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Preface

Julia Siegler, passed away tragically when she was hit by a car on her way to catch the school bus late in 2009. I was a graduate student working in the Library Conservation Lab at UCLA repairing books at that time. Though I did not know Julia personally, news of her death and its devastating effect on her community, which happened to be my community as well, had an immediate impact. Two days after I attended Julia’s Shiva, I was at work in the Conservation Lab. I went to the shelf to grab some books that needed repair and, as I walked back to my bench, I glanced at one of the titles in my stack of books. It was called Lessons From the Beyond by “Julia.”

I must admit that I got a chill as I leafed through the eighty year old pages and read phrases about communicating with spirits that have passed from this world and grieving the loss of a child. How could I not? That night when I got home, I was still thinking about it and so I decided I ought to check it out from the library to read it myself. I checked the UCLA catalog and found ONE copy at UCLA but it was checked out to the Conservation Lab. This meant that the book would not be back in circulation until I finished repairing it. This could be a while since it needed a new spine. Although it is not exactly good practice for a library conservation student to be distracted by a book’s content when its functionality is on the line, this book was irresistible. As it happened, the author, “Julia” wrote Lessons from the Beyond after her death, channeled through the hand of William Thomas Stead in 1931.

I searched for this book on Worldcat to request an Inter Library Loan from another UC Library. There were no other copies. There was one other copy in the United States at Boston Public Library that was designated for in-library use only. What made them make this distinction to designate this book as non-circulating? Are there books at UCLA that are non-circulating but not in special collections? This was the beginning of my thinking about what makes a book valuable and rare. And then I learned about the word “scarce.” What does scarcity mean?

I still wanted Lessons from the Beyond, knowing it was scarce, but found it difficult to find a copy on the book market. I finally got my hands on an ex libris copy. How fitting and even foreshadowing of what I would find out about so many scarce books; these at-risk books are not in the condition that would put them in special collections and mostly due to librarians’ markings and repairs!

There are no known digital copies at this time and UCLA’s copy is the only circulating copy. The book is now repaired but still sitting on my desk and the content is not available through the library in any media. A potential user would need to go to the Boston Public Library to obtain access. Lessons from the Beyond is one of many books not just in Worldcat but in the world that make up a population that are like endangered species at risk of being lost forever.
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It is difficult to imagine that books might be scarce at a time when there is more information generated in a multitude of media than we know how to handle. In fact, the explosion of new information has created an environment in which scarcity is guaranteed. That is, in the absence of censorship, or any other restraining forces, much of the newly available information must have a very small audience. A popular debate is whether or not books are dead in the Digital Age. There are more books printed today than ever. The fact that libraries can no longer even attempt to collect everything that is printed has led to an increase in the number of unique items. According to Constance Malpas, a researcher at OCLC, in 2008 WorldCat listed 649,809,508 records of which more than eight percent (or nearly 52 million) consisted of “unique print books” in academic
research libraries (ARLs)\textsuperscript{1} and more records have been added or updated since then. Applied to UCLA’s roughly nine million volumes, one can reasonably infer that there are approximately 720,000 unique items.

Often these scarce books in circulating collections are overlooked and slip through the cracks due to the fact that they are underutilized compared to other books in the collection. These scarce books are also at risk since book repairs in the past have not always been the best treatment for long-term preservation. Now these scarce books are in many instances dismissed as poor candidates for special collections, because of their poor condition.

It is no secret – there is an epidemic in the library of brittle books. The result is that many of these books meet their inevitable death, de-accessioned from the library and laid to rest in the dumpster. Brittle books are a challenge to library collections everywhere and rightly so; they continue to be top on the agenda for discussion amongst preservation librarians across the country, evidenced by the “Brittle Book Strategies for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century” talk at the 2012 ALA Annual Conference.\textsuperscript{2} A book’s physical structure fails in two ways: intrinsic deterioration and extrinsic damage. In the case of intrinsic deterioration, the passage of time is the enemy. Brittle books fall into this category since they fail due to the high acidic content intrinsic to their composition. Put in human terms, these books will die of natural causes as a result of their own deterioration.

Environmental mitigation can curb such intrinsic failures, but not forever. At this point in time, deacidification is the only thing that would prevent such rapid deterioration but this involves invasive intervention and cannot be performed on every book in the library due to high costs. The problem of brittle paper is not a focus of this study, though there is ample material for those who

\textsuperscript{1 Constance Malpas, “Managing Print as a System-Wide Resource” (Paper presented at the Librarians Association of the University Fall Assembly, University of California, San Francisco, December 3, 2008).}

\textsuperscript{2 Allyson Donahoe, Emily Holmes, Kara McClurken, “Brittle Book Strategies for the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century” (Paper presented at the American Library Association Annual Conference, Anaheim, California, June 24, 2012).}
would like to read further on the topic. Digitization is the cost-efficient alternative that is currently favored for the majority of these materials, making the content more widely available.

The second category of extrinsic damage occurs when there is interference from some external force. An example of extrinsic damage is evident when human intervention is the cause of damage. This can include damage incurred by users but it also includes librarians’ treatment of materials. It is the responsibility of the library preservation staff to work with the rest of the library community to encourage a larger awareness of proper care and treatment of the materials in the collections.

ARL administration emphasizes the importance of shared data and materials among member libraries and asserts that preservation is at the heart of the overall function of their libraries. The role of preservation within the larger infrastructure of the library is mostly a “behind the scenes” operation when successfully implemented; however it is important that awareness, planning and action remain in the forefront of the library’s agenda in order to fulfill its mission to preserve and ensure access to materials. The infrastructure of the library is not the same as it was 15 years ago due to the prevalence of surrogate digital copies that are now accessible remotely. Usage patterns of physical materials are changing to favor use of digital surrogates and so should policies that


continue to base decisions regarding retention to reflect this change. Usage patterns should include materials accessed digitally, and not just those books physically checked out of a library. Furthermore, until there is better evidence that digital surrogates will be preserved and better cooperation between institutions regarding the retention of preservation copies, an item should not be discarded based on the assumption that it is held elsewhere and/or that it is available digitally.

The library is one of the only cultural heritage institutions that allows the public to handle materials in a collection and even to borrow items to take home. The relationship between the physical material and the user affects the lifespan of collection materials significantly, which in turn may affect the value, both monetary and academic, of a collection and its ability to provide a sufficiently broad spectrum of materials for future scholars. There is no way to control how users treat materials once they are checked out, but there are things that can be done at the library to provide protection and to minimize the library’s potential contribution to any damaging forces on the materials. Due to the extraordinarily large size of many ARLs, it is impossible to care for each object in a collection as a museum would, on the item level.

UCLA libraries and other ARLs strive to be at the forefront of computer technology and digitization practices placing substantial effort and finances into these endeavors; nonetheless, it is imperative that the community of ARLs remember their role as protective stewards for longevity so as not to neglect the print collections for both present and future researchers. Assessing the physical condition of materials in large ARL collections will help the library fulfill its missions of preservation and access. This study calls into question some accepted definitions of “value” to protect those with otherwise disregarded artifactual value. One premise assumed in this study is that the role of Subject Specialists and Curators is to determine the value of materials for current scholarship; and that the role of the Preservation Department is to protect collections using criteria other than determining the content value of materials. In this way, the Preservation Department serves as a safety net for
marginal materials in the event that future researchers have different ideas of what merits valuable materials.

With ARL library holdings increasing annually and digitization mistakenly equated with preservation, there is a greater need than ever to identify scarce books World(cat)wide. Updated guidelines for distinguishing the fine line between “scarce” books and “rare” books that are associated with special collections must include a process to address “scarce” books unidentified as such in circulating collections. There are a number of difficult problems associated with the preservation of scarce books. Not only are scarce books generally unidentified as scarce, but once identified, they are often not considered valuable by the standards used by Special Collections libraries. However, this does not mean that some of these materials are not just as valuable and worth attention and protection from further damage and neglect. If collections are to be given any increased attention for prevention of damage, it is crucial that more information be made available about the condition of the materials so as to assure that copies with the least amount of damage are preserved. It is virtually impossible to predict which items might have importance in the future, and although there are materials that may appear to lack value by current standards, Preservation Departments are charged with securing unique materials, whether future standards will support this or not.

When librarians as a whole consider access to materials, content is often given priority over the medium in which it was originally presented. The actual book as an object is in fact significant and it is important to care for the original expressions with an eye toward long-term preservation. This concept is often discussed in the context of digital preservation issues, but applies equally to

print materials. All of these forms of access influence one another and, increasingly, materials that are not digitized are under-utilized. However, for scarce materials, lack of availability contributes to the lack of use and preservation alone does not equal access. Rare books stored in a special collection are preserved and handled differently than scarce books stored in circulating collections.

The differentiation between the terms “scarce” and “rare” in a library collection is important because this distinction ultimately determines the materials’ value, eligibility for conservation using higher quality materials, and eventual likelihood of survival. The Rare Books and Manuscripts Section (RBMS) and the Association of College Research Libraries (ACRL) of the American Library Association (ALA) “Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections” states: “Librarians have a responsibility to identify the rare and valuable materials currently held in general and open stack collections and to arrange for their physical transfer to a library location that provides an appropriate level of access, preservation, and security.” The “Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections” consider circulating materials as worthy of Special Collections based on: 1. Market value, 2. Age, 3. Physical and intrinsic characteristics, 4. Condition, bibliographic and research value.

Considered under the Physical and intrinsic characteristics are “the items for which five or fewer copies are reported in the national online bibliographic database (OCLC WorldCat) or items for which only

---


one copy is held in the geographic region (examples of library materials that are scarce or rare).”

It may practically be impossible to move every scarce book into Special Collections; however, it would help if these items could be flagged as such so that conservation treatments more in keeping with the treatment given to Special Collections materials can be considered. For the purposes of this study, driving priorities derived from these guidelines are the informational, bibliographic and research values as they apply to scarce materials whereas the monetary value, age, appearance, content and condition are seen as secondary to this population’s value but still primary variables to survey in order to learn more about this scarce population and assure the survival of the initial priorities mentioned. By prioritizing the preservation of books in their original bindings, rebound books are much more likely to have lost monetary value, even though they may offer research value. Librarians are the ones who have made the decision to rebind them in the past and it is the responsibility of today’s Librarians to forgive the oversights of their predecessors to help preserve what value remains in the books. Although traditionally market value is an inevitable concern when dealing with rare books, it is almost completely irrelevant for this study since the purpose at hand is to maintain the historic record for scholarship and to identify which copy is closest to “the ideal copy.” Thomas G. Tanselle believes that “Every book, however lowly or undistinguished, occupies its own niche in printing and publishing history, and there is no book that a bibliographer [or researcher] may not need to examine for its physical makeup.”

“It is significant that for collections of almost every type, about 30% of artifacts are in unknown condition.” At the American Library Association’s Midwinter meeting in 2006, The National Institute

13 “Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections.”

14 G. Thomas Tanselle, Literature and Artifacts. (Charlottesville: The Bibliographical Society of The University of Virginia, 1998), 27.

for Conservation’s Heritage Preservation presented findings from their “Heritage Health Index,” a national conservation survey of museums, libraries and archives. Heritage Preservation representatives reported that libraries hold 63 percent, or roughly three billion of the total 4.8 billion items, of the collections in this country but take the least amount of preservation actions.¹⁶

“Rare” books held in the Special Collections of a library receive different handling and care than “scarce” books that are scattered throughout the circulating collections. The workflow in most conservation labs at ARLs, such as UCLA, includes both Special Collection and circulating collection materials. However, the standards and conservation practices for Special Collections materials are different from those applied to Circulating Collections materials. There is currently a knowledge void about the condition of such scarce materials at UCLA that limits decision-making without the book in hand.

This study provides a broad condition assessment of monographs surveyed in the Folklore subject category in the UCLA Young Research Library’s circulating collection in order to determine the needs of this population for future retention. Beyond the broad condition survey, case studies of scarce monographs demonstrate the challenges that arise in caring for them. The term “scarce” is defined and discussed more thoroughly in the Methods section of this paper, but ultimately, monographs with 12 or less copies in Worldcat are deemed scarce. From a total population of 5,752 English language Folklore monographs at UCLA, this study took a random sample of 465 Folklore monographs and used OCLC’s Worldcat to determine how many copies are held in libraries globally. Once the scarce monographs are identified, this study sets out to review the preservation challenges presented by scarce holdings, and to better identify the current condition and best format for both preservation and accessibility. Recommendations based on the findings of this study

support that future prioritization of primary materials should remain in their original expression as much as possible. Furthermore, materials that show “preservation” intervention (e.g. commercially rebound books and tape repairs) based on past, accepted practice, can still be salvaged for the value that remains.

This study’s method is a general survey assessment of Folklore monographs, with the hope that the results will provide some insight into the differences in analysis from information obtained from online catalogs as opposed to information obtained from a physical examination of materials at the item level. Additionally, the item-level search survey, though less common or practical in large collections of circulating materials, is evaluated for its potential in identifying at-risk books whenever possible. This is to be carried out through collaborative efforts between UCLA’s Library Information Technology (LIT) Department and OCLC’s Worldcat to propose cross-comparisons between ARL’s holdings in the areas of scarcity.

How can one anticipate changes in intellectual needs and protect works still alive today, while tying this into the preservation and value judgment concerns faced in this study? It is most likely that this kind of anticipation is not possible. Therefore, one must ignore such an approach and, instead, use scarcity as a factor in prioritizing the appropriate conservation needs so that materials treated today will not be discounted tomorrow, if “preservation” remedies result in worsening the condition of such materials.

The results from a condition analysis of some of the scarce monographs uncovered in the initial holdings survey demonstrate some of the problems that affect many of the materials in the entire collection at UCLA and other ARLs. These findings provide reason for further examination of such materials. A larger condition analysis would allow one to assess the overall deterioration of an entire collection, but this is not possible in the present study. Thus, the evidence of this study can serve to invoke future surveys of this kind and encourage future implementation of plans and
policies that would enable library employees to make even more informed choices than currently possible, to help address the preservation needs of scarce materials in the circulating collection. Although the scarce monographs studied here may be unique copies of a particular expression, they are certainly not unique in their poor condition and, often, limited access.

“...The texts of many documents that once existed are now lost forever, and the texts of others are known only in copies. We use whatever there is; but when there are originals, we must not let substitutes supplant them as the best evidence we can have for recovering statements from the past.”

~Thomas Tanselle

LITERATURE REVIEW

Preservation of printed materials as a field of scientific study evolved dramatically in the late nineteenth century, primarily in Europe. William Blades, a book collector and bibliophile, first published his pioneering work, The Enemies of Books, in 1880. Beginning with a treatment of the history of dangers to collections dating back to antiquity, Blades discusses many destructive forces that ruin books. He identifies the following ten categories as the “enemies of books”:

1. Fire
2. Water
3. Gas and Heat
4. Dust and Neglect
5. Ignorance and Bigotry
6. Bookworm
7. Other Vermin
8. Bookbinders
9. Collectors
10. Servants and Children


If we redefine “Servants and Children” to mean “Graduate and Undergraduate Students, and other library patrons”, this list remains relevant and can even be extended to apply to university libraries.

Victor H. Paltsits, of the New York Public Library, adds, in response to Blades:

“That first chapter should have been devoted to librarians who mutilate books with embossing stamps or rubberstamps, write upon and muss the title pages, cut open leaves with scarred and ragged edges, write class-marks with white ink on the backs of the bindings, and do with them as one librarian said, "We fix our books so they will not be of use to anyone else."

Although the terminology and strategies for remedies to these dangers are always changing, the problems of the late nineteenth century persist.

From the dangers mentioned above, this study focuses primarily on the challenges in dealing with neglect, ignorance, and the variety of issues associated with the way librarians handle the scarce materials held in their massive circulating collections. In conducting a review of literature, it is necessary to examine some broader topics, which merge with key elements of this study. First it is necessary to look at print matter in the digital age, and how digitization has affected the concept of the book as artifact. Practical considerations, such as storage options for low-use materials and best locations for scarce materials, must be considered as well. And finally, this study makes use of other studies with similar survey methods regarding scarcity and/or the physical condition of materials.

Throughout the twentieth century, one of the most prolific scholars on the topic of bibliography, as well as a major proponent for the retention of print culture, has been Thomas Tanselle. Nicholson Baker, a popular novelist with no library training, wrote the controversial book, *Doublefold: Librarians and the Assault on Paper*, in which he points out the neglect and lack of organization in the removal of important historical documents by major institutions across the country. Tanselle is one of the few librarians mentioned favorably by Baker for his extreme views

favoring retention of library materials. Tanselle is also one of the few people within the library community to respond to Baker, giving him a review with both positive and negative comments, and agreeing with Baker that libraries should pay more attention to preservation and be more cautious when discarding or reformatting materials. Though Baker is not an expert on the subject, his book continues to provide a wake-up call to the library community that primary source materials have been seriously mishandled by librarians performing mass reformatting projects, especially by using microfilm. Tanselle is in agreement with Baker and states that,

“If this moment is not seized, the nightmare vision of microfilming that William A. Jackson depicted nearly fifty years ago may become a reality: ‘To all the classic "Enemies of Books" has now been added this devouring monster of the microfilm pressure table. By cajolery, threats, exhortation, and constant vigilance the librarians of today must guard their treasures against this danger which lurks in the distant corner where, amid his livid lights and chemical smells, the photographer has his lair.’ (p. 288)”

Jackson is clearly using hyperbole but his message persists. Microfilm was at one time a solution accepted by librarians to preserve the brittle pages’ content, and increase access. When considering access to materials, content is often given priority over the medium in which it was originally presented, but the actual book as an object is in fact significant. It is important to care for the original expressions whenever possible. With that said, it is seldom the case that scarce copies in the circulating stacks meet the criteria of most special collections’ definitions of “ideal copies.”

Practical decision-making is based upon unfortunate real world limitations, such as budgets, conflicting missions and competing interests, and other management considerations. The decisions


21 The term “doublefold” refers to the method of folding the corner of a page in a book back and forth two times to determine if the paper is brittle.


23 Tanselle, “Reproductions and Scholarship,” 47.
that arise in the pragmatic management of libraries betray theoretical or ideological biases, even when these are unrecognized by the library managers. For example, reformatting, currently by way of digitization, carries risk that the reformatted materials may be considered sufficiently primary to allow for discarding of original print copies. In other words, there is a growing potential for the “preservation” of information to lead to extinction of the primary print materials. Practical decisions of this type, whether as an ideological act or not, support the belief that the book itself does not hold artifactual value. Robert Bee’s “The Importance of Preserving Paper-Based Artifacts in a Digital Age” provides an excellent source for background and groundwork for the field of library preservation as well as concerns for the future. He states that:

“If books are merely information that can be migrated from one medium to another without loss, then it is perfectly acceptable to microfilm or digitize and then discard the original artifact. This is currently the consensus in preservation literature, which emphasizes preserving the original artifact only if it has ‘intrinsic value.’”

It is extremely important, during this time of transition to digital culture, that actions leading to inadvertent destruction that can come with microfilming or digitizing are avoided. Massive loss of artifactual material occurs during times of technological switches, such as the shift in the fourth century, from scrolls to codices, and in the fifteenth century, from manuscripts to print. This kind of loss is a risk in the twenty-first century, as the trend toward digitization increases, turning legacy media into “more modern” media, which happens to be accessible to more people than ever before.

This increase in accessibility is consistent with past increases in accessibility associated with past technological advances. Unlike the effects of previous technological switches, however, there is a new kind of danger to printed artifacts. The changes witnessed in centuries gone by were often based on conscious decisions, motivated by clear biases like religion or politics, to destroy materials.

---


There is a new risk of massive indiscriminate destruction of printed matter that is now “preserved” as digitized information. Except for the added bias for preserving materials with monetary value, materials with otherwise unidentified value are at risk of not being digitized or being discarded once available digitally. While religion and politics have always been used as manifestations of power of the dominant culture, value judgments based on monetary considerations are also power driven.

The process of digitization brings along its own problems and limitations. For example, the process of scanning the original printed material is impeded by previously incurred damage. It can also be noted that digitized information does not have a guarantee of permanence. Paul Conway concludes, in his 2010 article, “Preservation in the Age of Google,” that “[p]erhaps for decades to come, material culture artifacts will serve as the ultimate backups for their digital surrogates.” It falls to preservation librarians and preservation-minded collection managers to make the case for addressing the format and condition problems of library materials ingested into a mass digitization workflow.

Michele Cloonan, Dean of the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies at Simmons College, argues for the preservation of print matter. Cloonan sees preservation as “relative rather than an absolute concept because objects change over time, as do our approaches to viewing or interpreting those objects. Perspectives on preservation also change.” Priorities and technologies available to a given culture in a particular time affect what attention is given to preservation.


29 Cloonan, “W(H)ITHER Preservation?” 236.
Unfortunately new technologies often lead to solutions that have unforeseen negative consequences that only become obvious as time passes. For example, books that are mechanically rebound are often damaged because of the inherent risk in the materials and methods used. This will be discussed in greater detail later in this study.

It has long been debated in the library preservation literature whether a work’s merit is in the content (sometimes called “intrinsic value”) and determined by the subject specialists, or its artifactual value, based on its original form. It is also necessary to question the idea, as Cloonan and Bee both do, of what “intrinsic value” really means and how it dictates how materiality of objects are differently prioritized for preservation and conservation. In her article “W(h)ither Preservation,” Cloonan identifies the difference between these two notions as complex and ambiguous, exemplified by the longstanding misinterpretation of Pat Battin’s words: “Preservation is access and access is preservation.” Battin, known as an early proponent of microfilm “preservation,” later became a strong proponent for the digital library. Cloonan rejects Battin’s equivalence between preservation and access as out of context and inaccurate, taking this thought further by saying, “… Battin has unintentionally caused great confusion with her ‘preservation equals access’ equation.” Battin’s phrase becomes dangerous when digitization is used synonymously with access. Battin expressed the belief that digital preservation of “…deteriorating printed documents of the past… [has led to] … the paradigm of the future virtual library: in the digital world, preservation is access and access is preservation. The boundaries of the analog world have disappeared.”

It is no trivial matter that libraries have always had to allot physical space to store materials and for someone to determine what is saved. One of the unpopular topics that needs greater discussion is the current practice of removing books from collections, referred to also as “weeding” or “de-selection.” There is some literature that confronts the controversial issues at hand. ITHAKA, a non-profit organization that supports the academic community of research through digital records, released the report called *What to Withdraw: Print Collections Management in the Wake of Digitization*. The Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) responds to ITHAKA’s report, summarizing its view as taking “a systematic look at the preservation of print scholarly journals, setting ‘time horizons’ for print preservation based on the belief that ‘many of the rationales for retaining print are likely to decline over the course of time.’”

Too often, materials are weeded based on patterns of low use, rather than with forethought to the support of scholarly research. That is, weeding often ignores the fact that ideas can take time to gestate and become relevant. Additionally, this process of weeding is flawed based on the fact that use can no longer be determined by circulation since checking out a book is not the only way for materials to be used. Charles B. Osburn identifies the collection management work of Stanley Slote, who is known for using circulation patterns in public libraries to identify unused books. Slote’s view supports the idea that unused works are unnecessary to keep. Osburn says,


“deselection is undertaken in all types of libraries, but to varying extents and for differing reasons that stem from the mission of the library in support of its host institution. Several objectives may prompt deselection: to identify materials in need of preservation measures, to achieve greater flexibility in physical space usage, or to identify materials for discard when judged to be no longer congruent with policy.”

Although much of the literature about weeding is usually associated with public libraries, it is still also a reality for ARLs. While still making use of this strategy, the extent of weeding at UCLA, is very small compared to the size of the collection. The Library Information Technology (LIT) Department distributes lists to Subject Specialists, using the SRLF Selector’s Tool. The lists include books that have not been checked out in the past three years. UCLA Subject Specialists do not discard books that are the only copy on campus, however, LIT is not providing lists with cross-comparisons to other universities’ collections to assure that there are enough copies nationwide. These lists prepared by LIT, used to determine whether there are any candidates for de-accession, do not include information such as the number of holdings, per book, outside the UCLA system. It is, therefore, the responsibility of Subject Specialists to check whether or not there are wider holdings in OCLC’s Worldcat.

Subject specialists make decisions on whether or not to keep the materials on the list. Materials are either moved to the Southern Regional Library Facility (SRLF) or the Northern Regional Library Facility (NRLF), or discarded. Once the decision is made, someone, usually a student worker from the Access Services Department, pulls the materials to carryout the decision without benefit of the Subject specialists ever holding the material in their own hands. It is at the discretion of the Subject Specialists to decide whether to view the materials, firsthand, in the stacks. There are cases in which this is appropriate, however it is not required and the Subject Specialists are often too busy to take on additional tasks. Furthermore, duplicate copies are not allowed to be sent


38 Verbal conversation with Jennifer Osorio, a Subject Specialist at UCLA, January 2011.
to either SRLF or NRLF because they are both practically at capacity. The problem rejecting duplicates is that it is impossible to know which copy is in better condition. While there are some safeguards against this kind of “last copy,” there are major holes in current procedures resulting in loss of material, which may be important to our collective cultural heritage.

The practice of relying on “low-use material” lists, brings with it a number of other potential flaws. For example, scarce materials are, in theory, protected by the mission of the Preservation Department. There remains, however, inefficiency in identifying scarce books that should be identifiable through Worldcat. If Worldcat’s information could be brought to bear on this process, scarce books could be excluded from these lists in the first place. This kind of inefficiency could be reduced by policy and practice that enforce collaborative efforts among institutions, their materials, and their data.

To address these issues, CLIR released a report in June 2010 entitled, *The Idea of Order: Transforming Research Collections for 21st Century Scholarship.*[^39] This document is heavily weighted towards the discussion of digital preservation, but also addresses the concerns about preservation of print materials. CLIR, along with other organizations like the Center for Research Libraries (CRL), are working on collaborative endeavors to preserve print culture while also increasing accessibility of materials through digitization. One of CRL’s main initiatives to accomplish this is “Preserving America’s Print Resources (PAPR).”[^40] Paul Conway has written a concise and general article about preservation in the digital age that provides good initial background[^41] for those who wish to read


further on this topic. Currently, there is not enough information about collective holdings and condition of materials available to librarians at ARLs. This lack of information impedes the process of effectively monitoring the degree of scarcity of specific items and the actions necessary to mitigate the loss of at-risk materials.

Of relevance to the direction and ultimate recommendations of this study are the previous cooperative projects that have attempted to understand collective holdings for preservation purposes. The first national project of its kind in the United States was the Farmington Plan. One of the goals of The Farmington Plan was to preserve marginal materials and assign subject areas to different institutions to ensure that all areas were being collected and cared for. Overall, there was a mixed response regarding the practicality of this plan, but the ARL and Library of Congress met in 1947 to discuss the implementation of the Farmington Plan. This occurred two days after March 14, 1947, a date that is often remembered as the beginning of the Cold War. One can infer that fears of a nuclear attack were primary reasons for these discussions. The underlying motivation behind this plan was to geographically separate all of the world’s collective history, focusing on locations considered most susceptible to an attack.\textsuperscript{42}

Ultimately, the Farmington Plan failed because it was never able to accomplish what it set out to do. The National Union Catalog was the bibliographic tool used for the Farmington Plan but this presented problems since it was not completely representative of the holdings in the world nor did it include many of the foreign language materials and serials. (These problems continue to surface when using bibliographic tools like Worldcat. One must, however, make do with the tools that exist.) Another problem that led to its decline was the emphasis on subject specializations and

value judgments about what to save and collect. No consensus could be reached. Today, there are still challenges in achieving a consensus regarding prioritization of materials to preserve.

The Farmington Plan influenced other similar projects such as the Research Libraries Group (RLG), which, in the 1970s, continued to strive toward universal collecting. The RLG Conspectus created standards for collection assessment and management in the early 1980s, to which most research libraries subscribed. The RLG Conspectus implemented the latest computerized analysis and helped enable ARLs to plan for implementation of shared data. The Conspectus developed a code for different levels of library collections as follows:

0. “Out of Scope level suggests that the institution does not have an interest or mission in a specific classification range. The library, therefore, should not support acquisitions in that subject.
1. Minimal level is assigned when very basic works support users’ needs.
2. Basic information level suggests very selective choices at the introductory subject level, including circulating books, reference works, journals, and other materials. These collections are not sufficiently intensive to support courses for independent and senior level research in the subject area.
3. Instructional support level describes a collection that sufficiently supports undergraduate, independent, and graduate level instruction, but not post-graduate level research. Complete collections of important writers, basic bibliographies, major reference works, and selected works of secondary writers are in the collection.
4. Research level libraries support the acquisition of major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research. It includes specialized reference tools, conference proceedings, professional society publications, multiple editions, bibliographies, important foreign language material and at least 65 percent of available periodical titles. Older and superseded materials must be retained for historical research.
5. Comprehensive level collections have everything on the topic no matter what the language, age level, or format.”

According to this coding scheme, UCLA is a level 5 Comprehensive level library collection, relied on for scarce materials.

There have been many smaller initiatives to confront the “Last Copy” issue by way of developing print repositories. In 1990 Terry L. Weech wrote the “Reports on the Last Copy Center


45 Wood and Strauch, Collection Assessment: A Look at the RLG Conspectus, 13-14.
Study”, in which he identified statewide last copy centers in six states: Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Kansas, South Carolina, and Wyoming.46 “Last Copy Centers’ are repositories designed to house the last copies of library materials remaining in a particular region that can no longer be retained by the local library because of lack of space and/or facilities for preservation.”47 In 2001 CLIR published “The Evidence in Hand: Report of the Task Force on the Artifact in Library Collections”. CLIR proposes in this report that it is not necessary for every library to retain its own copy of a print book. While this is logistically a reality, it is important that proper procedures be developed; primarily to avoid the hasty disposal of duplicates before institutions have been able to coordinate with each other. CLIR proposes that regional print repositories be established to house low-use print matter. These “last, best copies” would be compiled from different institutions starting with monographs that are digitally available.48 Eleven years later, this has not caught on, although there continue to be attempts.49,50

Concurrent to the development of the RLG Conspectus, the Council on Library Resources (CLR) began taking aggressive actions to confront the issue of damage in paper-based materials. The 1980s was a decade of much change for preservation with the crisis of “brittle paper” and accompanying mass microfilm projects. RLG eventually merged with CLR and OCLC and now the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) and CRL have become strong forces addressing library preservation needs and collaborative efforts. In 2008 CLIR began its “Cataloging


47 Weech, Reports on the Last Copy Center Study, 1.


Hidden Special Collections and Archives Program,” funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, to uncover materials that are not often used or that are uncatalogued.

While all of these efforts, mentioned above, demonstrate overwhelming support for the concept of a joint print repository, there is still work that needs to be done to create a course of action and guidelines for the treatment of scarce materials in the ARL circulating collections. Jacob Nadal, formerly the Preservation Officer for UCLA’s Library system, worked toward confronting scarce materials that were sent to the Preservation Department and deemed damaged beyond repair, usually based on the presence of brittle paper. Nadal used the following criteria for reviewing whether to keep, withdraw, or replace materials based on Worldcat data:

KEEP if: There are less than 12 copies globally, less than 3 copies in California, or 0 others in the UC system.
WITHDRAW if: There are more than 26 copies globally and Subject Specialists agree.
REVIEW: If there is any question, the decision is reviewed again by the Preservation Officer, Subject Specialist, and any other relevant party.  

Jacob Nadal co-authored an article with Annie Peterson, the Preservation Officer for Tulane University (this article is currently under review for publication). Nadal and Peterson conducted a survey of brittle books sent to the Preservation Department for review to determine which materials were scarce. The study relied on Candice Yano’s research at UC Berkeley, to develop a rationale for the rate of loss for serials also available digitally in JSTOR; the findings were commissioned by ITHAKA and published in their report, “What to Withdraw? Print Collections Management in the Wake of Digitization.” For a more in-depth analysis of the use of Yano’s work


as applied to monographs rather than serials, see the article by Nadal and Peterson. The current study will also make use of Yano’s loss rate definitions for monographs to determine which materials are scarce. The criteria, as Yano describes, states that for a work to survive for 100 years with the annual probability of loss and/or damage for each copy being 0.01, the survival probability, if there are 26 copies is 99.9992859 percent, 99.57849 percent if there are 12 copies, and 36.6032341 percent survival rate if there is one copy.53,54

One of the most intimidating factors is that there seem to be a lot of these scarce materials. In 2005 OCLC reported that 37 percent of OCLC’s 55 million records had one holding. Thirty percent of OCLC’s records had two to five holdings and 33 percent had more than five holdings.55 Works from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries make up a large percentage of the scarce materials since their formats do not conform to established rules of collecting. That is, many of these books have not been collected in a way that has become standard for “rare books.”

Lynn Silipigni Connaway et al carried out a study called “Last Copies: What’s at Risk” in which the authors address this issue head on. Connaway leads the OCLC Research “User Behavior Studies & Synthesis” activities and data mining projects with WorldCat. The research team uses OCLC to compare holdings at libraries in the United States in WorldCat to determine which copies held at Vanderbilt University were the last expression, as defined by the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), a set of guidelines for bibliographic description that relate
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entities, such as works, manifestations, and expressions, to one another.\textsuperscript{56} The authors point out that it is not possible for OCLC libraries to search whether an item is a “copy of last resort,” meaning that there are no other copies except the one at Vanderbilt. In theory, all books in ARL collections have a copy of last resort. This can be problematic since these copies are not identified as such and may fall through the cracks if not flagged in the record. Connaway reports that twenty-four million records in WorldCat are held only at a single library.\textsuperscript{57} This is such a daunting number of records that it is often easier to do nothing than to attempt a seemingly large endeavor, such as identifying the physical state of these books in their records. When broken down, however, as this study does in the methods and discussion sections, it is potentially feasible to address this population of monographs. Unfortunately, three years after this research was published, the Vanderbilt Library system conducted a massive de-accessioning project, removing some scarce books, based on their lack of circulation. The Vanderbilt study addresses the issue of “last copy” holdings, yet it does not address the condition of its materials.

In addition to surveying holdings data for collections in the aggregate, numerous surveys that look at the actual condition of the materials in specific collections also influence the work addressed in this study. National Endowment for the Humanities funded one of the largest and most influential condition surveys in 1982, at Yale University. This survey sampled 36,500 volumes and found that 12.8 percent of the entire collections required urgent conservation, with 37.1 percent containing brittle paper.\textsuperscript{58} An earlier (1979) study at Stanford University surveyed 500 volumes and found that 27 percent of the collection contained brittle paper. Two years after Yale’s survey,


\textsuperscript{57} Connaway, O’Neill, and Prabha, “Last Copies: What’s at Risk?”

Library of Congress studied 1,200 volumes, finding that 90 percent of the collection contained brittle paper. Many have used these early condition surveys to inspire their own needs assessment surveys. For readers who would like to know more, Jennifer Hain Teper and Sarah M. Erekson (though their survey looks at Special Collections materials) provide an excellent overall history of condition surveys in their article “The Condition of Our ‘Hidden’ Rare Book Collections: A Conservation Survey at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.” They also emphasize the importance of item-level surveys in addressing issues of conservation, though this is not a regular practice for libraries otherwise, due to the large scale in holdings of most collections. Teper and Erekson further prove what the Heritage Health index tells us, which is that the condition and physical needs of many materials are unknown. David Ward and Thomas H. Teper also conducted a condition survey, titled “Undergraduate Library Collections 40 Years Later: An Assessment of Use and Preservation Needs at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign.” They found that almost 31 percent of the materials in the Undergraduate Library had commercial bindings and that aside from the expected damage from abrasion and general wear, 45 percent of monographs had been mutilated, 35.8 percent had stained pages, and 11 percent had torn pages. They look at circulation data and correlate the level of circulation to the degree of damage. They conclude that the student workers require more training to assess the condition of materials checked back into the collection.
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Library conservation as a field of study has evolved drastically in the past 50 years, stemming from the disastrous Florence, Italy flood in 1966, which spurred an astounding international joint response that ultimately changed the view of conservators regarding library collections; there is, however, still progress to be made. A more recent noteworthy study, written in 2009 by Whitney Baker and Liz Dube, is called “Identifying Standard Practices in Research Library Book Conservation.” The authors sought to record “the types of treatments employed by research libraries to conserve their book collections and to compare practices applied to special collections with those applied to general collections.”

“The data from this survey indicates that treatment practices for special and general collections are more similar than different; practices fell into the same classification as previously (i.e. ’standard practice,’ ‘moderate use,’ or ‘low-use’) for 32 (58 percent) of the 55 treatments. Furthermore, just 12 treatments (22 percent) showed a difference of 25 percent or more with respect to the percentage of respondents in each context who reported the treatment as standard practice in their conservation unit.” In other words, only 42 percent of treatment practices had a change in classification and where there was a change, this change was small in nearly 80 percent of those surveyed. While this study looked at both special and circulating collections and found reasonable congruity in conservation practices among institutions, this study did not clearly show a majority using practices that actually fall within the recognized standards for conservation.

This study was one of the first of this kind, however, a weakness to the study is that the survey responses came from a written survey whose participants were “self-selecting” and by
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invitation, resulting in responses that “should be regarded as respondents’ perceptions about
treatment practice” that could be biased. 66 Baker and Dube use Gary Frost’s words as follow:

> “Questioning why ‘we have this partitioning of book repair,’ Frost asked whether ‘an
integrated approach…would improve service overall. Noting that conservation practitioners
in both special and general collections arenas have grappled with exceptions—items falling
somewhere between a rare book and a nonrare book—Frost advocated ‘a middle zone of
conservation practice… [in which] the ‘exception’ category now appears key to a seamless,
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Generally speaking, the lessons of the past, support the need for sustained efforts aimed at
assessing the condition of collections and, equally importantly, the condition of individual items in
collections. The work done in these areas provides warnings about the potential damage that comes
from well-intentioned efforts, by librarians who attempt to combine the issue of improved access to
materials with efforts to preserve. New technologies continue to prove to be seductive, promising
solutions to challenges with both preservation and access. Unfortunately, current and future
generations of librarians are unlikely to be immune to the technological temptations of the future.

The literature that informs this study integrates: the effects of digitization on the book as an
artifact, the many efforts toward improved collaboration and shared resources among ARLs, and
previous examinations of collections’ condition and scarce materials, using the survey method. Still,
this study, and others like it, attempts to address the difficulties in preserving books as artifacts
without falling prey to the dangers lurking in an unknowable future. Preservation librarians must
continue the effort to sustain wider awareness of the relevance and importance of avoiding easy
solutions to the weeding problem with potential for dire outcomes. Librarians as physicians
responsible for the health of their collections must remember the most important part of the
Hippocratic oath, “First, do no harm.”


SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODS

This study examines the holdings and condition of monographs at UCLA in the subject category “Folklore” at the Young Research Library (YRL) that are scarce. In this study “scarce” refers to the population of monographs in the library that make up the last remaining copy or copies in the shared library system, as reflected in OCLC’s Worldcat. Based on studies described in the Literature Review, this study defines “scarce materials” as a work with less than 12 copies system wide, “nearly scarce materials” as a work with between 13 and 26 copies system wide, and “not scarce materials” as a work with 27 or more copies available system wide. “The Needs Assessment Survey” guidelines provided by Sherelyn Ogden, formerly of the Northeast Document Conservation Center, informed the condition element of this survey:

- “A survey must evaluate the policies, practices, and conditions in an institution that affect the preservation of all the collections.
- It must address the general state of all the collections, what is needed to improve that state, and how to preserve the collections long-term.
- It must identify specific preservation needs, recommend actions to meet those needs, and prioritize the recommended actions.”

This study is comprised of a random sample survey of monographs (n=465) in the “GR” subject heading (Folklore) to learn about the holdings and basic condition of these materials, looking most closely at the scarce monographs. Previous work has already identified that there is a gap in the system to identify scarce holdings however this work also tells us that there are too many books to address the issue on an item-level basis. Most surveys at UCLA are conducted through UCLA’s Library Information Technology (LIT) Department, which can generate lists of books based on specific criteria. For example, as noted above, one criterion may be how often a book was checked out in the past three years. Another example, obtained for this study was all English language monographs in the GR Folklore subject range located at SRLF. For reasons including the large size
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of this list of Folklore and the difficulty inherent in the restriction on visiting the SRLF shelves, it became evident that a different survey method would be more likely to be successful. An item-level survey is uncommon in large libraries because this kind of survey involves examining each individual book and is very time consuming. However, there may be something to gain from conducting an item-level survey to complement the larger reports from LIT and to learn more about the limitations in LIT’s data, thereby providing crucial information about ways in which useful data variables could be added to better label item-level information in the catalog record.

LIT and OCLC’s Worldcat can gather a certain amount of data, however this data does not include the kind of information accessed by a closer look at the actual scarce monographs. Item-level surveys are advantageous because they offer a greater level of detail for a study by reflecting what is actually on the shelf, rather than what is supposedly there, based on a description in a catalog (cataloged materials often include items that are missing or lost). Currently, item-level assessments are the only way to evaluate the condition and repair needs of materials in a collection. Though impossible and impractical in conducting surveys of extensive circulating collections, the item-level condition survey is possible when looking only at scarce materials of a larger sample survey. This type of survey facilitates the identification of books deemed at-risk, based on their poor condition, in a way that batch survey lists from LIT cannot.

Before beginning this item-level condition survey, a number of important decisions were necessary to limit the scope of this process to assure that the project could be completed within a reasonable timeframe and with a staff of one person. It was necessary to limit the search to look only at English language monographs physically present on the shelves of YRL since, as will be demonstrated later, the catalog entries for foreign language materials (especially those with non-Roman characters) are inconsistent and difficult to standardize to reduce duplicate records.
BACKGROUND OF FOLKLORE AT UCLA

“In the history of history a myth is a once valid but now discarded version of the human story, as our now valid versions will in due course be relegated to the category of discarded myths. With our predecessors, the bards and story-tellers and priests, we have therefore this in common: that it is our function, as is was theirs, not to create, but to preserve and perpetuate the social tradition; to harmonize as well as ignorance and prejudice permit, the actual and the remembered series of events; to enlarge and enrich the specious present common to us all to the end...”

Folklore is not limited to any one culture or geographic region and its subject matter is relevant to any part of the world, even when translated into English. Folklore is optimal for a study like this since it does not involve an overwhelmingly large collection, as would be the case for subjects like literature or history. Unlike fields of study that are shaped by the perceptions of dominant cultures, Folklore provides a fitting topic for preservation since the authority of this subject matter has become devalued, and even subversive. That is to say that Folklore is given less attention and less funding than most other areas of study since it does not reflect the current canon. Fields like science, anthropology and history are central to the current prevailing belief systems, supporting the structures of culture and power. Concepts that were once part of a central cultural ideology are now relegated to “folklore,” which tends to be based upon the remnants of obsolete power structures. The connection to any existing ideology or political structure is so tenuous and contradictory that it finds itself in an area that the “serious” fields of study consider folklore as disconnected from “truth.”


71 The ideas in this paragraph are based on the author’s personal experience with the UCLA Folklore collection in addition to the sentiments of Wayland Hand in his oral history.
The folklore collection at UCLA was once associated with an entire Folklore Department. Professor Wayland Hand, an ardent folklore collector and scholar, established the program in the 1940s. Before the University of California at Berkeley took on the role of specializing in folklore, Hand attempted to establish UCLA as the prominent Folklore Library. Hand, in his oral history, confesses that the Anthropology Department was unwilling to cooperate with the Folklore Department since the evolving field of Anthropology was distancing itself from the humanities. Anthropology sought its place with the established sciences, in which storytelling as a way to understand the human experience became marginalized. Between the 1950s to the 1990s the folklore collection grew and there was even a folklore library for many of those years. During Hand’s time at UCLA, he managed to develop a substantial Folklore Department.\[72,73\]

When the Folklore Department was dismantled and dispersed among other departments in the 1990s, some of the materials of the Wayland Hand Folklore Collection were put into storage until the early 2000s, when the materials were relocated to the second floor of the Humanities building at UCLA. At one time, there was a card catalog for this collection but it is now lost and it is unknown whether or not these materials were put into the UCLA library’s catalog.\[74,75\] It is possible that a portion of the Wayland Hand Folklore Collection was temporarily relegated to the basement of the YRL library, a space that legitimately can be described as dungeon-like: not fit for library materials. The Hand’s Folklore materials are no longer in the basement, presumably this portion of the collection was processed through cataloging and acquired by UCLA’s library. All that remain in

---
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73 Interview with Joseph Nagy, Professor of Humanities at UCLA, April 7\(^{th}\), 2011.

74 Hand. “The Development of Folklore Studies at UCLA Oral History Transcript.”

75 Interview with Joseph Nagy, Professor of Humanities at UCLA, April 7\(^{th}\), 2011.
Nevertheless, Hand worked closely with the library’s bibliographers to bulk up the university’s holdings and for this reason UCLA holds a substantial collection of folklore materials that are not overseen as a cohesive collection, as they once were. The Folklore materials are, therefore, an at-risk population of monographs.

**FOLKLORE HOLDINGS IN YRL**

As noted above, 465 monographs were surveyed (excluding serials and foreign language materials) from the GR section in YRL in order to assess the needs of this population. According to a report requested for this study, from LIT, there are 18,175 entries in UCLA’s Voyager catalog with a call number beginning with GR and including all languages, formats, and all locations at UCLA. Of these 18,175 entries, 5,752 entries are in English. This English language subset of all GR holdings, 5,752, is the total population found in all UCLA libraries. The California Preservation Program (CALIPR), created and maintained at UC Berkeley, provides a tool that allows museums and libraries to conduct preservation surveys used to assess their collections. The most useful function
of CALIPR, for the purposes of this study, is the random sample generator that asks for specifications about the materials in the collection, and the number of floors, bays, shelves, and monographs per shelf. CALIPR’s random sample generator, which provides valid results with a 95% confidence level and a tolerance of ± 5%, were applied to an estimated 2,500 items on the shelves.

Initial information about each item was recorded in an Excel spreadsheet. Collected data consisted of:

- Title
- Author
- Call number
- Date of publication
- Initial notes regarding binding
- Number of copies held at UCLA
- Whether there is another copy at another UC
- If held in a special collections library
- Number of copies in Worldcat of this edition
- Number of copies in Worldcat of any edition

**SEARCHING WORLDCAT FOR HOLDINGS OF MONOGRAPHS SURVEYED**

One of the most useful and challenging tools for this survey is OCLC’s Worldcat, the world’s largest and most comprehensive bibliographic database. Currently there are 72,000 libraries representing 1,838,336,329 holdings represented by 170 Countries and territories.76 One of the benefits of using Worldcat is that there is ample data that allows institutions all over the world to share their catalogued holdings, but the problem with this is that there is overly ample data, often leading to duplicate records. For older monographs or those with slightly complicated bibliographic records, there are often multiple catalog entries for the same material. The British Library apparently created many of their own bibliographic records because often their holding is displayed as a record
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that is separate from the rest. Because Worldcat is always changing and updated daily, it is
impossible to obtain completely stable data, so the count for holdings in this study reflect the
holdings at the time of the search. There are also potentially more copies in libraries that are not
reported by OCLC or that have not been catalogued. Fortunately, this inaccuracy may in fact be
counterbalanced by the fact that not all of the reported copies are physically present in the library,
and duplication, which is common in Worldcat is likely to have inflated the number of holdings,
especially for materials with non-standard catalog entries. Conversely, three UC libraries may claim
to have a holding but in fact it is in the SRLF and, in fact, there is just the one copy in the storage
facility. Additionally, many copies reported by OCLC do not necessarily come from ARLs or other
libraries with preservation priorities. That is to say that it should not be assumed that every copy
reported by OCLC is readily accessible or preserved.

Not all libraries report to Worldcat, so Worldcat’s records represent holdings in North
America for the most part. All of these factors contribute greatly to the potential compromises
within the searched holdings. Nonetheless, Worldcat is the most exhaustive bibliographic database
tool at this time.

 CONDITION OF THE SCARCE FOLKLORE MONOGRAPHS

From this random sample, a subset of scarce materials allows for a more detailed item-level
examination through case studies. The initial intention of the condition survey borrows from the
RBMS definitions and guidelines for transferring an item in a circulating collection to a special
collection (discussed above in the Literature Review).77 The criteria for physical attributes include:
original spine cloth on the monograph, an informative bookplate, whether the item is a first edition
(or other desired edition), is letterpress printed or contains evidence of other unusual printing
technique, is leather bound, retains the original endsheets, contains decorative endsheets or

77 “Guidelines on the Selection and Transfer of Materials from General Collections to Special Collections.”
marginalia, includes maps, photographs, lithographed color or other color pictures, noteworthy text, or is partially made out of vellum or other unusual materials. Other criteria include: items with local interest, custom produced materials, such as small press products, and, of course, last copies. The results of this survey tell a lot about the monographs observed, and the initial questions regarding the overall condition of the collection are answered: most of these books do not qualify as candidates to transfer to Special Collections because, overall, there are many that are in compromised condition and have at least one, often more, of the following characteristics:

- The monograph is not in its original binding or casing.
- The binding is damaged or detached from the cover.
- One or more leaves are missing or damaged.
- The material is mutilated or damaged.  
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**RESULTS**

**ANALYSIS OF HOLDINGS**

**LEVELS OF SCARCITY IN FOLKLORE AT YRL**

Not Scarce 86%

Nearly Scarce 9%

Scarce 5%

---

Figure 1.2 In this chart SCARCE is defined as 12 or less copies of the exact edition in Worldcat, NEARLY SCARCE is between 13-26 copies, and NOT SCARCE is any amount above 26. There is a confidence level of 95% and a tolerance of ± 5%.

Worldcat tells that of the 465 monographs surveyed, 400 items (86 percent) are not scarce (meaning that Worldcat accounts for 27 or more copies). Forty-two items (nine percent) are nearly scarce (meaning that Worldcat accounts for between 13 and 26 copies). Twenty-three items (five percent) are scarce (meaning that Worldcat accounts for 12 or fewer copies). If there is a confidence level of 95% and a tolerance of ± 5%, and the five percent of materials that are scarce correlate to the whole collection at UCLA, five percent of nine million volumes is about 450,000 items. With such a large number, it is important that librarians develop a way to obtain information about materials from bibliographic records, rather than an item-level analysis of 450,000 items. The only other alternative is to continue to ignore these items altogether, and potentially lose unique materials.

Figure 1.3 Analysis of the 465 Folklore monographs assessed in this study, broken down by quarter century since 1825,
Looking at the bar graph in figure 1.3, it is clear that the holdings shown above reflect both an increase in the collection when the Folklore Department was thriving, with a peak in holdings during the last quarter of the twentieth century. The drop in holdings in the twenty-first century correlates with the departure of Wayland Hand and the associated loss of physical infrastructure supporting these holdings. This correlation cannot be entirely attributed to a loss of interest in Folklore in the twenty-first century, since this graph is consistent with all library acquisitions and consequent holdings at UCLA. At some point in the past ten years, UCLA conducted a sweep of the circulating stacks to relocate materials older than those published in 1850 to SRLF or Special Collections. Although there is only one book that falls in the pre-1850 category from this survey, a directed examination of the open stacks, in which older monographs are the targets, it is clear that there are still some pre-1850 materials that remain on the shelves. This kind of more specific search for older materials, based on the experience of handling UCLA’s collections, can easily uncover many pre-1850 materials and some from the 1700s. Conversations with UCLA librarians further support this fact that pre-1850 materials remain in open stacks, despite efforts to enforce the policy and despite institutional beliefs that older works have been safely removed from the open stacks. Furthermore, a conversation with a librarian at UCLA’s YRL Special Collections, adds information that the Folklore subject, among others, may have been left out of the pre-1850 relocation project.

Although not shown in this graph, and although it is beyond the scope of this study, it is interesting to note that the data collected identifies both scarce and abundant materials. It is hoped that looking forward, this kind of data could be used responsibly to remove excess materials from the collection in order to create more space in the libraries. While this is an added bonus to this sort of project that pleases all of the librarians plagued with storage issues, it is not relevant to this study.
Data about the condition of the scarce monographs, as described in this study, include: monographs with no previous library intervention and original and/or paperback casings, and monographs with evidence of library interventions, such as, rebinding, pamphlet casings, spine tape, and other intrusions such as enclosures, substituted photocopied pages and repairs. Based on these classifications, 40 percent of the monographs surveyed indicate some previous modification by the library. Thirty percent of the monographs surveyed are rebound in commercial bindings, which is virtually identical to findings of Ward and Teper (discussed previously in the Literature Review), who found that almost 31 percent of the materials they surveyed in the Undergraduate Library at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign had commercial bindings.\footnote{Ward and Teper, “Undergraduate Library Collections 40 Years Later: An Assessment of Use and Preservation Needs at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign,” (24).}
The holdings data collected for the 465 monographs making up this study serve to identify the 23 scarce monographs that form the focus of a more detailed condition assessment. The types of repair and intervention that are the focus of this study are those with bindery and pamphlet casings.

The graph in Figure 1.5 above indicates that the earlier materials are either in bindery or pamphlet binder casings and since 1950 more books have been left in their original hardcover or paperback casing. Although the sample size of scarce materials is too small to reliably reflect all scarce materials, it is interesting that of the 23 scarce materials there is a higher frequency of library intervention with the exception of the period between 1950 and 1974, which coincides with the time that Wayland Hand was intimately involved with this collection. The correlation that the materials between 1950 and 1974 are part of the Wayland Hand Folklore Collection is not conclusive, and the same trend does not hold true for the corpus surveyed. However, it would be interesting to look
further into the materials from this quarter century to see if the originals are more likely to have belonged to Hand’s legacy collection.

![Bar chart](chart.png)

**Figure 1.6** The 23 scarce monographs show evidence previous intervention predisposes these monographs to the need for further intervention.

One of the ways that we continue to damage books is to send them to the bindery. While this is necessary for the overall function of the library, it may be helpful to remember that the fewer invasive markings the library contributes to materials, the better chance of survival for the future. In general, whenever possible, books should be left in their original format. Figure 1.6 indicates that 16 of the 23 scarce monographs had previous intervention and eight were in their original casings. The most telling part of this finding is that the materials that are hoped to be safely protected by library bindings are actually the ones that need repair. Conversely, materials that are left alone are in better condition overall. This is an insufficiently small sample (23 out of a total population of 5,752) from which to draw conclusions, but based on experience and a great deal of interaction with many of the Folklore materials, it is very likely that this conclusion would be valid for a much larger sample.
CASE STUDIES

In order to better demonstrate some of the striking findings in this study, a few case studies of scarce Folklore monographs are pictured and discussed below. Older pamphlet binders cause damage to materials because the stapling over an already delicate pamphlet, places added strain to the cover and subsequent pages. To better display these casings, photos of some of the scarce surveyed items demonstrate (below in figure 1.6 and 1.8) common damage from such interventions. Beginning in 2003, with the arrival of Kristen St. John, the Library Conservator, there is a marked improvement in the techniques used on the collections. Figure 1.9 shows the current improved pamphlet binder that replaced the older methods. This method uses a plastic, casing with a clear cover that is more durable and non-acidic. Further, the pamphlet can be attached with staples or sewn through the fold of the paper, rather than in the margin.

Figure 1.7 Examples of two types of bindery casings that can cause severe damage. These techniques are no longer practiced.
Figure 1.8 Damage resulting from brown pamphlet binder. Thick linen cuts into inner margin of the book causing pages to crease and detach.

Figure 1.9 The current technique used for pamphlet binders corrects the problems encountered by previous techniques.

Monographs that get re-cased at the bindery are often chopped at the spine and glued, called a double-fan adhesive binding, creating a flat rather than curved spine (figure 1.11). The glue can
seep through too far along the inner margin, which can interfere with content on the pages (figure 1.12). Ever since UCLA hired a Conservator to oversee techniques used to repair materials, including the bindery’s methods, a more concerted effort has emerged, whereby the Conservation Department filters materials to the bindery providing specific instructions for appropriate remedy.

One method that has led to major criticism of the commercial binderies in the past, is the method of oversewing (figure 1.10), which was the only method used in the 1970s. This method involves sewing over the textblock from the front to the back, rather than through the folds in the

---

signatures. Doing so severely limits the inner margin of every page in the book and leads to pages detaching when opened against the double folded, thick linen spine lining.

Figure 1.11 Example of a book that has had its sewing chopped and repaired with a double-fanned adhesive binding and bindery casing.

Figure 1.12 A book that has been rebound and glued such that the inner margins of the initial pages are impinged.
Another common “preservation remedy” that became the accepted practice for efficiency and economy, in the second half of the twentieth century, is to rebind books with two pieces of cardboard and glued spine cloth, as is the case for the Panorama Folklore pictured below (figure 1.13).

![Figure 1.13](image-url) A common repair in which a book is removed from its original casing, glued into a cheap casing made up of exposed binder board and spine buckram cloth, and chopped at all edges.

The buckram spine cloth attaching exposed binder board is an extremely cheap and quick method of casing in a text block. It does not, however, protect the pages nor does it enable functionality. Often these materials restrict the opening of the book, close to the spine. This technique usually leads to loss of visibility to content on the inner margin, as well. In addition to the damage caused by the staples and the content that gets obscured in the inside margin, much like that of the commercial bindery casings, the stock of the cloth is thicker than most papers and the paper breaks along the crease from opening against a hard edge. This is also a significant problem in bindery casings and has the most devastating effects on books with brittle paper.

The paperback book pictured below in figure 1.14, is in its original casing and was most likely spared from the bindery due to its irregular size as well as having text close to the inner margin, which the bindery cannot accept since there is not enough room to chop the spine and glue.
it back. These issues, perceived as problems in the past, actually protected books from bindery damage. *Performing Change* is an example of a nearly scarce paperback that does not appear “special” in its artifactual value, but may become so, at some point in the future.

**Figure 1.14** A nearly scarce book titled *Performing Change* in its original paperback format.

The book entitled *Traditions: The Folklore of Women and Children in Kuwait* (figures 1.15 and 1.16) is in its original paperback format. The title page for this book shows that the pages are stapled together (figure 1.15). The format of this book is an example of another scarce book that does not fit into traditional guidelines of value for special collections. Looking forward, these are the sorts of materials that may offer very specialized and unique information.
Figure 1.15 Title page of a scarce book titled *Traditions: The Folklore of Women and Children in Kuwait*, in its original paperback format.

Figure 1.16 Illustration from *Traditions: The Folklore of Women and Children in Kuwait*. 
Figure 1.17 provides another example of a scarce book that is potentially at risk of extinction. *The Woman of Nam Xuong* is one of four copies listed in Worldcat, three of which are in Southern California. This book is scarce, provides local history of the large Vietnamese community of Southern California, and supports UCLA’s Southeast Asian collection. Therefore, there should be some kind of special attention given to it to ensure its survival. Based on Candace Yano’s projections, this book would not survive in 100 years with only four circulating copies.

Although it is far more time consuming, the book shown below (figure 1.18) is an example of a reback, though it is not from the scarce materials surveyed. With the reback technique the original boards and spine label are retained but new spine linings are added. This method is used in the UCLA Library Conservation Lab Materials for circulating and special collections materials. Special collections materials are more likely to be rebound with materials that match the original binding in color and texture, however in circulating collections there are not always the same materials from which to choose. Additionally, when a book is the last copy, it is unknown to the conservation technician since there is no documentation of this sort in the catalog for circulating materials.
Figure 1.18 The copy of *Lessons from the Beyond* repaired in UCLA’s Library Conservation Lab using the reback method of spine repair, less invasive than the bindery case.

There is a lot to be gained from continued item-level surveys, especially in large research libraries like UCLA where it is easy to lose sight of the granularity of individual items, due to the immense size of a collection that is spread out among numerous buildings and campuses. The two monographs below (figure 1.19 and 1.20) offer an example of the some of the tendencies about which librarians need more awareness. *The King of the Snakes* (figure 1.19) is an example of a monograph in this survey that appears aesthetically striking and exhibits a kind of antique charm to which book lovers are attracted. However, according to Worldcat’s holdings data, this monograph is far from scarce; clearly it pleased so many librarians, just based on its cover art, that its survival is not only guaranteed, but guaranteed to be excessively held.
Figure 1.19 The King of the Snakes is an example of a book surveyed that is widely held and in its original casing.

_South Slavonic Folklore Stories_ translated from Karol Jaromir Erben's "A Hundred Genuine Popular Slavonic Fairy Stories in the Original Dialects," was published in 1899, later reformatted to microfilm, and then photocopied and bound (figure 1.20) in the college reader or thesis transcript format. It turns out that this copy is the only one in the West Coast and one of six in the United States. It can be argued that this work holds artifactual value because of the number of different media it has passed through. Unfortunately, it can also be argued that anyone looking at the catalog entry in Worldcat is likely to be fooled into thinking that UCLA has a copy from 1899, in its original form.

Figure 1.20 A scarce monograph called _South Slavonic Folklore Stories_ that was microfilmed from the original and then reprinted as a photocopy and cheaply bound.
One of the unforeseen findings of this study is that, of the roughly ten scarce monographs that showed such poor condition as to require treatment at the Conservation Lab, only one was sent for treatment. The rest were returned to general circulation. One monograph that is not scarce, but part of the sample, called *Ghost Stories of Hollywood*, contains evidence of mold (figure 1.21). This monograph did not get sent to the Conservation Lab either. If it had been, the moldy material would have been rerouted to the Preservation Department to review its holdings and determine whether it required replacement or withdrawal from the collection.

Figure 1.21 *Ghost Stories of Hollywood* was returned to YRL with evidence of previous mold.

**CONCLUSION**

The preliminary work for this project made apparent some of the difficulties connected to working in such an enormous system as UCLA coupled with an immensely large collection to pool from and obtaining data from a shared database like Worldcat that is constantly changing. The damaging mistakes of previous book repair from decades past now limit books that were at one time prioritized enough to be repaired for future access and now based on these poor repairs are no longer as valuable as they would be if they were in their original form.
There are a few major findings that emerged from this study. Worldcat data yields the finding that 400 of the 465 monographs surveyed (86 percent) are neither scarce nor nearly scarce, with 27 or more copies reported in Worldcat. Only five percent of the surveyed Folklore monographs were deemed scarce, with 12 or fewer copies reported in Worldcat. Although this percentage accounts for only 23 of the 465 monographs, this percentage becomes a massively daunting figure when applied to all of UCLA’s roughly nine million volumes (450,000 scarce monographs), or Worldcat’s 2008 holdings of roughly 650 million volumes (32 million scarce monographs).

Another major finding of this study is that older materials published before 1950 are more likely to be rebound at UCLA. This intervention is therefore likely to have affected the condition and function of a majority of all older materials that have not been transferred to Special Collections, where they would be protected from the ravages of crude intervention. Additionally, this study finds that of the 16 scarce monographs (70 percent), the majority had interventions with a clearly negative impact on the condition of the materials. While it is difficult to draw final conclusions from the small sample size, it should still be noted that the intention of these interventions was to preserve the artifacts. It is disheartening and ironic that librarians have had a negative impact on the condition of the materials that they are charged with preserving. In spite of small sample sizes, the author’s experience strongly suggests that this study’s tentative conclusions would hold true for a much larger sample size.

Finally, unlike materials in Special Collections, the items in circulating collections are not likely to be rebound with matching materials, cloth color, etc. Special Collections materials are not sent to the bindery and the standards of conservation are of a much higher quality. Since damage is rampant in the circulating collection, the findings of this study call for much greater attention.
Based on the findings of this study a number of challenges emerge, each one requiring recommendations for future remedy. This study barely scratches the surface of a number of large issues. It is obvious that new ideas and more studies are needed to develop pragmatic approaches to identifying, handling, and storing scarce materials. A starting point might be to find ways to identify the physical condition of materials in their records. For example, Jacob Nadal has opened up the discussion among preservation librarians to include the condition of materials in the 583 field of the MARC record. Without such condition notes it is difficult to imagine that decisions regarding retention of materials could be made by Subject Specialists without the book in hand. The lists generated by the LIT Department of materials that have not circulated in the past three years do not include any condition information and do not reflect an appropriate time frame to determine whether a book has become obsolete or not. Use of a monograph can no longer be determined by the number of times it is checked out and so circulation data on recent use should not decide whether or not a book provides research value in the future.

Preservationists must advocate to administrations to address the needs of these “medium rare” items. For example, a plan could be devised for undergraduates and other users to be simply and briefly trained by Wil Lin, the UCLA Conservation Technician, on how to identify materials that should be sent to the Conservation Lab at little or no extra cost (see Appendix 2 for example of such documentation used by Cornell University Libraries). The Conservation Lab is likely to be overwhelmed by an inundation of needy materials if undergraduates start identifying and sending more books to the lab. However, without this increase in conservation workflow, one cannot adequately demonstrate such true and dire needs to the administration. It will be crucial for library conservators and technicians to be made aware of last copies when these materials are assessed for repair. Ultimately, this must lead to a wider understanding that preservation of scarce materials is fundamental to the larger missions of the institution. Furthermore, the broader community of
libraries, is counting on institutions like UCLA to fulfill their responsibilities as a Level 5 library Collection.

In light of the overcrowded and backlogged Special Collections, limited storage, and budget limitations, the results of this study lead to the inevitably difficult questions that librarians must face. For example, it is necessary to reconsider definitions of “special” materials despite poor condition. The primary challenge for librarians charged with preserving these materials is to find new ideas that will allow for pragmatic approaches for their identification and optimal handling/storage. Without adequate resources, scarce materials needing repair could at least be sent to SRLF and/or the materials could be placed in a box or protective mylar jacket. ARLs will benefit from giving attention to this issue of unique print culture since the affects could include: removing unnecessary materials to make room for increasing collections by either moving them to special collections or SRLF or discarding abundant books. Such books should be identified so that they may be protected better in special collections, procedures implemented for librarians to recognize such scarce books, and provide more access to such obscurities digitally for researchers while preserving the integrity of the print copy in a shared print repository.

Initially, this study sought out to examine the “hidden treasures” in large research libraries that have artifactual value. However, it soon became apparent that this approach assumes a framework that, frankly, is ultimately based on monetary value and one which definitely judges books by their covers. Furthermore, beyond the broad conclusions from the data collected in this survey, it is a problem that the only criteria that exist for policy and procedures for high quality preservation for special collections are based on monetary attributes that favor scarce materials in good condition. This is, of course, reasonable to strive toward. It is problematic to ignore a large population of materials based on their poor condition, when the results are self fulfilling prophesies of further deterioration because the non-“beautiful books” cannot be given adequate attention.
Without discussions based on the real demand for care of this collection, the library’s Conservation Lab cannot fulfill the mission of the library to preserve the collections for which they are responsible. The solutions based on the very real budgetary restrictions, should not interfere with the quality of treatment. Research libraries like UCLA must remind themselves that their mission is not just an abstract concept. The entire library system of the nation (and beyond) relies on ARLs like UCLA to preserve and protect collections for the collective good and for the long term.

As previously noted, although ARLs are trusted stewards to preserve their collections, the logistics involved in caring for these scarce materials are compromised when the need for physical intervention outweighs what is currently feasible for most preservation departments. The challenges and solutions are based on very real budgetary restrictions and administrative complications. Nonetheless, such real world difficulties must not interfere with the quality of treatment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Damage</th>
<th>Needs Repair?</th>
<th>Previous Repair?</th>
<th>Damage caused by intervention</th>
<th>Binding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gr 355.6 n44</td>
<td>grand narratives of the great lakes region of Africa</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>yes staples, minimal</td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 313 v53</td>
<td>vietnamese folktales</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>acidic paper</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>Brown pam causing damage</td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 305 v4813</td>
<td>bai tal pachchisi</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td></td>
<td>og</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 313 p546</td>
<td>Thụ thọ Namin Xuong = The woman of Nam Xuong</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staples, minimal; scotch tape over staples; green spine pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 455 c67w</td>
<td>world-wide concepts on the after-life and the destiny of the dead</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>Brown pam causing damage</td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 351.3 a58</td>
<td>marriage of the palm tree and other stories</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>n yes</td>
<td>green spine pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 133 g8a44</td>
<td>amerindian stories</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>Brown pam causing damage pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 181 m43</td>
<td>the flying dutchman and other folktales from the Netherlands</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>n n</td>
<td></td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 313 p544</td>
<td>a fairy named giang kieu folktales of vietnam</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>staples, minimal; scotch tape over staples; green spine pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 178 p96i</td>
<td>introduction to maltese folklore</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>page mending; acidic paper</td>
<td>yes pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 312 m28</td>
<td>thai folktales</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>no n</td>
<td></td>
<td>paperback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 295 k38m38</td>
<td>traditions the folklore of women and children in kuwait</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>no n</td>
<td>maybe staples in back?</td>
<td>paperback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 121 s23m38</td>
<td>the folklore of st christopher's island</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>Brown pam causing damage pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 67 r78</td>
<td>horn dance or stag night?</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>no y</td>
<td>staples, minimal; scotch tape over staples; green spine pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 355.2 c35ec27</td>
<td>baladi women</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>no n</td>
<td>bindry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 141 a57n</td>
<td>the new fairy book</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>page mending; acidic paper; missing initial pages? yes yes</td>
<td>bindry; cut and glued bindry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 365.5 p47</td>
<td>performing change</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>no no</td>
<td></td>
<td>paperback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 25 f62r</td>
<td>round the world in folk tales</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>no yes</td>
<td>bindry; cut and glued bindry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 118 p261e</td>
<td>panama folklore</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>bindry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 259 e65s</td>
<td>south slavonic folk-lore stories</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>photocopy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 830 h12d</td>
<td>dragons and dragon slayers</td>
<td>n.d.</td>
<td>prevent yes</td>
<td>bindry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 138 k54</td>
<td>slavic mythical beliefs</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>loose pages. yes no</td>
<td></td>
<td>og</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr 225 t62je</td>
<td>giants and trolls in sweden</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>yes yes</td>
<td>pamphlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 – Examples from Cornell University Library’s Policies for consideration of potential strategies.

Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections
Policy on Transfer of General Collection Material to Special Collections
Cornell University Library's policy on the transfer of materials to special collections is adapted from national guidelines developed by the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association: Guidelines on the Selection of General Collection Materials for Transfer to Special Collections. 2nd Edition (Rev), 1999.

Research universities carry significant responsibilities for preserving the printed heritage under their care. Cornell University Library takes this responsibility seriously, and is committed to providing adequate protection and security for all its historic materials. Virtually all academic libraries acquire books and documents, which, with time, and regardless of intention, become rare. These materials acquire cultural and historical value, and sometimes a significant financial value in the marketplace, as well.

This policy will guide Cornell library staff in their responsibility to identify rare and valuable materials in general and open stack collections and to arrange for their transfer to the greater security of special collections.

I. Identification of Material
As appropriate, library units should inventory their general collections to identify materials appropriate for transfer to a special collections facility.

Rare material also should be identified for transfer during routine handling and review as part of the following library functions: acquisition; gifts and exchange; cataloging and retrospective conversion; preservation and conservation; duplication; circulation; inventorying and shelf reading; interlibrary loan; preparation of exhibitions; weeding; searching of dealer catalogs. Transfer candidates identified during these functions will be sent to special collections for review by knowledgeable staff.

II. Selection Criteria
Cornell Library uses the following criteria to identify general collections material appropriate for transfer to special collections:

1. Age - All materials printed before 1850, regardless of form or condition, must be provided with secure, climate-controlled storage and monitored reading room access. In addition, materials printed after 1850 will be considered for transfer if any of the following criteria are met:

   a. fine bindings;
   b. books with valuable prints or original photographs;
   c. publishers' bindings up to 1920;
   d. extra-illustrated volumes;
   e. books with significant provenance (e.g., signed by the author);
   f. books with decorated endpapers; g. fine printing; h. printing on vellum or highly unusual paper;
   i. volumes or portfolios containing unbound plates;
   j. books with valuable maps or plates; k. broadsides, posters and printed ephemera;
   l. books by local authors of particular note;
   m. material requiring security (e.g., books in unusual formats, erotica or materials that are
difficult to replace);
n. miniature books (10 centimeters or smaller);
o. 20th century literary works with intact dust wrappers.

3. Condition Age itself often will determine whether a book is "rare," while condition is usually more important in judging more recent material. All values of the book--scholarly, artificial, bibliographical, and market--may be greatly affected by condition. Copies that are badly worn, much repaired or rebound, are not generally included in rare book collections, unless the age of the material preempts condition as a criterion. The durability of most documents produced since the mid-nineteenth century has declined drastically. It is now increasingly difficult to locate even representative examples of many nineteenth- and twentieth-century printing and binding processes in fine original condition. So many volumes have required rebinding, for example, that the richness of the original decorative art applied to bindings and printed endpapers is increasingly difficult to find and study. Dust jackets frequently contain important information (e.g., text, illustrative design, and price), and their presence greatly affects both the market and research value of 20th century books.

4. Bibliographical, Research or Market Value The rarity or importance of individual books is not always self-evident. Some books, for example, were produced in circumstances which virtually guarantee their rarity (e.g. Confederate imprints). Factors affecting importance and rarity can include the following:

a. desirability to collectors and the antiquarian book trade;
b. intrinsic or extrinsic evidence of censorship or repression;
c. seminal nature or importance to a particular field of study or genre of literature;
d. restricted or limited publication;
e. cost of acquisition.
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Cornell University: Post-Circulation Examination

After circulation, before re-shelving, all books should be examined by circulation staff so that damaged and/or deteriorated items may be sent to B31 Olin Library for daily inspection by staff of the Preservation Department. The following points should be covered during the examination, which, with a little experience, may be done fairly quickly.

1. Binding:
   a. Is spine loose, torn, or detached?
   b. Is classification label secure and legible?
   c. Is case, or are individual boards, loose or detached?
   d. If boxed, check condition of box (case, portfolio, etc.) and contents.
   e. Are there loose or damaged pages?
   f. Are there loose or damaged plates or maps?

2. Paper:
   a. Is paper badly embrittled (i.e. will not withstand double corner fold)?
   b. Is paper moldy (i.e. limp with dark colored surface spotting)?
   c. Is there evidence of insect infestation (i.e. small live insects, insect eggs, or worm-like)

In the case of 2b and 2c, the book should be immediately placed in a plastic bag and twist-sealed with a rubber band and, if possible, taken directly to the Preservation Department.
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