



## CO-OPERATIVE CATALOGUING IN SOUTH AFRICA WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE GAUTENG AND ENVIRONS LIBRARY CONSORTIUM (GAELIC)

**Dr. Hester Marais**

University of South Africa Library

[maraih@unisa.ac.za](mailto:maraih@unisa.ac.za)

**Meeting:**

**145 Cataloguing**

**Simultaneous Interpretation:**

no

**WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS: 73RD IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND COUNCIL**  
19-23 August 2007, Durban, South Africa  
<http://www.ifla.org/iv/ifla73/index.htm>

### **ABSTRACT**

*The purpose of the paper is to discuss co-operative cataloguing within GAELIC, an academic library consortium in the Gauteng Province, South Africa. Three co-operative library projects in South Africa are discussed and are followed by a description of the five library consortia in South Africa. The role players in co-operative cataloguing and the impact of the transformation of higher education are highlighted. Peer reviewing, OCLC Enhanced cataloguing and the GAELIC (South Africa) NACO Project are discussed as examples of co-operative cataloguing within GAELIC.*

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

Library co-operation and co-operative cataloguing is not a new concept. Grisham (1992: 38) traced co-operation in the United States back to 1901 with the introduction of the Library of Congress card service. This signifies the start of shared bibliographic data and mark the beginning of centralised cataloguing that allowed libraries to use bibliographic records created by other libraries.

The history of library co-operation in Great Britain can be traced back to 1902 when Sidney Webb addressed the Library Association on the co-ordination and development of library services in London. He questioned the independence of the London libraries and suggested the establishment of a combined catalogue (for publication) at a central office to assist librarians by avoiding the purchase of reference books already available at other London libraries.

In 1907 the librarian of Gravesend established a scheme in which some London public libraries exchanged their printed catalogues and agreed to lend books to one another. The printed catalogues of the initial co-operative scheme were replaced by card and sheaf catalogues (Jefferson 1966: 10-14).

Library co-operation was first mentioned in a South African journal in 1933: "Once the principle of coöperation [sic] and inter-library lending is accepted, we feel that this feature could become of mutual benefit to all participating libraries" (Library Coöperation [sic] 1933: 8).

In the decades that followed, several authors mentioned the importance of co-operation. Varley (1941: 109-115) emphasised the importance of library co-operation in South Africa. He identified the distribution, rather than the provision, of books as the most pressing need in South Africa, as books were available to a small proportion of the public only. In 1958, Van der Riet (1958: 4-7) reported on the library resources of the various regions of the Union and suggested measures to improve co-operation between libraries. Gardner (1960: 31-35) toured the country and visited libraries. As the guest speaker at the South African Library Association (SALA) Conference, September 1960, he shared his impressions of library co-operation. The president of SALA made an urgent request for co-operation in his presidential address in 1961 (Robinson 1961b: 43) and in an article later that year, reported on the progress made since the conference (Robinson 1961a: 71-77).

## **2 CO-OPERATIVE PROJECTS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

One of the first co-operative projects in South Africa dates back to the early seventies. Duvenage (1977: 153-156) described the co-operative agreement of services and collection development between public libraries in the Vaal Triangle. The Vaal Triangle comprises the towns of Sasolburg, Vereeniging and Vanderbijlpark. A characteristic of these communities in the 1970s was the large number of immigrants due to the expansion of the Iron and Steel Corporation (ISCOR) in Vanderbijlpark and the Sasol Two (South African Coal, Oil and Gas Corporation) Project in Sasolburg.

The libraries agreed to develop their individual collections in specialised areas, for example Vanderbijlpark Public Library collected material on religion, economics, trade, business, mathematics, physics, engineering, architecture and European history. The library also collected recreational reading material for Dutch, Portuguese, Spanish and Greek immigrants. Members of the various libraries were allowed to borrow books from the other libraries free of charge.

Another co-operative project began in 1991 when the Academic Information Service of the University of Pretoria and the Division for Information Services at the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) agreed to co-operate to optimise their resources and to reduce operational costs, specifically with regards to periodical acquisitions (UP-WNNR Inligtings-vennootskap 1991: 14).

Neither of the co-operative efforts mentioned above was ever formally terminated, but interest steadily declined and at present there is very little co-operative activity within the scope of the original agreements (Duminy 2007; Pienaar 2007).

The Cataloguing Network in Pietermaritzburg (CATNIP), another South African

co-operative project, started in the nineties. The most striking feature of CATNIP is the fact that it owes its existence to the insights and initiatives of its librarians, and not to agreements between administrators and policy makers.

CATNIP was launched from within a group of libraries with common subject interests on the basis of instinctive feelings about the virtues of library co-operation. The Theological Cluster, comprising the School of Theology of the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg (UNP), the Federal Theological Seminary (Fedsem) situated at Imbali, and St. Joseph's Theological Institute and Las Casas Dominican Community (both at Cedara), used the cataloguing and database management skills and computer hardware and software at the UNP Library to create a combined online catalogue for all theological and related material in the Pietermaritzburg region. The aim was to enable the different institutions to exchange material and co-ordinate acquisition policies. The Evangelical Bible Seminary (EBSEMSA), Anglican House, and the Jesuits also joined the Theological Cluster. Since 1993, the Natal Society Library, the largest library in Pietermaritzburg, also started adding its records to the CATNIP database.

By the end of the 1990s, CATNIP had progressed towards its aim of documenting the collections of all Pietermaritzburg's libraries as a resource base for research, teaching and learning. Apart from the establishment of a centralised online bibliographic database and the exchange of material regionally, the greatest achievement of CATNIP has been the effective utilisation of computer and human resources (Merritt 1999a: 21-26).

Thus, the concept of library co-operation in South Africa is not new, but in recent years the demand is for formal co-operative arrangements and progress has increased. Although bibliographic co-operation has been acknowledged as being important, much attention has been focused on related areas such as the development of integrated library systems. Co-operation with regard to bibliographic and authority records, the exchange of these records, and standardisation have progressed slowly and much more can be achieved in this area.

It is necessary to look at a brief overview of consortium activity in South Africa.

### **3 LIBRARY CONSORTIA IN SOUTH AFRICA**

There are five academic library consortia in South Africa:

#### **3.1 Cape Library Consortium**

In 1992, five Western Cape tertiary education institutions were seeking ways of developing closer co-operation. Owing to budget cuts, cancellation of serial subscriptions and staff reductions, none of these organisations was in a position to meet the growing needs of the academic communities that each served.

The Vice-Rectors' Group of the Western Cape Tertiary Institutions Trust (WCTIT) initiated the idea of co-operation and presented a proposal for funding to the Ford

Foundation. The Ford Foundation team who visited the libraries in the region during 1992 was in favour of the formation of a library consortium, but believed that such a consortium needed to be expanded through joining forces with other libraries in the region to become a major community resource (De Kock 1997: 136-137).

As a result, the Western Cape Library Co-operation Project (WCLC Project) was initiated in 1993. The following institutions were involved:

- University of Cape Town
- University of the Western Cape
- University of Stellenbosch
- Cape Technikon <sup>1</sup>
- Peninsula Technikon.

In 1994 the WCLC changed its name to the Cape Library Consortium (CALICO), administered by the WCTIT. According to the Western Cape Tertiary Institutions Trust (1995: 1) the vision of CALICO is:

“To promote information literacy and economic development in a form users want, when, and where they need it. Inherent in this vision is the right of all citizens to be able to access, evaluate, and effectively use information that can contribute to improving their quality of life and economic well-being. Accordingly, the vision embraces the concept of a single Western Cape Library collection that is housed at different locations with all resources accessible to anyone who has need of them.”

Together, representatives from each organisation formed the following working committees (De Kock 1997: 137):

- Document Delivery Working Group
- Co-operative Journals Project
- Van Service Committee
- Team Building Committee

---

1. **Technikon** is a term used in South Africa refers to a university of technology. Technikon focus mainly on providing a hands-on approach to education and training. Technikon were renamed to **Universities of Technology**, resulting in several institutes of education merging to form new universities.

- Working Group on a Shared Automated System
- Committee on a Binding Policy
- Committee on Consortium Structure
- Co-operative Staff Training Sub-committee.

### **3.2 Free State Library and Information Consortium**

Under the name Free State Library and Information Consortium (FRELICO), the University of the Free State's proposal to the Mellon Foundation in the United States resulted in a grant to launch the planning phase of a resource sharing project. A delegation consisting of vice rectors or heads of organisations in the Free State met in August 1996 to convey information about the planning phase and discuss the possibility of participation and commitment of their organisations (De Kock 1997: 140).

The following institutions were included in the planning stage (FRELICO 1997: 51):

- Bloemfontein Public Library
- Free State Directorate for Information Services and Heritage
- SASOL Technical Library Services
- Technikon Free State
- University of the North, Qwa-Qwa campus
- University of the Free State
- Vista University, Bloemfontein campus
- Vista University, Welkom campus.

FRELICO's mission is to expand access to informational, research and study materials in the Free State through electronic means. The goal is to develop a comprehensive plan for electronic networks to provide mutual and enhanced access to users of participating institutions.

To achieve this goal, five areas for potential co-operation were identified and working groups were formed to address these (FRELICO 1997: 52):

- shared computerised regional database/catalogue
- document delivery systems
- co-operative journals project
- information literacy programmes
- training on technological issues related to information sciences.

### **3.3 Eastern Seaboard Association of Libraries**

The first meetings of the Eastern Seaboard Association of Libraries (ESAL) took place in 1994 under the auspices of the Regional Institutions Co-operative Project (RICP). The RICP became the Eastern Seaboard Association of Tertiary

Institutions (ESATI) (Merritt 1998b: 27).

ESAL comprises the eight libraries in tertiary education of the seven institutions in KwaZulu/Natal:

- Natal Technikon
- M L Sultan Technikon
- Mangosuthu Technikon
- University of Zululand
- University of Natal, Durban
- University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg
- University of Durban-Westville.

The mission of ESAL (cited in Merritt 1998b: 27-28) is:

“... to coordinate the resources of all the tertiary institution libraries on the eastern seaboard in order to develop a single resource base that will underpin teaching, learning and research in the area and in turn contribute to the national bibliographic network. In short, this means the maximum use of library resources within higher education both regionally and nationally, tighter integration of libraries into the academic process and the enhancement of the quality of research.”

### **3.4 South Eastern Academic Libraries System**

The South Eastern Academic Libraries System (SEALS) was formed in 1989 to establish co-operation and resource sharing between members. The initial set-up was not based on a structured agreement and in 1996 members decided to embark on a more formal co-operative project (De Kock 1997: 141-142).

The following institutions form part of SEALS:

- Rhodes University
- University of Port Elizabeth
- University of Fort Hare
- University of Transkei
- Port Elizabeth Technikon
- Border Technikon
- Eastern Cape Technikon
- Vista University, Port Elizabeth campus.

### 3.5 Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium

In 1995 the University of the Witwatersrand Library approached the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation (Mellon Foundation) to fund a new library system. Mellon's response was that it would prefer to support new library software for a consortium of libraries, rather than a single library, with the aim to encourage regional co-operation and resource sharing. At the beginning of 1996, under the auspices of the Foundation of Tertiary Education Institutions in the Northern Metropolis (FOTIM), senior administrators, library directors, and information technology directors met with representatives of the Mellon Foundation. A planning grant was made available and the Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium (GAELIC) was founded. (Multi-million Volume Library ... 1996: 1, 5).

Before the implementation of the National plan for Higher Education in 2001, GAELIC had the following members:

- Technikon North West
- Technikon Northern Gauteng (TNG)
- Technikon Pretoria
- Technikon Southern Africa (TSA)
- Technikon Witwatersrand (Wits Technikon)
- Vaal Triangle Technikon
- Medical University of Southern Africa (MEDUNSA)
- Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education (PU for CHE)
- Rand Afrikaans University (RAU)
- University of South Africa (Unisa)
- University of Pretoria (UP)
- University of the North West
- University of the Witwatersrand (Wits)
- Vista University (Pretoria campus)
- University of Venda
- University of the North

The Memorandum of Agreement (1996) states the vision of GAELIC:

“To create a virtual library with local service interfaces, forming part of a global community for clients in Gauteng and its environs. This will be achieved by a group of autonomous tertiary education information services, using technology and linked networks, which accept the need to explore co-operation and collaboration by consensus as a response to the formal educational, training and information needs of the country.”

GAELIC's mission was formulated to fully utilise and develop the information resources of the region to promote education, research and lifelong learning among its clients.

Initially the following task groups with sub-groups, responsible for projects and investigations, were established (Edwards 1999: 123-128):

- Systems Task Group, responsible for researching a co-operative library system for GAELIC members, setting up system evaluation workshops, and organising consultancy for advice on the system. This Task Group was also tasked to set up final agreements and business strategies between the parties.
- Resource Sharing Task Group with sub-task groups for
  - document supply
  - joint acquisitions
  - union list of current serial titles
  - human resources.
- Another task group emerged from this group, namely the GAELIC Cataloguing and Technical Services Workgroup (GCats), which has several sub-task groups. These sub-task groups were established to deal with specific responsibilities to ensure a clean union catalogue. The name was changed to the Cataloguing and Technical Services Work Group
- Networking and Infrastructure Task Group, responsible for the establishment of an information technology infrastructure to enable resource sharing.

Initially GAELIC adopted a highly democratic approach. All library directors, chairpersons of task teams, and representatives from stakeholders such as Sabinet Online and the National Library of South Africa were represented on the Steering Committee. Within this group, care was taken to ensure consensus and commitment. In the early stages of GAELIC this was imperative to ensure that everybody was committed and that larger, more established institutions did not take over or dominate the smaller, disadvantaged institutions.

All of the above served GAELIC well during the first years. In mid 1998, at a strategic planning session it became clear that the focus needed to be sharpened and the vision redefined to meet new challenges. A new structure and strategy was agreed upon, with the Strategic Management Team providing leadership and vision and overseeing the activity of the consortium. Teams were established to focus on (Edwards 1999: 126-127):

- Business Management
- Information Resources
- Human Resources
- Information and Communications Technology.

These teams currently include experts or people who wish to develop specific skills. With the exception of the Human Resources Focus Area Team, which is fully representative of all members, participation of all member institutions is no longer expected or recommended, but is left at the discretion of individual library

directors. Each focus area may form working groups to take care of operational areas or projects. The Business Management Unit, for example has working groups in the area of finance, marketing and management information.

## **4 ROLE PLAYERS IN CO-OPERATIVE CATALOGUING IN SOUTH AFRICA**

There are two important role players in South Africa, namely Sabinet Online and the South African National Bibliography (SANB).

### **4.1 Sabinet Online**

In 1983, the South African Bibliographic and Information Network (Sabinet) was established as an independent, non-profit membership organisation and supplier of online bibliographic references to materials in South African information services. In 1997, Sabinet became a private company, Sabinet Online (Pty) Ltd. (Harrod's Librarians' Glossary ... 2000: 644).

The mission of Sabinet Online (Pty) Ltd. is "to enable value-added electronic access to information to the serious information user, locally and globally" (Sabinet Online 1997: 2). Currently one hundred and forty six Sabinet members use the SaCat services, whilst 158 members use the World Cat Services of OCLC through Sabinet Online (Sabinet Online Standards Committee 2002: 1). Members include educational institutions such as universities, technikons, state departments, research institutions and provincial and public libraries. Other members include private institutions such as banks, law firms, auditors, mining companies and pharmaceutical firms (Sabinet Online 1997: 1).

A primary strategy of Sabinet Online is to construct and provide a national information infrastructure to complement and interface with various library systems. They also support national resource sharing infrastructure through a national union catalogue (SACat) of high quality South African bibliographic records and holdings to support shared cataloguing and acquisitions (Malan 1998: 4).

Considerable overlap in the requirements for regional union catalogues and a national union catalogue became evident. Consortia were seeking software solutions for their resource sharing and shared cataloguing needs, a situation that was further affected by a strong requirement for national co-operation and a fear that some regions may start isolating themselves and their resources from the rest of the country by focusing on regional union catalogues. It thus became urgent to

- avoid unnecessary duplication and costs
- ensure participation in the national union catalogue
- optimise the use of available funding and expertise in the country.

Sabinet Online plays an important role in the establishment, development and support of resource sharing and union catalogues in South Africa as a functional system and platform for a national union catalogue and regional union catalogues in South Africa.

## **4.2 South African National Bibliography**

Until November 1999, South Africa had two national libraries, the South African Library in Cape Town and the State Library in Pretoria (Lombard & De Beer 2000: 23). Both libraries were legal deposit libraries, but the main purpose of the South African Library was the preservation of documents and manuscripts, while the State Library was responsible for the compilation of the South African National Bibliography (SANB).

In 1997, the Legal Deposit Act, No. 17 of 1982 (Behrens 1994: 63) was replaced by a new Act on Legal Deposit, No. 54 of 1997, which nominated the State Library (now known as the National Library of South Africa (Pretoria Division)) as one of the agencies for the legal deposit of printed materials, and the National Film, Video- and Sound Archive as the sole agency for audio-visual material. The Pretoria Division of the National Library of South Africa, with the help of other libraries, still remained responsible for the compilation of the SANB. The last paper edition of SANB was published in 1999. Since then new bibliographic records are made available on OCLC and Sabinet.

Authority records for the South African National Bibliography were created on the Dobis/Libis library system, one of the few automated library systems available to South African libraries during the international sanctions of the eighties. The Dobis/Libis format is not compatible with current international automated library systems used in South African libraries and Dobis/Libis records are therefore not easily available to South African libraries (De Klerk 2001: 5). Authority headings are available in the printed SANB and electronically on OCLC, but variant headings for the same entry exist because authority records are not prescribed or readily available.

Because the National Name Authority File of the National Library of South Africa was not available for use by other South African libraries, libraries that were administering authority control experienced serious problems. Also, by its own admission, limited financial and human resources at the National Library delayed the production of South African bibliographic and authority data, with negative results (De Klerk 2001: 6).

## **5 TRANSFORMATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN SOUTH AFRICA**

The former minister of education, prof. Kader Asmal launched The National Plan for Higher Education (NPHE) in February 2001. The NPHE contains five key policy priorities and objectives deemed necessary for achieving the overall aim of the transformation of the higher education system (Key information about

the higher education system in South Africa, 2007).

The one outcome necessary for this paper is the reduction of higher education institutions. The NPHE proposes that 36 higher education institutions are reduced to 21. These changes impacted heavily on the Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium (GAELIC):

- Vista University officially closed down on Jan. 1, 2004. The different campuses were incorporated into different universities. The University of Pretoria incorporated the Mamelodi Campus and University of South Africa the Vista Head Office (Vudec).
- Technikon SA merged with the University of South Africa on Jan. 1, 2005 and the decision was made not to rename the new institution. The name University of South Africa was retained.
- Vaal Triangle Technikon was retained as a separate and independent institution and the facilities of Vista Sebokeng campus was allocated to it to allow for further growth. The name changed to Vaal University of Technology.
- The three technikons in the Tshwane metro, namely Technikon Northern Gauteng, Technikon North-West and Technikon Pretoria merged into one unitary institution with two sites, one at the Northern Gauteng site and the second at the Technikon Pretoria site. The name of the new institution is Tshwane University of Technology.
- Technikon Witwatersrand merged with the Rand Afrikaans University and the institutions new name is the University of Johannesburg.
- Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education and the University of the North-West merged into one unitary multi-campus institution and were named North-West University.

The impacts of the mergers were often dramatic and traumatic. In some institutions restructuring and placement of staff are still in progress which have impacted negatively on co-operation in general.

## 6 GAELIC CO-OPERATIVE CATALOGUING ISSUES

### 6.1 Co-operative cataloguing

During the late nineties, GCats met regularly and was actively involved in various activities. This resulted in:

- regular training sessions
- the completion of a comprehensive authority control policy document entitled ***Authority control manual and policy guidelines for GAELIC libraries Technical services workflow*** documents

- the approval of core bibliographic records for 11 types of publications

All the GAELIC libraries were trained to do original cataloguing on OCLC. It is cost and time saving, because one record is available for use in all the libraries. The GAELIC Focus Group is committed towards increased levels of participation from GAELIC libraries and works towards (GAELIC Cataloguing Focus Group 2007):

- greater awareness and application of international bibliographic standards
- sharing of expertise and knowledge regarding cataloguing standards
- improved skills and streamlined processes
- identification and addressing of training needs.

Due to changes in the infrastructure in the South African library scene and developments in library computer technology, it was decided to abandon the idea of a GAELIC union catalogue.

## **6.2 Peer reviewing**

There is a difference in the level of competency within GAELIC libraries. In order to ensure quality bibliographic records on OCLC, a peer review system was put in place. Skilled and experienced cataloguers were identified and libraries with inexperienced cataloguers were assigned a reviewer on request. The cataloguers can contact their reviewer with questions and problems and are encouraged to send problem cataloguing records for review. The reviewer checks the record, suggests changes and supplies the relevant AACR2 rules. This is therefore not just quality control, but is seen as an opportunity for training and development (Steyn 2007).

## **6.3 GAELIC and OCLC Enhanced Cataloguing Status**

OCLC established the Enhance function in 1983. Its goal was to decentralise quality control responsibility for WorldCat. The Enhance program allows designated libraries to make corrections or to add information to bibliographic records in WorldCat.

In 2007 the Unisa Library was the first GAELIC library to attain OCLC enhanced cataloguing status. Enhanced status has the following advantages for the Unisa Library:

- The cumbersome process of reporting errors to OCLC is no longer necessary
- Monetary reward as each record that is enhanced receives credit
- Unisa library becomes an international role player and can influence the future of WorldCat and cataloguing in general.

The challenge for GAELIC is to encourage its member libraries to follow the Unisa Library's example. This can only contribute to strengthening the cataloguing skills of each of the GAELIC participants and to assure that international standards are adhered to. Until such time, Unisa will help colleagues by doing changes for them on OCLC.

The Enhance program has had a positive effect on the quality of WorldCat's records. GAELIC, as one of the major consortia in South Africa and as "co-owner" of South African records can play an important role in the Enhance program by:

- Contributing high quality original bibliographic records for Southern African publications
- Enhancing bibliographic records for Southern African publications.

## **7 GAELIC (SOUTH AFRICA) NACO PROJECT**

The OCLC authority file contains readily available authority records for American, Canadian and British authors, but more limited coverage is given to South African, African, Dutch, French, German and Australian authors. The OCLC authority file is a closed file, and only NACO participants may create or change records. South African libraries were thus faced with two options. To

- create authority records not available on OCLC via in-house library systems, or to
- become NACO participants and create authority records on OCLC.

Massive duplication of effort and cost to consortium libraries made the creation of authority records via in-house library systems an unviable solution and three academic library consortia thus opted for NACO participation.

From 24 to 28 July 2000, a trainer from the Library of Congress trained the first South African librarians in NACO policies and procedures in Pretoria. The trainees were from the University of South Africa, Rand Afrikaans University, University of the Witwatersrand, Medunsa, Vista University in Pretoria, Technikon Southern Africa, Vaal Triangle Technikon and Technikon Witwatersrand. Representatives from FRELICO and the National Library of South Africa (Pretoria campus) joined the group from GAELIC. Members of the CALICO libraries were trained in Cape Town the following week.

During the first five years, GAELIC libraries contributed 18 967 new authority records for international use. They also improved 2 829 existing authority records by adding references and notes. During the 2006/2007 financial year, they created 6 257 new records and changed 504 existing records. Most of the records created and changed are for South African and African authors.

In order to accommodate needs of libraries who are not NACO participants, there is an unofficial "create for me" system whereby a NACO library can create

the record on request. In order to investigate the viability of central authority control within GAELIC, a cost study was done and the results will be discussed next.

## **8 COST OF CREATING AUTHORITY RECORDS IN SOUTH AFRICA**

The focus of the cost study was on the creation of new authority records and the cost and time involved in changing existing authority records. The purpose was to motivate the creation of a central body to ensure that all the authority records created are of international standard and are available for use by all the consortium members

### **8.1 Participants**

All the South African consortia were asked to participate in the study and twenty-three libraries were invited to participate. Managers from the Seals and Esal consortia indicated that they were not in a position to participate in the study, because cataloguers were involved in the implementation of a new library system. Eleven libraries indicated that they are just downloading authority records from bibliographic utilities and five libraries did not respond at all. The following seven libraries participated:

- University of South Africa
- Rand Afrikaans University
- University of the Witwatersrand
- University of Pretoria
- Technikon Southern Africa
- University of Cape Town
- University of Stellenbosch

### **8.2 Data collection**

The process of creating or changing an authority record was divided into three tasks to ensure that all the participants break down and time the same elements. For the purpose of the study, the activity of creating or changing of authority records was divided into:

Research, which involves:

- retrieving works by an author to search for different forms of the name, pseudonyms, name changes, etc.
- identification of all the different forms or variants of the name
- searches on databases and other library catalogues to determine commonly used names and to search for other authors using the same name
- consultation of reference sources to resolve conflict, if required
- a preliminary decision on the authoritative form.

Creating/changing the authority record, which includes the following elements:

- confirming the establishment of the authoritative form of the name by using it as the 1XX in the authority record
- making 4XX references from the unused form(s) of the name
- making 5XX references to link related headings with each other
- completing the authority record as required by local policies
- carrying out quality control on the record; save/store the record in the database
- downloading the record into the in-house system if the record has been retrieved from a union catalogue or a bibliographic utility.

Housekeeping describes clerical and clean up activities, for example:

- inserting the new heading in bibliographic records(s) if required
- checking and removing duplicate forms in the relevant index
- maintenance, or reporting errors in the consortium union catalogue or bibliographic utility
- keeping of statistics.

### **8.3 Results**

The results of the cost and time study of authority control in academic libraries in South Africa can be summarised as follows:

#### **8.3.1 Cost calculation for the creation of an authority record**

- The cost of creating an authority record on OCLC ranged from R7.06 to R65.73, the average cost being R29.00.
- The cost of creating an authority record on an in-house library system ranged from R3.47 to R23.01, with an average cost of R6.91. Only two institutions supplied data, thus making the sample too small to assume statistically valid results.

#### **8.3.2 Cost calculation to change an authority record**

- The cost of changing an authority record on OCLC ranged from R13.44 to R62.10; the average cost being R20.57.
- The cost of changing an authority record on an in-house library system was R3.43. No statistically valid results could be assumed, as only one institution supplied data, making the sample too small.

#### **8.3.3 The time required to create an authority record**

- The time taken to create an authority record on OCLC ranged from 5.1 to 47.6 minutes; an average time of 19.4 minutes.

- The average times for the three tasks in the process of creating an authority record on OCLC were
  - research: 9.3 minutes (48% of the total time)
  - creating the record: 7.3 minutes (37.6% of the total time)
  - housekeeping: 2.8 minutes (14.4% of the total time).
- The time taken to create an authority record on an in-house library system ranged from 2.7 to 13.6 minutes, the average time being 4.6 minutes.
- The average times for the three tasks in the process of creating an authority record on an in-house library system were
  - research: 1.7 minutes (36.9% of the total time),
  - creating the record: 2.1 minutes (45.6% of the total time)
  - housekeeping: 0.8 minutes (17.4% of the total time).

### **8.3.4 The time required to change an authority record**

- The time taken to change an authority record on OCLC ranged from 8 to 45 minutes, with an average of 13 minutes.
- The average time for the three tasks in the process of changing an authority record on OCLC were
  - research: 5.3 minutes (40.8% of the total time)
  - changing the record: 4.5 minutes (34.6% of the total time)
  - housekeeping: 3.2 minutes (24.6% of the total time).
- The average time to change an authority record on an in-house library system was 3 minutes. Since only one institution supplied data and the sample was small, no statistically valid results could be assumed.
- The average time for the three tasks in the process of changing an authority record on an in-house system were
  - research: 0.8 minutes (26.6% of the total time)
  - changing the record: 1.5 minutes (50% of the total time)
  - housekeeping: 0.7 minutes (23.3% of the total time).
- Since only one institution supplied data and the sample was small, no statistically valid results could be assumed.

## **9 CONCLUSIONS**

The catalyst for GAELIC was a proposed cooperative online catalogue with a single library system. None of the libraries individually had the resources to purchase and operate the system needed to meet local needs.

A major issue since the beginning of the consortium has been the question of co-operative cataloguing. There was a fear of loss of autonomy and some libraries are very fond of their catalogues, even if these are not cost effective.

Consortium members were encouraged and trained to use OCLC for cataloguing. Policies, standards and procedures were put in place to ensure a single bibliographic record for use by all members. Early in the discussions, it

was decided that authority control is important to ensure a good quality catalogue.

After the mergers related to reducing the number of higher education institutions are completed, the GAELIC Cataloguing Focus Group should develop the skills and expertise of staff to ensure that GAELIC libraries full participate in co-operative cataloguing. The Focus Group is busy compiling a list of training needs and cataloguing experts that can be involved in training.

## 10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Behrens, S.J. 1994. ***Bibliographic control and information sources***. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Clapp, V.W. 1973. Retrospect and prospect, in ***Reader in technical services***, edited by Edmond L. Applebaum. Washington, D.C.: NCR/Microcard Editions: 149-154.

De Klerk, T. 2001. ***Perspective on names in the South African National Bibliography: past, present and future: 2000-2001: 67<sup>th</sup> IFLA Council and General Conference, August 16-25, Boston***: 1-3. Online. Last accessed 16 February 2002. Available: <http://ifla.org/IV/ifla67/papers/129-199ws-e.pdf>.

De Kock, M.G. 1997. An information technology infrastructure for resource sharing in South African academic information services. D. Litt et Phil. thesis, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg. (Unpublished).

Duminy, H., Head: Sasolburg Public Library. 2007. ***Telephonic interview***. 3 April 2007.

Duvenage, A.P. 1977. Library co-operation in the Vaal Triangle. ***South African libraries***, 44(4): 153-156.

Edwards, H.M. 1999. South Africa's GAELIC: the Gauteng and Environs Library Consortium. ***Information technology and libraries***, 18(3), September: 123-128.

FRELICO : co-operative library services for the Province. 1997. ***Free State libraries***, April/June: 51-52.

***GAELIC Cataloguing Focus Group***. 2007. Online. Last accessed: 11 April 2007. Available: <http://www.gaelic.ac.za/cataloguing.aspt>.

Gardner, W.H. 1960. Library service and library co-operation. ***South African libraries***, 28(2): 31-35.

Grisham, F.P. 1992. Library cooperation. ***Journal of library administration***,

17(4): 37-45.

**Harrod's librarians' glossary and reference book: a dictionary of over 9000 terms used ...** 2000. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Compiled by Ray Prytherch. Aldershot, Hants: Gower.

Jefferson, G. 1966. **Library co-operation**. London: A. Deutsch.

**Key information about the higher education system in South Africa**. 2007. Online. Last accessed: 10 April 2007. Available: <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pubs/umrabulo/umrabulo14/educinfo.html>.

Library coöperation [sic]. 1933. **South African libraries**, 1(1), July: 8.

Lombard, P.M. & De Beer, J.F. 2000. National libraries around the world, 1998-1999: a review of the literature. **Alexandria**, 12(1): 3-32.

Malan, P. 1998. A new national union catalogue for Southern African libraries. **Innovation**, 17, December: 4-7.

Marais, H. 2004. Authority control in an academic library consortium using a union catalogue maintained by a central office for authority control. D. Litt et Phil. thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria. (Unpublished).

Merritt, C. 1998a. From the grassroots upwards: the Cataloguing Network in Pietermaritzburg (CATNIP). **Innovation**, 17, December: 21-26.

Merritt, C. 1998b. Tertiary library co-operation on the Eastern Seaboard: the case of Esal. **Innovation**, 17, December: 27-30.

Multi-million volume library to be established: GAELIC. 1996. **SAILIS newsletter**, 16(11):1,5.

Pienaar, A. 2007. **E-mail correspondence**. 3 April 2007, Pretoria.

Robinson, H.M. 1961a. Biblioteeksamewerking in die Unie van Suid-Afrika. **South African libraries**, 28(3): 71-77.

Robinson, H.M. 1961b. Presidensiële rede op die sestiende jaarlikse konferensie van die Suid-Afrikaanse Biblioteekvereniging, Grahamstad, 19 September 1961. **South African libraries**, 28(2): 43-51.

Sabinet Online. 1997. Vision of cataloguing and acquisitions support. **Sabinfo**, October: 1-2.

Sabinet Online Standards Committee. 2002. Minutes of the Meeting of 27 February 2002. (Unpublished).

Steyn, S.M., cataloguer, Unisa Library. 2007. **Interview**. 10 April 2007.

UP-WNNR inligtingsvennootskap (UWIV). 1991. **SALIS newsletter**, 11(8): 14.

Van der Riet, F.G. 1958. Library co-operation in South Africa: the next move? **South African libraries**, 26(1): 4-7.

Varley, D.H. 1941. Aspects of library co-operation. **South African libraries**, 8(3):109-115.

Western Cape Tertiary Institutions Trust. 1995. CALICO: the way forward. (Unpublished).

Visser, A.L., cataloguer, Unisa Library. 2007. **Interview**. 11 April 2007.