

An Examination of the Quality of Catalogue Records of Management Institutes in India

Chandrappa* and N. S. Harinarayana

Department of Studies in Library and Information Science, University of Mysore, Manasagangotri, Mysuru - 570 006, India; chandruekm@gmail.com, ns.harinarayana@gmail.com

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to examine the quality of catalogue records in the top five management institutes in India. The present study attempts to investigate the error rate found in the catalogue records of five management institutes by comparing with bibliographic records of Library of Congress (LoC). The study analysed the accuracy of 293 catalogue records. The errors in the data were listed and categorised as major and minor errors. The finding shows that while LoC records are absolutely error free, the quality of catalogue records of management institutes, on the other hand, was far from acceptable level. 1093 errors from 251 records were found amounting to 4.35 errors per record. These results show that there is a need for libraries in India to take up the bibliographic data entry more seriously than ever before.

Keywords: Catalogue Evaluation, Cataloguing Quality, Library of Congress, Management Libraries, Metadata, Online Public Access Catalogues (OPAC) Quality

1. Introduction

Quality of cataloguing refers to recording the details in the bibliographic record meticulously and comprehensively in conformance with the requirements as prescribed by the standards of cataloguing. Quality control is paramount as data of inferior quality can affect browsing and retrieval in catalogues. Paiste (2003)¹⁶ suggests considering user experience to drive cataloguing practice, and suggests that cataloguers need to aspire for adopting a “culture of quality” which is beyond the bibliographic record and the library catalogue. While commenting on the effect of errors in the catalogue records, Abd Manaf and Abdul Rahman (2006)¹ opine that “an inaccurate or inconsistent catalogue compels readers to perform repeated searches, either to find the particular item they seek or to find and make do with a broader range of relevant material on their topic, therefore violating Ranganathan’s law, *save the time of the reader*”. Even minor inaccuracies cast doubt on the quality of other records. Graham (1990)⁸ explored the relative importance of accuracy and fullness in each part of the bibliographic information in catalogue records, distinguishing between mechanical accuracy (correct transcription and description) and intellectual accuracy (appropriate description, access points, and classification). In this paper, the authors have tested

only the mechanical accuracy of the catalogue records of management institutes in India.

The focus of this research paper is to examine the accuracy of catalogue records obtained from Online Public Access Catalogues (OPACs) of institutes offering management programmes (hereafter, called Management Institutions/Institutes in this article) in India. The accuracy and comprehensiveness of the catalogue records created by the management institutes of India were compared against the records in Library of Congress (LoC) as it is widely accepted that the Library of Congress catalogue records are of high quality.

2. Review of Literature

The literature on the area of cataloguing quality is surprisingly sparse. It is surprising because cataloguing is one of the major activities of a library. The last quarter of previous century saw a few studies concentrating on cataloguing quality. While some deal with the theoretical exposition of the concept, others are empirical studies. The ‘accuracy in catalogue’ is given preferential treatment in the literature. The question of what is accuracy in the bibliographic records is the question some of the researchers have tried to define. Graham’s (1990)⁸

*Author for correspondence

categorisation of ‘mechanical accuracy’ and ‘intellectual accuracy’ helps to understand the various dimensions involved. Graham’s (1990)⁸ “mechanical accuracy” and “intellectual accuracy”, and Bruce and Hillmann’s (2004)⁵ “minimal accuracy” provide an idea of *quality* in metadata records of libraries. Even Graham, the most cited author in the field, agrees that mere adherence to standards cannot completely form accuracy, but it is useful and luxurious⁸. Suarez (1992)¹⁸ defines quality as “conformance to requirements”. Morris (1995)¹⁵ states, “Quality in cataloguing is measured by the degree to which a library’s catalogue fosters access to materials which benefit the user”. For Avdoyan (1995)² quality cataloguing is the “consistent creation of a comprehensive bibliographic record, aimed at the highest level of the researcher, yet retrieval by all users both now and (with minimal adaptation if necessary) in the future”.

There are a few interesting empirical studies reported in the literature on cataloguing quality with different approaches to measuring it. Massey and O’Brien (2000)¹⁴ classified inaccuracies in cataloguing records as “major” and “minor” errors. While the former category of errors was defined as those which affected retrieval, the later contains three categories: errors in controlled elements, errors in other indexed elements, and other errors⁶. Ballard (2008)³ documents the origins of numerous interrelated collaborative projects in Beall and Kafadar (2004)⁴ “Dirty Database” tests. The study concentrates on the accuracy of bibliographic records and the presence of “dirty data”^{7, 6, 14}. Shin (2003)¹⁷ reports on an assessment of 2,000 Korean-language bibliographic records in WorldCat and considers specific errors, error frequency, areas where errors occur frequently, and errors that could inhibit record retrieval. Taylor (1992)¹⁹ looked at variations of name access points in the OCLC database and found that at least 17.7% to 24.1% of the records have the names in forms that may affect recall or precision in name searches. Mansor (2003)¹³ found that out of the 410 MARC records identified, only 83 (20.2%) were precisely alike regarding name headings. In another report, OCLC and RLIN databases have analysed a group of 215 matched parts of catalogue records¹⁰. The results of the study pointed that the analysis of the two sets of records revealed no statistically significant differences in accuracy and fullness between OCLC and RLIN cataloguing. Zeng (1992; 1993; 1994)²⁰⁻²³ reports the findings of his study in a series of articles published in the early 1990s. His research includes 853 records from OCLC CJK and 453 from RLIN CJK. In the OCLC sample, over 54% of the total errors were content errors, 17% format errors, while the remaining 28% were of editing and inputting

errors. In the RLIN sample, editing and coding mistakes accounted for 55% of all errors. Ready-reckoner tables are given by Kiger and Wise (1996)¹¹ for selecting the sample size for studies in catalogue data quality; for a margin of error of 4.9%, 3.5% or 2.5%; one can choose a sample of 400, 800 or 1500 items, respectively. If the error rate in the catalogue can be estimated, however roughly, then it is often possible to justify smaller samples using a formula such as that provided by Herson (1994)⁹.

3. Methodology

The present study examines the accuracy of catalogue records of management institutes in comparison with Library of Congress. For the purpose of the study, only the data retrieved through the OPACs of the management institutes were considered. The selection of the institutions was made by taking the top five institutes which provide access to their OPAC databases through the Internet. It is learnt that the others have the OPACs but allowed access only through intranet. When asked about the non-availability of OPACs on Internet, one of the librarians in an informal discussion with the authors said that the OPACs contain details of the studies made by the students on various companies and those companies do not wish to share even the bibliographical data to be available on the internet based OPACs. The libraries have not made efforts to maintain a separate database of such material or to have restricted access rights to such materials in the OPACs.

A comparative analysis was conducted to identify the similarities and differences in the bibliographic elements of each selected record. The study examined – i.e., identified only those discrepancies in records - which could affect the merging of records from varying databases into a single file. The analysis looks into selected bibliographic fields, which significantly affect the accessibility of the records¹². Bibliographic elements examined are the main entry, forms of headings, and statement of responsibility; title proper, edition statements, imprint (place, publisher, and date of publication) and classification numbers.

The characteristics of the sample population of the study are described below:

- Only a tiny sample of the records was selected for the study. It was hypothesised that it is possible to gain an impression of the overall quality by browsing through these sample records. Since the method falls short of examining every record in the catalogue, the findings are not comprehensive. However, it is believed that the sample is sufficient

enough to get a fair idea of inaccuracy prevailing in the systems under study and to objectively quantify the quality,

- A set of error category lists was developed to facilitate the grouping of errors occurring in the sample records.

The differences were further categorised into 'Major error', 'Minor error', and 'No error'. The categories formulated for this study are based on similar classification adopted by earlier studies:

- 'Major error' consists of Entry Omission, Wrong Entry, Misplacing Entry, Spelling Error, Incorrect upper and lower case, Inadequate Spacing, Hyphen inserted,
- 'Minor error' consists of Full stop missing, Incorrect Punctuation, Punctuation missing, Incorrect Space, and Pages error, and
- 'No error' consists of error-free records.
- The investigator identified, in consultation with the faculty members and the librarian, a list of books by 56 famous authors in the management programmes from an institute in the city of palaces Mysuru, Karnataka, India. These books, according to the librarian, are most recommended text books and likely to be found in the management institutes. A total of 60 titles from these authors formed the basis for the study,
- The six libraries (including LoC) were tested for the availability of these 60 titles in each of them. None of the libraries had all the sixty titles, however. The number of records found is 42, 58, 53, 26, 58, and 56 corresponding respectively to LoC, Christ Institute of Management – Bangalore (CIMB); Birla Institute of Management Technology (BIMTECH) - Greater Noida in Uttar Pradesh (BIMN); Indian Institute of Management – Ahmadabad (IIMA); Indian

Institute of Management - Bangalore (IIMB); and Institute of Management – Nirma – Ahmadabad (IMNA),

- The names of the libraries have been disguised in the analysis. Their names have been coded as LIB-A, LIB-B, etc., the order of the libraries list as given above do not match with the order of their codes. The purpose of this study is not to identify and point out the errors of any particular library, but to find the trend in the quality of cataloguing in management libraries as a whole. Hence, the names of the libraries have been morphed in this study, and
- Out of the 60 titles in the sample, there were 14 general management books, 13 books on marketing, 11 books on financial management, 6 books each on human resource management and operation research, and 5 books each on international management and organisational behaviour.

4. Findings and Analysis

The data collected was entered into a spreadsheet to enable comparison of the records of management institutes with LoC. Each record from each of the libraries was meticulously examined for the presence of various kinds of errors, and they were grouped into major and minor errors. As mentioned earlier, the quality of cataloguing records in this study is confined to the examination of errors in the description of the resources.

4.1 ISBN (MARC tag 020)

International Standard Book Number (ISBN) (Tag 020) is a unique identifier for a given title. MARC 21 recommends the recording of additional information such as availability, whether the item is paper or hard bound

Table 1. Accuracy rate of ISBN in management institutes and LoC

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	9 (15.52%)	49 (92.45%)	3 (11.54%)	1 (1.72%)	9 (16.07%)	71 (24.23%)
2.	Minor Error	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	49 (84.48%)	4 (7.55%)	23 (88.46%)	57 (98.28%)	47 (83.93%)	222 (75.77%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

and so on. In this study, however, only the content in the MARC tag 020\$a is observed for the accuracy (Table 1).

The ISBN (MARC tag 020) is a critical element in describing a book. It identifies the work uniquely. It is, thus, imperative that ISBN number should be error free in the catalogue records. Of the 360 records considered in the study, 293 (81.39%) records possessed the ISBN tag in their catalogue records. The study looked into the presence of major and minor errors in the records of the libraries. It was noted that the records found in the LoC catalogues were error free. Other institutes have failed to record the ISBNs accurately which is surprising.

The LIB-B has a very low level of accuracy. It was found that there were major mistakes in 49 of their records out of 53 which correspond to 92.45%. Zeng (1992)²⁰; Massey and O'Brien (2000)¹⁴ suggests that absence of ISBN or wrong ISBN or insertion of hyphens or spaces in online catalogues are to be considered as major errors. The present study has adopted their suggestions. LIB-D and LIB-C are found to be good concerning the entry of the ISBN numbers with the accuracy rate amount to 98.28% and 88.46% respectively.

The result of the study suggests that the cataloguers need to pay greater attention while entering the data.

4.2 Classification Number (MARC tag 082)

Classification is an organising mechanism in a library. Classification number assigned to the items helps their systematic arrangement on the shelves. Use of Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) is widespread among Indian libraries in general, and all the five libraries in the study use it. LoC uses its own classification scheme called Library of Congress Classification, but its records, sometimes, contain DDC numbers also. Classification number is a location tool for the users. Its absence is a significant drawback in any catalogue records. Table 2 shows the analysis of the data in the tag 082\$a.

Table 2. Classification numbers

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	2 (3.45%)	2 (3.85%)	20 (76.92%)	0	0	24 (8.19%)
2.	Minor Error	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	56 (96.55%)	51 (96.23%)	6 (23.08%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	269 (91.81%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

In this study, it was found that in LIB-C, 76.92% records did not contain the classification number. Locating those items in that library may be difficult. Such instances of missing classification number were found in LIB-A and LIB-B also but in a negligible percentage of records.

It is interesting to note that the classification number for a given title varies from library to library. It is beyond the scope of this study to verify the correctness of those numbers. However, the study just confirmed their presence and accurate representation in the record. For the record 44 of this study, the researchers found out 3 different class numbers given by the libraries. The title of the record reads as “Essentials of organizational behavior” (Table 3).

Table 3. Data found in DDC

Class number
658.3
301.158
658.3001

4.3 Main Entry – Personal Name (MARC tag 100)

The main entry is assigned according to various cataloguing rules (such as AACR2, CCC), usually to the person chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of work. The main entry may contain the name of a person, family, or entity responsible for bringing the materials together.

It can be observed from Table 4 that 293 out of 360 records contain the main entry tags in their catalogue records. The author is a key element for retrieving documents in libraries. The libraries have shown some degree of diligence in entering the data of authors which is reflected by the fact that only 2.38% major errors

Table 4. Main entry – personal name

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	4 (6.89%)	1 (1.88%)	1 (3.85%)	0	1 (1.78%)	7 (2.38%)
2.	Minor Error	0	26 (44.83%)	42 (79.25%)	8 (30.77%)	19 (32.75%)	39 (69.65%)	134 (45.74%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	28 (48.28%)	10 (18.87%)	17 (65.38%)	39 (67.25%)	16 (28.57%)	152 (51.88%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

Table 5. Data entry in main entry

Brigham, Eugene F,
Bringham, Eugene F.
Brigham, Eugene F
Brigham, F Eugene

Table 6. Details of data entry errors in management institute libraries

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	1 (1.72%)	0	7 (26.92%)	39 (67.24%)	27 (48.21%)	74 (25.26%)
2.	Minor Error	0	56 (96.56%)	0	1 (3.85%)	19 (32.76%)	21 (37.50%)	97 (33.1%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	1 (1.72%)	53 (100%)	18 (69.23%)	0	8 (14.29%)	122 (41.64%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

were found. However, there are minor errors such as punctuation errors; capitalisation and so on (Table 5 which shows the variations in data entry concerning the record number 4 of the sample). It is found that management institutes of this study have 45.74% errors in the main entry data field. All the records examined in the LoC catalogue are error free. This demonstrates the importance that LoC gives for key data retrieval elements such as main entry data field in metadata records. The libraries in India in general and libraries of management institutes in India in particular, should ensure that error in data entry error is completely eliminated. It may be noted, for instance, that author name is misspelled in one of the libraries, which is a major error.

4.4 Title (MARC tag 245\$a)

Title is the most identifying element of an information

resource. The way of recording title has been an issue of discussion for cataloguers and catalogue codes. Titles, uniform titles, variant titles, former titles, short titles, etc., are all recorded appropriately in catalogue records. Specific and exhaustive guidelines are available in catalogue codes for entering the titles in the catalogues. Table 6 shows the details of data entry errors in management institute libraries.

Table 6 depicts the accuracy rate of the field title (tag 245\$a) in LoC and Management Institutes. LoC and LIB-B have achieved 100% accuracy. On the other hand, LIB-D has one or the other mistake in title field in all its records, of which 39 (67.24%) have a major error. LIB-A has errors in a large number (96.56%) records.

These results clearly the need to check the accuracy of catalogue records. The kind of errors found in the titles includes omission of words, the exclusion of part of the title, wrong coding in MARC fields, punctuation errors,

Table 7. Title statement (title and statement of responsibility) in various libraries

Financial management : theory and practice / Eugene F. Brigham, Michael C. Ehrhardt.
Financial management: theory and practice Bringham, Eugene F.
Financial management: Theory and practice / by Eugene F Brigham, Louis C Gapsenski, Michael C Ehrhardt.
Financial Management: Theory and Practice by Eugene F. Brigham and Michael C. Ehrhardt
Financial Management: Theory and Practice

Table 8. Statement of responsibility

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	29 (46.55%)	0	1 (3.85%)	2 (3.44%)	29 (51.78%)	61 (20.82%)
2.	Minor Error	0	23 (43.1%)	0	8 (30.76%)	54 (93.12%)	13 (23.22%)	98 (33.45%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	6 (10.35%)	53 (100%)	17 (65.39%)	2 (3.44%)	14 (25.00%)	134 (45.73%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

Table 9. Variations in the data entry in statement of responsibility field

a Human resource management / c Gary Dessler.
Human resource management Dessler, Gary
Human resource management / by Gary Dessler.
Human resource management \$cGary Dessler.
Human Resource Management by Gary Dessler
Human Resource Management

spelling errors, and so on. Some of the erroneous titles found in the libraries are shown in Table 7.

4.5 Statement of Responsibility (Tag 245\$c)

The statement of responsibility (Tag 245\$c) is a part of title field in MARC 21. It is represented by the subfield identifier \$c. The statement of responsibility usually contains information about authorship, but it can also include information about editors, photographers, translators, and others involved in creating the work. According to AACR2, the statement of responsibility is exactly transcribed as it appears on the title page, omitting degrees, honorary titles and institutional affiliations. Table 8 shows the data collected on the inaccuracies in transcribing the statement of responsibility information

into the online records.

On the whole, about 54% records were found to contain errors which are a higher error rate. Although the statement of responsibility is not an indexed field, its contents are meant to be displayed to the users, and hence accuracy is required. The kind of errors found in this field included omission of author details, punctuation errors, wrong entry, and so on.

Like other fields, the libraries have to pay a lot of attention for entering the details correctly in this field. Table 9 clearly indicates the inconsistency between the catalogues in data entry.

4.6 Edition Statement (Tab 250\$a)

An edition statement is a word or phrase appearing in the resource that normally indicates a difference

Table 10. Edition statement

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	16 (27.58%)	20 (36.53%)	6 (23.07%)	11 (20.69%)	37 (66.07%)	90 (30.72%)
2.	Minor Error	0	3 (5.17%)	0	2 (7.69%)	47 (79.31%)	1 (1.78%)	53 (18.09%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	39 (67.25%)	33 (63.47%)	18 (69.24%)	0	18 (32.15%)	150 (51.19%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

Table 11. Imprint

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	0	1 (1.88%)	2 (7.69%)	0	7 (12.50%)	10 (3.41%)
2.	Minor Error	0	57 (98.28%)	2 (3.78%)	9 (34.62%)	57 (98.27%)	24 (42.85%)	149 (50.86%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	1 (1.72%)	50 (94.34%)	15 (57.69%)	1 (1.73%)	25 (44.65%)	134 (45.73%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

Table 12. Physical description

Sl. No.	Types of Error	LoC	LIB-A	LIB-B	LIB-C	LIB-D	LIB-E	Total
1.	Major Error	0	5 (8.62%)	4 (7.54%)	4 (15.38%)	4 (6.89%)	4 (7.14%)	21 (7.16%)
2.	Minor Error	0	51 (87.94%)	49 (92.46%)	20 (76.93%)	54 (93.11%)	50 (89.29%)	224 (76.45%)
3.	No Error	42 (100%)	2 (3.44%)	0	2 (7.69%)	0	2 (3.57%)	48 (16.39%)
	Total	42 (100%)	58 (100%)	53 (100%)	26 (100%)	58 (100%)	56 (100%)	293 (100%)

in either content or form between the resource and a related resource. An edition statement can often be identified by the use of words such as *edition*, *issue*, *level*, *state*, *update*, and *version*, or their equivalents in other languages. Numbers and/or statements of responsibility may also appear with an edition statement ("250 Edition Statement", 2016). Table 10 gives the details of errors found in the information recorded by the management institutes in their catalogue database.

Table 10 illustrates the accuracy rate of edition statement found in catalogue records of the management institutes in India and LoC catalogue databases. Major errors were found in the records of all the institutes. While LIB-D has errors in all the records, other libraries have error rates ranging between 60% and 82%. The kind of mistakes found includes omission of edition statement, wrong representation of edition number, punctuation errors, and so on.

Table 13. Variations in the data entry in physical description field

Mason, Ohio : Thomson/South-Western, c2005.
Australia Thomson Learning (South-Western) 2002 xxviii, 1051 p.
Philadelphia: Dryden Press, 1999. 1087p.
Australia : Thomson South-Western , 2002
Australia Thomson Learning 2002 1051p
2004 Thomson Learning Australia 1052p

Table 14. Consolidated error rate

Sl. No.	Name	Number of Records	Total Number of Errors	Average Error per Record
1.	LoC	42	0	0
2.	LIB-A	58	282	4.86
3.	LIB-B	53	150	2.83
4.	LIB-C	26	92	3.53
5.	LIB-D	58	307	5.29
6.	LIB-E	56	262	4.68
	Total	251	1093	

4.7 Imprint (MARC tag 260)

Imprint relates to the details such as place, publisher and year of publication. Specific guidelines are available in AACR2 for recording the imprint details in the record. It is needless to emphasise that these details are relevant in identifying the resource uniquely. Moreover, these details are required to describe the resource entirely in a bibliography or reference list. Hence, the details have to be recorded as accurately as possible. Table 11 gives the error rate found in the entries in the catalogues of the libraries considered in this study.

Unlike in other fields, the presence of major errors in the imprint field is less. However, the percentage of minor errors is still significant (50.86%) in the records of management institutes. As usual, the entries in LoC are perfect with no errors found.

4.8 Physical Description (Tag 300)

Physical description, as the name itself indicates, gives an account of physical attributes of the item being catalogued. These details provide the users of the catalogue a fair idea of the resource’s physical features even before they lay their hand on them. The details such as number of pages, height, accompanying material, nature of contents etc., are recorded in this field (Table 12).

The performance of other libraries is very disappointing

with none of the libraries having more than 8% accuracy level. The presence of minor errors is very high. Table 13 shows variations and errors found in the data entry.

4.9 Consolidated Error Rate

Tables from 1 to 13 looked into the error rate in various fields of catalogue records. Table 14 shows the consolidated result of all the tables discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Table 14 gives an overall picture of the quality of catalogue records regarding the accuracy of data entered into the seven fields considered in the study. The Library of Congress has also been tested along with the five management institutes in India. The results of the present study show that all the 42 records of LoC considered in this study are entirely error-free. On the other hand, the error rate found in other libraries discussed in this study is really disappointing. LIB-B has the lowest error rate among the libraries in this study. Even in LIB-B, error rate per record is 2.83 which is not at an acceptable level. LIB-D has more than 307 errors in the 58 records. This kind of error rate shows that the libraries have not taken up the transcription of data on to their catalogue very seriously. It is likely that users of the catalogue face some problems while retrieving the books.

It is important for libraries to take some initiatives to improve cataloguing quality.

5. Conclusion

The study reports the cataloguing quality as found in various management institutes in India. The findings are not very encouraging. The overall average error per record was found to be 4.35 which are very high.

There is a need for libraries to look into the accuracy of bibliographic data in their catalogue records.

6. References

1. Abd Manaf Z and Abdul Rahman R. (2006). Examining the quality of national library of Malaysia (NLM) cataloguing in publication (CIP) records, *Library Review*. 55(6):363-73. Crossref.
2. Avdoyan L. (1995). Cataloging quality: A Library of Congress symposium. Washington D. C.: Library of Congress; 31p.
3. Ballard T. (2008). Systematic identification of typographical errors in library catalogs, *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. 46(1):27-33. Crossref.
4. Beall, J., & Kafadar, K. (2004). The effectiveness of copy cataloging at eliminating typographical errors in shared bibliographic records. *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 48(2), 92-101.
5. Bruce T and Hillman D. (2004). The continuum of meta-data quality: Defining, expressing, exploiting, American Library Association. 238-56. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/1813/7895>.
6. Chapman A and Massey O. (2002). A catalog quality audit tool, *Library and Information Research News*. 23(82):26-37.
7. Dwyer J. (1992). The cataloger's invisible College at work: The case of the dirty database test, *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. 14(1):75-82. Crossref.
8. Graham PS. (1990). Quality in cataloguing: Making distinctions, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 16(4):213-18.
9. Herson P. (1994). Determination of sample size and selection of the sample: Concepts, general sources, and software, *College and Research Libraries*. 55:171-71. Crossref.
10. Intner SS. (1989). Much ado about nothing: OCLC and RLIN cataloguing quality, *Library Journal*. 114(2):38-40.
11. Kiger JE and Wise K. (1996). Auditing an academic library book collection, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 22(4):267-72. Crossref.
12. Mansor Y. (1999). Issues in developing a cooperative cataloguing program in Malaysia: An analysis of MARC records in three university libraries OPAC databases, Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
13. Mansor Y. (2003). Bibliographic exchange in Malaysia: Variations in name headings, *Library Review*. 52(1):38-42. Crossref.
14. Massey O and O'Brien A. (2000). Auditing catalogue quality by random sampling. UK: UKOLN. Retrieved from: <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~bodl0842/dissertation/>.
15. Morris S. (1995). Cataloging quality: A Library of Congress symposium. Washington D. C.: Library of Congress; 31p.
16. Paiste MS. (2003). Defining and achieving quality in cataloguing in academic libraries: A literature review, *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*. 27:327-38. Crossref.
17. Shin H. (2003). Quality of Korean cataloguing records in shared databases, *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. 36(1):55-90. Crossref.
18. Suarez JG. (1992). Three Experts on Quality Management: Philip B. Crosby, W. Edwards Deming, Joseph M. Juran. DTIC Document. Total quality leadership office arlington va. Retrieved from: <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA256399>.
19. Taylor AG. (1992). Variations in personal name access points in OCLC bibliographic records, *Library Resources and Technical Services*. 36(2):224-41.
20. Zeng L. (1992). An evaluation of the quality of Chinese-language records in the OCLC OLUC database and a study of a rule-based data validation system for online Chinese cataloging. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.
21. Zeng L. (1993). Quality control of Chinese-language records using a rule-based data validation system-part 1: An evaluation of the quality of Chinese-language records in the OCLC OLUC database, *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. 16(4):25-66. Crossref.
22. Zeng L. (1994). Methodologies for measuring and enhancing the quality of bilingual bibliographic records. *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, Allen Kent ed., s.v. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.; 53, p. 237-57.
23. Zeng L. (1994). Quality control of Chinese-language records using a rule-based data validation system-part 2: A study of a rule-based data validation system for online Chinese cataloging, *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. 18(1):3-26. Crossref.