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Some of the barriers encountered in studying the course materials of correspondence courses on Library and Information Science (LIS) in India have been focused. This case study with cataloguing practical subject shows that mis-interpretation of rules and printing mistakes are the two major barriers for correct understanding of the subject.

INTRODUCTION

Correspondence courses are conducted, at present, by a number of universities in India, both at the Bachelor of Library & Information Science (BLIS) as well as at the Master of Library & Information Science (MLIS) levels. Though some of them have arrangements of contact sessions for their registered students at various places, some do not have such facilities. Where such facilities are not available, students mainly depend upon the course materials (CMs) provided by them. Of the universities conducting correspondence/distance education courses, the Annamalai University (AU) and Madras University (MU) have both BLIS and MLIS courses. The Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU) had so far BLIS only and have started the MLIS course since 1994.

In this paper, taking the subject of Cataloguing Practical, as example, an attempt has been made to highlight the kind of barriers the students usually encounter if they solely depend upon the course materials.

COURSES ON CATALOGUING PRACTICE

All the three universities viz, AU, MU & IGNOU, have prescribed Classified Catalogue Code (CCC) and (Anglo American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition (AACR2) for cataloguing practical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>BLIS</th>
<th>MLIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Cataloguing Practical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MU</td>
<td>Cataloguing Practical</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGNOU</td>
<td>Cataloguing Practical</td>
<td>4 P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The course materials cover (a) some essential rules; (b) few worked out examples to demonstrate the rules; and (c) some exercises as problems to be worked out by the students.

**MIS-INTERPRETATION OF RULES**

A serious barrier in the form of interpretation of the rules is found as revealed in the worked out examples. 

**Case 1**

AU MLIS Course Materials (AACR2) Lessons: 1 - 8

Transcription of a title page as printed on page 47 is reproduced below:

```
QUALITY FOR PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT
Papers presented at the
First Asian Congress on Quality and Reliability,
New Delhi, India
30 October - 2 November 1989
P.K. BOSE
S.P. MUKHERJEE
K.G. RAMAMURTY
WILEY EASTERN LIMITED
NEW DELHI BANGALORE BOMBAY MADRAS HYDERABAD
```

Other information as printed on the same page are:


The course material interprets this as an example of Shared Authorship having three authors, as is apparent from the write up provided at page 47, based on which the example has been worked out as (page 48):
(i) Whereas, names of three persons do appear prominently on the title page, this is not a case of shared responsibility having three personal Indian authors. But, the document has actually been emanated from a Corporate Body (CB), i.e., Conference. The relevant AACR2 Rule 21.1 B2 prescribes that the main entry of a book will be under the name of the Corporate Body (CB) provided:

a) The book has been emanated from a CB;
b) It satisfies the rule 21.1B2, category (d); and
c) The CB has its name.

AACR2, Rule 21.1 B2 - "General. Enter a work emanating from one or more corporate body under the heading for the appropriate corporate body (see 21.4B, 21.5B) if it falls into one or more of the following categories: d. those that report the collective activity of a conference (e.g., proceedings, collected papers),.. falling within the definition of a corporate body (see 21.1B) provided that the conference,.. is prominently named (see 0.8) in the item being catalogued."

In the footnote serial no. 2 on page 313 the code mentions: "Consider a book to emanate from a corporate body if it is issued by that body or has been caused to be issued by that body or if it originated with that body".

Even, it has been emanated from a CB and satisfies Rule 21.1B2, category (d), one cannot choose the CB for the Main Entry heading, if the Conference does not have a name.

Rule 21.1B1 "Consider a corporate body to have a name if, in a script and language using capital letters for proper names, the initial letters of the words referring to it are consistently capitalised, and/or if, in a language using articles, the words are always associated with a definite article. Typical examples of corporate bodies are associations,...and conferences." In the footnote serial no. 1 on page 313 of AACR2 it says "Conferences are meetings of individuals or representatives of various bodies of common interest, or meeting of representatives of a corporate body that constitute its legislative or governing body".

Thus, the book actually should get corporate authorship under conference, as it satisfies all its conditions i.e., Rule 21.1B2, category (d) and the conference has a name. Similarly, the rules for descriptive cataloguing have not been properly followed in the example.

Thus, the Main Entry should have been

Case 2

IGNOU Course Material BLIS (AACR2)

The material (page 91) says: "When an author is known by more than one name, the following procedure has to be adopted: (i) the name that appears most frequently in the person's works; (ii) the name that appears most frequently in the reference sources; (iii) the latest name." Then, it demonstrates the rule with the following example:

```
"Gunther, Heinz
Battalion 999/Heinz G. Konsalik [i.e. Heinz Gunther]; translated by Oliver Coburn".
```

Main entry is under the well-known or the present name."

The main entry (ME) has been done probably under the most frequently used name of the author, i.e., Heinz Gunther. The note given above does not help the students to understand the rules clearly for choice of headings.

On the title page, the other name of the author 'Heinz G. Konsalik' appears. In the descriptive part of the entry, in the 1st area after the title proper, there should be only the name of the author which appears on the title page. It would be as shown below:

Battalion 999/Heinz G. Konsalik;
translated by Oliver Coburn.

The name chosen for the ME Access Point is known from outside source, therefore, it would go in the 7th area, i.e., the note area, according to the relevant rule in AACR2, 2.7B6, Statement of responsibility which states

"Make notes on variant names of persons or bodies .....if these are considered to be important ....."

The inclusion of the name known from outside source within square brackets with the word"i.e." is perhaps influenced by rules in CCC for the pseudonymous authors for the ME headings.

Case 3

MU Course Material BLIS. (AACR2)

The Main Entry as it appears on page 183 is:

```
Utilisation of primary energy in India.
iv, 67p. : ill.; 20 cm. - (Occasional papers; no. 3)."
```
In case of Corporate Bodies (CB), particularly institutions, occupying the Access Points, either for Main or Added Entries, AACR2 in its rule 24.4 prescribes that some addition is to be made to the name of a CB as instructed in 24.4B - 24.4C. This is necessary for proper identification of the name by the users of the catalogue. CCC, too, has similar rules.

Therefore, to provide sufficient identification, it is necessary to add to the heading, the name of the country, where it is located. The heading would, thus be

| National Council of Applied Economic Research (India). |

On page 201, two worked out Added Entries have been displayed, one is subject Added Entry and the other one is the Title Added Entry for the same book. In both the entries the headings are: 'cataloguing'. It is difficult for the students to learn that in such situations, the Title Added Entry is not necessary in a dictionary catalogue.

**Case 4**

IGNOU Course Material BLIS (CCC. Part 1)

The transcription of the title page of a book as printed on page 85 of the IGNOU CM, Part 1 on CCC is reproduced below:

| "P3 p4411, N71 L2 |
| DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS (Third Seminar on -) |
| (Annamalainagar) (1971). |
| Conducted by the Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics. Annamalai University". |

The explanation provided in the material is "Some explanation is required on the above worked out example. If the above seminar is a regular one, with fixed periodicity, it is to be treated as a periodical publication. In absence of such information it is treated as a stray seminar.

No title is given in the title page and hence, it is treated as the proceedings of the seminar and rendered in square brackets. This is a case where an
entry to the sponsor of the seminar is called for. In the Main Entry, the sponsor is shown in the note section*.

i) An examination of the explanation given vis-a-vis the rules in CCC reveals that i) Treatment of conference publications (CP) in CCC is in two different ways. If the CP is non-periodical (ad-hoc) one, it is to be treated as a Corporate Body (CB), whereas, if it is held periodically, it is to be treated as a periodical publication (PP). Apparently, the publication is the proceedings of the 'Third Seminar', though there is no indication that the seminar was not held subsequently. It may be possible that libraries may acquire either the proceedings of the 3rd seminar or all the three seminars. This information regarding the holdings is taken care of in the 4th section of the ME in CCC.

The very presence of the word 'Third' in the beginning of the title page is adequate to treat this conference as a periodically held Conference and, therefore, it is better to treat this as a periodical publication according to CCC.

The CCC has provision of maintaining irregular periodical publications in the 3rd section of ME i.e., in the periodicity section. The concept 'stray seminar' is nowhere used in the CCC code.

Thus, the ME would better be done in the following way:

```
P3, P4411, N71 L2
[Proceedings], DRAVIDIAN LINGUISTICS
(Seminar on - ).
[Irregular. ].
The library has V3; 1972.
```

ii) Second sentence (Part) of the periodicity section of the ME has been left blank for the non-availability of the required information.

iii) The ME provided in the material, considering the conference as a non-periodical one, and therefore, as a corporate author, is not helpful for the students to understand the true spirit of the rules of the code. Moreover, in the CM, the name of the sponsor has been shown in the note section to justify the preparation of a Book Index Entry under the sponsor. But, it does not cite the relevant rule which permits to do this. CCC admits of only four kinds of notes (CCC. MFO):

a) Series note, b) Extract note, c) Extraction note, d) Change-of-title note. The rule followed in this case is not clarified.

The existing rules (CCC MEO) permit only to write the name of the sponsor (i.e. collaborator), thus, the title section may be

```
[Proceedings]. Ed by S Agesthialingam and S V Shanmugam; conducted by Centre of Advanced Study in Linguistics, Annamalai University.
```
PRINTING MISTAKES - SOME CASE STUDIES

A good number of printing mistakes in these course materials in indentation, punctuation and capitalisation of rules are the most disturbing factors and stands in the way of understanding the subject. Utmost care is important in such courses, particularly, where a large number of students does not have the facilities of having interaction with the teachers.

AU BLIS Course Material Lessons 1-8 (AACR2)

Case 1

In page 4, "Rule 1.1 B 4 Long Title. A long title proper only if this can be done without loss of essential information".

The missing word (italicized below) is supplied from the code to make it meaningful.

"Abridge a long title proper ...." (AACR2 Rule 1.1 B 4).

Without the word it becomes meaningless.

Case 2

In page 5, "Shared Responsibility (two authors). For two or three authors in between the first and second mentioned author the connecting symbol is comma ‘ , ‘ eg., Statistical Methods of biologists/ S. Planichamy and M. Mancharan.” Here, instead of ‘,’ ‘and’ is given.

The difference between the rule and example creates confusion. Similarly, In the title proper ‘Statistical Methods of biologists’ in the 1st area ‘m’ of methodology, will be ‘m’ and not ‘M’ as printed in the CM.

Case 3

In page 5, “Cataloguer is also given more autonomy to supply word group ‘and’ but it should be enclosed in square brackets, eg.,” Dark room/James Brown (and) Semour Lubertsky.”

The rule says if ‘and’ is supplied in between two authors, the word ‘and’ is to be written within square brackets. But, in the example provided, the word ‘and’ appears within circular brackets. Moreover, the word ‘and’ is not a ‘word group’, it is a single word.

Similar printing mistakes are also found in the MLIS Course Material, Lesson 9-16 of the AU.

MU BLIS Course Material (AACR2)

Case 1

"To satisfy this type of approach we prepare entry under the name of the author or principle author. This principle entry ....." (page 3, 3rd para, 6th line).

In the above quoted sentence the word ‘principle’ appears twice. The word should be ‘principal’.

Case 2

In page 7, Six examples of Added Entries have been provided. In each example, there are mistakes on the use of capitalisation rules. The code prescribes that in the first area of description in the title part, if the title is in English, the first letter of the words will be capitalised only, if the words are proper nouns. And the first letter of the first word is to be capitalised as per rules of the English grammar. But, the examples provided illustrate otherwise, for example, ‘Presenting the Library service’ should be ‘Presenting the library service’.

Case 3

a) Page 34 shows an example as : “Opiter dicta [A. Birrell]”.

It would be : Opiter dicta /[A. Birrell].

The ‘slash’ in between Title proper and Statement of Responsibility has not been shown.

b) In page 35, an example has been printed as :

"Developed Countries / U.K. Hicks .... [et al.]”

It would be “Developed countries / U.K. Hicks ... [et al].”
IGNOU BLIS Course Materials (AACR2)

Compared to MU and AU, the course materials of IGNOU are better in printing, layout, size and also student friendly, though there are a few printing errors, in the main entry such as,

Case 1

At page 43, there should be ',' in between two authors instead of 'and' i.e., "Psychology of perception/William N. Dember and Joel S Warm" should be "Psychology of perception/William N. Dember, Joel S. Warm", as in the transcription of title page at page 42, there is no 'and'.

Case 2

Similarly, the added entry access points, in page 53, should be started from 2nd indention instead of 1st indention. Similar mistakes occur in other places also, such as on page 55.

Case 3

In page 66, in the contents note there is a mistake in capitalization of letters viz., 'computational psychology.....' should have been 'Computational psychology.....'. Further, the model example provided in the Code is clear, less clumsy, and easy to remember for the students, as well as more helpful for the users of a catalogue for whom the catalogue is prepared than the one provided in the course material.

CONCLUSION

In case of all the three universities - AU, IGNOU and MU, one commendable factor is that they are providing elaborate CMs in the form of separate books and booklets.

It is necessary that some immediate positive step to bring out a correct version of course material is taken to facilitate correct understanding and interpretation of rules by all concerned.

The students who get the opportunity to attend the contact sessions may get assistance in overcoming the barriers to some extent, but for the rest of the students, who are the majority, the barriers will remain for ever.
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