

An Interview with Arlene G. Taylor

Arlene G. Taylor and David P. Miller

QUERY SHEET

This page lists questions we have about your paper. The numbers displayed at left can be found in the text of the paper for reference. In addition, please review your paper as a whole for correctness.

Q1. Au: Please check history date.

TABLE OF CONTENTS LISTING

The table of contents for the journal will list your paper exactly as it appears below:

An Interview with Arlene G. Taylor

Arlene G. Taylor and David P. Miller

An Interview with Arlene G. Taylor

Arlene G. Taylor^a and David P. Miller^b

^aSchool of Information Sciences, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA; ^bLevin Library, Curry College, Milton, Massachusetts, USA

5

ABSTRACT

In this interview, conducted via email during August 2016, Dr. Arlene G. Taylor discusses her career as a cataloger, professor of cataloging and classification, and her work in professional associations. Topics include her early cataloging/teaching experiences, changes in both cataloging practice and the teaching of cataloging, subject analysis, and “aboutness” as compared with form/genre access, professional experiences outside the United States, and the future of MLIS programs.


ARTICLE HISTORY

Received September 2016
Revised xxx
Accepted September 2016

KEYWORDS

Arlene G. Taylor; cataloging; classification; library science education; *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules; Second Edition*; form/genre

15 Arlene G. Taylor has been a member of the *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* Editorial Board since 1979. She received a B.A. from Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, and an MSLS from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She holds a PhD from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her experience as a library school educator covered more than thirty years, most recently at
20 the University of Pittsburgh, where she is Professor Emerita. She is lead author or co-author of widely-used texts, including *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification* (6th to 11th editions), and *The Organization of Information* (three editions). The balance of her publication record is extensive, including refereed articles, additional books and book chapters, research reports, and other writings. She has given
25 more than eighty guest presentations for national, state, and regional library associations, as well as library schools. Dr. Taylor’s international activities include serving as workshop leader, teacher, and/or consultant in Brazil, England, Thailand, and Israel. For her work in the latter two countries, she was the recipient of two Fulbright Senior Specialist Program Grants. Among her other honors are the ALA/
30 ALCTS Margaret Mann Citation, the ALA/Highsmith Library Literature Award for *The Organization of Information*, and the Distinguished Alumnus Award from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Graduate School of Library and Information Science Alumni Association. She has held positions on many professional association committees. These include the ALA/ALCTS Catalog Form and Function

CONTACT David P. Miller  dmiller@curry.edu  Levin Library, Curry College, 1071 Blue Hill Avenue, Milton, MA 02186-2395, USA.

Color versions of one or more of the figures in the article can be found online at www.tandfonline.com/wccq.

Published with license by Taylor & Francis © Arlene G. Taylor and David P. Miller

35 Committee (Chair, 1995–1998) and the ALA/ALCTS/CCS Subject Analysis Committee (Chair, 1992–1994) and Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access.

Arlene is married to Wayne Benson, a retired Presbyterian minister (see [Figure 1](#)). They have five children between them—his three and her two—nine grandchildren and one great-grandchild. Arlene and Wayne have lived in Chapel Hill, NC, since
40 2007. Prior to that, they lived in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, for fourteen years, in New York City for seven years, and in Chicago, Illinois, where they met in 1983.

Dr. Taylor’s complete curriculum vitae, including publications, are available at [*insert the persistent URL for her vita as supplemental material*].

DM: There are some aspects of your early experience as practitioner and teacher
45 that I’d like to ask you about. You started off as a teacher-librarian in Tulsa between 1963 and 1965? What are your strongest memories from that experience?

AT: I most remember cataloging! More about that in a minute. Growing up where and when I did—Oklahoma, 1940s–1950s—I learned that girls basically had three



Figure 1. Arlene Taylor and Wayne Benson. © Danielle Zielinski.

choices, once finished with school: marriage and motherhood, teaching, or nursing.

50 Later I added librarianship to that list—I think it was not brought to my consciousness early, because there were relatively few librarians in comparison to the other three categories. This despite the fact that I made pockets, checkout cards, and date due slips for all my children’s books and checked them out to my dolls. So I chose teaching, and started teaching seventh grade English and ninth grade Spanish in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1963. Seventh graders were not my cup of tea, but Spanish was the only language other than English taught in that school, and there was only one section of it, so the ninth graders who took Spanish were the cream of the crop, and I liked that class! When the librarian at my school retired at the end of my first year, the principal asked me if I might fill in, even though I did not have a library degree. I had worked in my high school library and then in my college library, so I had experience. I learned that one could be a teacher-librarian by teaching at least one class and being librarian the rest of the time, and also, I needed to take one library science class at night in order to qualify. I could not wait to get rid of seventh grade English! The class I kept teaching, of course, was the ninth grade Spanish class. The course I took was Cataloging, taught by Allie Beth Martin, head of the Tulsa City-County Library System. This was taught at the University of Tulsa, which taught library science as an extension of the library school at the University of Oklahoma. So, to answer your question, what I remember is how much I loved the cataloging course, how much I loved cataloging the books in the school library, and how much I enjoyed teaching the students how to use the card catalog, and teaching them about the Dewey Decimal Classification system and how they could find books matching their interests that way.

DM: So that is *why* you became a cataloger. *How* did you become one?

AT: As I’ve said, I loved the cataloging course I took, so I decided I really wanted the library degree in order to be a full-fledged librarian. I was accepted at the University of Illinois’ library school in 1965. I went there expecting to specialize in school librarianship. But then I took an advanced cataloging course—I had “tested out” of the beginning cataloging course—from Kathryn Luther Henderson, and I was hooked for life. She loved cataloging and passed it on.

80 DM: You worked as a descriptive cataloger in the Romance Languages Section of the Library of Congress (LC) in 1966 and 1967. What did you take away from that experience that informed your future work?

AT: Well, in those days most academic libraries used library cataloging “copy” as the basis for their own catalogs. (The mantra response to questions in almost all cataloging departments was, “because that’s the way LC does it.”) They ordered catalog card sets: that included identical “main entry” cards for the number of subject headings and added entries added, plus two more to be the “main entry” and

the shelf list cards. Let's say there were two subject headings, three name added entries, and a title added entry – you would receive eight identical cards in that set.

90 The subjects, names, and title had to be typed at the tops of six of the cards, and the call number was typed in the upper left corner of all eight cards. The shelf list card might also have copy numbers and acquisition information typed on it. So learning to *create* the original of those card sets at LC, learning to follow the rules as LC interpreted them, and learning to integrate my original cataloging into a catalog of millions of existing catalog cards set me up for life in being able to answer cataloger's questions about *why* things were done as they were. I moved from LC to Newport News, Virginia, in 1967, because my husband was transferred there. I went to four libraries in the area to ask about job possibilities. When they learned that I had just been cataloging at LC, they invited me on the spot to come in for an

100 interview, and I received four job offers! I took the one that would give me the most opportunity to do original cataloging.

DM: What led you to make the transition from cataloger to educator?

AT: Upon moving back to the University of Illinois in 1970—again following my husband, and this time additionally with two very young children—I went to the

105 University library's cataloging department to apply for a cataloging position. I was told that I would have to work with LC copy (typing the headings on the cards, etc.) for a year in order to learn their local policies and practices before I would be allowed to do original cataloging. I was a bit incensed that I had worked at LC *creating* LC copy, but now I would have to spend a year typing headings on LC cards.

110 I took my indignation to the library school Dean, who said that Kathryn Henderson would be going on sabbatical and asked if I'd like to teach cataloging while she was away! I had not particularly liked teaching junior high school, but I learned that teaching graduate students was much different! I loved it! Additionally, it was perfect for me at that particular time, because I could be at home with my two children while preparing for classes and grading papers.

115

DM: I'd like to know more about your dissertation for UNC at Chapel Hill, "A Five-Year Projection of the Impact of the Rules for Form of Heading in the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition*, upon Selected Academic Library Catalogs." What was the impetus for your choosing this topic? Who were your

120 mentors or advisors, and how did they help guide your research?

AT: I really wanted to do a study of online catalogs, comparing them with card catalogs, for my dissertation, but in 1978 I learned that there were no *complete* catalogs online yet. There were a lot of name-title catalogs, based on what had been entered into circulation systems of the day. But none had subject access. So I began

125 noticing, in my reading, things that seemed to be possible dissertation questions. One day, while reading an article by Joseph Rosenthal, titled "Planning for the

Catalogs: A Managerial Perspective” (from the 1978 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries) I came to the following: “The Library of Congress has estimated that approximately 49% of the existing MARC records will need to have headings updated to bring them into line with AACR 2. We do not know how to apply this projection to the records of any library other than LC ... What will happen to the rate of “changed headings” during the first five years of implementation of AACR 2? Will the rate of change decrease, and if so, what kind of declining curve will it follow?” Hmmm, I thought, I could find that out! So that’s how it began. When I had entered the PhD program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1977, there was no one teaching cataloging full time—only adjuncts. My program advisor was Lester Asheim, an absolutely wonderful person and teacher, after whom I have tried to model my teaching. He agreed to be my advisor for my dissertation because he felt that I already knew quite a lot about cataloging—I just needed help with how to write a dissertation. My committee consisted of three professors and two librarians. When I was preparing to defend my proposal, I took each of the committee members to lunch, one at a time, in order to defend my very unconventional methodology for doing a five-year projection—methodology that I had constructed on my own (one of my first inspirations in the shower!). My idea was to take a sample of one year’s cataloging from three academic libraries, one small, one medium-sized, and one large. Then I would make that sample stand for the first year after implementation of AACR2. Next, that same sample would stand for the second year after implementation, which would work because I could eliminate the headings that already had been changed in the first year. Then that same sample would stand for the third year, and so on. I managed to convince all five committee members, even the two catalog librarians: Joe A. Hewitt, Associate Director for Technical Services, Wilson Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; and Lawrence O. Kline, Head, Monographic Cataloging Department, Perkins Library, Duke University. My proposal was approved and the research proceeded. The research showed that if library catalogers were to wait until a name needed to be used in cataloging to change that name in the catalog, then even the first year’s changes would be a lot less than the figure from LC. Further, a name could be different from what it would have been in previous rules, but if there were no entries for that name already in the catalog, it would not be an issue. And if LC copy were to be accepted as it came, without changing a heading until LC changed it, there would be even further reduction (i.e., leaving the changes the first year: 3.6% - large; 2.9% - medium; 0.5% - small). The reason changes were such an issue at this time was that if a library wanted to have an integrated catalog with all new entries interfiled with pre-1981 entries, then headings on cards already in the catalog had to be erased and retyped, or cross references had to be made between two groups of cards; although if the change were very slight, such as addition of a date, then the cards could be interfiled. People began hearing about my results, and I was invited all over the country to speak. This was not your typical reaction to a library science dissertation! The most

170 influential invitation was speaking at the ALA annual meeting in 1981—the very large room didn’t even have standing room for another person!

DM: Did your projections turn out to be correct?

AT: Yes, catalogers at the library at Iowa State University, where I had been Assistant Head of the Catalog Department from 1972 to 1975, decided to keep statistics
175 on how many changes had to be made in their catalogs due to AACR2. That library was comparable to the medium-sized library in my study. Barbara Paff, Head of Catalog Maintenance there, and I analyzed the data and found that the difference between my projection and their actual cataloging was statistically insignificant. We published this finding in: “Looking Back: Implementation of AACR 2”
180 (*Library Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (July 1986): 272–285).

DM: How did cataloging change during the course of your teaching career?

AT: The most obvious change was going from card catalogs to online catalogs. At first I had to teach how to type catalog cards. (Does anyone remember card platens
185 for a typewriter that had a metal strip along the length of the platen to hold down the edge of the card?) Gradually we went to teaching the entry of records into MARC paper forms and then into MARC computer forms. Of course, I then had to add teaching of the MARC format to the teaching of cataloging rules, but after a while, I no longer had to spend as much time on filing rules. Cataloging rules change constantly, so that was always a change from year to year. In addition, LC
190 began to be more responsive to the subject needs of catalog users, with the result that there was more emphasis on the hierarchical logic of notes, references, and relationships. LCSH became more thesaurus-like, which led to the teaching of thesauri, ontologies, etc. LC Classification became more than just a list of numbers assigned to topics. Dewey had to find hierarchically logical places to insert new
195 concepts, such as “the Internet,” while also trying to overcome bias in parts of the schedule, such as the religion schedule being overwhelmingly devoted to Christianity. And finally, all of these things moved into the world of *metadata*. Another change was that of gradually taking into account the ways cataloging is done in places other than libraries, such as archives, museums, or on the Internet.

200 DM: Why did you write a textbook on the organization of information even though you were already the author of a primary textbook for introductory cataloging courses?

AT: I gradually came to the understanding that the introductory cataloging course, which was a required course in almost all LIS schools, needed to address the real
205 life situations that the students were going to face. Most of them were not going to be catalogers. Some *were* going to become catalogers or metadata librarians, but others were going to become reference librarians, library administrators,

acquisition librarians, information technology specialists, archivists, museum curators, subject information specialists, and so on. Many of them were also going to
210 be creating, using, and/or providing access to bibliographies, indexes, finding aids, registers, and all kinds of databases, including catalogs. These students needed to learn about all the ways of organizing information so that they could support creation of all kinds of retrieval tools in whatever settings they would find positions after graduation. I had adjusted my introductory course to reflect this understand-
215 ing through the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, and finally I wrote my lectures into a book that was published in 1999, and has gone through two additional revisions, with another now currently being written with my co-author, Daniel Joudrey.

DM: In the latter part of the 1970s, you taught an “Introduction to Automation in
220 Libraries” course at North Carolina Central University in Durham. How was that received? What were your students like?

AT: Well, as I’m sure you can imagine, it was quite primitive automation compared to what we have today! I taught them to write simple programs that were punched into keypunch cards. The program cards were followed by cards with the data to
225 be counted, and the whole pack had to be submitted to the mainframe computer. Then there was a wait until the next day to get the results, and if there had been even a tiny error on one of the program cards, that card had to be repunched, and the submission and wait process had to be repeated. The MARC format had been created in 1968, and by the late 1970s MARC was used largely to code records
230 through OCLC for printing cards for card catalogs, for book catalogs, and for microfilm catalogs. There were a few online catalogs (name access and title access only) in mini-computers. Mini-computers were largely used for circulation systems, and MARC was not usually the method of coding records for circulation until after online catalogs became more common and an effort was made to use
235 the same records for both circulation and catalogs. Students were quite quick to catch on to automation concepts. It was an elective course; so only the technologically adept students were drawn to it.

DM: You have had several experiences teaching cataloging in other countries. What was it like to teach people in Brazil to catalog for a brand new library, back
240 in 1978? What were the challenges and rewards?

AT: As you probably know, most people in Brazil speak Portuguese. I minored in Spanish in college, and I cataloged Spanish and Portuguese at the Library of Congress. Portuguese looks somewhat like Spanish, although it sounds very different. So I was able to read it, but not understand it when spoken. My sister and her husband were living in Brazil and were in the process of starting a Seminary. They
245 wanted a library that would have a circulating collection, because their students

would be coming in from rural areas, and they wanted these students to take books back with them for study. Few if any libraries in Brazil at the time had circulating collections, so there was little experience there to draw on. They called on me for assistance. I was able to teach some of the local folks to catalog the books by writing out catalog “cards” as they watched. They could see where I placed the title, the author(s), the publishing information, the description, etc. Then for subject headings, I relied on my sister to translate to the “catalogers” what I said about how to determine aboutness and choose subject headings from a list in Portuguese. In order to create a circulating collection, we had to design pockets, check-out cards, and date due slips, and then we took our designs to a printer, because we could not purchase these items already made, as libraries did in the US (and ordering them from the US would have taken weeks, if not months, not to mention the cost of shipping). With all these challenges, it was rewarding to see the catalog beginning to take shape before I returned home. The greatest reward was visiting again nineteen years later and being able to see the library and its catalog in existence and in heavy use in the Seminary building.

DM: How did your 1999 sabbatical at the Bodleian Library at Oxford University influence your teaching?

AT: My project at the Bodleian Library was to redesign their website. They had a site that consisted of separate URLs that were not categorized or linked. Although this was actually the state of the majority of websites at that time, libraries were working to provide organized sites, just as they provided organized collections. I created a design, but I was not expected to write the programs that would make the pages appear in that form, thank goodness. I did write all my syllabi in html “from scratch” at the time, along with my own entire website, but I would have needed a year instead of a semester to write the html for the Bodleian website! It was gratifying, several months after returning home, to look up the Bodleian site and see my design at work. The experience was helpful in my teaching, because it helped me widen my view of cataloging to be more of the approach of “organizing information.” I also expanded the coverage of my courses to include the idea of designing technical services websites.

DM: What were the purposes of your Senior Fulbright Fellowships to Thailand in 2002, and Israel in 2004? How did the outcomes meet your expectations?

AT: In both cases, I conducted workshops. In Thailand I was asked to teach two workshops. One was intended to teach online cataloging (e.g., using OCLC) to librarians who came from around the country to Suranaree University of Technology to attend the workshop. The second was to teach university professors the use of Blackboard for web-based instruction. In Israel I was asked to teach two workshops—one on metadata, one on ontologies and taxonomies—and a colloquium

on modern tools for organizing information. The workshops were attended by master's and doctoral students from the Information Science Department of Bar-Ilan University, Tel-Aviv, some faculty who were teaching in the area, and practicing professional catalogers, database managers, bibliographers, and library managers from around the country. The colloquium was attended by many Information Science Department faculty members and students and also by librarians from the area. I do think that, in general, outcomes met expectations. As had been the case in Brazil, language was a small issue. The attendees in both Thailand and Israel were much more fluent in understanding English than I was in their languages, so I had to rely on translators to read or repeat the questions for me. Otherwise, however, attendees seemed to learn what they came for. And I learned a great deal about two very different cultures!

DM: What changes did you see in library school students' attitudes toward cataloging, or metadata provision generally, during your teaching career?

AT: When I first started teaching in the early 1970s, introductory cataloging was a required course, and a majority of students dreaded it. They had to learn to type catalog card sets, as well as learn what seemed to many to be arcane rules for creating the records and for filing cards into catalogs. Authority control also began to be introduced, and soon MARC encoding was added. I did try to enliven the course by such things as having students catalog themselves. For example, I asked: what is your title? Who is your author? What was your date of publication? What is your physical description? Where would you be classified in Dewey and in LCC? Most students enjoyed this way of looking at the rules, because in such an exercise there are not "right answers," but there are "right" ways of understanding what kinds of data should be placed into each of these fields. However, students still dreaded the course and claimed not to understand why it was required for everyone. Several told me about librarians they knew prior to attending library school who told them that they would enjoy everything except cataloging, and they just had to grit their teeth and get through that course somehow. However, around the turn of the century, as the concept of organizing all kinds of information took hold, and as metadata moved online and into many less rigid formats, I could see attitudes changing. It was around that time that when students gave their oral reports at the end of a semester, they had a great deal of fun shouting META-DATA! every time it was appropriate to use the word "metadata" in their reports. There came to be more interest in understanding the theory, principles, standards, and tools behind information organization in all types of environments.

DM: Subject analysis, its nature and importance, has been the focus of much of your research and writing. Has your view of what a subject is, and/or what "aboutness" is, changed over time?

325 AT: I think that when I first entered the field, I viewed subject analysis as the process of finding the “right” heading(s) in the *Sears List of Subject Headings* (as a school librarian) and then in the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* list (as an academic librarian). And then one had to find the “right” notation in the Dewey Decimal Classification or the Library of Congress Classification. Cataloging at the
330 Library of Congress was divided into separate Descriptive Cataloging and Subject Cataloging departments. When I worked there I was assigned to Descriptive Cataloging, so I did not learn the principles behind LCSH and LCC as applied at LC, although I had learned some theory of subject analysis in library school. I didn’t make much progress in my understanding of subjects and aboutness until I
335 started teaching. Even then I didn’t make a lot of progress at first, partly because the cataloging profession in the US at the time was more engrossed with descriptive cataloging rules. Most academic and other research libraries did not even place subject references in their catalogs, because there was a strongly held belief that real scholars should search for authors and titles, not subjects. Many school and public
340 libraries also did not add references, because they did not have full-time catalogers and they purchased card sets ready to file from H.W. Wilson or other vendors. I hope I did not damage those early students too much. It was writing the subject chapters in the seventh edition of *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification*, published in 1985, that really made a difference. For the sixth edition, 1980, a third
345 co-author wrote the subject chapters while I did the descriptive chapters. For the seventh edition, though, I did the whole thing. I was forced to really pay attention to the work of Charles Cutter in the nineteenth century in the United States; to Ranganathan’s Colon Classification in the early to mid-twentieth century, which used a truly faceted approach; and the long tradition of British subject analysis,
350 including Brown’s Subject Classification, Bliss’ Bibliographic Classification, and the work of the British Classification Research Group. I finally began seeing subject analysis as a serious scholarly way to provide access to library materials.

The process of determining aboutness did not really receive my attention until the eighth edition of *Introduction to Cataloging and Classification*, published in
355 1992, the seventh edition having a chapter on *Subject Arrangement* of Library Materials instead. While the title of the chapter remained the same, the introduction to subject analysis increased from one page in the seventh to four pages in the eighth; in the ninth edition, published in 2000, the chapter was retitled *Subject Access* to Library Materials. Going on at the same time as the eighth onward were
360 my two decades (1990–2009) of serving on ALA’s Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) and its subcommittees, and also serving on the Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee. So I had lots more reason to learn about subject analysis than I had had when serving on descriptive cataloging or administrative-type committees.

365 Another major change in my understanding of what a subject is, and what aboutness is, concerns the place of form/genre terms in a subject heading string. I gradually came to understand that, while I might have fully understood that

Cats—Behavior represented a resource about the behavior of cats, and *Cats—Bibliography* represented a resource that gives a list of resources about cats, the fact that both subdivisions were coded \$x in MARC did not allow a computer system to automatically give users works about some specific aspects of cats (such as behavior, diseases, or nutrition) separately from giving users works that are forms or genres of resources about cats (such as bibliographies, pictorial works, or fiction). Coming to understand that form/genre terms are not subjects was very difficult for the profession. So I did quite a bit of writing about this topic. I also added to my website a large section devoted to all the documents that were generated during the process of bringing to fruition the development of ways to distinguish form/genre from subject/aboutness, including two of yours, David!

DM: There is constant speculation about the MLIS, and concerns for its viability as a professional credential. What are your recommendations for the future of library science Master's programs? Are there possibilities to break out of the cul-de-sac of limited time vs. expanding curriculum?

AT: While in the doctoral program I took a number of education courses. For one of these I wrote a paper about the possibilities that might be achieved by expanding the MLS into a two-year program. The paper was published in the *Journal of Education for Librarianship* in 1978. Ever since then I have believed that the real answer is a two-year master's program, but the profession has not agreed. There have been a few programs that have expanded the number of courses required to receive the degree, but there are none that are real two-year programs. While I was at Columbia University, we expanded the degree to be a true two-year program. It was quite successful, if you consider increases in enrollment to be success; regardless, the Provost and Board of the university closed the school because of their preconceived notion that there was soon to be no need for libraries, because everything was going to be in computers. Who would organize all that information in computers was not even considered. So I think there is no solution, acceptable to the profession anyway, to the issue of limited time vs. expanded curriculum.

I am quite concerned for the future of the MLIS. The current "iSchools" have dropped many library science courses, especially cataloging courses and school library courses. The School of Information Sciences at University of Pittsburgh has recently combined with Pitt's Department of Computer Science to become the School of Computing and Information, and what was the Library and Information Science Program of that school is now the Department of Information Culture and Data Stewardship (ICDS). The other two departments in the newly combined school are advertised to be Computer Science, and Informatics and Network Systems. The news release about this stated that a "growing number of other universities around the country ... have reorganized their programs in similar ways." The dean emphasized a shift to embracing big data, data analytics, and an interaction between computation and information as being what is driving the department

merger. Although the MLIS is still mentioned on the web page for the newly
410 named ICDS department, and the fact that the program is ALA-accredited is
emphasized, “Library” is no longer in any part of the school or department name.
As library science professors retire from these reorganized schools around the
country, many are being replaced by other kinds of scientists. Just as library
schools survived the spate of school closings in the 1980s (at University of Chicago,
415 Columbia University, Emory University, and about ten others), perhaps library sci-
ence programs will survive the current reorganizations. If they are to survive, the
facts must be emphasized: every library I have walked into lately is packed with
users—people reading, people waiting to use the computers, students following up
on research mentioned by their teachers/professors, children attending story
420 hours, people researching genealogy, people attending community information
programs, and so on. These libraries need librarians who have learned the latest
technology, the latest advances in organizing information, and best practices in
serving library users.

DM: Your research, publications, and professional presentations have covered a
425 wide range of topics over the years. Looking back, were there changes in emphasis
over time? What were they and what caused them?

AT: Starting with my first book in 1976, I always wrote about all of the topics of
descriptive cataloging, subject cataloging, catalogs and other retrieval tools, and
technical service aspects, because the books I wrote covered all these. But if one
430 just looks at my research articles, it appears that there was a rather sudden shift
around 1992 from descriptive cataloging to subject cataloging. I’ve already said
that I started serving on SAC in 1990 and became its chair in 1992. Because the
implementation of AACR2 seemed at the time to have solved most of the problems
of descriptive cataloging—which, of course, now is not quite true as libraries adjust
435 to RDA, I turned to research in the area of subject cataloging. These articles
included looking at subject access to information in periodicals indexes; form/
genre research; ontologies/taxonomies; controlled vocabulary vs. keyword search-
ing of titles, notes, etc.; keyword searching of FAST vs. LCSH; and knowledge man-
agement systems. Interspersed among all these, though, there continued to be
440 articles about authority control, system design, information organization, FRBR,
and general cataloging/metadata issues, often because I was invited to speak on
those particular issues, and then the speeches turned into articles. Also, I did a
series of presentations and/or articles about teaching various aspects of cataloging:
cataloging principles (1989), organization of electronic resources (2000), seriality
445 (1977 and 2002), subject cataloging (2002), authority control (2004), and Dewey
Decimal Classification (2006). I do want to acknowledge that a few of these proj-
ects and articles were accomplished with co-authors, several of whom were previ-
ous students of mine.

DM: You have been a major advisor and committee member for many doctoral
450 dissertations in library science. What were the major rewards and challenges that
this presented?

AT: There was always the reward of learning in depth about an area of cataloging/
librarianship that I had not delved into before. Sometimes the doctoral student's
research overlapped mine, and in those cases, it was helpful to have that area
455 already researched so that I could cite and build upon that work. A major challenge
I had was that about half of my doctoral dissertation advisees were from non-
English-speaking countries, which meant that there were issues with their English
to various degrees. But these students all produced excellent dissertations in the
end. I enjoyed the opportunities for co-authoring articles based on three disserta-
460 tions at the University of Pittsburgh (those of Patrice Clemson, Ling-Ling Lai, and
Daniel Joudrey) and a master's paper at the University of Chicago (that of Mark
Watson). Other students also rewrote and published their dissertations or master's
papers as articles, which made me proud!

DM: You've had many positions of responsibility in the American Library Associa-
465 tion, particularly in ALCTS and LITA. Which experiences would you say were
most rewarding, and why?

AT: Being on the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA),
ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, Cataloging and Classification Sec-
tion (ALA/RTSD/CCS) (1977–81) was awesome, partly because I was writing my
470 dissertation during this time, but also because it was such a turning point in the
cataloging profession. The CC:DA hearing on the AACR2 rule to catalog micro-
forms as microforms, not as the books they are copies of, was hugely eye-opening.
People got up to "testify" for their allotted time, and if not in tears when they
started, many were in tears within a minute or two. They were so concerned for
475 the users of these microforms – they thought that the users needed to have the
original book date (e.g., 1872) in the publication area, not the copy date (e.g.,
1975). I was touched by the caring that was demonstrated by these speakers. That
same situation taught me about ALA politics. The committee voted in a tie on the
question of whether to recommend that LC follow the new rule. So, even though
480 the chair thought that the new rule should be followed, she voted not to make that
recommendation because she believed that if the vote were to follow the new rule,
then RTSD would disband CC:DA and take the oversight of cataloging rules away
from CCS.

While what I just related can be considered somewhat rewarding, experiences
485 that were *truly* rewarding were serving on and chairing the ALA Association for
Library Collections and Technical Services Subject Analysis Committee, (ALA/
ALCTS/CCS/SAC) (1990–94), and chairing and serving on the ALA/ALCTS Cata-
log Form and Function Committee (CFFC), (1995–1999). In addition to serving

on SAC itself, I served on various SAC subcommittees between 1990 and 2009. So I
490 attended more than 25 years of SAC meetings, given that I had attended SAC
meetings before I became a member, and continued attending as long as I could
attend ALA meetings. As Chair of SAC, I put in place some procedures that con-
tinue to be followed today, such as not having SAC meetings at the same time as
CC:DA meetings, because most catalogers do both subject and descriptive catalog-
495 ing. The document numbering system used by SAC is another example. We put
on some important ALA meeting programs on subject analysis during my years of
service, including “Crisis in Subject Cataloging and Retrieval” in 1995, a pre-con-
ference on subject cataloging of electronic resources in 1997, and a program on
form/genre in 1997. And we did regional institutes on “Demystifying Subject
500 Cataloging” in 1995. The evaluation of Faceted Access to Subject Terminology
(FAST) done by the SAC FAST Subcommittee was extremely important, because
of the adoption of FAST by many agencies, not necessarily libraries, that have
wanted to provide subject access to their documents.

Chairing the Catalog Form and Function Committee (CFFC) was rewarding
505 largely because of the series of “briefing papers” sponsored by the CFFC that were
published in the *ALCTS Newsletter* from 1994 to about 2000. These papers covered
newer topics concerning catalogs that ALA members should know about, such as
Z39.50, subject authority control on the Internet, and the form/genre subfield v
implementation. The papers were brought together in a separate collection pub-
510 lished by ALCTS in 2005, and I was asked to write the introduction for that
collection.

Although not specifically ALA related, I also found it rewarding to serve on the
Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (2000–2008). It felt like
being in the forefront of the classification progress to be able to discuss needed
515 changes and new concepts with Committee members from various parts of the
profession that make use of DDC.

DM: What do you consider your most important contributions to librarianship?

AT: I believe that my two most important contributions were, first, my dissertation
and, second, getting \$v for form/genre terms through MARBI. With regard to my
520 dissertation, which I’ve already discussed, Michael Gorman once said in a public
presentation that Arlene Taylor almost single-handedly got AACR2 implemented
because her dissertation research made it seem reasonable to do. I have not been
able to find his quotation to cite. However, I did find a statement in Gorman’s
autobiography, *Broken Pieces*: “Probably the most valuable articles in favor of
525 AACR2 were contributed by Arlene Taylor, who had, unlike most of the other con-
tributors to the debate, done some research that showed it was cost-effective to
implement AACR2” (p. 200).

Getting \$v through MARBI in 1995 is a story I don’t think is widely known. As
already mentioned, I served on the Subject Analysis Committee from 1990 to

530 1994, as chair from 1992 to 1994. One of SAC's Subcommittees was on Form Data (1991–94) and I served on that as well. Coming to understand that form terms should not be coded with the same character as subject subdivisions was not easy for the profession. During the discussions of the Form Data Subcommittee, people on each side of the issue were sometimes quite emotional. Finally, though, the

535 Form Data Subcommittee and then SAC decided that the arguments demonstrating that users needed computers to sort their subject retrievals with a breakdown of the subject by form/genre won out over the “it will cost too much” argument and the “is all of this worth it” question. When the subfield v proposal was to be discussed and voted on at a MARBI meeting, I was being told by folks who knew

540 MARBI members that it was not likely to pass—that most MARBI members fell into the “it will cost too much” camp. I had been charged to attend the MARBI meeting and defend the subfield v proposal. I believe it wouldn't have passed when it did were it not for an insight that came to me in the shower as I was getting ready to go to the MARBI meeting that day! In thinking about what I would say, I suddenly

545 remembered that the charge to MARBI included something to the effect that MARBI was supposed to assist other committees of ALA in carrying out their needs with regard to the MARC format (*To encourage the creation of needed standards for the representation in machine-readable form of bibliographic information*, to be exact). It occurred to me that I should remind the committee of their charge

550 and point out to them that SAC had been through all the pros and cons and had determined that the new subfield code was what was needed to help identify form/genre terms for users. We were asking MARBI for assistance in accomplishing this, not for their permission to distinguish these terms. Before I spoke, the discussion and questions from MARBI members made me feel very discouraged, but

555 then I could see something like realization spreading across the faces of MARBI members as I spoke. The vote was taken soon after I spoke, and there was only one vote against it. I believe \$v to be my second important contribution to librarianship, because after my success with AACR2 in 1981, my friend Charles Simpson took me to lunch. He said to me then that I had just gotten my PhD and still had

560 many years ahead of me, but I had already done what many folks only accomplish after a professional lifetime. He asked, “What are you going to do for an encore?” I know that almost no one knows about the \$v story, and many would say I had done a lot of other things that folks would consider to be more important, but I have always thought of \$v as my “encore”!

565 DM: What did and do you do for fun, in and out of your job?

AT: Genealogy! I suspect many people do not realize how much “cataloging” is involved in categorizing people into families, keeping records of documents, keeping track of pictures, and so forth. I have enjoyed this tremendously. I also had the opportunity in 2014 to visit England, where my father was born in 1906. My

570 husband and I were able to meet cousins who are descended from the parts of the

family who stayed in England when my father's family emigrated. Two of my cousins drove us around to see family historical sites. It was both meaningful and fun.

DM: Arlene, thank you very much for taking the time to share so much about your
575 life and career!

AT: And I thank you for the opportunity!