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Abstract:
The paper examines copy cataloguing in Cape Town Metropolitan Public Libraries. The study was necessitated by the fact that cataloguing is a critical aspect of the library work without which there would be total chaos in the organization of library materials, making location and use of such materials almost impossible. The following research questions were formulated: What skills do the cataloguers of Cape Town Metropolitan libraries possess? To what extent do cataloguers in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries adhere to international standards when creating records in the online catalogue? How copy cataloguing is done in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries? Mixed methods and case study design were employed. The population of the study was made of 6 cataloguers and 500 000 OPAC records. A census of 6 cataloguers was applied. The sample of 384 was used for OPAC records. Focus group interview and document analysis were
used to collect data. Findings indicated that the records that cataloguers were copying from OCLC were of low quality and consumed more time when editing than creating original cataloguing. The study among other things recommends that copy cataloguing should be carried out by professionally experienced cataloguers. Furthermore, policies concerning adaptation of copy catalogue records should be established.
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**Introduction**

Copy cataloguing involves the adaptation of a pre-existing bibliographic record from other bibliographic databases, to fit the characteristics of the item in hand with modifications to correct obvious errors and minor adjustments to reflect locally accepted catalogue practice (Kim, 2003). Willer (1999) asserts that in the late 1930s, when cataloguers in the United States of America (USA) were dissatisfied with the contents of their cataloguing rules and standards, they proposed new rules and standards that were adopted internationally. In the late 1960s, the automation of cataloguing began with the translation of the existing procedures for the creation of catalogue cards according to cataloguing rules into the new Machine-Readable Cataloguing System of Codes (MARC) (Anderson, 1974). According to Das (2004), the MARC is a communication format computer code that consistently handles the catalogue data recorded on the cataloguing system. It is the international standard for the dissemination of the bibliographic data. The MARC was invented by the American computer scientist, Henriette Regina Davidson Avram (Library of Congress, 1974).

Avram designed a mathematical code, using cataloguing numbers, letters and symbols to denote different elements or fields of bibliographic information. The result was a system that could be
shared among libraries, greatly increasing access to their materials and reducing the time needed to find them (Library of Congress, 1974). The philosophy behind the MARC was to improve collaborative cataloguing.

**Statement of the problem**

The researcher observed that vendor records that are loaded in the bibliographic utilities for libraries to copy and use tend to be of very low bibliographic quality. Beall (2000) and Martin and Mundle (2010) observed that “vendors do not follow minimal-level cataloguing standards and generally do not have authorized forms for names, series, and subject headings. Vendor catalogue records have other significant shortcomings in that they require editing and enhancement before they can meet the minimal-level cataloguing requirements of libraries” (Beall, 2000). Martin and Mundle (2010) state that those problems include incorrect choices or forms of headings that affect authority control, missing call numbers, missing or duplicate records, typographic errors and MARC coding errors. Furthermore, the vendor's efforts are directed at cataloguing and do not extend to covering the submission of complete name authority records to the authority files (El-Sherbini, 2001), but instead their records tend to be provisional. Despite the low quality of the records, they are described as “fast, selective, and precise bibliographic information” on the Online Computer Library Centre (OCLC) (Beall, 2000). Beall (2000) further states that “for many libraries, the addition of vendor records to the utility has slowed access to materials, the low-quality vendor records have likely had an impact on inter-library loans because these records have missing or non-standard series, author, and title headings, they may not be retrieved and a user’s request for a particular information source may go unfulfilled”

**Research questions**
The study answered the following research questions

- What skills do the cataloguers of Cape Town Metropolitan libraries possess?
- To what extent do cataloguers in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries adhere to international standards when creating records in the online catalogue?
- How copy cataloguing is done in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries?

**Literature review**

The literature review includes cataloguing skills, international cataloguing standards and copy cataloguing.

**Cataloguing skills**

Park and Camei (2009) and Alajmi and ur Rehman (2016) assert that, “from ancient times, cataloguers and their skills have been the cornerstone of librarianship. They facilitate library service with the provision of organization and orderly means of retrieving materials from the collection. According to Bello and Mansor (2013), surveys of cataloguers’ job descriptions continue to reveal that knowledge of cataloguing and classifications such as original/copy cataloguing, authority control, descriptive/subject cataloguing and use of standard tools (AACR, LCSH, LCCS, MARC) is the most frequently required, therefore, cataloguers essentially provide a coordinated approach to the contents of all kinds of resources available in the library. In modern times, with the application of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to library operations and services, cataloguers’ skills have been recognized in the creation of thesauri and in database management. However, the skills, roles and duties of cataloguers in the paradigm shift of Information Technology (IT) have been a subject of continuous debate”.
Cabonero and Dolendo (2013) carried out a study on cataloguing and classification skills of library and information science practitioners in their workplaces at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, in the USA, and found that although the respondents showed proficiency in the basic areas of cataloguing, there were different records of the same work and item by different cataloguers on the same system. The study concluded that the years of experience that cataloguers had could have contributed to the inconsistency of those records. The study also revealed that the LIS practitioners had difficulties with subject analysis; their interview responses also validated the document analysis findings.

It was evident that the determination of subject content of the material was complex. Miller (2007) asserts that the cataloguer must determine the subject area of the work and identify it with explicit terms from a subject analysis thesaurus. Bello and Mansor (2013) assert that employers in all types of libraries predominantly seek persons with common cataloguing skills (knowledge of the AACR and the MARC) as well as technical qualities and experiences. That is evidence of the essential role of cataloguers and their skills for organization and control of library resources for optimal services. The study of Bibliographic control of theses and dissertations in four selected universities in Kenya by Ndungu (2017) found delays in capturing theses and dissertations in the libraries’ OPAC and lack of consistency and uniformity in the bibliographic records. Mavume’s (2013) study of the new roles and skills of cataloguers in managing knowledge in an academic library, with special reference to Walter Sisulu University Libraries, Eastern Cape, South Africa, found that competencies required by cataloguers were as follows: the ability to understand the cataloguing change processes and how these impact daily activities; involvement in the facilitation of the integration of new types of data description into traditional technical services workflow; ability to maintain a conducive atmosphere by encouraging group/team work.
flexibility as cataloguer so as to set priorities and deadlines; commitment to service excellence; continually seeking out new technology challenges and opportunities for the improvement of information analysis in new online cataloguing and classification tools; full participation in projects such as reclamation projects of database clean-up; complete enthusiasm to learn new developments and adopt new and emerging standards such as Metadata Schemes (Dublin Core) Electronic Thesis and Dissertations – Metadata Standards, RDA and other recommended standards so as to be relevant to information needs of the users.

Mavume (2013) asserts that cataloguers, equipped with the above roles, skills and competences, would be able to identify the importance of changing roles in the profession anytime during their career. Raju (2017) compiled the LIS competency index for South Africa using 23 academic library job advertisements from the year 2014 to 2016 and found that skills required for cataloguers were metadata creation and management, including cataloguing, subject analysis and classification, as well as skills in the use of relevant metadata standards such as the RDA, the AACR2, the DDC, MARC 21, Dublin core, the LCSH, the LCC, National Library of Medicine (NLM), MeSH, including applications of standards to digital objects. Sibiya and Shongwe (2018) carried out a comparison of the cataloguing and classification curriculum and job requirements in South Africa and used cataloguing and classification course outlines obtained from six LIS schools, interviews with professional cataloguers and job advertisements from newspapers, as well as the Library and Information Association of South Africa (LIASA) list. The study found that LIS schools aimed to provide students with the knowledge and skills to organize knowledge in libraries so that users can easily retrieve it. This was achieved by teaching cataloguing and classification standards and rules, tools such as the AACR, the DDC, the RDA, the LCSH and the MARC21. Findings from job advertisements indicated that apart from LIS qualification and work experience,
skills required for cataloguers were knowledge of cataloguing and classification tools such as the DDC, the AACR2 or the RDA, the USMARC and the LCSH, knowledge of the OCLC, SLIMS; knowledge of online cataloguing tools, for instance web Dewey, cataloguer’s desktop, WebClass; a good sense of general knowledge, experience with taxonomy, metadata and tagging for digital content management, robust digital content experience; familiarity with common social platforms; knowledge of legal deposits; knowledge of Millennium system; knowledge of Z39.50 and Unicorn; knowledge of the OPAC library system, South African catalogue (SAcat) and WorldCat, Connection, Inmagic, Basic and advanced computer skills (MS Office Suite, e-mail and internet)”.

**International cataloguing standards**

Chandrappa and Harinarayana (2018) assert that cataloguing standards act as a guideline for the creation of catalogue records and as benchmark for evaluation of those records. Sung (2013) outlines the basic cataloguing tools to include: the AACR2/ the RDA, the MARC 21 Formats for Bibliographic Data, Web Dewey and/or printed DDC, the LCC or any faceted classification scheme, the LCSH, Sears lists of subject headings, OCLC Bibliographic Formats and Standards, and Library of Congress (LC) Name Authorities. Dorner (2000) indicates that the high level of standardization has allowed a tremendous amount of cooperation in resource sharing and in system development work among libraries around the world. It also has allowed libraries to aim for Universal Bibliographic Control.

Frederick (2017) asserts that the RDA Toolkit is a subscription service containing RDA instructions, specific guidelines such as Program for Cooperative Cataloguing policy guidelines, various national library guidelines, music cataloguing options, examples and links to related resources such as the metadata registry. Frederick further observed that because the RDA is much more complex than the AACR2 and is updated twice annually, it is not practical for cataloguers to
attempt to learn the RDA in the same way they learned or memorized the AACR2. In addition, libraries that attempted to create local policy manuals, which include RDA instructions for paraprofessional staff, often found that it was nearly impossible to keep their documentation up to date because of the ongoing changes in the RDA. This reality has more or less forced the majority of cataloguers to depend on the RDA Toolkit. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to navigate the RDA Toolkit. It seems that with each revision of the RDA guidelines and with each addition of new community guidelines such as for music librarians, audio-visual cataloguers, serials and librarians, the complexity and confusion experienced were the Toolkit was getting worse. By early 2016, there was no question that the cataloguing community was feeling considerable pain because of the general inability to keep up with all of the changes and to use the RDA Toolkit in an effective way (Frederick, 2017).

In their study of knowledge management culture among library cataloguers at the University of Zambia library, Chitumbo and Kanyengo (2017) revealed that the use of existing rules or standards such as the AACR2 and LCC schedules with its subject headings was compromised by the poor grounding of cataloguers. A study of authority control in an academic library consortium using a union catalogue maintained by a central office for authority control by Marais (2004), revealed that authority control in South Africa had not developed alongside other library activities such as bibliographic description or inter-lending, which is still in its infancy. Marais (2018) indicates that by 2016, only six libraries in South Africa created few authority records even though the Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) offers authority control training to its members, free online access to training materials and selected cataloguing documentation. NACO membership is open to institutions willing to support their staff through a process of training, review and direct contributions of records to the NACO name authority file (Marais, 2018).
Copy cataloguing

El-Sherbini (2001) carried out a study of copy cataloguers and their changing roles at the Ohio State University Library and found that the copy cataloguing section consisted of civil service staff (para-professionals) and members of various ranks. Beall and Kafador (2002) carried out a study on the effectiveness of copy cataloguing in eliminating typographical errors in shared bibliographic records. The study used the OCLC World Catalogue database and examined 100 typographical errors in records. The catalogues of five libraries holding the items described by the bibliographic records which contained typographical errors were searched to determine whether each library had corrected the errors. The study found that only 35.8% of the errors had been corrected. The study suggested that the majority of libraries are continuing to share non-quality records and “feed” their users with such poor catalogue records. Typographical errors in bibliographic records can cause retrieval problems especially in online catalogues (Beall and Kafador, 2002).

Banks (2007) carried out a study of scrutinizing cataloguing copy records at Southeast Missouri State University (SEMO) during 2006. The study questioned if copied cataloguing records were still acceptable as they were in the past when more professional librarians were working with bibliographic records, considering the upswing in clerical staff editing catalogue copy and even creating original records in some libraries. The study randomly selected a monographic copy which came through the catalogue department with the corresponding books at SEMO during 2006 to determine what changes and additions were made to the catalogue records. The study used 379 records and found that 72% of the records needed editing although they passed through copy cataloguers. The records needed classification numbers, authority work (proper access points) and subject headings, and some had misspelled words.
This is evidence that cataloguers are copying low quality records, perhaps because some of the cataloguing responsibilities at some libraries have been moved to clerical staff. Purongo (2014) undertook a study titled Global records, local catalogues: Investigating local editing practices in copy cataloguing. The study used six countries, namely New Zealand, Australia, United Kingdom, United States, Canada and South Africa. One hundred and twenty academic library records and 120 public library records were used. The findings indicated that, on average, libraries made 11 modifications per record downloaded into their catalogue, 7, 15% of which were quality aspects modification. Overall, the country that produced the most user-centered modification for academic libraries was South Africa, followed by Australia. Purongo assumed that libraries of African countries do have individual and varying needs that cannot be met by one universal record, unlike American countries that formed the standards to suit their user’s information needs. South African public libraries were not sampled in Purongo’s study due to a lack of information.

Nampeya (2009) found that 50% of her study participants performed copy cataloguing, although the utilization of international standards was low. This could be due to the assumption that, catalogue records downloaded from World Cat being of high quality. Maphopha’s (2000) study indicated that academic libraries performed both original and copy cataloguing. The study also revealed that some cataloguing was done by unqualified staff. The formation of library consortia in academic libraries of South Africa aims to reduce original cataloguing significantly and release professional staff from cataloguing. Cataloguing work was divided among professionals and paraprofessionals in academic libraries studied by Maphopha (2000). It is assumed that professionals would perform original cataloguing, while paraprofessionals performed copy cataloguing in these libraries. Dockel (1992) opines that, copy cataloguing is used much more than original cataloguing and this signifies the beginning of deprofessionalization. Cloete, Snyman and
Cronje (2003) assert that copy cataloguing is one of the most important tasks of cataloguers. To adapt and utilize a copy record for a library’s own purposes, it is essential that the cataloguer should have a sound knowledge of cataloguing principles. Such knowledge can only be achieved through proper education and training in cataloguing. Coetzee and Skelly (2008) in their study of converting the card catalogue of the National Library of South Africa, Cape Town campus, into a machine readable format, assert that different methods may be used when converting a card catalogue to OPAC, such as using catalogue cards to create records manually, or finding records in machine-readable format and downloading or copying them from the OCLC. Coetzee and Skelly (2008) also state that downloaded records may need upgrading. Local information such as shelf numbers, specific collection, loan conditions and other bibliographic information has to be added to the record. If no record is found to download, then original records should be created. It is the view of the researcher that copy cataloguing should be carried out by qualified experienced cataloguers that will be able to edit the existing records, guided by the cataloguing standards.

**Methodology**

The study used MMR approach to collect qualitative and quantitative data. The population of the study was made up of 6 cataloguers and 500 000 OPAC records. Census surveys was applied for cataloguers and a sample of 384 OPAC records was drawn from the records using simple random sampling (SRS). Krejcie and Morgan’s (1970) table of determining sample size was used to determine the sample size for OPAC records.

**Data collection procedures**

Qualitative data from cataloguers was collected through the use of focus group interviews and analyzed using thematic categorization whereas quantitative data from OPAC records was
collected through document analysis and analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Table 1 indicates the instruments used to collect data from each category.

**Table 1: Instruments used to collect data from different participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus group interviews</td>
<td>Cataloguers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thematic categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document analysis</td>
<td>OPAC records</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>SPSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis and Interpretations**

Research question 1: What skills do the cataloguers of Cape Town Metropolitan libraries possess? This question responds to focus group data sets. The findings indicated qualification in LIS, good general knowledge, knowledge of cataloguing tools, computer skills, and attention to details, accurate, adaptable, willing to change, teamwork and information sharing. The participants also indicated that they obtained professional qualifications in librarianship. All the participants were qualified librarians, two had obtained postgraduate degrees, one had a master’s degree, two had obtained a BBibl. One had PGDIS and BTech, obtained from different accredited universities in South Africa, such as Rand Afrikaans University (RAU), University of Cape Town (UCT), Stellenbosch University, University of Western Cape (UWC) and Cape Technikon. Whitmell (2006) carried out a survey of cataloguing skills in Canadian libraries and found that the skills required for a cataloguing librarian were leadership, managerial competencies and flexibility to respond to changes, communication and technology skills. Hider’s (2006) Australian study
reported that more than 70% of the libraries’ skills needed for cataloguing included internet cataloguing, digital library development web authorizing and designing.

Park and Camei (2009), in a study of cataloguers’ job description in American libraries demonstrated, that knowledge of cataloguing and classification standards were most frequently required qualifications in job description. The activities expected for cataloguers were original cataloguing, authority control, copy cataloguing, descriptive and subject catalogues. In addition, the ability to use standardized cataloguing tools (AACR, MARC, LCC and LCSH) was equally stressed. The other knowledge requirements comprise knowledge of access point, editing knowledge and MARC codes. Chaudhry and Komathi (2002) carried out a study to review the requirements set by employers to select and recruit cataloguers in American libraries with a view to identifying the types of knowledge and skills for jobs related to cataloguing. Their study used job advertisements as they were also considered a good source of information about recruitment of different positions. Their findings revealed that knowledge of cataloguing tools and resources had been the most important requirements for cataloguing positions, while IT skills appeared to be in high demand. In South Africa, Raju (2014) performed a study of knowledge and skills for the digital era academic library and used content analysis of job advertisements and semi-structured interviews. The purpose of her study was to ascertain the key knowledge and skills sets required for LIS professionals in general. Her findings indicated that technology associated with LIS applications in the digital era was a requirement knowledge/skill set. With regard to cataloguing, Tamma in Raju, (2014) observed that cataloguing and classification had much relevance for the World Wide Web. A more thorough knowledge of the major cataloguing tools and their working principles was required to allow a cataloguer to adopt and accommodate existing metadata schemes to use and possess the basic expertise to construct new schemes.
Research question 2: To what extent do cataloguers in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries adhere to international standards when creating records in the online catalogue? This question responds to focus group and document analysis datasets. It was established from the focus group dataset that the cataloguers used the AACR2, the DDC and the LCSH. Other standards such as the MARC and authority control standards such as LC name authorities were not mentioned. The DDC volume 1 was not used to add notations as envisaged by the schedules. These could cause different catalogue bibliographic encoding when other libraries copy their records. It was also revealed that the RDA has not yet been adopted by the respondents. The findings from document analysis also confirmed that the RDA was not used when creating or adapting the catalogue records. For instance, General Material Designation (GMD) was still used on the catalogue records of the CCTML to indicate that the record is for an electronic resource. In the RDA, this element is being replaced by three MARC tags which are 336, 337 and 338 to supply information on the content, media and carrier, respectively. Moreover, MARC tag 260 was still used to denote publication field. In RDA tag 264 is used to include production, publication, distribution, manufacture and copyright notice. The AACR2 was not always followed when transcribing access points for information retrieval. For instance the majority of the OPAC records were entered under the first name of the author and not the surname, as required by the cataloguing standards. Table 2 presents the findings of the author entry from the OPAC records. Sample of the records are presented in appendices A and B.

**Table 2: Author entry checklist (n=384)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improper authors name</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>Entries under first name of the author,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and incorrect recording of main entry

missing and wrong punctuations, typographic errors. The author’s name is not assigned properly according to the cataloguing rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Missing author entry</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>38 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entries are recorded correctly under the surname of the author. Correct punctuations to precede to the name of the author. The dates associated with the names are also recorded.

| Total | 384 | 100 % |

In information retrieval, access points refer to the mechanism that enables a user to discover a target document (Chan & Hodgess, 2007:145). Therefore, it can be understood that errors in access points could harm the process of information retrieval. The cataloguers should verify the names of the authors on the authority file to maintain standardization. These findings revealed that the cataloguing standards were not fully followed when creating catalogue entries for access such as main headings for main and added entries. The researcher also found that some of those records were copied from the OCLC with those faults. Lambert, Panchyshyn and McCutcheon (2013) and Danskin (2013) also state that “in the US and UK, public libraries were far from considering the RDA, due to costs and minimal resources for cataloguing. Cronin’s (2011) study found that cataloguers at the University of Chicago in the US and in Europe used and favoured the RDA although they had difficulty to understand the rules of the RDA. Implementers of the RDA have
also demonstrated “similar attitudes and frustrations when it comes to the differences and changes, especially pertaining to the new concepts and terminology”. Bello and Mansor (2012) carried out a study of duties and job performance factors of cataloguers in Nigerian academic libraries and found that, although the libraries still possessed the card catalogue system, 86% of the cataloguers performed technical duties such as original descriptive and subject cataloguing, determining appropriate guidelines in applying cataloguing rules as well as subject heading policies with the use of subject headings such as the LCSH, SEARS, MeSH, ARABIC, the AACR2 and the LCC to perform their catalogue duties. Ahonsi’s (2014) study of Kenya and Nigeria revealed that in sub-Saharan Africa cataloguers faced challenges in gaining access to the necessary training and preparations in order to implement the RDA. Some of the challenges faced by Ahonsi’s participants were inadequate technological skills, limited internet access, unstable internet, low internet bandwidth and unreliable electricity in libraries. These were the challenges that posed serious problems to the implementation of the RDA since the toolkit is published electronically. In some African countries where the libraries have good access to internet, the high costs still put barriers on its usage (Sharma in Ahosi, 2014). Concerning the awareness and use of RDA rules, Ahosi’s (2014) study revealed that 50% of respondents in Nigeria, Benue State, 75% in Kaduna State and 25% in Kenya had never heard of the RDA. Concerning libraries that used the RDA, both Benue and Kaduna States respondents did not use the RDA, whereas only 25% in Kenya used it. Regarding those planning to implement the RDA, 60% of respondents in Benue State indicated that they were not planning to implement it as well as 25% from Kaduna and 25% from Kenya. Ahosi’s (2014) respondents were also asked if they had seen RDA records before and 50% of respondents from Benue State, 100% from Kaduna State and 25% from Kenya indicated that they had never seen the RDA records before. On the other hand, 90% from Benue State indicated that
they had never read the RDA Toolkit online, 100% from Kaduna and 50% from Kenya had never read the RDA Toolkit online.

In their study of cataloguers’ awareness and perception of RDA rules for cataloguing practices in some selected libraries in Bauchi State of Nigeria, Oni, Oshiotse and Abubakar (2018) found that cataloguers had little understanding and perception of the conceptual meaning of RDA rules. Participants agreed that there were problems militating against their perceptions and involvement in the RDA, which include lack of funding to pay for RDA subscription, lack of library automation and lack of understanding the concept and importance of RDA. Ifijeh, Segun-Adeniran and Igbinola (2018) state that libraries in developing countries did not implement the RDA, since the RDA could only be implemented in libraries that are automated and have e-resources as part of their collection. Some challenges that were found were lack of funds for RDA Toolkit subscription, lack of training funds, lack of internet facilities, lack of computer literacy of cataloguers, lack of support from library management and challenges of local experts to do training. Oguntayo and Adeleke (2016) also note that local cataloguing workshops had merely created awareness of the RDA and simply outlined the features of the RDA rather than training cataloguers on how to actually create catalogue records using the RDA.

In 2008 in South Africa, the Bibliographic Services Programme at the National Library of South Africa (NLSA) was tasked with forming a professional committee to inform the South African cataloguing community about the RDA as replacement for AACR2. From 2009, the RDA lecture series started to alert and train cataloguers in the RDA. The implementation of the RDA was adopted by the NLSA and the University of South Africa (UNISA), among other libraries in South Africa (Ahonsi, 2014; Van Wyk & Nhlabati2014). The findings of this study concur with the above cited studies.
Research question 3: How copy cataloguing is done in Cape Town Metropolitan public libraries? This question responds to focus group and document analysis datasets. The findings indicated that first, the participants used the ISBN search to check if the records were already available on the system. In case the records were available, the item information would be added. If not available, the record would be searched from the OCLC using the ISBN search; when found, the cataloguers copied the records and amended them to conform to their available MARC tags. Concerning the creation of authority records, findings revealed that participants were always coping authority records from the OCLC. The practice of performing original and copy cataloguing was also found by Banjade (2016) in a study of Nepal universities’ libraries. The study established that the practice was a growing pattern. Similarly, Mason (2009) notes that the libraries in developed countries have been doing copy cataloguing for years by using bibliographic utilities such as the OCLC.

Nwalo (2003) opine that copy cataloguing was of immense benefits to libraries and their users as it makes cataloguer records more readily available, saves costs and prevents duplication of efforts. Moreover, Rodman (2000) asserts that the availability of cataloguing copy in bibliographic utilities such as the OCLC or the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) has contributed to increasing the speed of processing information sources. However, Taylor (1988) mentions that several problems could occur when using cataloguing copy. This includes errors in MARC coding, varying forms of entry, problems with punctuation, lack of local practices, typographical errors, insufficient call numbers, discrepancies that cause serious problems such as authority control issues and the separation/integration of series or conferences. For example, if a Canadian catalogue record could contain American Subject Headings rather than Canadian, the overall authority control problems could be an ongoing concern as those countries used different authority control standards. Additionally, there are many records in databases that have seen a variety of cataloguing
practices and interpretations of rules that are no longer acceptable (Smith, 1994:8). It is important for libraries to issue policy statements that require cataloguers to use the latest copy available, especially if it is LC, to take advantage of its updating capability (Taylor, 1988). Chandrakar and Arora (2010) in a study of copy cataloguing in India outlined the following procedures involved in copy cataloguing: search for the bibliographic record in the bibliographic database that allows copy cataloguing, if the record is available on the database, the cataloguer would download the record, add local information such as class number, barcode and local notes, and then validate the record and save it in their database. Their study also found that academic libraries in India used the OCLC, British Library’s Integrated Catalogue, ready catalogue for publishers and WorldCat of the OCLC as their sources for copy catalogue. In Nigeria, Yusuf’s (2009) study entitled Management of change in cataloguing: A survey of practices in Covenant University and University of Lagos found that since the introduction of ICT in libraries, there have been changes in cataloguing, which include the use of CIP records, copy cataloguing using records from reputable libraries, the presentation of the catalogue in the OPAC and the involvement of non-professionals in cataloguing at the University of Lagos. According to Evergreen Indiana Catalog List (2012) the following should apply when matching the copy catalogue record with the information source being catalogued:

010 LC control number if present in the record.

020/022 ISBN or ISSN if present in the record and on the information source.

024 UPI number if present in the record and on the information source.

028 Publisher number if present in the record and on the information source.

245 $a must match (esp. for books); Note: for AV materials,
245 $b may match; matching information could be in a note.

245 $c may match; matching information could be in a note.

250 $a must match (exception: 1st ed. vs. no edition statement).

260 $a should match in most cases, but change of place within the same country between printings of the same edition and variation in choice of place for items with more than one place of publication is allowed. If more than one place of publication is involved, the first place on the information source should match the first place in the record.

260 $b should match in most cases, but change of publisher among parts of multipart items, variation in choice of publisher for an item having more than one publisher, and variation in choice of publisher when the publishers are part of the same organisation (e.g. Puffin vs. Penguin) is allowed.

260 $c must match unless the date is in brackets or with question marks.

300 $a must match, but there are slightly varying styles of entry for multipart items of ongoing publications (e.g., 300 4 v. vs. 6 v.); use best judgement or ask for help if not sure.

300 $b must match, but there may be slightly varying styles of entry.

300 $c must match for AV materials. For books, if the dimension varies by a few centimetres, and if that is the only difference, consider it a match.

490/8xxs $a must match if present, but tracing can differ. Be aware of nonstandard series statements.

511 Performers, narrators, presenters must be same for AV materials.
Reynolds (2018) indicates that MARC edit, a metadata editing programme used primarily to create and manipulate MARC records, originally developed by Terry Reese in 1999, can help to edit the MARC records copied from the OCLC. The software can perform different functions such as updating an AACR record to the RDA, removing duplicates on the record, assigning probable classification notation and subject headings, validating MARC tags, and so on. Reynolds (2018) asserts that MARC edit can be downloaded for free from the internet at http://marcedit.reeset.net/downloads. The findings of this present study and the literature cited established that copy cataloguing of bibliographic and authority records could save time of the cataloguer and increase cataloguing output. However, the copied records should be carefully edited in order for them to conform to cataloguing standards and improve retrieval of information sources.

Document analysis revealed that some records were missing information such as physical description, notes and subjects. The physical description of any information source is very important for retrieval from the shelf and online for electronic materials. The description of pages that the printed book has, helps to locate it from the shelf. The physical information checked would include the size of the book and its location based on such size. The extent of physical description information such as illustrations, maps, portraits, plates and pictures also help to evaluate the information source. Moreover, the description of the dimensions helps with the shelf location as
the patron would know the size of the source when locating it. The majority of records 309 (80%) featured pagination and 75 (20%) did not. Two hundred and nine records 209 (54%) contained the extent of physical description while 175 (46%) did not. However, some describing carriers were not featured, probably because the CCTML cataloguing system did not contain those MARC tags as the system had only the basic tags and again the cataloguers were not using the RDA during the time of the study. Besides, only 19 records (5%) featured dimensions with the rest 365 (95%) lacked dimensions. Table 3 and 4 presents the findings of the physical description entry from the OPAC records. Samples of the records are presented in appendices C and D.

**Table 3: Pagination checklist (n=384)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>80 %</td>
<td>Pagination is present and recorded in Arabic numerals following AACR2 rules Correct punctuations were recorded Correct abbreviations were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper records</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>Pagination missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 %</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Dimensions checklist (n=384)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Dimensions present Correct punctuation to precede the dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was also revealed that some records did not have content notes information. The cataloguer should record the contents of the information source to assist the patrons to choose or to reject the source. The contents indicate what to find in that information source and save the patron time browsing the shelf for the information source that he/she does not need. The findings revealed that only 59 (15%) of the records contained the contents, whereas 325 (85%) did not have the contents. The findings are depicted in Table 5 and appendix E.

Table 5: Formatted contents entry checklist (n=384)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Formatted contents recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AARC2 1.7B18 followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing contents</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Formatted contents not recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By reading the contents, the patrons would be able to evaluate the information source and decide if it is suited for their needs. Exceptions could be given to fiction sources that did not contain the contents. Some information sources were also lacking the summary. The summary/abstract/review of any information source describes an overview of the content of the work. It tells the reader what the work is all about by producing the synopsis of the work. It is very important to
transcribe the summary, abstract and review of the source on the catalogue records to assist the patrons in selecting or rejecting the information source. From the catalogue, the user should know what the information source contains before browsing the shelves or the database (in case of the electronic resources). The summary, abstract, review also helps the cataloguer in subject analysis of the work. The researcher sought to know if the catalogue records contained the summaries of the information sources for which they were surrogates. The findings indicated that of the 384 records, only 49 (13%) contained the summaries, whereas 335 (87%) did not have the summaries of the information sources. The findings are illustrated in Table 6 and appendix F.

Table 6: Summary, abstract or review entry check list (n=384)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Summary present AACR 1.7B17 followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing summary/abstract/review entry</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>Summary/abstract/review missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>384</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings suggested that the majority of the catalogue records did not contain the summaries of the information sources. The cataloguers should add the summaries on the records to enhance retrieval. It was also revealed that some records did not contain subjects. The catalogue should contain the subjects to enable the users to find information sources by their subjects. Taylor and Miller (2006) state that patrons may use subject access as much as 59% of the time. IFLA (2010) emphasizes that the ability to search for domains and subjects depends on the input of subject-oriented data in bibliographic records. The findings indicated that 289 (75%) had the subject headings, whereas 95 (25%) did not have the subject headings. The findings are presented in Table 7 and appendix G.
Table 7: Subjects entry check list (n=384)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Number of records</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improper records</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Subjects not recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing subjects entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable records</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Subjects recorded LCSH instructions were followed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Controlled vocabulary was used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The order of subdivisions were followed (topical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>geographical, chronological, form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All library materials should indicate the subjects on the catalogue records also for fiction sources. The LCSH uses the subject heading **Fiction** for collections and materials about fiction such as novels and stories. Fiction of particular national literature such as American uses **American fiction**, genres of fiction use **Fantasy fiction**. Names of places, personal and corporate names are used with the subdivision fiction to express the theme or subject content of collection of fictions. Examples: **Slavery $xFiction; United States$xHistory$d1861-1865$xFiction**. Searching by subject is important for patrons who do not know the author, title or international standard number for the resource. The subject is also important, as it is the first step to classification. The cataloguer usually will assign the subject heading before allocating the classification notation.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above findings and the literature cited, the researcher opine that copy cataloguing should be performed by qualified cataloguers who have gone through formal training and obtained
librarian qualifications so that they could be able to identify errors on the catalogue records and correct them accordingly. The cataloguers should also be able to enhance the catalogue records available on the bibliographic utilities because different bibliographic catalogue encoding presents a serious obstacle hampering international interlibrary communications and worldwide library search (Das, 2004).

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the interpretation thereof and conclusion presented above, the researcher made the following recommendations:

- Continuous development programmes for cataloguers are needed because the cataloguing standards are constantly changing, as revealed by the new editions of the DDC, the LCSH and now the RDA. Furthermore, there should be frequent cataloguing refresher courses to remind cataloguers of the utilization of the international cataloguing standards that should include all procedures of cataloguing including authority control.

- The CCTML cataloguing section should consider drafting a copy cataloguing policy to offer guidance on what sources of copy are acceptable and the kinds, as well as amount of editing to do before exporting a record to one’s local catalogue system.

- Given that, the current study found skeletal, non-standard and inaccurate catalogue records on the OPAC of the CCTML, which hinders access and retrieval of information sources. It is recommended that the cataloguers should consider re-cataloguing projects to enhance those records.
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Appendix A
Publication

Title
Above us the sky

Author
Milly Adams

Number
ISBN 0-7505-4285-3
Spine Mark: ADA

Edition
Large print ed.

Publication
Long Preston, N. Yorks. : Magna Large Print Books, 2016

Note
Statement of responsibility: Milly Adams
Target Audience: Large print

Subject Headings

Subject Heading
World War, 1939-1945 ; Great Britain ; Fiction
Large type books

Available in the following libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume/Part</th>
<th>Copy</th>
<th>Lending status</th>
<th>Date until</th>
<th>Reservations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charged out</td>
<td>21.04.2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Publication

Title: Contre-jour : q triptych after Pierre Bonnard
Author: JOSIPOVICI, Gabriel
Josipovici, Gabriel, 1940-
Number: ISBN13 978-0-586-08681-0
ISBN 0-586-08681-1
Spine Mark : JOS
Edition: Paperback
Publication: London : Paladin, 1988
Note: General: First published by Carcanet in 1986

Available in the following libraries

CTL1-Central Library
Book - English adult fiction - JOS
Volume/Part Copy Lending status Date until Reservations
- 36001008438893 Available - -

CTL4-Delft-South
Book - English adult fiction - JOS
Appendix D
Appendix F
Appendix G

Publication

Title
Gershwin modern masterpieces

Author
George Gershwin, 1898-1937
Henry Adolf,
Mario Rapko Delorko,

Institution/Organisation
Philharmonia Slovinka

Number
023 [Orbis]
Spine Mark : C 785.6621 GER
CC C 023 [Orbis]
Spine Mark : A

Publication
Germany : Orbis, 1993

Physical description
1 compact disc (60:02 min.), digital, stereo., 1 insert pamphlet

Note
Medium: sound recording
Statement of responsibility: George Gershwin
General: Classical collection
Formatted Contents: Piano concerto in F -- An American in Paris -- Preludes for piano

Available in the following libraries

Not subjects