1972

Computerized Centralized Processing or Individual Cataloging and Processing for School Libraries: A Comparative Study

Mary Catherine Glentzer
University of Northern Iowa

Computerized Centralized Processing or Individual Cataloging and Processing for School Libraries: A Comparative Study

Abstract

This survey and research study was designed to determine which of the following two methods for the cataloging, processing, and acquisitioning of school library materials is most efficient for use by school libraries: the computerized centralized processing method, or the individual school librarians.

COMPUTERIZED CENTRALIZED PROCESSING OR INDIVIDUAL CATALOGING AND PROCESSING FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY

A Research Paper

Presented to

Miss Elizabeth Martin

Department of Library Science

University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Course Requirements of

Seminar in Librarianship 35:289

---

by

Mary Catherine Glentzer

March 1972

Accepted as departmental paper 4/12/72

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

With the increasing number of books and audiovisual materials published in the United States each year, the advent of an increasing school population, the consolidation of school districts, and the introduction of modern technology into America's school systems, computerized central processing for the cataloging and acquisition of school library materials has become increasingly popular. Not only have several metropolitan school systems such as New York City and Los Angeles recently turned to centralized processing, but many smaller school districts throughout the nation (Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for example) have found the use of the computer in central processing to be highly advantageous to school library personnel.

School administrators share mixed feelings as regards centralized processing for school libraries. Many school administrators such as those in New York feel that, "The elementary and secondary public and private school libraries . . . benefit greatly from centralized book processing and a cataloging center."[1] Other school administrators in various parts of the country feel that centralized processing is not worth the money, time, and effort involved in incorporating it into their

---

[1]"Central Processing System for School Libraries in New York State," Report to Bureau of School Libraries. New York State Education Department (Boston, Massachusetts: Arthur D. Little, Inc., October, 1967), p.1. (Microfiche)

school system. According to a recent article written by Mr. Ralph Ellsworth, Director of Libraries at the University of Colorado, such administrators, ". . aren't interested and do not realize how much money they are wasting or how much slow and low quality cataloging service they are offering their readers."[2]

Certainly some form of descriptive research is needed to help resolve this two-sided dilemma in education. It is hoped that the following report of the findings from the literature, as well as the proposed survey study, will aid us in resolving this problem.

Statement of the Problem

This survey and research study was designed to determine which of the following two methods for the cataloging, processing, and acquisitioning of school library materials is most efficient for use by school libraries: the computerized centralized processing method, or the individual school librarians.

Specifically, the study was designed to answer the following questions: Under which method of cataloging, processing and acquisition is the least amount of time spent by the librarian and/or clerical help in the processing of an individual item?

Under which method of cataloging, processing and acquisition do the skills, abilities, and professional qualifications of the school library personnel appear to be used to the greatest advantage? More specifically, which method best allows both professional and non-professional school library personnel the opportunity to perform the tasks for which they were trained?

---

[2]Ralph E. Ellsworth, "Another Chance for Centralized Cataloging," Library Journal, 89:15 (September 1, 1964), 3104.

Which method of cataloging, processing, and acquisition will provide the most efficient use of both processing time and of the talents of school library personnel for the least cost to the school system? More specifically, is the overall cost of designing, organizing, providing, and operating each of the two methods of cataloging and acquisition equivalent to the time and personnel efficiency of the processing services each method provides?

Importance of the Study

One of the educator's concerns today is how he can provide his students with new, relevant materials quickly and efficiently. In the past decade the advent of federal funds and the increased emphasis on the development of centralized school libraries have caused the demand for books and other school library materials to rise sharply. As it appears that this demand will continue to grow in the near future, computerized central processing centers have been employed in the school systems of many of our larger cities in the United States.

Handling large quantities of material quickly and efficiently, the computerized central processing centers have appeared to be an answer for these larger school systems. A survey study determining the efficiency of both individual and computerized methods of cataloging, processing and acquisition in school libraries will assist us in ascertaining whether the computerized central processing method will be the most efficient and effective method for use in both large and small school libraries in our nation.

Assumptions

The computerized central processing centers are organized and structured basically the same in all school systems where the central process-

ing method is employed. For example, most central processing centers are located near the center of the school district, adjacent to the individual schools which they serve. Most centers contain a variety of well trained professional and clerical personnel to assist in the detailed process of the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of print and non-print materials.

The duties and tasks performed by the professional and non-professional personnel are basically the same in all school libraries which employ computerized central processing. In such school libraries the professional school librarian functions as a teacher, as wise selector of both print and non-print materials, and a wise budget manager who is allotted so much a year by his/her school to spend for library materials. These are the tasks for which a professional school librarian is trained and should be performing. To the non-professional personnel, or clerical help, fall the technical duties involved in the library. The circulation of books, collection of fines, re-shelving of books, and preparation of books for the shelves after central processing occupy a large part of a school library clerk's time.

The duties and tasks performed by the professional and non-professional personnel are basically the same in all school libraries which employ individual cataloging and processing of school library materials. In such school libraries the professionally trained librarian makes the final decision as to how a particular print or non-print item should be cataloged, in addition to performing her duties as a teacher, materials selector and budget manager. Both clerk and librarian in this situation work at the acquisition and processing of school library materials. In addition to her typing duties in the cataloging area, the clerk must also carry on her duties as circulation attendant, re-shelving attendant,

and so on. Of course, in those school libraries which do not employ a clerk and do not have access to centralized processing, the librarian must perform all the above duties.

The problems of cost and efficiency are basically the same for all school libraries. However, the larger the school library and the school system, the more complex become the problems.

Limitations of the Study

The majority of school libraries using computerized central processing are either large city, college, or university school systems. These are the school systems which will be randomly sampled in the survey for their use of the computerized central processing method.

The majority of school libraries using the traditional, individual method of cataloging and acquisition, as performed by the school librarians themselves, are either rural-consolidated, or the smaller-town school systems. These are the school systems which will be randomly sampled in the survey for their use of the individual method for cataloging and acquisition.

Any survey or questionnaire is limited in the amount of factual information and the conclusions which can be drawn from the information it provides.

Definition of Terms

Cataloging. This is the process of making a catalog card entry for each print and non-print item contained in the library collection. Each catalog card entry contains complete bibliographic information for the item it represents, as well as an explanation of the technical features of the item and the subject matter it treats.

Acquisition. This is the process of ordering, purchasing, receiving,

and unpacking from shipment those print and non-print items previously requested for the library by the professional staff. This aspect of library work is usually performed by the non-professional staff members (clerks and technicians).

Processing. This is the act of preparing each print and non-print item, newly received, for placement on the library stacks. This act involves placing the individual school's stamp on each item received, pasting book pockets on books and non-print items to prepare them for the collection, placing library cards in the book pockets so each item may eventually be signed out, placing special plastic covers on new books and special non-print items, assigning each item a number corresponding to its number on its specific catalog card entry and printing this number on the binding of the item, and placing the catalog card with the item itself, to be removed and placed in the card catalog when the item is placed upon the library shelf.

Central processing center. This is a building located in the middle of a region or a school district which contains clerks, technicians and special librarians who perform the functions of cataloging, acquisitioning and processing for all the school libraries in the region or school district. Often these central processing centers contain computers for the processing, cataloging, and acquisitioning of school library materials. Each school librarian in the individual schools of the region or school district which the center serves submits her order list to the central processing center, and the center handles the technical aspects of librarianship from then on until shipment of the ordered materials goes back to the school librarian requesting them.

Computerized central processing. This deals with the handling of the acquisitioning, cataloging, and processing of school library materials

through a computer, (or computers), located in the central processing center. Individual computers located at the center contain in their memory banks order information, a record of the catalog card entries for each item in each school library collection, and a print-out system for such information as it's required.

Individual cataloging and acquisition. This is the handling of all the processes and the technical procedures involved in cataloging and acquisitioning by the professional and non-professional library staff in each school library. All of these technical processes are performed manually by the library staff, without the aid of a computer or a central processing center.

Efficiency. This concerns the successfulness and usefulness of the processing method employed (computerized or individual) by a particular school library, determined according to such factors as the time involved in the processing of each item, the maximum usage of qualified school library personnel (as determined by their part in the processing method), and the maximum cost of the method in proportion to the processing services rendered.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

It appears that a variety of opinions exist as regards the cost, time and personnel efficiency of each of the methods of cataloging and processing under investigation in this study. There are those educators and librarians who prefer computerized central processing to any other cataloging method. There are also those who feel that only individualized cataloging and processing should be employed in school libraries.

Perhaps one of the best ways in which to approach the various facts, theories, and opinions which lie ahead, is to divide the discussion into four major areas which discuss the advantages and disadvantages of each cataloging and processing method. This may help to throw light on some of the real problems involved for various schools which employ either method.

In the following discussion, commercial cataloging receives some focus and attention. For the purposes of this investigation, commercialized cataloging and processing is viewed as but another form of computerized central processing.

As automation is the key question to many school librarians today in the area of cataloging, perhaps it's best to focus attention first on computerized central processing.

Growth of materials. Possibly some of the most pressing problems which face school librarians, (and librarians in university, public, special, and national libraries), stem from the burgeoning number of library materials being produced and available to library patrons of today. With an increasing number of materials being ordered and obtainable to libraries, effective, efficient methods of processing and cataloging such materials must be available. Perhaps the problem is best described in the following quote:

> Over the long term, mature libraries grow at a rate very close to the rate of growth of the Gross National Product when measured in constant dollars. . . .Librarians can only cope with exponential expansion if they are able to . . . expand the productivity of their personnel at a rate sufficient to offset the increases in personnel costs. . . . The cost of mechanization is decreasing rapidly, with order of magnitude cost reductions appearing in some areas and with a falling cost of computation that is currently doubling the productivity per dollar every nine months, . . .
>
> The primary conclusion of this study is that mechanization of the cataloging function is not only necessary and desirable, but also inevitable.[1]

It is obvious from the above quote that librarians in larger library systems have found computerized central processing valuable in handling an annually increasing volume of materials. Further evidence of this can be seen in the following quote stated by Michael M. Reynolds, Assistant Director of Libraries at Indiana University. Participants in the MARCI Project from 1966-1968, Indiana University officials had several comments to make on the MARC system of machine-readable cataloging. Speaking for them, Reynolds has the following to say about the

---

[1] J. L. Dolby, V. J. Forsyth, and H. L. Resnikoff, Computerized Library Catalogs: Their Growth. Cost and Utility, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1969), pp.15-16.

MARC system: ". . .it will free personnel to attack the ever-increasing, ever burgeoning number of orders which . . .during the fiscal year 1967-68, ... will more than double."[2] Clearly there are forms of computerized central processing, such as MARC, which have aided catalogers in libraries across the nation in their handling of an increasing amount of materials.

Looking to the school library situation, computerized central processing has been found to work effectively in coping with the expanding numbers of library materials being produced for students and young people. Notice the following quote taken from Report to the Bureau of School Libraries; New York State Education Department:

> . . .The findings of this study conclude that New York State libraries greatly benefit from a centralized book processing and cataloging center. . . . The growth of school libraries and library materials indicate a definite need for this at this time.[3]

Thus, there appears to be sufficient evidence to indicate that for large school systems and large university, public, and special libraries, the computerized central processing method is advantageous in assisting catalogers with the handling of increasingly larger numbers of library materials each year.

Use of personnel. Turning aside from the growth of library materials yearly, another aspect of the mechanization situation to consider is that of efficient use of personnel. According to several findings in the literature, computerized central processing provides many professional

---

[2]U. S. Council on Library Resources, The MARC Pilot Project, by Henriette D. Avram (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p.117.

[3]"Central Processing System for School Libraries," Report to the Bureau of School Libraries: New York State Education Department (Boston: Arthur D. Little, Inc., October, 1967), p.1, n. Microfiche.

librarians with much more time to perform the tasks for which they were trained. Take into consideration, for example, the following comments made by Mrs. Mildred P. Frary, Head Supervisor of the Library Section, Los Angeles, California, City Schools. In charge of a school system which centralized its ordering and cataloging for all Los Angeles City schools and colleges forty years ago,[4] Mrs. Frary is well aware of the implications of computerized central processing for school library professional and non-professional personnel. When asked if her catalogers would run out of work, Mrs. Frary had the following comments to make, "No! We hope that they may have some thinking and planning time and be able to consult the schools. We also see our department headed for a more administrative type of work."[5] Mrs. Frary has seen the advantages to her catalogers for using computerized central processing in the Los Angeles City Schools.

A further example of the implications to personnel, when computerized central processing is employed, can be seen in the following quote, stated by Mr. R. M. Pierson, in his discussion of libraries and centralized processing in a recent issue of Library Journal: ". . .It will cause many catalogers to seek other positions in the library, yet at the same time it will free them to work more with others - the patrons of the library."[6] Perhaps Mr. Pierson has noted here the goal and

---

[4]Mildred P. Frary, "Commercial Cataloging, Processing in the Los Angeles Schools," School Libraries, 15:2 (January, 1966), 11.

[5]Ibid., p.14

[6]R. M. Pierson, "Centralized Cataloging, Its Implications to Personnel," Library Journal, 90:4 (February 15, 1965), 828.

happiness of every potential and present librarian - the opportunity to work effectively and efficiently with a patron. It seems that this is what being a librarian is all about.

Thus, two professionals have stated quite clearly why they feel computerized central processing is advantageous to the professional library personnel employed in their area.

Possibly one of the best descriptions available as to why computerized central processing, organized and designed efficiently, could contribute to the effective functioning of professional and non-professional school library personnel, can be seen in the following statement. Advocates of the MARCI Project felt a truly computerized central processing method should do the following: ". . .Release personnel to perform more intellectual tasks. Jobs now neglected for lack of personnel could be accomplished."[7]

It is evident from the above statements that computerized central processing, if well-planned, organized, and implemented, could certainly be a helpful aid to the overworked catalogers and professional librarians.

Certainly another aspect of the problem in determining whether or not centralized processing should be employed in a school system, for the school libraries within that system, is the cost aspect. As most of the available data relating to the costs of computerized central processing per item is obtained through reports on the MARC Pilot Project, perhaps a brief review of the Project itself would be beneficial.

The MARC Pilot Project. The MARC (machine-readable cataloging)

---

[7]U. S., Council on Library Resources, The MARC Pilot Project, [by Henriette D. Avram] ([Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968]), p.83

Pilot Project began in November, 1966. Sponsored by the Council on Library Resources and partially funded by Congressional appropriations to the Library of Congress, the purpose of the Project was the following: ". . . an experiment to determine the feasibility of centrally producing.. producing a standardized machine-readable record for application by local installations to serve their specific requirements."[8]

In order to accomplish such a task, MARC tapes were made to be sent out to each of the sixteen libraries participating in the Project. The source data for MARC was a manuscript card containing bibliographic information from Library of Congress catalogers.[9] Each tape distributed to the participating libraries contained the following four files of information:

1. Machine-readable cataloging record
2. Machine-readable author/title record
3. Machine-readable subject-cross-reference tracing record
4. Machine-readable descriptive cross reference tracing record[10]

Completed in June, 1967, the first phase of the MARC Project distributed cataloging records for some 16,000 English language books to its sixteen participating libraries.[11] Truly such an accomplishment as this must have been available at a cost to the participating libraries.

Cost-analysis for the MARC Project. The following cost-analysis list summarizes approximately the cost of processing each MARC bibliographic

---

[8]Ibid., p.9.

[9]Ibid., p. 19

[10]Ibid., p.11.

[11]Germaine Krettek and Eileen D. Cooke, "Final Report on the MARC Pilot Project," ALA Bulletin, 63:6 (June, 1969), 752.

record input in March, 1968:

Supervision	$0.183
Manuscript card copying	0.007
Initial worksheet editing and proofreading	0.162
Initial paper tape punching	0.207
Computer operator	0.041
Diagnostic proofreading	0.125
Verified numbers and correction punching	0.033
Total labor cost	$0.758
Paper-tape typewriter rental	$0.156
Copying Machine and supplies	0.065
Computer processing	0.318
Paper materials	0.015
Other direct costs	$0.554
Total labor and other direct costs	$1.312 [12]

Truly for this type of processing for an individual item, the cost does not appear to be in excess of what might be expected.

Delving further into a cost-analysis for the MARC Project participating libraries, notice the following record of cost-time efficiency as reported by Harvard University Library from 1966-1967. It does not appear from this list that the increase cost-wise for production is in excess, when compared to the decrease in the amount of time it takes for production. Notice the following list:

	Hours	Cost
Sept. - Dec. 1966	26.65	$799.50
Jan. - Dec. 1967, Programming and Testing	28.76	$973.00
Jan. - Dec. 1967, Production	17.95	$869.50 [13]

As is recorded by the MARC Pilot Project at this time, ". . .Supervision costs had declined as production had risen . . ." [14] Clearly this

---

[12] U.S., Council on Library Resources, The MARC Pilot Project, by Henriette D. Avram (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p.76.

[13] Ibid., p.109.

[14] Ibid., p.76.

speaks well for the cost advantages in proportion to the time saved in production, through the use of the Library of Congress' Machine Readable Cataloging.

Extra services. Certainly this discussion of the advantages made possible to school and university libraries through the use of computerized central processing would not be complete without making some mention of the extra services made possible to the sixteen libraries participating in the MARC Project. Creative and innovative uses were made of the MARC tapes by the participating libraries. The following list is only a brief sample of what could be done to take full advantage of a computerized central processing effort.

The projects performed by the MARC participants can be broadly grouped into the following:

1) Use of MARC tape as a selection tool for awareness plus acquisition of new books or to match cataloging data with book in hand;

2) Production of 3x5 card sets;

3) Searching and selecting MARC records by LC subject headings and LC classification numbers for the selective dissemination of bibliographic information to university faculty members;

4) Production of book catalogs - a union catalog, . . . and a catalog for a thesis collection, which the participant produced by recording local information through an adaptation of the MARC format; . . .

5) Retrieval of MARC records to prepare specialized bibliographies;.[15]

Certainly the knowledge and professional skill of the cataloger would be broadened through the implementation of programs such as these. This is definitely an advantage to the computerized central processing method; it allows for creativity and innovation on the part of the professional librarian and professional cataloger.

---

[15] Henriette D. Avram, "MARC is a Four-Letter Word," Library Journal, 93:13 (July, 1968), 2604.

Conclusion. There are obvious cost, time, and personnel efficiency benefits to be obtained from the use of computerized central processing in the above examples. In the special, university, and public school libraries where the advantages are evident, the conditions are right for computerized central processing. Most of the libraries are large, well-funded, and contain a variety of qualified personnel. Now comes the question: What about smaller public schools and university libraries, which are not large and well-funded? This brings us to the next part of the discussion.

Disadvantages of Computerized Central Processing

Staffing problems. The smaller school libraries, as well as public and university libraries which are small, definitely run into problems when attempting to employ the computerized central processing method. For a good example of some of these problems encountered, let us turn once again to the MARC Project. While the Project was generally successful, it is perhaps beneficial to consider a few reasons why some of the libraries who had intended to participate in the Project when it began, found they could not after it had once begun. According to some of the libraries that were unable to participate, ". . .staffing problems prevented participation."[16]

The Montgomery County Public Schools exemplify this problem area quite well. Richard S. Darling, Director of the Department of Instructional Materials at the Montgomery County Public Schools had the following to say with regard to his experiences with the MARC Project:[17]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 2603.

[17] U.S., Council on Library Resources, The MARC Pilot Project, (by Henriette D. Avram) (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p.119.

> . . . it did reveal that a library system dependent on a computer controlled elsewhere in the same institution and on personnel not responsible to the library system may have difficulty in using computer services consistently and effectively.[17]

It is evident from these lines that personnel must be sufficiently well-trained and acquainted with the school libraries they serve in order to function effectively as programmers or operators of a computerized central processing center.

Further evidence of this need for trained personnel can be seen in the following quote taken from an article on the MARC Project written by Henriette D. Avram. Mentioning some of the problems encountered during the project, Miss Avram says the following in regard to staffing:

> . . . Enough lead-time must always be allowed for all the details, both administrative and technical, that are necessary to implement an automated project . . .
>
> It is absolutely essential to have the right personnel available to identify problems, ... to find a solution, implement it, and report it . . .
>
> In those libraries dependent on the staff of the computer center . . .low activity and inadequate results were reported in some cases.[18]

Thus, there appears to be evidence that, if personnel are not prepared to handle the problems involved in changing to computerized central processing, results may be very ineffective. This finding could be of significance to those schools and/or school systems contemplating the change from individual cataloging and processing to the computerized central processing method.

If problems in the training, management, and functioning of personnel occurred in a government sponsored project such as the MARC Project,

---

[17] U.S., Council on Library Resources, The MARC Pilot Project, (by Henriette D. Avram) (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1968), p.119

[18] Avram, loc. cit.

what problems might occur for an individual school system desiring to change to computerized central processing? The prospects here for those smaller schools pondering such a quest need to be considered.

Expense problems. What about the cost of such a project to the smaller school systems? Again, as MARC is one of the few computerized central processing methods which publicizes its data for the public, the comments from Project participants, and non-participants, are once again referred to. One of the major problems cited by various MARC non-participants as to why they felt they could not participate in the Project may be seen in the following statement: "It was ... too expensive to use MARC tapes not compatible with the equipment at the local institution . . ."[19]

Perhaps a more complete example of what it has cost libraries, participating in MARC II, to serve as distributors of MARC tapes, can be seen in the following table. The following figures were made public by the Oklahoma Department of Libraries in 1970. The Department functions as a centralized data base for MARC II records, distributed by the Library of Congress. Functioning in this capacity, the Department serves as a form of state aid to libraries, ". . .available to any library that can make use of it."[20]

While federal funds of course provide the tapes for the Department, the Department itself absorbs all the costs and expenses for, " . . . programming and machine time, . . .staff time and overhead costs. . . and the merging and maintenance of a MARC master file for the first year, . . ."[21]

---

[19]Henriette D. Avram, "MARC Is a Four-Letter Word," Library Journal, 93:13 (July, 1968), p.2603.

[20]Kenneth John Bierman and Betty Jean Blue, "Processing of MARC Tapes for Cooperative Use," Journal of Library Automation, 3:1 (March, 1970), 61.

[21]Ibid.

The following table is a breakdown for programming and machine time expenses, charged to the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, through the end of February, 1970:

Table 2. Costs

System design	$1,102.00
Programming	2,467.00
Machine cost for program testing, debugging, and machine and operator cost for merging through 2/28/70	2,026.00
Total Cost	$5,595.00[22]

From the data presented relating to the cost for one form of machine readable cataloging, MARC, it appears that without some form of state aid, it would be difficult for local school systems to implement computerized central processing. Certainly MARC is somewhat more expensive than localized centralized computer processing, but the price considerations to be made are similar for implementing such a service at the local level.

As the Director of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries says, "... cost figures for the MARC Project are difficult to determine and even more difficult to evaluate meaningfully."[23] Possibly this is why so little data relating to cost is available. Still, it would certainly benefit the school system considering the usage of computerized central processing to review the available information. Perhaps some definite cost disadvantages will leap forth at them.

Computer vs. human fallibility. Alas, perhaps the most distinct disadvantage of employing the computer in centralized processing and

---

[22]Ibid.

[23]Ibid.

library cataloging is the fact the computer is only as smart as the person who's operating it! A machine such as the computer can only feed back the information it receives. If it is fed the wrong information, only wrong or improper information can be fed out.

As even the advocates of MARC must confess, " . . .No matter how well we plan to check out every path that the computer will follow in processing data, we cannot predict every form the data will take. . . The computer is restricted by the limitations of its master, the human . . ." [24] Thus, precious hours of time could perhaps be lost if, at some point in the computerized cataloging process, the wrong information is fed into the computer.

Further emphasizing this dependence of the computer on human skill and intelligence, two strong advocates of individualized cataloging and processing have the following to say as regards the computer and its relationship to man:

> ... The computer, . . .can only do what it is programmed to do, and can accomplish this with speed and efficiency which repay the cost only when the operations are be repeated over and over again without change. This is the lowest level of skilled work, even though some of the operations, such as putting the information in proper sequence and arranging it for duplication may seem to be quite sophisticated. [25]

It appears from the above data that before a school library decides to employ computerized cataloging, it would be wise to see just how well such an operation would fit the qualifications of the local personnel and available facilities. Would the implementation

---

[24] Henriette D. Avram, "MARC Is a Four Letter Word," Library Journal, 93:13 (July, 1968), p.2603.

[25] John Phillip Immroth and Jay E. Daily, "V. The Computer and the Cataloging Process," Library Cataloging: A Guide for A Basic Course (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1971), p.131.

of a computer be degrading to the professional abilities of, and tasks now performed by, diligent catalogers? Would the addition of computerized cataloging aid the present cataloging situation or further hinder it? These are questions which must be asked before deciding to implement computerized central processing.

Possible expense vs. gain in production time. Is the possible gain in production time equivalent to the increased cost that will be levied on a school library system which employs computerized central processing? Again, advocates of individualized cataloging and processing do not think so. According to them, the following is true:

> ... No system exists which utilizes a computer to capacity for cataloging purposes. The requirements are such that a single library on its own budget could probably not afford to utilize a computer as the card catalog is employed, although this is technically feasible for a group of libraries operating within a wide area. It is doubtful that any great saving of time and money would result from a completely computerized cataloging system serving several libraries. Experience has shown that the resulting savings are soon required for improved service.[26]

Compare this commentary to the notable gain in production time for a slight increase in expense incurred at the Harvard University Library, discussed in the last section on the Advantages of Computerized Central Processing. Would the increase in production time which the computerized central processing might bring benefit the small school library when the increased cost simultaneously incurred is considered? It appears not. Time, expense, facilities, and personnel being considered, possibly the individualized method of cataloging and processing is best for smaller school libraries.

Conclusion. There are obvious personnel, facility, and cost disadvantages to consider when deciding whether or not to implement

---

[26]Ibid., p. 132.

computerized central processing in the smaller public school, university, college, and special library systems. Clearly the advantages for the use of computerized central processing, and all the services it provides, fall to the larger, wealthier school districts and university communities. Still, perhaps a group of small school districts together could utilize a central processing service well. There are pros and cons to either decision.

The only way in which to form an unbiased view as to what must be done, is to glance at the pros and cons of each method of cataloging and processing. After weighing all the evidence carefully, only then can one reach an intelligent, reliable decision as to what might be done in their own area and for their own school library.

Advantages of Individualized Cataloging and Processing

Local adaptation. One of the outstanding features of this method is the ease with which it may be adapted to local situations. While it was noted in the discussion on the disadvantages of computerized central processing that, ". . .It is absolutely essential to have the right personnel available to identify problems. . .",[27] the "right" personnel does not necessarily have to be a computer programming expert for a library which utilizes the individual method of cataloging and processing. Well-trained catalogers, adept at analytics, main entries, and all the other technical and scholarly aspects of cataloging, will do quite well in an individualized cataloging situation.

Neither will the problem of adaptation to local equipment and facilities be a problem for the individualized cataloger. Armed with

---

[27]Henriette D. Avram, "MARC Is a Four Letter Word," Library Journal, 93:13 (July, 1968), p.2603.

her typewriter, an efficient clerk, and electric eraser, and the know- 23
ledge she's obtained from library school, the school librarian can work can work quite well on an individual cataloging basis. Many school librarians today function as teachers, catalogers, and "librarians" and seem to do as efficient a job as could be expected from one professional person with one clerical assistant.

Correction of human error. It's a true fact that errors made manually are far easier to correct than those made by a computer, which carries its mistake throughout the entire cataloging process. Even advocates of the MARC Project had to admit this was true. Discussing the disadvantages of the MARC system, as revealed by the participants during the MARC Pilot Project, advocates and critics of the computerized system had this to say, ". . . The computer is a demon for detail. In manual systems, it is far simpler to remedy an error in approach or to change your mind about a procedure..."[28]

Thus, automation in our scientific age has its disadvantages. In a technical process such as cataloging, errors are far easier to correct at their source, than after they have been duplicated several times over. If errors are going to be made, and some are always made in any technical task prone to human error, then the individual method of cataloging is by far the easiest route to go in correcting them.

Cost and time advantage. The advocates of individualized cataloging and processing have declared that the individualized method, broken down into separate tasks and assigned to specific individuals qualified for each of those tasks, can be equally as efficient as the computerized

---

[28]Ibid.

central processing method both time and cost-wise. An excellent description of this task division is described by John Phillip Immroth and Jay E. Daily in the book entitled, Library Cataloging; A Guide for a Basic Course.

Part of this discussion of task division is quoted and described in the following lines:

> . . .Even the most primitive cataloging process, one with all cataloging done within the library and all cards prepared locally and individually, is fastest and costs least when the operations are broken down to several steps which can be accomplished by members of the cataloging department with different levels of skill-from the typist who prepared the card for duplication to the head of the department who makes final decisions only on the most problematic of materials, designs the flow of work and who maintains the quality of the finished product. The professional . . .time is devoted almost entirely to the problems of subject analysis. The technical assistant accomplishes almost all the descriptive cataloging except for the rare book . . .[29]

Such a division of tasks as described above would certainly cut down on the amount of time required for the processing of an individual item. It appears that the method would possible work as efficiently and effectively as a computerized central processing method of cataloging. Certainly at the smaller university, college, and public library level, such a system would be quite advantageous.

However, here the question might be considered: How many school librarians have access to a variety of technical personnel? Would such a division of tasks be feasible for an "average" school library? This writer doubts that it would be. Still, the aspect of computerized central processing is perhaps as far away in reality from the "average" school librarian as is the above proposal. One must continue to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of each method.

---

[29]John Phillip Immroth and Jay E. Daily, "V. The Computer and the Cataloging Process," Library Cataloging: A Guide for A Basic Course (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, 1971), p. 132.

More freedom to professional cataloger. ". . . more freedom is permitted in making entries."[30] This argument for professional, individualized cataloging is also put forth by advocates of the individualized method. The individual school librarian, in a library far from access to any form of computerized central processing, is certainly free to apply her knowledge to the decision of how a particular item should be entered in the card catalog. The scholarly and thought-provoking decisions which must be made by her when deciding on particular entries, would certainly be an asset to the organization of the card catalog in her individual school library.

Truly when emphasizing the professional role of the cataloger, the school librarian employing the individualized method has more opportunity to exercise her professional knowledge of cataloging than does the school librarian who has all the cataloging of school library materials done for her by a computer, or by professionals in a central processing center.

Conclusion. Clearly there are advantages to the individualized cataloging of library materials. For smaller school districts, university, college, public, and special libraries perhaps the advantages to individual cataloging far outweigh the advantages to computerized central processing. Still, individual cataloging and processing has its disadvantages, too. This brings us to the last phase of the discussion.

Disadvantages of Individualized Cataloging and Processing.

Time factor. Clearly for large university, public school, and

---

[30] Ibid., p.133

special libraries there is a definite time advantage to using computerized central processing over individualized cataloging and processing. Unless the tasks were divided, as Immroth and Daily suggested in the previous discussion on the advantages of the individual method, the process of catalong library materials in a school system such as the Los Angeles City Schools would be overwhelming on an individualized basis.

Mrs. Frary, Head Supervisor of the Library Section in the Los Angeles City Schools well attests to this idea in the following statements:

> Ordering, cataloging, and processing an increasing volume of materials is one of the most alarming aspects of providing services for individual schools in a very large school district. It can't be much less alarming in smaller districts. The demand for immediate access by students to books is universal, and problems of personnel, equipment, and space are the same everywhere. Commercial firms offering professional services are providing a way to solve what has seemed like an insurmountable problem.[31]

Obviously in a school system the size of the Los Angeles City Schools, computerized central processing clearly has the advantage.

Cost factor. In the long run, it must be admitted that computerized central processing costs large school systems less than would cataloging and processing done there on a totally individualized basis. Unless perhaps attempted on a divided-task basis, computerized central processing here again has the advantage.

Mrs. Frary again contributes to this fact, based on her experience in the Los Angeles City Schools. When asked if she felt the commercial method of computerized central processing cost less than that of the

---

[31]Mildred P. Frary, "Commercial Cataloging, Processing in the Los Angeles Schools," School Libraries (January, 1966), 11.

local method of cataloging and processing (once done on an individualized basis), Mrs. Frary had the following to say: "... we know the commercial cost is less than our own cost."[32]

Thus, again the cost advantages, according to those in larger school districts, fall again to computerized central processing.

Personnel factor. Perhaps a major disadvantage to the individualized method lies in this area. While it is obviously true that at the level of the large school systems, professional and non-professional school library personnel are more free to perform the duties for which they were trained (and hired) when employed in a system using the computerized central processing method, this is also true at the smaller school level. Those librarians who must catalog, process, file, and shelve books for their individual school libraries are certainly not as free to work with students all hours of the school day, as are those school librarians whose books are processed and cataloged through the help of a staff of professionals and a computer, located in a central processing center. Librarians in the schools must be free to function as teachers. Computerized central processing allows many school librarians to do this.

As Mrs. Frary said, her catalogers and librarians were now free to, "... have some thinking and planning time and be able to consult in the schools..."[33] As the MARC advocates said, they hoped their professional librarians would be more free to, "... perform more intellectual tasks."[34]

---

[32]Ibid., p.13.

[33]Ibid., p.14.

[34]U.S., Council on Library Resource, The MARC Pilot Project, (by Henriette D. Avram) (Washington:Government Printing Office,1968), p.83.

It appears that the computerized central processing method has excelled in freeing personnel to work effectively at the tasks for which they were trained. One question arises to mind here: Would an individualized method, even on a divided task basis, have freed personnel time as efficiently and effectively as this method appears to have done?

Conclusion. There are definite time, cost and personnel disadvantages for the use of individualized cataloging and processing, particularly for the larger school systems and their school libraries. Perhaps smaller school systems could overcome some or all of these disadvantages - perhaps not. Much more research needs to be done in this area of study, on both large and small school systems in order to draw any specific conclusions as to how effective individualized cataloging and processing really is.

Summary

It appears there is a real need for descriptive research on this topic of computerized central processing as opposed to individualized cataloging and processing for school libraries. Definite opinions, pro and con, exist on both sides of the issue.

Generally, those librarians, supervisors, and administrators in charge of libraries in the larger school systems, feel that computerized central processing is the only answer. An increasing number of materials to be catalogued annually; growing demands on the time of professional school library personnel; the increasing necessity to process individual items quickly and efficiently; and the increasing feeling that the cost-per-item goes down as production of items processed per day increases, are all reasons why large-city educators appear to be in favor of computerized central processing for their school libraries.

Those school districts with perhaps less money, on the other hand, seem to tend to favor individualized methods of cataloging and processing for their school libraries. Ease of local adaption; less time lost in error correcting; and efficient method of task-division which saves both time and money; and more freedom to function as a professional cataloger are all reasons why smaller-school educators appear to prefer individualized methods of cataloging and processing.

Disadvantages are viewed in a similar manner with respect to the size of the school system. Large-city school systems see individualized cataloging and processing as time-consuming for the large number of materials they must catalog; more expensive in the long run than would be individualized cataloging and processing; and less effective in utilizing personnel to the greatest advantage. School systems with less money and trained personnel view computerized central processing as too expensive when it comes to adapting it to local equipment and facilities; too inefficient when one considers the multiple errors a computer can generate; too ineffective when expense is more than production received; and too difficult to implement when one considers the trained personnel needed to accomplish the tasks of computer programming and operation.

What the literature appears to contain is a variety of opinions based on personal experience. However, if one is to intelligently decide for himself which method of cataloging and processing is most efficient for a majority of school libraries in the nation, both large and small, one must have more than opinions, he must have facts.

The following proposed survey study is aimed at finding out the facts, attitudes, and opinions on this issue of those in authority. They will be asked to explain not only which method of cataloging and processing is (or would be) most effective and efficient in their

school system, but also why this method would be best. Hopefully the results of this proposed study would enable us to determine, with a certain amount of accuracy, which method would be most efficient for a majority of school libraries. More specifically, using the results of this proposed study, we would hopefully be able to determine someday in the future which method of cataloging and processing would be most efficient for the school library in which we are employed.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The procedure to be followed for the objective evaluation of the time, personnel, and cost efficiency of each of the two methods of cataloging and processing used in school libraries (the computerized central processing method and the traditional method of individual cataloging and processing) will be as follows:

The research findings gleaned from this study and review of the current literature, along with a list obtained from the State Library Consultant for the State Department of Public Instruction (or Education) in each state in the United States, which lists specifically the schools within that state which employ computerized central processing, will be combined to form a list of those schools in the nation that employ the computerized central processing method for their school libraries.

From this list, a random sample of 50 schools will be selected as targets for this survey study. In order to select these 50 schools, each school on the list must be assigned a number. Then, through the usage of a Table of Random Numbers, the schools will be selected at random, the number of each school selected corresponding to the number equivalent to it in the Table of Random Numbers. In this way, the 50 schools selected should be representative of the total population of schools in the nation which employ the computerized central processing method for their school libraries.

In the same manner, a list will be compiled of those schools in the United States employing the traditional methods of cataloging and process-

ing for their school libraries. The research findings of this study, together with a list obtained from the State Library Consultant for the State Department of Public Instruction (or Education) in each state, which lists specifically the schools within that state which employ the individual method of cataloging and processing in their school libraries, will comprise the list of schools from which random selection will be made.

Again a random sample of 50 schools from across the nation will be selected as targets for this survey study. Each school on the list of those which employ the individual method of cataloging and processing for their school libraries, will receive a number. Then, through the usage of a Table of Random Numbers, the schools will be selected at random, the number of each school selected corresponding to the number equivalent to it in the Table of Random Numbers. In this way, the 50 schools selected should be representative of the total population of schools in the nation which employ the individual method of cataloging and processing for their school libraries.

After random selection of the 100 schools to participate in the survey has been made, each school is notified of its involvement in the survey at the beginning of the school year, six months prior to the time at which the survey will be taken. At the time of notification, the principal and superintendent of each school will receive a form requesting them to state whether or not they choose for their school to participate in the survey, and if not, why not. If they choose to participate in the survey, a battery of questions must be answered for each school, including such items as: the number of members on the school library staff and the duties of each; the number of members on the school board and the number of chief administrators for the participating school; the number of faculty members who will participate in the survey, one being selected from each area of

academic study by the principal and/or superintendent of each participating school.

This six-month time period will allow the participating schools time to respond to the notifications forms, or inform the researcher of their refusal to participate in the survey study, whichever may be the case. The notification forms are sent to each school explaining quite specifically that the contents are to be returned within thirty days or the school will automatically be cancelled from the survey and a substitute school selected.

If a particular school from either list refuses to participate in the survey or does not notify the researcher of its desire to participate within one month after the notification forms are sent, the Table of Random Numbers is again used to select a school randomly from one of the lists. This procedure of sending notification forms is then followed for the new school selected, until 100 schools, 50 from each list, are obtained for the survey study.

When time arrives for the survey to be mailed, each school will receive a packet of survey questionnaires containing one questionnaire for each member of the school library staff, one for each principal and superintendent of the participating school, one questionnaire for each school board member, and one for each of the participating faculty members from each area of academic study. The principal of each school will receive the packet, whose contents are to be distributed immediately to the participants. Thirty days will again be set as the time limit within which the questionnaires are to be filled out and returned to the researcher.

Each of the questionnaires used for the survey will contain questions designed for the particular respondents for which that questionnaire was designed. For example, the questionnaires distributed to the library staff members in each school will relate specifically to them and their

duties - the problems they realize in the use of personnel, the time needed for the processing of each item, and the overall cost of the method they are employing. The questionnaires sent to the administrators and selected faculty in each school will also be geared particularly to the duties performed by each in relation to the school library and their view of the method of cataloging and processing used in their school system.

Each of the questionnaires sent to each of the respondents participating in the survey will contain questions regarding the three specific questions stated in the statement of the problem. Questions regarding the time, personnel, and cost efficiency of the method of cataloging and processing being used in each school will be asked in some form on each questionnaire distributed in the survey. The data generated by these questionnaires will present to the researcher the facts and opinions concerning the time, personnel, and cost efficiency of each method of cataloging and processing.

The questionnaires will be validated by checking them against the Criteria for a Better Questionnaire designed by Stephen Romine of the University of Colorado. The questionnaires may also be validated by checking them against previous questionnaires and surveys taken in the area of library science. For example, the questions used in this survey may be evaluated for sentence structure and content as compared to the type of questions asked in the NEA's School Library Personnel Task Analysis Survey, performed in the 1960's. By checking the questionnaires against these various evaluating and validating methods, the research data collected by the questionnaires, used as measuring instruments, should be valid.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

In order to analyze and compare the results as to the cost, time, and personnel efficiency of each of the two methods of cataloging and processing as expressed by the library staff, administrators, school board members, and selected academic faculty in each of the 100 schools, a variety of tables will need to be constructed.

First, the results of the survey in each school which employs the individual method of cataloging and processing will need to be tallied. More specifically, the specific attitudes, facts, and opinions expressed by each group of respondents as to the time, cost, and personnel efficiency of their method of cataloging and processing, will need to be tallied for each of the 50 partipating schools. This will be accomplished by tallying both the total number of yes or no responses given by each group of respondents in each school concerning the time, cost and personnel efficiency of the individual method of cataloging and processing, and the reasons and opinions most often stated by each group as to why they answered as they did concerning the efficiency of each area. These yes or no responses will be totaled and numerically listed for each group in each school and the reasons and opinions most often stated by each group will be categorized, according to the type of response made. Thus, appropriate tables for each of the 50 schools may be made which properly illustrate the time, cost, and personnel efficiency of the individual method of cataloging and processing as expressed by the library staff, administrators, and selected faculty in each school.

Second, the results of the survey in each school employing the computerized central processing method will need to be tallied. This will be accomplished by tallying and recording the responses to the questionnaires in exactly the same manner as the responses to the above mentioned schools were tallied and recorded.

Third, a table needs to be compiled for each of the two cataloging and processing methods under study in this survey. Each table will illustrate the cost, time, and personnel efficiency of the cataloging and processing method which the table represents, as expressed by the three respondent groups. More specifically, the yes or no responses to each of the three questions concerning the efficiency of the individual method of cataloging and processing will be totaled from the numerical figures listed in each of the 50 individual school's tables. The reasons and opinions most often stated by each group as to why they answered as they did concerning the efficiency of each area will also be categorized and totaled from the 50 tables made for each of the 50 schools. This total of yes or no responses numerically listed and their corresponding reasons will be placed in a table which will illustrate for the viewer at a glance the cost, time, and personnel efficiency of the individual method of cataloging and acquisition, as seen by the three groups of respondents in the 50 schools in the survey which employed individual cataloging and processing.

In the same manner, a table representing the total number of yes or no responses given by the three respondent groups in all 50 schools in the survey which employed the computerized central processing method will be compiled from the numerical list of responses in the individual tables compiled for each school, and the reasons and opinions concerning the efficiency of each area (time, cost, and personnel), will be categorized.

This numerical listing of the total number of yes or no responses given by each of the three groups in all 50 schools, together with the corresponding reasons as to why the answer was yes or no for each area of efficiency, compiled into one table will enable the viewer at a glance to determine the cost, time and personnel efficiency of the computerized central processing method in the 50 schools which participated in the survey.

By careful, considerate observation of the results of this survey as represented in the two tables, the researcher can intelligently make judgments as to how efficient each method of cataloging and processing is, time-wise, cost-wise, and personnel-wise. He can also now intelligently deduce from the information he has before him, which method of cataloging and processing appears to be most efficient for all schools in the areas of cost, time spent in the processing of each item, and in the maximum use of qualified school library personnel.

In addition, with this data, the prospective school librarian will hopefully be able to determine which method of cataloging and processing would function most effectively and efficiently in his/her school library situation. Such a descriptive analysis will enable the diligent librarian to not only determine how well his/her own school library is functioning in terms of cost, time, and personnel efficiency but what opinions are possibly held toward the functioning of each area in his/her library, as well. Taking into consideration the size of his/her school, and the type of curricular program it provides, the school librarian (after a perusal of this data) should be able to ascertain the problem areas and take the necessary steps to begin correcting them at home.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aceto, Vincent J. "Panacea or Pandora's Box?: A Look at Central Processing in New York State," Library Journal, 89:2 (January 15, 1964), 322-324.

Avram, Henriette D. "MARC: The First Two Years," Library Resources and Technical Services, 12:3 (Summer, 1968), 245-250.

_____. "MARC Is a Four Letter Word," Library Journal, 93:13 (July, 1968), 2601-2605.

Bierman, Kenneth John, and Betty Jean Blue. "Processing of MARC Tapes for Cooperative Use," Journal of Library Automation, 3:1 (March, 1970), 36-64.

Dolby, J.L., V.J. Forsyth, and H.L. Resnikoff. Computerized Library Catalogs: Their Growth, Cost, and Utility. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press, 1969.

Ellsworth, Ralph E. "Another Chance for Centralized Cataloging," Library Journal, 89:15 (September 1, 1964), 3104-3107.

Frary, Mildred P. "Commercial Cataloging, Processing in the Los Angeles Schools," School Libraries, XV (January, 1966), 11-15.

Grose, M.W. and M.B. Line. "On the Construction and Care of White Elephants," ALA Bulletin, 62:6 (June, 1968), 741-747.

Krettek, Germaine, and Eileen D. Cooke. "Final Report on MARC Pilot Project," ALA Bulletin, 63:6 (June, 1969), 752.

Kozlow, Robert D. University of Illinois Library Automation Project. Washington: National Science Foundation, 1966.

New York (State). Education Department. Report to the Bureau of School Libraries: New York State Education Department. Boston: N.Y. State Education Department, 1967.

Pierson, R.M. "Centralized Cataloging: Its Implications to Personnel," Library Journal, 90:4 (February 15, 1965), 826-828.

Shera, J.H. "What the Computer Can and Cannot Do," Library Journal, 94:10 (May, 1969), 2875-80.

Skipper, James. "Centralized Cataloging," Library Journal, 89:14 (August, 1964), 2953.

U.S. Council on Library Resources. The MARC Pilot Project,(by Henriette D. Avram). (Washington: Government Printing Office,1968).

APPENDIX

The following questionnaire is a sample of the type of questionnaire study included in this survey. Although this particular questionnaire is designed for the school library personnel in each of the 100 schools participating in the survey, the questionnaires distributed to the administrators and selected faculty members in each school are quite similar in content and approach.

While this questionnaire places heavier stress on the efficiency of the tasks performed by school library personnel, the questionnaires sent to the administrators will stress more specifically the cost efficiency of the method employed in their school, and the questionnaires sent to the selected faculty members will more heavily stress the time element involved in the processing of an individual item, which they are awaiting for use.

The combined results of each of the questionnaires should give us a clear picture of the attitudes, facts, and opinions held toward the time, personnel, and cost efficiency factors involved in each method of cataloging and processing in each school surveyed. The combined results of the questionnaires from all 100 schools participating in the survey should give us a clear picture of the time, personnel, and cost efficiency for each of the two processing methods so that we, as researchers, and school librarians, can make an intelligent recommendation as to which method would be most efficient for any school system.

SCHOOL LIBRARY PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please place a checkmark in the one square below which is opposite the words best describing the position you hold or the duties you presently perform in the school library.

☐ Professional personnel (Graduate of an accredited college or University and possessor of at least a BA Degree in Library Science, Educational, or both)

☐ Clerical personnel (The staff member performing the secretarial duties of filing, typing, inventorying, etc.)

☐ Technical personnel (The staff member who repairs, produces, and maintains the audiovisual equipment and software in the school library collection).

For each of the following questions, select the letter of the <u>one</u> answer which you feel best describes the cataloging and processing system presently used in your school library:

_____ 1. Which of the following two methods of cataloging and processing are at present being used in your school library?

a. Individual cataloging and processing
b. Computerized central processing

_____ 2. In your opinion is this the most efficient cataloging and processing method which could possibly be employed for your school library?

a. Yes
b. No

_____ 3. If your answer to the above question was <u>a.</u>, which of the following explanations best describes why you chose that particular answer:

a. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is the most efficient method that could possible be employed in terms of the small amount of time it takes to process each item.

b. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is the most efficient method that could possible be employed in terms of the maximum usage this method allows the school to make of its professional and non-professional school library personnel.

c. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is the most efficient method that could possible be employed when one considers that the ratio of overall cost of the method to the services provided is equivalent to one.

d. Answers a and b.

e. Answers b and c.

f. Answers a and c.

g. All of the above.

h. None of the above.

____ 4. If your answer to question number 2 was b., which of the following explanations best describes why you chose that particular answer:

a. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is not the most efficient method that could possibly be employed because of the tremendous amount of time it takes to process a single item.

b. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is not the most efficient method that could possibly be used because the method does not allow the professional and nonprofessional enough opportunity to perform the tasks for which they were trained.

c. You feel the cataloging and processing method presently employed by your school library is not the most efficient method that could possibly be employed because the overall cost of the method far surpasses the services which the method provides.

d. Answers a and b.

e. Answers b and c.

f. Answers a and c.

g. All of the above.

h. None of the above.

In general,

____ 5. Approximately how much time is required for the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of an individual item under the

method your school library employs? Select the one answer from the following which most closely approximates the length of time required:

a. Approximately 15 minutes to 1 hour
b. Approximately 1 to several hours
c. Approximately 1 - 2 days
d. Approximately 3 days to 1 full week
e. Approximately 1 week to 1 month
f. Approximately 1 month to 1 year

____6. In your opinion, how much time should be required for the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of an individual item under the method your school library employs? Again select the one answer from the following which most closely approximates the length of time you feel should be required:

a. Approximately 15 minutes to 1 hour
b. Approximately 1 to several hours
c. Approximately 1 - 2 days
d. Approximately 3 days to 1 full week
e. Approximately 1 week to 1 month
f. Approximately 1 month to 1 year

____7. Does the time required for the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of an individual item in your school library meet up to your expectations of the time that should be required for the processing of an individual item?

a. Yes
b. No

____8. If you had the opportunity to choose a method of cataloging and processing for your school library which you felt required the least amount of time for the acquisition, cataloging, and processing of an individual item, which of the following methods, if any, would you choose?

a. A method of computerized central processing.
b. A method of individual cataloging and processing.

____9. Do you feel the present cataloging and processing method employed by your school library allows the professional and non-professional personnel sufficient opportunity to perform the tasks for which they were trained?

a. Yes
b. No

___10. If your answer to question number 9 was a., which of the following explanations do you feel best describes your reason for selecting that particular answer:

a. The processing and cataloging method employed in your

school library assumes so many of the technical duties connected with the task, that your professional and non-professional personnel are more free to work with the students and teachers.

b. The processing and cataloging method employed in your school library assumes so many of the technical duties connected with the task, that your professional and non-professional personnel are more free to perform the regular library tasks of circulation and selection.

c. Answers a and b.

d. None of the above.

___11. If your answer to question number 9 was b., which of the following explanations best describes your reason for selecting that particular reason:

a. The cataloging and processing method employed in your school library assumes so few of the technical duties connected with the task that your professional and non-professional personnel have very little time to work with the students and teachers.

b. The cataloging and processing method employed in your school library assumes so few of the technical duties connected with the task that your professional and non-professional personnel have very little time to perform the regular library duties of circulation and selection.

c. Answers a and b.

d. None of the above.

___12. If you had the opportunity to select a method of cataloging and processing for your school library which you felt would allow you, as professional and non-professional personnel, sufficient opportunity to perform the tasks for which you were trained, which, if any, of the following methods would you select:

a. A method of individual cataloging and processing

b. A method of computerized central processing

___13. Is the overall cost of the method of cataloging and processing employed in your school library, in your opinion, equivalent to the time and personnel efficiency of the processing services the method provides?

a. No
b. Yes

___14. If your answer to question number 13 was a., which of the following explanations do you feel best describes your reason for selecting that particular answer:

a. The overall cost of the cataloging and processing method employed in your school library far surpasses the services provided in the tremendous amount of time required for the processing of a single item.

b. The overall cost of the cataloging and processing method employed in your school library far surpasses the technical services the method provides in the small amount of opportunity it allows for the professional and non-professional personnel to perform the tasks for which they were trained.

c. Answers a and b.

d. None of the above.

___15. If your answer to question number 13 was b., which of the following explanations do you feel best describes your reason for selecting that particular answer:

a. The overall cost of the cataloging and processing method employed in your school library seems small when one considers the speed with which a single item may be processed.

b. The overall cost of the processing and cataloging method employed in your school library seems minute when one considers how many of the technical duties are assumed by the method, allowing the professional and non-professional personnel sufficient opportunity to perform the jobs for which they are trained.

c. Answers a and b.

d. None of the above.

___16. If you could choose, would you elect to retain the method of cataloging and processing presently employed in your school library, or would you select a different method than the one presently use?

a. I would change to a different method of cataloging and processing.

b. I would retain the method of cataloging and processing presently employed in my school library.

___17. If you elected to change the present method of cataloging and processing employed in your school library in question 16,

which of the following methods, if either, would you select?

a. The method of individual cataloging and processing.

b. The method of computerized central processing.

____18. If you could select a method of cataloging and processing for your school library which met the qualifications of being efficient as to the amount of time required for the processing of each item, the opportunities allowed the professional and non-professional personnel to perform the tasks for which they were trained, and the overall cost of the method being equivalent to the technical services provided, which of the following two methods do you feel would <u>best</u> provide you with the efficiency factors you want:

a. The computerized central processing method.

b. The individual method of cataloging and processing.

<u>Optional Question</u>

The following lines are provided for you to write additional comments as to your reasons why you might prefer either the computerized central processing method over the individual method of cataloging and processing or vice versa for your school library. Please try to be as honest as you can. Any sincere constructive comments you can make will be of tremendous help to this survey.

Thank you.