

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 399

IR 055 746

AUTHOR Telerski, R. Michele
 TITLE Bibliographic Control of Preservation Photocopies.
 PUB DATE May 95
 NOTE 28p.; Masters Research Paper, Kent State University.
 PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; *Bibliographic Records; Case Studies; *Cataloging; Internet; Library Catalogs; Library Surveys; Online Catalogs; *Preservation; Records Management; *Reprography
 IDENTIFIERS MARC; OCLC

ABSTRACT

This study examines how American Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries catalog full-volume, monographic, non-cartographic, preservation photocopies and explores the use of full, minimal, or dependent bibliographic records. It analyzes On-line Public Access Catalog (OPAC) records structure for multiple versions materials in terms of composite, hierarchical, or separate records. Through use of survey and on-line records analysis, the study also examines whether a relationship exists between the OPAC records structure at an institution and the accuracy of its holdings information on OCLC. An exploratory survey was sent to preservation officers at 66 American academic ARL member libraries (28 were returned) who made preservation photocopies during the fiscal year 1991-92; the officers were asked to provide basic bibliographic information about five titles of non-cartographic monographs for which entire volume preservation photocopies had been made within the past 2 years. Searches conducted on the Internet and OCLC and records for each institution were analyzed. Results indicated that the most common means of recording preservation photocopy information is the 533 field; institutions are also using the local note, 59X field and adding the same information found in 533 to provide the photocopy information. Among institutions recataloging their photocopied works using the 533 field, less than half are updating their holdings symbol on OCLC. The majority of institutions OPACs could be categorized as utilizing separate bibliographic records structure. All of the institutions using the holdings record for preservation information had a hierarchical structure. Composite records typically did not contain preservation information. Overall, the study indicates that there is still little consistency in the way preservation photocopies are being cataloged. Five tables provide information. (Contains 26 references.) (Author/AEF)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED 390 399

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Bibliographic Control of Preservation Photocopies

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

R. Michele Telerski

May, 1995

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roberta M. Telerski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

IR055746



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bibliographic Control of Preservation Photocopies

Abstract

This study attempts to determine how American ARL member libraries catalog full-volume, monographic, non-cartographic, preservation photocopies. It explores the use of full, minimal, or dependent bibliographic records. It analyzes OPAC records structure for multiple versions material in terms of composite, hierarchical, or separate records. Through use of survey and on-line records analysis, the study also examines whether a relationship exists between the OPAC records structure at an institution and the accuracy of its' holdings information on OCLC.

Master's Research Paper by

R. Michele Telerski

B.A., University of Chicago, 1990

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1995

Approved by

Advisor *Lechra H. Connell* Date *April 15, 1995*

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	p.1
Literature Review	p.5
Research Objectives	p.10
Methodology	p.11
Analysis of Data	p.13
Discussion	p.18
Conclusion	p.20
References	p.21

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Method of Recording Photocopy Information	p.13
2. Relationship Between Institution's Holding Symbol Attached to OCLC and How Photocopy Information Provided in the OPAC	p.14
3. Relationship of Level of Cataloging to Photocopy Information on OCLC	p.15
4. FTE Dedicated to Cataloging for the Preservation Department	p.16
5. Relationship Between Online Records Structure and Conveyance of Preservation Photocopy Information	p.17

INTRODUCTION

Reproduction in one form or another has been part of scholarship since antiquity. Many of our classic tales were oral histories reproduced on paper. The Bible and the writings of the classic philosophers and church fathers were painstakingly copied by hand for preservation. However, since antiquity, facsimiles have also created problems for scholars. Anyone who has ever played the children's game "telephone" understands the problems of oral history as a record. In modern times, criticisms of facsimiles as a tool of scholarship have been published periodically since 1880 when Henry Wilson wrote "Remarks on Facsimile Reproductions" for Library Association of the United Kingdom Monthly Notes.¹ More recently, bibliographers, such as G. Thomas Tanselle² have written that photocopies are an inappropriate tool for textual study and criticism. Organizations including the Committee on Scholarly Editions (previously the Center for Editions of American Authors) have created strict regulations governing the use of xerographic reproductions in scholarship.³

These limitations on the value of xerographic reproductions for scholarly use place the library community in a very difficult position. It is estimated that there are 320 million books in research libraries in the United States. Of these 320 million books, 80 million are brittle, i.e. the paper in the books could not withstand two double folds without breaking. There are approximately 12 million unique brittle titles in the nation-

¹ Henry Wilson, "Remarks on Facsimile Reproductions" Library Association of the United Kingdom Monthly Notes 1(1880). Quoted in G Thomas Tanselle, "Reproductions in Scholarship" Studies in Bibliography 42 (1989) 5-54.

² G Thomas Tanselle, "Reproductions in Scholarship," Studies in Bibliography 42 (1989) 5-54.

³ Center for Editions of American Authors, Statement of Editorial Principles (1967). Cited in G Thomas Tanselle, "Reproductions in Scholarship" Studies in Bibliography 42 (1989) 5-54.

wide research collection. The optimistic goal of the United States Brittle Books Project is to save on microfilm the textual content of 3 million of these titles⁴. The remainder of these titles will either cease to exist or will be saved by digitizing the information or by making preservation photocopies of these titles. A preservation photocopy, for the purposes of this study, is a macroform xerographic reproduction of an entire volume or bound pamphlet made on paper that has a minimum ph of 7.5, a minimum alkaline reserve equivalent to 2% calcium carbonate based on dry over weight of the paper, and includes no grounded or unbleached pulp.⁵ After a copy of a work is made, the original is often in such poor condition that it is discarded.

The preservation photocopy as a work creates an intellectual challenge for catalogers. Items which are reproductions of older works are neither exact replicas of the original nor unique works in terms of intellectual content. Library of Congress coined the term "multiple versions" to describe the relationship between different formats with the same intellectual content. For the purposes of this study, multiple versions will encompass reproductions of original works, items that have minor physical variations from original works, and items with the same intellectual content that are issued in multiple physical formats. New editions, translations, abridgements and the like, while related, are unique intellectual items and are not within the scope of this discussion. Cartographic materials are also excluded from this study because the Library of Congress and Anglo American Cataloging Rules 2nd Edition (AACR2) treat them differently than other print materials.

There has been tremendous debate within librarianship about how to describe multiple versions material and under what circumstances a unique record should be

⁴ Slow Fires: On the Preservation of the Human Record, or Turning to Dust (Washington DC: Center for Research Libraries and the National Endowment for the Humanities, 1986) Video recording.

⁵ These standards for xerography are taken from the ARL Preservation Statistics Questionnaire 1990-1991 in the explanation of questions 21 and 22.

created. This debate centers on whether the original item or the item in hand should be the primary focus of the catalog record. This question has been viewed in terms of the needs of users, technology available, and associated costs of cataloging.⁶ The Multiple Versions Forum was organized by the Library of Congress to arrive at a consensus on constructing bibliographic records for multiple versions material. The conclusion of the participants was that a hierarchical two tiered approach be utilized. In this approach the first level was a USMARC record for the original regardless of whether or not the library holds the original. The second tier was a dependent USMARC holding record which indicated what was actually held by the institution. The Library of Congress attempted to follow these recommendations and developed a proposal which it submitted for discussion at the June 1991 meeting of the USMARC Advisory group⁷. The group rejected these recommendations due to concern about the appropriateness of including version information in a holdings records format. Additional fields would also have to be added to the MARC holding record to contain this version specific information. The American Library Association Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, (CC:DA) Task Force on Multiple Versions suggested a compromise approach which incorporated the Multiple Versions Forum's hierarchical two tiered approach but did not rely on the USMARC holding record format.⁸ The CC:DA felt the mixing of holdings information and bibliographic information obscured bibliographic relationships. Instead of using holdings records, it recommended that dependent bibliographic records be used. The American Library

⁶ Crystal Graham, "Rethinking National Policy for Cataloging Microform Reproductions" Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 6, no.4 (1986): 69-83.

⁷Crystal Graham, "Microform Reproductions and Multiple Versions: U.S. Cataloging Policy and Proposed Changes." The Serials Librarian 22 (1992): 213-234

⁸ MARBI, Discussion Paper 67: Multiple Versions in the USMARC Formats (April 1993).

Association Committee on Machine Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI) responded with a discussion paper of its own⁹, this time rejecting the dependent record theory entirely and instead suggesting either full bibliographic records or minimal bibliographic records depending on the technology for cloning available at a given institution.

In 1994 the CC:DA incorporated the concerns of MARBI¹⁰ and comments from its own Task Force to Review the Guidelines for Bibliographic Descriptions of Reproductions and developed a formal statement which was approved by the CC:DA at its Midwinter meeting in February of 1994. The guidelines for bibliographic control of multiple versions material were published in 1995¹¹. These guidelines focus on the specific descriptive cataloging elements rather than on institutional presentational approaches. They provide specific examples of both holdings records for preservation photocopies and use of the note field with complete printing of all 533 subfields to give complete information regarding the publication of the reproduction.

The majority of literature about multiple versions cataloging has focused on microform reproductions. This study attempts to find out how academic research libraries catalog preservation photocopies of monographic, non-cartographic materials.

⁹ MARBI . Discussion Paper 67 : Multiple Versions in the USMARC Formats (April 1993).

¹⁰ These concerns were brought out in MARBI Meeting Minutes ALA Annual Conference 1993 where Discussion Paper 67 is discussed.

¹¹ CC: DA Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions (1995).

LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of the library literature reveals little information directly discussing preservation photocopies within the question of multiple versions cataloging. The only quantitative studies discussing preservation xerography do so within the context of the larger preservation program of an institution. The Association of American Research Libraries (ARL) is an organization which is made up of the largest research libraries in the United States and Canada. ARL preservation statistics¹² indicate that photocopying is a prevalent preservation tool within research institutions. ARL institutions made preservation photocopies of 49,687 entire bound volumes and pamphlets during the 1990-1991 fiscal year. Preservation photocopying is heavily relied on in smaller institutions as well. In a study of 18 medium size Midwestern academic libraries during fiscal year 1988-1989, Lamb¹³ found that 14 of the institutions utilized a portion of their preservation budget for full volume xerography.

A study project by Jan Merrill-Oldham¹⁴ on preservation program models for ARL included creating benchmark standards for preservation programs. She advised that ARL libraries at level 4 (which implies that an institution is committed to preservation program development and has sufficient depth and breadth to make significant progress in preserving retrospective collections over the next two decades) but with collections under 2 million volumes should be reformatting materials to either microform or preservation xerography at a rate of over 800 per year. As institutions grow larger in size these reformatting minimum standards increase as well.

¹² ARL Preservation Statistics 1990-91: A Compilation of Statistics from the Members of the Association of Research Libraries (Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1992).

¹³ Robert Scott Lamb II, Comprehensive Academic Library Preservation and Conservation Activities Survey for Fiscal Year 1988-1989. (Indiana State University, 1989).

¹⁴ Jan Merrill-Oldham, Preservation Program Models: A Study Project and Report. (Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1991) 55.

Furthermore, those same standards indicate that libraries with between 2 and 3 million volumes should have at least a .5 FTE cataloger and a full time bibliographic assistant reporting directly to the preservation officer. Again, as institutions grow in size so does the preservation cataloging demand with the benchmark that at over 5 million volumes, 1 to 2 catalogers and 2 to 3 bibliographic assistants should be reporting directly to the preservation officer.

Cataloging policy for multiple versions has been discussed in the library literature. The first report on the special need of multiple versions was written by Wesley Simonton for ARL in 1961¹⁵. Simonton identifies two theories for the physical description of reproductions: 1) facsimile theory; and 2) edition theory. Facsimile theory emphasizes the intellectual content of the work and considers reproductions of previously existing works as copies of the original. In describing reproductions, facsimile theory attempts to describe the original first and then adds pertinent information describing the reproduction second. Edition theory on the other hand is concerned with trying to describe the physical item present. Edition theory cataloging focuses on the reproduction rather than the original work.

The first edition of the Anglo American Cataloging Rules (AACR1) supports Simonton's facsimile theory. Rule 191 indicates that reproductions should be cataloged for the original they attempt to reproduce. Reproduction information is included with a "dashed entry" in the note field. The second edition of the Anglo American Cataloging Rules (AACR2) and its later revision (AACR2R) both reverse this focus in support of edition theory. Rule 0.24 requires cataloging of the item in hand. The Library of Congress opposed this change and issued a rule interpretation supporting Simonton's facsimile theory and ignoring the mandate of AACR2.

The decision by Library of Congress to catalog reproductions with emphasis on

¹⁵ Simonton, Wesley. "Bibliographic Control of Microforms." Library Resources and Technical Services 6, no 1 (1962): 29-40.

the original forced the library community to focus on the circumstances under which one should create new bibliographic records. Janet Swan Hill (1982) points out that

When a library possesses a copy of a work and acquires or creates another manifestation of it, it may catalog the copy, making a separate catalog record of it, or it may choose not to. The decision is internal, and not governed by AACR2.¹⁶

Crystal Graham in "Definition and Scope of Multiple Versions"¹⁷ states that reproductions made for conservation purposes are often described as though the original were held. This may be done due to institutional concern that the identification of the publication is obscured by highlighting the publication details of the reproduction rather than the original, limitations in the on-line public access catalog (OPAC) record presentation format, or because of the amount of cataloging resources required to recatalog materials.

There is no shortage of 'versions' that the bibliographic community must deal with. Claudia Houk McNellis' study at the University of Chicago¹⁸ indicated that between 21% and 32% of a research library's collection exists in multiple manifestations. She found up to 83 versions for a single item in her sample of 250 bound volumes. Not all of her manifestations meet the definition set here for multiple versions because she also includes translations and analytics as manifestations of a work. However, it does indicate the diversity of records one might find in an online catalog for a single title.

¹⁶ Janet Swan Hill, "Descriptions of Reproductions of Previously Existing Works: Another View" Microform Review 11 no.2 (1982): 18.

¹⁷ Crystal Graham, "Definition and Scope of Multiple Versions" Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 11, no.2 (1990): 22.

¹⁸ Claudia Houk McNellis, "Describing Reproductions: Multiple Physical Manifestations in the Bibliographic Universe" Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 5, no.3 (1985): 43-44.

The Multiple Versions Forum held in December 1989 discussed the different ways multiple versions records could be displayed in an online environment. The forum explored different record structures from the perspective of the cataloger and the patron of composite records, hierarchical records, and separate linked records of multiple version material.

Composite records carry descriptions of all multiple versions within the holding notes of a single record. An example of composite records can be found in the paper presented by Marjorie Adams and Daphne C. Hsueh at the 4th Annual Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) conference in 1986¹⁹. Their paper provides examples of a single bibliographic record emphasizing the intellectual entity or content of a work rather than its physical manifestation. Holdings are provided in conjunction with a short title display. No format designators are included for paper version, whether original or xerographic. Microformats are indicated in parenthesis within the holding note.

Hierarchical records carry descriptions of multiple versions in partial records that are bibliographically dependent on a separate full bibliographic record of the original. This approach was recommended by the Multiple Versions Forum and is discussed in great detail in the forum report. It is also discussed in the CC:DA guidelines.

Separate bibliographic records for each item are currently used at the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada (although in Canada they are following the procedures outlined in AACR2 and are cataloging the item at hand as

¹⁹ Marjorie E. Adams, and Daphne C Hsueh. "Handling of Serials in Micro Reproduction: Single Bibliographic Record/ Multiple Formats-- an Ohio State University Experience." in Energies for Transition: Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Baltimore, Maryland, April 9-12, 1986. (1986): 23-26.

predominant²⁰). The Library of Congress is using its own call number as a linkage between bibliographic records (originally as an interim measure until the recommendations of the Multiple Versions Forum could be implemented). The addition of linkage fields in the USMARC bibliographic format are discussed in MARBI Discussion Paper 75 and in Proposal No.95-6 .

OCLC input standards require new entries for bibliographically unique works. A change in the USMARC 533 (Reproductions note) field is sufficient reason to enter a new record onto the OCLC database. The Cooperative Cataloging Council issued a final report in October of 1993 recommending cataloging multiple versions as separate records and linking them through the 300 (Physical description), 533, and 539 (full length Data Elements of Reproduction Note) USMARC fields.

As demonstrated in the above discussion, there are several different ways in which libraries may catalog multiple versions material. Materials may be cataloged using edition theory or facsimile theory. They may be incorporated into composite records, hierarchical records, and separate records which may or may not be linked. Many of the possible combinations of approaches do not consider the unique needs of reformatted materials that do not change general materials designation (GMD). There are many options and few standards for cataloging preservation photocopies of monograph non-cartographic materials. It is the goal of this study to discover how academic libraries are actually cataloging these materials.

²⁰ John Clark and Wayne Jones, "The Cataloguing of Serial Microform Reproduction at the National Library of Canada." The Serials Librarian 22 (1992):199.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The objective of this study was to discover how American Academic ARL member institutions convey multiple versions information. This objective was achieved through study of the following questions:

- * Do ARL libraries convey preservation photocopying information? If so, do they provide the information in full bibliographic records, minimal bibliographic records, or dependent records?
- * If libraries are conveying preservation photocopy information in their OPACs, how are they using the USMARC bibliographic and holdings formats to present the information to users? Are they also conveying this information to OCLC?
- * Do these libraries' (OPAC) record structures fall into the categories of composite records, hierarchical records, or separate records which may or may not be linked?
- * Does a relationship exist between how American Academic ARL member institutions catalog monographic non-cartographic full volume preservation photocopies and the records structure of their OPACs for multiple versions material?

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In order to determine how libraries are actually providing bibliographic control for preservation photocopies on a local and national level, an exploratory survey of preservation officers from ARL libraries was conducted in January 1995 in conjunction with a search of library holdings on OCLC and the Internet for participating ARL institutions.

Sample

The initial survey was sent out to preservation officers at the 66 American academic ARL member libraries whose institutions indicated that they made preservation photocopies during the fiscal year 1991-1992 in the ARL preservation survey. These institutions were chosen because they already have statistical information gathered about preservation photocopying activities. These institutions comprised the only population of American Academic ARL institutions which were known to make preservation photocopies of full volume non-cartographic materials. Canadian libraries were excluded because the National Library of Canada has chosen to perform cataloging in accordance with AACR2 and it was assumed that most Canadian institutions are following their lead. Further, it was assumed that U.S. research libraries are cataloging in accordance with Library of Congress Rule Interpretations which require cataloging records of reproductions which emphasize the original work rather than the item in hand. The survey asked preservation officers to provide basic bibliographic information about five titles of non-cartographic monographs for which the institution made entire volume preservation photocopies within the past two years. Multiple titles were requested in order to verify consistency in records presentation within a given institution. Serials were excluded because the cataloging requirements of CONSER have created standards in this area. Non-

cartographic materials were specified because since the implementation of integrated MARC it is possible to describe both the book format and cartographic nature of atlases and other bound groupings of maps. The Library of Congress requires cataloging in accordance with the principles of AACR2 for reproductions of cartographic materials. This inconsistency in the rule interpretations made inclusion of bound cartographic volumes inappropriate for the purposes of this study.

Instrument

Since this topic had never been studied in depth previously, the author designed a questionnaire for the purposes of this study. The questionnaire was short with its primary purpose being to obtain basic bibliographic information about the reproduced volumes. The survey was reviewed by my advisor and by individuals with knowledge of the preservation and cataloging fields to test validity.

Searches on the Internet and OCLC were made by the author. Screen prints for each title were made of OPAC records for each institution as viewed on the Internet and were analyzed to determine if their nature most closely resembles composite, hierarchical, or separate multiple records structure. It was also noted whether full, minimal, or dependent cataloging was performed as defined in OCLC input standards. When able to view the MARC record, it was noted how preservation information was included in the OPAC record.

Procedures and Design

Surveys were mailed out along with a cover letter to the preservation officer at each institution. Due to the nature of this survey institutional anonymity could not be provided however, assurances were made that data collected will be presented in statistical format only and that the original information from each institution will only be

viewed by the author and her advisor. A postage paid return envelope was enclosed to attempt to decrease non-response bias along with the option for contributors to receive copies of the authors results.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Results

Survey responses were received from 28 institutions, which is a 42.4 % response rate. A brief overview of how libraries are recording preservation photocopy information, if at all, is provided below. In all cases either MARC records were available on the OPAC or the institution provided copies of MARC record, or comments provided with survey indicated method used by institution. When institutions provided multiple titles that were not all cataloged the same way, accompanying written comments which indicated current procedures determined how the institutions cataloging method was categorized. If no written materials were provided, the method used on the majority of titles was considered to be the institution's standard method.

Table 1-- Method of Recording Photocopy Information

Method of recording photocopy information	Number of institutions
533 field utilized	12
59X field utilized	2
Holding record utilized	3
Preservation photocopy information not conveyed on OPAC	3
Titles had minimal cataloging only with a note of cataloging in process	1
Library does not keep records of preservation xerography performed	4
Library no longer performs preservation xerography, no old records kept	3

The survey indicated that the most common means of recording preservation photocopy information is the 533 field. However, it is not the only location in the MARC record utilized. Institutions are also using the local note, 59X²¹ field and adding the same information found in 533 to provide the photocopy information. From a user standpoint both fields print as local notes and this differentiation makes little difference in the OPAC record. The difference in the use of these two fields does have implications for the accuracy of information available on the bibliographic utilities. Unlike the use of 533, 59X local notes do not require a new record be input onto OCLC. The use of 59X seems to indicate that these institutions consider preservation xerography to be a local selection issue.

Even amongst institutions that are recataloging their photocopied works utilizing the 533 field, less than half are updating their holdings symbol on OCLC. The table below illustrates the relationship between how preservation photocopy information is provided in the OPAC and whether the information is updated on OCLC.

Table 2-- Relationship between institution's holding symbol attached to OCLC and how photocopy information provided in the OPAC²²

Institution's holdings symbol attached to	Method of providing photocopy information in OPAC				
	533	holding	59X	no note	temporary record
OCLC record for original only	6	2	2	2	0
OCLC record for copy	4	1	0	0	0
No holdings attached to OCLC record	2	0	0	1	1

²¹ According to USMARC Concise, local notes are described as 59X. OCLC only utilizes 590 within its input standards. The institutions surveyed mainly, but not exclusively used 590. One institution created a 593 local system note.

²² 21 institutional responses are provided rather than the 28 listed in Table 1 due to seven institutions not providing titles within their responses.

The lack of reporting to OCLC in no way reflects the level of cataloging being done by institutions. The majority of institutions are providing full cataloging as defined in the OCLC input standards for the original item photocopied. When photocopy information is provided in the note area of the bibliographic record (533 or 590 fields), publishing institution, location, and date of copy were consistently given as well. The table on the following page gives a breakdown of cataloging by level and relates this information to holding symbols on OCLC for the xerographic reproduction.

Table 3--Relationship of Level of Cataloging to Photocopy Information on OCLC²³

Level of Cataloging	Photocopy Information on OCLC	
	yes	no
Full	4	12
Minimal	0	2
Dependent	1	2

Additional analysis was performed to see if the number of FTE an institution dedicates to cataloging for the preservation department could be correlated with use of any given cataloging method (533, holdings, 59X). No formal correlations could be made with statistical accuracy, however, all institutions not keeping records about preservation photocopying performed at their institution also indicated that less than 0.1 FTE was dedicated to cataloging for the preservation department. Additionally, all institutions that indicated by free form note that they were unable to respond to the survey question because preservation cataloging was integrated into their overall library work flow utilize the 533 field. A complete breakdown cataloging method used related to dedicated FTE is as follows:

²³ 21 institutional responses are provided rather than the 28 listed in Table 1 due to seven institutions not providing titles within their response.

Table 4--FTE Dedicated to Cataloging for the Preservation Department

Number of FTE	Method photocopy information conveyed	number
Less than 0.1 FTE	Did not respond to question	4
	Library does not keep records of xerography performed	5
	533 field utilized	1
	590 field utilized	1
0.1 FTE to 0.9 FTE	Photocopy information not conveyed on OPAC	1
	533 field utilized	4
	590 field utilized	1
	Titles had minimal cataloging with note of cataloging in process	1
1.0 FTE to 1.5 FTE	533 field utilized	2
	Holding record utilized	1
	Photocopy information not conveyed on OPAC	2
1.6 FTE +	533 field utilized	1
*Unknown	533 field utilized	4

* Unknown per preservation cataloging integrated with work flow

The majority of institutions' OPACs could be categorized as utilizing separate bibliographic records structure. In particular, the 533 field is most often used in conjunction with separate records. All of the institutions utilizing the holdings record to provide preservation information had a hierarchical structure. Composite records typically did not contain preservation information. In the one exception to this the 590 field incorporated a note indicating that copy two of this item was a photocopy. A complete breakdown of record structure follows:

Table 5--Relationship Between Online Records Structure and Conveyance of Preservation Photocopy Information

How information conveyed	Records Structure		
	Composite	Separate	Hierarchical
533 field utilized	0	10	2
590 field utilized	1	1	0
Holding record utilized	0	0	3
Photocopy information not conveyed on OPAC	2	1	1

In addition to the methods described, four of the above institutions also displayed preservation photocopy information by changing the date cuttered as part of the call number. Three of these institutions added an alpha after the year of original publication to convey that it was a copy held. The other institution changed the year in the call number to the year the copy was made. One of the preservation officers indicated in a free form comment that his institution now used an alpha indicator but previously had changed dates. The policy had been changed due to concerns that patrons doing a title search may believe the information in the newer call number date implies that the information is more recent in the copy than the information in the original.

DISCUSSION

There seems to be little general consensus within the profession regarding the role photocopies play within the larger context of national preservation efforts. On the one hand, 25% of the libraries responding to this survey either no longer perform preservation photocopying and kept no records of titles previously completed or do not keep records of current titles being copied. Of those recataloging their photocopies using the 533 field only 33% provided holdings information for the copy to OCLC. One institution indicated "We do not report photocopies to the national utilities (OCLC, RLIN) because photocopy replacement is a local treatment decision not a national preservation decision". On the other hand, another institution provided a complete set of formal procedures which had been in place several years requiring use of the 533 field and a change in call number for photocopies. Institutions that recatalog items and update their holdings on OCLC may feel that since scarcity is one of the criteria an institution may use in making a decision on whether or not to preserve an item, that it is important that the national utilities accurately reflect their holdings. Additionally, there are those users for whom a xerographic reproduction is an unacceptable substitute for an original item. These users should be able to tell through the utilities where original items may be located.

Photocopies are not the only types of items affected by multiple version cataloging decisions for reproductions. Digitally scanned items for which a paper facsimile is then produced are being noted with the term "photocopy" at some institutions. As technology improves, users may demand the enhanced legibility and clarity digitally scanned materials offer. Unfortunately, the likelihood of corrupted information is also increased. As a result it may be even more important to scholars for whom xerographic reproductions present problems that the true nature of materials available be made known. For those institutions for whom the decision to make copies

is a local selection issue only, the presence of digitally scanned information may intensify the arguments in favor of reporting these materials to the utilities since multiple copies may be made repeatedly without degeneration of reprint quality. The term "photocopy" may need to be replaced with a term specific to digitally scanned reproductions to meet those needs.

The issue should also be addressed as to whether or not there should be so many methods of reporting xerographic reproductions within the MARC bibliographic and holding formats. The guidelines published by CC:DA earlier this year demonstrate several different approaches and indicate that choice of format is a local decision only. This lack of consistency may be difficult for users, especially as the number of remote users of library catalogs increase. This inconsistency of format may be even more confusing to users when other institutional OPAC issues are taken into account. Long and brief versions of the same record may be available on an OPAC. The photocopy note is often available only on the long version of the record. Since the default for most catalogs of this type is the brief display, this information is not readily available to the user. At other institutions, where the MARC record is a viewing option on the OPAC display, the 533 field may not be printed as a local note in the main record and may be visible only from within the MARC view. Unless bibliographic instruction includes discussion on how to utilize information in the MARC format many users may not know to locate preservation information. Much of the variation noted may be related to the date at which institutions began addressing multiple versions issues and the OPAC system they utilize. Both the study of the date institutions began recataloging xerographic reproductions and the types of information in different OPAC displays are beyond the scope of this study, however, they may act as a starting point for future research.

CONCLUSION

This study indicates that there is still little consistency in the way preservation photocopies are being cataloged. Libraries are using the 533, 59X, and holding records to provide their patrons information about preservation photocopies. 14% (3 out of 21) of the libraries in this study are choosing not to provide this information to their patrons at all. Instead they list the reproduction as copy two, and show in their circulation records that copy one has been withdrawn. Institutions that do not use holding records to provide this information to patrons tend to prefer separate records in their OPACs to hierarchical records despite the possible confusion for patrons when multiple listings for the same title are found. The addition of the proposed linkage fields to the MARC record may alleviate some of that confusion in the future. If institutions choose to adopt the guidelines recently published by the CC:DA consistency will increase in what information is presented. They should also ensure that the same level of detail provided for micrographic reproductions today will be available for multiple versions materials regardless of format. Additional study is warranted focusing on whether standardization should occur regarding the methods by which preservation information is recorded and displayed.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Marjorie E. and Daphne C Hsueh. 1986. Handling of Serials in Micro
Reproduction: Single Bibliographic Record/ Multiple Formats--an OhioState
University Experience. In Energies for Transition: Proceedings of the Fourth
National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries,
Baltimore, Maryland, April 9-12, 1986, edited by Danuta A. Nitecki, 23-26.
Chicago: American Library Association.
- Anglo American Cataloging Rules. North American Text. 1967. Chicago: American
Library Association.
- Anglo American Cataloging Rules 2nd Edition 1988 Revision. 1988. Ottawa and
Chicago: Canadian Library Association, American Library Association.
- ARL Preservation Statistics 1990-91: A Compilation of Statistics from the Members of
the Association of Research Libraries. 1992. Washington D.C.: Association of
Research Libraries.
- Clark, John and Wayne Jones. 1992. The Cataloguing of Serial Microform
Reproduction at the National Library of Canada. The Serials Librarian 22 :
197-211.
- Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, Cataloging and Classification
Section, Association for Library Collections and Technical Services. 1995.
Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions. Chicago : American
Library Association.
- Cooperative Cataloging Council. 1993. Final Report (October).

Genz, Janet. 1993. Preservation Analysis and the Brittle Book Problem in College Libraries: Their Identification of Research Level Collections and Their Implications College and Research Libraries 54 no. 3 : 227-239.

Graham, Crystal. 1992. Microform Reproductions and Multiple Versions: U.S. Cataloging Policy and Proposed Changes. The Serials Librarian 22 : 213-234.

_____. 1990. Definition and Scope of Multiple Versions. (Presented at Multiple Versions Forum, December 5-8 1989.) Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 11, no.2 : 5-32.

_____. 1986. Rethinking National Policy for Cataloging Microform Reproductions. Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 6, no.4 : 69-83.

Hill, Janet Swan. 1982. Descriptions of Reproductions of Previously Existing Works: Another View. Microform Review 11, no 2 : 14-21.

Lamb, Robert Scott II 1989. Comprehensive Academic Library Preservation and Conservation Activities Survey for Fiscal Year 1988-1989. Indiana State University.

Library of Congress Rule Interpretations for AACR2, 1988 Revision. 1995. Oberlin, Ohio: Oberlin College Library.

McNellis, Claudia Houk 1985. Describing Reproductions: Multiple Physical Manifestations in the Bibliographic Universe Cataloging and Classification Quarterly 5, no.3 35-48.

MARBI 1993. Discussion Paper 67: Multiple Versions in the USMARC Formats

_____. 1994. Discussion Paper 75: Linking Fields in the USMARC Bibliographic Format

_____. 1993. MARBI Meetings ALA Annual Conference 1993 Minutes June 26-28, 1993.

_____. 1994. Proposal Number 95-6: Linking Code for Reproduction Information in the USMARC Bibliographic Format.

Merrill-Oldham, Jan. 1991. Preservation Program Models: A Study Project and Report. Washington D.C.: Association of Research Libraries

Multiple Versions Forum. 1990. Multiple Versions Forum Report. Washington D.C.: Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress.

Network Development and MARC Standards Office 1991 USMARC Concise Formats Washington D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Services, Library of Congress.

Online Computer Library Center 1993 OCLC Prism Bibliographic Format and Standards Dublin, Ohio: Online Computer Library Center Inc.

Simonton, Wesley. 1962. Bibliographic Control of Microforms. (originally presented to ARL June 1, 1961)Library Resources and Technical Services 6, no 1: 29-40.

Slow Fires: On the Preservation of the Human Record, or Turning to Dust 1986 Center for Research Libraries and the National Endowment for the Humanities .

Tanselle, G. Thomas. 1989. Reproductions in Scholarship. Studies in Bibliography 42: 5-54.