University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries | Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

10-19-2002

Do We Catalog or Not? How Research Libraries Provide Bibliographic Access to Electronic Journals in Aggregated Databases

Charity K. Martin
University of Nebraska - Lincoln, cmartin3@unl.edu

Paul S. Hoffman
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarycience

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Martin, Charity K. and Hoffman, Paul S., "Do We Catalog or Not? How Research Libraries Provide Bibliographic Access to Electronic Journals in Aggregated Databases" (2002). *Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries.* Paper 69.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/librarycience/69

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications, UNL Libraries by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Do We Catalog or Not? How Research Libraries Provide Bibliographic Access to Electronic Journals in Aggregated Databases

Charity K. Martin
Paul S. Hoffman

ABSTRACT. Traditionally, librarians have provided access to journal titles through the library's catalog. With the introduction of full-text databases, which consist of articles from many different journals, librarians are faced with the challenge of providing access to these titles. This article reports the results of a survey which tried to determine if research libraries were attempting to catalog the titles in aggregated databases and the issues surrounding their decision. *[Article copies available for a fee from The Haworth Document Delivery Service: 1-800-HAWORTH. E-mail address: <getinfo@haworthpressinc.com> Website: <http://www.HaworthPress. com> © 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.]*

KEYWORDS. Aggregators, databases, electronic journals, cataloging, bibliographic access

---

Charity K. Martin is Assistant Professor, Cataloging, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, N209 Love Library, P.O. Box 880410, Lincoln, NE 68588-0410 (E-mail: cmartin3@unl.edu).

Paul S. Hoffman is Assistant Professor, Library Instruction, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, N219 Love Library, P.O. Box 880410, Lincoln, NE 68588-0410 (E-mail: phoffman2@unl.edu).

The authors would like to thank the College and University Section of the Nebraska Library Association for the Research Grant it awarded this project.

© 2002 by The Haworth Press, Inc. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

Computers have had a profound effect upon library policies, procedures and services. The creation of the online catalog has enabled patrons to search the catalog quickly and efficiently. Patrons no longer have to pull numerous drawers and flip through cards in order to find the material they are searching for. Instead, they can discover the same information in a few keystrokes. This has led to a desire and expectation that all information finding aids, such as the library's catalog and article indexes, be available via the computer. The Internet especially has led users to expect to find the information on any given subject by typing in their request on the library's computers.

Librarians and vendors are quite aware of users' expectations and information needs. In the mid-1990s, vendors began making article indexes and abstracts available electronically, first by floppy disks, then CD-ROMs and eventually by remote access via the Internet. Librarians have appreciated the time and space saving attributes of these electronic indexes and encourage the vendors to create even better products. Demanded by users and encouraged by librarians, vendors started to collect the articles from numerous journals into a database. These databases, called aggregated databases, provide both indexes and full- text articles to the user and can shorten the user's research time.

Patrons and public services librarians alike appreciate these aggregated databases. However, technical services librarians have encountered problems in how to provide bibliographic access to these databases through the online catalog, and question whether they should be attempting to do so. If one decides to catalog the aggregated databases, other questions and issues arise. For example, at what level should the cataloging take place? Should only the database be cataloged as an entity, or should each journal title be accessible through the online catalog? Given how quickly titles are deleted or added to various aggregated databases, how will technical services ensure that the records in the catalog are current and accurate?

These issues have been a source of many discussions and uncertainties for libraries and library organizations. In an effort to better understand the range of issues involved in the cataloging of aggregated databases and how various institutions are dealing with the issues, the authors conducted a survey of various Research Level I and II institutions to determine what methods were being used to provide bibliographic access to titles within aggregated databases. The survey was supported by a grant from the College and University Section of the Nebraska Library Association. The

goal was not to produce a definitive study of the topic, but rather to take an informative initial "snapshot" of the institutional terrain.

DEVELOPMENT OF, AND IDEAS FOR, THE RESEARCH PROJECT

The concept for the project was developed during a discussion on *Newlib-L,* the New Librarian's Listserv, in January of 1999. Charity K. Martin posed the question of how one develops ideas for research projects and published papers. The brainstorming began by focusing on areas of professional interest and "things we would like to know." The discussion eventually narrowed in scope to the area of electronic journals. Specifically, the participants discussed if and how various libraries were actually handling the organization of e-journal titles in collections of electronic journals such as JSTOR and Lexis-Nexis. Were libraries providing title-level access through the OPAC (Online Public Access Catalog)? Were they creating hot-linked lists of the journal titles? Were other methods being used?

Questions such as "what do we mean by access?" and "what are the characteristics of electronic journal collections?" helped to clarify the direction of the project. The latter question led to the discovery of a new term, "aggregated database." This term was then gaining currency to describe databases composed of various e-journal titles, mainly full text. Eventually, two questions were formulated which shaped the structure and the direction of the subsequent survey: (1) Which aggregated databases are most likely to be purchased by libraries? (2) How are libraries providing bibliographic access to them? With these questions in mind, development of a survey instrument began.

During the summer of 1998, the CONSER (*C*ooperative *ON*line *SE-R*ials) Program formed the Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases under the auspices of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging. This task group was given the mission "to investigate and make recommendations for a useful, cost-effective and timely means for providing records to identify full-text electronic journals acquired in aggregated databases."[1] In the summer of 1998, the task group conducted a survey of CONSER libraries. The results can be found in the July 1998 issue of *CONSERline.* In May of 1999, Martin contacted John Riemer, chair of the task group, and Karen Calhoun, a task group member, seeking input concerning the activities of the task group and how the authors' proposed project could be improved.

In June of 1999, Paul S. Hoffman, Assistant Professor and reference librarian at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, was asked if he would consider being a co-researcher on the project. Given Hoffman's position as professor of record for the University Libraries' Library 110 class, he could bring to the project a unique understanding of the searching techniques of the average UNL student as well as the ability to "demystify" cataloging jargon.

SURVEY DEVELOPMENT

Development of the survey involved determining the survey's purpose, reviewing the literature, defining terms, determining the survey population and developing the survey questions. This section will describe each step of the process with the exception of the literature review, which is discussed in the next section.

As mentioned in the previous section, the purpose of the survey was to answer two questions posed by the authors. The first question was, Which aggregated databases are most likely to be purchased by libraries? The second was, How are libraries providing bibliographic access to them?

Next, the authors began to develop working definitions of **aggregator**, **aggregated database**, and **bibliographic access**. These appeared at the beginning of the survey instrument and provided a baseline for common understanding of these concepts.

- **Aggregator**–a vendor or publisher who gathers the content (usually full text) of dozens to thousands of serial titles and makes them available to a subscribing institution.
- **Aggregated database**–a collection of electronic resources (usually full text) from separately issued publications, assembled as a convenience to libraries and other subscribing institutions. JSTOR and Lexis-Nexis are examples of such databases.
- **Bibliographic access**–a method of making material available, regardless of format, to the user by allowing the user to search a library catalog by a number of different identifiers. For example, a user may search by title, author, subject and material location (i.e., call number).

The target audience of the survey was restricted to Research Level I and II institutions. Assuming that larger, well-established institutions with a

research focus would have more library resources, the authors felt that the libraries at these institutions were more likely to have greater exposure to and experience working with aggregated databases. This created a target audience of 123 institutions. The survey was sent to the Electronic Resources or Serials Librarian at the targeted institutions.

The survey instrument, found in Appendix I, consisted of multiple-choice and short answer questions. The short-answer questions were designed to enable individuals to provide detailed responses that could clarify or enhance the multiple-choice responses. The basic questions of the survey (A-D, F) concerned the following: the type of online system used by the respondent's institution, whether or not the titles within the databases were cataloged, if a single- or multiple-record approach was used, what databases were purchased, and what percentage of titles within the database were cataloged. The authors recognized the need to solicit feedback on a related issue, namely, what technical and administrative issues had to be overcome to create bibliographic access (Questions E, G and H). The last question (I) was to determine if the activities of consortia were influencing how an institution was handling the problem of cataloging aggregated database titles.

Drafts of the survey were circulated to colleagues at the authors' institution, as well as colleagues at other university libraries, for comments and suggestions. Additional suggestions regarding composition and structure were provided by UNL's NEAR (Nebraska Evaluation and Research) Center. The final version was completed in August of 1999.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In July of 1999, the authors conducted a search of library literature to determine what information had been published concerning aggregated databases and the cataloging of the titles within them. Only a handful of sources dealt with aggregated databases and/or the problems concerning how to provide bibliographic access to the titles within the databases.

The major source dealing with aggregated databases was a *CONSERline* article about the results of the Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases.[2] The results of this survey showed that CONSER libraries were providing access in a variety of ways. These libraries also reported that the biggest stumbling block to providing bibliographic access to the titles within full-text databases was a lack of staff time and resources.

The Interim Report of the Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases became available via the Internet in May of 1999. This report in-

cluded information gathered from a survey of the general library community in the fall of 1998, which helped to establish the working assumptions of the task group. The task group had decided to pursue the possibility of vendor-supplied records for titles in aggregated databases. It began working with EBSCO on a demonstration project to see if vendor-supplied records would be a viable option for libraries.[3]

Sharon Cline McKay's 1998 article described the problem of dealing with aggregated databases from the vendor's point of view.[4] McKay's definition of aggregated databases was useful in helping to clarify the project's definition.

In May of 2000, another literature search was conducted. Four more articles were found which dealt specifically with aggregated databases (as full-text databases of e-journals are now known). Tenner and Yang's article, "End User Acceptance of Electronic Journals," found that many users were not utilizing the resources found in aggregated databases. It was noted that this seemed to be a function of the level of comfort the user had with electronic resources, rather than type of aggregated databases utilized.[5]

The article "Electronic Journals in Academic Libraries" included the results of a 1997/98 survey which examined the use of aggregated database titles. This survey compared ARL libraries to non-ARL libraries. In the section concerning access methods to full-text journals and journal articles, the authors found that non-ARL libraries are significantly less likely than ARL libraries to offer bibliographic access to electronic journals through their OPAC.[6] The survey findings led the authors to state "today, cataloging is taking on more importance in accessing e-journals," emphasizing the usefulness of the OPAC in accessing electronic materials.

"Aggregation or Aggravation?" by Calhoun and Kara offered a good overview of the problems associated with providing bibliographic access to electronic journals in aggregated databases. It also gave a summary of the various approaches for dealing with the issue.[7]

The last article was the "Final Report of the Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases." The task group made several recommendations concerning both human and machine record creation, as well as outlining the next steps to be taken by the task group.[8] Of special note is the fact that the task group focused on vendor-supplied records that could be loaded into a library's OPAC, rather than records created by librarians. These vendor records would be machine-derived and created by a computer program. The program would harvest bibliographic data and create a record based in pre-programmed information. Vendor-supplied records could be

a potential problem for those libraries that are utilizing a single-record approach for different formats, since it would be difficult to maintain these records without affecting the information concerning the paper version of the serial.

There is little in the way of published information or articles that deals with aggregated databases in library literature at this time. However, there are indications that this will change as more libraries and researchers explore the issue of how to provide access to aggregated databases in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

SURVEY RESULTS

As previously mentioned, the survey consisted of both multiple- choice and short answer questions, generally open-ended. Information gathered primarily from the multiple-choice questions will be presented here first, followed by data gathered from the open-ended questions. Forty-four surveys were returned between September and December of 1999, representing 36% of queried institutions.

Multiple-Choice and Brief-Answer Questions

The first question concerned what type of catalog system/software the respondents used. Of the 37 who answered this question, 12 (32%) use Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III), 9 (24%) use NOTIS, 4 (11%) use Voyager and 4 (11%) use SIRSI. The remaining 22% use Horizon, DRA or CARL as their catalog system. Many of the respondents who utilize NOTIS reported that within the year, they would be changing systems. Most would be migrating to the Voyager system. Because of this, information reported from the NOTIS users may change.

When asked if their institution subscribes to aggregated databases, all but one of the 44 respondents reported that they do. In other words, 98% subscribe to aggregated databases and only 2% do not. Of the 43 institutions that subscribe to aggregated databases, 30 (70%) provide bibliographic access to the individual journals within the aggregated database. Of the remaining respondents, 12 (28%) do not provide bibliographic access at the title level and 1 (2%) did not respond to the question. The definition for bibliographic access within the survey did not specify MARC format, although MARC access was mentioned in the survey itself. It is possible that those who responded positively to this question considered

other methods of access which differ from the MARC format, such as Dublin Core and other metadata schemes.

Respondents were asked if a single- or multiple-bibliographic record approach was used in the cataloging of e-journals within aggregated databases. In 1996 CONSER adopted guidelines which allow serials catalogers to note the existence and location of the online version for a title in the record for the printed serial. An important reason for choosing this single-record approach is to avoid confusing patrons with many different records for the same title that is available in different formats.[9] On the other hand, the multiple-record approach follows AACR2r principles. In this approach, each format has a separate bibliographic record. For example, if you have a journal in paper, microfilm and electronic format, there will be three different bibliographic records in the OPAC for this title. In this portion of the survey, the results were mixed. Of the 44 libraries responding to the survey, 20 (45%) use the single record approach and 7 (16%) use the multiple record approach. Of the remaining 39%, 4 (9%) are using a mixed approach–single records for some titles, multiple records for others. The remaining 13 (30%) failed to answer the question.

Respondents from libraries that did not provide bibliographic access to e-journal titles within aggregated databases were asked which factors contributed to that decision. Although this question was meant to solicit a single response from multiple options, often more than one reason was indicated and many respondents gave short answers to this question. For this reason this question will be dealt with in the short-answer section.

The last multiple-choice question concerned which aggregated databases were being subscribed to by the institutions. Seventeen aggregated databases were listed on the survey form, with space in which other aggregated databases subscribed to could be listed (see Appendix I for the list). After each database named, respondents were asked what percentage of the titles within it had been cataloged in the respondents' OPAC. Seven databases were found to be the most selected, with over 50% of the respondents subscribing to them. Project MUSE had the most subscribers, with 38 (86%) of the respondents reporting a subscription. This was followed by Lexis/Nexis Academic Universe with 35 (79%) of the respondents subscribing, JSTOR with 32 (73%), ABI/Inform with 29 (66%), Medline with 29 (66%), ProQuest with 25 (57%) and LINK (Springer-Verlag) with 23 (52%) of the respondents reporting a subscription.

This question also helped determine which aggregated databases were most likely to have the e-journals it contained cataloged by the subscribing institution. Given the large number of titles within each database, the

cataloging of each title is an ongoing process. Respondents were asked to approximate the percentage of titles cataloged in each database at the time of the survey. Of the seven databases with the most subscriptions, the e-journal titles in JSTOR were the most likely to be cataloged, with an average of 73% of the titles cataloged. Project MUSE was next with 68% of its e-journal titles cataloged, followed by LINK with 49%, Proquest with 19%, ABI/Inform with 16%, Lexis/ Nexis Academic Universe with 7% and Medline with 7%. These figures are the averages of the titles cataloged for each database. Some institutions had cataloged all titles within an aggregated database, while others had cataloged 25% or less.

As expected, the type of aggregated database and the number of e-journal titles within each database played an important part in determining whether or not the individual titles of a database were cataloged. Another factor that may have played a part in whether or not e-journal titles were cataloged is the type of OPAC used by an institution. Libraries utilizing SIRSI cataloged the most titles, averaging 53% of the titles of a database being cataloged (See Table 1). Libraries with III were next with 42%, Voyager with 39% and NOTIS with 28%. Due to the structure of the data collected (via a Likert scale), it was not possible to do a test of significance on them. However, the results seem to indicate that there is a slight correlation between the type of online system a library has and the percentage of e-journal titles in aggregated databases that are cataloged. It should be noted that the averages found in Table 1 are weighted. The average was calculated by considering each institution subscribing to a particular database and the percentage of titles cataloged for that database by the subscribing institution.

The percentages in the table represent the average percentage of titles cataloged for that database relative to the subscribing institution's OPAC. Libraries with SIRSI systems cataloged a higher percentage of titles in each database than did any of the others, with the exception of the MEDLINE database. This is followed by Voyager, III and finally NOTIS. Why libraries with a SIRSI system are able to catalog so many titles within aggregated databases is unclear. One explanation was offered during a presentation of this survey and its results at the 2000 NASIG annual conference. During the discussion following the conversation, many SIRSI users reported that the ease with which macros could generate templates for bibliographic records was a contributing factor. This could perhaps be a validation of the CONSER task group's recommendation to develop machine-derived records.

Open-Ended Questions

TABLE 1. Percentage of E-Journal Titles in Aggregated Databases Cataloged by Type of OPAC System

	III	NOTIS	Voyager	SIRSI
Project MUSE	78%	56%	75%	75%
JSTOR	96%	56%	50%	100%
Lexis/Nexis Academic Univ.	0%	5%	0%	33%
ABI/Inform	28%	11%	50%	33%
MEDLINE	20%	0%	0%	0%
ProQuest	28%	20%	0%	33%
LINK	50%	50%	50%	60%
Averages	**42%**	**28%**	**39%**	**53%**

It was asked which departments in the respondents' institution were responsible for providing bibliographic access to e-journals. Eighteen of the 44 respondents (41%) cited the Cataloging Department. Eleven (25%) cited the Serials Department, which included a cataloging unit. Seven (16%) cited a combination of Technical Services departments and 8 (18%) cited a combination of Technical Services departments and other library departments such as Reference, Automated Systems and Electronic Resources. However, each respondent noted that a cataloging unit was involved in providing access.

As was previously mentioned, trying to determine why institutions were not providing bibliographic access was designated as a multiple-choice question, which permitted the respondents to mark more than one answer. However, due to the complex nature of cataloging electronic resources, many respondents chose to write in a more detailed explanation, as well as indicate which categories contributed to delays.

Eighteen respondents reported that they do not provide title-level bibliographic access to the e-journals in the purchased aggregated databases. These institutions indicated why by marking which categories fit their reasons. The categories included were administrative decision, insufficient time, insufficient staff, insufficient experience cataloging electronic resources, questioning the value of cataloging electronic resources and preferring to provide access in another manner (such as through a web page). Respondents were also given the opportunity to describe other reasons as well.

Of the 18 respondents, 8 (44%) cited insufficient time and staff as the main reasons why they did not provide access via their OPAC. This is consistent with the findings of the Task Group on Journals in Aggregated Databases in their 1998 survey.[10] Six of the respondents (33%) indicated that their institutions question the value of cataloging electronic resources. Three respondents (17%) cited an administrative decision, and two (11%) indicated that they prefer to provide access in another manner (such as a web page or other database). No respondent reported that they had not provided access because of insufficient experience cataloging electronic resources.

Among the written responses, the most frequently cited reason for not cataloging the individual titles within the aggregated databases was that the institution was still investigating what would be the best way in which to provide access. This was reported by 5 (28%) of the 18 respondents. This response was followed by those who were waiting to see if vendor-supplied records could be batch-loaded (2 (11%)), and those who are not providing access because their OPAC can not be accessed from the web (2 (11%)). Other reasons included waiting to provide access until after a migration from one OPAC to another and concerns regarding ownership versus access of materials.

The most in-depth responses came from the question "What technical, administrative, or workflow issues have you had to overcome in order to create MARC records for some or all of your electronic journal titles?" This question led to some respondents reporting the problems encountered during the process of deciding how to handle electronic resources in terms of bibliographic control and/or the procedures developed for dealing with those problems. It is interesting to note that the problems encountered by these institutions are similar to the reasons why others have chosen to wait before providing bibliographic access to titles in aggregated databases.

The lack of staff and staff time was cited more than any other problem. Almost as frequently cited were the problems with maintaining the bibliographic records in the ever-changing environment of electronic resources. Other issues identified included problems with identifying the e-journal titles within the aggregated databases, problems with maintaining the single-record approach, lack of communication between departments and/or with vendors, uncertainty concerning AACR2r rules and MARC coding, and problems concerning ownership issues and holdings. Additional issues cited were lack of in-house technology and workflow concerns.

It was asked whether or not the responding institution was collaborating with other institutions or consortia. Of the 44 respondents, 14 (32%)

were involved in collaborative efforts. Of those 14, three (21%) reported that they were collaborating with other libraries through OCLC's Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC). Two (14%) cited Ohiolink and another two cited the California Digital Library, which is part of the University of California System. Of the remaining 7 (50%), five did not cite the actual consortium or participating institutions. The remaining two respondents cited the Utah Academic Library Consortium and the HELIN Consortium. This suggests that institutions are working on this problem in the consortium venue only if they were already used to working with other institutions within the consortium on various cataloging issues.

CONCLUSION

Given the small number of institutions that responded to the survey, it is hard to make conclusive statements concerning the issues involved in the cataloging of serial titles within aggregated databases. Given the increase in full-text databases and in users' expectations, more libraries will subscribe to an expanding number of aggregated databases and probably will attempt to provide bibliographic access to the titles within those databases. However, other, more tentative, observations can be made based on the data gathered from the survey.

First of all, most institutions favor a single-record approach over a multiple-record approach. The multiple-record approach follows AACR2r cataloging rules. However, it is assumed that patrons and Public Services librarians dislike the multiple-record approach because of confusion concerning so many multiple records for the same item. The single-record approach involves including an 856 hot link field and a 530 note field in the MARC record of the existing paper record. It is believed that the single-record approach is often undertaken in order to avoid confusion by patrons concerning the holdings that an institution might have for a particular journal. However, if an institution decided to go with downloading machine-derived records and updates from a vendor, the single-record approach becomes unfeasible. Unless a viable option to provide both machine-derived records and updates in a single-record approach becomes obvious, librarians will have to make a choice. They can choose the single-record approach which will increase staff time and effort for maintenance, or librarians can choose to have multiple records in which only the records for the electronic version is machine-derived and electronically updated.

The data also suggest that the type of OPAC will determine the rate and speed at which aggregated database titles are cataloged. Libraries with SIRSI systems, with its macro ability to assist in the creation of records, consistently cataloged more titles than libraries with other systems. As noted before, this validated the findings of the CONSER Task Group on Journals in Aggregated Databases regarding machine-derived records as a viable option.

A final observation is that the lack of staff and staff time was the predominant obstacle to the cataloging of journal titles in aggregated databases. The maintenance of those records is also a big concern. The lack of human resources in technical services will influence when and how institutions will provide bibliographic access to titles in aggregated databases.

The results of this survey represent preliminary research into a new and complex issue facing technical services librarians. Cataloging of titles in aggregated databases presents a host of challenges, many of which are just beginning to be addressed. Solutions are being investigated and integrated into the workflow of the small number of institutions surveyed. The desire to catalog collections of separately issued electronic publications is evident in the survey results, as are the many questions and hurdles the surveyed institutions face. For now, it is safe to say that cataloging of aggregated databases is being done with varying degrees of success.

With the current absence of a single national standard for cataloging aggregated databases, it falls to individual institutions to decide what approach they wish to take. Catalogers are opting for the approach that is easiest to implement in-house, is likely to cause the least confusion to patrons and is consistent with local cataloging policy. As a result, many libraries are putting into practice cataloging procedures that may end up contrary to future recommended standards.

Staffing levels and experience have a significant impact on the policies and procedures regarding the cataloging of titles in aggregated databases. This was a constant theme in the majority of surveys returned. Even with advances in technology, the ability to create and maintain records depends largely on the availability of trained personnel. The downsizing of some technical services departments further impacts this. A possible solution to problems in staffing may be in machine-derived records acquired from vendors. However, this solution may be affected by the type of on-line system used and would be affected by the existing cataloging policies of the library.

As preliminary research, we believe the survey tends to reinforce ideas and impressions held by many technical services librarians. Given how quickly technological changes occur, it is possible that new solutions to

the problems surrounding the cataloging of titles in aggregated databases will present themselves at any time. The authors recommend that another survey, similar to their own, be distributed in the future. Ideally, the survey would target a wider audience than this one, perhaps including more ARL libraries.

NOTES

1. Program for Cooperative Cataloging, *Task Groups on Journals in Aggregator Databases: Charge. http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/aggregatortg.html*. July 19, 2000.
2. Ruth Hass, "Providing access to journals in full-text databases," *CONSERline,* no. 12 (July 1999). *http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/consln12.html#providing*.
3. Karen Calhoun and John Riemer, *Interim Report: PCC Standing Committee on Automation (SCA). Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases.* May 1999. http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/aggupdrpt.html.
4. Sharon Cline McKay, "Partnering in a changing medium: The challenges of managing and delivering E-journals: The subscription agents' point of view," *Library Acquisitions* 22, no 1 (spring 1998): 23-7.
5. Elka Tenner and Zheng Ye (Lan) Yang, "End-user acceptance of electronic journals: A case study from a major academic research library," *Technical Services Quarterly* 17, no. 2 (1999): 1-14.
6. Marian Shemberg and Cheryl Grossman, "Electronic journals in academic libraries: A comparison of ARL and non-ARL libraries," *Library Hi-Tech* 17, no. 1 (1999): 26-45.
7. Karen Calhoun and Bill Kara, "Aggregation or Aggravation? Optimizing access to full-text journals," *ALCTS Online Newsletter* 11, no. 1 (spring 2000): *http://ala8.ala.org/alcts/alcts_news/gateway_pap15.html*.
8. John Riemer and Karen Calhoun, *PCC Standing Committee on Automation (SCA) Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases: FINAL REPORT.* January 2000: *http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/aggfinal.html*
9. CONSER, *CONSER Cataloging Manual* (Washington, DC: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1999), module 31, 14.
10. Ruth Hass, "Providing access to journals in full-text databases," *CONSERLine* 12 (July 1999): *http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/consln12.html#providing*

APPENDIX 1

Aggregated Databases Survey

Definitions:

Aggregator: a vendor or publisher who gathers the content (usually full-text) of dozens to thousands of serial titles and makes them available to a subscribing institution.

Aggregated Database: a collection of electronic resources (usually full text) from separately-issued publications, assembled as a convenience to libraries and other subscribing institutions.

Bibliographic Access: a method of making material available, regardless of format, to the user by allowing the user to search a library catalog by a number of different identifiers. For example, a user may search by title, author, subject and material location (i.e. call number).

A. What on-line catalog system (e.g., III, Dynix, Winnebago, etc.) does your institution use?

_____

B. Does your institution subscribe to any aggregated databases?

1. _____ Yes, we subscribe to one or more aggregated databases (Go to question C)
2. _____ No, we do not subscribe to any aggregated databases (Stop here. Return survey in stamped envelope.)

C. Is your institution providing bibliographic access to these electronic journal titles by means of a bibliographic record?

1. _____ Yes (Go to question D. Skip question E.)
2. _____ No (Go to question E. Skip question D.)

D. If yes, is your institution using a single record approach (i.e., one record for all formats) or a multiple record approach (i.e., a separate record for each format)?

1. _____ Single record
2. _____ Multiple records

E. If no, please indicate why your institution has decided not to provide bibliographic access to the electronic journals within the aggregated databases.

Check all that apply

1. _____ Administrative decision
2. _____ Insufficient time
3. _____ Insufficient staff

APPENDIX 1 (continued)

4. _____ Insufficient experience cataloging electronic resources
5. _____ Question value of cataloging electronic resources
6. _____ Prefer to provide access in another manner, such as through a web page
7. _____ Other (Please describe) _____

_____
_____
_____
_____

_____
_____
_____

F. Which of the following products does your library or system of libraries subscribe to? Of these, approximately what percentage of the electronic journals in these databases are cataloged in your on-line catalog? (If your institution does not catalog the electronic journals, leave the % line blank)

Y/N		% cataloged in your on-line catalog
1. _____	JSTOR	_____
2. _____	Project MUSE	_____
3. _____	Electronic Collections Online (OCLC)	_____
4. _____	IAC Health Reference Center	_____
5. _____	MEDLINE	_____
6. _____	Expanded Academic Index (Infotrac)	_____
7. _____	Ciao	_____
8. _____	Science Digest (Elsevier)	_____
9. _____	LINK (Springer Verlag)	_____
10. _____	Proquest Direct (Bell & Howell)	_____
11. _____	Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe	_____
12. _____	ABI/Inform	_____
13. _____	EBSCO Online	_____
14. _____	EBSCO Host	_____
15. _____	EBSCOnet	_____
16. _____	Corporate ResourceNet	_____
17. _____	EBSCOmed	_____

Others (Please list)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

G. What department(s) is/are responsible for providing bibliographic access to the electronic journals?

_____
_____
_____

H. What technical, administrative, or workflow issues have you had to overcome in order to create MARC records for some or all of your electronic journal titles?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

I. Is your library collaborating on any projects, consortia activities, or other kinds of cross-institutional initiatives in which the cataloging of electronic journal titles is a component?

1. _____ No
2. _____ Yes (Please elaborate)

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____