

Interlibrary Loans: A Symposium

THREE OF THE following five papers—those by James G. Hodgson, Carl H. Melinat, and Walter W. Wright—were presented at the meeting of the University Libraries Section, ACRL, January 30, 1952. The paper by Dr. Hodgson and Mr. Kidder was prepared earlier. Miss Lucy's paper is a condensation of a study recently completed at Columbia University. Following the papers is the "General Interlibrary Loan Code, 1952," prepared by the ACRL Committee on Interlibrary Loans.

By JAMES G. HODGSON

A Preliminary Report on Interlibrary Loan Costs

Dr. Hodgson, who has been the director of libraries of Colorado A & M College, Fort Collins, Colorado, since 1936, did much of the work on the study here reported while on sabbatical leave at the University of Illinois Library School during 1950-51.

THERE COMES a time in every man's life, particularly if he is a library administrator, when the one question he wants to ask is "What are the facts?" Usually his only answer is a guess, an estimate, or a logical deduction based on uncertain premises. Probably it will be a long time before the library administrator will have all of the facts he should have as a basis for some of his decisions, but this afternoon it is my purpose to report on one effort to arrive at some facts which will be useful to that administrator.

Interlibrary loans are a fairly small aspect of library operations, but they are basic and fundamental because if libraries are to get all material available to all students and scholars, it will only be through the medium of interlibrary loans, or some of the substitutes which are now being used. If we are to know how best to operate our necessary system of interlibrary cooperation, it seems logical to start looking for facts on some one element which is basic, and yet which can be isolated for study. The resulting study of the costs of interlibrary loans started out to be a one-man undertaking, covering a limited number of libraries, but the interest and cooperation of the ACRL Committee on Interlibrary Loans

swelled the project to cover—as of the present—2,357 transactions in 32 libraries and two Bibliographical Centers in the Middle-West, the Rocky Mountains, the Pacific North-West and California. The project was planned to study every possible ramification of this specific subject, and to find out every possible influence that might have an effect on costs. The result was a complex study which required considerable time and care in the collecting of data and put the researcher under a deep obligation to the staffs of all the various libraries which so willingly cooperated. However, the size to which the project grew made it too much to complete in any single year of study, and as a result it now is suffering from the slow progress inherent in any "leisure time project" of a busy administrator.

As a one-man project there were obviously certain things which could not be done in connection with the study to insure its statistical soundness. As a matter of fact before the first tabulations, or the writing of the "first dictated draft" of the report (the parts so far done come to some 180 pages, but there should be another 400 pages to come) an effort was made to estimate all of the possible sources of error which might exist in the study. The description of these elements came to seven double spaced typewritten pages so anyone who wants to criticize the project from a research angle should find plenty of ammunition ready at hand. However, as the tabulation of the data continues, it seems apparent that while errors do exist they either cancel them-

selves out, or are of such small magnitude as not to unduly influence the results.¹

One specific instance of where costs may be used by the administrator will suffice to illustrate why they are important. Where interlibrary cooperation is full blown and the individual libraries are able to hold up their end in such cooperation by having adequate collections in their own specialties, the decision on whether to borrow or to buy may well be an economic one. In other words how many loans will be necessary to make those costs equal the costs of acquiring, cataloging and storing any particular volume? Without any adequate figures to guide me, I once estimated that if any particular book or any individual volume of a serial was borrowed four times in six years that it be more economical to own that specific volume. As a result of the study here being reported that estimate may be revised.

It will not be necessary here to go into any explanation of how many different processes or activities any single interlibrary loan goes through, or what some of the academic problems of costs are. Much of that information is covered in the "progress report" which was issued last July.² It will be sufficient to say that the forms which were used to collect the data recorded the time taken, and material and transportation costs, for every activity that had any direct connection with the making of the interlibrary loans, but many costs which may be called "joint costs" were not considered. Those who are interested in making studies themselves may secure samples of the forms used, and copies of the instructions. If copies of the "progress report" are no longer available when asked for, copies have been sent to all library schools on the ALA list, and to each land-grant college or university, and should be available on interlibrary loan.

Several attempts have been made in the past to secure some idea of the cost of interlibrary loans. In 1930, before the dollar devaluation era, Hand of the University of California reported that the average cost of interlibrary

loans was \$1.59.³ In 1932 Brown came to the conclusion that the total cost of interlibrary loans, including costs both ways was \$3.56.⁴ In 1936 Rider estimated that the labor costs alone in his library were \$1.11.⁵ In 1949, with the dollar well devaluated, David of the University of Pennsylvania estimated that interlibrary loans cost his library \$3.50 on the average, and for the completed transaction arrived at a cost of \$7.00.⁶

There is some question as to the basis on which interlibrary loan costs should be figured. All transactions started are not completed, yet the cost of initiating procedures, even though books and periodicals are not secured, are a part of the costs to the library. It is therefore possible to fix the average cost, either on the basis of the number of transactions started, or the number of transactions completed. The average cost of the number of transactions started seems most logical because that figure is of importance to an administrator who must figure the costs on the basis of the persons coming to his library to request interlibrary loans. However, the figures have also worked out on the basis of transactions completed for the benefit of those who keep their records in that fashion.

In the study made, four different types of transactions are recognized: (1) requests sent by a library to a bibliographical center; (2) transactions which arise from the passage of those requests through the bibliographical centers; (3) loans of books by a lending library, irrespective of whether the request came directly from a library or from a bibliographical center; and (4) transactions where the borrowing library sends requests directly to the lending library without any intermediary. This is done quite often in bibliographical center territory when it would result in lower costs, and of course is the only type of transaction possible where there is no bibliographical center available.

In all 203 requests, of which 169 were completed, went to a bibliographical center. These

¹ Hand, Eleanor. "A Cost Survey in a University Library," *Library Journal*, 55:763-66, October 1, 1930. (See p. 766.)

² Brown, Charles H. "Inter-Library Loans: an Unsolved Problem," *Library Journal*, 57:887-89, November 1, 1932. (See p. 887-88.)

³ Rider, Fremont. "Library Cost Accounting," *Library Quarterly*, 6:331-81, October, 1936. (See p. 359.)

⁴ David, Charles W. "Remarks upon Interlibrary Loans, Mid-20th Century Style," *College and Research Libraries*, 10:429-33, October 1949. (See p. 431.)

¹ The method or organization of the study, and an outline of the possible sources of errors are given in: Hodgson, James G. *A Progress Report on a Study of Interlibrary Loan Costs*. Fort Collins, Colo., 1951. 17 p. processed. (Colorado A & M College. Library. Library bulletin 22.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 2-6.

203 cases cost on an average \$1.095 each. If calculated by the number completed, the cost amounts to \$1.315 for each transaction. This is of course the direct cost to the borrowing libraries. The Bibliographical Centers handled 242 requests from the college or university libraries in the study, during the period when data was collected. The average cost to these centers was \$0.51. If the borrowing library, as a part of its membership, pays the actual cost of using the center, the total cost to the borrowing library is therefore the cost in the library, and the cost at the center, or \$1.61 per transaction started or \$1.83 for each one completed. There were 804 cases where the borrowing libraries made applications directly to the lending libraries. Of these 646 were completed. Here the cost was \$1.37 for each transaction started, or \$1.71 for each one completed. Thus when the cost of the borrowing library, and that of the bibliographical center, are added together it would seem to cost more to use that method of borrowing, but later in discussing errors some explanation of that situation will be found. As a matter of fact, considering time alone, requests sent through the bibliographical center cost about 80 cents per transaction started, while it costs only 63 cents for requests made directly to the lending library.

There is a general feeling that it costs as much to lend as to borrow. The overall figures do not substantiate that belief. Of course the cost of transportation to the borrowing library must also be considered but that does not tell the whole story. In all 1108 requests were made on the lending libraries in the period studied, and 947 of them were granted. The cost per transaction works out at \$0.59 for all requests and \$0.69 per completed loan. This is less than half of the cost to the borrowing library when transportation costs are included. The differences, when time and materials costs alone are considered, are not as great but are marked. Thus the 59 cents for the lending library compares to 87 cents when material is borrowed through a bibliographical center, and 74 cents when it is borrowed directly. If, as will be pointed out later, costs due to errors or incomplete entries could be eliminated, the costs to the lending library would be much reduced, and the differences would be much greater between the borrowing and lending libraries.

The total cost of the 2357 transactions studied came to \$2103.485. Of this amount 64.3 per cent was for staff time, 9.5 per cent was for materials used and 26.2 per cent was for transportation. The amount spent for materials was so small that there are no great possibilities for savings there, although the use of post cards and the reuse of some types of mailing bags could reduce the cost by a few cents. When it is realized that the average cost of shipments by express is \$2.07, and that by parcel post but 33 cents, it is evident that a considerable reduction in cost is possible if more extensive use could be made of parcel post. Because 64.3 per cent of the cost of interlibrary loans is for staff time, it seems probable that if costs are to be reduced, the most promising avenue of approach is that of labor costs. Until it is possible to analyze the individual processes in detail, it will not be desirable to make any recommendations on methods, but it might be noted that in certain cases it seemed clear that professional help was often doing certain operations that could be done more advantageously by non-professional help. In certain obvious cases professional help was needed because of the difficulties encountered, but as a casual observation it may be said that very often too much professional help was used consistently on some processes that were more nearly clerical in character.

While much "raw data" has been worked out for many of the different angles to be studied, in only one direction has sufficient work been done to justify any public pronouncements. The effect of errors or omissions in citations on costs seems, at this moment, to be definitive. It is certainly possible to reduce the cost of interlibrary loans at the borrowing library level by not verifying requests or otherwise checking for accuracy. Until I have been able to check through some individual transactions which contained errors or omissions, it will not be possible for me to say exactly how much the individual libraries saved by not completely verifying the items desired. However, at the bibliographical centers, and in the lending libraries, records were made of incomplete entries or errors in the citations and it is possible to determine whether or not these transactions were more expensive.

Before reporting these data, however, a little background may be desirable. Most

librarians recognize the classical statement by Hicks that in 1913 80 per cent of the requests received at Columbia University were unnecessarily incomplete and inaccurate.⁷ Miss Winchell said that for the same library from October, 1929 to March, 1930, 60 per cent of the requests for loans received were either incomplete or inaccurate.⁸ A study made by Kidder covering data on requests made at the University of Illinois Library from November through December, 1936 found that nearly all of the requests were lacking in some respects from a perfect bibliographical entry.⁹ Of the 520 titles which he investigated there was an average of 2.65 errors or omissions per title. For the books this was 2.04, for serials 3.31 and for theses 2.03. It might be noted that in the case of book titles out of 474 errors or omissions 374 or 79 per cent were omissions. Only 13 per cent were inaccuracies, and 5 per cent were misspellings, some of them serious and some of them not as important.

Because these Kidder data had implications for the study undertaken, the original data were reworked and classified, as a result of personal experience, according to the probability of excess time being taken for identification of the items. As a result it was found that 8 per cent of the requests contained errors or omissions which could be considered "serious." Another 24 per cent contained errors or omissions that could be considered only as "troublesome," while for 20 per cent they were definitely of a minor nature. Thus 52 per cent of the requests contained errors which it was felt might influence the actual costs of identifying the materials requested. The errors in the other 48 per cent of the requests were not considered of sufficient nature to require extra time in locating the desired materials.

This tabulation was of particular interest when it was found that 10.6 per cent of the transactions handled by bibliographical centers or by lending libraries contained errors or omissions of sufficient magnitude to cause them to be recorded on the record sheets, or to make it necessary to take time to verify the requests. One of the reasons why it cost

more to send requests through a bibliographical center was obviously due to the fact that difficult problems were routed in that direction whereas simple requests, which presented no such difficulties or problems, were sent directly to the lending libraries. As a matter of fact 29.0 per cent of all requests to bibliographical centers showed errors or omissions of some sort whereas but 4.5 per cent of those sent directly to libraries, from libraries which had bibliographical centers available, contained such errors. Institutions which were not in any center territory showed that 10.9 per cent of the requests which came to them had such errors.

For libraries in areas served by bibliographical centers many of the requests had already been checked in bibliographical centers. It would then be expected that a smaller percentage of such requests would need to be verified. A check showed that there were only six such requests which contained errors and that four of these were difficulties with the authors and titles of specific articles in serials, difficulties which could be found only when the actual serial itself was handled for the loan. However, this interesting thing was found. If the requests which came from bibliographical centers to libraries were eliminated, it was found that the requests which came directly from libraries in areas with bibliographical centers contained errors or omissions in 11.5 per cent of all requests. This compares with the 10.9 per cent of errors or omissions in all requests made to libraries in non-bibliographical center areas.

The subdued mutinous mutterings, and on occasion the outright blasts and forthright statements, with which interlibrary loan assistants have been known to greet requests which were incomplete or contained errors have some justification according to the results from this study. In bibliographical centers the average cost per transition handled was \$0.511. Entries which contained errors actually cost \$0.746 to handle, and it was then found that those without errors cost only \$0.458 for each transaction. In other words those entries with errors cost 62.9 per cent more to handle than did those without errors. Interestingly those with errors took 72.7 per cent more time than those without errors although the time cost was only 64.1 per cent greater. The situation was not quite as bad

⁷ Hicks, F. C. "Inter-Library Loans," *Library Journal*, 38:71, February 1913.

⁸ Winchell, Constance M. *Locating Books for Interlibrary Loan*. New York, H. W. Wilson, 1930, p. 15.

⁹ See Hodgson, James G. and Kidder, Robert W., in this issue.

at the lending libraries. While the average cost for handling transactions received was \$0.591, the cost for handling entries with errors was \$0.777 each. This last figure then compares with the average cost of handling the transactions without errors of \$0.577. Thus in the lending libraries the cost of such errors only increased the cost per transaction by 34.7 per cent. Time taken was up 35.3 per cent over the requests without errors but the cost of time, due largely to use of more skilled workers made an increase of 38.1 per cent. However in a large establishment, which handles an enormous number of inter-library loans each year, this increase of one-third in cost would amount to no small sum during a year.

It is, of course, obvious that the errors which would be recorded on the data gathering sheets would naturally be those which were most bothersome to the searchers in the catalogs and that many errors which were irritating but not too time consuming would be disregarded, particularly if they occurred in later parts of the entry and were not noted until after the proper item had been located. As a result it is not surprising that 76.7 per cent of the errors noted in requests for books were found in the author entry. The next largest number was 16.7 per cent in the titles. The third most important location for such errors as were noted was the series note in books where 5 per cent was located. This distribution of location of error shows an interesting deviation from the findings in the Kidder report mentioned above.¹⁰ Since serial publications have an author only when they are regular issues of some society or governmental body, it is not surprising that in the case of serials 46.7 per cent of the errors were found in the title of the serial being searched—13.3 per cent were in the author entry. Those two combined made up a total of 60 per cent of all the errors noted. However here some 20 per cent of the recorded errors had something to do with the imprint or collation of the serial, whereas

another 20 per cent was found in the lack of an author or title for the specific articles in the needed serial. Since it was these errors in both the bibliographical centers and the lending libraries which caused the greatest amount of increase in cost, it is obvious that there is considerable need for encouraging libraries to be more careful with their citing of authors of books and titles of serials.

Mention of the type of errors that went to bibliographical centers and the variations in costs prompt a short statement on the place of the bibliographical center in interlibrary loans. Obviously the difficult requests had been sent to the centers and there is some evidence, as yet not completely worked out in detail, to the effect that they were sent there after the borrowing library had spent somewhat more time than usual in an effort to identify the particular item desired. After all, one of the functions of the bibliographical center is to identify certain of these difficult references where adequate tools are not available in the library which wishes to borrow the material. Since the activities of the bibliographical center are paid for by the member libraries, it is perfectly proper to send such difficult questions through the bibliographical center and to pay for proper identification there rather than to send those same requests to the lending library and to let that library bear the cost of identification. The fact that requests coming from bibliographical centers to the lending libraries contained such a small number of errors is an indication of the usefulness of that type of organization.

Although a very careful search was made for all possible literature containing facts relating to interlibrary loans before the study was made, additional studies or reports which contained material that helps to illuminate the findings of this larger study are constantly being reported. It will be some time before the study is completed and in the meantime any such studies which are to be found in various libraries, or in the library schools, but which have not yet been reported in *Library Literature* would certainly be grist to the mill and I should be pleased if you could send me copies of any which you know to exist.

¹⁰ See Hodgson, J. G. and Kidder, Robert W. in this issue

Interlibrary Loan—Smothered in Tradition

Mr. Wright is assistant librarian, Service Division, University of Pennsylvania Library.

I

WHEN I WAS invited to prepare this paper, my first thought for a title was "Regional Liberalization of Interlibrary Loan." My local critics, however, protested that this was rather a mouthful, and accordingly the title was changed to "Interlibrary Loan—Smothered in Tradition." Now it is a bit curious, unless explanation be offered, that I should in 1952 take such a title when my chief, Charles W. David, spoke before the ACRL College Libraries Section in 1949 on the topic "Interlibrary Loans Mid-20th Century Style."¹ Actually, there is no discrepancy between our approaches, and I shall return to Dr. David's proposals before I finish.

I cannot appropriately refer to interlibrary loan as smothered in tradition unless I forestall some criticism by stating at the outset that I am well aware that much progressive thinking is going on in various parts of the country, and that this has produced effective and cooperative arrangements centering, among other places, around the various bibliographical centers and those institutions on the west coast which have been active on the ACRL Interlibrary Loan Committee. Other institutions, among them some government and state agencies, have also been active and devised interlibrary loan forms that fit into a conventional charge file. It is my impression, however, that most of us have been following traditional costly procedures; and that until the new interlibrary loan request forms came along, in turn followed by the preliminary draft of a new ALA interlibrary loan code which many of us have seen, we have done little fundamental probing of the problem. At the University of Pennsylvania our policy and experimentation have led us into channels which may interest you. An interlibrary loan librarian soon comes to sense the attitudes of the institutions with which he is

dealing, and to categorize them as "helpful," "liberal," "holier-than-thou," "difficult," "petty," or "stuffy." It will be useful and perhaps revealing to us at Pennsylvania if those of you who have had dealings with us would accept my invitation to write to me and tell me where you have classified us. If we fall into the holier-than-thou, difficult, petty, or stuffy classifications, we want to know it, and why. We know that some of you were not wholly happy about some of our simplified postal card forms, and sheet of instructions, even though they were designed to save work for recipient and sender alike.

II

Let us now consider a few of the traditional procedures of interlibrary loan which detract from its usefulness. It is obvious first that not all institutions represented here will agree with me, and second, that it does not necessarily follow that they can be classified as stuffy. Further, unilateral criticism of specific practices cannot take into account all extenuating circumstances in various institutions. One cannot criticize those large institutions that lend generously and that bear a large share of the country's lending load as stuffy merely because they require that all their materials be used within the borrowing library. By virtue of this restriction, some of them will assert, they can be even more liberal in lending than would otherwise be the case. But one suspects that a dominating motive is that of protecting the book and of being assured of its immediate availability in the event of what the interlibrary loan code calls "summary recall." This protest against this "building use" restriction is based on a consideration of the reader whom we are trying to serve. The faculty member or scholar does not always have an office in the library building with easy or convenient access to the department which has custody of the loans; all his books and papers are somewhere else. He may live miles away. The "building use only" requirement more often than not is an unnecessary imposition on the reader and an additional detail for a busy service desk to be

¹ David, Charles W. "Remarks upon Interlibrary Loans Mid-20th Century Style," *College and Research Libraries*, 10:429-433, October 1949.

concerned with. It is further unsound from this point of view: that the perpetual policing of 999 loans in order to forestall the trouble the 1000th may cause is *ipso facto* the wrong approach. To be sure, there are classes of material—rare, unique, or fragile, which any librarian would be derelict to let circulate freely, and they are excluded from this argument; but for the bulk of the material such blanket restrictions seem to me to serve no useful purpose. The instances of summary recall seem rarely to arise. Unless an item be specifically exempted by either lending or borrowing library, why not give the latter responsibility for determining where an item can be used? Much good and little harm should result from such practice.

There will be those who will declare that it is no business of a borrowing library how the lender chooses to ship. It may not be its business, but it is certainly its concern when express charges are compared with ordinary book or library book postal rates. It is hard to argue with the librarian who says he will not send a bobby-soxer to the post office (unless that office be just around the corner) when the Railway Express agency will call at his desk, but it is harder to justify the borrower being asked to use express to return the book when the circumstances do not warrant it. Can not more books go by parcel post than now do? We are overconcerned with protecting our books from every conceivable mishap; we at Pennsylvania have had no worse experience with books sent through the mails than with those shipped by express. Incidentally, when you do ship by express, do you insist on the special book rate which is one half the first class rate up to a \$10 valuation?

Insurance is another matter in which many of us have been inclined to use traditional procedures unthinkingly. If a library has a sufficient volume of business it may find that an annual parcel post insurance policy costing \$50 is cheaper than coupon insurance or postal insurance. All the library need do is keep a running record of shipments in a ruled book provided by the insurance company. It may find that a rider attached to an all-covering fine arts policy can cover books borrowed (or lent) on interlibrary loan. Or it may find that it will save money by being its own insurer, and not buying insurance at all ex-

cept for items of special value. There seems to be a trend in this last direction which will bear investigating by those who follow the more conventional methods.

Collection of postal charges is another small but traditional part of interlibrary loan. It is proper that carriage charges should be borne by the borrowing library (or, according to its policy, by its reader). And yet the carriage costs constitute but a small part of interlibrary loan costs, emphasized probably because they are easily measured and represent out-of-pocket expense. We have received postal cards stating that we owed small amounts like 13 or 16 cents. We were sorry that we failed to return this postage but it was hard to avoid the conclusion that our colleague libraries had spent much more than the amounts claimed collecting them. The new ALA forms will simplify the matter of recording and refunding postage, and ought to result in the abolition of elaborate running accounts of postage spent and owed in libraries all over the country.

I should like also to present the provocative proposition that we are often overcareful in refusing to lend rare books. Between institutions that maintain active rare book collections based on a concept of research and service rather than on the mere treasure room concept of storage, such loans can be made with safety. The point is that a rare book curator who knows the personnel and the conditions under which a book will be used in another library can give an affirmative answer to a request when a negative one might ordinarily be expected. There are a number of institutions that have rare book experts on their staffs and we should be disposed to view favorably interlibrary loan requests for rare books from such institutions, though we should apply the restriction that the books be used in their rare book rooms.

The withholding of interlibrary loan shipments during the Christmas mailing rush makes some sense, but let us not carry it to the extreme of suspending operations as early as November 12, as has been known to happen.

Interlibrary loan for the large libraries has long since outgrown the hand-tailored exceptional transaction, handled personally by the chief librarian in his office. But the little amenities linger. It is nice to get a personal

note of appreciation and may we never forget that courtesy is involved in any interlibrary loan. But in our defense of the amenities let us not regret the passing of pretty phrases on the new interlibrary loan form. The ACRL committee recommended that correspondence be addressed to the interlibrary loan librarian only, omitting the name of an individual, and yet several libraries which have adopted the new forms, and have had the institutional names printed thereon, cannot resist also typing the names of the individuals involved. One interlibrary loan librarian declared that he was accustomed to warm up—to get into practice, so to speak—on the twenty-seven-letter name of Pennsylvania's interlibrary loan librarian, but I have told her that there will be wide rejoicing by those who do not have to type her long name over and over, time and time again.

III

In 1941, a supplement to the ALA interlibrary loan code was drawn up by a committee of reference librarians for use in the Philadelphia area. In 1951, a revision of this code to conform to the local practice as it had developed among us was drawn up by a committee of representatives from five of the colleges and universities in the region. The draft received correction and approval at a meeting of the College and Reference Section of the Pennsylvania Library Association and was endorsed by the executive board of the Special Libraries Council of Philadelphia and Vicinity. The new code liberalizes several points and in certain procedures to which some institutions were unwilling to subscribe, suggests alternatives. We were able to build into the code several of the more friendly practices that have developed in the past few years and we hope that the code will exert a softening influence. Naturally, a local code can be more liberal than a national code; for we are better acquainted with our near neighbors, and the personal element often enters. Perhaps our local code offers possibilities for use in other similar areas, especially in academic circles.

The first deviation from the ALA 1940 code occurs in the opening sentence. The ALA code reads thus, "The primary purpose of the interlibrary loan service is to aid research calculated to advance the boundaries of knowledge by the loan of unusual books."

The Philadelphia code asserts, "The primary purpose of local interlibrary loan is to facilitate the use of books where they are needed." Both codes then follow the opening clause with the qualifying restriction, "after due provision has been made for the rights and convenience of the immediate constituents of the lending library." The local code adds, "it is desirable that the needs of serious readers and students should be satisfied as completely as possible through such local interlibrary loan." The ALA code states, "Some libraries may find it desirable to lend material for other than research purposes to institutions within their own territory or toward which they have some particular obligation. Such transactions should be considered as part of an extension service rather than as interlibrary loan." One of the difficulties of this latter provision, locally at least, was that the interlibrary loan concept was too strongly ingrained to be so easily given up and almost all transactions were recorded as interlibrary loans. Even when students came to us from neighboring institutions bearing letters of introduction with requests for books, the loans were charged not to the students but to their libraries. Here is the suggested procedure of what was termed "direct borrowing."

a. The student presents a letter from a librarian indicating either specific title wanted or the type of study engaged in.

b. If the library allows the student to borrow the books needed, it charges them to the student's library as it would any other interlibrary loan, adding also the name of the student.

c. The lending library notifies the student's library of the books borrowed and the date due. The student should return the book but the lending library holds the student's library responsible for its safe return.

d. Upon return of the books borrowed, the lending library notifies the student's library of their return.

Even this timid step was in the right direction but a real service spirit was still stifled by detail. All that was saved was packing, mailing, and collection of transportation charges, inasmuch as the student acted as his own messenger. A new paragraph in the revised code reads thus:

Readers should generally be expected to visit the libraries within the city for needed books unless such procedure is exceptionally inconvenient. For those libraries which will accept

direct student borrowing, alternative procedures are outlined as follows:

a. The student presents a letter from an authorized librarian indicating either specific title wanted or the type of study engaged in.

b. If the library allows the student to borrow the books needed, it charges them to the student. If the lending library has any trouble with the student over the return of the books or unpaid fine, the library of the student's institution should be notified at once. If disciplinary action is required, the student's library will initiate necessary action for the lending library.

c. Those libraries which are unwilling to lend directly to a student on his own responsibility may still be willing to let him act as his own messenger, although making the transaction an interlibrary loan. Confirmation of the loan should be made to the student's library if either library desires.

The effect is to relieve both libraries of unneeded duplication of the records of these transactions. We thus avoid policing the local loans that cause no trouble, and call upon the student's own library only when difficulty arises. Such difficulties occur infrequently and, kept in perspective against the number of loans, are as nothing (one student last year, for example, at each of three colleges). Some suburban colleges have been unfailingly cooperative in helping us to recover books lent to their students and faculty. In other quarters, there seems to exist the feeling that any action taken for us amounts to an assumption of responsibility. We have been rather liberal in our interpretation of the "present a letter" clause. When a student travels miles and gives up an afternoon to seek out a book at Pennsylvania, we do not say, "Go back and get a note, and come again tomorrow," but usually let him have the book, telling him that on any subsequent visit he is expected to bring a letter from his own librarian. Only occasionally do we guess wrong. We allow undergraduates introduced by other librarians to use our library for a two-week period (although the loan period on their books may extend longer), and give graduate students from other libraries privileges for the rest of the semester.

Our local code gives a broader interpretation of what constitutes the proper scope of interlibrary loan, as the following paragraphs (not in the ALA code) illustrate:

... Where a library is definitely committed to a certain subject or field, or places emphasis on

certain materials, it will promote the economical use of research materials if it will lend, regardless of the price or date of individual items, to institutions not having sufficient demand to justify their purchase of such items.

... Although it is seldom the custom to lend books for classroom use, libraries may be willing to lend to small groups of honor students, graduate seminars, or other study groups.

We changed the phrase "All oral requests should always be confirmed by letter" (which was tautological anyway), to "Oral requests should be confirmed by letter of the lending library wishes." This eliminated a lot of unnecessary paper work which had previously been part of the follow-up of a telephone transaction.

Pennsylvania has for years considered the acknowledgement of receipt of interlibrary loan packages an unnecessary step, but has felt obligated to conform to current practice when the books of other libraries were involved. We changed the local code statement: "Receipt of books borrowed should be acknowledged and when books are returned the lending library should so be informed," revising it to read: "Receipt of a book need not normally be acknowledged unless specifically desired, except for rare items, but when a book is shipped a separate transmittal notice should always be sent." We were delighted to have the new interlibrary loan forms eliminate the acknowledgement formality.

The University of Pennsylvania is fortunate to have housed in one of its buildings the Philadelphia Bibliographical Center and Union Library Catalogue. This is a non-profit corporation organized to provide and coordinate bibliographical services to the community. Its chief tools are the Union Library Catalogue of 3,500,000 cards describing 6,000,000 volumes in 171 libraries, and a national union catalog of microfilm. With the Union Library Catalogue, and several of our borrowing libraries, we have worked out arrangements by which a request for location made to the Catalogue automatically becomes an interlibrary loan request made to us, if the book is in our possession. Although the Philadelphia Catalogue does not execute the loans, as is the practice in some other regional centers, its procedure has reduced correspondence and cut the time involved by several days in our shipments to a half dozen libraries. We recognize that this service can be extended even further.

In his paper, "Interlibrary Loans Mid-20th Century Style," Dr. David proposed that books could often be mailed directly to a reader, with the request originating from the reader's own library. A few summers ago a graduate student away on vacation had to make a 300 mile round trip by train to Library A to consult two books borrowed from Library B. There was no reason other than the operation of tradition why Library B could not, at the request of Library A, have mailed those two books directly to the student at his summer address and have saved him the time and expense involved in the trip to the city. The University of Pennsylvania stands ready to act on such requests, assuming that they originate from authenticated sources, on behalf of responsible persons, and yet I have to report to you that since Dr. David delivered that paper, we have not received one such request.

IV

If there be a crisis in interlibrary loan, I

am inclined to believe that it arises chiefly because the increase in the volume of interlibrary loan requests has been superimposed on an unwieldy and expensive procedure. I do not believe that the mere volume of business constitutes any crisis. We must face the problems, reducing costs per unit, at the same time rejoicing over this increased volume. Clearly, the multiplication of interlibrary loan transactions is itself a development its early exponents could not have foreseen, but it is a development which mid-20th-century librarians look upon with favor. The view of the service-minded librarian embraces the desire to be rated helpful and friendly; while he hopes that the difficult days, with procedures resembling those of registered mail, are over. If anything I have said should contribute to the easier exchange of interlibrary materials, through the elimination of practices still smothered in tradition, not only will the librarian be the gainer, but so also will be the scholar, he, "soul-hydropic with a sacred thirst."

By JAMES G. HODGSON and ROBERT W. KIDDER

Errors and Incomplete Entries in Interlibrary Loan Requests¹

Dr. Hodgson is director of libraries, Colorado A & M College, and Mr. Kidder, assistant, Circulation Department, University of Illinois Library.

THE LENDING of books between libraries, as so universally practiced in the United States, is not only an important method of making materials available to scholars and students in general, but, more specifically, it is linked with other current developments in interlibrary cooperation. As might be expected when cooperation is practiced, difficulties arise at certain points. Melinat² re-

ported in 1949 that, in answer to the question "What are your greatest problems in connection with lending material to others?", 74 per cent of the replies from university libraries gave "unverified citations," as did 33.3 per cent of the college libraries and 40 per cent of the public libraries, for an over-all average of 55 per cent. In every group except the public libraries this difficulty was also the one most often mentioned. Yet 87 per cent of the libraries queried said that they attempted to verify all citations before making requests, and most of them felt that they verified from 90 to 95 per cent of them. This contrasts with the 30 per cent of the university libraries, who say that most citations which come to them are verified and complete, while 60 per cent report that many are not verified and complete. For all libraries the percentages were 41 and 47.³

Previous comments have indicated the

¹ A summary of certain data and conclusions from: Kidder, Robert W. "The Verification of Interlibrary Loan Requests: a Four-fold Investigation," 1947, 124 p. and Hodgson, James G. "Errors in Interlibrary Loan Requests: a Further Consideration of Certain Data from the Kidder Study," 49 p. Both manuscripts are in the University of Illinois Library School Library.

² Melinat, Carl H. "The Administration of Interlibrary Loans in American Libraries," Unpublished Master's thesis, Syracuse University, 1949, pp. 67-68, 133.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 57, 110-11.

TABLE I
 ERRORS IN REQUESTS FOR BOOKS AND SERIALS BY LOCATION AND TYPE¹⁴
 (Not including 36 requests for these and 7 unidentified items)

Location of Error	Total Requests	No. of Errors	Per cent	Errors per Request	Types of Errors			
					Omissions	Misspellings	Incompleteness	Inaccuracies
Books								
Author		67	14		39	9	4	15
Title		51	11		17	25	—	9
Edition		13	3		12	—	—	1
Place		109	23		106	—	—	3
Publisher		141	30		136	1	—	4
Date		71	15		46	—	—	25
Volume		12	2		10	—	—	2
Series		6	1		6	—	—	—
Contents		4	1		2	—	1	1
Total	232	474	100	2.04	374	35	5	60
Per cents			100		79	7	1	13
Serials								
Title		135	16		2	26	62	45
Place of Pub.		174	21		172	—	—	2
Volume		51	6		45	—	—	6
Pagination		77	9		75	—	—	2
Date		201	24		22	—	177	2
Series		3	1		3	—	—	—
Author of Article		83	10		83	—	—	—
Title of Article		109	13		99	—	—	11
Total	252	833	100	3.31	501	26	239	67
Per cents			100		60	3	29	8
Books & Serials								
Total	484	1,309		2.70	875	61	244	127
Per cents			100		65	5	19	10

¹⁴ Compiled from Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 28, 38, 39.

seriousness of unverified entries. In 1913 Hicks,⁴ then assistant librarian of Columbia University, said that 80 per cent of the requests received were "unnecessarily incomplete and inaccurate," while Winchell⁵ found that at the same library during the period from October 1929 to March 1930 approximately 60 per cent of the requests were incomplete and inaccurate. As a corollary it might be noted that Ewing⁶ in 1933 reported that while 10 college libraries—out of 29 queried—reported verifying 90 per cent of their requests before they were made, in 14

large libraries—all those queried—only 25 to 80 per cent were verified.

Although the ALA Interlibrary Loan Code, Section 7,⁷ reflects the common belief of libraries in verified entries, Kidder, as a result of the survey of the literature from 1921 to 1946, found the some 60 papers to reflect "a commonly-held assumption—that the large lending libraries must necessarily assume the burden of verification of interlibrary loan requests, inasmuch as the smaller libraries are not equipped with the bibliographic tools to do so."⁸

⁴ Hicks, F. C. "Inter-Library Loans," *Library Journal*, 38:71, February 1913.

⁵ Winchell, Constance M. *Locating Books for Interlibrary Loan*. New York, H. W. Wilson, 1930, p. 15.

⁶ Ewing, Marion J. "Borrowing from Our Neighbors," *Library Journal*, 58:18-23, November 15, 1933.

⁷ "Interlibrary Loan Code," *College and Research Libraries*, 2:319, September 1941; also: "Proposed Interlibrary Loan Code," *ALA Bulletin*, 34:200, March 1940; "Revised Code," *Library Journal*, 65:803, October 1, 1940.

⁸ Kidder, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Errors and Incomplete Requests at Illinois

Kidder checked the accuracy and completeness of all requests for loans at the University of Illinois Library between November 1 and December 31, 1946. In those two months requests were received from 180 different libraries for 527 titles, a number which was considered as a fair sample of the activities for a full year. Even the large number of requests from a few libraries—230 from 20 libraries—was typical. Over half, 62 per cent, of the libraries making requests were connected with colleges and universities, and accounted for 74 per cent of all loans. When special libraries and those connected with some governmental agency were included, the total came to 92 per cent of the libraries and 93 per cent of the requests.⁹ Standards for judging completeness¹⁰ were based on the ALA Code¹¹ and the recommendations of Hutchins¹² and Winchell.¹³ According to these standards there was a total of 1380 errors found in the 520 requests which could be identified, or an average of 2.65 errors per request. The largest number, 3.31 per request, was in those for serials.

As shown in Table I, the greatest number of errors, 93 per cent, occurred in the five most common elements of an entry for a book: author, title, place, publisher, and date. It also shows that the bulk of the errors consisted of omissions, with two-thirds of the omissions being of place and publisher. Actually those two elements accounted for one-half of all the errors in requests for books. Omissions in the author element may be serious. Of the 39 such omissions, 15 left out the forename, and three left out the author's name completely. Under title, two of the omissions were for the whole of it, with the series given instead; three omitted dates from the title, which could cause confusion with similar titles. The nine misspellings in the author's name could have been serious, particularly the three in the surname. The greater number of inaccuracies consisted of wrong dates of publication, while among the 15 under author, one was an incorrect fore-

⁹ Calculated from Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 26, 37, 47, and Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

¹⁰ These standards are given in full in Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 22-24, 34-36, 44-45.

¹¹ "Interlibrary Loan Code," *op. cit.*

¹² Hutchins, Margaret. "Inter-Library Loans," *Library Journal*, 50:902, November 1, 1925.

¹³ Winchell, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-18.

name, one an incorrect middle initial, seven were entries under editor in place of author, and three were under the wrong part of a compound name. Actually 15 types of errors, 12 of them omissions of one type or another, accounted for 85 per cent of the errors in requests for books.¹⁵

In serials, as with books, the bulk of the errors, 501, or 60 per cent, consisted of omissions. It is only fair to state that the largest number of these omissions, 172, included 144 omissions of the place of publication after the title of the serial, which is not one of the elements considered as necessary by the ALA Code. The next three of the larger groups of omissions, author, title, and pagination of the individual articles, are most serious when microfilms or photostats are requested. But failure to include these elements makes it impossible, in any case, to be sure that the right volume has been sent. Naturally, it was impossible to tell whether any such errors had been made; and it was deemed impractical to verify the accuracy of the situations as to author, title, and pagination for individual articles, when they were given.

The majority of the inaccuracies in the titles of the serials requested (28 in all) were the giving of a title in a form other than that used in the *Union List of Serials*. Eleven of the inaccuracies were incorrect titles, most of them for foreign academy publications. In five cases the English translation of the title was given, which required retranslation back into the foreign language. All of the misspellings occurred in the title of the serial, and consisted mainly of inaccurate spelling of "Academy," "Society," and "Institution," in various foreign languages. Twenty-four of the 62 omissions under title were the use of abbreviations in place of full titles, another practice which can be misleading to the searcher.

As in the case of books, omissions of one kind or another made up the six most frequently noted errors among the 10 which accounted for 86 per cent of all errors. This compares with the 15 under books. Omission of month and day in the date was noted 177 times, which constituted 21 per cent of all errors in the requests for serials. The 144 omissions of place following the title ac-

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

TABLE II
TOTAL OF REQUESTS CLASSIFIED BY MOST SIGNIFICANT ERROR²⁰

	Total Requests	Serious Errors	Per cent	Troublesome Errors	Per cent	Minor Errors	Per cent	Total Errors	Per cent	Without Errors	Per cent
Books	233	14	6	76	33	70	30	160	69	73	31
Serials	277	29	11	41	15	25	9	95	34	182	66
Theses	36	3	8	15	42	12	33	30	83	6	17
Total ^a	546	46	8	132	24	107	20	285	52	261	48

^a Not including 7 unidentifiable requests, but including 26 requests for added material, calling for additional volumes of the same work, when included in the same letter.

counted for another 17 per cent.¹⁶ Misspellings occurred in a greater proportion of the requests for books than in those for serials, both in proportion to the number of titles, and in the number of errors made.

In requests for theses the most often repeated error was the omission of the name of the university, a not too important criterion, since in most cases it might be assumed that the request was sent to the University of Illinois because the thesis was prepared there. Fifteen of the 16 errors in degrees were omissions, and one the citation of a wrong degree. Under title, seven were incomplete, four contained misspelled words, and two left the title out completely. In nine cases the date was omitted, and in four it was found to be incorrect.¹⁷ Fewer errors were found in citations for Doctorate theses than for Masters', probably because of the availability of tools for verification. One of the theses, called for as a Master's thesis, was found to have been an "Honors thesis" and was not on file in the library.¹⁸

Relative Difficulty of the Errors

During the summer of 1950 the Kidder data was reworked by Hodgson to determine, if possible, any relationship between difficulties in identification of the requests and the types of material requested, and the libraries from which the requests came. As a result, the errors were classified into four groups according to the apparent difficulty of identification, and each request was counted but once, no matter how many errors were noted in each request. The groups were as follows:

1. *Serious errors*: Those which required tools other than the library catalog for verification, or the use of different parts of the catalog.

2. *Troublesome errors*: Those which would probably require additional time at the catalog, but which probably could have been figured in the same section of the catalog.

3. *Minor errors*: Those which could be corrected easily, or would cause little delay in the location of the call number.

4. *Errors not counted*: Those which were considered of such small importance as not to hinder the work of the searcher.¹⁹

Table II shows the total number of requests classified by the error most likely to give difficulty to the searcher. Here, perhaps, the most significant fact to be noted is the high percentage of serious errors found in the serial requests, compared with the relatively low percentage when all errors are considered.

Size of the requesting library, taken alone, did not show a high degree of correlation with the percentage of requests which contained errors. While more requests per library were received from the larger libraries, it was found that the proportion with errors was not consistent. That is, 40 per cent of the requests from libraries containing 500,000 or more volumes had errors, as compared to 49 per cent for those containing 200,000 to 499,999 volumes; 76 per cent for those containing 100,000 to 199,000 volumes; 58 per cent for those with collections between 50,000 and 99,999; and 71 per cent for those with collections of less than 50,000 volumes. Yet the actual correlation between the sizes

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

¹⁹ For a full statement of the types of errors included under each of the headings, see Hodgson, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-4.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

of the libraries and the percentages of requests with errors ranged from $-.13$ to $-.23$, according to the system used, a far too low correlation to be significant.²¹

Since in general the largest libraries were those connected with universities, and the smallest those connected with industry and with governmental agencies, it is interesting to note that only 26 per cent of the requests from university libraries contained errors of a serious or troublesome character, as compared to 56 per cent from the colleges, 50 per cent from the public libraries, and 32 per cent from the special libraries.²² The implication of these facts seems to be that both the size and the type of library have a relationship to the number of errors found in requests.

The difficulty in the type of material requested could be supposed to have a relationship to the number of errors made. If this is so, literature in foreign languages should be indicative of the tendency. In all, 47 per cent of the requests were for foreign materials, and they accounted for 35 per cent of all the errors. Yet 40 per cent of the troublesome and serious errors combined, and 58 per cent of the serious errors, were found in the requests for foreign literature.²³ However, there was found to be a more definite inverse correlation between the size of the library and the number of errors in the foreign material, since for serious and troublesome errors it came to $-.38 \pm .01$ while for serious errors alone it came to $-.28 \pm .01$.²⁴

As has been pointed out, 93 per cent of the requests received by the University of Illinois Library came from universities, colleges, special, and governmental libraries, the groups varying in size in that order. As pointed out, the colleges, the middle group in size, had the largest proportion of errors per request. They also asked for the smallest number of foreign language materials, in proportion to the number of requests, than did any other group of libraries, except the public libraries.²⁵ The inference is obvious: that while the size of libraries, type of libraries, and type of material asked for, all have an influence on the kind and number of errors made in requests, the relationship is not clear cut.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 24.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 27.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

Tools for Verifying Entries

The bibliographical tools used for the verification of entries in Kidder's study were not selected in advance; instead, a list was compiled of the various places in which complete entries for the titles requested could be found. Book entries were checked first against the most important national library catalogs, second, in national trade bibliographies, third, in the more important and inclusive subject bibliographies, and, fourth, in the general encyclopedias and biographical dictionaries. The 232 book titles were verified 650 times in all, in 76 different tools, ranging from the *LC Catalog of Books*, verifying 126 titles, to a great many specialized sources which verified but one entry each.²⁶ It is interesting to note that six national library catalogs between them verified 227 titles, or 35 per cent of the total, while 16 trade bibliographies included 216 titles, or 33 per cent. These two types of tools accounted for 443 verifications in all. Seven subject bibliographies accounted for 79 verifications, while four encyclopedias and dictionaries between them had 36. These 33 tools together accounted for 558 of the verifications, or 86 per cent of the total.²⁷

In verifying serials, only those which could not be located in the *Union List of Serials*, 2d ed., were checked in other sources. Since 247 of the titles were found there it was necessary to locate only five in other sources. Three were verified in the *List of the Serial Publications of Foreign Governments*, one in the *LC Monthly Check List of State Publications*, and one in the *Union List of Serials, Supplement, 1941-1943*. No attempt was made to verify the authors, titles, and pages of the individual articles through any of the subject bibliographies. For theses, 94 per cent of the Doctors', 43 per cent of the Masters', and 25 per cent of the Bachelors' were identified through printed sources, most of them special subject lists.

The extent to which libraries held the various tools for verification was obtained by circularizing a checking list of 30 titles, including 43 items, to 60 selected and representative libraries that between them had made 70 per cent of the requests. Properly checked lists were returned by 55 of the

²⁶ A full list of these tools is to be found in Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-18.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 56.

libraries, for a 92 per cent return.²⁸

Of the 25 university libraries, seven had all the tools on the list, while 18 had 35 or more, although the general average was brought down by the fact that a few of the smaller ones held only between 11 and 25 of the items. The general average was 35, or 88 per cent of the titles in the list. The one state library held 65 per cent. The average for the public libraries, which included a number of large ones, was 55 per cent, while the average for the colleges was 48 per cent. The federal libraries, including a few large ones, held 38 per cent, while the special libraries held but 15 per cent.²⁹ The holdings of the bibliographical tools were found to show a positive correlation with size of library ranging from +.86 to +.94, depending on the type of correlation used.³⁰ At the same time, the holdings of certain general tools by the special libraries was held to indicate the probable holdings by those libraries of the special tools of most use in identifying materials in the subject covered by those libraries.

Testing of Serious Errors

Kidder had found, in another test, that 82 per cent of the requests which were verifiable directly at the catalog had taken on an average two minutes and 54 seconds to locate. Another 9 per cent, not in the catalog, had been found to be correct citations, and these took an average of three minutes and 23 seconds to locate. However, the 5 per cent which were incorrect took an average of 12 minutes and 49 seconds for verification, while the 4 per cent that were unidentified had taken an average of 10 minutes and 32 seconds before the search was ended.³¹ Since Hodgson had classified 8 per cent of all requests as having serious errors, it seemed reasonable to use that data as a check on the citations which were most likely to represent added costs to the lending library, at least in searching the catalogs.

Statistically, the 46 errors classified as "serious" constitute too small a total for con-

clusive statements, but the results are quite suggestive. Their distribution followed the general pattern in that the larger libraries, and the university libraries, had fewer errors per request, while the smaller libraries and the special libraries had the largest percentages. The college libraries and the public libraries, which were typical of the libraries in the middle-sized groups, showed an average number of such errors. Only in the case of foreign language literature was this distribution disturbed, for there public libraries, making less than 2 per cent of the requests for such literature, did not make any requests which contained serious errors.

About 17 per cent of the serious errors were misspellings which could have been due to carelessness or a failure to verify entries. Yet, when the libraries from which such misspellings came were compared with the libraries of a similar nature which had reported on bibliographic holdings, it seemed probable that those particular libraries had all the necessary bibliographic tools for the verification of those particular requests.³² Leaving out the misspellings, on the possible argument that these errors were due solely to carelessness, even though they amounted to 3 per cent of all errors, it was found that 53 per cent of the remaining 38 errors were verifiable in sources which probably were in the libraries making the requests. Interestingly enough, the largest percentages of the verifiable errors were in the largest and smallest libraries, while the highest percentages of the unverifiable errors were found in the middle group, representing the college and public libraries.³³

The general conclusion reached by both the Kidder and Hodgson studies is that entirely too many careless errors are being made in the citations in interlibrary loan requests, although errors in only about 8 per cent of the requests are causing serious difficulties. There is no real relationship between such errors and the size of the requesting libraries, or their type. In general, a very large proportion of the errors that are made could be avoided if the entries were properly verified in a few bibliographic tools owned by the majority of libraries concerned.

²⁸ For a list of the tools see Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-23; for the percentage held by each library see Kidder, *op. cit.*, pp. 104-8.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

³⁰ Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³¹ Kidder, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

³² Hodgson, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Interlibrary Loan Practice and the Interlibrary Loan Code

Mr. Melinat is associate professor, school of library science, Syracuse University.

THE PRACTICE of lending books and other materials among American libraries has gone on for a good many years without much attention to the development of a uniform system. It was not until 1917 that the American Library Association felt it necessary to issue a "Code of Practice for Interlibrary Loans" for the guidance of cooperating libraries. This code was revised in 1940 by an ACRL Interlibrary Loan Code Committee¹ under the chairmanship of Mr. Harold G. Russell and officially approved by the American Library Association Council. The "Interlibrary Loan Code of 1940" has been the only concrete guide to policies in this field which librarians have had.

How well has the 1940 Code worked as a guide to the operation of this cooperative library service? Many librarians during the past few years have observed that the code was being constantly violated either through ignorance of its terms or by intent because of disagreement with its terms. This problem has assumed crisis proportion to many because of the increasing volume of interlibrary loans in recent years.

As part of a study on "The Administration of Interlibrary Loans in American Libraries,"² the writer was interested in discovering just what the interlibrary loan practice of libraries consisted of and how closely it was related to the code. A questionnaire, based largely on the code, was sent to a group of libraries to determine at which points practice varied from library to library and at which points it was uniform.

The selection of the libraries to be surveyed was based on the assumption that the libraries most concerned with interlibrary loans and those which controlled the practices involved were the large research libraries. To this group were added representative ex-

amples of other types of libraries to broaden the scope of the survey. The selection included: 45 library members of the Association of Research Libraries (two Canadian libraries and one research library, which did not lend books, were omitted); 23 university and college libraries which were actively engaged in research (selection based on a total of more than 35 Doctorates awarded by the institutions over a seven year period);³ 21 college libraries selected as representative by Dr. Felix E. Hirsch for his study of interlibrary problems of college libraries;⁴ and 24 public libraries with holdings of over 500,000 volumes.

Of the 113 questionnaires sent out, replies were received from 100 libraries and fell into the following groups: 50 university and special libraries, 30 college libraries, and 20 public libraries. From the responses to this questionnaire it is possible to determine the degree of acceptance of the policies as stated in the 1940 Code and to make some recommendations for revision.

Many of the recommendations suggested in this survey have already been incorporated into the code of 1952 now being prepared by an ACRL Committee on Interlibrary Loans under the chairmanship of Mr. William A. Kozumplik. The primary purpose of this report is to highlight some of the limitations of the 1940 Code and to emphasize the main lines of revision which should be considered in a code of 1952.

The first question put to librarians in this questionnaire was: "In borrowing books from other libraries, what code or set of regulations do you follow?" The majority (62%) of the libraries⁵ surveyed follow the ALA Interlibrary Loan Code plus their own regulations. Only 20% follow the Interlibrary Loan Code without variation, and 16% use only their own set of regulations. The university and college groups follow the same

³ American Council on Education. *American Universities and Colleges*. ed. by A. J. Brumbaugh. 5th ed. Washington, D.C., 1948, pp. 59-60.

⁴ Hirsch, Felix E. "Interlibrary Loans from the College Viewpoint," *College and Research Libraries*, 10:434-9, 444, October 1949.

⁵ Unless otherwise noted, the percentages given are for the total sample of 100 libraries.

¹ "Interlibrary Loan Code—1940," *College and Research Libraries*, 2:318-19, 376, September 1941.

² Melinat, Carl H. "The Administration of Interlibrary Loans in American Libraries." Master's thesis, Syracuse University, 1949. 140 p. (Microcard edition available from author at \$1.00)

pattern as the total sample, but the public libraries tend to use their own set of regulations more frequently (45%) and the ALA Code less frequently (10%).

This level of acceptance of the code is not high enough and may account for many of the dissatisfactions with the interlibrary loan system. It would seem that the task of getting near 100% acceptance of a revised code is as important as the revision itself.

The primary purpose of the interlibrary loan service is probably still in 1952 as it was in 1940, "to aid research calculated to advance the boundaries of knowledge by the loan of unusual books." The difficulty with this first section of the code is that it does not go on to mention some secondary purposes which are becoming increasingly important today. Our survey indicates that over one-third of the libraries borrow (40%) and lend (38%) for the use of undergraduate students. One-quarter (26%) borrow for any serious reader or student, while one-half (50%) are willing to lend to this group.

There seems to be no reason why a library should not borrow for any serious reader or student as long as each request is carefully screened and found to be necessary. Why should not an important secondary purpose of interlibrary loan service be to provide the reading as well as the research needs of patrons? If the library does not own and cannot buy the book or its equivalent for a serious reader, an interlibrary loan is certainly in order. To say that transactions for other than research purposes "should be considered as part of an extension service rather than as interlibrary loans" is misleading. It would be better to replace the last paragraph of this section with the statement that a secondary purpose of the interlibrary loan service is to provide the book needs of any serious reader or student when these needs cannot be met in any other way.

The statement in the code regarding restricted materials reads as follows: "Libraries are usually unwilling to lend; material in constant use; books of reference; books which are not to be taken from the library except by special permission; material which by reason of its size or character requires expensive packing; material which by reason of age, delicate texture, or fragile condition, is likely to suffer from being sent by mail or express."

This list of material which libraries are usually unwilling to lend corresponds quite well to present lending policies as discovered in our survey of procedures. However, it should be noted that books of reference are often lent by 7 percent of the libraries, rare books by 12 percent, material of unusual size by 11 percent, and material in fragile condition by 7 percent. Libraries do often lend to other libraries "books which are not to be taken from the library except by special permission." Our survey of procedures also indicates that one of the major problems of 12 percent of the borrowing libraries is the reluctance of libraries to lend certain types of materials. These materials are often of the type which do not circulate except by special permission. We shall probably always have disagreement on what constitutes restricted material, but the statement in the code should be as liberal as possible in order to encourage lending with a minimum of restrictions.

The need for verification of the bibliographic details of requested items is stated in the code as follows: "All citations ought to be verified; when this proves to be impracticable, the statement 'Not Verified' ought to be made and a reference given to the source of the information." This statement is far too weak to cope with a very real problem. Our survey indicates that almost half (47%) of the lending libraries are not satisfied with the references sent to them. Slightly less than half (45%) report that requests do not usually indicate "Not Verified" even when that is the case. Almost one-third (31%) indicate that there is general uncertainty as to whether citations have been verified or not. Over half (55%) of the libraries report unverified citations as being a major problem in connection with the lending of material to others. It is obviously unjust to burden the lending library with incomplete and unverified citations. It is suggested that this provision be modified to read: "All citations ought to be verified; when this proves to be impracticable, the statement 'Not Verified' must be made and a reference given to the source of the information; disregard of this provision is considered a sufficient reason for declining to lend."

Sufficient examples have probably now been given on the relationship between interlibrary loan practice and the Interlibrary Loan Code.

In pointing out some of the limitations of the 1940 Code, many sections which agree with practice and probably need no revision have not been considered. Any complete comparison based on the present survey makes it apparent that the 1940 Code is still basically sound. Some of its provisions simply need to be revised to meet present day conditions and practice.

The college libraries are probably more than any other group dissatisfied with the provisions of the code as they now stand; the code was written too much from the university library point of view. The public libraries, borrowing much less for research purposes, tend to ignore the code when it does not suit their purpose. The college libraries, however, borrowing heavily from university and research libraries, cannot do this and still meet the needs of their patrons. They tend to believe that the code lacks the liberality necessary for effective interlibrary cooperation in the use of materials. Certainly any revision of the code should consider more carefully the problems of the college and public libraries.

The Interlibrary Loan Code needs constant revision to make it adaptable to changing conditions. The original code of 1917 stood 23 years before being revised in 1940 and that revision is now out-of-date. The fact

that the code is adhered to on a voluntary basis makes it important that it be revised at frequent intervals. As long as its provisions meet general agreement among participating libraries, it will act to make practice more uniform. As soon, however, as there is marked variation between its provisions and actual practice, it will fall into disrespect and disuse.

Provision should be made for constant revision of the code through the appointment of a permanent ACRL Committee on Interlibrary Loans. This committee would be charged with continuous appraisal of interlibrary loan practice and the drafting of amendments to the code as needed.

The final success of these efforts toward uniformity of interlibrary loan practice depends upon the cooperation and enthusiasm of all librarians concerned. The Association of College and Reference Libraries must take on the job of making the code known and making it liked by all cooperating libraries. Why not get the library supply houses to include a copy of the code with each order of Standard Interlibrary Loan Forms? Only by getting an oversupply of copies in circulation and generating enthusiasm for their use will the code contribute to the free flow of materials from one library to another. It provides a real basis for cooperation.

By MARY LOU LUCY

Interlibrary Loans in a University Library

Miss Lucy is reference assistant, Columbia University Libraries.

A SURVEY of current practice in interlibrary loans at Columbia University Libraries, based on the records of all transactions begun between July 1, 1951 and April 30, 1952, was made during the first six months of 1952. The study includes the types of material borrowed and loaned, the libraries involved, the procedures used, and the costs to Columbia.

In 1940¹ it was estimated that the cost of lending a volume, excluding transportation, was about \$2, but since that time, costs have

risen, the standard request form has been developed, express rates have gone up, and photographic processes have been greatly improved. A new appraisal of the situation was desirable, so the study was made to determine how much interlibrary loans now cost Columbia and whether or not costs can be reduced without reducing service. Since masters' essays and dissertations make up a large portion of the total transactions, they deserved special attention. Inadequate preparation of requests for loans was known to contribute to costs, but the seriousness of this problem had not been determined. These were the major areas studied, although all factors affecting costs were considered.

Fortunately, complete records had been kept during the year, so figures on both in-

¹ Columbia University Libraries. *Annual Report*, 1939-40.

TABLE I
MATERIAL LOANED BY COLUMBIA¹

Kinds of Libraries	% of vol.	Total no. of vols.	Books			Serials		Theses			Other
			Before 1900 No.	1900-1940 No.	1941 & Later No.	Before 1940 No.	1940 & Later No.	M.A. No.	Ph.D. -1950 No.	Ph.D. 1950+ No.	No.
University	55.1	1041	105	339	89	112	40	171	63	54	68
College	20.0	378	28	135	34	33	26	64	35	20	3
Government	11.9	226	7	79	20	39	24	31	5	20	1
Business	6.1	114		23	13	24	30	12	9	3	
Public	2.1	41		15	5	1	1	18	1		
Foreign	2.1	41	2	25	5	2	2	1	2	2	
Other	2.6	50	2	8	4	13	5	7	9	2	
Total Vols.		1891	144	624	170	224	128	304	124	101	72
Percentage			7.6	33.0	9.0	11.8	6.8	16.1	6.6	5.3	3.8

¹ Figures for ten month period.

coming and outgoing requests, transportation charges, and use of the Union Catalog are based on actual count. Supply costs have been determined by counting specific kinds necessary in each procedure. To obtain the cost of staff time devoted to interlibrary loans, a time study was made for two weeks in which 210 transactions were begun. Time was kept on all parts of the total procedure, rather than on one complete transaction. Staff time in departmental libraries is based on the timing of 86 transactions involving eight departmental libraries as well as the central loan desk. Time reported by departmental libraries may not be as reliable as desirable, because of the limited number of transactions spread over several departments. In the ten-month period, departmental libraries contributed 55.4% of the loans made, while 44.6% were loaned from the central collection.

Lending

Columbia's policy is to lend to any library within the United States, Canada, or Mexico and to other libraries in special circumstances. Lending outside these countries actually presents no problem because requests are seldom received. The new interlibrary loan code is followed in all respects, but all volumes borrowed or loaned are required to be used within the library building. There are no blanket restrictions on lending, although in some instances, circulation of any kind is prohibited by the terms of the establishment of a

particular collection. Otherwise, the decision on lending rests with the department which owns the volume, rather than with the interlibrary loan librarian.

During the period studied, requests for 2971 titles were received, of which 1726 (58.1%) were loaned to 419 libraries. In addition to this number, 97 (3.3%) were referred to the Medical Library or Teachers College which have separate interlibrary loan services, after it had been ascertained that the volumes were available for loan. There were 469 (15.8%) requests which were not filled although the material was in the library. These were not loaned for the usual variety of reasons, such as in use, at the bindery, on reserve, etc., but the largest number were in the Avery Library of Architecture which includes art and archeology. Since this is a rich collection, we receive a large number of requests for material in it; however, nothing may leave the building under any circumstances. In the second largest category of loans not granted, photographic copies were offered in place of 71 volumes of periodicals, when the articles wanted consisted of 10 pages or less.

There remain 679 titles requested (22.8%) which were not owned by the library, including 377 book titles and 28 serial titles of which no volumes were owned. It can be shown that regular use of the Union Catalog at the Library of Congress would considerably reduce requests for material not owned by the library, and increase the efficiency of the

TABLE 2
MATERIAL BORROWED BY COLUMBIA¹

Columbia Readers	Books		Serials		Theses		Other	Total Volumes
	Before 1940 No.	1940 & Later No.	Before 1940 No.	1940 & Later No.	M.A. No.	Ph.D. No.	No.	
Faculty	35	21	16	2	8	25	12	119
Instructors & Lecturers	41	9	17	1	2	9	8	87
Ph.D. Cand.	84	18	31	4	19	84	64	304
M.A. Cand.	24	18	12	1	6	18	6	85
Other	6	4	12	8	6	15	14	65
Total Volumes	190	70	88	16	41	151	104	660

¹ Figures for ten months.

borrowing library. In a recent *LC Information Bulletin*² it was reported that of 817 titles searched, 72.8% were located immediately, with 234 located outside of LC. The *Author Catalog* would have located 391 of these at once.

Columbia's experience further demonstrates the value of using this means of location. Even after the New York Public Library and other likely libraries in the city had been searched, leaving relatively unusual titles to be sent to the Union Catalog, 61.8% of the titles sent by Columbia, were located immediately, of which 47.6% were found outside of LC. In New York, locations can usually be received from the Union Catalog within 48 hours. Another 11.6% of the titles sent were located through circularization, making a total of 73.4% located, with 59.2% located outside of LC. Columbia always attempts to locate copies in other libraries first, except those for the use of faculty members which are often borrowed directly from LC. It is encouraging to find in their annual reports that there is an increasing use of the Union Catalog since it relieves libraries of some of the searching for titles not definitely known to be in their collections.

Borrowing

Columbia attempts to borrow for graduate students, faculty, visiting scholars, and members of the various branches of the University, but all borrowing is done for individual use, only. During the period studied, volumes were borrowed for 45 faculty mem-

bers, 23 lecturers and instructors, 120 Ph.D. candidates, 53 masters' candidates, and 32 other members of the University. Table 2 shows a detailed breakdown of the 660 volumes borrowed, representing 517 titles. Easy access to large libraries may account for this seemingly low number of borrowers in a university of Columbia's size.

Of 794 transactions begun, 76.2% were satisfactorily completed, which includes the 7.8% of the titles which were found at Columbia or in the city, 3.2% for which only locations were wanted, and the 65.1% actually borrowed. Locations were known for 535 titles, since 224 were theses or dissertations, 62 were in the city, and 229 were located through the *Union List of Serials*, bibliographies, or borrowed from the Library of Congress. The remaining 259 titles were sent to the Union Catalog which located all except 76. A large number of the 113 titles not available for loan were classed as rare books. (Many of these would have been obvious but as lending policies vary, with some libraries being exceptionally generous, it seemed only fair to our readers to make the requests.)

Although an attempt is made to spread borrowing among as many libraries as possible, there has been a necessary concentration of Columbia borrowing on both LC and Harvard, because only these libraries owned the material. We were able to lend a comparable number of volumes to most of the other libraries from which we borrowed. Ten or more volumes were borrowed from each of eight other university libraries: California-Berkeley, Chicago, Cornell, Michigan, Penn-

² Library of Congress. *Information Bulletin* 11:12, May 19, 1952.

TABLE 3
 ERRORS AND INCOMPLETE CITATIONS IN INCOMING REQUESTS¹

Material	Number of Requests	Number Correct	Number Correct	Number Unver.	Per cent Unver.	No Date	Other Errors	Total Errors	Errors per Request
Books	243	16	6.7	204	83.9	72	230	506	2.09
Serials	49	8	16.3	41	83.6	1	135	177	3.61
M.A.	53	4	7.5	49	92.4	7	9	145	1.30
Ph.D.	59	3	5.1	56	94.9	24			
Total	404	31	7.7	350	86.8	104	374	828	2.04

¹ Figures based on study of all requests received in one month.

sylvania, Princeton, Stanford-Hoover, and Yale. The remainder were scattered among 88 libraries.

Preparation of Requests

Incomplete incoming requests is one of the most troublesome aspects of interlibrary loan. A more complete study of this problem can be found elsewhere in this issue, but a report of findings in another situation may be of interest. It may be agreed that every library desires to lend whatever it can to other libraries, but as is shown in Table 3, the borrowing library too often sends inadequate information for the desired volume to be found without difficulty in the lending library or even to be found at all, although the volume is there. In a four week period, 404 requests were examined for completeness according to the ALA code³ and only 31 (7.7%) were found to be complete in all respects. In this study no distinction was made between errors and omissions, and the *Union List* was counted as verification of serial titles. A total of 828 errors were made, or 2.04 per request. Table 3 shows the distribution of errors. It is possible that not all of the information required by the code is essential to find the volume; for example, omission of publisher was probably of little consequence. On the other hand, over one-fourth omitted the date of publication, which is absolutely essential as few libraries have the staff time for verification of titles in bibliographies and indexes which are chiefly by date of publication. The average cost of verification is reported with other costs in this paper.

Lack of verification accounted for 42.3% of the total errors made. It is possible that

libraries do verify, but omit the source of verification on requests, but this is of little aid to the lending library. Melinat⁴ found that 87% of the libraries reporting in his study attempt to verify and the majority do verify (90-95%). If verification is sometimes impossible, than even a small library can provide the source of the reference. In the six requests in which the sources were given, without verification, two were discovered to be incorrect, with the author entirely omitted in one and misspelled in the other. Had these sources been omitted, these titles would not have been properly searched.

At Columbia it has been found necessary to require the reader to provide a printed source of reference when he fills out the initial request form. This need not be a national bibliography or library catalog, but rather the place where he saw the reference to the title he wants. The interlibrary loan librarian must then verify the information before sending it out, or in rare instances where verification is impossible, the source must be given.

Incomplete information given for dissertations and essays make them especially difficult to find. Often no indication is given of whether it is an essay or dissertation; dates and first names are omitted, and only approximate titles are noted. Some of this can be justified because of inadequate lists of masters' essays, the increasing number of notes on titles in progress, and the delayed publication of lists of dissertations completed. It is especially important to give the source of the reference in these cases where verification is impossible. In the latest volume of *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American*

³ American Library Association. "Interlibrary Loan Code." *College and Research Libraries* 2:318-19, 376, Sept. 1941. See also new code in this issue.

⁴ Melinat, Carl H. *Interlibrary Loan Practice and the Interlibrary Code*. M.A. thesis, Syracuse, 1949. p. 57.

Universities a distinction has been made between Columbia and Teachers College which may help to reduce the number of requests which now have to be identified and sent on.

Multiple Request Form

On the brighter side, the multiple, 5 × 8 forms, approved by the ALA have been found to be more than satisfactory at Columbia. It is encouraging to know that an increasing number of libraries are using them, and it is to be hoped that more of the large libraries will soon adopt them. At the end of April 1952, only 22.3% of all the libraries which had made requests since January 1952 were using this form, with 24.1% of the college and university libraries using them. The real success of the form lies in standardization of procedure. A detailed study of the clerical time necessary using the old routine compared with that using the new form was made during the same two weeks of the cost study. An average of five minutes and two seconds were saved on each outgoing request, and nine minutes and 24 seconds were saved on each incoming request when the form was used. The substitution of window envelopes was included. If the clerical time is computed at 2¢ a minute, the cost of routines is reduced more than 10¢ on borrowing and 18¢ on lending, while the form costs 2.8¢, and at the same time other supplies are saved. Specifically, time was saved as follows: no acknowledgment of receipt, less time to prepare return notice, less time on renewals, no typing of envelopes, and less typing of records.

Theoretically, professional time is saved on verification, but since 24% of the titles not verified in the 404 requests were on the new form, and this corresponds roughly to that using the form at the time, it appears that little influence has been exerted. However, professional time is saved in checking the catalog when one title is given per page because titles can be alphabetized and checked in order. Loans go out faster when one title no longer has to be held until all others are ready. Of course, this could be true of any form, but it is now compulsory.

There has been a noticeable drop in the amount of correspondence handled with the use of the form and the elimination of acknowledgment of receipt. From January through April 1952, there was a decrease over the preceding six months of 1200 pieces which

represented a drop of only 108 titles involved. This means a substantial saving in a library where correspondence runs into thousands per month.

Photoclerk

The possibilities of using the photoclerk in interlibrary loan have not been fully explored at Columbia, although some experimentation has been done in an attempt to eliminate extra typing. At present every incoming request has to be copied on a multiple call slip for either the central loan desk or the departmental libraries. A brief record by author of volumes out on loan is also kept, which we find useful, especially when there are waiting lists for some titles. Since the new form can be photoclerked very well, with space left for writing in, and the print can be sent by pneumatic tube, this may be a means of shortening procedure. More work needs to be done on this before anything definite can be reported.

Costs of Interlibrary Loans

Costs of personnel needed for both borrowing and lending are based on a time study of procedures for two weeks in which 164 incoming requests and 46 requests from Columbia readers were received. By averaging the time spent by the four people involved in the borrowing process (reference assistant, clerk-typist, page, and shipping clerk), and multiplying by the individual rate per minute, the cost of personnel per volume borrowed was found to be \$1.47. The rate was determined by taking the net time worked by a full-time employee, 1680 hours, and dividing by the annual salary. Transportation costs were added for all loans during the 10 months and found to average 95.5¢⁵ per volume, and to this was added 17.5¢ for supplies including postage, and 10¢ for shipping supplies. (Columbia does not use shipping bags.) These costs total \$2.70 per volume borrowed, with 54.5% in personnel costs, 35.4% in transportation and the remaining 10.1% in supplies.

Fees collected from Columbia borrowers at the rate of \$.50 per printed volume and \$1.00 for a ms. thesis, totaled \$409 in ten months, which makes the net loss on transportation 33.5¢ a volume and the total net cost to

⁵The average cost by express was \$2.19 and by mail, \$.26.

Columbia \$2.08 a volume. The apparently low cost of transportation can be explained by our policy of sending material by first class mail whenever it is cheaper than paying the minimum express rate of \$1.61 each way. Up to three and one-half pounds can be sent for less by first class mail than by express anywhere in the country. We were also able to return two or more volumes together on many occasions.

The average cost of lending was found to be \$1.27 per volume, divided as follows: \$1.07 in personnel costs, 9.6¢ in supplies including postage, and 10¢ in shipping supplies. These costs do not include the campus messenger or the telephone, both of which are rather large items in a library with departments in many different buildings. The cost of processing a request which did not result in a loan averaged \$.58, while the average cost of requests for material not borrowed was \$.99. The incoming requests which required verification cost 23.5¢ to verify.

It is interesting to compare the cost of transportation of a dissertation by express at \$3.22 both ways, with the average cost of a microfilm copy. University Microfilm has estimated the average cost of a copy on microfilm at \$2.78, based on a count of more than 500 titles. There are some limitations in using this alternative, aside from possible inconvenience to the reader, because there are now just 24 participating institutions, and some of these are not yet represented in *Dissertation Abstracts*. During the 10 months, Columbia still loaned 101 dissertations completed in 1950 or later, although they were available on microfilm. The cost of processing the film copy after it has been purchased by the library is always an argument for not buying them, but it would be cheaper to buy them and throw them away than to borrow and return by express. In many instances it would be cheaper to buy the film than to borrow by first class mail.

Renewals

In an effort to determine whether or not the length of the loan period had any effect on renewals, the loan periods were tabulated for all titles borrowed by Columbia. Renew-

als were requested on 26.7% of the titles. The ratios of loan periods to renewals were as follows: 1 month, 14.4% of loans and 13% of renewals; 3 weeks, 16.4% of loans and 16.8% of renewals; 2 weeks, 67.9% of loans and 69.7% of renewals. These correspond so closely that apparently the length of the loan makes no difference. Columbia's usual loan period is one month, and only 5.8% were renewed. The average cost of renewing a title loaned was found to be 18¢, and that of renewing a title borrowed was 12¢.

Summary and Recommendations

Costs of interlibrary loans at Columbia can be reduced without reducing the service. Approximately \$400 was spent in 10 months on requests for material not owned by the library. Other libraries can make use of the Union Catalog first, and resort to guessing at locations only after this has been done, since it has been shown that a large percentage of titles can be rapidly located by this means. Borrowing libraries can also give more complete information on requests. If verification is not possible, the source of the information can be included. More care can be taken in requesting essays and dissertations which are so troublesome to the lending library.

General use of the multiple 5 × 8 form would reduce costs both through elimination of many supplies, and reduction in the clerical time needed to process requests. This would mean use of the form by the very large libraries, especially since many of them have not yet adopted it.

Libraries which borrow from each other with some regularity could send annual bills for postage to eliminate the constant counting and handling of small packets of stamps now necessary.

Other means of reducing costs might be found through a more intensive study of procedures at Columbia with a view toward reducing clerical time on procedures, and substituting some clerical time for professional time. But for the most part, reduction of our costs depends on greater cooperation with other libraries. It is hoped that the new code will help in this direction.