DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 752                                             LI 002 986

AUTHOR         Wingate, Henry W.
TITLE          Cataloging--In--Publication: Problems and Prospects.
PUB DATE       71
NOTE           15p.; (18 References)

EDRS PRICE     EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS    *Cataloging, *Libraries, *Library Services, *Library
               Technical Processes, Problems, *Publishing Industry
IDENTIFIERS    *Cataloging In Source, Library of Congress

ABSTRACT
               The interest in cataloging-in-source was revived
during the twentieth century, with the most important experiment
being that of the Library of Congress which concluded the program
could not be justified from the viewpoint of financing, technical
considerations or utility. A new program has been developed which
poses many problems and has far-reaching implications for all
libraries. The largest problem is that of cooperation with individual
publishers. The publishers, the Library of Congress, and the
libraries which will use the entries must all cooperate and find a
program consistent with their individual objectives, and many of the
inevitable programs must be identified as early as possible if the
program is to succeed. A more critical attitude on the part of those
involved and a more objective examination of the problems are also
required to ensure success. (AB)

CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

By

Henry W. Wingate
1971

When the Library of Congress issued its very negative report in 1960

on the Cataloging-in-Source program it was generally felt that the century-

old idea of a system which would provide for the printing of cataloging

information in each individual book as published was at last dead. The

idea had first been suggested in 1876 and had been experimented with

during the late 1870's. By 1880, however, the experiments had ceased due

to a general lack of interest.[1] During the twentieth century the concept

has been frequently revived, and projects similar to Cataloging-in-Source

have been undertaken in Australia, New Zealand, the Soviet Union and the

United States. By far, the most important experiment was the 1958-59

Cataloging-in-Source program carried out by the Library of Congress. In

an eight-month period from July, 1958, to February, 1959, the Library of

Congress cataloged 1,203 books before publication, using page proofs sent

to the Library by publishers. The cataloging entries were returned with

the proofs to the publishers, and the entries appeared printed in each

copy of 1,082 of the 1,203 titles cataloged. The entry generally appeared

on the verso of the title page in the form of a facsimile of a Library of

Congress card. In 1960 the Library issued its conclusions concerning the

program in a 199-page report.[2] Based on the eight-month experiment, it

was decided that

> the over-all conclusion seems inescapable that a permanent,
> full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program could not be justified
> from the viewpoint of financing, technical considerations, or
> utility.... In the light of the experience gained through the
> experiment, it is concluded that neither a full nor a partial
> Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable.... There should be
> no futher experiments with Cataloging-in-Source.[3]

1

The failure of the project was so conclusive that it appeared the idea had been dealt a deathblow. In truth, it had only been stunned. The concept remained dormant for nine years, and then in 1969 it was revived in what appears to have been an almost spontaneous plea on the part of librarians for a new program. The revival rapidly gained momentum, and in two years has led to the current Cataloging-in-Publication program. The optimism accompanying the new program might seem curious in light of the failures of such projects in the past. There has been some feeling among librarians, however, that the 1958-59 CIS program was not given every chance for survival by the Library of Congress. It has been pointed out that the inadequate funding and the limited number of books cataloged invalidate the conclusions reached by the Library. Be that as it may, there is a new program which poses many problems and which has far-reaching implications for all libraries.

## Cataloging-in-Publication from the Publishers' Viewpoint.

The single largest problem which any cataloging-in-publication program faces is that of gaining the co-operation of individual publishers. Unlike the Library of Congress, which may accept the greater part of the burden of a cataloging-in-publication program in its role as the national library, or the individual libraries, which will make use of the cataloging information supplied through CIP, the individual publishing firm has very little to motivate it to co-operate in a program. Nearly a century ago, within a year of the first suggestion for pre-publication cataloging, R.R. Bowker saw the problem quite clearly. In 1877, speaking at the annual meeting of the American Library Association, he pointed out:

> The difficulty in regard to obtaining the co-operation of the book trade would be that publishing books is a business and not philanthropy. It is desirable to approach publishers chiefly from the commercial side. They desire to see that there is money in it.[4]

This is essentially the same problem which faces Cataloging-in-Publication today.

Because book sales to libraries do represent a sizable portion of the revenues of most publishers, the publishing industry has no desire to alienate librarians by vigorously opposing an idea which has so long been cherished by librarians and the American Library Association. At the same time, CIP does not appear to offer any incentive to publishers which might insure their participation in the program. In 1968, libraries accounted for approximately 19% of the total book sales in the U.S. ($486 million of the $2.6 billion total).[5] More important than the fact that the publishing industry does not depend overwhelmingly on the library market is the realization on the part of the individual publisher that libraries are obligated to buy books without regard to the presence or absence of CIP entries in those books.

The 1960 report on Cataloging-in-Source pointed out some of the difficulties involved in acquiring the co-operation of publishers. In 1958, the Library of Congress approached over 300 publishers to ascertain if they would be willing to participate in the CIS experiment. Of these, 244 agreed to send in page proofs for one or more of their forthcoming books. However, when the project was terminated in 1959 only 157 publishers or something less than 52% of the more than 300 originally approached had submitted proofs for at least one book.[6] Perhaps more telling is the fact that in the post-experiment survey which the Library of Congress took of publishers in 1959 only 50 publishers expressed a willingness to continue in the program.[7] That is, something less than 16% of the more than 300 publishers approached had co-operated in Cataloging-in-Source and were willing to continue to do so. Furthermore, "co-operation" on the part of a publisher generally meant submitting a small percent of his total output. Of the 141 trade publishers who actually submitted

proofs (the remaining 16 publishers were U.S. Government agencies) only
12 submitted more than 14 books during the entire period. On the other
hand, 106 publishers or about 75% submitted fewer than 7 books each.[8]

The types of books which publishers chose to send to the Library of
Congress for cataloging-in-source also indicate something about the
attitude of the industry toward the program. Individual publishers,
realizing that some delay in their production schedules would be inevitable,
tended to submit proofs for books which had not been assigned a high
priority, rush schedule. This tendency was evident in the very small
percent of CIS books which became bestsellers. Of the 136 titles which
appeared on the lists of bestsellers in Publishers' Weekly during 1958-59
only 5 contained CIS entries.[9] Unfortunately, the books which publishers
refused to submit for cataloging-in-source were the very books libraries
were most interested in getting to their readers in the shortest possible
time. If Cataloging-in-Publication is to achieve its objective of reducing
the processing time for prime adult fiction and non-fiction, publishers
must be persuaded to submit their more important titles for pre-publication
cataloging.

The record of publisher co-operation in the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-
Source project was a very poor one, and there is reason to suspect that
their performance in the current Cataloging-in-Publication may be no
better. One of the problems encountered by publishers in the 1958-59
program was the delay involved in sending the proofs to the Library of
Congress. In the words of the 1960 report, "The interruption of production
schedules was reported by a great majority of publishers as being a very
real problem. Only a few firms experienced no difficulties of this sort." [10]
If present plans are carried out, there will be considerably more delay
involved in the new program than in 1958-59. In Cataloging-in-Source

the Library of Congress set a 24-hour time limit for cataloging a book.

This emphasis on speed led, however, to some difficulties for the cataloging

staff.

> The work was taxing because of the over-all time limit,
> the presence of the "rush" slip, the necessity for recording
> the exact amount of time spent, and the special difficulties
> involved in working with proofs and data sheets.  These
> factors combined to produce a feeling of tension and considerably
> greater fatigue than in regular cataloging.[11]

To relieve the pressure on the cataloging staff the new program will operate

under a one-week time limit rather than the previous 24-hour limit.  This

will no doubt relieve some of the tension for the catalogers, but a week-long

delay may prove to be unacceptable to a majority of publishers.

It has been suggested that the only way to assure satisfactory publisher

participation in a cataloging-in-publication program is to require their

co-operation by force of law.  K.A. Lodewycks offered this solution in 1953.[12]

However, the record of cataloging-in-publication in the Soviet Union has

demonstrated that even legal requirements will not necessarily insure success.

In 1959, the Russian Ministry of Culture ordered publishers to include

cataloging information in all books in certain classes.  At the same time,

the burden of cataloging was shifted to the publishers by requiring that

the books be cataloged at the individual publishing houses by members of

the publishers' staffs.[13]  Even under these circumstances cataloging-in-

publication has experienced difficulty.  It was reported in 1970 that

"after a decade of effort, the Soviet Union still has not achieved the

comprehensive CIP program that is envisaged by American proponents of the

plan."[14]

Supporters of cataloging-in-publication have for years (the first

instance was in 1877)[15] argued that publishers would be willing to

participate in a program because it would result in increased book sales.

The reasoning is that such a program would permit reductions in the
cataloging staffs of most libraries and so would permit funds previously
spent on cataloging to be spent for book purchases, thus resulting in
increased revenues for the publishing industry. There are at least two
questions which are raised by this argument. In the first place, it has
never been demonstrated that cataloging-in-publication would actually
reduce cataloging costs for individual libraries. There was no study
conducted after the 1958-59 project to measure the effect that the 1,203
titles cataloged in the program had on the processing routines of libraries.
The second fault in the argument results from its failure to look at
cataloging-in-publication from the viewpoint of individual publishers.
If indeed the program did result in increased book sales for the publishing
industry, it would not offer incentives to individual publishers to include
CIP entries in their books. Publishers will recognize the fact that
libraries cannot base their book selection on the criterion of whether
or not a book contains cataloging copy. Libraries will have to continue
to purchase books for their collections without regard for cataloging-in-
publication entries. To the individual publisher, this means that partici-
pation in the program will not necessarily result in increased book sales
to libraries.

While there are other problems that Cataloging-in-Publication presents
from the viewpoint of the publishing industry (such as cost, aesthetic
considerations involving the appearance of a facsimile of a library card
on the printed page, the objections to the printing of authors' real names
in pseudonymous works, and the interruption of production schedules), the
main difficulty is that Cataloging-in-Publication means to each publisher
additional expense and additional problems while it offers him nothing in
return.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of the Library of Congress.

The 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source experiment was not a happy experience
for the Library of Congress. After eight months of the program there were
still some publishers who were willing to continue to submit proofs for
selected books, but the cataloging staff of the Library of Congress was
nearly exhausted. The problems encountered in 1958-59 have, however, been
valuable in planning for the current Cataloging-in-Publication program.
A number of changes have been made in the new project in an effort to avoid
some of the difficulties' experienced in the earlier project.

Probably the most difficult aspect of Cataloging-in-Source for the
Library of Congress was the pressure on the cataloging staff caused by the
24-hour "nonstop-rush" schedule. The 1960 report concluded that the
catalogers "were unanimous in regarding this type of cataloging as unrewarding
and taxing." [16] To eliminate this pressure CIP will operate on a one-week
schedule. While this will undoubtedly reduce the pressure on the cataloging
staff it is questionable if the publishers who complained of the delay
involved in the 24-hour schedule will be able to tolerate the new one-week
schedule.

Changes have also been made in the new program to reduce the percentage
of discrepancies between the catalog entries and books, which was so high
in 1958-59. Of the 1,082 titles published which contained cataloging copy,
615 or 57% of the entries contained one or more errors.[17] Many of the 615
entries contained more than one error, resulting in a total of 1,062 errors.
Very close to one half of the errors (505 to be exact) occured in the
collation. Errors in the imprint accounted for another 184 discrepancies.
Because the greatest occurance of errors was in the imprint and collation,
it has been decided that in CIP these statements will be omitted altogether.

Judging from the 1958-59 project this should reduce the rate of discrepancy
from the 57% of the CIS experiment to approximately 20%. There has been
some discussion of futher reducing this discrepancy rate by omitting all
subtitles.[18] Additional omissions would of course serve to further decrease
the error rate, but at the same time they would reduce the usefulness of
the program. Carried to its logical conclusion, this process would result
in no errors, but also in no entries. In any event, there will always be
a fairly high rate of discrepancy in cataloging done from proofs. Alex
Ladenson, writing in 1960, described the problem:

> The basic difficulty is that a book cannot be cataloged
> adequately until it has been endowed with all of the physical
> properties of a book. To attempt to catalog a book from
> galley or even page proofs is to ignore some of the fundamental
> bases of cataloging.[19]

To the Library of Congress, this means that it must, to all intents and
purposes, catalog every book in the CIP program twice. The Library will
first catalog a book from the proofs to prepare the CIP copy. After the
book is published the Library will be faced with the task of preparing
another, completely accurate, catalog entry for its own catalogs and for
the production of Library of Congress cards to be sold through the Card
Division. It is questionable if the CIP entry will be of much help in
cataloging the book the second time. The discrepancy rate of the CIP
entry will always be too high to permit a cataloger to accept any part of
the entry without checking it carefully against the published book, and
the omissions which are part of the current program will necessitate
adding the collation and imprint in the second cataloging process.

The problems which Cataloging-in-Publication present for the Library
of Congress are not as formidable on the whole as those which concern the
publishing industry. It is the Library of Congress, however, which must,
almost alone, bear the total cost of Cataloging-in-Publication. It must

be willing to increase its cataloging staff considerably in order to handle the double cataloging which CIP entails.

## Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of Librarians.

The main purpose of any cataloging-in-publication program is, of course, to provide individual libraries with cataloging information for a particular book within that book. The simplest way to accomplish this is to have a facsimile of a Library of Congress card printed on the verso of the title page of each copy of a book selected for CIP. Ideally, this would enable each library receiving the book to produce a set of cards, using the cataloging information in the book as the master copy. In this way, the process of ordering and waiting for catalog cards could be eliminated, and the book could be processed immediately. There are, however, a number of obstacles which must be overcome if anything near this objective can be achieved.

The single factor which might have made cataloging-in-publication the panacea that some of its stronger advocates have claimed it to be is the elusive "cataloger's camera." This is a device which would photocopy the facsimile of a Library of Congress card appearing in a book and then produce a complete set of catalog cards from that photocopy. Until the present CIP project the idea of such a camera has been inseparably linked with the idea of pre-publication cataloging. The final report on the Cataloging-in-Source experiment saw the cataloger's camera as an integral part of the program:

> The underlying concept was that all books could be cataloged
> once and for all at some central point by standardized methods,
> and that libraries would transfer the catalog entries by means of
> a "cataloger's camera" from the books themselves to cards.... [20]

The idea of such a camera has been abandoned, at least for the foreseeable future, for a number of reasons. Most important is the fact that such a camera has not yet been developed. In addition, the 1958-59 experiment demonstrated that even if a satisfactory cataloger's camera could be developed, its use would be severely limited because of the high number of discrepancies between CIP entry and printed book. The current program has had to completely abandon the concept due to the omissions of collation and imprint from the entries. It would be necessary to add these items to the facsimile before a set of cards could be produced.

Lacking a method by which card sets could be produced directly from the CIP entries, the important questions become how and to what extent libraries will use Cataloging-in-Publication. Unfortunately, there was no study of the actual use made by libraries of the 1,082 entries which were printed in books during the 1958-59 experiment, and therefore there is no accurate measurement of the impact a CIP program might have on libraries. There have been a number of surveys taken with the intention of measuring the attitudes of librarians toward such programs, and as one would suspect these have shown that they are endorsed by a large majority of librarians. These surveys could hardly have come up with a different conclusion, since libraries will bear none of the expenses of a CIP program, but stand to reap all of its benefits. While the surveys have shown very little negative reaction on the part of librarians, there is some indication of a feeling of apathy toward the idea.

The often cited "Consumer Reaction Survey," which was taken in 1959 after the cessation of the Cataloging-in-Source project, reached the conclusion that "the vote for CIS was overwhelming approval, possibly as high as 98 or 99 percent." [21] A closer look at the survey shows that these

11

figures may be misleading. In the first place, the method of selecting

the libraries to be surveyed raises some questions. Rather than sending

the questionnaires to randomly selected libraries, the survey committee

followed a different procedure:

> When the interview form settled down into its final shape,
> letters were sent to approximately 200 libraries to ask if
> they would cooperate with the Cataloging in Source project
> to the extent of granting interviews.... It was only after
> they consented that they saw the questionnaire.[22]

In effect, only librarians who expressed an interest in the program were

surveyed. It is curious that an 100% expression of approval was not

achieved using this method. More telling perhaps is the fact that 56%

of the librarians stated that they would continue to purchase Library of

Congress or Wilson cards for those books containing CIS entries.[23] It

appears that while "98 or 99 percent" expressed approval of the program,

only 44% intended to use it for its primary purpose: the preparation of

card sets from CIS entries.

A more recent survey of librarians was taken in 1970 to measure their

attitudes toward the new CIP project. Like the earlier survey, it concluded

that "97% in all welcomed it." [24] Again, this indication of overwhelming

enthusiasm may be misleading. The survey was conducted by mailing

questionnaires to 391 libraries of all types. However, only 230 question-

naires were completed and returned.[25] This represents a 59% response.

Of those responding, indeed 97% did express approval. The more important

factor here, however, is the percentage of returns. By not taking the

time to complete a questionnaire which consisted of 7 multiple-choice

questions a librarian was at least expressing a degree of indifference,

if not disapproval. If only 59% of all librarians in the U.S. are

interested enough in Cataloging-in-Publication to take the time to return

a questionnaire, the need for such a program may be doubtful.

12

More important than the attitudes of librarians toward CIP is the
question of how the CIP entries will be utilized. With the elimination
of the concept of the "cataloger's camera" which would produce card sets
directly from CIP entries, librarians are faced with a rather limited
range of options. Each CIP entry will have to be retyped onto card stock
to prepare a master card from which a card set can be produced. It has
been suggested that this is not a cataloging task, but is rather a
clerical step.[26] However, the rate of discrepancy between the entries
and the books will necessitate careful examination of every CIP entry.
This, together with the tasks of retyping the partial CIP entry and the
examination of the book itself to obtain the missing imprint and collation
would appear to require a cataloger rather than a clerk. Because the
missing information must be supplied as the master card is typed, it will
probably be necessary for a cataloger to type the entire card. Perhaps
the most economical method of producing card sets under these circumstances
would require the use of an IBM Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST).
A MT/ST would permit a cataloger to type a number of master cards onto a
tape which could later be run off by a clerk to produce the card sets.
Because of the increased typing time on the part of catalogers, utilization
of CIP entries by a library may require an increase in its cataloging staff
while permitting a reduction in its clerical staff.


## Conclusions.

Any cataloging-in-publication program is made difficult by the fact
that publishers, the Library of Congress, and the libraries which will use
the entries must all co-operate and must find such a program consistent
with their individual objectives. Publishers must be willing to include
in their production schedules a step which will permit galley or page

proofs to be sent to the Library of Congress, and they must be willing
to print in each copy of every title cataloged in the program the catalog
card facsimile prepared by the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress
must be willing to accept practically the entire expense of the program and
must set up a department to rush catalog the titles submitted by publishers.
The libraries which will use the CIP entries will have to demonstrate that
the program is indeed as useful as has been claimed. If the publishers,
or the Library of Congress, or the libraries find the program inconsistent
with their objectives the program is destined to failure.

If the Cataloging-in-Publication program is to succeed it is important
that as many of the inevitable problems be identified as early as possible.
If many of the potential problems are not anticipated before they are
actually encountered, and if solutions are not worked out in advance, it
is likely the program will flounder before it is well under way.
Cataloging-in-publication programs, in spite of a long record of failures,
seem always to be approached by librarians with surprising optimism. The
optimism surrounding the current program is very much in evidence in the
recent journal articles which have appeared on the subject. A more
critical attitude, especially on the part of those directly involved in
the program, might, in the long run, mean the difference between the
program's success or failure. The fact that any cataloging-in-publication
program is fraught with problems should not be glossed over by the
optimism of well-meaning librarians. The program would be better served
by a more objective examination of the problems facing it.

References.

1. Jane Kaser, "The Venerable History of Cataloging-in-Source," Missouri Library Association Quarterly, XX (September, 1959), 76-7.

2. U.S. Library of Congress, Processing Department., The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment (Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress, 1960).

3. Ibid., pp. 47, 52.

4. American Library Association, "Proceedings of the Annual Conference," Library Journal, II (September, 1877), 33.

5. The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information, 1970 (New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1970), pp. 22, 27.

6. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, pp. xix-xx.

7. Orcena Mahoney, "Cataloging in Source," ALA Bulletin, LIV (March, 1960), p. 200.

8. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, pp. 133-40.

9. "Cataloging in Source," The Library of Congress Cataloging Service Bulletin, No. 53 (June, 1959).

10. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 26.

11. Ibid., p. 18.

12. K.A. Lodewycks, "The Self-Cataloguing Book," Australian Library Journal, II (April, 1953), p. 33.

13. Eleanor Buist, "Soviet Centralized Cataloging: A View from Abroad," Library Trends, XVI (July, 1967), pp. 130-1.

14. Eleanor Buist, "Cataloging-in-Publication in the Soviet Union," The Library of Congress Information Bulletin, August 20, 1970, p. A-108.

15. Kaser, "The Venerable History of Cataloging-in-Source," p. 76.

16. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 18.

17. Ibid., p. 140.

18. Verner W. Clapp, "CIP in Mid-1970," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), p. 16.

19. "Cataloging-in-Source: A Symposium," Library Resources and Technical Services, IV (Fall, 1960), p. 274.

20. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. v.

21. Ibid., p. 58.

22. Virginia Drewry, "Consumer Reaction Survey of Cataloging in Source," Library Resources and Technical Services, III (Fall, 1959), p. 249.

23. Library of Congress, The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment, p. 70.

24. "Plan Presented for Cataloging-in-Source," Publishers' Weekly, October 5, 1970, p. 35.

25. Clapp, "CIP in Mid 1970," p. 17.

26. Joseph L. Wheeler, "Why We Must Have Cataloging in Publication," Library Resources and Technical Services, XV (Winter, 1971), p. 9.

Henry W. Wingate