

1983

MAUL: An OCLC Union List of Legal Periodicals

Marilyn K. Nicely

Kaye Stoppel

Richard C. Amelung

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/faculty>

Part of the [Cataloging and Metadata Commons](#), [Collection Development and Management Commons](#), and the [Law Librarianship Commons](#)

HEINONLINE

Citation:

Marilyn K. Nicely; Kaye Stoppel; Richard Amelung, MAUL:
An OCLC Union List of Legal Periodicals, 76 Law. Libr.
J. 394 (1983)

Provided by:

Saint Louis University Law Library

Content downloaded/printed from [HeinOnline](#)

Wed May 15 11:49:34 2019

-- Your use of this HeinOnline PDF indicates your acceptance of HeinOnline's Terms and Conditions of the license agreement available at <https://heinonline.org/HOL/License>

-- The search text of this PDF is generated from uncorrected OCR text.

-- To obtain permission to use this article beyond the scope of your HeinOnline license, please use:

[Copyright Information](#)



Use QR Code reader to send PDF to your smartphone or tablet device

MAUL: AN OCLC UNION LIST OF LEGAL PERIODICALS

Marilyn K. Nicely*
Kaye Stoppel**
Richard Amelung***

BACKGROUND

The Mid-America Law School Library Consortium is an incorporated association of eighteen academic law libraries formed in 1980 to promote cooperation among its members. The organization includes libraries in Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Within the framework of the organization's by-laws, the group engages in such varied cooperative activities as telefacsimile document delivery, collection development, staff exchanges, and union listing. The union list of periodicals on OCLC was authorized by the Consortium directors in June 1982. (Two libraries opted not to participate in the OCLC union list project, leaving sixteen involved.) The four-letter symbol chosen to identify the union list online is MAUL.

DEVELOPMENT

Off-line union listing was an early activity of the Mid-America Consortium that helped fulfill its resource-sharing goals. A printed union list of microforms and one of looseleaf services have been produced, and a Canadian/Australian list is under development. In early 1982, the library directors of the Consortium became interested in the possibility of using the OCLC union listing capability to create a union list of periodicals. In order to do this, the Consortium had to select a single network through which to join. Eileen

Searls, Director of the Saint Louis University Law Library and President of the Consortium, investigated the packages offered by the networks to which the various libraries belonged. Four networks were possible choices: Amigos, BCR, ILLINET, and MIDLNET. At the Consortium meeting in Detroit in June 1982, the Board of Directors voted to join through Amigos. The Consortium's initial contract with Amigos included one-time costs of \$1,500 for training agents at two sites and \$34 per hour for profiling. These costs were prorated. The Consortium pays the annual membership fee, which was \$739 for sixteen libraries in 1983/84. Each library is billed for the charges associated with local data records directly by its own network. This venture was the first cross-network OCLC union list.

Union list projects previously completed or planned by the Consortium have had a legal subject orientation and have emphasized type of publication format or geographic jurisdiction. The decision to develop a union list of periodicals on OCLC did not alter this topical/format approach. The technical aspects of the project, however, created a need for technical services librarians to become involved at an early stage of the planning. The Consortium directors appointed Marilyn Nicely, the University of Oklahoma Law Library Technical Services Librarian, to serve as Agent/Coordinator for the project. She contacted those designated as local agents and worked with them on the preliminary steps leading to their training. The sixteen participating libraries and their original agents are: University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Melanie Nelson; University of Illinois, F. E. Mansfield, Jr.; Southern Illinois University, Heija Ryoo; Drake University, Kaye Stoppel; University of Kansas, Martin Wisneski; Washburn University of Topeka, Dave Ensign; University of Missouri-Columbia, Bruce Frost; University of Missouri-Kansas City, Michele Finerty and John Popko; St. Louis University,

* Technical Services Librarian, University of Oklahoma Law Library, Norman, Oklahoma.

** Associate Librarian and Associate Professor of the Law Library, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa.

*** Head of Technical Services and Instructor in Legal Research, St. Louis University Law Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

Richard Amelung; Washington University in St. Louis, Margaret Goldblatt; University of Nebraska, Brian Striman; Creighton University in Omaha, Elizabeth Monaco Kelly; University of Oklahoma, Marilyn Nicely; Oklahoma City University, Nancy Smith; Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Chris Fernandez; and University of Tulsa, Sue Sark. The Agent/Coordinator's continuing role is to provide the necessary means of communication to alleviate some of the problems of decentralized creation and maintenance of local data records for the union list.

UNION LISTING ON OCLC

The union listing capability of OCLC is part of the serials control subsystem. A library's volume holdings of a title are listed in summary form by means of an online display called a local data record (LDR, Figure 1). LDRs for libraries in the union list display together on the OCLC terminal screen as a union list group display (Figure 2). Each LDR is electronically linked to a bibliographic record in the database.

Most earlier union lists utilizing OCLC were created by a central agency inputting holdings information sent to the agency by participating libraries. The lack of financial means to support such an agency for the Mid-America Consortium led the group to consider the possibility of having each library input its own local data records. A difficulty with this decentralized method of input was the existence of duplicate bibliographic records appearing properly or improperly in the OCLC database. If libraries inputting locally chose different records, then the union list group displays would be split, defeating the purpose of a unified record.

The University of Oklahoma was already participating in a state OCLC union list which was input during 1980 and 1981 by a central agency at Oklahoma State University. The record selection had been done by a professional cataloger, Sue Saunders, who later became Library Liaison Officer for Union Listing at the Amigos network in Dallas. Marilyn Nicely was able to obtain her library's worksheets that had been used by the inputting agency. From these worksheets, a typed list of 680 titles with OCLC record numbers was compiled. This Title/Record Selected list was proposed as a core list to use for record selection for the new law library union list.

IMPLEMENTATION

Since Amigos had been chosen as the network through which the union list was to be formed, it

was that network's responsibility to train the agents and to provide ongoing support of the project through the Agent/Coordinator. The training sessions were scheduled to coincide with the meetings of the two regional associations to which Consortium librarians belong: the Mid-America Association of Law Libraries conference in September 1982, at Carbondale, Illinois, and the Southwestern Association of Law Libraries conference in March 1983, at Tulsa, Oklahoma. The Amigos training sessions included information on how to select bibliographic records, explanations of how to create local data records, a detailed discussion of how to apply the ANSI (American National Standards Institute) standard for listing serial holdings at the summary level, information on how to list microforms, and hands-on experience at OCLC terminals. Much time was also needed for agents to discuss procedures and to decide how best to coordinate efforts.

Certain decisions had to be made at the first training session that would be binding on all the participants. The major decision was how to handle microform holdings. The choice was whether to show these holdings in separate LDRs linked to bibliographic records for the title in microform or to combine holdings in all formats on the record for the hardcopy. The latter was chosen because combined holdings enable the user to learn the complete holdings from one record, and because this approach does not necessitate creating new bibliographic records when records are lacking for the microform format. The agents decided to utilize the core list of 680 titles provided by the University of Oklahoma, working first with that list to input local data records. The list eliminated the time-consuming process of searching the database and selecting a record. Group displays were unified. The list also gave participants an opportunity to gain experience quickly with the online union list concept.

By spring 1983, five libraries had completed this phase of the project. The agents were unanimous that a continuation of the list process was desirable. Therefore, the alphabet was divided into fifths for searching and record selection. The five agents prepared lists of titles selected and of OCLC record numbers, which were sent to Marilyn Nicely. She then combined them into alphabetical lists, using a word processor, and mailed them to all sixteen agents. The lists were called "Union List Additions and Changes." Librarians receiving the lists could then check holdings for the titles on the list, call up the title by OCLC number, and input their LDR on the record for the title. Of course, this approach re-

quired reliance on the searching and record selection ability of others plus willingness to forgive a few errors and to pay the costs involved in correcting them. But because agents have been able to meet together at regional and national law library association meetings, they have developed confidence in one another and have been able to discuss the problems involved in producing a high quality union list.

As others completed the original Oklahoma Title/Record Selected list, the alphabet was further subdivided. By the end of June 1983, over 1,300 titles had been union listed. A final phase of the project is for each library to complete inputting its periodical holdings and to select records or do original cataloging for unique titles held. (For illustration of a workform and the steps involved in creating a local data record, see Figure 3 and Appendix II.)

At the initial training session, the entire logistics of the project were established, including quality control and error reporting. A vehicle for exchanging information on record selection, changes, and progress was obviously needed. These ongoing communications are being maintained through a newsletter edited by the Agent/Coordinator and through letters and telephone calls.

Record selection has not been difficult for the agents. Catalogers are accustomed to having to choose which record to use for cataloging purposes, and the special considerations for union listing were similar or identical. *OCLC Technical Bulletin No. 99*, dated October 24, 1980, was edited to eliminate references to monographs and was then distributed to agents for use as a reader reference guide in record selection. (See Appendix I.) Some errors in selecting records required changing to another record because CONSER marked one DO NOT USE subsequent to its selection.

The CONSER project has great impact on union lists. Sometimes a CONSER participant will mark a record DO NOT USE after a number of libraries have used it for union listing. OCLC has a notification system which requires that the network be advised of changes such as DO NOT USE, cessations, title changes, and so forth, and these are displayed on a designated record in the serial subsystem. Getting them displayed, however, requires noticing the change in the first place in order to be able to notify OCLC. No mechanism exists whereby the CONSER participant notifies OCLC or the libraries with LDRs attached to the record that a change has been made to the record. A long-term solution might be to

find some workable way for CONSER catalogers to let database users know about changes they make. The MAUL group has been including information on DO NOT USE and other changes in the database in lists of titles selected for LDRs distributed as "Union List Additions and Changes." The MAUL newsletter also serves as a continuing medium to notify participants of such changes so that local data records can be moved to the verified record.

The most difficult ongoing problem is application of the American National Standards Institute's standard for reporting serial holdings at the summary level. Because the way holdings are reported is essentially a matter of technical convention, application of the rules to actual publications which may or may not resemble the example described in the ANSI standard is sometimes difficult. Most of the agents' problems involve recording enumeration and chronology data and making the microform total notes as specified by ANSI. In August 1983, OCLC published *Serial Holdings Statements at the Summary Level: User Guide to the American National Standard*, which was written by the OCLC Union List Standards Task Force. This publication has explanations and more examples to illustrate application of the ANSI standard. In general, the ANSI standard as written was intelligible to the agents who are accustomed to AACR2 and OCLC documentation, which is similarly technical, but the user guide should make consistency easier to achieve.

OFF-LINE PRODUCTS

Participants are eagerly awaiting the availability of OCLC-produced copies of the MAUL union list in print and microfiche. The union list project has progressed so well that the use of the system to include other types of serials seems attractive. The initial list is a union list limited to periodicals because of the criteria established for titles to be included. The group attempted to union list publications generally considered to be law reviews by the legal profession without becoming overly technical in defining a periodical. A working definition for the group stipulates that titles should be indexable and should be comprised of signed, scholarly articles of potentially permanent value. No special attention is paid to frequency. Newsletters might be included if the library is prepared to provide interlibrary loan for such publications. Annuals having a periodical format also are included.

In order to preserve the periodical format distinction desired by the Consortium directors for

union listing, great care will have to be used in designing off-line products. Once LDRs for other types of serials are union listed in OCLC, they will enter the online database, which is a single electronic pool of all bibliographic records in the system. MAUL must find a means to distinguish between serials in order to produce off-line indexes by category. The new subfield "i" of the call number field, which was introduced into the subsystem by OCLC in September 1983, seems to offer a means of identifying categories of serials for off-line indexes. Another problem for expansion of union listing to other types of serials is the fact that many publications may not be serials in the technical sense as defined by AACR2 and as used for the database. OCLC union listing requires that LDRs be attached to serials. Looseleaf services, statutes, and codes frequently are not cataloged as serials in the database and therefore may not be used for union list LDRs.

ADDING UP THE SCORE

The Mid-America Law School Library Consortium Union List of Serials has achieved some firsts. It was the first union list in OCLC constructed along special library lines and the first to cross network boundaries. It might have been expected that these pioneering efforts would encounter difficulties, but the creation of one union list from law libraries in several networks has developed remarkably smoothly. Having formation and training administered by one network has worked well while each library pays its current operating expenses for local data record creation and editing through its own network. The Union List Agent/Coordinator has had to cope with concerns such as relaying information, scheduling two training sessions separated in time and place, making certain to cover the same information, and handling discrepancies in input and record selection. However, these are problems that could have been expected even if the union list had been formed within a single network.

Certainly, minuses can be listed for union list participation. The cost factor is one. Start-up costs, annual membership fees, and charges for inputting and editing local data records are significant budgetary items. Storage costs for LDRs will soon be added. Display holding charges may be applied to union lists as well. Budget provisions must also be made to keep local data records current when a library changes its subscription or when titles change or cease.

LDR creation and upkeep add to staff costs as well. All Consortium libraries inputting holdings

have done so without increasing staff. This program has had to be absorbed into the individual libraries' routines with accompanying adjustments in service priorities. A continuing staff commitment must be made to keep records current. Although the inputting procedure is simple, handling the OCLC record requires training and should be delegated to a full-time staff member with OCLC and/or serials recordkeeping experience. Public services personnel also need to be trained to use the OCLC union list.

Perhaps cost is the major drawback to union list participation, but a second minus is found in procedural problems. Frustrations in record selection are not readily resolved. Union list participants must use successive entry records. They must agree through their coordinator which records to choose, when to create a new record, and who will do it. Some catalog records in the database need to be modified. These are problems that confront any serials cataloger but that must be handled uniformly by union list participants.

Some benefits are associated with dealing with these problems. Being compelled to do some overdue housekeeping is one. The decisions as to whether a library will input an individual title or show volumes within any title is influenced by the completeness of holdings. Therefore, an inhouse notation that the holdings are scattered must be made explicit. Most law libraries have some titles cataloged successively and some by latest entry under old cataloging codes. It is not necessary to recatalog all the latter, but the local library record from which inputting is done must include all the title changes with the effective volumes and dates and format. Whether the library is inputting from Kardex records, shelf list, or official catalog card, the records must be current and clear.

Another fringe benefit of union list participation has been the opportunity to work more closely with colleagues in other libraries. The resulting interchange of information on title cessations, suspensions, numbering discrepancies, and so forth has proven helpful and more timely than other sources of information.

Aside from these less tangible benefits, union list displays have some obvious advantages for all database users. Knowing the precise holdings of a given library and the format of those holdings is useful for interlibrary loan purposes or for acquisitions decisions when resource-sharing arrangements exist. For interlibrary loans through OCLC, a library saves both time and money by choosing libraries for the request string that are known to hold the volumes needed. A further advantage accrues to groups like the Consortium,

which is pledged to sharing resources and in which the majority of the libraries have signed free loan and photocopy agreements. Because checking that membership first is incumbent, detailed holdings are helpful.

An anticipated benefit is in the area of the off-line products. Planned for 1984, these products will be available in both paper and microfiche with the latter at especially reasonable rates. One option will be a list compiled by title of the exact holdings of all union list members or of an individual library. The latter may be a less cumbersome and expensive way of producing periodic lists of holdings. Another option is an index that will cross-reference to OCLC number for online checking.

LOOKING AHEAD

The directors who originated this project and the librarians who are implementing the project

can see many prospects for future union listing. For example, MAUL hopes that other law library groups will form similar union lists. Their displays would then be available online. At some point, a comprehensive off-line list of all law library holdings in union lists might be produced. The Mid-America group is also exploring the feasibility of expanding beyond periodicals to include other types of serials in union listing.

The participating Consortium libraries expect to complete the inputting of the periodical union list in less than eighteen months from initial training. The members have already realized the benefits of readily determining each other's holdings in detail. They intend to utilize the off-line products when these become available. These advantages are expected to offset the increased staff and budget requirements. On the basis of their experience thus far, the Mid-America group recommends that other law libraries consider this approach to resource sharing.

```

Harvard law review.
ISSN: 0017-811X CODEN:          OCLC no: 1751808 Frequn: m Regul: x

Hid lib: OKLM Copy:          Repr:  Subsc Stat:  Loan:

1 DEFN    v vol. p no. e 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 f m g [ p ]
2 SIHD    OKL d 8103 g e 4 v 1- y 1887-

```

Figure 1-A. Local Data Record

A Local Data Record for a title when the library holds only one copy and does not classify the title.

```

Harvard law review.
ISSN: 0017-811X CODEN:          OCLC no: 1751808 Frequn: m Regul: x

SLU (8212,0,4) 1- 1887-

LIB COPY NEXT EXPECTED ISSUE

1 SLUL    1
2 SLUL    2

```

Figure 1-B. Multiple Copy Local Data Record

A Local Data Record for a title when the library holds more than one copy.

MID-AMERICA LAW SCHOOL LIBRARY CONSORTIUM UNION LIST OF SERIALS

Harvard law review.

ISSN: 0017-811X CODEN: OCLC no: 1751808 Frequn: m Regulr: x
ITEMS MARKED + HAVE FULLER HOLDINGS. REQUEST LINE NO. TO VIEW THESE.

```

1 ALR (8205,0,4) 1- 1887-
2 + CLL (8310,0,4,[Total=1- 1887-. Microfilm, except for latest 2 years=
1857- 0,4]) 1- 1887-
3 IWD (8211,0,4) 1- 1887-
4 + KFL (8304,0,4) 1- 1887-
5 KWL (8301,0,4) 1- 1887-
6 LMU (8302,0,4) 1- 1887-
7 OKL (8103,0,4) 1- 1887-
8 OKY (8108,0,4) 1- 1887-
9 + SLU (8212,0,4) 1- 1887-
10 + SOL (8303,0,4) 1- 1887-
11 + NUL (8305,0,4) 1- 1887-

```

Figure 2-A. Union List Group Display

Each three-letter symbol is a library, for example, IWD is Drake University Law Library, OKL is University of Oklahoma Law Library, and SLU is St. Louis University Law Library. Note that microform holdings are displayed with bound holdings. The + by the line number indicates that additional information is available by calling up that line. It may mean that the library holds more than one copy.

Harvard law review.

ISSN: 0017-811X CODEN: OCLC no: 1751808 Frequn: m Regulr: x
SLU (8212,0,4) 1- 1887-

```

1 - SLUL 1 K8.A75 (8212,0,4) 1- 1887-
2 SLUL 2 K8.A75 (8212,0,4) 1- 1887-

```

Figure 2-B. Multiple Copies

Fuller holdings shown by calling up the line number from the Union List Group Display.

Harvard law review.

ISSN: 0017-811X CODEN:

OCLC no: 1751808 Frequn: m Regulr: x

Hid lib: OKLM Copy: Repr: Subsc Stat: Loan:

1	CLNO	b
2	LOCN	b
3	FUND	
4	RMKS	
5	DEFN	v vol. p no. e 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 f m g [p]
6	NEXT	v p d
7	DTRD	
8	CRHD	v p y
9	RTHD	v p
10	SCHD	d 8312 g 0 e 0 f
11	SIHD	OKL d 8103 g 0 e 4 v 1- y 1887-
12	PUJC	i l m n o s t
13	CLMS	b c d e i
14	BNDG	

Figure 3. Workform for a Local Data Record

The information required for an LDR has already been inserted on line 11 SIHD.

APPENDIX I Mid-America Union List

Record Selection for Union Listing¹

A. Serial Titles: Choosing Among Multiple Records

General Principles

- (1) For textual serials (printed or microform), choose only records that are in the serials format (Bib lvl:s).
- (2) For nontextual serials (for example, a serial sound recording), choose either a serial record (Bib lvl:s) or a record appropriate to the type of material (Type: c, e, g, i, j, n, o).
- (3) Use a successive entry record only (S/L ent:0). Successive entry records MUST be used for Union Listing.
- (4) Do not attach an LDR to a record with a "DO NOT USE" note.

B. Successive Entry Records: Choosing Among Multiple Records

Choose among successive entry records according to the following order of preference:

- (1) An authenticated record. An authenticated record is one which has field 042 containing at least one symbol from a center of responsibility:
 - lc Library of Congress

1. For the basis of these guidelines, see *Choosing Among Multiple Records in the On-Line Catalog*, OCLC TECHNICAL BULLETIN No. 99, Oct. 24, 1980. References in the OCLC document unrelated to serials were deleted to make this an aid for union listing only. Item B(4) was added as a policy decision of the Mid-America group.

nlc National Library of Canada
nsdp National Serials Data Program
isds/c International Serials Data System/Canada.

- (2) The record which most closely adheres to AACR2 choice and form of entry.
- (3) The record with the most information.
- (4) For bilingual Canadian publications two authenticated records are often found; one French, one English. Choose the English record (040 b eng). The 010 LC number has a prefix ce.

In case of doubt, prefer the record with the greatest number of holding institutions. If two or more records have an equal number of holding institutions, choose the record with the lowest OCLC control number.

APPENDIX II

Creating a Local Data Record

To create a Local Data Record, it is first necessary to locate the appropriate bibliographic record. There are criteria established for this selection process which are described in OCLC documentation such as *Technical Bulletin 99*. This process can be bypassed when libraries are working with an agreed-upon core list and its supplements as contributed by the participating libraries. The more onerous selection process comes into play again when the library is working with titles not previously listed.

Once the record is selected, a workform is requested (Figure 3). This is a serials subsystem workform and is designed to include serials check-in and claiming, as well as union listing. Many of the fields in the workform are not needed for union list purposes and are automatically eliminated during the inputting process. The library symbol and inputting date are system supplied. If the library classifies the title, the call number (CLNO) line needs to be completed. A subfield "i" can be inserted in the CLNO field with free-text language up to 1,000 characters to identify the serials format, content, audience, etc. If the library has more than one copy and different locations are involved, it is necessary to fill in the Summary of Copy Holdings (SCHD) and to do a separate workform for each copy. The Summary of Institution Holdings (SIHD) may be used for a composite statement of holdings without listing for each copy. The SIHD field means that at least one copy of each volume listed is owned. Each library in the group completes either the SCHD or the SIHD field. The two advantages of the SCHD are that call numbers are displayed online and that it allows the showing of separate collections.

The SCHD and SIHD lines require the following information: acquisition status, enumeration data, and chronological data. Some titles may call for completeness and retention data to be inserted. A note area may need to be included and is required where microform holdings are also present. After the workform is completed, it is reformatted, checked again, and input into the database. The completed LDR then looks like Figure 1.