December 2001

Group Therapy-Checking for Duplicates

Rosann Bazirjian

Penn State University, rvb9@psulias.psu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Bazirjian, Rosann (2001) "Group Therapy-Checking for Duplicates," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 13: Iss. 6, Article 31.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.3664>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

The Collection Development Role from page 78

proper method to fill out book slips for ordering, and the basic operations of the acquisition software program, which I could use to monitor the financial status of my different accounts.

Soon after this first meeting, coordinators could introduce liaisons, as Jack did with me, to other library faculty or staff who may be able to help them carry out their duties. I am thinking specifically of individuals such as the serials coordinator, acquisitions staff, and catalogers, who could explain, among other things, the procedure for requesting, terminating, or withdrawing items; how to check their status, including price, frequency, content, and scope; how to interpret the meaning of unfamiliar acronyms, terms, or bibliographic tools that may be unfamiliar — standing order, ISSN, OCLC, or MARC. I know from my personal experience that I have called upon all these individuals on several occasions to assist me with some problem, request, or inquiry. I have been continually impressed with their savvy, skills, experience, and institutional knowledge, and I would advise any liaison to make their acquaintance and learn from their considerable expertise.

At this time, coordinators could help new liaisons by arranging or suggesting they meet with their predecessors, but only if these latter individuals are competent, readily available, and receptive to the idea. My meeting with my predecessor, for instance, was especially informative and of immeasurable value. I found her to be extremely polite, encouraging, and full of sound, practical advice. She suggested numerous resources to consider during the selection process; she also discussed ways to organize and sort book slips and offered other valuable short cuts to help me make better, more efficient use of my time. This type of information, while helpful, was relatively inconsequential compared to the other things she told me — the most helpful being insights into my faculty representatives. I learned about faculty members' attitudes, behaviors, personality traits, and idiosyncrasies, not to mention work habits and priorities. I learned, for example, who may need to be prodded and coaxed into returning book slips; who is notorious for missing deadlines; or which approach to use with certain faculty member to gain their trust and cooperation.

After they have gleaned this information, liaisons can turn their attention to actually meeting their faculty representatives. If coordinators know faculty members well, they could take this opportunity to introduce them to liaisons, but at this juncture, I feel that liaisons are ready to assume a more active, self-sufficient role and can initiate their own meetings. This is not to say, however, that liaisons will no longer need coordinators or elicit their help on occasion, but it does mean that the relationship has entered a new phase, one that is characterized by the liaison's increasing autonomy, independence and self-reliance.

Acting on their own, liaisons will want to approach faculty representatives tactfully,

stressing the importance of an initial meeting, but not doing so overzealously or in an intrusive way. Liaisons should keep in mind that the logistics of meetings can be challenging in their own right. Simply trying to coordinate work schedules can be problematic, especially in light of faculty members' sometimes fluid office hours, which can fluctuate dramatically due to research, travel, service, or other professional commitments. Liaisons should equally be warned that their desire for a meeting may not be reciprocated, or it may garner only a lukewarm response from those faculty members who regard their library responsibilities as unimportant or a low priority.

If liaisons are unsure about the best way to initiate contact with faculty members, they may want to try what I did, which was to send a brief email message introducing myself, asking representatives if they would like to meet in person to discuss their accounts. Overall, the response I received was positive and cooperative, with most contacts extending a cordial invitation for me to visit them in their office. Only one of my representatives failed to acknowledge the message, but he later apologized for this oversight and was receptive to future meetings, which have been highly productive and congenial.

Once faculty and liaisons meet, they have an excellent opportunity to discuss a range of issues that will affect their working relationship and how they attain their common goals. During my first meeting, for example, I asked

faculty representatives about their academic pursuits and areas of interest, even asking them to provide me key words, concepts, or subject headings (if they knew them) to assist me in selecting relevant resources and materials. Finances and record keeping were also frequent topics of discussion, and a few of the topics discussed included the amount allocated to each account, its distribution, the way it should be spent, and the frequency with which I would report the balances to representatives. Still other areas that could be broached are inadequacies or superfluity of materials in the collection, weeding, withdrawal, or replacement of titles, or the possibility of investing in alternative electronic or digital resources.

Finally, during this or subsequent meetings, liaisons and faculty representatives are encouraged to set aside some time to discuss all those unexpected events and developments that can, and often do, impact collection development, making it the interesting activity it is. I am speaking of things such as the possibility of financial cutbacks, windfalls, gift items, disasters, accidents, ever-changing deadlines, personnel adjustments, and policy and procedure modifications. When these and other events happen, and they inevitably will, they can seem insurmountable. But if all parties — whether they be liaisons, faculty representatives, or coordinators — have developed proactive, collaborative ways to solve them, they will be richly rewarded for their efforts, with substantial benefits and gratifying results.

Group Therapy — Checking for Duplicates

Column Editor: **Rosann Bazirjian** (Assistant Dean for Technical & Access Services, University Libraries, The Pennsylvania State University, 507 Paterno Library, University Park, PA 16802-1812; Phone: 814-865-0404; Fax: 814-865-3665) <rvb9@psulias.psu.edu>

GRYPE: (submitted anonymously)

I work in an Approval Plan Unit of the Acquisitions Department at a large research library. We currently search our new receipts in our online catalog to make sure that they do not duplicate any titles already in the collection or currently on order. We check the catalog by both ISBN and title in order to rule out this duplication. My question: do we need to search by both ISBN and title? In a random check of 500 titles, we discovered only 3 duplicates that were caught because we checked both elements. Is that sufficient cause to keep checking when the checking is so time consuming? Wouldn't it make more sense to only do a single search (ISBN or title), but not both?

RESPONSE: (Submitted by Leah Black, Assistant Acquisitions Librarian, Michigan State University)

While it is certainly necessary to avoid duplication to the collection when processing approval plans, searching the local online catalog by both title and ISBN for each new receipt is unnecessary. A title search alone should suffice.

At Michigan State University we subscribe to the OCLC PromptCat service for our major Yankee Book Peddler approval plans. Duplicate detection through a title search in our online catalog has proven to be very reliable; approval plan processors know that if a title search retrieves more than one record a thorough investigation is in order. Processors for the dozen or so other approval plans (non-PromptCat plans) follow a similar procedure.

Approval profiles that are specific and well documented and a thorough understanding of the approval plan vendor's procedures also

continued on page 80

Group Therapy from page 79

serves as a duplicate-detecting tool. For example, our approval profiles are set to reject titles from series we receive on standing order. An occasional mistake slips through, however, so our approval plan processors are trained to be especially alert to titles in series.

RESPONSE: (Submitted by **Kathy Wachel**, Head, Monographic Acquisitions, University of Iowa Libraries)

This is an interesting question to which it probably isn't possible to give a definitive answer. At the **University of Iowa Libraries**, when searching new approval plan receipts in our **GUI OPAC**, our primary search is by title. We also search by author if the title is ambiguous, such as *Collected Plays* or *Works*. An ISBN search would be our last choice.

Our primary approval plan provides both U.S. and U.K. books. ISBN searching will bring up an exact match, however a single ISBN search won't locate a publication with a title variation published in both the U.S. and U.K. and inadvertently supplied by both arms of the plan. For our needs an author search

has the best chance of catching this type of duplication. An ISBN search will not necessarily find a copy if the only difference is hard bound/paper bound. Sometimes a bibliographic record will contain only the ISBN for the hardbound edition. If the search happens to be the ISBN for the paper bound edition, it will fail. Since the numbers probably have to be keyed into the system, an ISBN search seems to have inherently more possibility of error, because numbers can be easily mistyped or transposed. Also, entering long numbers can be a slow and tedious business for anyone but a very skilled typist. This is a long way of saying we would not recommend doing an ISBN search if only a single search is done.

In my opinion it is necessary to consider cost effectiveness when reviewing any procedure. At one point we did both author and title searches for our approval books, but we decided that there weren't enough duplicates found to justify the author search in every case. Giving the searcher the latitude to decide whether or not a title search is sufficient may seem slightly risky. However, we have a small staff, so when the staff time saved is weighed against the need to return a few additional copies that aren't caught with an initial search, the time saved is more important for us.

RESPONSE: (Submitted by **Linda Moran**, Manager, Approval Plan, Franklin Book Co.)

I'd like to first ask if your approval plan vendor has in place a method of comparing your current approval plan selections to your firm orders on file with their company? If so, you can most likely feel comfortable in relying on an occasional single spot check using the ISBN as a method of comparison of new receipts to titles already in your catalog. ISBNs remain uniform whereas titles can change from the pre-publication announcements to the actual published book. The spot check will ensure your confidence level that your approval plan vendor does indeed check for, and prevent duplication of receipts.

Using your own statistics, the rate of duplication, under 1%, is so low that your valuable time can more effectively be used in monitoring other aspects of your acquisitions operations. The primary objective of an approval plan is to bring the library new publications in selected subject categories immediately upon availability from the publishing company. The success of the program depends on the library's confidence in their vendor to do just that.

The Library Marketplace

Column Editor: **John Riley** (Sales Director, Eastern Book Company) <jdriley@javanet.com>

"The International Marketplace: IFLA 2001"

This year the 67th Council and General Conference of the **International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions** was

held in Boston, Massachusetts from August 16-25. The theme was "Libraries and Librarians Making a Difference in the Knowledge Age." Areas where librarians were seeking to make a difference ranged from government and industry in economic development to society in social and cultural development to advancing the leadership role of the librarian in the "Knowledge Age" to forging collaborative partnerships.

This was the first time in 15 years that **IFLA** has been held in the U.S., the last time being Chicago. Over 4,000 librarians from 143 countries participated in this year's conference. As was to be expected, the largest turnout was from the U.S. with over 750 librarians in attendance. Surprisingly, Russia had the second highest attendance at 175, followed by the U.K. 150, France 120, Canada 80, China 70, Netherlands 70, Denmark 65, Norway 56, Korea 50, Finland 40, Mexico, S. Africa, Japan and Iran 35 each, Australia 30, with sizable contingents from the rest of the world. Over 500 librarians received Fellowships to attend **IFLA**, so there was good attendance by many librarians who might not otherwise have been able to afford the conference.

For most librarians it was there

first time in Boston and the city and its numerous libraries put on a great reception for the visitors. Nearly all of the libraries in the Boston area had open houses and tours, and parties and receptions were held all over the area. **Boston Public Library** even managed to have Dartmouth Street shut down and covered with a tent for one of the major receptions. The international librarians all remarked on the hospitality of the host country and on the wealth of colleges and libraries in Boston. The whole conference had the air of an Olympics without the competition. International cooperation was the watchword. However, the one program for acquisitions libraries reported on the difficulty of maintaining the international exchange of publications.

There were nearly 200 exhibitors at the **Hynes Convention Center** representing companies that had an international market presence. All of the integrated library system vendors were represented with imposing booths reflecting the worldwide sales of their systems. Electronic product vendors were equally well represented reflecting the worldwide flow of information. Document delivery was in the forefront at the **CISTI**, **Linda Hall** and **Purdue** booths, reflecting the growing marketing of library collections. The national libraries of Spain, France, England, Canada and of course the **Library of Congress**, were all demonstrating their digital collections and their international accessibility. The **Queens Borough Public Library** was demonstrating their

continued on page 82

TOP U.S. EXPORT MARKETS, 1999-2000 (\$ IN MILLIONS)

COUNTRY	1999	2000	% CHANGE
Canada	\$807.5	\$756.7	- 6.3 %
United Kingdom	253.6	264.2	+ 4.2
Japan	101.1	123.1	+ 21.2
Australia	139.6	116.3	- 16.7
Mexico	65.6	73.9	+ 12.6
Singapore	41.1	80.7	+ 47.5
Netherlands	68.1	58.8	- 13.7
South Korea	24.6	36.8	+ 49.4
Taiwan	25.1	35.7	+ 42.5
Germany	43.1	34.3	- 20.4
Hong Kong	20.7	32.5	+ 57.2
Philippines	14.0	18.3	+ 30.6
Belgium	24.7	17.6	- 28.6
Italy	10.3	16.6	+ 61.6
Brazil	16.9	16.5	- 2.4
Total, Top 15	\$1,656.0	\$1662.0	+ 0.4 %
Total, World	1,871.1	1,877.0	+ 0.3

SOURCE: U.S. COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Because of a strong dollar and a weakening world economy, the latest U.S. Commerce Department report for the first 6 months of 2001 shows a 5.6% decline in book exports.