



MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION - MIDWEST CHAPTER

NEWSLETTER

SPRING 1984

THE 1983 MIDWEST CHAPTER MEETING

The Midwest Chapter held its annual meeting in Chicago, October 13-15, 1983. It was attended by 75 individuals. Karen Nagy chaired the Program and Local Arrangements Planning Group, which included Janice Das (American Conservatory), Lauren Dennhardt (American Conservatory), Don Draganski (Roosevelt University - Chicago Musical College), Peter Eisenberg (Vandercook College of Music), Dena Epstein (University of Chicago), Rosalinda Hack (Chicago Public Library), Diana Haskell (Newberry Library), Richard Griscom (Northwestern University), Don Roberts (Northwestern University), Charles Simpson (University of Illinois, Chicago), and Richard Schwegel (Chicago Public Library).

The meeting began early on Thursday, with open sessions presented by several of the Chapter committees and working groups. In the afternoon, Mary Lynn Ritzen-thaler (Society of American Archivists) presented a workshop entitled "Preserving Musical Materials." Although focusing on paper materials, the workshop also touched on preservation of recorded sound. An especially appreciated feature of the workshop was the "hands-on" experience with preservation techniques, from removing pencil marks from paper, to repairing damaged paper, to encapsulation techniques. A reception followed in the rotunda of the Chicago Public Library Cultural Center which featured buffet hors d'oeuvres and music performed by a student string quartet from Northwestern University.

On Friday, Richard Jones (University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee) chaired a session on research in music librarianship. Jaclyn Facinelli (University of Akron) read a paper entitled "A Study on Teaching Music Bibliography," and Peggy Daub (University of Michigan) read "An Experiment in Cooperation: the RLG Music Program Committee." John Druessedow (Oberlin Conservatory) and Richard Griscom (Northwestern University) discussed the uses of microcomputers in music libraries with John reporting on several useful commercial programs and Richard discussing several applications developed at Northwestern. The audience joined in a lively discussion of other uses and a call was made for developing a clearinghouse for computer applications, both to avoid duplication of efforts and to coordinate the development of similar projects. (*Texts or summaries of the above papers appear later in this Newsletter.*)

Following a coffee break, Thomas K. Willis, former music critic for the *Chicago Tribune* and currently Concert Manager of the Pick-Staiger Concert Hall, delivered the keynote address, "Toddlin' On: a Few Words about Chicago's Musical Scene."

After the chapter luncheon and business meeting, participants were treated to tours of the major music libraries in Chicago. Among those visited were: the Newberry Library, American Library Association headquarters, American Conservatory Library, Chicago Musical College Library (Roosevelt University), Chicago Public Library Fine Arts Division, Northwestern University Music Library, Regenstein Library Music Department (University of Chicago), and the music library of radio station WFMT.

CHAPTER MEETING (Continued)

On Saturday morning, Don Roberts (Northwestern University) moderated the second formal session "The Disc Still Spins." Kurtz Myers (Record Review Editor, *Notes*) discussed compiling the "Index to Record Reviews" and Stephen Ellis, author and reviewer for *Fanfare*, expounded on "Songs My Schwann Never Taught Me: the Back Alleys of Disc Availability." Arne Arneson (University of Wisconsin - Madison) spoke on "State of the Art: the Quest for User Friendly Audio Hardware" and Rich Warren (producer at WFMT) discussed "Compact Discs." This concluding session left all of us with much to consider about the future of recording technology in music libraries, but also with a feeling that it is a field we can handle with thought and confidence.

(Editor's note: *This summary of the Chapter meeting was based on the Annual Report of the Midwest Chapter, prepared by Richard Jones.*)

FROM THE CHAIR:

Greetings from the Chair! I hope that many of you are looking forward to the fall meeting in Cincinnati as much as I am. As a former resident of southwestern Ohio (Oxford), I came to appreciate Cincinnati as one of the finest cultural centers in the Midwest, and I believe it can lay claim to some of the most renowned restaurants in these parts. It has had, as many of you know, a distinguished musical history -- Stephen Foster, Theodore Thomas, the May Festival, the Cincinnati Conservatory of Music, the Cincinnati Symphony, James Levine, etc., etc. (see vol. 4, pp. 404-406, of *The New Grove* for an article by Samuel F. Pogue) -- and continues to command attention in the musical world. I know that Rick Jones, who chairs the Program Committee, and Mark Palkovic, who is handling the local arrangements, are putting together a memorable program for us. Please mark the dates of October 11-13 on your calendars. If memory serves me, we haven't met in Cincinnati since the fall of 1973, so it will be good to renew acquaintances and review the old landmarks.

On a different subject, I am glad to report that the Nominations Committee (Linda Hack, Karen Griffith, and Arne Arneson) as well as the Bylaws Committee (Tom Heck, Gordon Rowley, Phyllis Schoonover, and Richard Griscom) are off and running. And the Membership Committee (presently consisting of Susan Lundell and Marty Rubin) will be looking for ways to attract new members to the organization, particularly those within the tri-state area surrounding Cincinnati who would be within a short driving distance. I should mention at this point that any of you who may be interested in membership on a committee should let me know in the near future -- before the end of this month if at all possible. I think we may have room on several of our committees, and I can think of one in particular, the Publications Committee, where one or more volunteers would be especially welcome.

Have a wonderful spring and a pleasant summer!

--John E. Druessedow, Jr.
Oberlin College
Chairperson, MLA/Midwest Chapter

MLA Midwest Chapter Financial Report
Dec. 31, 1982 to Post-Meeting 1984

Checking Account Balance on Hand, December 31, 1982 \$1066.46

Receipts

1983 Chapter Meeting
Registration (71 @ \$7.50) \$ 531.50
Luncheon (54 @ \$9.50) \$ 513.00
Workshop Registration (20 @ \$5.00) \$ 100.00
Dues \$ 349.00

Dues paid separately before and after Chapter Meeting \$ 375.00

Gifts \$ 175.00

Total Receipts \$2043.50

Disbursements

Dues/Membership Notices
Photocopying \$ 14.40
Postage \$ 17.32

2 Chapter Newsletters
Photocopying \$ 271.45
Mailing Labels \$ 45.43
Postage \$ 137.25

Reprinting of Bibliographic Instruction Brochure \$ 26.78

Chapter Meeting
Bismarck Hotel - Luncheon, Rooms & Coffee & Rolls \$1019.36
Photocopying \$ 113.63
Workshop
Supplies \$ 385.44
Presentors \$ 125.00
Reception \$ 133.27
Programs \$ 23.70
Miscellaneous supplies \$ 40.88

Supplies \$ 13.38

Total Disbursements \$2417.30

Checking Account Balance on Hand, February 15, 1984 \$692.66

Savings Account Balance on Hand, February 15, 1984 \$447.13

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION - MIDWEST CHAPTER

COMMITTEE REPORTS

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON THE PRESERVATION OF MUSIC MATERIALS AND RECORDINGS

At their first meeting last October (1982), the Working Group on the Preservation of Music Materials and Recordings established goals and discussed activities appropriate for our local chapter. Ideas were sent on to the national committee on preservation to assist in the planning of the Music Preservation Workshop for the annual MLA meeting. Local members prepared a bibliography of Preservation for Music Librarians and prepared a display for the national meeting identifying some of the problems.

It was suggested that this group act as a clearinghouse and through the local chapter newsletter provide input on current trends, update bibliographies on preservation, identify rare items held in member libraries and determine responsibility to preserve a copy for the local chapter membership, in particular, 19th Century materials.

Rosalinda Hack, Chair
Debra Austin
John Druessedow
Jean Geil
Marion Korda
Deborah Pierce
Richard Jones (ex officio)

REPORT OF THE BYLAWS COMMITTEE

During the past year the committee monitored the implementation of the revised Constitution and Bylaws as adopted at the annual meeting in 1982. As far as the committee is able to ascertain, no problems arose during the implementation phase, and no specific proposals for amending the bylaws are suggested by the committee at this time. The committee would, however, recommend that in the coming year the matter of voting privileges for all membership categories be reviewed to determine whether the bylaws as adopted accurately reflect the current disposition of the membership on this point. The full text of the Constitution and Bylaws as adopted on Oct. 22, 1982, was forwarded to the chapter Secretary-Treasurer for duplication and distribution.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon Rowley, Chair
David Fenske
Richard Jones (ex officio)
Connie Nisbet Field

REPORT OF THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Excepting a reprinting of the chapter's directory of bibliographic instruction programs, the Publication Committee has no activities to report for the preceding year. No proposals for chapter publications have been submitted by the membership.

Currently the committee consists only of myself. During the past year I have not had the time to devote to active solicitation of manuscripts or development of projects, as my energies in this area have been consumed by similar responsibilities in my capacity as editor of the MLA Technical Reports. For this reason, I hope that a new committee chairperson can be recruited soon, though I would be willing to continue as a member of the committee under a new chair.

Michael Fling

REPORT OF THE CATALOGING COMMITTEE

The committee's activities this year centered on reviewing LC AACR2 rule interpretations and LC policies on analytics for sound recordings. We have corresponded on these matters during the year and by the end of our meeting in Chicago, or soon thereafter, we hope to have some resolutions to present to the MLA AACR2 subcommittee. LC interpretations for AACR2 rules 21.7B, 21.7C, 21.23C, 25.35 and 25.36 are our current focus of attention. These all deal with collections and the extent to which access points should be provided. Also, LC now has stopped providing full analysis for certain kinds of recordings (operatic recitals, organ music collections, collections of instrumental arrangements, etc.). This change in policy has not been announced in the Music Cataloging Bulletin. Some committee members, but not all, are concerned about this development. It will be discussed at the committee's meeting in Chicago.

Ralph Papakhian, Chair
Connie Field
Elizabeth Knowles
Barbara Strauss
Richard B. Wursten
Richard Jones (ex officio)

FROM THE SECRETARY-TREASURER:

Those Chapter members who have not paid their Chapter dues through this academic year (1983-84) will receive a separate statement along with this NEWSLETTER indicating the amount of back dues owed the Chapter. If you find no additional statement in your Newsletter, you can assume that you have paid your dues and are in good standing with the Chapter!!

CALL FOR PAPERS / CALL FOR PAPERS / CALL FOR PAPERS / CALL FOR PAPERS / CALL FOR PAPERS

Plans for the 1984 annual meeting of the Midwest Chapter MLA, to be held 11-13 October in Cincinnati, are well underway. We believe it will be an interesting, exciting, and valuable meeting for everyone. Beginning at about Noon on Thursday, the Cataloging Committee will present a special workshop on subject access to music and music books. Although this is being presented by the Cataloging Committee, the aim of the workshop will be for everyone concerned with access to music--both public and technical services librarians, both music specialists and those who deal with music only peripherally or occasionally. The presentations will review the basics of subject control and proceed through very specific topics, such as ethnic musics, new subdivisions, etc. Also on Thursday, several of the other Chapter committees will hold open meetings.

Friday morning will begin with presentations on music in Cincinnati and current research in music librarianship and bibliography. Anyone with a proposal for a paper should contact Richard Jones, Program Chn. (4333 N. Marlborough Drive, Shorewood, WI 53211). The afternoon session, after the Chapter Luncheon and Business Meeting, will feature a presentation sponsored by the Bibliographic Instruction Committee: Virginia Tiefel, Chair of the BIS Research Committee Subcommittee on Evaluation, will present a session on evaluating bibliographic instruction programs.

Saturday morning we are planning a session which should be of interest to all music librarians: Time Management for Music Librarians. How many times have you wished for a 72-hour day? or thought, if only the patrons weren't here, I could get my work done?, etc. These and similar topics will be addressed by a professional in the field at our Saturday morning session.

All in all, we believe this will be a very important Chapter meeting and we hope to see all of you there. Don't forget to send proposals for research papers to Richard Jones as soon as possible (deadline 25 July).

--Richard Jones, Program Chairperson

MLA Midwest Chapter Officers

Chairperson:

John Druessedow
Conservatory Library
Oberlin College
Oberlin, OH
(216) 775-8280

Past-Chairperson:

Richard E. Jones
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
P.O. Box 604
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414) 963-5529

Secretary-Treasurer:

Susan Lundell
College Conservatory Library
404 Blegen
M.L. 152
University of Cincinnati
Cincinnati, OH 45220
(513) 475-4471

Newsletter Editor:

Karen Nagy
Northwestern University Music Library
1935 Sheridan Rd.
Evanston, IL
(312) 492-3434

NEWS & NOTES

Constitution Available...

Copies of the Constitution and Bylaws, revised in 1982, were distributed at the Fall 1983 Chapter Meeting. If you did not attend that meeting and would like to have a copy of the Chapter's current Constitution and Bylaws, you can obtain one by writing to the Secretary/Treasurer (see address on p. 6).

News of Members...

Arne Arneson (University of Wisconsin-Madison), Richard Jones (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), and Karen Nagy (Northwestern University) have been elected to a 2-year term (1984-86) as members-at-large on the Board of Directors of the Music Library Association. With Jean Geil and Gordon Rowley already on MLA's Board (1983-85), the strong Midwest vote is apparent in the national organization!!

SALE SALE SALE SALE SALE...

Some preservation/conservation supplies were left over after the Workshop at the Fall 1983 Chapter Meeting. We now offer the following supplies to members of the Chapter at reduced prices:

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Skum-X Cleaning Pads (3) | \$2.00 |
| Metal-edge Rulers (10) | \$.50 |
| Bone Folders (11) | \$2.00 |
| Rolls of Double-Stick Tape (8) 1/4 in. wide | \$1.00 |
| Magic Rub Erasers (5) | \$.40 |
| Mylar sheets (12 X 14 in.) for encapsulation | \$.25 for 10 sheets |

The numbers in parentheses indicate how many of each item we have. If you are interested in purchasing any of the above supplies, please request them from Karen Nagy (address on p. 6) and make your check payable to MLA-Midwest Chapter. Please add \$.50 for postage if you order is over \$2.00.

BI Publications...

There are still some copies left of *A Directory of Music Instruction Programs in the Midwest*. They are free for the asking from either Susan Lundell or Karen Nagy (see addresses on p. 6).

* "Music Students and Bibliography Instruction: A Study" *
* by Jaclyn Facinelli, University of Akron *

Introduction

Music students typically encounter a multitude of literature when formal study begins at a university or college. Characteristic music students may fail to have proper library orientation or instruction which provide an acquaintance with materials and the skills to use them.

Literature of academic bibliography instruction has been growing over the years, and varied and creative programs are now being tried at many institutions. (Krier, 1976, p. 7)

National recognition of the importance of music bibliography instruction has produced instruction standards. These standards have been listed and developed by such organizations as Project Loex, a clearing house for academic library orientation and instruction materials at Eastern Michigan University, the Music Library Association Midwest Chapter Bibliographic Instruction Committee, and ACRL Bibliographic Instruction Section and the American Library Instruction Round Table. In this study national bibliographic instruction standards formed the foundation for materials used and methods taught in the music bibliography classes.

A review of the literature shows that specific course related instruction (bibliography courses versus instruction in music literature, history or theory classes), often has the most success and that measurement of the results is absolutely essential (Jennerich and Smith, 1979, p. 226). Once bibliographic instruction has been incorporated into a curriculum of a discipline it may be easier to convince students that the library is an essential component of their academic study. A review of lecture and lecture-worksheet methods of bibliography instruction has been examined in this study. This was an endeavor to expand and strengthen an existing music bibliography program at a major Midwestern university. In this program, bibliography courses called "Research in Music," and Graduate Music Bibliography" were taught in a strict lecture method. As an experiment, classes were divided into lecture groups and lecture-worksheet groups, then tested to determine the effectiveness of each method.

The music library in many universities typically exists as a facility in the music building. It functions as a curriculum center for music scores, recordings, and a basic reference collection. Microfilm, periodicals and journals, indexes, biographies, style guides, computer searches and directories are housed in the main library. This, since the music materials are separated, course instruction has attempted to cover materials in both libraries, showing the student the necessity of using both source areas for research.

Procedures

The music bibliography instruction program was divided into three sections: freshman orientation, undergraduate course instruction, and graduate course instruction. Freshmen make up one-third of the music classes and all take a basic music literature course that includes an orientation session in the music library provided by the music librarian. The class of approximately

120 students was divided into sections of 10 students per orientation group. It was believed that the smaller the group, the more individual attention would be provided for each student. During this one hour of instruction, types of holdings were explained and call numbers, tracings, subject headings and card catalog information were emphasized. A handout of an annotated basic reference guide was given to all students with an explanation of the materials. The objectives of the orientation were to teach the music students the location and holdings of the music library as well as how to use the card catalog and other reference tools. No testing was carried out with the orientation students.

"Research in Music", the undergraduate course in music bibliography, was a two-credit class with prerequisites of one year of "Music Literature" and "Music Theory." Mostly sophomores took this course. The class met for two hours per week for one semester. During the semester oral reports, reading assignments in Watanabe's *Introduction to Music Research*, and Duckles' *Music Reference and Research Materials*, and a term paper were assigned. Music sources such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, directories, biographies and bibliographies were emphasized as well as a review of the card catalog, and library terminology. Use and explanation of several style manuals were stressed including proper procedures for researching a subject and writing a paper. The objectives of the course were to teach students how to use the library effectively, how to write a research paper and how to use several types of research materials.

Graduate students took "Graduate Music Bibliography," a two-credit course that met for two hours per week for one semester. Class requirements included oral reports, reading assignments in *General Bibliography for Music Research* by Mixer, selected sections of Duckles' *Music Reference and Research Materials*, and Phelps' *A Guide to Research in Music Education*, as well as an annotated bibliography and a term paper. Students were obligated to complete an undergraduate music degree before taking this course and to have some knowledge of the library and basic music reference tools. Sources that included music topics such as International Indexes and bibliographies were emphasized in the graduate-level course, subjects heretofore not covered in lower level bibliography course work.

Objectives of the course instruction were to impart knowledge of advanced level reference sources, and to instruct students in the skill of writing a well-rounded, documented paper. Sources including music and non-music subjects were investigated to emphasize the importance of outside influences on any music subject.

Subjects tested were undergraduate and graduate female and male music majors randomly selected from "Research in Music" and "Graduate Music Bibliography" classes held in a large Midwestern university. Subjects were randomly assigned to one of four groups: lecture or lecture-worksheet, undergraduate and graduate sections. Groups contained 10 subjects. These students were pretested and then posttested after a lecture or lecture and worksheet exercise. Worksheets reflected class discussions, (see appendices B and D). Each group was given the pretest and then taken to the music library or main library for a lecture and discussion period with audio-visual aids. At the end of each discussion period, students in the lecture group were given a posttest to determine what was learned, and students in the lecture-worksheet group were given a worksheet to complete. The lecture-worksheet group was posttested during the beginning of the following class period. Worksheets were completed by the students outside of class time and returned to the professor for grading before the next class period. The professor returned the worksheets to the students after the posttest was administered.

Subjects such as approaches to music research, library terminology, use of the library, dictionaries, style manuals, encyclopedias, bibliographies, indexes, bibliographies, catalogs and periodicals were covered in the pretests, posttests and worksheets, (see appendices A through D).

All test questions reflected research knowledge needed by students to successfully use the library and library materials. The worksheets paralleled class discussions.

Undergraduate students were also instructed in the use of basic music sources. Although graduate students were taught about complex music sources and large indexes that included music subjects, it was felt that the undergraduate students had enough to comprehend. Graduate students were expected to have some knowledge of music sources and also to expand their research projects into areas that influences or were influenced by their research.

Pretests and posttests were administered five times during a 15 week term. Subjects that were in the lecture-worksheets groups were also given five worksheets to complete. This program was repeated using the same worksheets, pretests, and posttests with new subjects in identical bibliography classes.

Subjects tested were divided into groups of 10 students because of the naturally small class sizes. Music History, Music Theory and Applied Music Performance Majors were the only students required to enroll in the music bibliography classes. Since such major were small in number, classes were also small. Education Majors could have taken either course as an elective, but due to scheduling conflicts this was almost an impossibility.

Scores from a population of 80 students were analyzed in the following manner: (1) pretest and posttest means were attained for each group; (2) comparisons between pretests of the lecture groups were achieved through use of the t-test on dependent means; (3) comparisons between pretests of the lecture-worksheets groups were accomplished through the use of the t-test on dependent means; (4) comparisons between posttests of the lecture groups were attained through the use of a t-test on dependent means; (5) using a t-test on dependent means comparisons between posttests of the lecture-worksheets groups was accomplished; (6) comparisons between the pretests and posttests for all groups was attained through the use of the t-test on dependent means; (7) lecture-worksheets group scores on pretests and posttests were compared with the lecture group scores by use of the t-test on independent means.

Results

Testing determined that worksheets and discussion classes led to more successful learning on undergraduate and graduate levels.

The average posttest scores of the lecture-worksheets groups were considerably higher than the groups that had no worksheets or discussion periods, (see tables 1-4).

TABLE 1
Means of pretests and posttests undergraduate lecture groups

| Groups | Pretests | Posttests |
|--------|----------|-----------|
| A | 62 | 80 |
| B | 59.5 | 79 |

TABLE 2
Means of pretests and posttests undergraduate lecture - worksheet groups

| Groups | Pretests | Posttests |
|--------|----------|-----------|
| C | 64 | 95 |
| D | 60 | 94 |

TABLE 3
Means of pretests and posttests of Graduate lecture groups

| Groups | Pretests | Posttests |
|--------|----------|-----------|
| A | 57 | 83 |
| B | 60 | 79 |

TABLE 4
Means of pretests and posttests of Graduate lecture - worksheet groups

| Groups | Pretests | Posttests |
|--------|----------|-----------|
| C | 55 | 96 |
| D | 56 | 92 |

With the use of a t-test on dependent means, pretests of the undergraduate lecture groups were compared. There was no significant difference between test scores (see table 5). Pretests of the undergraduate lecture-worksheets groups were also compared showing no significant difference (see table 6).

TABLE 5
Pretests of Undergraduate lecture groups
alpha p = <.05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 62.10 | 0.00 | 3.20 | NS |
| B | 58.90 | | | |

TABLE 6
Pretests of undergraduate lecture - worksheet groups
alpha p = <.05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 58.70 | 0.00 | .70 | NS |
| D | 59.40 | | | |

On a graduate level, with the use of a t-test on dependent means, pretests of the lecture groups were compared showing no significant difference (see table 7). No significant difference between pretest scores of the lecture-worksheets groups was found (see table 8).

TABLE 7
Pretests of Graduate lecture groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 63.70 | 0.00 | 4.30 | NS |
| B | 59.40 | | | |

TABLE 8
Pretests of Graduate lecture - worksheet groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 54.40 | 0.00 | 1.30 | NS |
| D | 55.70 | | | |

Lecture and lecture-worksheet posttest scores on undergraduate and graduate levels were compared respectively within each group by use of the t-test on dependent means. These comparisons showed no significant change (see tables 9-12).

TABLE 9
Posttests of undergraduate lecture groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 79.90 | 0.00 | .30 | NS |
| B | 80.20 | | | |

TABLE 10
Posttests of undergraduate lecture - worksheet groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 81.80 | 0.00 | 1.30 | NS |
| D | 80.50 | | | |

TABLE 11
Posttests of Graduate lecture groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 91.70 | 0.00 | .90 | NS |
| B | 93.80 | | | |

TABLE 12
Posttests of Graduate lecture - worksheet groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 95.60 | 0.00 | 4.00 | NS |
| D | 91.60 | | | |

With the use of a t-test on dependent means, table 13-16 show comparative results of pretests and posttests on the undergraduate and graduate learning levels. Groups using the worksheets scores significantly higher than groups without the additional help.

TABLE 13
Pretests and Posttests of Undergraduate Lecture Groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 62.10 | 79.90 | 5.09 | 17.80 | .001 |
| B | 58.90 | 80.20 | 5.31 | 21.30 | .001 |

TABLE 14
Pretests and Posttests of Undergraduate Lecture-Worksheet Groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|---------------|----------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 63.70 | 94.90 | 9.72 | 31.00 | .0001 |
| D | 59.40 | 93.80 | 11.42 | 34.40 | .0001 |

TABLE 15
Pretests and Posttests of Graduate Lecture Groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 58.70 | 81.80 | 6.67 | 32.10 | .001 |
| B | 59.40 | 80.50 | 6.23 | 21.10 | .001 |

TABLE 16
Pretests and Posttests of Graduate Lecture - Worksheet Groups
alpha p = < .05

| Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|--------|---------------|----------------|-------|--------------------|--------------|
| C | 54.40 | 95.60 | 11.52 | 41.20 | .00001 |
| D | 55.70 | 91.60 | 9.03 | 35.90 | .0001 |

Using a t-test on independent means, the lecture-worksheet group scores on the pretests and posttests were compared with the lecture group scores from the undergraduate and graduate courses (see tables 17-20). The lecture-worksheet groups scores significantly higher on the posttest, thus indicating that worksheets are necessary as an aid in skill development.

TABLE 17
Pretests of Undergraduate Lecture and Lecture-Worksheet Groups
 $\alpha p \leq .05$

| Lecture Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 62.10 | 63.70 | .40 | 3.96 | NS |
| B | 58.90 | 59.40 | .12 | 4.17 | NS |

TABLE 18
Posttests of Undergraduate Lecture - Worksheet Groups
 $\alpha p \leq .05$

| Lecture Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 79.90 | 94.70 | 6.50 | 2.28 | .0001 |
| B | 80.20 | 93.80 | 5.92 | 2.30 | .001 |

TABLE 19
Pretests of Graduate Lecture and Lecture - Worksheet Groups
 $\alpha p \leq .05$

| Lecture Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 58.70 | 54.40 | .87 | 4.94 | NS |
| B | 59.40 | 55.70 | .80 | 4.65 | NS |

TABLE 20
Posttests of Graduate Lecture and Lecture-Worksheet Groups
 $\alpha p \leq .05$

| Lecture Groups | Mean Pretests | Mean Posttests | t | Standard Deviation | Significance |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|------|--------------------|--------------|
| A | 81.80 | 95.60 | 8.02 | 1.72 | .0001 |
| B | 80.50 | 91.60 | 4.61 | 2.41 | .001 |

Discussion

Students who completed the music bibliography instructional program on undergraduate and graduate levels were able to successfully locate and use materials in the main and music libraries. Their success is partly explained by the fact that library instruction is given in the courses and library use is essential for course completion. Students were given the opportunity to interact with librarians and

materials, and quickly became aware that library use is not only related to their academic discipline, but it is also a main factor in scholarly success. All work by students was graded and returned; thus the students were able to clearly see the results of their efforts. The librarian was also able to judge the effectiveness of her teaching methods and make improvements as necessary.

The lecture-worksheet groups scored significantly higher on posttests than the lecture groups. Worksheets greatly improved comprehension and therefore were viewed as the critical factor in the improvement of usage skills in music bibliography coursework.

In this study pretesting showed that the majority of music students lack exposure and experience with library materials. Although bibliography course instruction introduced the student to the library and its resources, posttests indicated that lecture instruction alone was not enough. Albert that testing units had only 10 subjects per group, all testing was duplicated with a second similar group. Results, including the duplicate testing, showed that the teaching method described in this study was successful. Learning was achieved with the addition of worksheets. Worksheets reinforced the material given during the lecture and discussion periods. Thus it would be advisable to include worksheets in any bibliography coursework.

References

- Duckles, V. H. "The Library of the Mind: Observations on the Relationship between Musical Scholarship and Bibliography." Current Thought in Musicology, September 1981, pp. 277-98.
- Jennifer, E. and Smith, B. "A Bibliographic Instruction Program in Music." College and Research Library News, May 1979, pp. 226-33.
- Kernan, H. "Forum: Bibliographic Instruction." Tennessee Librarian, 1980, 32(4), 35-37.
- Krler, Maureen. "Bibliographic Instruction: A Checklist of the Literature, 1931-1975." Reference Services Review, 1976 4, 7-12.
- Meggett, J. Music Periodical Literature: An Annotated Bibliography of Indexes and Bibliographies. New Jersey: Scarecrow, 1981.
- Palmer, Ellis. "Bibliographic Instruction." College and Research Libraries News, 1982, 43(1), 12-13.
- Simon, R. "Library Use Instruction." North Carolina Libraries, 1980 38(3), 4.
- Thackray, R. "The Fourth International ISME Seminar on Research in Music Education." Journal of Music Education (Australian), April 1975, p. 47.
- Webb, M. "Collection Development for the University and Large Research Library, More and More Versus Less and Less." In Essays Honoring Jerrold One. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1977.

Appendices

A: Pretest and posttest for "Research in Music."

1. Describe and label the parts of the following call number M 1001 .B44 Op. 55.
2. What is a main entry?
3. Draw a catalog card and label all its parts.
4. How can tracings on a library card help you find materials?
5. Why is imprint information on a catalog card important?
6. What is a uniform title, why is it useful?
7. What is the organization of the card catalog in both the main and music libraries?
8. Name the two types of cross reference cards.
9. In what order are materials housed in both libraries?
10. What is the name of the source that would help you find subject headings for materials?

B: Worksheet for "Research in Music."

1. Where are the music materials housed in both libraries?
2. Look at an author card from the card catalog and draw label all parts.
3. What are the different types of cards in the card catalog?
4. What does a recording card look like?
5. What are the three general classification letters for music?
6. Where would you find all music biographies?
7. If you are looking for all works about Debussy where in the card catalog would you look?
8. What is the uniform title for Mozart's Marriage of Figaro?
9. Pull out the Library of Congress Subject Headings source and list the subject headings given for music theory.
10. How is the card catalog set up and organized?

C: Pretest and posttest for "Graduate Music Bibliography."

1. What is a style manual, list one.
2. What is a national bibliography?
3. List one retrospective bibliography and its usage.
4. What would you use a discography for?
5. A trade bibliography contains what information?
6. What source would you use first if you had no knowledge about a subject.
7. What is a well-known periodical index on music?
8. What is RILM?
9. What is RISM?
10. Name a biography index.

D: Worksheet for "Graduate Music Bibliography."

1. Locate Kate Turabian's Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations, what is the call number, subject heading, and imprint information?
2. According to Ms. Turabian, how do you footnote a public document?
3. Locate the American Psychological Association Style Manual--how do you footnote a source using the APA style?
4. How many music entries does A World Bibliography of Bibliographies have? List five topic headings.
5. What does the Bibliographic Index contain?
6. Find the Encyclopaedia Britannica fifteenth edition. How are the thirty volumes divided, how can you use the sections?
7. What music dictionaries have signed articles?
8. Look up Vocal Pedagogy in the Music Index for the year 1982--what do you find?
9. What is the call number for J.S. Bach's Complete Works?
10. What is the most current discography--how would you find it?

* "New Experiments in Cooperation: the RLG Music Program Committee" *
* by Peggy Daub, University of Michigan *

The need for cooperation among libraries has increased with the growing economic pressures in recent years. Our optimistic beliefs in the 50's and 60's that enough money would let us get whatever our scholars needed has given way in the 70's and 80's to a more realistic view. But, in fact, few libraries have ever been in place for some time. All three of the largest networks or computer utilities in the U.S. -- OCLC, WLH, and RLIN -- were created by participating libraries because those libraries had a need to share library and computer resources. Different missions cause different needs, of course, and this paper is a brief description of how some research libraries are attempting to become stronger collectively through a close alliance, and specifically how the music branches of these libraries are experimenting with various cooperative projects.

Although "libraries" is the middle name of the Research Libraries Group, it is actually the institution (usually a university) rather than the library alone that becomes a member of the organization. The fact that the institution as a whole is committed to this alliance, and that the institutions involved are relatively homogeneous in their purposes has allowed RLG to move ahead with some kinds of cooperative ventures faster than consortiums of disparate libraries. For example, all of the members have pockets of rather old material that is important to the research of their users (or future users). The realization that there are large problems in this area came about at relatively the same time throughout the group and a consensus to put preservation issues near the top of the priorities list for RLG was soon accomplished.

The music libraries in the group have, perhaps, more differences among them than do the institutions as wholes. We serve units ranging from small departments with 20 to 30 majors emphasizing scholarly aspects of music, to large conservatory-schools of 1000 students. However, we do all try to serve research needs in at least some areas, and, as we all have experienced in meetings such as this, the commonality of experience we have day-to-day as music librarians in dealing with the practical problems of music material in libraries gives us much to say to each other regardless of the institution employing us at the moment.

HISTORY OF RLG (summarized from "An Introduction to the Research Libraries Group, Inc." c1979)

The Research Libraries Group was established in 1974 by Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the New York Public Libraries. It is owned and governed by the member institutions and is dedicated to "improving the management of the information resources necessary for the advancement of scholarship." The first focus of the program, and the one that is still most visible to overseers, was establishing a computer-based bibliographic system now known as RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network). In 1978 RLG reached an agreement with Stanford to use BALLOTS, a system for automated bibliographic control and cooperative technical services, as the basis for RLIN. Stanford became a member of RLG and host to the central staff and central computer facility. Harvard had withdrawn from the partnership by this time, but other institutions joined, making it a truly national network. RLG now has 26 members plus various institutions who participate only in certain programs but do not take part in everything. Its four major programs are:

1. Collection Management and Development
2. Shared Resources (i.e., interlibrary loan)
3. Preservation
4. Technical Systems and Bibliographic Control (RLIN)

RLG has had its share of administrative, technological, and fiscal problems in its history. A few years ago its future was quite doubtful, but the problems were resolved and at the moment it is strong.

HISTORY OF THE MUSIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Music librarians from the RLG institutions first held a meeting in early 1980 during MLA in San Antonio, and later that year a formal Music Program Committee was officially formed. It consists of one representative (usually, but not always, the music librarian) from each RLG institution which wishes to participate. The full committee meets once a year, in conjunction with the national MLA meetings, and stays in contact the rest of the year through letters and electronic mail. Late last year a steering committee was formed to keep issues moving between the annual meetings. A subcommittee to deal with the special problems of music cataloging was formed in fall 1981, and also meets in conjunction with MLA. It has worked hard advising RLG central on guides for users, proposed changes in the system (such as clustering for music), and responses to suggested changes in the MARC format for music. It is the only subject oriented cataloging group in RLG, and also answers questions from any music cataloger in the consortium.

The major area of concern for the Music Program Committee so far has been cooperative collection management and development. One of the first projects undertaken by the Committee was a compiling of lists of all serials received by the members. (In this, as in all projects, members were asked to participate as much as they were able, depending on local staffing and local situations.) A union list of titles of serials held was compiled, also giving a symbol showing how much importance each library placed on each title. Librarians were then asked to assume responsibility for certain titles. This responsibility means continuing to obtain them and make them accessible (i.e., catalog and bind). This is a small step, but in a time when many librarians are being urged to manage their serials budgets carefully, the knowledge that someone else has agreed to responsibility for a "fringe" title makes it easier for a librarian to cancel in good conscience. A similar list is now in process for monographic series.

Tied in with the idea of cooperative collection development is reciprocal access, which has been a premise of RLG from the beginning. Members agree to give each other special service and privileges in interlibrary loans as well as on-site access. (For instance, members try to five three-day turn-around time on ILL requests, and ship items UPS with no fee.) There are no differences for music libraries in this area so far, but we have discussed the idea of using tapes to inter-library loan sound recordings in much the same way that photocopies are used for journal articles. There are some copyright problems to be worked out, but it is an interesting idea that would affect all of us.

RLG in general has been very active in the area of preservation, as I mentioned earlier, but the Music Program Committee is still trying to determine how our needs should be addressed. I think we know what some of the questions are, and have held some preliminary discussions, but we haven't found answers yet. The area of preservation that I think music librarians need to be concerned with is not that of fine book conservation, but in preserving the content of an item whose importance as a physical object is minimal. For instance, when a book's intellectual content

is important, but its physical condition is awful, the common solution is to microfilm it and toss the book. Obviously, that won't work for sound recordings, and it often is not very helpful for scores, either. It's difficult to play through a microfilmed score or read it while listening to a recording. Paper copies can be made from a film, of course (usually page-by-page), but the brevity of scores would probably lead to filming a number of scores on each reel, and then there would be problems of bibliographic access. Before we get to the point of determining what kind of solutions will work for music materials, however, we must first try to get a better idea of the condition of our collections, i.e., we need to do some sampling to learn the extent of the problem.

An area in which the music libraries are leading the way for the rest of RLG is in cataloging cooperation. A cooperative program of sound recordings cataloging got off the ground last fall. In it, each participant accepted responsibility for cataloging at least 100 titles per year from a specific record company, or from a combination of smaller companies. The idea is that it saves time to have people concentrating their efforts on specific areas, resulting in less duplication of effort. Many people outside music libraries are interested in this idea, and it is being tried now in RLG for analyzed monographic series in the sciences. It will also be tried for scores in the near future, dividing responsibility by publisher.

The area of RLG work which may have the widest impact in the immediate future is development of what is termed the collection conspectus. The conspectus grew over a period of several years from ideas tossed about first by a small group of major research libraries and then by a group within ALA preparing guidelines for writing collection development policy statements, and was finally developed into a working model in 1980 by Paul Mosher of Stanford. Basically, the conspectus is a means for broadly surveying the strengths and weaknesses of a library collection in such a way that one library can be compared to another. The realm of knowledge is divided into elements or categories (generally subjects), then for each element a number from 0 to 5 is used to indicate strength of the library's materials in that subject. A letter to indicate language of the items can be added. In the case of music collections, the LC classifications M, ML, and MT were broken up into 139 categories by the music committee, and each category was assigned a number and letter by each library. (One such element might represent the subject of ML 100-109, music dictionaries and encyclopedias, and I might assign the level "3M" to our collection of music dictionaries. The "3" means "Instructional Support Level" or "A collection that is adequate to support undergraduate and most graduate instruction." The "M" means "Wide selections of material in all applicable languages.") In fact, the conspectus actually contains two such indications for each category: the first represents a library's current holdings (existing collection strength), and the second represents the current level at which the area is being collected (current collecting intensity). There is also a provision for adding notes, so we can highlight curious aspects. Obviously, we had to do much of the assigning of the original conspectus values by guesswork. Every librarian has notions about what is strong and weak in his or her own collection, but I doubt that many of us are willing to place wagers on exactly how accurate our notions are in every aspect of the collection, or how we measure up to other libraries. (It was easy to let it seem as though libraries were being judged in the conspectus writing, and it has taken a certain amount of courage to open up our libraries to this kind of scrutiny.)

But a measurement more concrete than our "gut feelings" is needed to help ensure that a "4" from one library is even relatively comparable to a "4" from another library. For this reason, several means of verifying the information in the conspectus are being tried. The Music group held its first such project

a year ago: members were asked to do a shelflist count using the categories set up in the conspectus. The count was based on the procedures used in the National Shelflist Count, which has been going for some years. Thus we estimated numbers of titles held in a category such as Music Dictionaries by measuring the number of centimeters of ML 100-109's in our shelflist, and multiplying that by a number determined by formula to be our local average number of titles per centimeter. (I must add here that for me, coming into a new library last fall, the results of this count have been an invaluable tool for letting me become quickly aware of the strengths and weaknesses in my collection. Not only do I have statistics on my collection, but I can compare them in any area to other libraries supporting similar programs.) About 15 music libraries participated in this exercise. The results pointed out the problems of this kind of verification: we don't all use the same LC class for the same kind of materials, some of us never use certain classes, and some of LC's classifications do not really cut across subjects in a way that is useful for this purpose. For some subjects it worked well, and for others it didn't. Obviously, a variety of verification tools would give us much more information than reliance on just one. For instance, the Art Program Committee of RLG searched a specific bibliography of important books in Renaissance art compiled by one of their members. A sample of 1000 titles from a good commercial bibliography was searched in the field of English literature. A comparable application in music might be that all of us would search Heyer's guide to monuments and collected works, or a sample from it. (M 2's and 3's have proved to be a problem with the shelflist measuring method because some of us use holdings cards in the shelflist, some use analytic cards, etc.)

None of this measuring and verifying is meant to change the way institutions create policies, or to change those policies. This is merely a way to coordinate them, so that we're all speaking the same language. The conspectus was not designed so we could pat ourselves on the back or be embarrassed, depending on the results, but to lay the groundwork for developing an eventual national resource collection for those doing research. The Association of Research Libraries has recently tested the RLG conspectus format to explore the potential benefits of using it to create a national conspectus. From what I have heard, the results were favorable to this approach, and the testing is being expanded.

Unlike the lists of serials received in music libraries (which I mentioned earlier), no one is assigned responsibility for collecting in every element of the conspectus. It is only when areas are found that have two or fewer members collecting at a level to support research that someone is asked to preserve their strength. (Strengths in collections outside RLG are considered too.) These are the "endangered species" of human knowledge, at least as housed in the libraries of this country, and so the commitments are needed to protect the material of future generations of scholars.

In summary, the RLG affiliation of our institutions has touched our lives in the music libraries in more ways than through cataloging. It has opened up new possibilities for creating useful tools and procedures, but it has also given us some new responsibilities, I believe that some of the ideas being tried would fit readily into almost any music library and I hope that this talk will help open new areas of cooperation among music libraries in general.

Handout for

NEW EXPERIMENTS IN COOPERATION: THE RLG MUSIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Peggy Daub
Oct. 1983

COLLECTION INTENSITY INDICATORS

The numbers 0 through 5, supplemented when necessary by a language code, describe existing collection strength (ECS) and current collecting intensity (CCI). The ECS describes the strength of the present collection, i.e., what is on the shelves; the CCI describes actual collecting practice, i.e., what is being added to the collection each year.

The numbers are defined as follows:

- 0 Out of Scope: The library does not collect in this area.
- 1 Minimal Level: A subject area in which few selections are made beyond very basic works.
- 2 Basic Information Level: A collection of up-to-date general materials that serve to introduce and define a subject
- 3 Instructional Support Level: A collection that is adequate to support undergraduate and most graduate instruction
- 4 Research Level: A collection that includes the major published source materials required for dissertations and independent research
- 5 Comprehensive Level: A collection in which a library endeavors, so far as is reasonably possible, to include all significant works of recorded knowledge

LANGUAGE COVERAGE CODES

The following language codes are added to ECS and/or CCI values in the Conspectus when the codes usefully qualify the values reported. (Language codes are not indexed in the Conspectus On-line.)

- E - English-language material predominates; little or no foreign-language material in the collection.
- F - Selected foreign-language material included, primarily European, in addition to the English language material.
- W - Wide selection of material in all applicable languages.
- Y - Material is primarily in one foreign language.

NEW EXPERIMENTS IN COOPERATION: THE RLG MUSIC PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Handout, page two

MUS 74

Dictionaries, encyclopedias

| | |
|------|-------|
| COSG | 3/3 |
| CSUG | 3F/4F |
| CTYG | 4/4W |
| CUBG | 4W/4W |
| ILNG | 2/4W |
| MDJG | 3F/3F |
| MIUG | 3W/3W |
| NHDG | 4/4W |
| NJRG | 3F/3F |
| NYCG | 4/4W |
| NYUG | 3/3F |
| OKUG | |
| PATG | 3F/3F |
| UTBG | 3F/4F |

 * "Computer Software Packages in Use at the Oberlin Music Library" *
 * by John Druessedow, Oberlin College *

The following is a brief report on three software packages currently in use at Oberlin. Each has characteristics relevant to specific kinds of activities in music libraries. As computer technology advances, these and many other software materials will assuredly be supplanted, but for the present their usefulness can be noted.

1) ELECTRONIC CARD FILE is a program in the public domain of relatively modest capabilities, activated by MBASIC (Microsoft BASIC) and commercially available. It can be used to prepare indexes and files in which extensive bibliographic description is not required. One of the two handouts I have provided lists some of the characteristics of ELECTRONIC CARD FILE, and the other shows the output of a simple example, a partial index of an anthology entitled The American Book for Pianos (N.Y.: Galaxy, 1975). Part of the example shows a straightforward index and the other demonstrates how this index can be sorted by composer, title, and date.

In addition to the capabilities listed on the handout, ELECTRONIC CARD FILE can access a specific, predetermined field distributed among all of the "card files" by means of the search key technique. In this program it is called "immediate access," and it allows one to call up all of the listings under a specific name or title by keying in the first four characters of the field name.

2) WORDSTAR is a widely used word-processing software package that facilitates the manipulation of text. Small, medium, or large blocks of text can be corrected, shifted, inserted, reformatted, or otherwise altered--even eradicated--with the ease and speed that only a memory chip can provide. The generation of certain kinds of lists, such as bindery lists or reserve lists can be made less arduous with a single WORDSTAR diskette. Insertion of new material and deletion of old is a simple matter, and as long as the lists do not require various kinds of sorting, this program can save a great deal of typing time. At Oberlin, the Library of Congress Rule Interpretation series has been consolidated into a single data base, which is updated as each new issue is received. [These updates are commercially available through the Catalog Department of the Oberlin College Library, Oberlin OH 44074.]

WORDSTAR could also conceivably be used for the distribution of special notices to patrons via an allied program, MAILMERGE, provided the patron lists would not be extremely large, i.e., more than several hundred names.

3) dBASE II is a powerful software package--actually a constellation of programs of the type known collectively as a data base manager--which can be used to generate extensive indexes with a multiplicity of data elements. At Oberlin it has been used to catalog a gift collection of about 400 American Communist Party pamphlets accompanied by about 200 hearings from the House Un-American Activities Committee. It was considered too expensive and perhaps even inappropriate, because of the ephemeral nature of some of these materials, to provide standard OCLC records. With the aid of dBASE II, author/title as well as keyword access has been provided. And with this experience to guide us, we intend to go after at least part of our extensive collection of 78 r.p.m. recordings, only a fraction of which are represented in our card catalog.

Those who are in a position to know strongly recommend that such applications be supported by a micro linked to a hard, or Winchester, disk (with 15 MB, or over 200 times the capacity of the standard diskette); such hardware currently lists

at about \$1,500. The kind of operations we are talking about far exceed the capacity of the standard diskette.

I hope to report on our progress with the cataloging of our 78 r.p.m. collection at a later date.

ELECTRONIC CARD FILE (public domain)

Sequential and random files
 Up to 127 characters/card; up to 20 fields/card
 E.g., on 90 K disk, space for 500 127 character cards
 Can fit up to 10 cards into one record

Fields:

- 1) Numeric--4 characters used
- 2) Dollar--8 characters used
- 3) Date--2 characters in numeric form
- 4) String--alpha-numeric, optional limits

Runs with MBASIC
 Menu driven

Procedure:

- 1) Name file
- 2) Type of field
- 3) Field length
- 4) Field name
- 5) Additional fields

Keep track of file names

Capable of searches by field; numeric manipulation

Other program: SUPERFILE (FYI, Inc., Austin, TX; \$195)
 See The Sonneck Society Newsletter, Spring, 1983, pp. 23-24: "The Personal Computer, American Music, Me--And You?" by Dale Cockrell

Sample Entry:

| | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| DATE ENTERED | Record #1 |
| Composer | 10 10 83 |
| Title | Weber, C. M. von |
| Performer | Concerto in F For Bassoon |
| Label | Brooke, Gwydion |
| Number | Columbia Graphophone |
| Date | D.X. 1656-1657 |
| | Unknown |

| COMPOSER | TITLE | DATE SOURCE |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| ARRANGEMENT | | |
| 1 Bay Psalm Book | Psalm 100 | 1698 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 2 Carr, Benjamin | Sonata I | 1796 ABFP |
| 3 Billings, William | Chester | 1770 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 4 Hopkinson, Francis | My Love Is Gone to Sea | 1788 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 5 Phile, Phillip | The President's March | ABFP |
| 6 Taylor, Raynor | Adeste Fidelis | 1804 ABFP |
| 7 Anon. | Three Dances | 1804 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 8 Mason, William | Lullaby, Opus 10 | 1857 ABFP |
| 9 Foster, Stephen | Soiree Polka | 1850 ABFP |
| 10 Foster, Stephen | Sweetly She Sleeps | 1851 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 11 Mason, William | Two Duos | 1869 ABFP |
| Piano duet | | |
| 12 Anon. | Battle Hymn of the Republic | 1862 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 13 Lowry, Robert | Beautiful River | 1865 ABFP |
| By ed. | | |
| 14 Paine, John Knowles | The Shepherd's Lament | 1875 ABFP |

| COMPOSER | TITLE | DATE |
|----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1 Anon. | Three Dances | 1804 |
| 2 Bay Psalm Book | Psalm 100 | 1698 |
| 3 Billings, William | Chester | 1770 |
| 4 Carr, Benjamin | Sonata I | 1796 |
| 5 Foster, Stephen | Soiree Polka | 1850 |
| 6 Foster, Stephen | Sweetly She Sleeps | 1851 |
| 7 Hopkinson, Francis | My Love Is Gone to Sea | 1788 |
| 8 Mason, William | Lullaby, Opus 10 | 1857 |
| 9 Phile, Phillip | The President's March | |
| 10 Taylor, Raynor | Adeste Fidelis | 1804 |

| TITLE | COMPOSER | DATE |
|--------------------------|--------------------|------|
| 1 Adeste Fidelis | Taylor, Raynor | 1804 |
| 2 Chester | Billings, William | 1770 |
| 3 Lullaby, Opus 10 | Mason, William | 1857 |
| 4 My Love Is Gone to Sea | Hopkinson, Francis | 1788 |
| 5 Psalm 100 | Bay Psalm Book | 1698 |
| 6 Soiree Polka | Foster, Stephen | 1850 |
| 7 Sonata I | Carr, Benjamin | 1796 |
| 8 Sweetly She Sleeps | Foster, Stephen | 1851 |
| 9 The President's March | Phile, Phillip | |
| 10 Three Dances | Anon. | 1804 |

| DATE COMPOSER | TITLE |
|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 Phile, Phillip | The President's March |
| 2 1698 Bay Psalm Book | Psalm 100 |
| 3 1770 Billings, William | Chester |
| 4 1788 Hopkinson, Francis | My Love Is Gone to Sea |
| 5 1796 Carr, Benjamin | Sonata I |
| 6 1804 Anon. | Three Dances |
| 7 1804 Taylor, Raynor | Adeste Fidelis |
| 8 1850 Foster, Stephen | Soiree Polka |
| 9 1851 Foster, Stephen | Sweetly She Sleeps |
| 10 1857 Mason, William | Lullaby, Opus 10 |

* Use of Microcomputers in the Northwestern University Music Library *
* by Richard Griscom, Northwestern University *

I have been asked to speak today on the use of microcomputers in the Northwestern University Music Library. It might seem odd that a library blessed with a sophisticated online system should have a need for in-house microcomputers. The need arose when the chairman of the music theory department recognized the potential of recently developed microcomputer programs for use in the department's aural skills program. Computer-assisted instruction of this type has been around for years, but until recently it was available only to institutions that either had access to a large computer or were members of established instructional networks, such as Plato. With the advent of microcomputer technology, music departments can now acquire computers with sound production capability at reasonable prices. Of course, computer manufacturers didn't have theory departments in mind when designing these new computers. The new generation of microcomputers was tailored to meet the demands of the home user. For many of these people, the strongest selling point of a computer is the machine's ability to play games--video games that dazzle and stimulate the senses with highly developed graphics and sound. The sound effects for video games can range from gunfire and explosions to tuneful background music; to accommodate such a variety of sounds, manufacturers have built sophisticated sound generators into their personal computers. Musicians, in turn, have benefited from the industry's interest in the video game market, for now there are several models on the market with programmable sound.

The Bell and Howell corporation was willing to loan the NU School of Music such a machine--an Apple II. Although the sound capabilities of the Apple are sufficient to support an instructional program in aural skills, the theory department, after conducting a search for suitable software, found all commercial programs wanting in various regards. The department decided to make use of the programming skills found among graduate students by developing its own software. When an alumni grant came through in the spring of 1982, the department was set on purchasing the Apple II and commencing with software development.

About this time, a new computer was introduced by Commodore Business Machines that not only rivaled, but surpassed the sound capabilities of the Apple, at about one-third of the cost. The Commodore 64--"sixty-four" standing for the sixty-four kilobytes of memory--proved to be an attractive alternative to the Apple, but, while the instructional software for the Apple was deemed inadequate, software didn't even exist for the Commodore 64. All programs would have to be developed from scratch by the theory department, and without the hardware documentation available for the Apple II.

The department, nevertheless, decided to purchase the Commodore 64's. Upon their purchase, three graduate students in the School of Music began work on software, and according to the Chair of the Theory Department, they have written programs superior to those available commercially. So far, programs have been developed for interval- and rhythmic-training, melodic dictation, and chord recognition. As soon as a disk drive and links for the three computers are installed, computer-assisted instruction will be implemented for the freshman class, and, as more programs are developed, instruction will slowly be worked into the more advanced classes.

The Theory Department also has in mind for the future a program of instruction in computer programming for music educators. During the past few years, the number of secondary schools with computer facilities has increased significantly;

approximately seventy per cent of all secondary schools have at least one microcomputer. In most cases, funding doesn't allow the hiring of a full-time instructor for computer education. Inevitably, the responsibility falls on the shoulders of that teacher who has both the time and the training. The Theory Department believes that, in light of this development, experience in programming would make music education students at Northwestern more marketable.

Several months after the Commodore 64's were installed in the Music Library's Listening Center, I, too, bought one, and, to give myself some experience in the BASIC programming language, I sought out projects that I could undertake utilizing the computer. One afternoon, in search of the answer to a student's question concerning a call number, I turned to Richard Smiraglia's MLA Technical Report on shelisting music. As I thumbed through it, I recalled that the author had included a thorough flow-chart of the entire shelisting process, taking the shelflister by the hand through a pilgrim's progress of decisions, and actions based on those decisions. Flowcharts such as this represent the first step in developing a program; once the flow of work is diagrammed, the programmer creates a case of the shelisting program, I found that a few of the decisions specified in the flowchart could actually be made internally by the computer; for example, "Is the initial letter of the name a vowel?" or "Will this symbol follow a title number?";--these questions can easily be answered by the computer without soliciting a response from the user. Incorporating shortcuts of this type proved to be the most trying task of writing the program.

I have given you two printed examples of the output of the shelisting program. On the left, the score shelisted is a vocal score of Michael Tippett's opera The Ice Break, including a German translation of the text; on the right, Schumann's Piano Sonata, Op. 14 in F, edited by Harold Bauer.

Now, granted, few experienced catalogers would have use for this program; the shelisting process is second nature to us, and, besides, this program calculates the ideal call number, and, like most ideals, it is something often trived for but seldom attained. Many call numbers produced by the program would require alteration to fit into a library's shelflist. Not to say that the program is simply a theoretical exercise. It could be valuable as a pedagogical tool to introduce the uninitiated to the mysteries of shelisting.

As a theoretical exercise, I found the experience valuable on a number of different levels. It not only sharpened my skills in working with programming commands, but also got me thinking about the whole concept of shelisting in an automated environment and what promises the future may hold for catalogers working online. Northwestern will soon be implementing a new circulation system that will link a circulation record to each bibliographic record. The library shelflist will be online, and we could conceivably do away with our manual shelflist sometime in the future. What would keep us from incorporating a shelisting program similar to this one into the system--one that could assign call numbers automatically, adjusting elements when conflicts arise. I find this an exciting prospect.

One other program I have written computes our department's monthly and annual statistics. Each month, a staff member collections statistics reports from each member of the technical services staff and compiles the results on a large work-form. Certain columns are added to other columns, which are subtracted from yet other columns, and the results are then totalled. The task requires only basic math skills, but the work is so tedious that errors are virtually unavoidable. The program I wrote prompts the user with requests for the raw data, then compiles the statistics automatically and displays the results. The program has remarkably improved the accuracy of our statistics, and it really

wasn't difficult to write. That is the thought I would like to leave you with this morning--that many programs don't require an extensive programming background, and even those of you uninterested in learning programming might find that business software packages can meet your library's needs in compiling statistics, planning budgets, or, as John Druesedow has pointed out, in work processing and data-base management.

Libraries now unable to justify the purchase of a microcomputer will soon find it a necessity. A few weeks ago, I read in Library Journal that the new OCLC Model 300 terminal will be an IBM personal computer customized by OCLC. Besides providing access to OCLC, this new terminal will have the capability of being used in the library as a personal computer. This, if anything, will surely increase the use of microcomputers in libraries, and I will wager a guess that our session this morning will be only the first of many where we exchange ideas on micro-computer applications in music libraries.

NEWS OF MEMBERS

Editor's note: As a regular feature, we would like to include news from members of our Chapter. Please complete and return this form to share news with everyone.

Name & Address _____

New Position _____

Publications _____

Professional activities _____

Other _____

Send to: Karen Nagy, Northwestern University Music Library, 1935 Sheridan Rd.
Evanston, IL 60201

FROM: Karen N. Nagy, Newsletter Editor
MLA - Midwest Chapter
Northwestern University Music Library
1935 Sheridan Rd.
Evanston, IL 60201



TO:

Robert L. Acker
3817 1/2 N. Greenview
Chicago, Illinois 60613

FIRST CLASS MAIL