note the death of Laura Colvin.

CCS Committees and Discussion Groups: The section’s committees and discussion groups worked hard under fine leadership. Discussion groups attracted many participants—a tribute to the thoughtful choice of topics and outstanding publicity by their chairs. Among committee activities, Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (chair, Verna Urbanski) created a broadly based Task Force on Multiple Versions to consider definitions and potential responses; Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials (chair, Andrea Stamm) worked on establishment of geographic area codes for Southeast Asia, names of African ethnic groups in LCSH, and Arabic romanization; Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee (chair, Doris Cruger Dale) noted publication of its Cataloging Correctly for Kids and planned a preconference on the Dewey Abridged twelfth edition; Committee on Education, Training, and Recruitment for
Cataloging (chair, Heidi Hoerman) attracted dozens of observers and continued planning its future agenda; Policy and Research Committee (chair, Judith Hudson) evaluated section committees and created a subcommittee to address research issues; Margaret Mann Citation Committee (chair, Janet Swan Hill) selected Lois Mai Chan as 1989 award recipient; Nominating Committee (chair, Edward Swanson) presented 1989–90 candidates for office; and Subject Analysis Committee (chair, Patricia Luthin) discussed the proposed MARC format for classification, among other important issues.

It is a privilege to have worked with these dedicated people and shared in the many contributions made by CCS to cataloging and classification.—Sheila S. Intner, 1988–89 chair.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section
1988–89 Annual Report

The past year has seen RLMS bringing to closure a variety of projects and setting an organized agenda that includes both programming and publications on the practical issues surrounding reproduction of library materials. As we continue to see the lines of specialization in technical services areas dissolve, RLMS helps in integration of many nonbook technologies with routine procedures of library access, processing, and public service. The RLMS Discussion Group (Errol Somay, chair), and the newer Public Service Managers (of Microform Facilities) Discussion Group (Karen Sinkule, chair), continue to attract new audiences to share problems and knowledge of common working experiences. Implementation of photocopying services, access to microform sets, public access equipment and interaction with microfilming service bureaus were the formal topics of discussion, but a great value is also derived by bringing together a roomful of people with the same concerns. The Electronic Imaging Technology Committee, chaired by Thomas Bourke, also works well in bringing together those with knowledge and those with questions on the topic. Publications resulting from RLMS committee activity include the "Guidelines for Cataloging of Microforms Sets," "Guidelines for Packaging and Shipping Microforms," and Preservation Microfilming: Papers from the Institute Held in New Haven, April 1988. It is expected that a NISO Task Force will be formed to develop a national standard for bibliographic guides or indexes for microform sets as a result of a task force of the Bibliographic Control of Microforms Committee. Under direction of Shirley Leung, chair, this committee has also initiated planning for a future preconference on bibliographic control of microforms and recommended establishment of an RTSD Task Force on the Bibliographic Control of Microform Masters. The Copying Committee, chaired by Wesley Boomgaarden, has completed review of some older publications, and is undertaking revisions where warranted; surveys were conducted investigating several aspects of
copier service operations too. This committee helped prepare, in cooperation with Library Technology Reports, a very successful booth for the Dallas Conference, featuring the three latest models of edge copiers; the handout from that effort will be republished in an upcoming issue of the RTSD Newsletter. From survey work, the interest in the RLMS Discussion Group and other recent activities, the outline of a program has emerged, and a planning committee is working toward a future presentation on copiers and copying services. The Publications Committee, chaired by Mary Ann Ferrarese, has initiated a project to produce an annotated bibliography of basic readings in the areas of RLMS interest. The Standards Committee, chaired by Myron Chace, continues to bring a multitude of standards issues to the attention of RLMS, and is also working to bring the RLMS point of view to those standards-making bodies. Certificates of appreciation for many years of dedicated service and significant contributions to the development of library reprographics were sent by the Executive Committee to Joseph Nitecki, Lawrence Robinson, and Francis Spreitzer. The Executive Committee and the Policy and Research Committee continue to work through the internal section review and will implement changes which seem to better direct the organization to the activities and needs of the members. The year’s Executive Committee (Tamara Swora, past chair; Helga Borck, vice-chair; Karen Sinkule, secretary; Thomas Bourke, member-at-large; and Nancy Elkington, chair, Policy and Research) has worked to bring RLMS into systematic response to changing technologies and needs of members. With the spring election of Shirley Leung, vice-chair/chair-elect, and Debra McKern, secretary, RLMS continues to promote the sharing of practical knowledge through all aspects of RTSD. —Ann Swartzell, RLMS chair, 1988–89.

Serials Section 1988–89 Annual Report

The Serials Section during the year 1988–89 devoted its energies to continuing committee activities, to holding programs and meetings relating to serials activities, and to coping with matters near to serials librarians’ hearts: serials pricing, multiple versions, and the like.

The Executive Committee continued its review of section committees. The review of the Worst Serial Title Change of the Year Award Committee was completed. A new charge for the committee was developed, widening the scope of the award to include noteworthy changes other than to title. As well, a new charge was approved for the Committee on Serial Standards.

This year’s winner of the Bowker/Ulrich’s Serials Librarianship Award was John Merriman. The award was given in recognition of his efforts to improve the understanding of the components of the serials chain and of the organizing role he has played in establishing the United Kingdom Serials Group and the North American Serials Interest Group, Inc.

The Serials Section program presented at the Dallas Annual Conference
LRTS • 34(1) • 1989 Annual Reports /103

was entitled "The Electronic Journal: The Future of Information Access." Nearly 200 people attended to hear Edward Kurdyla, director of OCLC's Electronic Publishing and Information Delivery Division, and Douglas White of the School of Social Sciences, University of California, Irvine. White is editor of World Cultures, one of a few truly electronic journals. The speakers reviewed the state of the electronic journal today and gave a glimpse of the still untouched power that lies in the future of the electronic journal.

Other presentations and work of Serials Section units this year included a discussion of serials standards, the preparation of a draft of a serials glossary, and the preparation of a list of the section's goals and priorities as part of ALA's Strategic Long-Range Plan.

Elaine Rast was elected vice-chair/chair-elect and John Riemer was elected member-at-large of the Serials Section Executive Committee.

Thanks are due the members of this year's Executive Committee: Suzanne Striedieck, vice-chair/chair-elect; Jean Farrington, past chair; Jim Cole, secretary; Doris Anne Bradley, Odette Shepherd, and Ellen Soper, members-at-large; John Riemer, chair of Policy and Research; and Minna Saxe, LRTS section editor. Their help and energy, as well as the work of all of the section chairs, helped make this year a successful one for the Serials Section.—Alexander Bloss, chair 1988–89.


The ninety-fifth meeting of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (DCEPC) was held in Albany, New York, on November 18, 1989, preceding the Conference on Classification Theory in the Computer Age. Unlike the normal DCEPC meetings and in lieu of a formal agenda, this meeting was devoted to a discussion of the future of the Dewey Decimal Classification, following a discussion held the day before on the future of classification systems in general attended by an invitational group of classification experts. Both discussions focused on four key questions:

1. What are the most important trends in the areas of information retrieval and how will they affect general classification systems over the next five to ten years?

2. What will be/should be the future operating environments (at the working library level) for such classification systems? Assuming that the current structure of general classification systems does not change, what approaches can be used to modify the user environment to improve the use of the classification systems in such environments?

3. What changes in present classification systems will improve their use
for arranging books or their surrogates for subject retrieval in a manual or online environment?

4. What needs, other than arranging books or surrogates, can classification systems meet? How can/should current classification systems be adapted to serve these needs, or what new systems or services should be developed? Consider classification systems both for organizing materials (e.g., journal articles) and/or information (e.g., in thesauri and AI systems).

Many ideas and viewpoints were generated during the discussion. In summary:

1. Browsing is still an important function, both online and in the library stacks.
2. A flexible Dewey for many users is desirable.
3. The importance of creating specifications and standards for online displays cannot be overemphasized.
4. Classification systems should be improved and Dewey enhancements online developed to meet the wide variety of user needs.
5. The balance between the need to regularize the schedules and the need to maintain shelf location stability must be carefully weighed against each other.
6. Boolean operators should be made available between classification systems, descriptors, and key words.
7. The development of a MARC format for classification that allows the encoding of hierarchies and synthesized numbers is crucial.
8. Since costs must always be justified, cost-effectiveness is a factor in all of the above.

At the close of the meeting, a copy of the proposed MARC format for classification was distributed to DCEPC members, who were asked to review this document to be discussed at the next meeting.

Also at this meeting DCEPC bid farewell to Margaret Cockshutt who completed her tenure on the committee after serving three terms, including six years (1979–1985) as its chair.

In the spring of 1989, DCEPC greeted the publication of Edition 20 with a sense of pride and satisfaction. It represents the culmination of ten years of editorial work since the publication of Edition 19 in 1979. Although still far from being perfect, Edition 20 embodies the best efforts of the editors, DCEPC, and many individuals and professional groups who were called upon to assist in the revision. To help users implement Edition 20, a preconference on Dewey 20 was planned for the ALA Annual Conference to be held in Dallas, Texas, in June 1989. Speakers and instructors for the preconference would include EPC members and the assistant editors. Also planned were a series of workshops to be held at various sites in the United States.

The ninety-sixth meeting of DCEPC was held at the Library of Congress on March 13–14, 1989. The main topics of discussion were the Abridged Edition 12 and the MARC format for classification. Approximately 40 percent of the schedules, tables, and index was presented for review. After detailed discussions, the draft schedules, tables, and index presented at this meeting were approved in principle, subject to editorial refinement.
and consideration of comments and recommendations from the SAC Subcommittee on Abridged Edition 12. The remaining portions will be reviewed at the next meeting.

A subcommittee, chaired by Joan Mitchell, was established for the purpose of drafting a response to the proposed MARC format for classification DCEPC's position. The proposed MARC format was first examined by the entire committee and further reviewed by the subcommittee. When completed, the response will be forwarded to the Library of Congress for consideration of incorporation into the MARC format.

The next meeting will be held at the Library of Congress on October 12-13, 1989.—Lois Mai Chan, Chairperson.

---

Non-Tax Sources of Revenue for Public Libraries

By Mary Jo Lynch, Director, ALA Office for Research

User charges; fines, contracts, and sales; and fundraising and financial development are potential sources of non-tax revenue for public libraries. In fall 1987 ALA surveyed a nationwide sample of public libraries of all sizes to find out if they received any revenue from these sources and how much money was involved.

Tables and figures show the percentage of respondents receiving revenue from specific sources, the dollar amount of revenue received, and the percentage of operating expenditures represented by non-tax revenue. The text comments on the findings and includes an annotated bibliography.

The survey was conducted by the Mary Jo Lynch, Director, ALA Office for Research, with help from an Advisory Committee from the Public Library Association and the Library Administration and Management Association. Financial support was provided by The H.W. Wilson Foundation.

ALA Survey Report


ALA Publishing Services, 50 East Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611
Situation Analysis

Understanding the basic problems of conversion isn’t difficult. It’s finding the right solution that’s the challenge.

At OCLC, our specialists work with you to determine which conversion method — customized, batch processing, in-house — is best for your individual situation.

Whether you have a whole library to convert, or just parts of your collection, our bibliographic database of more than 20 million records in 8 different formats ensures a high hit rate — even for those difficult items like government documents, maps, and audio-visuals. And, full MARC records mean a quality conversion with records that will be compatible for future resource sharing use in a local, state or regional database.

For help in analyzing your situation, give our Conversion Specialists a call at the toll-free numbers below. They’ll work with you to ensure the solution you choose is the right one for your problem.

OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.
6565 Frantz Road
Dublin, Ohio 43017-0702
(614) 764-6000

800-848-5878 (U.S., outside Ohio)
800-848-8286 (Ohio only)
800-533-8201 (Canada)
For nearly three decades Maurice Line has been a dominant voice in British and international librarianship, and from his impressive bibliography of over 270 items (p.319–34) the editor has judiciously selected a mere thirty. Photographically reproduced from their original periodical publications, the collection is organized along the main outlines of Line’s professional preoccupations: (1) The profession (“white elephants and golden retrievers”); (2) users; (3) academic libraries; (4) national libraries; (5) document availability and supply; (6) universal availability of information; and (7) patterns of publication. An eloquent envoi on GOD (Great Online Database) concludes the volume. For all their diversity, these essays are all of a piece, and the punning title could easily have been in the singular.

Although the volume contains no summing up of the Line philosophy of libraries and librarianship, it is fair to say that the cornerstone is the user, and in this respect alone the collection repays study by both the seasoned and the burgeoning librarian. Four essays directly related to users are given here
(including "Ignoring the User," which begins: "I do not propose to go into the history of ignoring users, since there is not time to give an account of librarianship from its beginnings"), but the concern for users underlies much of the volume, in discussion on the collecting of isolated rarities and the roles of academic or national libraries, and above all in his important work on universal availability of information. His essays, as his conversation, are dotted with bon mots (e.g., union catalogs as "the last refuge of a despairing library world" or "I believe it is good deal easier to modify systems than to modify human nature"). Apart from a few straightforward accounts of library developments and three or four essays photographically reduced so greatly as to go unread by the trifocular (as they did by me), the volume is continually provocative and stimulating.

There are some irritants. The apparatus, which lists the original source of each article in the acknowledgments but not with the piece itself, is not particularly user friendly. There are a few gender allusions that may have passed when written but seem abrasive in the 1980s. Negative comments on resource sharing and its dubious cost-effectiveness are not substantiated (at least not here), and there is virtually nothing on library preservation. But there is so much to stimulate further thought that the collection must be highly recommended for all who take our calling seriously.—David H. Stam, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.


Brittle Book Programs opens with the customary flyer and survey. Jan Merrill-Oldham and Gay Walker briefly describe the brittle book problem and the library community's efforts to find a solution before going on to the survey data. Responses from 64 of 118 ARL members show the growth not merely of concern about brittle books, but of action: 89% of the respondents systematically identify brittle books and 58% use microfilming as one method of preserving the content of the brittle volumes. Other methods listed are protective enclosures (81%), hard copy replacements (81%), purchased microform replacements (72%), creation of preservation photocopies (67%), and conservation treatment (55%). Of the libraries that purchase or create microform or photocopy replacements, "nearly half discard 90 percent or more of the original copies of the volumes after they have been reproduced" (p.2). Merrill-Oldham and Walker also touch on preservation microfiche, decision making, and the management challenges inherent in a brittle book program.

The kit, which contains documents from 21 of the 37 responding libraries with operating brittle book programs, offers a practical supplement to Nancy Gwinn's Preservation Microfilming (1987). Topical headings include: planning, organizational charts and job descriptions, selection priorities and procedures, procedural guidelines and descriptions of workflow, searching procedures, searching forms, microfilm and photocopying procedures, and record keeping. Bibliographic control receives marginal consideration in the form of queuing instructions.

Procedural guidelines and searching forms together constitute more than half the volume and provide an interesting variety of approaches. The section on record keeping, in contrast, could usefully have been stronger, given the necessity of keeping disparate statistics for ARL, for any grant-sponsored work, and of course for internal purposes. A move toward consensus on the statistics to be kept would be a major benefit to all libraries involved with preservation.

Although microfilming inevitably assumes a prominent place here, the volume is by no means devoted entirely
to filming. Several thoughtful presentations of the range of available preservation options are incorporated in the section on procedural guidelines in recognition that no one answer is the solution for all brittle books.—Janet Gertz, Columbia University, New York.


Among its attributes, a discipline has a body of theory and knowledge and a constantly evolving and broad research base consisting of both basic and applied studies. Each volume in the series “Foundations of Information Science” addresses a specific topical area, showing how the various parts fit together and contribute to the disciplinary base of information science. Willett discusses the contributions of research on document retrieval systems to that disciplinary base.

Besides providing a brief historical overview of document retrieval systems and indicating areas in which research has occurred, Willett identifies major studies. He describes automatic indexing, best match searching, search term weighting, and other techniques. He also notes journals and proceedings that report research, and reprints sixteen book chapters and journal articles published between 1972 and 1988. These papers, five of which describe operational retrieval systems, constitute 260 of the 292 pages.

Willett neither provides an index nor compensates for different publishing practices. There is no standardization of references among the papers, and some (but not all) papers contain abstracts. To recreate the appearance of the original paper, the publisher used
several type faces and reproduced some papers in single columns and others in double columns. The introduction neither provides a complete state of the art for the research nor offers sufficient direction to future researchers. Willett, however, briefly notes some research areas that may be prominent in future systems.

The brevity of the introduction may appeal to some readers but not to those wanting an in-depth analysis. Many libraries may not want to purchase a relatively expensive work that largely reprints literature already contained in their collections. Despite these weaknesses, Document Retrieval Systems offers an excellent selection of readings and links research to the advancement of a discipline.

Concepts of Information Retrieval, a textbook for a course in document-based retrieval systems, complements the above work. Pao as well provides a discipline context. She notes that information science has “a definable domain” (p.xv), with its own theory, concepts, principles, and research. Information science is a hybrid of those disciplines involved in the study of information, and “a lack of precise definition” guides the study of information “properties, behavior, and interrelationships within systems and organizations” (p.10). Chapter 1 expands on the “apparent confusion concerning the extent and scope of the field” (p.4).

The textbook contains four sections: (1) basic concepts such as information, bibliometrics, users and uses, and relevance; (2) information retrieval systems—their design, selection, information representation, file organization, etc.; (3) measurement and evaluation; and (4) new directions (artificial intelligence and expert systems). Each section incorporates published research.

Pao addresses all the key concepts, but occasionally too superficially. This is particularly evident in the coverage of research methodologies (p.47–50). Curiously, both the numerator and denominator for measurement of availability are identical (p.223). This merits clarification.

Occasionally Pao provides direction for future research. For example, she points out the need for a conceptual framework for research on information needs and uses, and calls for the development of new approaches and their testing in practice (p.52). A discipline-oriented textbook might offer more direction to researchers of the future.

Concepts of Information Retrieval is highly recommended for anyone needing an introduction to information retrieval. The discussion is clear and succinct and makes ample use of illustrative matter to clarify the concepts. The discussion of half-life, obsolescence, subject dispersion, and other concepts is easy to follow. The book, in conclusion, contains a wealth of information at a reasonable price.—Peter Hernon, Simmons College, Boston.


In 1988, a revision of the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules was published. To alert catalogers to the new rules and to assist bibliographic systems managers in assessing the implications of adopting these rules, Jean Weih and Lynne Howarth wrote a brief guide. Rule revisions addressed in this guide are limited to those which have not been published previously. Thus, revisions published in 1982, 1983, and 1985, as well as the 1987 preliminary draft for chapter 9, computer files, are not included. This well-organized guide is divided into two distinct parts.

Part 1 is written by Jean Weih, chair of the joint committee for revision of AACR. Contained in this part is a listing of revised rules, arranged by AACR2R rule number. The actual rules are not reproduced here. Instead, the author draws upon her firsthand knowledge of committee deliberations.
Announcing the source that redefines the standard for encyclopedic research...

The New GROlier ELECTRONIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

"... student users found the electronic encyclopedia an exciting way to find information... more fun and less work than searching in the print version."

—School Library Journal

The first update of Grolier’s highly acclaimed Electronic Encyclopedia is here—all 21 volumes and 9 million words of *The 1988 Academic American Encyclopedia* now instantly accessible on a single compact disc. Thousands of new articles and fully updated entries bring this issue completely up-to-date. And expanded documentation makes it easy for you and your library patrons to maximize CD-ROM’s incredible research advantages.

The New Electronic Encyclopedia provides unlimited, full-text access with new features that include:

- up to 10 article windows at a time
- pull-down menus
- split-screen capability
- Boolean search techniques
- full screen text
- easy save and print functions
- on-screen timers for multiple-user settings
- and much more.

Compatible CD-ROM Drives include:

- Sony CDU-100
- Philips CM-100
- Hitachi 1502S & 1503
- Amdek Laserdek
- NEC CDR-77

A network version is now available. Call for additional information.

Coming Soon... a Macintosh version!

To use the New Electronic Encyclopedia, all you need is:

- IBM PC, XT, AT, PS/2 series or supported compatibles
- DOS 3.0 or later
- 512K RAM
- CD-ROM Drive with controller card
- Monochrome or color monitor
- Printer (optional)

Your package consists of:

- A compact disc
- A diskette containing state-of-the-art search and retrieval software (available in both 3½" and 5½" formats).
- A reader-friendly User’s Guide

The New Electronic Encyclopedia is available now. Order your copy today! Only $395.00 plus $4.00 shipping and handling.

Call toll-free 1-800-356-5590.
Or send your order to:

Grolier Electronic Publishing, Inc.
Sherman Turnpike, Danbury, CT 06810.
to provide a brief but clear explanation of the nature of the rule changes and why the changes were needed. Since the 1988 revision of AACR2 does not flag rules which have been revised, this section of the guide will be of particular interest to catalogers who wish to easily identify revisions. Another change which is not flagged in the 1988 revision is the renumbering of rules. It would have been helpful if Weihs had also elected to note all instances in which renumbering occurred.

Lynne Howarth is the author of Part 2 which focuses on the interrelationship between cataloging codes and evolving automated systems. Detailing specific system capabilities is beyond the scope of this brief guide. However, an explanation of differences between MARC and non-MARC record-based systems is included. Also pointed out are the effects of specific rule revisions on the length of bibliographic records and on products generated from automated systems. Options for authority control are addressed. For library managers, the author has included a discussion of cost factors and various implementation strategies.

A Brief Guide to AACR2, 1988 Revision, and Implications for Automated Systems has been published by the Canadian Library Association. Yet, the guide will be of equal interest to catalogers and systems managers anywhere the revised rules are applied.-Jean P. Altschuler, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.


This slender volume is worth its weight in gold. Each article is timely, substantive, and succinct—a nugget of information about a particular aspect of using microcomputers in libraries.

The book is well-organized, beginning with an article by Gary Kildall, which provides a brief history of the storage and retrieval of knowledge, from the scroll to the CD-ROM, while making the point that the complexity of our society requires the use of ever more sophisticated technology for knowledge storage and access. An article by Monica Eriel explores the future role of librarians as guides, educators, and facilitators in accessing the vast proliferation of information. Jennifer Cargill’s paper focuses on library staff use of micros for specific library tasks such as processing of materials, desktop publishing, and administrative applications.

The next papers deal with the evaluation, selection, and management of microcomputer software and hardware. Dorice L. Horne lists many valuable tips for analyzing software choices for technical services, public services, and administrative applications, including a helpful Software Checklist Form and Software Evaluation Form. Karl Beiser brings order to the confusion of computer hardware by clearly delineating the key factors on which understanding microtechnology hinges.

High quality training and appropriate levels of continuing support, the topics introduced by Dan Marrion, are often given scant attention or completely overlooked in budgeting for microcomputer technology, yet are absolutely vital to successful implementation.

The last paper ties the conference together and points the way to the future. William Gray Potter states the need to strike a balance between planning and policy-making and creativity in the use of micros in libraries. He reaffirms the mission of librarians, “to develop systems to deliver the best information to the greatest number at the least cost.”

The inclusion of an index provides easy access to this important collection, while references lead the reader on to additional useful sources. Connecting with Technology, 1988 is highly rec-
Fast, effective relief for your acquisitions headaches.

Unlike some CD-ROM products, which are nothing more than electronic vendors' catalogs, Books In Print Plus™ is an important acquisitions tool specifically designed to reduce the time and effort you spend on researching and ordering titles. Tasks that used to keep you and your staff busy for hours can now be completed in minutes.

ORDER TITLES AS EASILY AS YOU LOOK THEM UP.

Exceptionally powerful, yet easy-to-use search and acquisitions software distinguishes Books In Print Plus from other CD-ROM products. Citations can be saved or printed out in seconds — in a number of formats, or sent as electronic orders to not just one, but your choice of twelve of the most important book distributors.*

UNIQUE WORK-SAVING SOFTWARE MAKES IT SIMPLE.

On-screen prompts, instant help screens, and a special novice mode insure that you won't waste any time getting up and running with Books In Print Plus. Custom search through the database by combining any or all of up to 18 search criteria. For example, search for all titles dealing with wine published after 1987 and a list is displayed in seconds. If you then decide that French wines should be excluded from the search, make a simple command change and immediately all titles dealing with wine (with the exception of French wines) published after 1987 appear. The results are so incredible that once you try Books In Print Plus, it will change the way you do acquisitions forever.

TAKE TWO MINUTES AND CALL US IN THE MORNING.

To order Books In Print Plus for the IBM PC or Apple® Macintosh®, or for more information about how you can streamline your acquisitions process, call Bowker Electronic Publishing toll-free at 1-800-521-8110. In New York, Alaska, and Hawaii please call us collect at 212-337-6934. For technical assistance call 1-800-323-3288. You'll be feeling better in no time.

The first edition of this work, published in 1976, quickly became a classic text in the field, used by catalogers, managers of cataloging departments, library administrators, systems analysts, library educators, students, and noncataloging librarians. Changes in copy cataloging since then have been substantial. Although the author has kept the same general outline of chapters, and in some cases, the same chapter titles, the content of these two editions defies comparison. The text has been rewritten, the technical language has been updated and modernized, and the body of examples has been enlarged to include prints of online records in the MARC formats. The author has taken into account new rules and publications affecting description, subject analysis, and classification.

Throughout the second edition, emphasis has been shifted away from decisions regarding the production and maintenance of catalog copy in card form and toward the utilization of copy in a machine-readable environment. Assembled here are the issues which copy cataloging decision makers need to consider. Chapters one and nine provide an overview of copy cataloging. Included are discussions of sources for copy, integrating copy into existing catalogs, and knowledge requirements for copy cataloging personnel. Chapters two through six describe choices for the practitioner working with bibliographic records. These chapters cover descriptive elements, choice of name, form of name, title access points, subject headings, classification, and call numbers. Chapter seven discusses the issues and choices related to utilizing near copy and cooperative copy in the copy cataloging workflow.

Chapter eight, "Computer-Based Copy Cataloging," is new to this edition. Based on the premise of using machine-readable cataloging records to process materials "... in a timely, efficient, and cost-effective manner," this chapter addresses staff training, searching, using matching and near copy, inputting, and authority control. It also summarizes those decision points related to participation in a cooperative network, maintenance of records on tape, staffing for online cataloging, documentation of local policies, and online versus offline work.

Although most of the examples used in this work are for printed monographs, the authors have been careful to include some for materials in other formats. The reader will find examples based on printed and typed cards, as well as those from online sources. The earlier, printed record, which is often a mystery to staff copy catalogers who have been trained in an online environment, is presented in a way which will be useful in helping them to understand how old and new records can be integrated. The text also covers the evolution of the bibliographic record, carefully pointing out significant rule changes, particularly those which can cause variations in description, choice of entry, and form of name. Each chapter ends with a summary list of questions which need to be considered by the decision maker.

This second edition will be used as extensively as the original upon which it is based. The authors have provided us with a working tool which is both practical and theoretical in scope, unpretentious in tone, and clear in presentation. It is an important and welcome work.—Julieann V. Nilson, Indiana
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This volume comprises twelve papers presented at a conference held in Sydney in 1987. They cover a wide range of topics in Australian library history with particular emphasis on New South Wales. The authors include historians and philologists as well as librarians and archivists.

Rayward introduces the collection with a concise overview of library history within the broader contexts of L’histoire du livre and social and cultural history. Several papers deal with archives. Michael Piggott examines the debate which took place in Australia in the 1950s over library control of archives. Many of the political and professional concerns touched upon remain relevant. Some papers discuss aspects of book collecting. Wallace Kirsop attempts to reconstruct general trends among nineteenth-century Australian book collectors, both individual and institutional. His observations, which have interesting implications for modern collection development, suggest that private collectors and amateur scholars were far more perspicacious than institutions in providing for the needs of future scholarship. Still other papers deal with publishing and the book trade. Carol Mills examines the NSW Bookstall Company as a publisher of popular books in the early twentieth century and notes the bibliographical and preservation problems created by the practices of such publishers. James Cleary’s essay on book publishing in the years 1939–45 shows the effect external factors (e.g., wartime shortages and political pressures) had on the availability of books. Other papers cover such topics as parliamentary libraries, censorship, and the public library movement.

While the book will be of interest primarily to those concerned with the history of libraries, it does offer an interesting perspective on many aspects of contemporary librarianship. Some of the essays might also provide useful historical parallels to current library developments in less advanced countries. It must be noted in closing that the book is marred by numerous typographical errors.—Fred W. Jenkins, University of Dayton, Ohio.


In this SPEC Kit Helen Wiltse, associate library director, Georgia Institute of Technology, surveys the use of electronic mail use in ARL libraries. She has the benefit of a previous SPEC Kit (106 from 1984) on the same topic against which to contrast the results of her survey. What she found was that, while interlibrary loan was the primary application of electronic mail in 1984, in 1988 the emphasis had shifted to general administrative support. Electronic mail was taking the place of paper memos as a medium for written communication, at least among those librarians who had easy access to E-mail terminals. No matter how elegant and user-friendly an electronic mail system may be, it will not be used unless the users have terminals on their desks. Another barrier to effective use
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of E-mail systems is the large number of them, putting the user in a position of having to check a variety of electronic mail boxes on a regular basis.

The OMS Occasional Paper, Toward Telecommunications Strategies in Academic and Research Libraries: Ten Case Studies of Decision-Making and Implementation, by Thomas Kinney, assistant head of the Systems Office at the University of Florida, while in some respects like a big SPEC Kit, is actually more than that. Instead of being simply a compilation of survey results, this paper presents ten carefully chosen case studies (including several from non-ARL libraries) illustrating the telecommunications options which are available to academic research libraries. The purpose of the paper is “to explore recent developments related to the application of telecommunications technology in academic and research libraries and to recommend ways in which library managers may better understand and make decisions relating to its use.” By “telecommunications technology” the author is referring not to telephones, but to the provision of remote access to electronic information. Because it does not focus solely on what is being done at ARL libraries, it has real value for a more general audience.

The four telecommunications technology application areas with which the paper deals are local area networks (LANs), the library and the campus network, links and common interfaces for bibliographic systems, and alternatives for remote access. The author devotes a chapter to each area, and each chapter contains a brief introduction, the case studies themselves, and finally observations and conclusions the author has drawn from the cases. The final chapter recommends the formulation of a telecommunications strategy tailored to the conditions which prevail at a given campus. The paper also includes a selected bibliography.

The author deserves credit for dealing with a somewhat technical subject without depending heavily on technical jargon. The reader does not need to have an extensive background in telecommunications technology to benefit from this paper.

To summarize, this SPEC Kit and Occasional Paper, although both published by the Association of Research Libraries Office of Management Services, are very different kinds of documents with very different purposes. The SPEC Kit summarizes the results of a survey of what ARL libraries are doing. The Occasional Paper attempts to help academic research librarians to define a strategy for dealing with a new technology.—David T. Buxton, University of Arizona, Tucson.


This is the second edition of a book first published in 1984. Its purpose was, and is, to provide a basic introduction to MARC. This edition also has a secondary political motivation: to promote the idea of format integration, a topic that appeared only peripherally in the first edition.

How well does this book fulfill those aims? Quite well. When first published, it filled a gap in the literature; it still remains the only general introduction to MARC. The author describes structural aspects of USMARC (a term he carefully distinguishes from MARC), provides a historical background, gives many complete examples of USMARC records, and considers OCLC, RLIN, and UTLAS format extensions, non-MARC formats, non-roman data, linkages between fields and records, and questions of system and format compatibility. In addition to the chapters devoted to the specific bibliographic formats, there are chapters on the holdings and authorities formats. While a new chapter discusses the history and effects of format integration on the format itself and on the USMARC user community, ref-
erences to the effects of integration appear throughout the book. The final chapter focuses on USMARC as a tool to meet library needs. This chapter includes sections on sources of USMARC, retrospective conversion, processing and local use, problems with USMARC tapes, reading MARC records, etc. The appendix contains an annotated version of "USMARC: Underlying Principles," which MARBI and the USMARC advisory group approved in 1982, plus additional principles adopted in 1988 as part of format integration.

The book is clearly written, with a minimum of technical jargon, and is generously supplied with illustrative figures and tables.

How does this edition differ from the earlier one? Differences show up in updating of existing chapters and treatment of some topics in greater detail. Each material format is now treated in its own chapter as are topics such as format integration and non-roman data.

The glossary of MARC-related terms has been rewritten. Although much remains the same, some terms appearing in the first edition have been omitted, new ones have been added, and others either renamed or given modified definitions. The filing order has also been changed and is now more strictly alphabetical.

The bibliography has been reduced to make it more a reading list, with very brief annotations of selected books and articles dealing with USMARC rather than a comprehensive list of works consulted in the preparation of this book.

This book will be useful to library school students, to public services staff who, with the implementation of online public access catalogs, are faced with the need to understand how the database is constructed, administrators involved in dealing with vendors of database services or considering online catalogs, and even experienced catalogers, who will find new insight into areas they had taken for granted.—Judith Hopkins, State University of New York at Buffalo.


In the introduction to The Library Microcomputer Environment: Management Issues, the editors note that they wanted to: (1) avoid topics that would become easily out-of-date; (2) address hardware and software issues; and (3) address several audiences, including technicians, managers, department heads, and library science faculty and students. This is a tall order. Unfortunately, the resulting volume is a hodgepodge. There are too many unanswered questions throughout, not the least of which is, What is the definition of a management issue?

Some of the chapters provide good information, but they inadequately address the most important issues or leave the reader wishing for a more in-depth discussion of the particular topic. A small but nagging problem is the impression that the book is too concerned with "who" and too little with "how" or "what" or "why." Nancy B. Olson's and Jean Weihs's chapters on cataloging go to great lengths to recite names of important people. Patrick R. Dewey's chapter on software review sources becomes suspect given the number of times that Dewey cites his own works (I found seven references in seven pages).

The book often suffers by being too technical or narrow when it should be general and practical. This is true of Pamela Reekes McKirdy's chapter on copyright issues, John A. Sciglano and Barry A. Centini's chapter on UNIX, and James D. Anderson's chapter on database management.

Conversely, some of the more general chapters also do not fare well. Jonathan S. Intner's chapter on choosing microcomputer hardware includes a description of his "ideal basic all-purpose system" in which he includes "two floppy disk drives" (size unspecified), "at least 256K of memory"
enough, and advanced users will find little new or relevant. Microcomputers of some chapters are useful. Even though OCLC currently shows more than 300 libraries that have purchased this volume, this book cannot be recommended.-Arnold Hirshon, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond.


In the course of a quarter-century, what began as a modest textbook (with test questions) for beginners in retail bookselling became a three-volume reference work drawing on the knowledge of numerous specialists. The audience changed from booksellers to "laymen" (bookbuyers, bookborrowers, and "readers"), and the quantity of information and advice outgrew the memorizing capacity of even the brightest student. Only the continuing concentration on books available in the current American trade distinguished The Reader's Adviser from a truly "select universal" bibliography.

The thirteenth edition, enlarged to six volumes, makes it still easier to forget that what happens to be available from American retail booksellers is not a complete, balanced representation of the whole of literature or even of that part of it contained in a well-stocked library. Readers should keep in mind this important distinction, since it excludes most foreign publications, most American books no longer in print, and all literature published only in periodicals.

In this new edition the mixed content of volume 3 of the twelfth edition has been distributed through the new volumes 3-5; and, as if to rub in the fact of fragmentation, volumes 4-6 are bound in a distinctive color. The general title, the general introduction, and the new comprehensive index (volume 6) are the reminders that the set is conceived as a single work. The publisher might justifiably consider discontinuing The Reader's Adviser as a collectivity, allowing the component parts to be revised individually at appropriate intervals. Obsolescence is the curse of all printed bibliographies, and no work published in editions that are years apart can keep up with (to name three examples) college dictionaries, cookbooks, and manuals of etiquette.

The new index volume includes a Directory of Publishers (p.1-39, with an impressive number of unfamiliar names), a Name Index (p.41-192), a Title Index (p.193-477), and a Subject Index (p.479-511). The first three are mechanical conveniences, and one has no difficulty running down a known book—hardly the purpose of a "guide." The index of "subjects" calls for considerable imagination on the part of the user. It abounds in headings for categories: "collections," for example; "controversial issues, contemporary religious movements"; and "published papers, personal." Either a trained indexer's product or an out-and-out keyword index would seem preferable.

The two features that distinguish The Reader's Adviser from Books in Print
Rosemary Magrill and John Corbin
$27.50cl. 294p. 0-8389-0513-7 September 1989
The first edition of this popular text was described by College and Research Libraries as "an excellent work from nearly every angle... Magrill and Hickey leave no stone unturned in describing and reviewing the ways in which this aspect of library work can be managed."

Collection Management: Background and Principles
William A. Wortman
$25.00pbk. Approx. 200p. 0-8389-0515-3 September 1989
An in-depth look at a complex area of library management. Author William Wortman provides an integrated discussion of all aspects of collection management: essential principles, basic practices, and the service philosophy which guides it.

Buying Books for Libraries
Liz Chapman
$17.50cl. 142p. ALA order code B428-9 1989
Defines for library students and beginning professionals the basic procedures used by library acquisitions departments to purchase monographs from mainstream publishers. Published by Clive Bingley, Ltd., an imprint of the Library Association of the U.K., and distributed in the U.S. by ALA.

ALA Books
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
are selection and annotation. Both are of a quality that encourages browsing and affords quick-reference information. The recasting of the set has left obvious effects on the new volume 3 ("The Best in General Reference Literature, the Social Sciences, History, and the Arts," edited by Paula T. Kaufman). Opera, for example, receives much less space (p. 495) than in the twelfth edition (vol. 3, p. 801–4). The sketchy list on Wagner (twelve titles) makes no mention of Ernest Newman, Robert Gutman, or George Bernard Shaw; and the knowing reader who checks the Title Index in volume 6 for "The Perfect Wagnerite" will be led to volume 2, in which, incredibly, the book is cited as one of two on the subject of the Nibelungenlied.

But the real issue raised by the thirteenth edition comes to the fore in volume 4 ("The Best in the Literature of Philosophy and World Religions," edited by William L. Reese) and volume 5 ("The Best in the Literature of Science, Technology, and Medicine," edited by Paul T. Durbin). Volume 4 (801 pages) replaces three chapters (p. 86–352) of volume 3 in the twelfth edition. Volume 5 "takes what was a relatively short—and some would say representative—chapter in the twelfth edition and expands it to an entire volume" (725 pages) in an effort to be "more representative, as well as more comprehensive" (Introduction, p. xxxi). Both volumes impress this nonspecialist reviewer as magnificent, but they bring up the question of how far a book-promotion tool should venture into professional evaluation in such topics as clinical psychology and the more esoteric specialties in philosophy, in which the frontiers are constantly extended in sources not distributed through the book trade.

Even in its latest expansion The Reader’s Adviser best suits the requirements of the class of reader described by Patrick Wilson as "the studious of the first degree who are also the natural audience of the commercial bookstore": the browsers for whom "indirect bibliographical access" may be a deterrent, to be preferably replaced by direct personal advice."

By librarian "advisers" in particular, The Reader’s Adviser should be approached with discriminating judgment, but it is a rich source of valuable information—and great fun to read.— Robert Woodman Wadsworth, The University of Chicago.

REFERENCES AND NOTES
1. Volumes 1–3 (1986) were reviewed in LRTS in July 1988 (vol. 32, no. 3, p. 269–70), with a general description of the edition as a whole.

The Librarian’s CD-ROM Handbook.

The CD-ROM (compact-disc read only memory) revolution for the storage and retrieval of information has provided a whole new dimension for library service. The author has designed this handbook as an introductory source for librarians or information managers who have little or no knowledge in this field. The book is primarily focused on issues related to CD-ROM selection, implementation and management, with little discussion on CD-ROM technology itself.

The major sections in the work include: selecting a CD-ROM product, hardware, management issues, concerns, library applications (e.g., cata-
The Concise AACR2, 1988 Revision

Michael Gorman

$15.00 pbk. Approx. 160p. 0-8389-3362-9 December 1989

*American Reference Books Annual* said of the first edition: “Practicing librarians, library technicians and cataloging students will appreciate *The Concise AACR2* for its ability to clear away the rarely used specific rules, and present a clear path to describing common library materials.”

Authority Control: Principles, Applications, and Instructions

Doris Hargrett Clack

$45.00 cl. Approx. 336p. 0-8389-0516-1 January 1990

Examines both theoretical issues and practical aspects of the complex field of authority control. The text is heavily illustrated with examples, charts, and diagrams. *Authority Control* is an essential professional resource for all cataloging departments.

Information Access: Capabilities and Limitations of Printed and Computerized Sources

Richard Joseph Hyman

$35.00 pbk. 208p. 0-8389-0512-9 October 1989

The central purpose of *Information Access* is to explore the effectiveness of the tools available for constructing and verifying catalog records. Students and practicing librarians alike will find their professional skills greatly enhanced by a deeper understanding of this area.
loging, ILL, public access catalogs, reference works, indexes), specialized applications (business, law, medicine, government, education, science, etc.), future projections, and a brief bibliography.

Two of the core chapters in the book, "Library Applications" and "Specialized Applications," which take almost 50 percent of the text, are devoted to listing and describing short (half- to two-page) summaries of CD-ROM products and services on the market. Although this provides a useful inventory of products as of when it was compiled, the list quickly gets out of date because of new product releases and changes in existing products.

The hardware chapter contains some useful information on PC workstations, CD-ROM drives, interfaces, and maintenance and an excellent checklist of hardware and software considerations when purchasing a product. A list of CD-ROM hardware manufacturers is supplied, but once again this type of list with names, addresses, and costs rapidly goes out of date in this quickly changing market.

Other major trends in the CD-ROM arena which are only very briefly touched upon include networking of CD-ROM products or workstations, multimedia CD-ROMS (e.g., compact disc interactive), integrated workstations, and increasing disc capacity. Much greater emphasis should have been given to the networking of CD-ROM products with the concomitant advantages and limitations. No mention is made of erasable optical disc technology, which although just coming to the marketplace has the potential of radically changing the distributed computing environment. Another omission is the lack of any mention of CD-ROM authoring systems, which provide the opportunity for organizations to master their own discs.

The best and most lasting chapters are on selecting a CD-ROM product and management issues, and concerns. These chapters, although brief, offer general advice and guidelines that will not quickly become obsolete.

This book could be synthesized into a nice booklet with the removal of the more ephemeral sections. A brief bibliography, which provides some useful references through 1988, concludes the work. The major difficulty in any monograph about CD-ROMs such as this is that the technology and new products are changing so quickly that lists of hardware, software, and products are soon obsolete.—George S. Machovec, Arizona State University, Tempe.


The authors have designed this book to serve as an introductory, self-contained overview of CD-ROM and optical information technology as it relates to library services and systems. It provides an excellent framework for acquiring and understanding the implementation of this technology in libraries.

The major chapters include: the basics of optical information technology; an overview of library applications; software design and retrieval issues; public service considerations; technical services considerations; hardware and software considerations; fiscal considerations; the future; and strategies for implementation with case studies. Appendixes provide a list of producers and distributors of optical information products and a selective bibliography.

One of the first-rate features of this work is that the authors did not attempt to give laundry lists of products and services but focused on relevant issues relating to libraries. The book should have a much longer shelf life than some other books on the market because issues are the major focus and not particular products.
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In the chapter on public service considerations the authors provide some good information on evaluating how optically based information sources can fit in with print and online services, taking into account cost, currency, search mechanisms, audience, number of users, and use.

The chapter on technical services considerations is rather short (five pages) and provides only a brief overview of acquisition systems, cataloging and retrospective conversion systems, public access catalogs, and related issues. However, many of the other chapters in this book should provide useful information to technical service librarians. The chapter on hardware and software considerations provides some excellent introductory information on gateways and networking of optical products, although the most current information on these topics is better found at conferences, in newsletters, or in the current journal literature.

Discussions are provided regarding the fiscal considerations associated with implementing CD-ROM workstations. The typical cost of a workstation and CD-ROM subscription is compared with average search costs through commercial search services. Some discussions relating to the future information-delivery infrastructure, telecommunications networks, and fee or free searching are useful thought-provoking sections.

One of the most interesting sections of the book is the case studies, in which nine libraries describe their implementation of optical disc products. Different types of libraries (academic, public, special, and school) with a variety of optical products were chosen in order to interest a wide audience.

Appendix A offers a list of producers and distributors of optical information products. Although this type of list goes quickly out of date, the authors have been careful to cite their sources for compiling the list. This book is highly recommended for any library that would like a basic overview of issues related to CD-ROM or other optical information technology—George S. Machovec, Arizona State University, Tempe.
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