OLAC NEWSLETTER
Volume 10, Number 4
December, 1990

FROM THE EDITOR

NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The following communication was received by the Editor from the Office of the Associate Librarian for Collections Services, Library of Congress.

The Library of Congress recently undertook a thorough reexamination of the Library's structure and services. In Fall 1989, a Library study group was convened to examine and make recommendations regarding the future of the Audiovisual Data Sheet Program. The group's work yielded the following information:

1. Over the last decade, new formats such as computer software have emerged, and we have been requested by the community to give high priority to making records for these items available. Because LC's Audiovisual Data Sheet catalogers also have responsibility for the new formats, the output and timeliness of Data Sheet records have declined.

2. During the same period, the program experienced a significant decline in receipts -- a 52% reduction between 1981 and 1988. The program's lack of timeliness along with changes in the nature and direction of the audiovisual industry are recognized as contributing factors to this decline.
3. Libraries have been creating large numbers of audiovisual records and sharing them via the bibliographic utilities. This cooperative cataloging reduces the need for the Data Sheet Program. Libraries also have the advantage of cataloging from the materials themselves, rather than the surrogates which have been the prime source used by the program's catalogers.
4. The Library will continue to support cataloging of audiovisual materials in other ways (see ATTACHMENT for a detailed statement of the Library's intentions in this regard).

   Recognizing these facts and acting on the study group's recommendations, the Library is now proposing that the program be discontinued. We are asking for comments on this proposal. During the comment period, work will continue on Data Sheets already received; additional contributions will not be accepted.

Questions, comments, and other responses received by April 1, 1991 will be considered. Please send them to:

Henriette D. Avram
Associate Librarian for Collections Services
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540

ATTACHMENT

The Library of Congress proposes that the Audiovisual Data Sheets Program be discontinued and will undertake measures to continue or expand efforts (listed below) which will support libraries that have benefited from the program:

1. The Library's Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy will continue to advise the AV cataloging community (for example through assistance to the Online Audiovisual Catalogers organization and to the Audiovisual Committee of the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, American Library Association) and will continue to provide assistance to staff who catalog moving image materials that are added to LC's collections.
2. The Library will continue its name authority support of audiovisual cataloging by encouraging the production of name authorities for audiovisual materials by NACO participating libraries.
3. The Library will reapply the cataloging resources currently involved in the Audiovisual Data Sheet Program to cataloging of non-book materials added to the collections of the Library.
4. The Cataloging Distribution Service and the Library's Information Technology Services Directorate (ITS) will undertake feasibility and market studies on the conversion of

moving image Copyright catalog records to the USMARC format so that Copyright records may be used as the basis for moving image cataloging in LC and other libraries.

5. The Library will support and encourage ALA in its efforts to establish a National Information Standards Organization standard for consistency and accuracy in producers' and distributors' description of audiovisual titles.

FROM THE CHAIR

What a great meeting! The Rochester meeting is over -- all the planning, worries, excitement. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those involved -- the planning committees, local arrangements, speakers and those of you who attended. We had a wonderful time, and learned a lot.

If anyone is interested in hosting the next OLAC meeting (in 1992, so you have some time) please let me know. We have had meetings now in Dublin, Ohio, Los Angeles, and Rochester. We are open to suggestions. If you are not interested in hosting the meeting, but would be willing to work with the committee if needed, please let me know that as well.

The regular OLAC meetings have been scheduled for ALA Midwinter. CAPC will meet Friday night, 8-10, the business meeting and OLAC session will be Saturday night 8-10. We do not have room assignments yet, so please check the ALA conference schedule. OLAC is listed under Unaffiliated Organizations.

Thanks again to all who made the Rochester meeting such a success.

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

```
    Reporting period:
    July 20, 1990 through October 26, 1990

    Account balance July 20, 1990                    $3,583.45

        INCOME

            Interest                                    107.77
            Memberships                                 891.00
            MN filing fee returned                       35.00
            Back issues                                 117.50
            Conference monies                        11,534.00
```

```
                                           ------------
      TOTAL INCOME                          12,685.27

      TOTAL                                $16,268.72

      EXPENSES

            Newsletter v. 10, no. 3            851.48
            ALA Midwinter room fee            120.00
            Check printing                      5.00
            OLAC Conference expenses
                    Advance                 11,000.00
                    Refund                      70.00
                    Bounced check               90.00
                    Postage and phone           26.46
                    Postage                     50.35
                                           ----------
      TOTAL EXPENSES                        12,213.29

      Account balance October 26, 1990      $4,055.43
      CD at 8.10% matures 3/91               6,000.00

      TOTAL OLAC ASSETS                     $10,055.43

      Current membership: 691
```

CONFERENCE REPORTS
Bobby Ferguson, column editor

1990 OLAC CONFERENCE IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK
TECHNOLOGY: FRIEND OR FOE?

REPORTS FROM GENERAL SESSIONS

I. Do We Catalog for Other Catalogers?
Presenter: Beatrice Kovacs, University of North Carolina

Dr. Kovacs' opening speech was as provocative as she intended it to be, and certainly created much discussion throughout the OLAC Conference. She began by contrasting the qualifications most professional positions require with the training a new employee actually receives, which tends to stifle creativity and to produce a clone who will work exactly like everyone else on the staff.

Some of the questions Dr. Kovacs raised were: 1) What has been the impact of technology on cataloging? 2) What is authority control, and why do we need it? 3) Is change good? 4) What methods are there for providing access to collections? 5) What about the patron? 6) Are patron needs and standardization incompatible? and, finally, 7) Where do we go from here?

Dr. Kovacs mentioned technological innovations and discussed how they affected both catalogers and patrons. That the topic being discussed was not a new one was shown in the many quotes from acknowledged authorities, as well as newcomers in the library field, covering a wide range of ideas. Dr. Kovacs made us look at ourselves in a new way, and the fact that some of us became heated and uncomfortable only re-emphasized the idea that technology can be as friendly or unfriendly as we make it.

Bobby Ferguson
State Library of Louisiana

II. Technology and AV Cataloging: Relationship?
Presenter: Jean Weihs, Technology Services Group

Jean Weihs gave attendees of the OLAC conference the benefit of her years in libraries, both as an administrator and in working with technology. She began her speech with the admonition that beginning to automate by putting in a COM catalog was not a good step. Any institution would be better off waiting longer and going with an online catalog. To be most effective an OPAC should be MARC-based and able to interface with a library utility. The system should be capable of displaying both brief and full records, and should be able to supply labels in a variety of sizes and shapes.

Ms. Weihs emphasized planning when writing a contract for an online system. Don't assume anything, and detail exactly what you want as an end project. Specify the help you want from the dealer, and the completion date for installation. Have a lawyer look over the contract before signing. Some institutions hire an expert to do the detail tasks, but if you decide to do this, get one with a proven record, and someone who knows library processes. A person connected with a dealer is not a good choice, nor is someone who knows only computers.

The aspect of workflow change which has the greatest impact on increasing productivity is staff reorganization. Those institutions providing the best cataloging have the lowest productivity increases. It is quick-and-dirty cataloging, with very brief records, which shows the highest rates of increase. Audiovisual cataloging takes the most time, especially if full and complete records are produced. Full records do, however, give patrons the best access to materials in the collection.

There must be one person responsible for implementing an online system -- one person who can work with consultants, visit sites, attend all meetings, trouble shoot, work with system administrators, train staff, etc. Trying to do this in addition to a regular workload is unsatisfactory for both jobs.

There is always resentment if the people affected by a change are not involved in the planning for it. There should be a staff team involved in all decision making. Staff

participation in the planning and implementation phases will insure support for the change.

Bobby Ferguson
State Library of Louisiana

III. Mastering Technology.
Presenter: Sheila Intner, Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science

Sheila Intner began her address by recognizing OLAC's 10th anniversary. She expressed thanks to all those who have contributed to the development of OLAC, beginning with the founder, Nancy Olson, and including all the subsequent chairpersons, Sheila Smyth and the 1990 OLAC Conference Planning Committee, and all attendees of the Rochester Conference. She then presented a summary of the events of the past two and one-half days, describing the highlights of the general sessions, workshops, and tours.

Dr. Intner then spoke about five common myths that many librarians hold. The first myth is "Technology is just a tool." She asserted that to the contrary, technology is more than neutral; it shapes our work activity and the outcome of our work, an example being online catalog displays. Because we take part in database design as librarians and catalogers, we need to know how the online system operates and must pay attention to developments in the automation industry. The second myth is "We can't afford it" (to buy the best technology). If we settle for only a partial, cheaper system, we may regret it. The third myth, "Newer is better," will not serve us well when evaluating a system for possible purchase. We must look at new systems and features critically, and ask, "Does it do what we need done?"

"Paperless society is just a myth," with its corollary, "Technology won't replace books" is the fourth myth. Although the book will never be replaced we must acknowledge the value of new technologies, such as videotext used as textbooks. The fifth myth is "Standards will emerge." Unfortunately, there is no guarantee that producers of emerging technologies will subscribe to existing standards, or that librarians will always be able to shape standards for their purposes.

Dr. Intner closed with a final corollary: Catalogers will always be needed. Catalogers may always be around, but they will not necessarily do the same things they do today. Referring to Dr. Kovacs' assertion that the term "user friendly" is an oxymoron, Dr. Intner challenged the audience to take the oxymoron out of "user friendly." Our objectives must go beyond individual projects and short-term views. We should also look at the long-term view, and take long-term risks. If we do not, we as catalogers will not be needed. As AV catalogers, we are particularly suited to achieve such objectives, because we know the media, the technology, and the problems of the automated environment and we know that it is our job to serve our users.

Bo-Gay Tong
UCLA

REPORTS FROM WORKSHOPS

1. Informed Processing Decisions: Controlling the Technology Once It Arrives.
Presenter: Karen Driessen, University of Montana

This workshop proved to be a great arena to share and provoke ideas about AV processing. Ms. Driessen began her presentation by asking the audience what kinds of media are causing processing problems. Included in the list were compact discs, video and audiocassettes, computer software, laser discs, interactive video packages and AV as accompanying material.

Ms. Driessen then outlined some of the specific problems non- book media present in shelving, labeling, circulation, preservation, and packaging. Audience participation was invited throughout the workshop.

An important and often overlooked consideration when acquiring AV materials is the cost of processing supplies, such as carousel trays, containers, blank cassettes for making archival copies, a variety of labels, special shelving brackets or display units. A solution offered by Ms. Driessen is to add processing costs to the item's purchase order.

Shelving also affects processing decisions. A show of hands revealed that only a few libraries were integrating their media in the stacks. If media are integrated in the general stacks, sturdy packaging may be needed to protect them from the harsh treatment encountered in an open stack environment.

The discussion of labeling problems for non-book media which circulate generated some helpful suggestions. Use permanent markers for marking ownership or call numbers on the piece when labels will damage the material. If using labels, foilback labels seem to work best. There are numerous shapes and sizes of labels available and many companies will also provide custom imprinting. Barcodes are often affixed to containers when they cannot be placed on pieces such as computer software or compact discs. Mylar strips can be applied to protect barcodes and labels from damage and more securely fasten them. As for kits, it is recommended that each component be labeled in case items get separated from the kit. Contents labels or a copy of the catalog card affixed to the item facilitates inventory of boxed items and kits.

There are new security tattle strips on the market which are particularly designed for media. Extra care should be taken when circulating media, in particular with desensitizing equipment and magnetic media. Brightly colored warning labels can help to alert circulation staff.

Preservation is another important processing consideration. Acid-free packaging is recommended whenever possible to help media stand the test of time. Duplicate or backup copies of tapes or software (when permission is granted to make them) can be made for archival storage. Accompanying guides or instructions may be photocopied and filed separately to protect against possible loss. Containers should be sturdy enough to withstand circulation and shelving. Preservation needs will vary depending on how and where your media are housed.

Repackaging is another factor to consider. We repackage for many different reasons. Often the manufacturer does not provide packaging or it is not sturdy enough for circulation. Also, our storage cabinets may require uniform packaging. For circulation purposes, separate mailing or circulation containers may be necessary. Looseleaf binders, cardboard pambinders, pocket folders, and expanding file folders were offered as suggestions.

Mary Konkel
Governors State University

---

2. Cataloging Videorecordings.
Presenter: Glenn Patton, OCLC

Glenn Patton opened the presentation with an informal poll of the audience to determine the types of materials that we were cataloging. A brief discussion then ensued on the newest item to hit our shelves: interactive media. These are difficult to catalog because they cross formats, e.g. some elements are videorecordings and some are computer software. This was a good example of how models for cataloging AV materials have evolved and are still evolving. AV cataloging is a changing field with new products and new equipment coming out all the time. AV catalogers "tend to figure it out on their own" and OLAC provides catalogers a chance for input toward developing standards that change as the technology changes.

Mr. Patton next addressed the rules revision process. A CC:DA task force is exploring ways to make a clearer distinction between producer and publisher/distributor. CC:DA is also working on modifying the definition of kit. AACR2R included rules which changed the location of the format indication for videorecordings (VHS, Beta, etc.) from the physical description area to a note. There is a proposal to validate the 538 tag (Technical Details note) for recording of the format information. The goal is to facilitate display of this information in local systems. It is easier to manipulate one specific field (538) in online systems than to distinguish one 500 field from another.

We moved on to a discussion of the 007 field (Physical Description fixed field). Data in this field have been used to create different circulation periods for different media. They could also be used to set up different search groups in local systems. OCLC uses the 007 field when searching for duplicate records. "How important is this field?" Mr. Patton felt

that it was extremely important, especially subfield e (videorecording format). He reminded the audience that subfield e was not in the older records for videorecordings. Use of the subfield began in about 1985, so check when cataloging now to make sure the information is current. "Would OCLC be able to use the 007 field to help qualify online searching by VHS or Beta?" No, because the older portions of the database, in which the 007 field was not encoded according to today's standards, would be eliminated from the search result. Encoding on all pre-1985 videorecording records would have to be updated before this search strategy could be effective. Another newer element in the 007 field is subfield i (kind of sound). Here one can record monaural or stereo. When uncertain of the appropriate value for this subfield, always include the subfield and code it "unknown." This applies to all fields in 007.

"Was there a move to include a code for 'closed captioned for the hearing impaired' in either the 007 or 008 field?" Not yet, but it is a good idea and Mr. Patton will take the suggestion back to OCLC.

Music video cataloging was the next topic. Included in the discussion were videos of operas, ballets, rock videos and others. The big question asked is "What is the main entry?" Mr. Patton told us to apply rules 21.23Cl and 21.23Dl, and to apply the LC rule interpretation 21.23C, January 5, 1989. The main entry may be principal performer or title, depending on the layout of the information for the work in hand.

"Is there a value in adding a GMD to the added entries?" No, it is not current practice. It would be better to depend on coded values, like the 007 field. Also, in some local systems that have authority control, adding the subfield h can interfere with headings causing them not to display or creating multiple headings. The same holds true for adding a GMD to the uniform title.

"Has there been a move to use the videorecording publisher number?" Yes, stock numbers are recorded in the 037 field. These numbers are currently the last required 500 note. There is also talk of extending the use of the 028 field (Music Publisher's Number) to include this stock number. It was mentioned from the floor that more videos were adding the ISBN. Mr. Patton cautioned us to make sure the number was really an ISBN and not a Universal Product Code (UPC). The UPC can be used in the sound recordings format (024 field) but not in videorecordings.

"How does one treat a colorized version of older videos?" The 007 subfield d reflects that it is color, the physical description area (300 subfield b) says color, the fixed field Date 1 relates to the item in hand or the date when colorized, the Date Type is c or p, whichever is applicable. The older original date would not be in Date 2. Date Type r is not used; it is not a reissue. Because it has been colorized it becomes something new and different. "Colorized version" is recorded in the edition area (250) and a bibliographic history note about the original black and white version is made. "What about videos in letter box format?" These can be treated the same way. Record "Letter box format" in the edition area (250) and make a note. "What does one do if the only date on the videorecording is the original date of the film?" Code as Date Type q and catalog accordingly.

Our last topic of discussion was videorecordings that were originally broadcast on television. Some cataloging agencies treat them as multi-part monographs with one title and different episodes. The result is multiple records, each with the same title (the title of the TV series) given as the title proper (245 subfield a), and a different part title (245 subfield p), for each episode, as many as needed. Problems with this approach were discussed. Records following this pattern require extensive editing when used by libraries which prefer other approaches.

Each individual program could also be the main entry providing the title of each episode can stand on its own. However, do not do this if one or more titles cannot stand alone, e.g. the first tape is called introduction, or just has a number. We were reminded that each library needs to take its own concerns into account; for shelving purposes items in a series may also be treated as a set. Mr. Patton told us that if there are a small number of tapes and the series ends, he prefers individual entries and makes series titles (440). However, if it is an open-ended program such as NOVA, he would make individual title entries and use uniform title added entries (730). It depends on how the item presents itself. Do videorecordings represent themselves as a series? The theory is that the videorecordings themselves are not issued in series, but began life as a television program so a uniform title added entry is needed for a tie-in. However, there are always exceptions such as Star Trek which need both series title entries and uniform title added entries. The recordings are issued as a numbered series from the publisher but not in the same order as they were first aired. Mr. Patton left us with the reminder that there are no hard and fast rules about this; one needs to look at each item individually.

Beth Boni
Nazareth College of Rochester

---

3. Retrospective Conversion and the AV Cataloger.
Presenters: Bobby Ferguson, State Library of Louisiana; Cynthia Whitacre, OCLC

This workshop presented options for retrospective conversion for libraries with access to bibliographic utilities, for libraries with access to some form of in-house cataloging programs, and for institutions without any form of automated cataloging. The presenters broke the problem up into two basic sections -- in-house conversion, and vendor-contracted conversion. Both presenters emphasized planning as the most important part of any conversion project.

Ms. Whitacre gave an overview of the four primary ways of conducting a retrospective conversion (recon) project, and discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each. The topics covered were in-house conversion using computer technology such as CD-ROM databases, and vendor-contracted, out of library, conversion.

Ms. Ferguson covered in-house conversion with an emphasis on planning. The topics covered were personnel, desired output, time, and quality control. A brief overview of the

audiovisual recon project at the State Library of Louisiana gave some tips on do's and don'ts. A discussion of possible costs finished this segment of the program.

Ms. Whitacre discussed the option of vendor-contracted recon projects. She gave valuable tips on setting parameters for your project. She provided handouts of the OCLC proposed definition of matches for audiovisual materials and for sound recordings, and went into explicit detail on what does and does not constitute a match, with advantages and disadvantages for various choices. Costs of vendor-contracted programs were discussed, as well as options available from OCLC, RLIN, and Professional Media Services Corporation. Other vendors who offer or do not offer audiovisual retrospective conversion services were also named.

There was a great deal of discussion, questions, and input from the audience. A lot of the discussion centered around the costs involved, and the prevalence of quick and dirty projects to make the material available for automated circulation systems and OPACS.

Lola Varughese
Louisiana State University Libraries

---

4. Audio Recordings and AV Cataloging.
Presenters: Joan Swanekamp and Jennifer Bowen, Eastman School of Music

Joan Swanekamp focused first on differences between cataloging audio recordings and other formats. She mentioned the variety of physical formats (LPs, CDs, cassettes, cylinders, reel to reel tapes, DATS, piano rolls, etc.) and encoding of the 007 field. Digital vs. analog recording is a particularly tricky issue. Compact discs are often reissues of analog recordings. Many LPs have been recorded digitally. Ms. Swanekamp recommended looking for notes with the recording to discover which you have, particularly notes on the date of the recording of the work. If it was recorded before 1982, you may assume it is an analog recording. Examples of how to note this information and encode it are in the OCLC Sound Recordings Format.

The problem of brief displays of cataloging records in local systems poses problems for users searching for specific physical formats. Since LPs and CDs are both described as "l sound disc", unless the remainder of the 300 field is displayed, users may be unable to differentiate. Size is a fairly obscure way of differentiating between CDs and LPs from a user's standpoint. The length of cataloging records of audio recordings also poses a problem for users trying to locate specific musical works or items contained on an audio recording. Composer/title entries in 700 fields often do not appear in brief or truncated displays, leaving a user with the impression of retrieving mismatches to his/her search. Possible solutions include cataloging all works on a single audio recording separately (an AACR2 option for items without a collective title) or using 'in' analytic cataloging.

Another problem is the possible difference in main entry prescribed for different formats (score: composer, sound recording: performer, music video: title) of the same work. Potential problems in retrieval occur in local systems which lack the ability to collect these different formats in one display.

Jennifer Bowen then speculated on the potential impact of multiple versions implementation on audio recording cataloging. Differences between versions of the same work include: differing amounts of accompanying material (less with cassettes, more with CDs and LPs), contents sometimes vary in order and amount (more works on CDs), titles sometimes differ, the same performances are often issued under different labels and numbers in different countries, and the same works may be reissued later under a new label and different packaging.

Questions Ms. Bowen posed included: Is it too time consuming to catalog all of these versions separately? Is saving space in a database important? If a multiple versions technique is implemented, what will it look like? Will it solve problems or create more? Ms. Bowen presented examples of different scenarios for possible implementation along with problems caused by each. Which version of the recording will be designated the "original" version? Will it be the first one cataloged in a national database, or will other criteria be used? A method to mark multiple version records would be needed, as well as a hierarchical method of storing the linked data for the other versions. The concept of identical intellectual content is controversial and difficult to define; what would be considered eligible for multiple version treatment? Would a conservative approach (only different formats of same content on same label at the same time), a liberal approach (all possible issues and reissues of the same performance) or something in between be adopted?

Ms. Bowen concluded that the decision making involved in multiple versions could make cataloging of audio recordings more difficult and more costly than it is now. Music librarians are unlikely to ever adopt this technique.

Cynthia Whitacre
OCLC

---

5. Workflow, Technology, and AV Catalogers.
Presenters: Liz Bishoff, OCLC; Dorian Martyn, The Upjohn Company

Background information on workflow design was the main focus of Liz Bishoff's presentation. Dorian Martyn spoke of her experiences at Upjohn Company and the link between workflow design and quality control. This useful and entertaining session asked and answered the question: "How Much Stress is Too Much Stress?"

The transition from a manual to an online environment can have a great impact on workflow in many libraries. With more libraries turning to local online systems,

workflow analysis is more important than ever before. The components of cataloging workflows are basic and variable. Basic components include receiving and sorting, searching, selection of record, editing, assignment of class number and subject headings, card and record production, processing and maintenance. Variable components include staff expertise, source of copy (LC or member copy), class system (LC, NLM, or Dewey), material type (format), authority control (problem resolution), revision, local system capabilities and automated acquisitions. These basic and variable components require decisions about who will do the work, what can be done, and when it will get done.

In determining your library's workflow, look for opportunities to review staffing patterns and automation opportunities. Every staff member should be challenged to review his/her routines. Interviewing all staff and letting them offer suggestions is important. Managers should evaluate workflow every two or three months and make necessary adjustments.

Changes at OCLC designed to improve library efficiency, including the PRISM and EPIC services, were discussed. The impact of future innovations such as electronic file transfer, linked systems, and multiple cataloging sources on workflow design was explored.

The handouts presented various flowcharts of daily cataloging activity showing distinct duties for different levels of staff. The discussion following the lecture focused on special considerations for AV materials. Are they special in terms of who handles them? Should they be treated differently? Our biggest challenge: How to control job stress.

Sue Neumeister
SUNY at Buffalo

---

6. Cataloging Computer Software.
Presenter: Ann Fox, Library of Congress

Ann Fox's workshop on cataloging computer software emphasized cataloging problems. She guided workshop participants through the cataloging record to demonstrate solutions to typical questions.

The title area may contain a host of problems: variations, initialisms, uniform title decisions. Ms. Fox suggested including notes giving the source of the title proper, even if it is taken from the chief source (the title screen), as well as including notes giving the variations. Besides providing information to the user, these variations and notes prove useful to other catalogers in determining if the record is a match.

The edition area can also be problematic because of different versions and updates. Documentation and containers may be produced while the software is still being tested. When the software is released, it may have been updated, resulting in different release

numbers on the pieces. The edition area needs to contain the software's release number, with the other information included in a note. Ms. Fox suggested indicating early in the record which version is in hand, using notes to link different versions and to give the source of the edition statement.

Updates are another problem. What is in hand should be cataloged, with identifying notes, whether it is the original release or one of the updates. If the original was cataloged first, the record for it should be revised to show that updates exist. Ms. Fox pointed out that it would be helpful to have a holdings record to track updates and versions; changes in technology make the format volatile.

After going over file characteristics, physical description, and notes, Ms. Fox explored other computer file issues, including the number of added entries needed, the usefulness of uncontrolled subject terms in the record, and MARC coding for technical details access and language.

Ms. Fox also touched briefly on cataloging interactive videos. She feels that since the software is used in order to view the item, it should be cataloged as a video, with the accompanying software described in a note. We are supposed to catalog the em in an but an interactive video may consist of several pieces in different formats. It may be difficult to choose which piece or format is the main item and which is accompanying.

Ms. Fox ended the workshop by pointing out that the real difficulty is in applying rules to a technology that changes so rapidly. The rules themselves are not that difficult to understand; the technology simply changes faster than they do.

Anne Moore
Boston College

7. Authority Work and Audiovisual Cataloging.
Presenter: Laurel Jizba, Michigan State University

Laurel Jizba's workshop on authority control was filled with very useful information. She defined authority control as the process of limiting the vocabulary of a catalog to maximize the retrieval of items in a search. She stressed that nothing is gained in key-word searching by scattering the terms, and that the best retrieval was accomplished by a combination of authority-controlled headings and key-word abilities. The headings subject to authority control range from personal and corporate names to subject headings, series titles and uniform titles.

Ms. Jizba named nine issues in authority control to be discussed when an institution is considering beginning its first online catalog. These nine issues are: 1) deciding when to stop using the existing files; 2) deciding which types of headings will receive authority control; 3) learning the MARC authorities format; 4) choosing which variable fields to

use; 5) learning to complete the variable fields online; 6) learning to edit and delete (or suppress) authority records; 7) deciding when and how to keep authority statistics; 8) planning for the ongoing need for LC authority records, and how completely the institution will use utility/LC records; and 9) deciding how your OPAC's authority capabilities can best be utilized.

Three issues Ms. Jizba discussed with respect to retrospective conversion cataloging were determining the timing of vendor tape manipulations, deciding what instructions to give the recon staff, and determining when your library is going to pay for authority control; before or after retrospective conversion.

She stressed the need for using uniform titles in cataloging sound recordings, and the need for cross references in subject heading authority records. Added fields for titles beginning with symbols, numerals, etc., are generally used, but there is a need for the same type of access to subjects beginning with symbols, numerals, etc.

Ms. Jizba ended her talk with the admonition that authority work is seriously underestimated both in its importance and in the time it takes to maintain adequate control. She recommends keeping accurate and extensive statistics on all authority control, and emphasizes that only accurate authority control can assure the most accessible and user friendly public access catalog.

Bobby Ferguson
State Library of Louisiana

MORE NEWS FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The Congress of the United States has provided funds, beginning January 1, 1991, to fill 164 permanent positions to begin tackling the Library's backlog of 40 million uncataloged items.

The Library needs staff with a diverse array of educational backgrounds and skills to fulfill this task which Congress has called deserving of the "highest priority." It needs individuals to work with prints and photographs, manuscripts, motion pictures and recorded sound, music, rare materials, etc. These positions range from librarians and archivists to curators and technicians.

Most entry-level librarian positions and other entry-level positions requiring the masters degree are posted at the GS-9 level with an annual salary (as of January 1) of $25,717. Such positions are normally part of promotion plans which lead to GS-11 (beginning at $31,116 per year) and GS-12 (beginning at $37,294) positions.

Those interested should call the Library's Personnel Team One at (202) 707-9147 for additional information.

Cataloging books: a workbook of examples. **William E. Studwell and David V. Loertscher. Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1989. $14.00 U.S. $17.00 elsewhere. Answer disks (Apple, IBM, Mac) $25-00 U.S. $30.00 elsewhere. ISBN 0-87287-641-1, 201 p.**

The introduction states "The purpose of this workbook is to provide 100 practice problems for cataloging students covering a wide variety of description, classification, main and added entry, and subject cataloging problems. Each example contains information printed on the title page and then provides enough information contained on the verso and other pertinent information for the cataloger ... The right-hand page of each example contains lines to record information for each MARC tag used by the Library of Congress cataloger when the item was cataloged at the Library of Congress." There is also a helpful guide to OCLC tags in the front of the book.

As a veteran cataloger, I immediately recognized many problems that had plagued me over the years and therefore felt they had picked worthy problems. The clarity of presentation and space given for answers would be very helpful to beginning cataloging students. The list of two to five focus problems with each example really brings the students' attention to the problems presented.

Questions on choice of main entry, uniform titles, conference entries, varying titles, physical description, classification for Dewey and LC, were just a few of the problems seen while scanning the pages. Care had been taken to cover a wide range of questions involving many rules.

Answers based on AACR2R, DDC editions 19 and 20, LCSH, and Sears 13 are said to be available on computer disk to cataloging professors and trainers by contacting the publisher. Though I called the toll free number and requested these answers, I did not receive them by press time so I cannot comment on their presentation, fullness of explanation or ease of use. However, advertising accompanying the books says the "answers are in MARC format and catalog card format and additional exercises, which may be modified by the cataloging instructor, are included." Answers are indexed by rule number.

It seemed to me a very current, complete, useful aid for teaching and learning cataloging.

Judith Wing
State University of New York at Albany

The Impact of Online Catalogs. **Edited by Joseph R. Matthews. New York: Neal Schuman, 1986. 146 pp., index, $32.50.**

Published in 1986, this book is still relevant four years later. Its content is based on a 1981-1983 project funded by the Council for Library Resources (CLR) to study 17 online catalogs in 29 libraries. Data on use of online catalogs were collected and analyzed by the Library of Congress, Research Libraries Group, OCLC, University of California, and J. Matthews & Associates. A thorough synthesis of the CLR data is available in Using Online Catalogs: A Nationwide Survey, by Joseph R. Matthews, Gary Lawrence, and Douglas Ferguson (Neal-Schuman Publishers, 1983).

The Impact of Online Catalogs comprises seven papers based on the CLR study data; the papers were presented at ALA's 1983 Annual Conference. Each of the authors offers opinions about the CLR study's results from their vantage points not only as project participants, but also as cataloging and reference librarians, technical services manager, library manager and systems designer.

As a cataloger of audio-visual and pictorial materials, and survivor of the transition from manual to online cataloging, I read with special interest the chapters by Karen Markey ("Users and the Online Catalog -- Subject Access Problems"), Douglas Ferguson ("Reference and Online Catalogs"), and Joseph Matthews ("The Online Catalog and Technical Services"). Indeed, there was much to engage me, with AV and special materials' focus on subject access. Almost all the writers repeated two findings: 1) Users want more subject access, through indexing of subject-rich fields, inclusion of book indexes or contents pages, an easier relationship between controlled subject vocabularies and the user's terms, easy expansion of no-hit subject searches, and contraction of high-hit subject searches, and 2) Users want various kinds of increased user-cordiality in searching.

Here are some of the salient points from each paper.

University of California's Systemwide Administrator Gary Lawrence made recommendations to system designers in the arenas of: 1) Telecommunication -- plan for more than the "minimal" number of terminals; consider the conflicting requirements for "dumb" and "smart" terminals, that is, ones with no special function of display features and those which do offer search-simplifying special functions; and make printers easy to use; 2) User Interface -- here he sees the need for increased ease of command and search control, such as user prompts, plenty of subject cross references, spelling correction routines, brief displays, display interruptibility, general online assistance features, more subject access points, and online circulation status of desired items; and 3) The Database -- store more subject access data, avoid elimination or truncation which could prevent access. Lawrence was struck by the study's finding that users were rather (80%) satisfied with online catalogs.

Library consultant Joseph Matthews seems right on the mark, advocating retrospective conversion and inclusion of all formats, not just books; increasing subject headings and

sharing that task among several libraries; retaining the complete MARC record because of cheaper data storage costs and search-limiting potential. He encourages communication between reference and cataloging librarians about MARC fields. Regarding subject access, he observes that users want "bridges" between their vocabularies and LCSH (or other controlled-term lists), and could use a "roadmap of options" when a search hits a snag. Douglas Ferguson, former reference librarian and director of the Fred Meyer Charitable Trusts's Northwest Library Information resources, suggests reference staff build on users' positive attitudes toward the online catalog, as 80% of users reported relatively high levels of satisfaction. (Lawrence noted this, too.) He encourages online display of synonymous subject headings. Like Matthews, he suggests reference staff upgrade their knowledge of online system details. He notes other pressing user needs, such as privacy and ease of printing. Notably, he suggests libraries include their archival materials online in "collection-level" records. (Special collections catalogers, take note.) Ferguson's paper revealed he is an independent thinker, and an experienced librarian well-grounded in technical details.

The paper by Karen Markey, then of OCLC's Office of Research, focused on the importance of subject access, as demonstrated in the CLR study results. The too-few/too-many hits problem needs attention, and she suggests the system advise the user in such cases.

Markey offers specific solutions (still valid), such as online alphabetical subject headings lists with cross references. Because known-item searching is no longer the traditional library staple it once was, online user aids must offer help in the patrons' subject search efforts. Markey's paper includes helpful charts, tables, and quotes from users in the CLR study, as well as sample user-friendly displays showing search results and subsequent prompts used by some of the libraries studied.

From the library manager's point of view, Library of Congress planner Rosemary Anderson cautions that the online catalog is a non- intuitive tool. She promotes dual-level computer access, to serve both the naive and the sophisticated user. (Currently, the Library of Congress' test phase ACCESS terminals are attempting to address needs of naive users.) She tells managers to retire such myths as "online catalogs will save money and cause staff reductions." She also warns of the prohibitive cost of online tables of contents and indexes suggested by some.

Lois Ann Colaianni, a manager for the National Library of Medicine's Library Operations, advises other managers to take the online system planning process as an opportunity to build in data gathering systems which will provide data and answers to "Who are our users?" and "What do they want?" The final paper in this volume was not delivered at ALA, but rather shows follow-up work inspired by the CLR study. A case study of New York University's (NYU) online system, Bobcat, it includes the study's hypotheses, methodology, tables, results, and three appendices: supplemental questions for user and non-user questionnaires, interview data, and comparison of NYU and Likert-scaled variables. While somewhat out of the scope of the book, it revealed to me the

rigors of such a study, and demonstrates uses of the CLR study beyond its immediate findings.

All but one of the articles include a bibliography and question- and-answer portion from the ALA presentation. The book itself has a short index. Overall, this is a focused presentation of the CLR study results. It is notable that the writers, though from different vantage points, have many recommendations in common. One hopes that results of studies like CLR's will help improve online catalogs.

Sarah Rouse, Library of Congress Prints and Photographs Division
(formerly with LC's Motion Pictures, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division)

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS
Barbara L. DeCoster, Column Editor

WORKSHOP ON AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGING

Nancy B. Olson will be teaching a two-week workshop on cataloging audiovisual materials this summer at the University of Pittsburgh. For more information, contact the Department of Library Science, University of Pittsburgh.

MUSIC LIBRARY ASSOCIATION ANNUAL CONFERENCE

The 60th Annual Conference of the Music Library Association will be held February 13-16, 1991 at Hilton-at-the-Circle, Indianapolis, Indiana. Sessions will be hold on music printing, ephemera in the music library, collection evaluation, and videos in the music library. For further information contact Christine Hoffman, Rodgers & Hammerstein Archives, The New York Public Library, 111 Amsterdam Avenue, New York, NY 10023, 212/870-1662.

THE BEST OF MOUG, THIRD EDITION

The third, revised and expanded edition of *The Best of MOUG* is now available, it contains authority lists, current to June 1989, for Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Schubert, and Vivaldi. This new edition has added English to Russian cross references for Glazunov, Prokofiev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Shostakovich, Stravinsky, and Tchaikovsky, and English to Czech cross references for Janacek.

The cost is $5.00 plus $1.50 for postage and handling, U.S. funds.

All orders must be **prepaid**, and the checks made out to the **Music OCLC Users Group**. Send name, address, and check to Judy Weidow, Cataloging, PCL 2.300, The General Libraries, The

University of Texas at Austin, P.O. Box P, Austin, TX 78713-7330. MOUG currently plans to have the Third Edition available through 1991.

NEW PUBLICATIONS FROM MLA

The Music Library Association has announced the publication of two new items, available from MLA, P.O. Box 487, Canton, MA.

Authority Control in Music Libraries: Proceedings of the Music Library Association Preconference, March 5, 1985. Edited by Ruth Tucker. 109 p., ISBN 0-914954-37-7. $22.50 ($17.60 for MIA members).

This work seeks to broaden understanding about the nature of authority control as it relates to music materials, its potential and real benefits to catalog users, and the reality of the difficulties and costs involved in doing authority work to achieve those benefits. The papers that constitute the proceedings begin with definitions and needs, and move to considerations of national standards and cooperative work and the impact and potential of automation on authority control of music materials.

Planning and Caring for Library Audio Facilities. Edited by James P. Cassaro. 69 p., ISBN 0-914954-38-5. $20.00 ($16.00 for MIA members).

This work consists of five expanded versions of papers presented during a session on Planning for Audio Facilities, held as part of the MLA annual meeting in 1988. The papers may be of interest to librarians seeking to enhance or refurbish existing listening facilities, planning new listening facilities, and all librarians concerned with rapid integration of new recording technologies.

ALA MIDWINTER MEETINGS OF INTEREST

Data are taken from preliminary meeting schedules. Please consult the final meeting program to confirm all dates and times.

OLAC CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE

Friday January 11, 8-10 pm.

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING

Saturday January 12,8-10 pm.

OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD

Sunday January 13, 8-10 pm.

CC:DA

Saturday January 12, 2-5:30.
Monday January 14, 9:30-12:30.

CC:DA TASK FORCE ON MULTIPLE VERSIONS

Friday January 11, 2-5:30.

ALCTS AV COMMITTEE

Sunday January 13, 8-9 am.
Tuesday January 15, 2-5:30.

ALCTS AV: AV STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE

Sunday January 13, 2-5:30.

ALCTS AV: PRODUCER/DISTRIBUTOR LIBRARY RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday January 15, 8-9 am.

ALCTS COMPUTER FILES DISCUSSION GROUP

Sunday January 13, 9:30-12:30.

MARBI

Saturday January 12, 9:30-12:30.
Sunday January 13, 2-4.
Monday January 14, 2-4:30
Tuesday January 15, 8:30-12:30.

SUBJECT ANALYSIS

Saturday January 12, 2-5:30.
Sunday January 13, 2-5:30.
Monday January 14, 2-4.

SAC TASK FORCE TO REVIEW AV SUBJECT HEADING GUIDELINES

Saturday, January 12,9:30-11.

ALCTS/NATIONAL LIBRARIES REPORTING SESSION

Saturday January 12, 9:30-12:30.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
Verna Urbanski, Column Editor

QUESTION: Cataloging sets of duplicating masters and spirit masters just drives me nuts. I don't have to do it very often and when I do I have forgotten everything I ever knew about it. Can you give me some hints on what AACR2R chapter to use and which format is correct?

ANSWER: I have pretty much the same difficulty. In fact my local online catalog shows that I did one set of black line masters as a monograph! Ooops! OCLC's AV Media Format page MED 0:17 lists spirit masters and transparency masters as code "z" under the $b specific material designation segment of the 007. This can be confusing since other possible codes in the $b area also have their appeal (like "i" for picture, or "I" for technical drawing). The Type Mat (type of material) code in the fixed field is also "z" (p. MED FF:28 of the OCLC format) for "Others."

Nancy Olson's chapter on graphic materials (in Cataloging of AV Materials, 2nd ed., Minnesota Scholarly Pr., Mankato, MN, 1985.) has good examples of how to handle this material (p. 155-157). One point to remember is that these materials have no GMD since there is not one which is accurate for the material.

QUESTION: We have recently begun to catalog some computer data files -- largely ICPSR compilations of data. These files generally consist of data compiled under the direction of the principal investigator. The investigators are usually named in the ICPSR Guide. [Editor's note: ICPSR stands for Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Science Research] In the OCLC database some libraries follow 21.4 and enter under the principal investigator, while other libraries apparently follow 21.lCl paragraph c, and enter under the title. I have asked catalogers from other institutions their opinion. Two thought entry under title was correct and two thought entry under principal investigator was more accurate!

ANSWER: I consulted three heads of cataloging departments in the Southeast and a cataloger who actually works with the ICPSR files. In my opinion, in an automated file it matters less and less whether these are entered under title or a principal investigator as long as useful added entries are made. But, my consultants universally support the concept of entry under principal investigator. They see the principal investigator as someone who is ultimately responsible for the shaping of the project (possibly even from

the point of writing the original grant application) and analysis of the data, and therefore ultimately responsible for the intellectual content of the file.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ARE FROM THE Q&A SESSION HELD AT THE OLAC BUSINESS MEETING JUNE 23, 1990.

PANELISTS INCLUDED: Ed Glazier (RLG), Sheila Intner (Simmons College), Nancy Olson (Mankato State University), and Verna Urbanski (University of North Florida)

QUESTION: If a videocassette was done by one person, would you put it under personal author entry in the 100 field or under title? For instance, Spike Lee's movie "Do the Right Thing"?

ANSWER: If the same name is repeated in the credits for camera work, sound, narration, production, direction, writing, editing, etc., then it would be entered under the person's name. Otherwise, entry would be under title. The cooperative creative process is definitely a factor for videos and motion pictures. The responsibility for creation of the final item is so diverse that single authorship is extremely rare. --- Nancy Olson

No commercial motion picture would be entered under personal main entry. Even though Spike Lee wrote, directed and starred in "Do the Right Thing," the final product is not a result solely of his efforts. --- Ed Glazier

QUESTION: Well, what about engineering lectures where the camera is only on the one person talking and nothing else is happening, no questions and answers, it's only his lecture?

ANSWER: For locally recorded lectures like this enter them under the person lecturing. "Talking head" videos often are important because of the person doing the lecture. For a commercially produced lecture, it depends on whether or not the lecturer is also the producer, editor, writer, director of the production. If she or he is, then yes enter it under the "author." Otherwise, enter at title with an added entry. --- Sheila Intner

Yes, I agree with Sheila, and can only repeat what I have just said, it would be very unusual for a videorecording to be entered under author. --- Ed Glazier

QUESTION: But what about music videos? Chapter 21 clearly states that music is entered under its composer.

ANSWER: When the medium changes, you have to consider the special circumstances of the creative process surrounding the item. A score is clearly the responsibility of the composer. A video made of an opera is not the same thing. Its creative process involves many more aspects than even a sound recording of the work. Lighting, costuming, directing, producing, staging are all essential to the final product. --- Sheila Intner

And, we need to remember that the constant counsel of AACR2R is to enter under title when unsure, not enter under author when unsure. This guidance should help people move more quickly in their decision making rather than agonizing endlessly about entry points. --- Nancy Olson

If someone like Andy Warhol had set up a camera and filmed himself, then edited it and sold it, then I would enter it under his name. --- Sheila Intner

QUESTION: What are people doing with video where there is one date on the chief source (the film itself) and other dates on the text, manual or other accompanying material? For instance, the video says c1986 and its manual says c1989.

ANSWER: Use the date from the chief source of information (the video itself) for your main date and add a note about the other date(s). If the later date is on a unifying element like a container that is presenting materials as a unit, then I would use the later date and add a note that the video has a different date. --- Verna Urbanski

Making a note is imperative to help everyone else know it is the same piece. Everyone has the eye-readable information, but not everyone has the hardware available to mount the item and actually consult it for information. It is important that all eye-legible information be recorded. --- Sheila Intner

But, we do all agree that under normal circumstances the date on the item itself (i.e., the video when it is played) is the one to be considered the most important. --- Nancy Olson

Everyone should be aware that the LC cataloging records done from the data sheet program should be treated like CIP. You must review the LC cataloging very carefully. What you have may be what they were describing, but there are often very consequential differences. --- Audience member, Mary Konkel (Governors State U)

QUESTION: I had one computer disc, but the company sent ten extra labels with instructions to copy the master, apply the labels, and use the copies for circulation. How many copies should I record in the physical description one or ten? I bought just one, but if I follow their instructions I'll have ten!

ANSWER: Your physical description should have just 1 computer disc. If you make all the copies you can include that in a local note on the cataloging copy. If you choose to make only one backup copy to circulate, you may not even want to mention it on the cataloging. --- Ed Glazier

---

* * * NEWS FLASH * * *

Jay Weitz of OCLC's Online Data Quality Control Section has issued an update for handling multiple formats in one computer software package.

The original instructions were seen in *OLAC Newsletter* v.8, no.2, p.11.

> ... "Multiple Formats in One Software Package," needs to be reconsidered in light of Rule 9.5D2 in the AACR2, 1988 revision. Although software producers still issue packages that include more than one computer disk format, they seem to do so less often now than they did a few years ago. When cataloging such a multiple-format software package, follow 9.5D2--"If the item consists of more than one physical carrier and they differ in size, give the smallest or smaller and the largest or larger size, separated by a hyphen."

3 computer disks ; 3 1/2-5 1/4 in.

No longer should you choose one disk format to describe in the 300 field, relegating the other format to a note. However, you may still want to add a general 500 note under the provision of Rule 9.7BlO to specify the physical details of the software package.

500 Consists of two 3 1/ 2 in. disks and one 5 1/4 in. disk.

Different sizes and formats of computer disks issued separately (that is, in independent packages, each with its own documentation, etc.) should be cataloged separately.

The membership rates given in the last issue of the OLAC Newsletter contained some errors. The rates given on the back cover of this issue reflect the original intention of the Board. --Editor

---

Last modified: December 1997