Entry Element in the Name of a University.
(Cataloguing problems. 13).

P Jayarajan, *Research Assistant to National Research Professor in Library Science, Documentation Research and Training Centre, Bangalore* 3.

[In the Opinion Survey conducted recently, in many cases the readers easily chose the word with the highest Recall Value in the name of an Institution. But. in the case of the name of a University they could not express a definite opinion. Unlike the names of other kinds of institutions the names of Universities pose special difficulties. To overcome these, in his Ed 5 of CCC Ranganathan has prescribed some temporary solution by prescribing Generic Name Cross Reference Index Entry, under the word 'University'. Now it is felt that the Original (Substantive) Entry itself may be made under the word 'University' as the Entry Element. This will reduce the range of search for the name of a University, in the alphabetical part of a catalogue, considerably. It is an additional advantage to render the word 'University' in the Language of the Library. The dominant term(s) in the name of a University should be used as Individualising Element(s) only, and not as Secondary Element].

0 Introduction
·01 DRTC Mid-Year Seminar
        The formulation of the Canon of Recall Value (7) necessitated a thorough examination of the existing Cataloguing Rules. To consider and evaluate the implications of this new Canon, a Seminar on Cataloguing, with special emphasis on the Canon of Recall Value, was organised in DRTC in May 1970. About 35 working librarians took part in the Seminar. The Seminar generally approved the idea; but there were many unsolved problems arising in implementing this Canon (1, 2). This situation is due to the Recall Value of a term not being always objectively determinable. It involves an appreciable amount of judgement

likely to vary from person to person. Further, the century old
tradition of using the First Word in a Name as the Entry Element,
brought into vogue by the Anglo-American Code, has a tendency
to warp the natural formation of judgement.

Some of the librarians who participated in the Seminar were
ready to conduct some Survey in respect of these unsolved prob-
lems. A few of them did the Survey and sent the results to
DRTC (8). The specialist readers generally agreed with the Term
of highest Recall Value in the case of the names of certain
kinds of institutions.

02 DRTC ANNUAL SEMINAR (1970)

In the Annual Seminar (1970) of DRTC, again the same
subject was examined in the light of the findings of the earlier
Mid-Year Seminar (3). About 90 librarians, including teachers
in Library Science, participated in this Seminar. This Seminar
threw some more light on the problem.

Some of the findings of the Seminar pertinent to the prob-
lems discussed in this paper are as follows:—

1 If the name of an institution, including a University, is a
two-worded one — both substantive and one of which is a Generic
Name indicating the corporate nature of the body — the word
other than the Generic one has the highest Recall Value;

2 If the name of an institution, including a University, is a
multi-worded one — all substantive — then the sequence pre-
ferred by the Canon of Recall Value is helpful; and

3 In the case of the name of a University containing a Name
of Area as well as a Name of Person along with the Generic Name,
opinion was divided in regard to the choice of the term with the
highest Recall Value.

03 OPINION SURVEY

Even though a large number of librarians appreciated the
implications of the Canon of Recall Value, it was found advisable
and necessary to seek the opinion of readers also. For this,
an Opinion Survey among advanced readers was made (6). In
this Survey about 1,000 readers belonging to 42 libraries — 31 Spe-
cialists libraries and 11 University libraries — participated. The
Questionnaire sent out for the Survey contained four tables raising
the following successive issues:—

1 Choice between First Term and Subject or other Dominant
Term;

2 Choice between Unqualified Subject Name and Qualified
Subject Name;

3 Choice between Name of Area, Person, or Subject and
Generic Institutional Name; and

4   Choice between Name of Area or Person, Name of Subject, and Generic Institutional Name.

031   *Preference Between First Term and Subject or Other Dominant Term*
        The largest number of examples — one thousand — were submitted for opinion in the first table, as it was believed that this was the most recurring problem. Seventy-three percent of the readers deemed the Term denoting a Subject or other Dominant Term to have the highest Recall Value. But, only 27 percent deemed the First Term to have the highest Recall Value. This large minority-opinion confirmed the conjecture that the century old practice of choosing the First Word in the Name of an Institution as the Entry Element would have warped the choice of a few. Anyhow, the Survey has shown that any appreciable weight need not be given to the opinion of this minority still under the spell of the "Century old practice". But, it is gratifying that the relatively high percentage of 73 have cast off this spell and thought for themselves.

032   *Preference Between Unqualified Subject Name and Qualified Subject Name*
        Only 30 examples were given in the second table, on account of the relatively smaller number of such cases. Further, virtually a "Qualified Subject Name" is a substitute for a compound Subject Name, made necessary by linguistic exigencies, though without much foundation in the idea plane. Actually 69 percent deemed the Qualified Subject Name (Compound Subject Name) to have the highest Recall Value; only 25 percent deemed the Unqualified Subject Name to have the highest Recall Value. As against no abstention in respect of table 1, there was 6 percent of abstention in this case. This fact shows that there has been real difficulty in exercising judgement, because of the mischief of the verbal plane.

0321   Definite Conclusion
        In the first two cases the general consensus of opinion is that the highest Recall Value in the Name of an Institution goes with the Name of the Subject or other Dominant Term in it. Therefore, the new Rule on the choice of Entry Element in the Name of an Institution can be firmly based on this large majority-opinion.

033   *Generic Name for Institutions*
        Tables 3 and 4 were turned on the preference between Generic Institutional Name and other Dominant Term. Here in

these two cases, the Names of Institutions given in the Question-
naire belonged to the following kinds:—

1   Observatory;

2   University;   and

3   Museum.

0331   Preference Between Name of Area, Person, or Subject and
       Generic Institutional Name
          Only 20 examples were given in the third table. This
was made up of eight Universities, eight Museums, and four
Observatories. In these 20 names, nine contained Names of
Subjects, five Names of Persons, and six Names of Areas. Unlike
in the case of the first two tables, in this case the number of readers,
who preferred Subject or other Dominant Terms as Entry Element,
was not very high, even though a narrow majority preferred it.
It was only 56 percent; whereas it was 73 and 69 respectively
in the earlier two cases.

0332   Preference Between Name of Area or Person, Name of
       Subject and Generic Institutional Name
          Only ten examples were given in the fourth table. These
ten were made of six Universities, and four Museums. It was
surprising to see that only 19 percent preferred Generic Institutional
Name to be the Entry Element in this case, whereas it was 47
percent in the case of table 3. Further, a large majority —
63 percent — preferred Name of Subject. It was found that about
250 readers had preferred Name of Person, Area or Subject in
this case, as against Generic Institutional Name in the earlier case.

04   FAILURE OF THE SURVEY
        The contradiction between the preferences in tables 3 and 4
w as very surprising. The reason for this is not very easily under-
standable. The following inadequacies of the Survey might have
contributed to this contradiction:—

1   The number of examples given in tables 3 and 4 was very
small;

2   As against 25 examples in table 3, there were only 10
examples in table 4;

3   In table 4 all the examples contained Name of Subject; but
in table 3 only nine examples contained Name of Subject; and

4   Names of three types of Institutions — Universities,
Museums, and Observatories — were mixed up in table 3; and
Names of two types of Institutions — Universities and Museums —
were mixed up in table 4.

05 NEED FOR FURTHER INVESTIGATION

The contradiction in the opinion of readers necessitated a further investigation of the problem. This Paper deals only with the difficulties likely to have been caused in determining the term with the highest Recall Value in the Names of Universities.

1 Number of Universities

10 PRELIMINARY STUDY

As a preliminary to going to the actual problems in Cataloguing of Universities, it was found necessary and helpful to study as many as possible the names of Universities of the World. For this purpose, *The world of learning* (1969–1970) was used.

11 UNIVERSITIES IN THE WORLD

At present there are about 1,200 Universities in the world. The number of universities specialising in particular subject-fields is about 200. Specialisation in one subject does not, however, mean exclusion of certain auxiliary and cultural subjects.

12 UNIVERSITIES IN INDIA

At present there are 79 Universities in India (4). It was only 28 in 1950–51, 44 in 1960–61, and 70 in 1966–67. Out of the 79 universities, 14 are specialising in particular subject-fields. In 1960 there were only 4 Universities of this kind.

13 FUTURE TREND

The present rate of growth in the number of universities shows that the rate of growth will be much faster in the coming years. Further, there may be an increase in the number of Universities specialising in particular subject-fields.

2 Structure of the Name of a University

21 GROUPING INTO EIGHT CATEGORY

A study of the names of the Universities of the world shows that there appears to be little logic in the Naming of Universities. I could group them into the following eight categories, according to the content in their Names. The following table shows the number of Universities under each of the eight categories.

SN	Contents in the name	Number of Universities	SN	Contents in the name	Number of Universities
1	Area alone	861	5	Subject alone	27
2	Area + Subject	161	6	Fanciful	23
3	Person alone	94	7	Person + Subject	4
4	Area + Person	49	8	Area + Person + Subject	1

22 A New Difficulty

There is a new kind of difficulty in the case of Names of Universities. Whatever may be the sequence of the terms in the statutory name of a University, other permutations of these terms occur in the name of the University as found in its different publications. This will cause difficulty in the Recall of the Name of the University.

3 Prescription of CCC Ed 5

The examples given in Sec JD13 of CCC imply that the First Word in the statutory name of a University should be the Entry Element. Accordingly to this Rule, the Entries carrying the Names of the Universities of the world will get alphabetically scattered as shown in the following table. In this table the Names of Universities beginning with the Generic Name are excluded.

First letter in the Entry Element	Number of Universities	First letter in the Entry Element	Number of Universities
A	40	N	34
B	25	O	20
C	45	P	35
D	19	Q	1
E	22	R	18
F	20	S	71
G	16	T	47
H	23	U	99
I	18	V	17
J	18	W	31
K	44	X	2
L	30	Y	10
M	33	Z	0

The Entries for the remaining — about 650 — Names of Universities will have the Generic Name as the Entry Element.

4 Failure of the General Rule

The Catalogue will fail in its function if a reader approaches it without knowing the correct sequence of words in the Name of a University, he has in mind. He will have to search in the Catalogue the whole alphabetical range — from A to Z — unless he is quite certain about the first word in the Name of the University being looked up.

5 Temporary Solution in CCC

51 GENERIC NAME ENTRY

The Author of CCC sensed the difficulty of readers in locating the Name of a particular University, if the Entry Element is the First Word in the Name. To get over this difficulty he prescribed a special entry, called "Generic Name Entry" for Universities (5). He advocates the need for such an Entry in following words:—
"The experience of the Reference Section is that entries of this type are of use in helping readers. This is due to the name of the institutions · · · consisting of several words and the first word not being always the same either in official use or in popular usage. The one piece of information about which one can be sure is the type of the Institution. If all the institutions of one type are listed under the Generic Name · · · the readers will have to look through only a limited number of consecutive entries, before he can spot out the name of the particular institution sought by him, though he may remember it vaguely."

52 RANGE OF SEARCH REDUCED

The Number of Cross Reference Entries with the term "University" as the Entry Element will not exceed 3,000 assuming that the Library has Entries under the Names of most of the Universities. These 3,000 cards will occupy not more than two or three standard catalogue trays. The number of alphabetical entries in the Catalogue of a library of 100,000 volumes may be as many as 300,000. These may require about 200 standard catalogue trays. As a result, the search through the range of two trays for the Cross Reference Index Entries under the Generic Name "University" will need only one percent of the time needed to search through the entire range of the Catalogue. Having picked up the Entry Element in the name of a specific University from the two trays, the reader can locate the regular entry for it in no time.

6 Proposed Rule for Ed 6 of CCC

It is now under consideration, whether it will be more eco-

nomical to make the regular entries under "University" as Entry Element instead of making them merely Cross Reference Index Entries. This reform in the Rule is the combined result of the Law of Parsimony working in full measure and the Canon of Recall Value working in an appreciable measure.

7 Language of the Entry Element

The next point for consideration is the language in which the Entry Element should be rendered. There is no doubt that the Law of Parsimony will be better satisfied, if the Entry Element is rendered in the language of the Library. Otherwise, even if the Generic Term in different languages begin with the letters "Univ" the entries will be scattered according to languages. On the other hand if the equivalent of the term "University" in any language begin with a letter other than "U" — for example "Hogeschool" — all the Entries will not get concentrated together. Therefore, it is proposed to prescribe in Ed 6 of CCC that the Entry Element should be in the Language of the Library.

8 Individualising Element instead of Secondary Element

When the term 'University' is the Entry Element, it is not necessary to add Secondary Element. It is sufficient if an Individualising Element is added. In most cases, it may be the Name of a Place; in some it may be the Name of a Subject; in some other cases it may be the Name of a Person; it may be a combination of any two or more of these; in extreme cases Year also will have to be used. Each of these Individualising Elements should be written independently in separate brackets. What about the sequence of the Individualising Elements if more than one becomes necessary ? The sequence will be that of decreasing Recall Value. It is proposed to include a Rule on these lines in Ed 6 of CCC. The 14 names of Universities given in tables 3 and 4 of the Questionnaire, mentioned in Sec 03 and its sub-divisions will be rendered and arranged in the following way, assuming English to be the Language of the Library:

UNIVERSITY (Agriculture) (Bangalore)

————. (——) (Andhra Pradesh)

———— (——) (Kalyani)

————. (——) (Punjab)

————. (Dibrugarh)

————. (Heriot-Watt) (Edinburgh)

UNIVERSITY (Indira Kala Sangeet) (Madhya Pradesh)

———. (International) (US)

———. (Mount Saint Vincent) (Halifax)

———. (Newfoundland)

———. (Saint Francis Xavier)

———. (Sanskrit) (Varanasi)

———. (Technology) (Bath)

———. (———) (Loughborough)

91 Bibliographical References

1 Sec 01 CATALOGUING (DRTC Seminar on —) (1970). working paper and proceedings. 1970.

2 Sec 01 CHAYADEVI (A). The canon of recall value. (Her Lib Sc 9; 1970; Paper ZY).

3 Sec 02 DOCUMENTATION (— Research and Training Centre). Library cataloguing: Rendering of names of corporate bodies (Annual seminar, (DRTC) 8; 1970; Part A).

4 Sec 12 MANGLA (P B) and SARDANA (J L). Development of university and college libraries in India during the 4th five-year plan: Suggestions. (ILA bull 4; 1970; 125–28).

5 Sec 51 RANGANATHAN (S R). Classified catalogue code. Ed 5. 1964. Chap LF.

6 Sec 03 ———. Entry element in the name of an institution. Assist by P Jayarajan. (Lib sc 8; 1971; Paper A).

7 Sec 01 ———. Recall value and entry word in heading. (Lib sc 6; 1969; Paper Q).

8 Sec 01 RENDERING OF name of corporate body: Readers reaction. (Annual seminar, (DRTC) 8; 1970; Paper AG).