



8-1977

## A Study of Cataloging Procedures in Community Colleges in Eleven Southeastern States

Gayle L. Pierce

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses)



Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Pierce, Gayle L., "A Study of Cataloging Procedures in Community Colleges in Eleven Southeastern States" (1977). *Master's Theses*. 2270.

[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses/2270](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/2270)

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



A STUDY OF CATALOGING PROCEDURES  
IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES  
IN ELEVEN SOUTHEASTERN STATES

by

Gayle L. Pierce

A Project Report  
Submitted to the  
Faculty of The Graduate College  
in partial fulfillment  
of the  
Specialist in Arts Degree

Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
August 1977

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses much appreciation to those librarians in the community and junior colleges, and technical institutes, in the southeastern United States, who took not only the time to respond to the survey, but who also made appropriate and helpful comments.

We express special appreciation to four faculty members at Western Michigan University who gave much advice and assistance throughout the development of the survey and the writing of this project: Dr. Laurel Grotzinger, Dr. John P. Comaromi, and Dr. Hardy Carroll of the School of Librarianship; and Dr. David W. Hessler, College of Education.

Without the support of the author's husband, who served as mother and father during the development of this project, this survey would not have been completed.

Gayle L. Pierce

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear in this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

### University Microfilms International

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106 USA  
St. John's Road, Tyler's Green  
High Wycombe, Bucks, England HP10 8HR

MASTERS THESIS

13-10,457

PIERCE, Gayle Louise, 1938-  
A STUDY OF CATALOGING PROCEDURE IN  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES IN ELEVEN SOUTH-  
EASTERN STATES.

Western Michigan University, SpA.,  
1977  
Library Science

**Xerox University Microfilms**, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
	The Problem . . . . .	1
	Background of the Community College System . . . . .	3
	Background of the Community College System in the Southeastern United States . . . . .	7
	Background of the Community College Library . . . . .	14
	Purpose and Plan of the Study . . . . .	19
II	METHODOLOGY . . . . .	21
	Review of Literature . . . . .	21
	Research Method and Population . . . . .	21
	Definition of Terms . . . . .	22
	Design of the Questionnaire . . . . .	24
	Distribution of the Questionnaire . . . . .	26
	Receiving and Compiling the Data . . . . .	26
III	RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	27
	On-Line Participants . . . . .	27
	Libraries Using Manual Cataloging Procedures . . . . .	35
	Alabama . . . . .	36
	Florida . . . . .	39
	Georgia . . . . .	41
	Kentucky . . . . .	43
	Louisiana . . . . .	47

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Mississippi . . . . .	49
	North Carolina . . . . .	52
	South Carolina . . . . .	55
	Tennessee . . . . .	58
	Virginia . . . . .	60
	West Virginia . . . . .	63
	General Results . . . . .	66
IV	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY . . . . .	78
	Summary . . . . .	78
	Implications and Suggestions for Further Study . .	81
	APPENDIX: THE COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES . . .	84
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	97

TABLES

1. Employees in the Technical Processing Departments of SOLINET Libraries . . . . .	28
2. Searches Made Monthly, Original Records Input and Books Cataloged Annually by SOLINET Respondents . . . . .	30
3. Cataloging Changes in SOLINET Libraries . . . . .	31
4. SOLINET Terminal Use . . . . .	32
5. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Alabama Community College Libraries . . . . .	37
6. Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Alabama Community College Libraries . . . . .	38
7. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Florida Community College Libraries . . . . .	40
8. Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Florida Community College Libraries . . . . .	41
9. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Georgia Community College Libraries . . . . .	43
10. Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Georgia Community College Libraries . . . . .	44
11. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Kentucky Community College Libraries . . . . .	45
12. Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Kentucky Community College Libraries . . . . .	46
13. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Louisiana Community College Libraries . . . . .	48
14. Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Louisiana Community College Libraries . . . . .	49
15. Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Mississippi Community College Libraries . . . . .	50



16.	Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Mississippi Community College Libraries . . . . .	52
17.	Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in South Carolina Community College Libraries . . . . .	56
18.	Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by South Carolina Community College Libraries . . . . .	57
19.	Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog in Tennessee Community College Libraries . . . . .	59
20.	Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Tennessee Community College Libraries . . . . .	60
21.	Selected Statistics and Amounts of Backlog in Virginia Community College Libraries . . . . .	61
22.	Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by Virginia Community College Libraries . . . . .	63
23.	Selected Statistics and Amounts of Backlog in West Virginia Community College Libraries . . . . .	64
24.	Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R) by West Virginia Community College Libraries . . . . .	65
25.	Percentages of Libraries Using Cards Preprinted With Subject Headings and Call Numbers . . . . .	72

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### The Problem

For many years, librarians have been cataloging books, and through the years they have learned to accept changes in cataloging procedures which have appeared necessary and desirable. From classifying and cataloging the books and producing catalog cards, librarians have come to appreciate standardized information and preprinted cards, first from the Library of Congress and then from several other sources. Recently, commercial vendors such as Jostens, Baker and Taylor, Midwest, and Blackwell North America, have provided special services. With the advent of computers, cataloging has changed even more radically. When, in the early 1970's, OCLC (Ohio College Library Center) went to on-line cataloging, (where the terminals are in direct and continuing contact with the central processor), a new world of computerized cataloging was opened up to catalog librarians nationwide. Faced with tremendous backlogs of books and other materials needing cataloging, many librarians recognized that computerized cataloging could be beneficial to them. University librarians, especially, were eager to participate in on-line cataloging, because it offered to them a way not only to reduce the backlog of materials, but it also allowed them to make these materials available to their clientele much more rapidly.

Community college librarians also perceived, in some instances, that on-line cataloging was a means of getting materials on the shelves

much more rapidly while reducing their backlogs of books and other media. Since the current philosophy of the community college is to provide an educational opportunity to everyone, the community college library must be prepared to provide a wide variety of materials at many reading levels and for all levels of comprehension.

The increased enrollments of community colleges have generally meant increased book budgets. With personnel costs rising in many community colleges, however, there has not been the addition of librarians to take care of the increased amounts of materials which many of the community colleges have been able to purchase. Backlogs of uncataloged materials have convinced librarians that they must look for alternatives to the methods they have been using in cataloging so that they can eliminate, or at least reduce, backlogs in their libraries.

The author has been a catalog librarian in a community college in Mississippi for several years. The library purchases about 85 percent of its catalog cards from two sources: Jostens and Library of Congress (LC).<sup>1</sup> This means that the staff, which consists of a catalog librarian, a part-time clerk and occasionally a student worker, must do original cataloging for about 15 percent of the new books. The library usually has a substantial backlog of materials waiting to be processed. In recent years, there have been problems with cataloging copy received from these sources, such as catalog cards never arriving, incorrect cards sent, and delays of three months and more for catalog cards to arrive from LC. In discussions with other catalog librarians

---

<sup>1</sup>(LC) is the acronym used for Library of Congress. LC cards are the catalog cards produced at the Library of Congress.

in neighboring community colleges, the author discovered that they had similar problems with staffing, cataloging copy, backlogs, and many also felt that they were doing too much original cataloging, as well, with too few tools.

This study was designed to find out how widespread cataloging problems are and if there might be possible alternatives to the cataloging procedures now used by the author. It was assumed that a regional study of this situation might reveal the degree to which other catalog librarians in the community colleges of the Southeast were experiencing similar problems.

As a result, the following study of cataloging procedures in community colleges in the Southeast was designed to see which libraries still were doing manual cataloging, what problems were associated with obtaining catalog cards from various sources, the type of staffing in the technical processing departments, whether preprocessed books were purchased, what problems were associated with the cataloging copy itself, and what tools were used to obtain cataloging copy. Those community colleges identified as members of an on-line cataloging network were queried about their use of the network and how networking affected their operations.

The investigator made no attempt to study cataloging procedures with regard to audiovisual software.

#### Background of the Community College System

In order to locate the technical processing department of a community college library in the community college scene, it is

necessary to present some background information about the community college and the southeastern states which are surveyed in this project.

From the early 1900's until the end of World War II, the growth of the junior college movement was slow. Most of the junior colleges of this era were part of the public school system and were frequently extensions of the high school program which provided post-high school work. During the depression, the junior college movement came to a standstill. However, public pressure caused school boards to reopen those junior colleges which they had closed because of the depression. Between the years 1929 and 1945, 171 new junior colleges were created.<sup>1</sup>

By the end of World War II, the role of the community college had changed from that of only a "junior college" to one which was more aptly described by the term used widely today: "community college." This change took place when vocational and technical education was added to the junior college curriculum.

At this same time, the G.I. Bill became law and thousands of veterans were able to attend college, some for the first time in their lives. Other veterans returned to discover that their former places of business had closed down, or that technological advances had eliminated their former jobs. These veterans, too, began looking for a school which would provide them with new job skills. It was the community college that took on this task.

As the concept of the community college changed, so did the typical description of the community college student. No longer were

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles R. Monroe, "Profile of the Community College" (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972), p. 13.

the students mostly in the 18-20 year age bracket, but many of them were much older, married, and working full-time.

In the fifteen years following the end of World War II, community colleges continued to grow at a steady rate. A commission appointed by President Truman issued a report which called for free education for the first two years of college.<sup>1</sup> The name "community college" came out of this same commission. Although most of the community colleges did not provide a free education to their students, their philosophy was to keep the tuition costs as low as possible. In many communities across the nation, people were willing to approve bond issues to provide monies for the creation and support of local community colleges which offered a varied curricula and low tuition schedules.

New technical programs were developed and community college administrators decided that both general education and technical education could be a part of the associate degree. During the decade from 1959-1969, the growth in the number and enrollments of community colleges was phenomenal. The number increased from 390 colleges in 1959 to 794 in 1969, and enrollments from 551,760 in 1959 to 2,051,493 in 1969.<sup>2</sup>

By 1970, the growth of the community colleges had begun to slow down. By this time, most states had well-developed master plans, many

---

<sup>1</sup>George L. Hall, "Behind the Bramble Bushes: a Mid-Century History of the Community College," Community College Review, 2 (Fall 1974):8.

<sup>2</sup>James O. Wallace, "Newcomer to the Academic Scene: the Two-Year College Library/Learning Center," College and Research Libraries, 37 (November 1976):508.

of which had been nearly implemented. The growth emphasis changed from that of developing new community colleges to that of developing programs within existing community colleges and providing additional buildings to house these new programs.

In the early 1970's, enrollments across the nation were still rising, although at a slower rate than the previous decade. During the period 1971-1974, more students enrolled as freshmen in community colleges than in four-year colleges and universities.<sup>1</sup> Community colleges had had a tremendous impact on the educational system.

However, by the mid-seventies, it appeared that the peak had been reached in community college enrollments. Realizing that the birth rate had slowed, and that the influx of students of the late 1960's was past history, college administrators looked for alternative programs to keep enrollments from falling off too rapidly. The concept of the "open door" was implemented, for the first time. The former junior college truly became a community college, as it opened its doors to everyone, regardless of educational background.

The impact that the open door policy has had on southeastern United States community college libraries, and the technical processing departments of these libraries in particular, is discussed in the next section.

---

<sup>1</sup>Hall, "Behind the Bramble Bushes," p. 9.

Background of the Community College System  
in the Southeastern United States

In the Southeast, the population is made up of states such as Mississippi and Florida which have had strong community college systems for many years, as well as the state of West Virginia, where the community college movement is just getting under way. It is evident that some community colleges, in existence for some time, have well-developed programs and libraries, while other community colleges, which are barely started, may take several years to develop a variety of programs and a strong library.

It should be noted that the newness of a state's community college system does not necessarily mean that these community colleges are any less effective than those community colleges which have been in existence for a half century or longer. In fact, some of the newer community colleges have been able to benefit from the mistakes of others, and have been able to eliminate programs or functions which have proven to be noneffective in meeting the needs of the community they serve.

Following an alphabetical order, the first state in the southeast complex is Alabama. The first community college in Alabama, now Southern Union State Junior College, was established in 1922 under the auspices of the United Church of Christ. Until 1963, when Governor George C. Wallace's administration began a big push for community colleges throughout the state, little was done on community college development. By 1965, there were fourteen state owned and controlled junior colleges in operation. Four years later, three more community



colleges were on the drawing board and, by 1974, the last of these three was in operation.<sup>1</sup> Today, in 1977, Alabama has seventeen public junior colleges along with eleven technical colleges, which serve much of the population of the state.

Florida, the next state to be considered, has a well-developed community college system. In 1933, the first junior college established in the state had become a public junior college. By 1962, more than 50 percent of the freshmen in Florida colleges were enrolled in the public community colleges. At that time, in seventeen districts there were twenty-nine community colleges within commuting distance of 63 percent of Florida's high school graduates.<sup>2</sup>

In 1957, the Florida Community College Master Plan was implemented and a study was undertaken to determine where community colleges were needed in order to provide community college education to a greater percentage of the population. The Florida Legislature approved the creation of five more junior college districts in 1965. By 1970, there were twenty-seven community colleges within commuting distance of 95 percent of Florida's inhabitants. Finally, in 1971, the twenty-eighth and last community college opened, permitting 99 percent of Florida's residents access to community college education.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Walter A. Graham, "It May Happen in Alabama, Too!" in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 134.

<sup>2</sup>James L. Wattenbarger, "Five Years of Progress in Florida," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 60.

<sup>3</sup>William Morsch, State Community College Systems; Their Role and Operation in Seven States (New York: Praeger, 1971), pp. 47-53.

As early as 1933, Georgia had eight junior colleges which were already operational. By 1958, four of these junior colleges had become four-year institutions, yet no new junior colleges were created. In the same year, the Georgia Legislature approved the Junior College Act of 1958,<sup>1</sup> which provided that six new junior colleges be developed as system institutions; two existing community-owned junior colleges elected to become units of the university system. One junior college was developed outside the system.<sup>2</sup> In the eight year period from 1959 through 1968, Georgia opened seven new junior colleges, and by 1977, there were eighteen community colleges in operation in the state.

In Kentucky, Ashland and Paducah had established community colleges in the 1930's which were under local control as municipal junior colleges. In 1962, the University of Kentucky Community College System was developed which placed the jurisdiction of the community colleges under this authority. By 1969, there were sixteen community colleges in Kentucky, including the ones at Ashland and Paducah which had joined the system in 1957 and 1968, respectively.<sup>3</sup> There are currently thirteen community colleges operated by the University of Kentucky Community College System and one at Bowling Green, which is new and is not operating under the University of

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry S. Downs, "Georgia's Junior Colleges: An Important Role," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 260.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 261.

<sup>3</sup>James L. Wattenbarger, "The Other Twenty-Two," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), pp. 283-84.

Kentucky System.<sup>1</sup>

Although Louisiana had the authority as early as 1928 to establish community college districts in the various parishes, only one parish took advantage of this authority. Later, as other community colleges were established, they were placed under the control of Louisiana State University and eventually became four-year colleges. Legislation in 1964 enabled Louisiana to create several branches of both Louisiana State University and Southern University. Funding for land purchase and building construction was granted, but it appears that little was actually done.<sup>2</sup> Today, in 1977, Louisiana State University operates three community colleges in the state, and three other public community colleges are also in operation. There appears to be a great deal of interest in the support of community colleges by Louisianians, but so far the monetary support has not been forthcoming.

Mississippi's junior colleges are an outgrowth of the county agricultural high schools which were authorized in 1908 by the state legislature. Legislation enacted in 1922 provided for the addition of freshman and sophomore years to any county agricultural high school which was at least twenty miles from a state college. Two years later, four schools were offering freshman and sophomore level courses.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977), pp. 38-39.

<sup>2</sup>Wattenbarger, "The Other 22," p. 285.

<sup>3</sup>Garvin H. Johnston, "State and Local Partnership in Mississippi," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 269.

In 1928, a Junior College Commission was established and by that fall, eleven junior colleges were in operation. More legislation in 1950 updated earlier legislation and gave continuance to the fourteen junior college districts containing seventeen public junior colleges.<sup>1</sup> By 1977, there were fifteen junior colleges, one of which was a municipal junior college, and one which operated three campuses.<sup>2</sup>

North Carolina was slow to develop community colleges. In 1957 the Community College Act was passed, yet by the 1962-1963 school year, only five community colleges were in existence, four of which were operational prior to the Act.<sup>3</sup> These few community colleges tended to concentrate on college parallel programs, so that vocational-technical education and adult education received relatively little attention. Boozer considers two factors to account for this: the existence of a separate system of industrial education centers and lack of state support for programs of less than college grade.<sup>4</sup> In 1963, the Department of Community Colleges was created which helped bring college parallel programs and vocational-technical and adult education together under one board. By 1971, North Carolina had fifteen fully comprehensive community colleges and thirty-nine

---

<sup>1</sup>Johnston, "State and Local Partnership in Mississippi," p. 270.

<sup>2</sup>Community College Directory, pp. 48-49.

<sup>3</sup>Howard R. Boozer, "North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969), p. 63.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid, p. 66.

technical institutions.<sup>1</sup> In 1977, there were fifty-six community colleges and technical institutions.<sup>2</sup>

Tennessee made rapid progress in the development of its community colleges. In 1965, money was made available to establish three community colleges. The State Board of Education controlled the community colleges and a master plan was developed to provide community colleges within commuting distance of most of Tennessee's population. There were ten public community colleges and three state technical institutes operational in 1977.

At present, South Carolina does not have a community college system. Yet in 1969, South Carolina did have twelve technical institutes and nine branches or centers, which were operated by the University of South Carolina, and two branches which were operated by Clemson University. According to the 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory,<sup>3</sup> there were sixteen technical institutes (two of which had two campuses each) and five regional campuses operated by the University of South Carolina. These sixteen two-year post high school institutions are part of South Carolina's technical education system.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., ed. American Junior Colleges (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971), p. 376.

<sup>2</sup>Community College Directory, pp. 58-63.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, pp. 70-73.

<sup>4</sup>Linda Chastain, "Raising the Economic Level in South Carolina," Community and Junior College Journal 47 (September 1976):22.

Virginia was slow in developing community colleges. As late as 1959, the Commonwealth still did not feel a need to advocate a policy calling for higher education to be made available to Virginia's residents.<sup>1</sup> However, in 1966, with the passage of the Community College Act, a system of comprehensive community colleges was developed. Until this time, three of Virginia's universities operated twelve two-year branch institutions. Virginia developed a master plan which:

. . . recommends that the state be divided into twenty-two community college regions. Several of these regions are expected to have two or more campuses because of being either high-density urban regions with heavy concentrations of prospective students or low-density rural regions where long distances dictate a second campus. Each region is designed so that it normally has a minimum of 100,000 population and 1,000 high school graduates annually; the community college campuses are being located so that practically every Virginia resident will be within commuting distance (thirty<sub>2</sub> to forty-five miles) of a community college campus.

In 1977, there were twenty-four public community colleges within the state of Virginia. Five of these community colleges have branch campuses.<sup>3</sup>

West Virginia is the most recent newcomer to the community college scene in the Southeast. As late as 1969, there were no

---

<sup>1</sup>Loyd D. Andrew and Norval L. Wellsfry, "Community College System Pays Its Way," Community and Junior College Journal 47 (March 1977):29.

<sup>2</sup>Fred L. Wellman and Dana B. Hamel, "Community College Progress in Virginia," in Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, ed. Roger Yarrington, (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969) p. 241.

<sup>3</sup>Community College Directory, pp. 80-83.

community colleges in West Virginia, nor did the legislature plan to provide the residents of the state with a comprehensive community college plan. However, in 1971, a resolution was adopted by the legislature which directed the Board of Regents to create a state plan which would establish and implement a system of comprehensive community colleges.<sup>1</sup> By 1974, there were three community colleges in operation, but no others were planned due to inadequate financial resources to meet the needs of higher education throughout West Virginia. The 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory<sup>2</sup> does list ten community colleges, eight of which appear to be community colleges which are not a part of the university branch system.

#### Background of the Community College Library

The community college library has developed in two ways, either the library is the outgrowth of a high school library, or it was begun at the same time the community college was established.

Changes in community college libraries occurred in those which were an outgrowth of the high school library. Since many high school libraries used DDC (Dewey Decimal Classification)<sup>3</sup> and Sears (Sears

---

<sup>1</sup>Krishna S. Dhir, "From University Branch to Community College," Community and Junior College Journal 44 (March 1974):37.

<sup>2</sup>Community College Directory, pp. 84-85.

<sup>3</sup>Melvil Dewey, Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index 18th ed. (Lake Placid Club, N.Y.: Forest Press, 1971).

Subject Headings),<sup>1</sup> it followed that the community college library, which evolved from the high school library, would continue to use DDC and Sears.

However, new community college libraries tended to use LCC (Library of Congress Classification)<sup>2</sup> and LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings).<sup>3</sup> Librarians from the community colleges which evolved from high school libraries observed what was being done in these newer libraries. Many librarians from the long established community colleges felt that LCC and LCSH had advantages over DDC and Sears, so they decided to convert their holdings to LCC and their subject headings to LCSH. Other community college librarians believed that LCSH was better than Sears for their libraries, but felt that DDC was more useful to their students, so these librarians changed only their subject headings. A few librarians decided against any changes. A survey, conducted in 1967, showed that many libraries were still using DDC. In the Southeast the ratio of DDC to LCC was 4:1.<sup>4</sup>

Besides changes in classification and subject headings, there were changes in staff. With larger enrollments came larger book

---

<sup>1</sup>Minnie Earl Sears, Sears List of Subject Headings, 10th ed. (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1972).

<sup>2</sup>U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Cataloging Division, Classification. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, n.d.).

<sup>3</sup>U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress Subject Headings, 8th ed., 2 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1975).

<sup>4</sup>Desmond Taylor, "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries 29 (September 1968):353.



budgets, and the need for more staff to process the increased acquisitions. Many libraries found it necessary to create an area for the processing of the increasing amounts of materials they were adding. Some libraries had enough space to assign for processing of materials; this was usually designated as a technical processing department. With this new "department" came the need for a cataloger to take charge of its operations. As acquisitions continued to increase, supportive staff was needed to assist the cataloger.

With the addition of staff and the creation of a separate cataloging or technical processing department, many libraries found that they were still not able to keep up with the amount of materials acquired. By this time, most of the community college libraries were using commercial vendors from whom they purchased printed catalog cards. There were problems with these cards, since some vendors provided fast service, but their catalog cards would smear easily or else contained many cataloging errors, while other vendors provided quality format and cataloging, but at such high prices as to be unaffordable by most libraries. Other companies provided excellent catalog cards, but the libraries would have to wait months before the catalog cards finally arrived. These and other problems with catalog card sources plagued librarians.

Many librarians who chose to make their own catalog cards found it too time consuming. Some libraries used the offset press to print their catalog cards, while others used the magnetic typewriter and copyflow production methods such as the Xerox system. Even with these techniques, there continued to be backlogs of books for which cards

needed to be made.

Some libraries decided to use book jobbers who would supply preprocessed books in an effort to reduce backlogs and to provide materials more quickly for their patrons. While the purchasing of preprocessed books did help reduce the backlogs of some libraries, others felt that the jobbers could not supply enough titles to make such purchases cost-effective.

In the late 1960's, as a result of the dilemma regarding catalog card vendors as well as the problem with jobbers of preprocessed books, the Ohio College Library Center in Columbus first offered computerized cataloging to its member libraries. In 1967, OCLC, as the Ohio College Library Center is commonly called, began operations. By the early 1970's, OCLC had gone from an off-line system (where the terminals operate independently of the central processor) to an on-line system and now was offering its services to libraries outside of Ohio.

In 1971, the Southeast began to form a network of libraries where various services, such as cataloging, would be offered to member libraries. This network, formed in August of 1971, was called SOLINET (Southeastern Library Network) and was comprised of ten states in the Southeast. SOLINET is one of several on-line subsystems of OCLC.

The stated purpose of SOLINET is to:

Establish and maintain an inter-library network in the southern United States which, through the use of electronic data processing and telecommunications, shall increase the availability of the bibliographic records and resources of the region. Specifically, SOLINET will have as its goals, the provision of regional (1) shared cataloging, (2) bibliographic information retrieval, (3) serials control, (4) technical processing, and (5) circulation control. Machine-readable

data bases, telecommunications terminals, and other requisites to achieve these goals will be established or acquired. SOLINET will be modeled after the Ohio College Library Center.<sup>1</sup>

As Kennedy concludes, in an article on SOLINET, the shared cataloging subsystem "provides a means by which cataloging records produced at the Library of Congress are made available to other participating libraries, thereby reducing the amount of original cataloging required by each library."<sup>2</sup>

While SOLINET is available to all community colleges in this region, few community colleges have apparently taken advantage of the network. A check in OCLC Participating Institutions<sup>3</sup> showed that, in April 1977, only thirteen community colleges in the Southeast were participants of SOLINET. The cost of participation in on-line cataloging has been assumed to be the main reason why the percentage of participants is low.

It has also been assumed that through the use of on-line cataloging, community college libraries will be able to catalog books more rapidly, utilize staff more efficiently, and reduce backlogs.

In this chapter the background of the community college situation in the states surveyed has been summarized. Brief background information about the community college libraries has been noted and some of

---

<sup>1</sup>John P. Kennedy, "The Southeastern Library Network: Second Progress Report," Southeastern Librarian 23 (Summer 1973):12.

<sup>2</sup>John P. Kennedy, "The Southeastern Library Network: A Progress Report," Southeastern Librarian 23 (Spring 1973):13.

<sup>3</sup>OCLC Ohio College Library Center, OCLC Participating Libraries (Columbus: Ohio College Library Center, 1977) pp. 35-41.

the problems met by community college librarians in obtaining cataloging copy identified. The concept of on-line cataloging and the purposes of SOLINET are also discussed.

#### Purpose and Plan of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the number of employees in the technical processing departments and also if (1) those community college libraries in the Southeast, which participate in on-line cataloging, are libraries which do a large volume of cataloging; (2) on-line participants are adapting their cataloging to that of OCLC and use SOLINET for a variety of functions; (3) on-line cataloging reduces backlogs and provides materials to patrons quickly; and (4) there are any changes in the technical processing staff as a result of a library going to on-line cataloging.

The study should further determine the size of staffs of the technical processing departments in libraries using manual cataloging and if they (1) are experiencing problems with cataloging copy; (2) have large backlogs of uncataloged materials, and (3) do substantial amounts of original cataloging. It is hypothesized that the majority of the libraries use LCC and LCSH and that the trend toward the use of these continues.

In the second chapter, the author will discuss the methodology of the survey used in this study. Included are the review of literature, research method and population, the definition of terms used in this study, the design and distribution of the questionnaire, and how the data were analyzed as they were received.

The third chapter will discuss the results of the survey. The first section will describe the community college libraries which participate in on-line cataloging, the second section will analyze those libraries which still do manual cataloging.

A summary of results, and implications of the study will be dealt with in the fourth chapter.

## CHAPTER II

### METHODOLOGY

#### Review of Literature

A review of the major abstracting and indexing sources<sup>1</sup> for the years 1970-1977 reveals no significant research on cataloging procedures in community college libraries. The author, attempting to keep this study current, found that with the exception of background data on the community college, and SOLINET, only one journal article, written in 1968, entitled "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries,"<sup>2</sup> was pertinent to this study. It was used earlier to establish background data.

#### Research Method and Population

The investigation began as an attempt to discover the procedures used in other area colleges and to find alternatives to cataloging procedures which are currently being used by this author in the community college library in which she is employed. The author undertook a survey of cataloging procedures of community college libraries in eleven southeastern states: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina,

---

<sup>1</sup>The author searched Library Literature, Education Index, ERIC, and Dissertation Abstracts International.

<sup>2</sup>Desmond Taylor, "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries (September 1968): 351-56.

Tennessee, Virginia and West Virginia. The first ten states were chosen because they are part of SOLINET. West Virginia, although not a member of SOLINET, was chosen because it is geographically part of the Southeast.

Due to the time factor, no on-site visits were made by the author.

#### Definition of Terms

Backlog indicates all books for which no processing has been done. Backlogs may or may not include books for which catalog cards have been ordered.

Cataloging is that function where materials are described, assigned classification numbers, subject headings and added entries.

Clerical workers are those persons who type, file, check in new materials and perform similar tasks within a technical processing department or in connection with it.

A community college refers to any two-year post high school institution which offers either the freshman and sophomore levels of college preparatory courses, or vocational-technical programs designed for the student who plans to complete only two years of post high school training. This author will use "community college" when referring to "junior college," as it is referred to in some states, or when referring to a technical college, technical education center, etc.

DDC, an abbreviation for the Dewey Decimal Classification, is a numerically arranged system for organizing books by subject areas.

ISBN is the acronym for International Standard Book Number which consists of a ten digit number found on the verso of the title

page in most recently published monographs.

Jobbers, such as B&T (Baker and Taylor), Jostens, Midwest, Blackwell North America and Bro-Dart supply preprinted catalog cards.

LCC, the abbreviation for Library of Congress Classification; it is basically an alphabetically arranged system for grouping books by subject.

LCSH, the abbreviation for Library of Congress Subject Headings; they were created by the Library of Congress and are very detailed. Use of LCSH is prevalent in academic and research libraries.

A librarian is a person who has earned a degree from an accredited library program.

Library will be used throughout the paper when referring to the community college library, regardless of name currently in use, e.g. learning resources center, etc.

MARC is machine readable cataloging copy produced by LC.

Sears refers to Sears Subject Headings, which are generally used in public and school libraries and are less detailed than LCSH.

SOLINET is the acronym for Southeastern Library Network. A network is a group of libraries which have joined together to share resources. SOLINET is a subsystem of OCLC (Ohio College Library Center). On-line means that all of the peripheral devices used by the network members, such as terminals, are in contact with the central processor, in this case, OCLC.

The Southeast refers to the following states which are located in this geographic region: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.



Student workers are students who attend a given community college and who may perform tasks such as pasting in pockets, stamping books, security stripping, etc.

The technical processing department is that area where, among other things, cataloging takes place, usually with a librarian in charge of the department. In some community colleges, this may be a separate department. In other community colleges, there will be no separate department and the cataloging of library materials may take place in the library work area and be handled by several persons, not necessarily librarians.

Technicians are people who may have taken special courses in library science to qualify them to perform some of the technical operations of cataloging.

#### Design of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information about the cataloging procedures in the community college libraries of the southeastern United States. At the time of the survey, it was known by this author that some of the community colleges in the Southeast were members of SOLINET. Since there was no way to determine exactly which libraries were currently members of SOLINET,<sup>1</sup> a two-part questionnaire was sent to each library with directions explaining how to fill it out. Part I of the questionnaire was designed for those libraries which were participating in on-line cataloging, and it covered such topics as:

---

<sup>1</sup>OCLC Participating Libraries identified all those institutions which were members of SOLINET as of April 1977.

1) use of SOLINET; 2) changes which occurred in staffing in the processing department when it went to on-line cataloging; 3) length of time a member of SOLINET; and 4) if on-line cataloging reduces backlogs, thus getting materials into circulation quickly.

Part II of the questionnaire, which was to be completed by all libraries not participating in SOLINET (or another on-line network), was sent to 166 community college libraries. Topics included: 1) number of persons in the technical processing department, both full-time and part-time; 2) the classification scheme used; 3) type of subject headings used; 4) whether the library purchases preprocessed books; 5) whether the library buys preprinted catalog cards; 6) what the library likes and dislikes about the preprinted catalog cards; and 7) the use the library makes of such tools as NUC (National Union Catalog),<sup>1</sup> CBI (Cumulative Book Index),<sup>2</sup> BPR (American Book Publishing Record),<sup>3</sup> and CIP (Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data).<sup>4</sup>

Copies of Parts I and II of the questionnaire are to be found in the Appendix.

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Library of Congress. Processing Department. The National Union Catalog, 1956 Through 1969; A Cumulative Author List Representing Library of Congress Printed Cards and Titles Reported by Other American Libraries (Ann Arbor, Mich.: J.W. Edwards Publisher, 1969).

<sup>2</sup>Cumulative Book Index: A World List of Books in the English Language (New York: H.W. Wilson, 1898- ).

<sup>3</sup>American Book Publishing Record (New York: Bowker, 1960- ).

<sup>4</sup>CIP (Cataloging in Publication Data), brief cataloging information provided by Library of Congress, is on the verso of the title page.

Part I contains a total of fifteen questions and Part II has twenty-six questions. Space was provided on each questionnaire for respondents to request a copy of the results in brief. A space for additional comments was also provided at the end of each questionnaire.

#### Distribution of the Questionnaire

The first mailing of the questionnaire was completed on June 18, 1977. A cover letter (see Appendix) and a self-addressed stamped envelope were enclosed. A second mailing was made on July 1, 1977 to those community colleges which had not replied. Again, a cover letter (see Appendix) and a self-addressed stamped envelope were enclosed.

#### Receiving and Compiling the Data

The returns from the libraries surveyed totaled 136 of the 179 surveyed, or 75.9 percent. Six of the questionnaires were so incomplete as to be useless, so they were discarded. One library responded to both the first and the second questionnaire, so the second was discarded. This brought the usable responses to 129, or 72 percent of those surveyed. The libraries were given an opportunity to request a copy of the results in brief and ninety-nine, or 72.8 percent of the respondents have asked for a copy of the results.

To maintain anonymity, no names of individuals or libraries are used in this study.

As the questionnaires were received, each was examined and the data tabulated.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

#### On-Line Participants

There were 129 usable replies to the questionnaire, of which ten, or 7.7 percent, are currently SOLINET members. One, although a charter member, is not yet active as the terminal is still on order; another has its cataloging done at a regional processing center, which is a SOLINET member; a third community college shares a SOLINET terminal with a nearby university; and a fourth respondent was a regional processing center, which processes material for several other libraries in its region. Four of the libraries surveyed indicated that they were "charter members" of SOLINET.

Each library was asked to indicate how many employees work in the technical processing department. The replies indicate that the libraries ordering the least number of books have fewer employees. The library ordering the greatest amount of books reported that it employs nineteen full-time personnel: five full-time librarians, five technicians, and nine clerical workers. Two part-time clerks are also employed, along with twenty students. The respondent indicated that at present, they are "somewhat overstaffed due to a decrease in book fund monies."

Table 1 shows the breakdown of technical processing employees in the community colleges which are members of SOLINET. Note that respondent G apparently had no librarian responsible for cataloging.

Respondent E uses two part-time librarians rather than a full-time person. Library J is a technical processing center where books are processed for several libraries, and because it is not an individual library, it is not included in figuring any percentages. Eight of the nine respondents, or 88.8 percent, use technicians. Only five out of nine, or 55.5 percent, employ clerical help, and six of the nine, 66.6 percent, utilize student workers. Apparently, the number of books cataloged does not always have a positive correlation to the amount of staff in a library. For example, Respondent C catalogs 15,000 books (see Table 2) with seven staff members, but Respondent B has eleven staff members to catalog only 8,200 books.

Table 1

Employees In the Technical Processing  
Departments of SOLINET Libraries

Community College	Full-Time Employees				Part-Time Employees			
	Libn.	Tech.	Clerk	Student	Libn.	Tech.	Clerk	Student
A	5	5	9				2	20
B	3	1	7					
C	3	1	5				1	varies
D	1	1	1				1	2
E					2		2	
F	1	1						1
G*		1						1
H	1	1						4
I	1					1		
J**	1	1	5					

\* Shares a SOLINET terminal.

\*\* A central processing center.

Each of the libraries was asked to indicate approximately how many searches were made on the SOLINET terminal each month. The responses varied from 45 to 2,000. It is interesting to note that the library making the most searches is not the library with the largest number of acquisitions. This indicates that library C makes greater use of the terminal than does library A. One respondent was unable to supply an approximate figure for this question. Again, taking all the respondents, except the one which is a central processing center, to figure averages, the average number of searches made monthly by eight responding community college libraries is 809. These libraries are making considerable use of SOLINET.

The number of original records input (put into the data bank) varied considerably. Three libraries indicated that they do not input anything. Of the remaining six respondents, one inputs about three records a month, while another library inputs twenty-five records a month. Table 2 shows that the library having the most searches per month also inputs the majority of the original records. The average number of original records input is 7.5 monthly. The survey did not discover reasons for no input. Possibly, those libraries which input no original records are not permitted to do so. Perhaps, the libraries which do not input records and those which input few records are able to obtain most of the cataloging data through searching only.

The number of volumes normally cataloged each year in the ten responding schools in SOLINET varies from 1,500 to 20,000. The library cataloging 20,000 volumes did indicate that in fiscal year

1977, only 13,000 were cataloged due to budget cuts which halted further cataloging.

Table 2  
 Searches Made Monthly, Original Records Input and  
 Books Cataloged Annually by SOLINET Respondents

Library	Searches monthly	Original records input	Books cataloged annually
A	1500	15	20000
B	1000	0	8200
C	2000	25	15000
D	--	10	9000
E	1000	0	3000
F	225	10	2800
G	45	0	1500
H	350	3	3450
I	350	5	3200
J	1500	--	10000

One question asked was whether those using on-line cataloging accepted the cataloging as it appeared on MARC or OCLC, i.e. with (1) no changes; (2) minor changes; or (3) major changes. Four libraries, or 40 percent, indicated that they accepted the LC cataloging exactly as it appeared on the cathode ray tube (CRT) terminal. Minor changes were made by five, or 50 percent of the libraries. Only one indicated that their library made major changes in the LC cataloging. Table 3 shows how each of the respondents answered this question. The majority of the SOLINET members surveyed accept LC cataloging with little or no

change.

Table 3  
Cataloging Changes in SOLINET Libraries

Library	No changes	Minor changes	Major changes
A			x
B		x	
C	x		
D	x		
E	x		
F		x	
G		x	
H		x	
I	x		
J		x	
Totals	4	5	1

The libraries were then asked to indicate all of the functions for which they use the SOLINET terminal. Five of the ten respondents use the terminal for pre-order verification. All ten use SOLINET for searching. Nine libraries stated that they use SOLINET for (1) card production, and (2) card production from both MARC and OCLC records. Eight libraries use SOLINET to obtain card production from MARC. Table 4 shows how each of the libraries responded to these questions. Fifty percent of the libraries are not taking advantage of the pre-order verification function available to them.



Table 4  
SOLINET Terminal Use

Library	Pre-order verification	Searching	Card production	From MARC	From MARC & OCLC	Original input
A		x	x	x	x	x
B	x	x		x		
C		x	x	x	x	x
D	x	x	x	x	x	x
E	x	x	x		x	
F	x	x	x	x	x	x
G		x	x	x	x	x
H	x	x	x		x	x
I		x	x	x	x	x
J		x	x	x	x	x
Totals	5	10	9	8	9	8

Eight libraries indicated that they used the terminal to input original records. This response does not agree with a previous question which asked how many original records were input monthly. To that question, three libraries answered zero. This discrepancy is due to the fact that either one of the libraries does input at least one record a month, or else that a library inadvertently checked that it uses the terminal to input original cataloging records.

To the question, "Do you feel that you have benefited from on-line cataloging?" all of the respondents answered yes. Asked, "how they had benefited", a variety of responses were given:

"We have access to cataloging from sources other than LC now, thus reducing the amount of original cataloging done inhouse; access

to the data is much quicker via the terminal, as opposed to searching NUC;" it "saves clerical time, card typing, filing...;" provides "fast service, precise records, neat cards;" "better service, mainly;" "fast production of cards and more records available;" it is "helpful in assigning call numbers and subject headings to original cataloging, and has freed catalogers to work in public services part-time;" "the error rate has dropped drastically and turn-around time cut by two-thirds;" and "new books are ready for the user quicker."

One library mentioned cost by saying that it "is costly but have been able to increase output with no staff increases."

Not all of the respondents answered "yes" to the question, "Has the efficiency of your technical processing operations improved significantly since you began using an on-line system?" Eight did reply "yes," while two said "no." Those responding "no" gave no reasons for this response. Reasons for improvement include: "cataloged all backlog, neater catalog cards, and materials are cataloged and sent to the stacks earlier than before;" "The whole cataloging and acquisitions departments have been reorganized and efficiency has resulted, as shown in the number of volumes cataloged;" "work flow moves faster;" "Less backlog. Most titles are ready for shelf within several days of receipt. No need for additional staff. Most work done by non-professional staff;" "Books move through processing faster. Cards are received quicker, eliminating some filing of slips and several other steps are eliminated;" "By receiving card sets fully processed, the staff can handle more volumes and we can offer more services to the public since we no longer have to spend so much time doing routine tasks."

One respondent stated that "we are a new library, but from past experience, our operations simply do a more effective and higher quality job."

To the question about whether the respondents felt that on-line cataloging was more or less effective than previous operations, nine libraries said yes and one no. The respondent who said "no" felt that "more books were cataloged, but not as carefully done." Two of those who answered "yes" stated that the same reasons applied to this answer as had to the previous two answers, i.e. "more books were cataloged, but not as carefully done." The other four made these comments: "Better quality cards in shorter time;" "Higher quality cataloging in general;" "Faster, neater, easier to search than manual systems;" and "have access to material in the data base before it is available otherwise."

Asked whether there were staff changes when the changeover to on-line cataloging was made, five said no and five yes. Of those who answered "yes," one stated that they added one professional. The other four responded as follows: one stated that they need approximately one-third fewer positions; another uses one less student assistant; a third stated that before going to on-line cataloging, there was no one assigned to perform cataloging functions in the library (they now use two part-time professionals); the fourth responded that they catalog for three other campuses and on-line cataloging has permitted them to allow librarians and clerks on these campuses to be freed to do other things. The original staff of this library was able to absorb the work load brought about by centralized processing.

Each respondent was given an opportunity to make comments and one comment not already incorporated in this study deserves attention. This institution catalogs using a three-part process. The respondent states that, "We first search MARCFICHE for a citation. If found, we make a copy of the record, paste-up the copy, and send to General Microfilms in Boston for copy duplication on card stock. If we do not find the record on MARCFICHE, we search SOLINET and order cards if available. If not, we catalog from scratch. We also receive preprocessed materials on orders to Baker and Taylor. We find that this system keeps the costs of our cataloging and processing down compared to the projected cost of total reliance on SOLINET. We share a SOLINET terminal...Our quality from MARCFICHE produced cards is not as high as SOLINET, but that's the trade-off we make."

#### Libraries Using Manual Cataloging Procedures

There appear to be differences from state to state in the way cataloging is done. In deciding how to present the data, the investigator considered first taking the responses state by state, but this did not seem to convey adequately the varying responses to some of the questions. If taken as an entire region, unique differences could not be noted, so a compromise has been made. Responses to the questions which deal with staffing, classification and subject headings used, numbers of volumes cataloged, percent of original cataloging and what cataloging copy is used, sources for cataloging copy, and what tools are used for cataloging copy have been brought together on a state by state basis. The rest of the responses to the questions dealt with

will be brought together and discussed regionally at the end of this chapter.

To maintain continuity, the investigator will present each state in alphabetical order, beginning with Alabama.

### Alabama

Thirteen libraries out of seventeen, or 76.5 percent of those queried in the libraries in Alabama responded to the questionnaire. When asked what classification scheme was used, seven responded that they use DDC and six responded that they use LCC. Twelve libraries use LCSH, although two of these twelve indicated that they use Sears Subject Headings when doing original cataloging. One library indicated that it uses Sears only.

Not all of the libraries responded to the question about the number of catalog card sets ordered each year. Of the eight which did respond, the number varied from 100 to 2,500. Of those libraries reporting backlogs, there were from 40 to 3,000 books awaiting cataloging. Without talking individually with the librarians, there is no way to know whether these are normal situations or not. The 3,000 figure seems high, yet this same library orders about 2,500 card sets, so the figure is logically acceptable.

Twelve of the thirteen libraries indicated that they do some original cataloging. The amount of original cataloging done ranges from 5 percent to 95 percent. Two libraries purchase precataloged

books in the amount of 20 and 90 percent respectively. Table 5 shows these percentages, along with the amounts in the backlog, numbers of card sets ordered annually, and percentage of precataloged books ordered.

Table 5  
Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Alabama Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
A1	--	200	15	
A2	--	75	10	
A3	--	40	10	
A4	100	50	95	
A5	--	1500	20	
A6	--	200	10	
A7	2500	3000	5	
A8	200	200	40	
A9	800	200	20	20
A10	1500	400	10	
A11	720	80	20	
A12	--	100	5	
A13	800	--	--	90

The community college libraries in Alabama order most of their cards from LC. Six libraries indicated that they use LC cards in amounts of 45 to 100 percent. These six, plus four other libraries, indicate that of the cards they order from LC, they receive from 60 to 95 percent, or an average of 81.5 percent of those ordered. Only one

library ordered from Jostens and of the 55 percent ordered from this source, it receives about 70 percent of the cards ordered. Five libraries use B&T, ordering from 10 to 90 percent of their books from this jobber. The rate of return on B&T for the Alabama libraries is 77.5 percent. Two libraries indicated that they order cards from other sources. One library orders 15 percent of its cards from Midwest and receives a 75 percent return. The other library orders 35 percent of its cards from Bro-Dart, but did not indicate what percentage it receives from its orders. Table 6 shows these percentages in detail. It can be concluded that the rate of return on cards ordered from these sources is not high. While some libraries receive a high percentage of their requests, others receive considerably fewer than they request.

Table 6

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Alabama Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
A1	55	70	45	85	10	-		
A2			75	85	25	75		
A3			100	85				
A4			100	95				
A5			-	75	-	90		
A6			-	-				
A7			90	85	10	85		
A8			100	60				
A9					90	60		
A10			85	80			15	75*
A11			100	75				
A12			100	90				
A13			65	-			35	-**

\* Midwest

\*\* Bro-Dart

Florida

From Florida there were seventeen valid responses out of eighteen to Part II of the questionnaire. Five other libraries from Florida responded to Part I of the survey. This brings the total number of respondents from Florida to twenty-three, or 85 percent of those queried.

Of the respondents from Florida, only three were using DDC in their library, while the other fourteen use LCC. All of the respondents use LCSH.

Twelve of the libraries surveyed answered the question about the approximate number of card sets purchased annually. These amounts varied from 500 to 5,300. Sixteen of the libraries stated that they had backlogs. Only one library reported that it had no backlog. One of the libraries stated that it had a backlog of only twenty-five books, but another 250 books were awaiting cards which were on order. Those libraries which did have backlogs stated that their backlogs ranged from 25 to 1,000 items. The library which ordered the most catalog cards was the library without any backlog. Seven Florida libraries stated that they purchase from 2 to 85 percent of their books precataloged. The library ordering 85 percent of its books cataloged must receive a large number of books for which precataloging is not available, for it has a backlog of 1,000 books.

All but two of the libraries stated that they do some original cataloging. One library said that it does "little." Other libraries gave amounts from 2 percent to 100 percent. There appears to be no



relation between the amount of card sets ordered and the percentage of original cataloging done.

Table 7 shows the percentages of original cataloging done by the Florida libraries, along with the numbers of card sets ordered, the number of books in their backlogs, and the amounts of precataloged books ordered.

Table 7  
Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Florida Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
F1	2000	50	10	
F2	5300	40	20	60
F3	--	45	5	45
F4	2000+	100	10	40
F5	4000	100	30	
F6	--	300	30	
F7	--	--	--	
F8	1500	150	5	
F9	--	240	100	
F10	--	80	--	
F11	--	50	little	2
F12	700	1000	5	85
F13	2000	25-50	30	
F14	500	100	15	
F15*	4440	0	25	50
F16	1300	25	2	
F17	2200	25	12	33
F18	670	300	15	

\* To join SOLINET in late summer 1977.

Each of the libraries was asked where it obtained preprinted cards, and what percent it ordered from each jobber. The libraries

were also asked to indicate what percentage they receive of those ordered. Thirteen of the respondents indicated that they order cards from LC, ordering from 25 to 98 percent from them. The return from these orders varied also, as Table 8 demonstrates. The average rate of return from LC was 73 percent. One library indicated that it orders 25 percent of its cards from LC, but receives only 2 percent of those ordered.

Table 8

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Florida Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
F1			80	70	20	10		
F2			10	80	50	50		
F3								
F4			100	90				
F5	70	80	30	75				
F6			100	90				
F7								
F8			100					
F9								
F10								
F11			98	90			2	-
F12			100	75				
F13			100	70				
F14	75	75	25	90				
F15			1		99	90		
F16			100	98				
F17	75	82	25	2				
F18	25	66	50	50	25	-		

### Georgia

Georgia had six respondents out of a possible nine to Part II

of the questionnaire. Three libraries responded to Part I, and one other library indicated that it participates in centralized processing with another library and felt that any answers supplied would not be valid. The total response from Georgia was ten, giving a return of 77 percent.

The six Georgia respondents use the LCC and LCSH.

Three of the five libraries answered the question concerning number of card sets which they buy annually. One received 1,000 sets of cards, another 2,400 sets, the third 7,000 sets, and the fourth 5,000 sets. Backlogs in these libraries varied from 30 to 1,000.

The amount of original cataloging performed by the five respondents varied. Two libraries reported that they did 8 percent of original cataloging. Two more replied that they did about 10 percent; another 60 percent and the sixth one said 95 percent. Two libraries purchase precataloged books, but only one library stated that it receives 50 percent of its books precataloged. The number of card sets ordered, backlogs, percentage of original cataloging, and percentage of precataloged books ordered for each of the Georgia libraries which responded, is shown in Table 9.

The question about the percentage of catalog cards and the percentages received from various jobbers was answered as follows by the five Georgia libraries which responded to this question. One library orders from Jostens and states that it receives 90 percent of its orders. Five libraries use LC, ordering from 1 to 80 percent of their cards from this source. Their average rate of return is 89

Table 9

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Georgia Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
G1		125	95	
G2	2400	60	8	50
G3	7000	50	10	--
G4		30	8	
G5	1000	500	60	
G6	5000	1000	10	

percent. It appears that Georgia community college libraries are able to obtain a high percentage of cards ordered from LC. Although three libraries order from 10 to 56 percent of their cards from B&T, only two libraries responded with the percentage of return from this source. One library receives 50 percent of what it orders, the other library 67 percent. This averages out to 58.5 percent, a low percentage. Cards from other sources are purchased by two libraries, which order 5 and 80 percent, respectively from Bro-Dart and Midwest. Both libraries state that they receive 100 percent return on these orders. These responses are shown in Table 10, on the following page.

### Kentucky

There were eleven respondents out of fourteen, or a 78.6 percent return, from Kentucky. It should be noted here that most of the

Table 10

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Georgia Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
G1			100	90				
G2			44	85	56	67		
G3			20	80			80	100
G4								
G5	25	90	1	100	10	50		
G6			80	90	15		5	100

community colleges in Kentucky, save one, are part of the University of Kentucky Community College System. Nine of these respondents are "members" of the system and one respondent was a technical institute. The eleventh respondent is a member of SOLINET and the results from this respondent have already been described in the previous chapter.

Of the seven Kentucky libraries responding to the question about the numbers of card sets ordered, the amounts they order range from 650 to 1,500 sets annually. The libraries stated that they had backlogs of from 10 to 1,400 books. The amounts of original cataloging done vary from 2 to 100 percent. One library indicated that it did "little" cataloging. This same library, as noted later, obtains its cards from three sources and states that each source supplies 90 percent of what is requested. Although they have a backlog of 1,400 books, it is not clear if they are waiting for catalog cards, or original

cataloging. Three of the respondents order precataloged books. Two of these three stated that they order 33 percent and 75 percent, respectively. Table 11 shows how each of the Kentucky Libraries responded to these questions.

Table 11

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Kentucky Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
K1	951	365	30	
K2	800	200	2	
K3	1300	100	62	
K4		40	25	75
K5	650	425	20	
K6	1500	1400	little	
K7	1500	100	10	
K8		10	5	
K9		250	100	
K10	500	150	50	33

Five of the Kentucky libraries which responded to the questions about the classification scheme used stated that they use DDC. The other five use LCC. All ten of the libraries use LCSH.

Each of the Kentucky libraries was asked from whom it orders catalog cards, what percentages it orders from each source, and the percentage of returns. Six libraries use LC cards, ordering from 10

to 100 percent of their cards from this source. Their average return from LC was 69 percent. Two libraries order 90 percent and 40 percent respectively, of their cards from Jostens. They report that the return on these requests are 95 and 90 percent, respectively. Four libraries use B&T for cards, averaging a 77 percent return. One library uses Bro-Dart and reports a 75 percent return. Another library uses Blackwell North America and receives 90 percent of the cards it requests. Table 12 shows how each of the libraries responded to this question.

Table 12

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Kentucky Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
K1			10		50			
K2	90	95	10	50				
K3			100	35				
K4						75		
K5			100	90				
K6	40	90	40	90			20	90
K7					90	66		
K8			10	80	90	90		
K9*								
K10					35	75		

\* Does 100 percent original cataloging.

## Louisiana

Louisiana has the fewest number of public community colleges in the southeastern region. Of the six libraries surveyed, four responded, a 66.6 percent response from Louisiana.

Two of the four Louisiana libraries which responded to the survey indicated that they use DDC. The other two libraries use LCC. All four of the libraries use LCSH.

Only one of the Louisiana libraries queried responded to the question asking about the number of card sets purchased annually. The one respondent purchases 6,000 sets of cards.

All four libraries in Louisiana responded to the question about the amount of original cataloging that they do. The amounts varied from a low of 10 to a high of 75 percent, with two libraries doing 12 and 20 percent. It might be noted here that the two libraries doing 20 percent and 75 percent original cataloging are the only two which buy preprocessed books. These same two libraries order cards only from LC, but both state the rate of return is only 50 percent (see Table 14), so it is probable that the percentage of original cataloging they do appears high (especially LL) because they receive so few of the cards they order from LC.

Backlogs in the responding Louisiana libraries ranged from zero to 2,000. Table 13 shows how each library responded to the number of card sets ordered, the percentage of original cataloging done, the backlog and the percentage of precataloged books ordered.



Table 13

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Louisiana Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
L1	--	175	75	25
L2	--	2000	10	
L3	--	800	20	--
L4	6000	0	12	

The responses from the Louisiana community college libraries regarding their sources for catalog cards were as follows. Two of the three libraries using LC stated that they purchase 10 percent of their cards from LC, but receive only 50 percent of what they order. Another library did not indicate what percentage it normally orders from LC, but said that it receives about 90 percent of its requests. This means that the responding libraries receive 63 percent of their cards requested from LC. B&T is used by two libraries, only one of which indicated the amount, 15 percent, which it usually orders from B&T. This library indicated that it receives 100 percent of what it orders. Another library, although not giving the percentage of cards ordered, stated that it receives about 95 percent of its requests. This gives a rate of return of 97.5 percent for B&T. One library uses Midwest for 60 percent of its card orders and said that it receives 80 percent of those ordered. In Table 14 it can be seen how

each library responded to this part of the questionnaire. It appears that the Louisiana libraries have a better return from B&T than do some of the other community college libraries in the Southeast, but a worse return from LC than others.

Table 14

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Louisiana Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
L1			10	50	15	100		
L2			100	90				
L3			10	50			60	80
L4			100			95		

### Mississippi

From Mississippi there was a 66.6 percent response, as twelve of the eighteen libraries surveyed responded to the questionnaire.

The numbers of card sets ordered by the responding Mississippi libraries varied from 450 to 2,900 in the eight libraries which answered this question. All but one of the libraries responded to the question asking them to indicate approximately how many books were in the backlog. Of the respondents, one library stated that it had no backlog at all. The other amounts varied from 20 to 353. The author estimated that the backlog in the library in which she is employed was about 150 at the end of the 1976-1977 school year in

mid-May. Since the cataloger is on a thirty-eight week contract, there is no one to catalog from mid-May until late August, when the new school term begins. By the time the cataloger returns to her position, the backlog will have grown to 3,000 or more volumes.

When asked about the amount of original cataloging done, one Mississippi library indicated that it does 100 percent of its own cataloging. The other eleven libraries averaged 12.54 percent original cataloging. Two libraries purchase precataloged books, however only one library gave the amount (95 percent) that it receives. This same library does only 5 percent original cataloging, and has a backlog of only twenty books. It would appear that for this library, buying precataloged books is most effective. Table 15 shows how each library responded to this question, as well as to the questions regarding the number of card sets ordered, and the backlogs they had.

Table 15

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Mississippi Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
M1	2900	150	12	
M2	1000	200	10	
M3	1000	35	20	
M4		100	8	
M5			100	
M6	450	50	10	
M7	1000	200	3	
M8	2000	60	20	
M9		20	5	95
M10	1500	353	10	
M11		0	20	
M12	2300	150	20	

Most of the responding Mississippi libraries use LC for obtaining cards. These libraries order from 5 to 100 percent of the cards they purchase from LC. The amount of return fluctuates from 45 to 95 percent and averages 85.25 percent. Currently only one library uses Jostens and reports that it orders 90 percent of its cards from this source, receiving about 95 percent of what it orders. Four libraries use B&T, ordering from 60 to 90 percent of their cards from this jobber. Three of these libraries report that they receive from 75 to 92 percent of what they order from B&T for an average of 84 percent. One library stated that it used to order 70 percent of its cards from Victor Hotho, but stated that it no longer uses this source because they were not satisfied with the service. One library orders no cards as it does all original cataloging. Table 16 shows how the Mississippi respondents answered the questions about the percentages of cards ordered and received from various sources.

The Mississippi libraries obtain a better rate of return on cards ordered from all of their sources than have any of the states discussed so far in this study.

All of the libraries in the responding Mississippi libraries use DDC. Sears is used in two libraries and three libraries indicated that they use Sears when they do original cataloging, but accept LCSH for any catalog cards purchased. The library in which the author is employed changed from Sears to LCSH two years ago, because they were receiving 97 percent of the catalog cards with LCSH.

Table 16

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Mississippi Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
M1	90	95	10	45				
M2			100	90				
M3			25	90	75	85		
M4			95	--			70	
M5**								
M6			20	95	80	92		
M7			100	97				
M8			40	95	60	75		
M9		85*	5		90			
M10			100	90				
M11								
M12			100	80				

\*Not now using Jostens, but when they did, got this return.

\*\*This library does 100 percent original cataloging.

### North Carolina

Although there was a 74 percent response from North Carolina (twenty of the twenty-seven libraries answered the questionnaire), there were only two respondents who stated that they did their own cataloging. Seventeen belong to the statewide technical processing center, located in Raleigh. The services of the processing center are available to all fifty-seven of the institutions in the community college and technical institutes system. The twentieth respondent is a member of SOLINET and its responses were analyzed in chapter 2.

The author is grateful to the North Carolina community colleges which did respond and answer the questionnaire, even though it was designed without central processing in mind.

There were two libraries which did not respond to the question about the classification scheme used. Thirteen of the libraries use DDC, and LCC is used in four others. All of the seventeen respondents use LCSH, however two libraries indicated that they also use Sears. It was not noted whether these libraries use Sears only for original cataloging.

Because most of the North Carolina libraries make use of the central processing center, only two libraries were able to supply the number of cards which they ordered for items cataloged locally. Backlogs, too, were minimal and were materials which were ordered directly from the publisher. However, in comparison with the other states, the amount of original cataloging done was about the same. One library indicated that this cataloging was due to direct orders, gifts, and some "audiovisual software" which were cataloged locally.

Since the North Carolina community college libraries may use the processing center in Raleigh, several respondents stated that they do not have technical processing departments in their libraries, and therefore employ no personnel in this capacity. One librarian stated that "half of my time and half of the non-professional's time is spent on other duties."

The two libraries which do not participate in statewide central processing order cards from LC, but neither supplied the percentage they order. One library stated that it receives about 90 percent of

the cards ordered from LC.

One librarian stated the following about the central processing center in Raleigh: "They are understaffed, underpaid and work in cramped quarters. Yet, they try to meet the individual desires of each library in the degree of processing done there and in cataloging procedures and classification. Besides the cataloging, all book orders are processed through them. From them, we get new books with card sets for each book..."

Another librarian stated that all they have to do in their library is to "accession, paste in pockets, sensitize for the security system and stamp with identification. This is handled by our para-professional. She processes CIPed books. The small amount of original cataloging is done by the assistant librarian."

Having a central processing center has other advantages as well, in that it supplies extra cards so that additional tracings may be added. The center also will duplicate any original typed catalog cards sent to it from the community college libraries. Some libraries indicated that they take advantage of this service for all cataloging done for "audiovisual software." One librarian stated that since there is centralized processing, they now have more time to work with patrons.

There appear to be some problems with centralized processing, however. One librarian stated that, "I believe that centralized processing is a good idea in theory but it simply does not work well in practicality. Every library is different, every school is different, and certainly every librarian is different." The North Carolina

processing center has only one professional in charge and often the cataloging tasks fall to non-professionals. Respondents indicate that there is a high frequency of errors in the cards coming from the center. Another problem is that the center has NUC sets only as far back as 1942, and many books carry earlier copyright and publication dates. In these cases, the center cannot, or does not, process the books and the individual libraries have to do original cataloging.

### South Carolina

North Carolina was not the only state surveyed which has a centralized processing center available to its community colleges. South Carolina offers those community colleges which are part of the University of South Carolina this service through a regional campus processing center at the main campus in Columbia. Since the university is a SOLINET member, it offers on-line cataloging to its regional campuses as well. However, since most of the community colleges in South Carolina do not belong to any type of central processing center, South Carolina is described in the same manner as all of the other states.

There were ten respondents from the community college libraries surveyed in South Carolina, for a return of 62 percent. One library stated that since it was part of the regional campus processing center, it did not feel that any of its answers would be valid. One other library, although it does have access to SOLINET, did respond to most of the questions and was included in this part of the questionnaire.



Each of the libraries from South Carolina which responded to the survey uses LCC and LCSH.

The libraries were then asked approximately how many sets of cards they order each year. The South Carolina respondents stated that they order from 120 to 6,000 sets from jobbers. In response to the question about the amount of original cataloging done, the answers ranged from 0 to 90 percent. To the question about their backlog, the libraries responded that this ranged from 48 to 250. Six libraries stated that they order an average of 70 percent of their books precataloged. The manner in which each library responded to these questions is shown in Table 17. The South Carolina libraries do more original cataloging, on the average, than do the respondents from the other states, despite the fact that a greater percentage of their libraries buy precataloged books. It should be noted, however, that the libraries doing the most original cataloging bought no precataloged books.

Table 17

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in South Carolina Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
S1	1600	230	30	
S2	--	250	15	65
S3	--	100	20	50
S4	6000			90
S5	1000	100	15	85
S6	1200	250	33	
S7	120	150	90	
S8	1500	48	2	90
S9*	4090	--	0	40

\* This library has access to SOLINET

Each of the nine responding South Carolina community college libraries orders some cards from commercial sources. Seven libraries order cards from LC, with a rate of return of 60 to 95 percent, or an average of 76 percent.

Five of the seven libraries which purchase cards from B&T report the percentage of return to be from 10 to 85 percent, giving B&T an average return of 60 percent.

Two libraries use Jostens, and receive an average 57.5 percent return on requests. This rate of return and that from B&T is low in contrast to other returns.

The other jobbers used were Blackwell North America and Bro-Dart. These jobbers were able to supply 89.5 percent of the card sets requested.

To see how each library responded to this question, see Table 18.

Table 18

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by South Carolina Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
S1			100	80				
S2			25	60	65			
S3	5	65	50	80	45	65		
S4								75*
S5			25	80	50	85	35	95**
S6	68	50	10	80	20	60	2	
S7			5	60				
S8			5	95	2	80	90	98**
S9					10	10	90	90***

\*Blackwell

\*\* Bro-Dart

\*\*\* Includes several jobbers

Tennessee

There were eight respondents out of eleven from Tennessee, giving a rate of return of 72.7 percent. All eight of the respondents answered the question about the number of card sets ordered. These amounts vary from 800 to 4,000 sets. One library reported that it had no backlog, but others had from 20 to 450 books waiting to be cataloged. One library indicated that the 200 books in its backlog were all awaiting LC cards. Another library stated that besides the 200 books in its backlog, there were 3,000 titles which had not been "converted." (By this, the author assumes that "converted" means the holdings are being changed from DDC to LCC). On the average, the responding Tennessee libraries do less than 7 percent original cataloging.

Four libraries order from 20 to 80 percent of their books preprocessed. The two libraries having the largest backlogs order the largest percentage of precataloged books. The numbers of card sets ordered, backlog, percentage of original cataloging done, and percentage of precataloged books ordered by the Tennessee community colleges which responded to the survey are shown in Table 19, on the following page.

Asked where they obtain cards, two of the Tennessee community college libraries stated that they order 65 and 95 percent, respectively, from Jostens. These two libraries receive 75 and 95 percent return, or an average of 85 percent. Although seven libraries order cards from LC, only four of them gave the percentage they order from LC. These amounts ranged from 40 to 90 percent of the cards ordered. The

Table 19

Selected Statistics and Amount of Backlog  
in Tennessee Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
T1	800	200*	5	
T2	4000	400	20	75
T3	1300	20	10	
T4	850	200**	10	20
T5	2000	450	2	80
T6	2500	50	1	
T7	2700	0	1	
T8	1500	75	5	30

\*another 3000 due to "conversion."

\*\*awaiting LC cards

percentage of return was supplied by seven libraries, in amounts from 45 to 98 percent, for an average of 78 percent. B&T is used by three libraries, supplying them with 5 to 55 percent of the cards they order. The rate of return from B&T is 82 percent. Four libraries indicated that they order from 5 to 50 percent of their cards from either Bro-Dart, McGraw-Hill or Midwest, with an average rate of return of 67 percent. Table 20 shows how each library in Tennessee responded to this part of the questionnaire.

Table 20  
Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Tennessee Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
T1	95	90			5	100		
T2	65	75	75	75			50	50
T3			100	90				
T4			90	75			10	
T5			40	75	55	75	5	100
T6			100	98				
T7			50	45			50	50
T8				90		70		

### Virginia

When asked how many card sets they purchase annually, the Virginia libraries which responded to the question gave amounts from 20 to 8,000.

All but one library responded to the question about the amount of original cataloging performed by each library. The range was from 5 percent to 100 percent.

In response to the question about backlogs, the amounts in each library varied. One library reported that it never has a backlog because it has a system which allows books to be circulated before they are cataloged. Backlogs from the other libraries vary from 40 to 1,200 books. One library having a backlog of 70 books indicated that

the books have been temporarily cataloged, so, technically, a backlog does not exist. Another library was given the holdings of a former professor and the 700 volumes in its backlog reflect these gifts. Of the three libraries which purchased precataloged books, one did not indicate how much it purchased. The other two libraries stated that they purchased 60 and 50 percent, respectively.

Table 21 shows how the community college library respondents in Virginia answered these questions about card sets ordered, backlogs, amount of original cataloging they do, and percentage of precataloged books purchased.

Table 21

Selected Statistics and Amounts of Backlog  
in Virginia Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
V1	550	60	50	
V2	6800*	200	4	
V3	8000	600	5	
V4	2892	--	20	
V5	1000	300	8	
V6	--	75	100	
V7	1000	70**	10	
V8	100	700***	40	60
V9	1550	50	5	
V10	20	50	--	
V11	2000	1200	35	
V12	1700	400	10	
V13	--	0 <sup>+</sup>	10	
V14	1500	40	18	50
V15	2500	50	10	

\* Ordered 6800, received 5200

\*\* These have been temporarily cataloged

\*\*\* Gifts, a professor's library added this year

+ Books are circulated before cataloging

Like most of the community college libraries in other states, those libraries which responded from Virginia order the bulk of their cards from LC. Only five of the libraries indicated what percentage of cards they order from LC, since they also order from other sources. These amounts vary from a low of 10 percent to a high of 98 percent. Eleven libraries responded to the question about the percentage of return from LC. One library said that it receives only 5 percent of the cards ordered, whereas four libraries stated that they receive as high as 90 percent of their orders. The average percentage received by the responding Virginia libraries is 77 percent.

Five libraries order cards from Jostens, although only three of the libraries gave the percentage of cards ordered. Returns from orders to Jostens vary from 10 to 94 percent, with an average return of 70 percent.

Two libraries order cards from B&T. One library orders only 2 percent of its cards from B&T, while another library uses B&T for 75 percent of its card orders. The library ordering 75 percent of its cards from B&T indicated that it receives an 80 percent return. The other library did not supply this information. One Virginia community college library orders 30 percent of its cards from Blackwell, receiving about 83 percent of what it orders. The results of this part of the survey are to be found in Table 22, on the following page.

Table 22

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by Virginia Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
V1			100	80				
V2		76						
V3	25	10	75	5				
V4			98	80	2			
V5			100	90				
V6*								
V7			100	90				
V8		85						
V9			100	90				
V10								
V11			100	75				
V12			15	80	75	80		
V13	90	94	10	80				
V14	40	83	30	83			30	83
V15			100	90				

\*does 100 percent original cataloging

### West Virginia

West Virginia has only seven community colleges in operation at this time and responses were received from four of their libraries.

The libraries were asked how many card sets they order annually. Two libraries responded to this question stating that they order 1,200 and 1,500 sets, respectively. The amount of original cataloging done in the libraries ranged from 9 to 40 percent. When asked about



backlogs, the West Virginia community college libraries responding to the survey stated that they have backlogs of 40 to 800. Only one library orders precataloged books and these constitute 30 percent of its orders. Table 23 shows this information.

Table 23

Selected Statistics and Amounts of Backlog  
in West Virginia Community College Libraries

Library	Card sets ordered	Backlog	Percentage of original cataloging	Percentage of precataloged books
W1	--	40	40	30
W2	1500	150	12	
W3	--	800	40	
W4	1200	40	9	

All of the West Virginia libraries use LC and LCSH.

The question about who supplies cards was answered by all of the libraries which responded to the questionnaire. Two of the libraries order from Jostens; one ordering 5 percent of its cards and receiving a 100 percent return, the other ordering 10 percent but listing no percentage of return. All of the libraries order some cards from LC. The amounts ordered from LC vary from 25 to 90 percent. However, one library reported that it receives only 20 percent of its orders from LC, and another library reported that its rate of return is 80 percent. This means that the average rate of return on catalog cards from LC is only 57 percent, according to the West Virginia respondents, the lowest percentage of return of all libraries in the Southeast.

B&T supplies two libraries with cards. One receives 5 percent of its cards from B&T and another library receives 33 percent from B&T. The library ordering 5 percent of its cards from B&T stated that it receives about 50 percent of the cards requested.

Two of the West Virginia libraries also use Bro-Dart for cards, receiving 10 and 32 percent, respectively, from this jobber. Midwest supplies one other library with 40 percent of its cards. This library states that it gets about 40 percent of what it orders from Midwest. To see how each library responded to the question about card suppliers, see Table 24.

Table 24

Percentages of Catalog Cards Ordered (O) and Received (R)  
by West Virginia Community College Libraries

Library	Jostens		LC		B&T		Other	
	O	R	O	R	O	R	O	R
W1			40	20			40	40
W2	10	*	25	*	33	*	32	*
W3			90	80			5	
W4	5	100	80	70	5	50	10	

\*all together about 80 percent.

### General Results

The rest of the chapter will be devoted to those parts of the study which were not treated on a state by state basis.

Staffing is a real problem in some of the community college technical processing departments in the Southeast. Of the respondents, only two states, Louisiana and Tennessee indicated that they have at least one full-time librarian in their technical processing department. Florida, which reported nineteen full-time librarians, has as many as three librarians in two of its libraries, whereas two libraries have no librarian at all in charge of the technical processing department. Some respondents from Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi and South Carolina stated that although they do not have a full-time librarian who is primarily in charge of the technical processing department, they do make use of all of the librarians and each one has an opportunity to catalog.

The use of technicians varies greatly. Kentucky reports that there are no technicians in the community college technical processing departments which responded to the survey. Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia each reported the use of technicians in at least half of their technical processing departments.

The community college libraries which responded to the questionnaire in all the states except South Carolina reported that they use some full-time clerical workers in their technical processing departments. South Carolina respondents stated that there were no full-time

clerical workers and only two part-time clerical workers in two of the ten technical processing departments of the responding libraries. It is evident that technicians serve as clerical workers in these libraries. There is at least one technician or clerical worker in each of the responding South Carolina libraries.

All of the respondents except West Virginia use student help. The amount of student help varies from state to state and library to library. A total of fifty-three of the respondents make use of student workers. In eighteen libraries, there are no clerical workers, but there is student help. It is probable that the students do some of the clerical work, such as typing and filing. The author reports that this is the situation in her library. There is a part-time clerk, who checks in the magazines, books, and all audiovisual materials. The student worker types catalog cards, files cards, and prepares new books for circulation. There is enough work to warrant a full-time clerk, but no money at this time to pay the additional salary.

Each of the libraries was asked to indicate whether it uses NUC, CBI, BPR and/or CIP. Of those who responded to this question, eighty-four, or 70 percent, use NUC; forty-six, or 39 percent, use CBI; sixty-nine, or 58 percent, use BPR; and eighty-five, or 71 percent, use CIP. It appears that most of the libraries make wide use of NUC and CIP. The percentage of those using CBI is low, however, for more than half of the respondents using NUC do not use CBI. Several of those who do use CBI do not subscribe to NUC.

Each of the libraries was asked whether it uses CIP and if it had found CIP helpful. Eighty-three of the libraries stated that

they found CIP to be helpful, but three libraries said that they had not found CIP to be helpful. The ones not finding CIP useful said it was because the information was incomplete and frequently inaccurate. One library replied that CIP is "not widely used, so can't depend on a book having it." It might be noted here that as of June 17, 1977, LC had 100,000 books containing CIP, with 1,250 publishers participating.<sup>1</sup> Those who found CIP to be helpful stated some of the reasons as follows: "Saves time; usually accurate; can shelve books without waiting for catalog cards; saves ordering cards and we can use the offset, which is cheaper." One librarian said this about CIP, "I cannot express high enough praise for CIP. CIP is a very large reason for our very small backlog (20 books), and its advent has been a catalyst for providing ready access for our students."

Asked whether they use the LC number or ISBN (International Standard Book Number) to order cards, only thirteen respondents indicated that they use the ISBN. The rest of the responding libraries stated that they order only by LC number. Of those ordering by ISBN, all but one library order some of their cards from Jostens. Jostens permits libraries to order either by LC number or ISBN. The rate of return when ordering by ISBN is not good since it is only 39 percent. It appears from the responses that until cataloging information is in the MARC data base, that those librarians who order by ISBN may continue to expect a low rate of return.

---

<sup>1</sup>"CIP Makes It 100,000," Library of Congress Information Bulletin 36 (17 June 1977):415.

The libraries were asked if they returned catalog cards when sent the wrong ones. Seventy-six stated that they returned cards for credit if they were not the correct ones and if the error was not on the part of the requestor. Nine libraries said that they did not return incorrect cards because it was "not worth the cost or time." One library stated that it returned errors only if the errors amounted to at least \$1.00 (this would mean a minimum of three sets @ 35¢ per set). Another library replied that in the past three or four years it has not received any incorrect cards. Generally, the libraries do return incorrect cards for credit. It would appear that the decision to return cards for credit would lie in how many errors there were, and the postal costs involved in their return.

When asked if they would pay for a search when they could not supply an LC number or the ISBN, forty-three libraries responding to the questionnaire said yes and forty said no. One of the libraries which said "yes" stated that it only submits requests for searches after it has exhausted the cataloging tools it has. Another library said it requests searches, "but without much success." The libraries which replied "no" stated reasons for not paying for a search, such as, "we do not pay for a search because of the time involved in receipt of orders and it is too expensive;" it "takes too long if LC does it; we search NUC and MARCFICHE." Although the library in which the author is employed does not have NUC, it has been found that it is too expensive to pay for a search and it takes too long to achieve results. In most cases, if the cataloging information is not in

CBI, BPR, or CIP, the staff does original cataloging.

The libraries were asked to indicate whether they purchase cards with or without subject headings, and/or with or without call numbers printed on them. Of the libraries responding to this question, thirty-three, or 41 percent of the libraries state that they request cards with the call number and the subject headings imprinted on them, when they can be obtained. Forty-one of the libraries, or 51 percent, indicated that they prefer to order cards without subject headings or call numbers printed on them. Six, or 8 percent, of the libraries stated that they order cards either without the call number, but with the subject headings, or vice versa. Reasons given for ordering cards without call numbers or subject headings vary. The primary reason given was that the library adapts the subject headings to its local needs. For some libraries, the subject headings supplied are not compatible with those they use. For others, the DDC number is too long. Still others use the Cutter tables, and some card suppliers do not. Two libraries stated that they have a divided card catalog and all of their subject headings are typed in red.

Several libraries stated that they had no real reasons for ordering cards without call numbers and/or subject headings. To order or not to order cards with or without subject headings and/or call numbers appears to be based on the needs of each community college library.

A comparison was made between those libraries using DDC and

those using LCC to see if there was a tendency for the ones using LC to accept preprinted cards with the call numbers and subject headings already imprinted on them. There were fifty-eight libraries, or 68 percent, using LCC. Of these fifty-eight, thirty-nine, or 67 percent, accept preprinted cards with subject headings and call numbers. Seventeen, or 29 percent, did not accept cards with subject headings and call numbers imprinted on them. One library accepted the call number but not the subject headings, because they made adaptations. In the libraries using DDC, six, or 22 percent, of the twenty-seven libraries accepted preprinted cards with call number and subject headings. Fifteen, or 56 percent, did not accept cards with subject headings or call number. Three, or 11 percent, accepted cards with the subject headings but without the call numbers. Two libraries request cards without the call number and one library requests cards with call number only. Table 25, on the following page, shows these comparisons.

From these data, it can be concluded that libraries using LCC are more willing to accept preprinted cards than the libraries which use DDC.

The libraries were compared by size and how they requested catalog cards. Those colleges having fewer than 2,000 students were considered small; those having between 2,000 and 5,000 students, medium-sized; and those having more than 5,000 students, large. In the small libraries only thirteen of the respondents would accept cards with the call numbers and subject headings imprinted upon them.



Table 25

Percentages of Libraries Using Cards Preprinted  
With Subject Headings and Call Numbers

Classification	Accept Subject headings and call numbers	Do not accept subject headings and call numbers	Accept subject headings but not call numbers
DDC	22	56	11
LCC	67	29	*

Classification	Accept without call number	Accept with call number	Accept without subject headings
DDC		*	
LCC	**		*

\* Indicates one library

\*\* Indicates two libraries

Twenty-eight of these small libraries requested cards with no call numbers or subject headings. In the medium-sized libraries, eleven libraries asked for cards without call numbers and subject headings, while twelve libraries wanted their cards with call numbers and subject headings. Seven of the eight large libraries accept cards with subject headings and call numbers. The eighth library prefers to assign the subject headings to adapt to special needs of the library. It does appear that two out of three of the small libraries prefer not to accept catalog cards with the subject headings and call numbers on them.

To see whether there was a correlation between the size of community college and the percentage of precataloged books ordered by non-SOLINET members, the small, medium-sized and large community colleges were compared. Of the ninety-one colleges whose enrollments

could be determined, fifty-four, or 59 percent of the colleges enroll fewer than 2,000 students; twenty-nine, or 32 percent enroll between 2,000 and 5,000 students; eight, or 9 percent, enroll over 5,000 students. In the small colleges, 30 percent of the libraries order preprocessed books; the medium-sized colleges order 28 percent preprocessed books and in large colleges, preprocessed books are ordered by 75 percent of the libraries.

To see if there were problems in cataloging copy due to the size of a library, the author checked to see if there were especially large backlogs in the libraries ordering catalog cards from one jobber; if these libraries did 50 percent or more original cataloging; and if these same libraries used NUC or MARCFICHE. The results were that twenty libraries in small colleges order cards only from LC. Three other small libraries order from either B&T or another jobber. While nine libraries in medium-sized community colleges order cards exclusively from LC, two more medium-sized libraries order only from B&T. None of the large libraries orders cards solely from LC. Only one of these large libraries orders from one source, that being Jostens. All but five of the libraries, which order cards from only one source subscribe to NUC. Two small libraries use MARCFICHE and one large library uses it. Two small and two medium-size libraries do 100 percent original cataloging. Of the libraries ordering only from one source, three do original cataloging for 50 to 95 percent of their books. There appears to be no correlation between amounts of backlogs in libraries ordering cards from only one source and those ordering from two or more sources. Only two libraries ordering exclusively

from LC reported large backlogs in amounts of 1,200 and 2,000. The rest of the backlogs were in amounts from zero to about 400. The largest backlog in those five libraries not having access to NUC or MARCFICHE was 353. It would seem that for some libraries NUC and MARCFICHE are able to provide the cataloging copy needed when LC does not supply the cards.

When asked what they especially liked about the cards they received from various card suppliers, the libraries using Jostens stated that they like the service and the cost, which is "reasonable." Comments such as, "can receive the cards in alphabetical order by author or title, if you wish; can use an order slip to obtain cards; and packets allow for speedy processing," were made by the respondents.

Those libraries using LC said that the format was the main feature they liked best. However, one librarian stated that the "cluttered computer format" is not acceptable. Other favorable comments include that cards are available for most books, the work is authoritative, the data are accurate, LC will search for cards even if there is no LC number or ISBN, and some felt they receive a good response to requests with a higher percentage of return than they have had from other card suppliers.

The libraries using B&T like the print and the low cost, and especially the fact that the cards come with the books. One library said it receives 90 percent of what it orders and those which B&T cannot supply are cancelled within a reasonable amount of time. Since the cards come with the books, no additional typing is needed, which appeals to several of the respondents.

Libraries using Midwest stated that they like the readable type, the fact that the cards come with the books, and are alphabetized. One library commented that Midwest is "efficient and economical."

Another card supplier is Bro-Dart. The respondents said that their service was "excellent" and that their "cataloging copy makes the books instantly ready for the patron."

Blackwell North America also supplies cards and the respondents stated that they liked Blackwell because of their efficiency, speed, clarity of cards and the fact that they supply cards for books published before 1968. One library said that it liked the "arrangement of the invoices" from Blackwell.

Unfortunately there are almost as many complaints, or dislikes, about preprinted cards as there are likes. Taking the "dislikes" in the same order as the "likes," Jostens is disliked mostly because of the format. Eight librarians stated that the card stock is "cheap" and the print "poor." The format is "sloppy" and "hard to read," because the print is done by a computer printer. The cards are often "incorrect" or have "omitted data." The service from Jostens is "poor" according to one of the respondents. One librarian said the rate of return was 35 percent; another said 50 percent. One respondent said "they only have MARC," and they don't carry cards for government publications.

The primary complaint about LC cards is that LC is "SLOW." In fact, fifty-one, or 67 percent of the seventy-six libraries using LC cards made this complaint. Other problems with LC are that the 90-day

waiting period is frequently not adhered to, that requests have been held a year or more. One library reported that slips sent to LC in 1973 were finally returned to the library in the spring of 1977, without the cards. LC loses orders and sends the wrong cards. Sometimes one library receives cards destined for another library. Failure to have the cards LC claims to have is another problem, as well as the fact that there are no cards available for many audiovisual software items.

Those community college libraries using B&T had several complaints: the card stock is of poor quality; the type is hard to read and smears; the cards requested for a specific edition are not always the ones supplied; slips are not returned with the books; the subject headings are not always accurate and complete; and there are too many books without cards (a complaint from a library ordering preprocessed books from B&T).

The complaints about Midwest and Blackwell North America were similar. The card recipients do not like the format because it is "not as good as LC," and it has an "unattractive computer print."

Bro-Dart's cards tend to smear, according to the respondents, who also stated that any cards "not from MARC have to be checked and verified" because sometimes the data are "incorrect or omitted." Two libraries reported that they do not like the appearance of the cards.

More than half of the responding libraries, or 51 percent, said that when they have to do original cataloging, they type the cards. Some of these libraries make masters and then Xerox them or use card

duplicators. Two libraries stated that they microfilm a typed master, then send the microfilm off to be developed and have cards made. The offset is used by three of the respondents. One library subscribes to LC proof slips, which are stencil copied and then cards are made. The MT/ST (Magnetic tape selectric typewriter, or one similar in nature) is used by ten of the respondents. This is the same kind of typewriter used by the staff in the library where the author is employed. A student operates the MT/ST, following processing slips made by the catalog librarian.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

#### Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine the status of certain cataloging procedures in the community college libraries of the Southeast. Results show that technical processing is performed in a variety of ways, although the libraries in North Carolina, which have access to a central processing center, are one exception. Even within a given state, the methods of technical processing are diverse.

The data have shown that only 7.2 percent of the libraries surveyed are members of SOLINET. These libraries participate in on-line cataloging and catalog from 1,500 to 20,000 volumes annually. Some of these libraries have full-time librarians in their technical processing departments, but at least two do not. While each of the technical processing departments has either a technician or clerical worker, two libraries do not have this help on a full-time basis. Only three-fifths of the SOLINET respondents use student help.

The majority of the SOLINET respondents input some original cataloging, averaging about eleven records input per month. The SOLINET respondents perform from 45 to 2,000 searches a month.

The majority of those who responded to the survey are willing to accept the OCLC or MARC cataloging with few, if any, changes.

Except for preorder verification and original input, all of the SOLINET respondents use the terminals for searching and card production

from MARC and/or OCLC records. About half of the respondents use the terminal for preorder verification.

The majority of the community colleges which are SOLINET members, and who responded to the survey, said that they find on-line cataloging to be more efficient than their previous method of cataloging. They reported that on-line cataloging speeds up processing considerably, reduces backlogs, and as a result, the patrons receive materials more quickly.

Half of the SOLINET libraries found that they needed fewer people in technical processing, as a result staff members were relocated elsewhere in the library. No one lost his/her job as a result of on-line cataloging, and one library found it necessary to add another staff member to the technical processing department

For those libraries which currently are part of SOLINET, the way in which cataloging is done is well established and each library has adapted to the requirements for on-line cataloging.

In the community college libraries which do manual cataloging, it appears that several of the technical processing departments are understaffed. There are some libraries which do not have a full-time librarian in charge of the technical processing department. They either handle the processing with a part-time librarian, or else all of the librarians take turns cataloging. Other libraries may have a librarian in charge of technical processing, but they do not have enough supportive staff to process the materials. Several of the libraries shift staff members around in an attempt to make more efficient use of the personnel which they do have, and to acquaint



them with other library functions.

Those libraries purchasing some or all of their cards find that they frequently do not get what they ask for when ordering cards. One time a library might receive nearly all of the cards which were ordered, yet another time the amount received may well be less than half of those ordered. The cards may arrive with mistakes in cataloging, even those from the Library of Congress. The quality of card stock and print varies from jobber to jobber. The print on some of the cards is difficult to read. The turn-around time from the Library of Congress is extremely slow, causing lengthy delays in getting books processed and out on the shelves. Sometimes, cards never arrive, or, one library may receive cards intended for another library.

The majority of the libraries have backlogs, some in amounts exceeding 1,000. Other libraries appear to have small backlogs, although they may have no more or less technical processing staff than the libraries having large backlogs.

A few of the libraries do all of their own cataloging, using a variety of sources for cataloging copy. The most frequently used tool is CIP, followed closely by NUC, and more distantly by BPR and CBI. Some libraries report that they also use MARCFICHE to obtain cataloging copy. Many libraries still type their catalog cards, or at least make an original which is duplicated in some manner.

The results of the survey support previous research which indicates a trend away from DDC to LCC. For every library using DDC, there are 1.27 libraries using LCC. Of the ninety-six libraries indicating which classification scheme they use, fifty-four, or 56 percent, use LCC

and forty-two, or 44 percent, use DDC. Sears Subject Headings are used in only a few libraries. Several of these libraries state that they use Sears only for original cataloging. The vast majority of the libraries use LCSH. Other libraries do some original cataloging, but order preprocessed materials in an attempt to keep their original cataloging to a minimum. Still others combine the buying of preprocessed materials with preprinted cards obtained from one or more sources. The combinations of these procedures are numerous.

Libraries using LCC accept cards with the call numbers and subject headings already imprinted on the cards, by a three to one margin over libraries using DDC.

Three-fourths of the libraries in colleges having more than 5,000 students order preprocessed books. For colleges having fewer than 5,000 students, only about 30 percent of the libraries take advantage of this service. The smaller libraries tend not to accept catalog cards with call numbers and subject headings already imprinted on the cards.

#### Implications and Suggestions for Further Study

It does appear from the study that the cataloging problems in the community college libraries are extensive. Solutions to these problems are not found easily, however.

At this point in time, on-line cataloging offers the best alternative to manual cataloging. This study has shown that on-line cataloging does reduce backlogs and does get materials in circulation faster than does manual cataloging. Also, it appears that participants

of on-line cataloging make better use of staff members in the technical processing department than do those who catalog manually. The problems of obtaining catalog cards from several sources are eliminated. Participants of on-line cataloging get all the cards they order, exactly as they request. They are uniform in style and appearance. There are no problems with receiving cards for the wrong edition, or in receiving the wrong cards because the LC number in a particular books is incorrect, because all of the information can be verified when it is input, and before requesting cards. The catalog cards are sent in filing order and are received in a matter of days. There is no waste, because the library gets exactly the number of cards it needs. If additional tracings are needed, extra cards may be requested, and the tracings may be added easily.

There are many community college libraries in the Southeast which may not be able to participate in on-line cataloging for some time to come. Meanwhile, what can they do to improve their technical processing departments and technical processing procedures in general?

First of all, each community college library should do a self-study. Those persons primarily involved in technical processing should assess their operations and determine where improvements are needed. Questions which should be raised include ones such as these: (1) do we have enough staff to handle our operations; (2) are we utilizing the skills of the staff to their fullest extent; (3) would precataloged books help reduce backlogs, cut down on the amount of original cataloging we do, and be cost-effective; (4) do we have access to the tools needed when doing original cataloging; (5) do we do too much original

cataloging; and (6) can we obtain more catalog cards by using more or different jobbers? The most important question of all should be, are we willing to consider on-line cataloging as an alternative to manual cataloging and adapt our technical processing procedures accordingly?

If the answer to the last key question is "yes," then those community college libraries which are not yet part of SOLINET or another network should try to find ways to become part of on-line cataloging. Since many libraries will cite cost as a deterrent, a grant might be sought, either from the government or from the private sector, to provide the capital necessary to install the terminals and defray operational expenses. If such a grant is not made available, then the southeastern librarians should consider lobbying for legislation to provide the necessary monies for the expenses which will be incurred by participation in on-line cataloging.

Another possibility would be to consider ways of sharing terminals. Smaller libraries within a given region could band together and either do their own cataloging, on-line, at a specific location, or create a type of on-line centralized processing center which would catalog the materials for them.

Regardless of whether the southeastern community college libraries go to on-line cataloging or not, they MUST begin to find solutions to the cataloging problems which now exist. This author has listed a few possibilities, but, hopefully, other librarians will feel the need to build upon this study so that technical processing in community college libraries will be an asset to the college, not a detriment.

APPENDIX:

THE COVER LETTERS AND QUESTIONNAIRES

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
First Letter to Community College Libraries in the Southeast Using On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	85
Second Letter to Community College Libraries in the Southeast Using On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	86
Part I of Questionnaire for Libraries Participating in On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	87
First Letter to Community Colleges in the Southeast Not Participating in On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	90
Second Letter to Community Colleges in the Southeast Not Participating in On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	91
Part II of Questionnaire for Libraries Not Participating in On-Line Cataloging . . . . .	92

18 June 1977

Dear Colleague,

This survey is to study cataloging procedures in community and junior colleges throughout the Southeastern United States. As a catalog librarian at Meridian Junior College (Mississippi), I have long been aware that a survey of this type would be beneficial to the profession and also helpful to me in finding alternative procedures for our own library. Any information obtained from this survey is solely for research purposes.

Should you be interested in the results of this survey, please indicate this interest at the end of the survey in the box provided, and I will furnish you a copy of the results in brief.

Please mail back this survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided by 1 July 1977.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. The information compiled should prove helpful to our profession.

Sincerely yours,

Gayle Pierce

1 July 1977

Dear Colleague,

On 18 June 1977, I mailed a copy of this survey to your library. In the event that you did not receive this survey the week of June 20th, I have enclosed another copy which I would appreciate your filling out and mailing back to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than 12 July 1977. It will only take a few minutes to check off the items which pertain to your library. If you have already returned this survey to me, please disregard this reminder.

As I indicated in the cover letter, the information gathered from this survey is to be used for research purposes only. It is very important that your library participate in this survey in order that a more accurate report of cataloging procedures in the community and junior colleges in the Southeastern states be made.

Your cooperation in helping with this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Gayle Pierce



## PART I

Please fill out this part of the survey ONLY if your library is part of an on-line cataloging system.

1. Is your library a member of SOLINET?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ YES  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO
2. If YES, how long has it been a member of SOLINET?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
3. If NO, is it a member of another consortium or network?  
 YES (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO
4. How many employees work in the Technical Processing Department?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ a. Full-time.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Part-time.
5. Of the full-time employees, how many are  
 \_\_\_\_\_ a. Professional librarians?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Technicians or paraprofessionals?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Clerical (non-student)?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. Student workers?
6. Of the part-time employees, how many are  
 \_\_\_\_\_ a. Professional librarians?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Technicians or paraprofessionals?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Clerical (non-student)?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. Student workers?
7. What is the average number of searches made monthly?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is the average number of original catalog records input monthly?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
9. Approximately how many books do you catalog in a year?  
 \_\_\_\_\_

10. Do you
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Accept LC cataloging with no changes?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Accept LC cataloging with minor changes?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Accept LC cataloging with major changes?
11. Do you use the terminal for (Please check all which apply)
- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Pre-order verification?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ b. Searching?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ c. Card production?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ d. Card production from MARC records?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ e. Card production from MARC and OCLC records?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ f. To input original catalog records?
12. Do you feel that you have benefitted from on-line cataloging?
- \_\_\_\_\_ YES  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO  
 \_\_\_\_\_ How?
13. Has the efficiency of your technical processing operations improved significantly since you began using an on-line system?
- \_\_\_\_\_ YES  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO  
 \_\_\_\_\_ In what ways?
14. If you are part of SOLINET, or some other network, do you find on-line cataloging more effective than your previous operation?
- \_\_\_\_\_ YES  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO  
 \_\_\_\_\_ In what ways?
15. Did any staff changes take place when you changed to on-line cataloging?
- \_\_\_\_\_ YES (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NO

16. Our library would like a copy of the results of this survey.

---

Librarian

---

Library

---

Address

---

City

State

ZIP

17. Additional comments welcomed.

18 June 1977

Dear Colleague,

This survey is to study cataloging procedures in community and junior colleges throughout the Southeastern United States. As a catalog librarian at Meridian Junior College (Mississippi), I have long been aware that a survey of this type would be beneficial to the profession and also helpful to me in finding alternative procedures for our own library. Any information obtained from this survey is solely for research purposes.

Should you be interested in the results of this survey, please indicate this interest at the end of the survey in the box provided, and I will furnish you a copy of the results in brief.

Realizing that some of you now participate in on-line cataloging systems and networks, I have enclosed a two-part survey. Part I is for those libraries which are part of an on-line system or network. Part II is for those libraries which do not participate in on-line systems.

Please mail back the appropriate part of this survey in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided by 1 July 1977.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to complete this survey. The information compiled should prove helpful to our profession.

Sincerely yours,

Gayle Pierce

1 July 1977

Dear Colleague,

On 18 June 1977, I mailed a copy of this survey to your library. In the event that you did not receive this survey the week of June 20th, I have enclosed another copy which I would appreciate your filling out and mailing back to me in the enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelope no later than 12 July 1977. It will only take a few minutes to check off the items which pertain to your library. If you have already returned this survey to me, please disregard this reminder.

As I indicated in the cover letter, the information gathered from this survey is to be used for research purposes only. It is very important that your library participate in this survey in order that a more accurate report of cataloging procedures in the community and junior colleges in the Southeastern states be made.

I have enclosed Part II only, since as of April 1977, there are only thirteen community and junior colleges in the Southeast which are members of SOLINET.

Your cooperation in helping with this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Gayle Pierce

## PART II

This part is for libraries which are NOT part of an on-line cataloging system.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. How many employees work in the technical processing department of your library?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Of these employees, how many are  
\_\_\_\_\_ a. Full-time?  
\_\_\_\_\_ b. Part-time?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Of the full-time employees, how many are  
\_\_\_\_\_ a. Professional librarians?  
\_\_\_\_\_ b. Technicians or paraprofessionals?  
\_\_\_\_\_ c. Clerical (non-student)?  
\_\_\_\_\_ d. Student workers?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Of the part-time employees, how many are  
\_\_\_\_\_ a. Professional librarians?  
\_\_\_\_\_ b. Technicians or paraprofessionals?  
\_\_\_\_\_ c. Clerical (non-student)?  
\_\_\_\_\_ d. Student workers?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Do you purchase pre-cataloged books?  
\_\_\_\_\_ YES  
\_\_\_\_\_ NO
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. If YES, what percentage of your book acquisitions do these pre-processed books constitute?
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. From which of the following sources do you purchase pre-printed catalog cards? (Please check ALL which apply)  
\_\_\_\_\_ a. Jostens  
\_\_\_\_\_ b. Library of Congress  
\_\_\_\_\_ c. Baker and Taylor  
\_\_\_\_\_ d. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

8. If you order cards from more than one source, what percentage of pre-printed cards do you receive from

- a. Jostens
- b. Library of Congress
- c. Baker and Taylor
- d. Other

9. Which of the following methods do you use when ordering catalog cards? (Please check BOTH if applicable)

- a. LC number
- b. ISBN

10. When you do not have the LC number or ISBN, do you normally submit requests for catalog cards anyhow and pay for a search?

YES

NO

If NO, why?

11. What classification scheme do you use?

- a. DDC
- b. LC
- c. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

12. Do you use

- a. Library of Congress subject headings?
- b. Sears subject headings?

13. Do you order your catalog cards

- a. With subject headings?
- b. Without subject headings?
- c. With call number?
- d. Without call number?

14. If you order catalog cards without the call number and/or without subject headings printed on the cards, is it for a particular reason?

YES (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

NO

15. Of the sets of catalog cards you order, approximately what percentage do you actually receive from titles submitted to

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Jostens
- b. Library of Congress
- c. Baker and Taylor
- d. Other

16. If you order catalog cards by ISBN, what percentage do you actually receive from titles submitted to

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

- a. Jostens
- b. Library of Congress
- c. Baker and Taylor
- d. Other

17. If you receive catalog cards which are incorrect, and it is not your fault (mix-up in LC number in book or in selection tools), do you return them for credit?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

YES

NO

If NO, why not?

18. How many times do you resubmit requests for catalog cards before deciding to make your own?

\_\_\_\_\_

19. Approximately how many sets of catalog cards did you order last year from catalog card suppliers? (Please include ONLY those for monographs.)

\_\_\_\_\_

20. What is it that you LIKE BEST about the service/format/price, etc. from

- a. Jostens
- b. Library of Congress
- c. Baker and Taylor
- d. Other



21. What is it that you DISLIKE MOST about the service/format/price, etc. from

- a. Jostens
- b. Library of Congress
- c. Baker and Taylor
- d. Other

\_\_\_\_\_ 22. What percentage of original cataloging do you do?

23. Do you use any of the following to obtain cataloging copy? (Please check ALL which apply)

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. National Union Catalog (NUC)
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Cumulative Book Index (CBI)
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. American Book Publishing Record (BPR)
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Library of Congress cataloging in publication data (CIP)
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

24. Have you found CIP to be helpful?

\_\_\_\_\_ YES

\_\_\_\_\_ NO

Why or why not?

\_\_\_\_\_ 25. Approximately how many titles do you have in your backlog?

26. If you produce some/all of your own catalog cards, which method(s) do you use?

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Typewriter
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Flexowriter
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST) or magnetic card
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Xerox or other copy flow production
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Offset
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

27. Our library would like a copy of the results of this survey.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Librarian

\_\_\_\_\_  
Library

\_\_\_\_\_  
Address

\_\_\_\_\_  
City

\_\_\_\_\_  
State

\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP

28. Additional comments welcomed.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries and American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Guidelines for 2 Year College Learning Resources Programs. (Washington, D.C.: Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1972).
- Boozar, Howard R. "North Carolina Is Counting on Community Colleges." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 63-72. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Downs, Harry S. "Georgia's Junior Colleges: An Important Role." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 259-66. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr., ed. American Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.
- Graham, Walter A. "It May Happen in Alabama, Too!" In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 130-37. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Henderson, Lee G. "Coordination: the Florida Pattern." In Coordinating State Systems, pp. 97-106. Edited by Edmund J. Gleazer and Roger Yarrington. New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 6. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.
- Johnston, Garvin H. "State and Local Partnership in Mississippi." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 267-75. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.
- Morsch, William. State Community College Systems; Their Role and Operation in Seven States. New York, Praeger Publishers, 1971.

- 1977 Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977.
- Nitecki, Joseph Z. OCLC in Retrospect: A Review of the Impact of the OCLC System on the Administration of a Large University Technical Services Operations. Illinois. University. Graduate School of Library Science. Occasional papers, no. 123. Champaign: University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, 1976.
- Thomson, Sara Katharine. Learning Resource Centers in Community Colleges; a Survey of Budgets and Services. Chicago: American Library Association, 1975.
- Wattenbarger, James L. "Five Years of Progress in Florida." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 54-62. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Wattenbarger, James L. "The Other Twenty-Two." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 276-97. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.
- Wellman, Fred L. and Hamel, Dana B. "Community College Progress in Virginia." In Junior Colleges: 50 States/ 50 Years, pp. 236-45. Edited by Roger Yarrington. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

#### Journals

- Almy, Patty. "Background and Development of the Junior College Library." Library Trends 14 (October 1965):123-31.
- Andrew, Loyd D. and Wellsfry, Norval L. "Community College System Pays Its Way." Community and Junior College Journal 47 (March 1977):28-31.
- Bachrack, Stanley D. and Scoble, Harry M. "Mail Questionnaire Efficiency: Controlled Reduction of Nonresponse." Public Opinion Quarterly 31 (Summer 1967):265-71.
- "Catalogs and Catalogers: Evolution Through Revolution." Journal of Academic Librarianship 2 (September 1976):172-9.
- Chan, Lois Mai. "Years Work in Cataloging and Classification: 1975." Library Resources and Technical Services 20 (Summer 1976) p. 213-235.

- Chastain, Linda. "Raising the Economic Level in South Carolina." Community and Junior College Journal 47 (September 1976):22-23.
- "CIP Makes It 100,000." Library of Congress Information Bulletin 36 (17 June 1977):415.
- Dhir, Krishna S. "From University Branch to Community College." Community and Junior College Journal 44 (March 1974):36-7.
- Dillman, Don A. "Increasing Mail Questionnaire Response in Large Samples of the General Public." Public Opinion Quarterly 36 (Summer 1972):254-57.
- Edsall, Shirley. "The Community College Librarian: a Profile." Community and Junior College Journal 46 (December/January 1976) 32-33.
- Hall, George L. "Behind the Bramble Bushes: a Mid-Century History of the Community College." Community College Review 2 (Fall, 1974):6-14.
- Hines, Theodore C. "Commercial Cataloging Services." Library Trends 24 (April 1976):775-83.
- Kennedy, John P. "The Southeastern Library Network: A Progress Report." Southeastern Librarian 23 (Spring 1973):13-15.
- Kennedy, John P. "The Southeastern Library Network: Second Progress Report." Southeastern Librarian 23 (Summer 1973):12-13.
- Kirkman, Ralph E. "The Community College: The Nature of the Beast." Peabody Journal of Education 51 (January 1974):77-79.
- Pirie, James W. "Junior College Library Processing." Library Trends 14 (October 1965):166-73.
- Reeves, Pamela. "Junior College Libraries Enter the Seventies." College and Research Libraries 34 (January 1973):7-15.
- Taylor, Desmond. "Classification Trends in Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries 29 (September 1968):351-56.
- Turner, Ann Craig. "Comparative Card Production Methods." Library Research and Technical Services 16 (Summer 1972):347-58.
- Wallace, James O. "Newcomer to the Academic Scene: The Two-Year College Library/Learning Center." College and Research Libraries 37 (November 1976):503-13.

Weakley, Jim. "Something to Cheer About." Community and Junior College Journal 47 (May 1977):12-14.

Wheeler, Joseph L. "Top Priority For Cataloging-in-Source." Library Journal 94 (September 15, 1969):3007-13.