Editing Author Main Entry Towards Complying Standards: Study on Original Catalogue of Jaffna Public Library

S. Ketheeswaren¹

Abstract

The catalogues of the libraries should follow a common standard. While maintaining accepted cataloging standards by libraries, method of searching and retrievals for a book would be uniform, meaningful and responsive. Libraries need to make studies on their catalogue entries to ensure that they are providing such uniform, meaningful and responsive searching and retrievals from the library catalogue. In this scenario, the study is made on the purpose of understanding the deviations of standards that occurs in the original catalogue of Jaffna Public Library. The deviation is measured by using a sample of randomly selected titles of the original catalogue of the Jaffna Public Library for complying with cataloguing standards. The necessary comparison is made against the same title in the library of congress to identify the deviation types and measure the corresponding numbers of edits.

The study identifies three major types and eight sub types of deviations (edits) that are required to be rectified to comply with cataloguing standards on author main entry (MARC Tag 100\$a). Among the sub-types of edit, the editing of “correctly selecting author entries” (whether personal-name, corporate-name, meeting-name or uniform-title?) is found as predominant edit in the author main entries. Full-stop mistake is found as common mistake for all author main entries. Moreover, the paper extends through discussion on all major and sub types of deviations of cataloguing standards by putting the normalized values of editing percentage in tables and figures, while providing necessary recommendation to systematically rectify all types of deviations that are currently left in the catalogues and maintain accepted cataloging standards during future data entering.

Keywords: Cataloging, Copying, Author Entries, Library Catalogs, Errors

¹ Senior Assistant Librarian, University of Jaffna, Email: vskethees@gmail.com

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0892-5089>

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share A like 4.0 International License.

Introduction

Information resources, say books, are usually cataloged using its resources description, such as name of Author, title, publisher, subject, etc. For cataloging, there are international standards to be strictly followed. And selection of resource description for meaningful catalogs should be studied well, and selected. The standard and selection of resource description must be uniform among all libraries to have uniform catalogs from the libraries of a region or state. In the ground idea of these, the description of catalogue of Library of Congress is prepared strictly following rules and regulation of standards Myall and Chambers (2007); Shin (2003). The description of catalogues can be searched and imported from Library of Congress using copy cataloguing*! and it can be compared with Original Catalogues**. The systematic comparison will provide the deviation types and necessary data for editing the regional catalogue towards correction, and maintaining standard catalogue in the regional libraries; this is the study of the research.

Definitions

*! **Copy cataloging:** McCutcheon (2011), “A centralized system for archiving regional resource description is necessary to provide access for standard bibliographic descriptions for information resources like books, serials, etc. maintained by the regional libraries. In the system, the bibliographic description for an identified resource can be searched, imported and saved directly to the local Integrated Library System (ILS)”. The method of this direct import and saving is known as Copy cataloging.

** **Original cataloging:** But the original cataloging is done other way; Schultz (1995); Orbih and Aina (2014) describe “the original cataloging as “creating a bibliographic record without reference to other bibliographic records for the same item or different editing of the item”. Original cataloging is the process of describing an item by examining the item of information including physical parts.

Integrated Library System (ILS)

“Integrated library systems (ILS) are multifunction, adaptable software applications that allow libraries to manage, catalog and circulate their materials to patrons” (Müller, 2011).

Z39.50

Z39.50 is a protocol “a set of rules and procedures for the behaviour of two networked computer systems communicating in order to perform database searching and information retrieval tasks” (Clissman et al., 1997).

RDA

“RDA makes description of, and access to, print and electronic resources possible based on the Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records (FRBR) conceptual model and accordingly, not only will it affect cataloging rules but it will also be effective when it comes to the structure and design of online catalogs.”(Pazooki, Zeinolabedini, & Arastoopoor, 2014).

MARC Tag

“The bibliographic record is divided logically into fields. There is a field for the author, a field for title information, and so on”. “Each field is associated with a 3-digit number called a MARC tag.” (Library of Congress, 2017).

Purpose of Study

To find out the types of edit and its strength of percentages, that are necessarily needed to be made to the author main entries (MARC Tag 100\$a) of the regional catalogue in order to comply with the standard cataloguing. Where and how to rectify the deviation of regional catalogue towards complying the cataloging standards by making necessary editing, as compared to the catalogue of Library of Congress

Literature Review

Shin (2003) examines the quality of Korean cataloging records in OCLC’s WorldCat by evaluating records in terms of specific errors, error frequency, areas where errors occur frequently, and errors that could inhibit record retrieval. Based on the results, the author proposes some recommendations on how to maintain quality in cataloging of Korean-language records. It is very similar to the present study of research.

Myall and Chambers (2007) conducted a study comparing the extent of editing required for records to meet necessary bibliographic standards during copy cataloging for Print and Video Books in Two different Academic Libraries. The result showed that records for print Books acquired at the two

institutions usually required little or no editing, while records for video/DVD Books required considerably more editing.

Lam (2007) compared error rates found in copy cataloging before and after a cataloging outsourcing program conducted at the University of Saskatchewan Library. The author found that the error rates were low and acceptable, and there was no significant difference between error rates before and after the outsourcing programme.

Kulczak (2000) evaluated the practice of Copy-cataloging for Books. It is reported that 47.3 percent of headings correctly matched records already present in the library's local file. Another 41.3 percent exactly matched records in the OCLC. Kulczak advised the selected library to stop checking name headings at the point of copy-cataloging while library's local file is correctly updated for authorities.

Jeffrey and Karen (1995) examined one hundred typographical errors in records of the OCLC WorldCat database. The local catalogs of five libraries holding the items described by the bibliographic records with typographical errors were searched to determine whether each library had corrected the errors. The study found that only 35.8 percent of the errors had been corrected.

Walker and Kulczak (2007) evaluated cataloging and physical processing supplied through the University of Arkansas Libraries' shelf-ready contracts. The authors examined 298 titles from three samples, with emphasis placed on series headings. Results showed that while 99.33% of titles received records and 99.66% of records received correctly matched their corresponding books, 27.05% of records exhibited errors affecting catalog access, and records for 38.59% of titles needed modification. Moreover, 32.11% of series headings required further attention to comply with local authority procedures.

Methodology

The original resource descriptions of books prepared by defined group of library technical staff are the primary data of the research. The catalogue entries prepared by a defined group will be similar in content, format and inputs. This similarity in cataloguing will produce a good source of data for the study where common deviations of the regional cataloguing from the

standard practice can be measured and discussed meaningfully. Then the study needs to focus in narrow level on the original catalogue that is prepared by a small group of library technical staff working in a main library or in local libraries in the region. The study focuses on the Jaffna region. According to the statistics, Jaffna Public Library (JPL) holds more than two hundred thousand numbers of Books, where nearly 40 library technical staffs are cataloging there in the Library. It is richest as compared to the other libraries in the region. Therefore, the collections of books from JPL are found as samples for the study where adequate library staffs have been found available in support of the research works.

The records for resources descriptions for the Books originally prepared by JPL technical staffs were available in Microsoft excel files. The record structure of the file has been analyzed and matched with the tag numbers of MACR (Lunau & Turner, 1997), then necessary immigration has been made to a Integrated Library System (ILS) using the reference Goyal (2012).

Resource Description from the Library of Congress is accepted as an international standard - Myall and Chambers (2007); Shin (2003). Resources Descriptions available from the z39.50 server maintained by the Library of Congress, are used as standard cataloguing data for necessary comparison to identify the editing which are required to be performed on author main entry of the JPL catalogue in order to comply with cataloging standard. The resources descriptions for the Books, for which the maximum visibility is expected from Library of Congress, say published in the United States of America and other western countries, have been updated using, “z39.50 update”, the facility available in the ILS. The catalogues getting the updates from the LC have been automatically assigned an authority value with a special MARC field 509\$a for the purpose of accumulating the updated records of catalogues for the study.

The standardized/updated resource description is accumulated using a special key of MARC tag number assigned for necessary accumulation, and then exported to an excel file from the ILS. The original catalogue and updated catalogue (copy catalogued) have been combined in an excel sheet by mapping rows of accession number using a Microsoft excel function “VLOOKUP“. All together, 1895 records were successfully accumulated for the study. These 1895 records are randomly selected in the English language

publications available in the JPL for which the bibliography for copy-cataloguing is available from Library of Congress.

The title and the author are basic metadata field in bibliography. Compared to the title entries, author entry has many rules in the RDA or AACR2 to be followed. The study is going to look at the rules of standard. Therefore, the author entry is selected for the study. Further, in access points of catalogue, Main Author Entry plays prominent role. Therefore, 1895 Main Author Entries (100\$a of MARC21) are randomly selected as sample population for the study.

The identified types of editing have been classified into three types as shown by Shin (2003); These are **Format editing**: Incorrect or missing punctuation and space (as required by ISBD) e.g., incorrect punctuation – Comma, Full Stop. **Content editing**: Missing a whole field – eg: Missed place of author names. **Input editing**: Incorrect or careless entries, e.g.: Improperly using upper and lower cases, misspelling of words.

After interpreting and analyzing the data, normalizations have been made as referred to Myall and Chambers (2007); Shin (2003); Each Editing type is normalized to the total item records of study, and total number of editing to classify the most and least to be edited. The necessary data has been collected into the spreadsheet using different functions of Microsoft excel.

Results and Discussion

The normalized values of editing for total number of records and total number of editing are tabulated for major types of editing in the table 1. The Figure representation of the values is shown in the Figure 1. The full-stop editing is the highest numbers in editing, that all records (1895) of the original catalogue of JPL need full-stop editing. As full-stop editing becomes in full of adjustments, it should be a local authority decision of JPL that is advising to avoid making full-stops for the catalogue entries. Therefore, the full-stop editing is not included in the normalization, and in addition to make measurable comparison between the rest types of editing with limited range of values. The Figure 1 is prepared without incorporating full-stop editing. Figure1 shows that nearly 50 percentage of total editing should be made on the contents of author main entry to meet the requirement of a standard cataloguing while format and input editing, each require nearly 25

percentage of editing for the same purpose. We can make another observation in Figure 1, from the compound column marked with “editing / total no. of records” that nearly 28 percentages of total records have to be edited, on content editing while nearly 15 percentage of total records should be made on format and input editing.

Table 1: Normalized Values for Major Editing Types

	Format Editing	Content Editing	Input Editing
Editing	266	534	251
Editing / Total Number of Records (%)	14.04	28.18	13.24
Editing / Total Number of Editing (%)	25.31	50.81	23.88

Figure1: Normalized Values for Major Edit Types

Sub-level of observation can be made though generating the values of editing for the sub-level of different categories, which have been identified by the study as to be edited in the sub-levels in order to tally the requirement of a standard catalogue on author main entry, as tabulated in the table 3. Table 3 elaborates all possible types of editing with their corresponding values in

comprehensive manner. For making the graphical representation of the table 2, tabulation is prepared as shown in the table 3. The table is rearranged with decreasing percentage values and without making divisions for major editing types.

Table: 2 Normalized Values for All Edition Types in Comprehensive View

	Format Editing			Content Editing		Input Editing			
	Full Stops	Commas		Missed Place of author names		Misspelling of words		Missing upper case for first letters	
	Found for all records	Only comma	By location changes	Location-vice versa	Not a author entry	Personal name	Other name	Personal name	Other name
Editions	1895	17	249	249	285	148	40	17	46
Editions/ Total no. of records(%)	Not taken for Normalization	0.90	13.14	13.14	15.04	7.81	2.11	0.90	2.43
Editions/ Total no.of editions (%)		1.62	23.69	23.69	27.12	14.08	3.81	1.62	4.38

The different observations can be made by looking at the Figure 2; The bar shows that the “Not an author entry” gets the maximum percentage, which is 27%, in editing, out of from eight different categories of editing; it tells type of author main entry could not be correctly identified by the library technical staffs when preparing the catalogues.

Table 3: Normalized Values for Sub Categories to be Edited

	Full Stops	Not a author entry	Location –vice versa	Comma for location	Spelling – Personal name	Upper case – other name	Spelling –other name	Only by commas	Upper case –Personal name
Editions	1895	285	249	249	148	46	40	17	17
Editions/ Total no. of records (%)	Not taken for Normalization	15.04	13.14	13.14	7.81	2.43	2.11	0.90	0.90
Editions / Total no. of editions (%)		27.12	23.69	23.69	14.08	4.38	3.81	1.62	1.62

Figure: 2 Normalized Values for Sub Categories to be Edited

Thus, much more concentration or understanding should be made on deciding author entry whether it is personal name entry, corporate name, meeting name, nor uniform title, while preparing the original author main entry of the JPL. Second most concentration should be made on identifying and entering the correct author name components; personal name element and other name element. This type requires nearly 24 percentage of the total editing. Therefore, the name elements, the personal name element and other name should be correctly distinguished and placed. The personal name element must be placed left while other name right following a comma at the end of the personal name component. Strictly applying rules of Resources Description and Access (RDA) or AACR2 will be the solution for this type of editing. While satisfying or replacing the name elements correctly during the editing work, the commas also should be placed correctly at the end of the personal name entry element. Therefore, the number of editing work for the comma gets the same 24 percentage of total editing work.

Another necessary editing should be made for making correct spelling of personal name element, which is found as more pronounced spelling mistake in the author entries. This editing takes strength of work nearly 14 percentage of total editing work.

The editing work on capitalization of first letter of the author name elements falls in two different stages that more number of editing, that is nearly 4

percentage of work, should be made for other name element (right part) while less number of editing, that is nearly half, 2 percentage of work, need to be made for personal name element (left part). Double concentration is to be made on other name part as compared to personal name part while adjusting catalogue entries.

Recommendation

Distinguished inferences can be made from the result and discussion of the study. To move making a standard author entry catalogue, identified editing works need to be settled thoroughly. The full-stop should be made on each and every author entries; this is found as a common work. If local author of the JPL has made a decision of avoiding full-stops at the end of author entries, it is recommended to revise the decision referring the rules of RDA.

While focusing on the three major types of editing; format, content, input; 50 percentage of total editing work should be fore-mostly carried out on the contents of author main entry to satisfy the requirement of a standard catalogue. Format and input editing works should be settled almost each in equal counts for the same. Therefore, preparation of catalogue should pay more attention on the contents of catalogue entries.

While focusing the editing works in the sublevels of observation, regardless of major editing types, it is found that the original catalogues should be fine edited in 8 different sub-types to go with the standard pattern of catalogue. Those are “correctly finding the types of author entry” (personal name, corporate name, meeting name or uniform title), “selection of name elements” (personal name and other name elements), “comma”, “full stop”, “spelling personal name”, “spelling other name”, “upper-case personal name”, and “upper-case other name”. From these 8 sub-types, more pronounced editing work or carefulness should be made on “correctly finding the types of author entry” while secondly focusing on “selection of name elements”. By going with the rules of RDA, the editing work “selection of name elements” can be rectified and settled correctly in future. To avoid the unnecessary editing on “correctly finding the types of author entry”, in future, the rules and regulation of RDA and AACR2 should be point-fully extracted in tabulation and applied on cataloguing practice on the aspect of correctly finding the types of author entry.

While looking on spelling deviation of regional catalogue from Library of Congress catalogues, prominent deviation is observed in personal name elements of the author entries. It can't be rectified using excel function or other methods. This type of editing should be rectified in two folds, first the entry should be conformed that the author entry is there an access point of the book selected. If so, secondly the correct name should be selected for representing an author entry and then it should be typed without spelling mistake, followed by double checks.

In addition to spelling, the capitalization editing also become vital part in certain places of the records. More number of editing need to be made on "other name element" (right part), and nearly half the value on personal name entry element (left part). This mistake can be rectified quickly by exporting the data of personal name and other name, together with other biblio-data, from the library database to an excel sheet. Applying the excel function UPPER(LEFT(A1,1)) to the personal and other name cells, the necessary capitalization can be made. Then updated excel data can be imported to the same database. But, for the future new entries of author name elements, in the attempt of making original catalogues, more concentration should be taken on capitalization while typing. Hopefully, the inference of study can be found as a source of information useful for keeping a standard catalogue in the regional libraries.

Reference

- Clissman, C., Murray, R., Davidson, E., Hands, J., Sijtsma, O., Noordzij, A., Pettman, I. (1997). The UNiVerse Project: state-of-the-art of the standards, softwares and systems which will underpin the development. Part 1: Z39.50; WWW Integration with Z39.50; and Unicode. *New Library World*, 98(7), 267-274. doi: 10.1108/03074809710188798
- Goyal, K. (2012). Importing Excel data into Koha. Retrieved 14 November 2015, from <http://manual.koha-community.org/3.2/en/marceditexcel.html>

- Jeffrey, B., & Karen, K. (1995). The Effectiveness of Copy Cataloging at Eliminating Typographical errors in Shared Bibliographic Records. *LRTS*, 48(2), 92-100 p.
- Kulczak, D. E. (2000). Name Authority Work for OCLC Copy Cataloging: Is It Worth the Effort? *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 28(1), 69-81. doi: 10.1300/J104v28n01_07
- Lam, V.T. (2007). Error Rates in Monograph Copy Cataloging Bibliographic Records Before and After Outsourcing at the University of Saskatchewan Library. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 44(3-4), 213-220. doi: 10.1300/J104v44n03_04
- Library of Congress. (2017). WHAT IS A MARC RECORD, AND WHY IS IT IMPORTANT? , 2017, from <https://www.loc.gov/marc/umb/um01to06.html>
- Lunau, C. & Turner, F. (1997). Issues Related to the Use of Z39.50 To Emulate a Centralized Union Catalogue. (pp. 8p.). Ottawa (Ontario): National Library of Canada.
- McCutcheon, S. (2011). RDA Testing in Triplicate: Kent State University's Experiences with RDA Testing. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 49(7-8), 607-625. doi: 10.1080/01639374.2011.616262
- Müller, T. (2011). How to choose a free and open source integrated library system. *OCLC Systems & Services: International digital library perspectives*, 27(1), 57-78. doi: 10.1108/10650751111106573
- Myall, C. & Chambers, S. (2007). Copy Cataloging for Print and Video Monographs in Two Academic Libraries: A Case Study of Editing Required for Accuracy and Completeness. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 44(3-4), 233-257. doi: 10.1300/J104v44n03_06

- Orbih, D. E. & Aina, A. (2014). Issues, benefits and challenges of Original Cataloging Versus Copy Cataloging. *International Journal of Library and Information Science*, 6(5), 88-97 pp. doi: 10.5897/IJLIS2013.0416
- Pazooki, F., Zeinolabedini, M. H. & Arastoopoor, S. (2014). RDA Implementation Issues in the Iranian National Bibliography: An Analysis of Bibliographic Records. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 52(6-7), 621-639. doi: 10.1080/01639374.2014.945022
- Schultz, L. (1995). A beginner's guide to copy cataloging on OCLC/Prism. *Libraries unlimited*], 10.
- Shin, H. S. (2003). Quality of Korean Cataloging Records in Shared Databases. *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly*, 36(1), 55-90. doi: 10.1300/J104v36n01_05
- Walker, M. & Kulczak, D. (2007). Shelf-ready books using PromptCat and YBP: Issues to consider (An analysis of errors at the University of Arkansas). *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 31(2), 61-84. doi: 10.1016/j.lcats.2007.07.016