OLAC NEWSLETTER
Volume 6, Number 4
December, 1986

FEATURING:

NACO Survey
Questions & Answers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Grace Agnew

This issue finishes reports from an exciting and productive ALA National Conference in New York in June. The reports from liaison Bo-Gay Tong (MARBI) and observer Marilyn Craig (CC:DA) make it clear that av cataloging was a central concern for both groups at the annual conference.

I have been editing this newsletter for a year now, and I'm grateful that OLAC is such an active organization that there are plenty of reports, articles and new items about OLAC activities to make the newsletter interesting and useful without a lot of effort on my part. Many of you have just attended OLAC's conference at OCLC on November 6-7, 1986. Reports of some of the sessions will be available in the next newsletter for those of you who were unable to attend. OLAC can look back on six years of achievement with a growing, committed membership, two successful conferences, an informative quarterly newsletter and now an index for the volumes 1-5 of the newsletter. In addition, OLAC has been active in suggesting changes and innovations for av c ataloging and in monitoring and reporting on the activities of other agencies and organizations concerned with av cataloging.

The newsletter staff is committed to keeping you informed of significant developments in av cataloging. To continue to do this, we need your help. I would like to encourage anyone who is doing research in av cataloging to report briefly on your findings in the "Research in Progress" column. If you are doing something innovative or interesting in your library involving any facet of av cataloging, from organizing an av unit to any computer-produced cataloging products that result, we would like to hear about it. There are a lot of you and just a few of us. We need contributions from you to keep the newsletter responsive to your needs.

FROM THE CHAIR
Richard J. Thaxter

Maybe this column should be titled "From the Couch" this time since I am writing these words while cooling my heels after an exciting and somewhat exhausting, but extremely successful

OLAC conference at OCLC. *Formats: Old and New* was the theme of the conference and it was attended by over eighty "old and new" faces. This was the first independent conference held by OLAC and its success, I think, guarantees that similar events will be held in the future.

You will be reading more about the conference in the next issue of the newsletter, but some of the highlights were:

- Shirley Lewis's inspirational opening keynote address in which she encouraged all of use to employ sound management practices and philosophy in our decision making as we are confronted with the vast array of choices afforded us by modern technology.
- Donald Bidd's very professional talk and slide show on FORMAT, the sophisticated information system for Canadian audiovisuals that makes the best of current cataloging practices and computer technology.
- Workshops on diverse topics ranging from a down-to-earth, old fashioned question and answer session to a futuristic panel discussion in which the participants were asked to discuss "Utilities in the Year 2000."
- Tours of OCLC, Dublin High School, and the software library of the Columbus School District.

As the current chair of OLAC I felt tremendously proud of the entire conference but I will take no credit for its success. That credit belongs collectively to the many OLAC members who planned and participated in the conference, to OCLC--our gracious hosts for the second time-- and most of all to conference organizer Barbara Ritchie and her assistant, Bo-Gay Tong. Barbara and Bo-Gay ensured that everything went smoothly by working tremendously hard on the logistics and by pitching in wherever necessary providing everything from chauffeur service to old fashioned hospitality.

This kind of event--one which reaches out to our membership in an effort to bring AV catalogers together for educational purposes--represents best the purposes for which OLAC was founded. Hope to see you all at ALA Midwinter, but I feel too pampered by the comfort of our own meeting to much enjoy the hustle and bustle of ALA.

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

```
Reporting period:
July 14, 1986 through October 6, 1986

Account balance July 14, 1986                            $3,078.70

INCOME

    Interest on regular account                             40.18
```

```
    Interest on CD                                      88.47
    Memberships (27 new; 7 renews)                     404.00
    Back issues                                         50.00
    Conference ($1725, registration
         fees; $ 105.81 motel fees)                  1,830.81
                                                    ------------
-
    TOTAL INCOME                                    $2,413.46

TOTAL                                               $5,492.16

EXPENSES

    Newsletter v. 6, no. 3                             737.63
    Index                                              804.92
    Air fare for conference speakers                   597.28
    Editor-in-chief stipend                             50.00
    Production editor stipend                           50.00
    ALA New York room fees                             160.00
    Mailing labels                                      45.60
    Treasurer postage                                   18.16
                                                    ------------
    TOTAL EXPENSES                                  $2,463.59

Account balance October 6, 1986                     $3,028.57
CD at 6,85% matures 5/87                             5,000.00

TOTAL OLAC ASSETS                                   $8,028.57

CURRENT MEMBERSHIP= 573
```

MEETINGS TO WATCH FOR AT ALA MIDWINTER

OLAC CAPC (Cataloging Policy Chicago Hilton	Friday –	8-10 pm
Committee) Private Dining	January 18	
Room 3		
OLAC Business Meeting Chicago Hilton	Saturday –	8-10 pm
	January 19	
Williford Room B		
OLAC Executive Board Meeting Chicago Hilton	Sunday –	8-10 pm
	January 20	
Conference Room		

OLAC NEWSLETTER INDEX PUBLISHED---(FINALLY!!!)
Verna Urbanski

The long awaited index to volumes 1-5 of the *OLAC Newsletter* has been completed and was mailed to all current members of OLAC on September 29th. If you haven't received your copy of the index please contact OLAC treasurer Catherine Leonardi (3604 Suffolk // Durham, NC 27707). Extra copies of the index can be purchased from Cathy also. The next issue of the index covering v. 1-6 should be mailed in April 1987. The editors solicit comments and corrections to the text.

MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP - ANNUAL MEETING

The annual meeting of the Music OCLC Users Group will be held February 10-11, 1987 at the Eugene Hilton in Eugene, Oregon. For more information contact:

> Dean W. Corwin
> Roscoe L. West Library
> Trenton State College
> Hillwood Lakes CN 4700
> Trenton, NJ 08650-4700
> (206) 771-2418

NACO PARTICIPANTS AND HEADINGS FOR AV:
A Report of a Survey
Verna Urbanski

OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee is testing the feasibility of organizing a NACO project for AV names, similar to what the Music Library Association has organized within their REMUS project. The Committee is interested in determining the degree to which NACO participants contribute AV names to the LC name authority file. CAPC wants to both increase the number of audiovisual headings established in the NAF and increase the accuracy of the headings by

including more which are established by actual inspection of the item rather than from data sheets (the main source of LC established AV headings).

Before undertaking a complicated, long-term project, CAPC distributed a survey to current NACO participants in August 1986, to find out if such a project would duplicate work being done by current NACO contributors. Of 38 surveys distributed, 24 were returned (63%). As part of the cover letter, CAPC indicated that our primary interest was in the cataloging of audiovisual materials (i.e., motion picture, videorecordings, microcomputer software, filmstrips, kits, slides, transparencies, etc.) Since some agencies include music related material in the category of audiovisual/nonprint cataloging, the survey provided a division between these two major categories, but for simplicity's sake, the materials are not broken down into further categories.

As with all surveys, the returns indicated that the survey may not have been the perfect instrument the surveyor thought it was when it went into the mail!!! None-the-less, some useful conclusions can be drawn from the responses. The survey with a summary of the responses is below and is followed by general comments from the respondents. CAPC will review the results of this survey during their Midwinter meeting in Chicago. If OLAC members reading this report have comments they wish to make, they should be directed to:

> Dorian Martyn
> Chair, CAPC
> Corporate Technical Library
> The Upjohn Company
> Kalamazoo, MI 49001

> [Please note that there is never a clear total of 24 answers to a question. Some respondents did not fill out the survey question by question, but responded with an explanation of some sort. Twenty-two respondents did complete the form. -- vu]

SURVEY OF NACO PARTICIPANTS

1. Does your institution do full AACR2 cataloging for its nonprint materials?
   1. Music scores and recorded music

      YES -- 16
      NO -- 6

   2. Other nonprint materials (films, videos, slides, microcomputer software, transparencies, kits, filmstrips, etc.)

      YES -- 19
      NO -- 3

2. Are headings established during cataloging of nonprint materials included in NACO submissions?
   1. Music scores and recorded music

      YES -- 4
      NO -- 18

   2. Other nonprint materials (as 1B above)

      YES -- 7
      NO -- 15

3. Are you aware that LC establishes names for nonprint material (as 1B above) without physical inspection of the item?

   YES -- 15
   NO -- 7

4. Are your nonprint catalogers encountering name forms on AV items which vary from the forms established by LC for the same title?

   YES -- 9
   NO -- 9

5. If your institution catalogs nonprint material but does not include nonprint (as 1B above) names established in NACO submissions, why not?
   1. Nonprint not part of NACO assignment -- 9.
   2. Other (please explain on an attached sheet) -- see COMMENTS below
6. If you do not now include nonprint (as 1B above) headings in your submissions and there is no restriction on your submissions, are you willing to start including them in your submissions?

   YES -- 4
   NO -- 7

SURVEY OF NACO PARTICIPANTS -- COMMENTS:

It was evident from some of the accompanying letters that many NACO participants are stretched thin by the conflicts caused by staff shortages, the demands of their jobs and their desire to serve the larger library community by their NACO work. Below are some of their comments.

- "Although we are not restricted by LC to which names we submit, we could never hope to send in NACO forms for every heading we use in-house. I am afraid that those appearing on AV records tend to be at the bottom of our priority .... However, please be encouraged. Your survey has made us aware of an existing problem we had not as yet encountered. I will make an effort to have our AV cataloger do NACO records for our video and sound tapes.

  --- Saint Louis University School of Law

- " ... Nothing was said in the Cooperation Agreement about type of material ... Workload factors have prevented Berkeley from considering the addition of music and nonprint materials ... Berkeley is committed to begin contributions of series authority records to NACO and this will impose a further strain on already limited resources."

  --- University of California, Berkeley

- "Because of the nature of our collection, most of the items we catalog do not have LC cataloging available. We submit NARs to NACO for headings within the scope of our NACO guidelines regardless of where we encounter them."

  --- Minnesota Historical Society

- "Music and AV cataloging are not done in the Cataloging Department. We do NACO for all new headings for all roman alphabet languages and CJK ... Indiana already contributes more headings to NACO than other any library except LC/GPO. We cannot t ake on extra responsibilities at this time."

  --- Indiana University, Bloomington

- "We send very few names for nonprint materials to NACO, but these names are not deliberately excluded. Most of the nonprint material is cataloged by catalogers who are not regularly submitting any names to NACO."

  --- University of Wisconsin, Madison

- "We began cataloging videorecordings in the Spring of this year and will be ready for heading submission in the near future."

  --- Northwestern University Library

- "We are submitting headings from nonprint items. Because of a large original cataloging project, we have suspended participation in the NACO project."

  --- The State Library of Ohio

- "This library does no nonprint cataloging now, but we give what we do catalog nearly full NACO coverage; if we were at some future date to catalog something that is nonprint, we would likely give it the same kind of NACO coverage."

  --- Dept. of Interior, Div. of Information & Library Services

- "At the moment we are considering redefining the categories of materials for which we submit NACO records. We may include non-print materials if we can justify the costs of doing so."

  --- Stanford University

- "We don't have a lot of AV materials to catalog, but we do establish names from those we have for NACO."

  --- Ohio State University

OLAC ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING MINUTES
June 28, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Katha Massey, chair.

Minutes of the Midwinter business meeting were approved as they appeared in the *OLAC Newsletter.*

TREASURER'S REPORT(Catherine Leonardi)

> There are currently 553 members of OLAC, and the balance of the regular checking account is just under $9000.00.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Update on OLAC Conference: Barbara Ritchie.

   On behalf of the Executive Board, Katha Massey thanked Barbara Ritchie and her committee for the outstanding job they have done on the conference. Barbara announced that the registration forms for both the conference and hotel would be run again in the September issue of the *Newsletter.* She will need to notify the hotel of the number of rooms to reserve.

2. OLAC Award Update: Sheila Intner

   Sheila announced that the OLAC Award has been established "to recognize and honor librarians who have made significant contributions to the advancement and

understanding of audiovisual cataloging..." A brief description and a "call for nominations" will appear in the Sept. issue of the *Newsletter.* The Awards Committee will review candidates and present their recommendation to the Executive Board at Mid-Winter. Formal presentation will be planned for the annual conference in San Francisco.

3. OLAC's Program: Dick Thaxter

   OLAC was founded six years ago at the Annual Conference held in New York City. A short program honoring the founder, Nancy Olson, was scheduled for Tuesday morning.

4. OCLC Users Council Designation: Sheila Intner

   Sheila announced that OLAC has been designated as OCLC's audiovisual users' group.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. OCLC: Glenn Patton

   Glenn Patton reported that things were going well at OCLC and that Releases 12 and 13 would be out this fall.

2. RLN: Ed Glazier

   Ed Glazier reported that Updates 12 and 13 would be released this fall. This MRDF Format has been loaded and is being used by several libraries.

3. CAPC: Verna Urbanski

   Verna reported that CAPC has been working steadily since Mid-Winter. They have several recommendations about GMD's and Chapter 9 that will be forwarded to CC:DA through channels.

4. MARBI: Bo-Gay Tong

   Bo-Gay reported that MARBI has made several suggestions concerning music and they will be incorporated in the revised edition of Music Format.

5. CC:DA Audience Observer: Marilyn Craig

   Marilyn reported that the discussion on the revisions to Chapter 9 have been slow going but that the committee will finish the review before the conference has been completed.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Call for volunteers: Dick Thaxter

   Dick repeated his call for regional workshop volunteers. He would like to establish a network of volunteers who would conduct workshops on a variety of topics. If you are interested in teaching a workshop please contact Dick.

2. San Francisco Program: Dick Thaxter

   Katha and Dick asked that if any member has suggestions for possible program ideas for San Francisco to please contact Dick Thaxter. A Program Theme will be appointed at the Executive Board Meeting.

3. New Board: Katha Massey

   Katha formally presented the new board to the membership at the close of the business meeting.

MARBI REPORT TO ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS

The MARBI (RTSD/LITA/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information) Committee met several times during the ALA Conference in New York in June. Of particular interest to audiovisual catalogers were the following items pertaining to changes to the USMARC formats.

1. A proposal submitted by the Music Library Association (MLA) to add a code "k" for discographies to the 008 Physical Description Fixed Field for books and serials was approved. A code (as yet undefined) for filmographies will also be added.
2. Also submitted by MLA was a proposal to change subfield $a (Publisher Number) of field 028 (Publisher Number for Music) from "not repeatable" to "repeatable" in order to accommodate two or more numbers identified as a multi-part item. MLA contended that this change was worthwhile because it would reduce the length of bibliographic records and would eliminate the redundancy of including subfield $b data in more than one 028 field. However, MARBI believed that the benefits accrued would not outweigh the programming costs involved to be able to properly index such data when it appeared in a single field, and the proposal was not approved.
3. Another MLA proposal was to add a definition of "existence of parts" to the description of byte 21 (Existence of Parts) of field 008 for music. Under this proposal the existence of parts for music scores is determined by the content of field 300 (Physical Description). If field 300 includes a description of a part or

parts, then code "a" is used. Action on this proposal was postponed pending further investigation by MLA.

4. A possible simplification of the coding of leader 18 (Descriptive Cataloging Form) of the MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data (MFBD) was discussed. A proposal to: a) reinstate code "i" (Record is in full ISBD form) for visual materials, archival and manuscripts control, maps, music, and serials and validate the code for machine-readable data files, b) simplify and redescribe the definitions of codes " ," "a," and "i," and 3) make the codes "p" (Record is in partial ISBD form) and "r" (Record is in provisional ISBD form) obsolete will be voted upon by mail this summer.

5. A substantial document describing proposed additions and changes to the Visual Materials Format to accommodate data needing to be recorded for three-dimensional artifacts and naturally occurring objects was discussed. This document was the outgrowth of two meetings held at the Library of Congress during the last year, attended by a representative group of experts on three-dimensional materials. Formal proposals pertaining to changes in the Visual Materials Format will be submitted to MARBI at the ALA Midwinter Meeting.

Reported by
Bo-Gay Tong
OLAC liaison to MARBI

REPORT ON CC:DA MEETINGS AT ALA - NEW YORK

The ALA-RTSD-CCS Cataloging Committee: Description and Access (CC:DA) held its usual marathon of meetings on Friday afternoon and all day Saturday and Sunday, June 27-29, 1986. The agenda, as always, was lengthy, involving reams of documentation. (My apologies for the rather sketchy perspective of this report, since I do not yet have copies of all the past and current documentation.)

There were several agenda items directly related to audiovisual cataloging concerns. The major item under consideration was, of courser the discussion and review of AACR 2 editor Michael Gorman's proposed revision of Chapter 9, including its recommended title change from "Machine-readable Data Files" to "Computer Files: Data and Programs." Virtually from the moment AACR 2 was adopted in 1981, members of OLAC have been very vocal in expressing the need for extensive revision of this chapter. They have been deeply involved in the long process leading up to the development of this draft proposal, providing input and expertise at every stage (including the publication of the interim "Guidelines for Using AACR 2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software" published by ALA in 1984). During the CC:DA meeting, Michael Gorman's final draft of the revised Chapter 9 was discussed and voted upon, section by section, resulting in numerous additional revisions and refinements. The next step in the process will be a

discussion and hopeful adoption of the revised chapter at the Fall 1986 meeting of the Joint Steering Committee. The goal is to have the chapter fully revised and adopted in time for the upcoming reprinted edition of AACR 2, which will consolidate all of the revisions to AACR 2 which have been made since it was first published. During the interim between the official adoption of revised Chapter 9 and the "consolidated reprint" of AACR 2, the new version of the rules for cataloging computer files, we have been assured, will be distributed to the cataloging community in some manner. Stay tuned.

Another agenda item related to av cataloging was the report of the Task Force on Choice of Entry for Videorecordings and Films of Performance, chaired by Richard Smiraglia. The charge of the task force was to explore the question of whether the choice of entry for videos or films of performances should be consistent with that of sound recordings, which results in main entry under performer in certain circumstances. The report of the task force was very brief, having concluded that there was no compelling need to make the rules for entry of videorecordings and films consistent with those for sound recordings.

Unfortunately, due to the volume of reports and old business to be covered, all new business agenda items had to be tabled until the Midwinter meeting of CC:DA. All four items of new business were related to audiovisual cataloging, including OLAC's proposal to revise 6.5D1 to accommodate sound recordings of two or more sizes in a set. Also included in upcoming new business are three proposals by Nancy Olson concerning the GMDs "art reproduction" (in chapters 8 and 10) and "art original" (added in chapter 10), as well as the addition of "toy" as a new GMD.

Submitted by Marilyn Craig
OLAC Observer to CC:DA

WLN INTRODUCES BRIDGE-IT

WLN is making available to participants a new software program, Bridge-It, that allows users to download records from WLN, pass the records through Bridge-It, and then use those records in various database management programs. The files created can then be used to produce new titles lists, printed catalogs, rental lists, or virtually any type of listing of use to a library or media center. The cost for the program is $125. For further information contact:

> Western Library Network
> Washington State Library, AJ-11W
> Olympia, WA 98504-0111

AV, BRIDGE-IT AND ME

Barbara L. De Coster, Ph. D,
Technical Processes Librarian
Bellevue Community College

The card catalog has been the mainstay for the audiovisual materials collection at Bellevue Community College. In the past book catalogs have been produced for distribution to the faculty, other community colleges in the state, and frequent users of the av collection. The last book catalog was published in the late 1970s at an average cost of $50 per copy. Budget limitations have precluded producing an updated edition of the book catalog.

In order to keep the students, faculty and staff updated on new acquisitions, each month a library technician keyboarded information on new titles into a word processor capable of sorting that information by various categories, e.g., title, producer, call number and subjects. Eventually a Macintosh microcomputer and the software Jazz were utilized to produce the new titles list, but it still necessitated original input of the data to be used.

In 1985, WLN introduced Bridge-It and for me it was love at first byte. The capability of downloading complete records from the WLN database, changing delimiters in those records (from double daggers to commas, for instance), and loading processed records into a database management system opened whole new worlds of possibilities--not the least of which was producing a new titles list in-house with a minimum amount of keyboarding.

In order to use Bridge-It, it is important to determine which fields are going to be used and the size allocated for each of those fields. For the Bellevue list, the ME, TIL, SU, AE and CAL fields were used. The trial downloading went smoothly enough, and it was no problem to massage the records through Bridge-It. The records were loaded into dBaseIII, the files indexed on the various fields and the first lists produced. A lot was learned on that trial run.

For instance, on the authors' lists, those items without an author main entry were listed first, and then a second alphabet commenced with the main entries. dBaseIII alphabetizes nothing before something, Also, the diacritics used in foreign names and words produced some very weird effects on the IBM printer. Some records had no CAL field, so there were blanks in that column and a double alphabetized classified list. And finally, the subjects were difficult to read. With the delimiters removed between subjects and their subheadings, only a space separated the various components of a complicated subject heading. It was apparent that some editing of the bibliographic records was a necessity.

There are two options for editing the records. The records can be edited on-screen when they are displayed on a WLN PC screen. The downloading process involves what is actually on the screen. The records can also be edited after they are loaded into dBaseIII. Either way works well.

The procedure that has evolved from trial and error is basically simple and straightforward. The bibliographic record for each new item is called up on the screen. Whoever is doing the procedure checks for the following items:

1. ME.
   If there is a personal name main entry, the "q" and "d" subfields are deleted.

   Eliot, T. S. (Thomas Steams), 1888-1965,

   becomes

   Eliot, T. S.

   There have been no complaints regarding the deletion of the author's "complete name" and/or dates. Diacritics, such as author' umlauts and accents, are deleted. If there is no author main entry, which is the usual case with audiovisual materials, an ME is created using the first AE. This may be a personal names, sans "q" and "d" subfields, or a corporate name. So far, no one has complained that an AE was used for an ME.

2. TIL
   If the titles begins with an article, that article is deleted, since dBaseIII does not have capabilities of ignoring initial articles when indexing. If the title is rather long or contains a subtitle, the title may be edited to only the title in the "a" subfield. A TI field such as:

   Rhythm and game songs for the little ones [sound recording] / Ella Jenkins.

   becomes

   Rhythm and game songs for the little ones

   The "h" and "c" subfields are eliminated. Media is downloaded according to its format, so that the "h" subfield becomes unnecessary for identification.

3. SU
   Subjects are shortened, if necessary, to fit logically the space allotted for them. Dashes are inserted between subfields. A typical subject such as

   United States History Civil War, 1861-1865

   becomes

   United States--History--Civil War.

4. CAL
   Make sure there is a CAL field, because often there is only an SCN field or no field at all.
5. Where appropriate, insert a field for rental price.

The final product, *New AV Materials List,* is printed on 8-1/2 x 11 inch paper. There are three columns on each page for the Authors, Titles and Call Numbers sections, and four columns on each page for the Subjects section. One line is allowed for each entry. With space at such a premium, it is easy to understand why certain fields were edited so carefully for length.

Different formats for the printed list may be devised. Right now, a more formal bibliographic format is being experimented with that would include the summary note and the physical description.

Bridge-It has allowed us to create useful lists by downloading records from the WLN database, massaging the data through the software, and then uploading into a database management system. The full potential of the system is yet to be utilized.

Further information on Bridge-It can be obtained from WLN, Washington State Library AJ-11W, Olympia, WA 98504-0111, or you can contact me:

For Bridge-It from WLN, contact:

Bobbie DeCoster
Library Media Center
Bellevue Community College
3000 Landerholm Circle SE
Bellevue, WA 98007

REMEMBER TO USE TO SUBFIELD Z
Verna Urbanski

Have you ever worked away eagerly correcting and perfecting a print-off, only to find the record you were working on merged with some other edition of the same title when you returned to OCLC to produce cards? Well, there is no use swearing at OCLC when this happens. The fault probably rests not with our friends in Ohio but with whomever originally input the record. They probably used an incorrect (or inappropriate) LC card number found on the item and neglected to precede it with a subfield z.

Glenn Patton at OCLC helped explain the situation. He pointed out that the merge program matches on (among other information): LCCN, Type, Bib lvl, Repr, author/title

key and title key when merging member copy and LC copy. Other information is added to the parameters, if necessary, when merging member copy with member copy. Examining this list it is conspicuous why it is vital to remember the subfield z in the 010. Without it, later editions which carry the LCCN of the original, become fair game for the merge program.

Do yourself and your fellow database users a favor. Get out the format and take a look at when and how to use the subfield z in the 010. Machine matching is going to be around from here on so we all need to learn how to work efficiently with it. If you see records online that need a subfield z in the 010 report it as an error. That will take a lot less time than putting in a new record. -- Oh, and thanks for reporting the error, it may be a record I need next week!!!

BOOK REVIEW

Notes for Serials Cataloging, compiled by Nancy G. Thomas & Rosanna O'Neil; edited by Arlene G. Taylor. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1986. ISBN: 0-87287-535-0; $17.50 (hardcover)

Reviewed by Sheila S. Intner, Assistant Professor, Simmons College Graduate School of Library & Information Science

This compact and inexpensive reference work for serials catalogers should be a must on everybody's shelf. OLAC members frequently deal with audiovisual and machine-readable data file serials. Although the serial-specific note fields for these formats are not as complete as they are in the serials format, needed information can be coded 500 or 590 and included in the record. The hard part for catalogers (and this applies to students, too) is formulating the desired note briefly, objectively and understandably.

The authors used *New Serial Titles*, the OCLC Online Union Catalog and their own original cataloging as sources for this compilation. The notes are arranged in MARC-tag order and subarranged by topic. Fields 500, 515, 525, 530, 533, 546, 550, 555 and 580 are included. Common notes, e.g., "Description based on:" and "Cover title:" are excluded as well as frequency notes (310, 321) and basic linking notes (780, 785). The exclusions were made because the authors assumed this information is either taken directly from the piece being cataloged or is so basic to serials cataloging as to be unnecessary to cover. One must remember this is directed at serials catalogers, not AV/MRDF catalogers, so the second assumption is fair.

Cross references from one note to another are given, assisting catalogers in seeing the relationships among them. A notable exception is the 520 field, not used for informal summaries of serials, but don't let this confuse you--it refers to printed serials primarily and is not implying that you should omit summaries for AV or MRDF materials. Since nonprint serials can rarely be browsed, summaries are extremely important and must not be neglected.

Notes that should be of great assistance to the AV/MRDF cataloger who normally deals with monographs include the following: Varying forms of title; issuing information; format; numbering peculiarities; supplements; and additional physical forms available.

The notes themselves are followed by a section in which their sources are listed by LC and/or OCLC control numbers. Sitting at your terminal, you can quickly check a particular record to see whether its note is suitable for your item-in-hand.

The only drawback to the book, in this reviewer's opinion, is its traditional binding. A more sensible format would make it easier to use at the terminal, in the style of a stenographer's spiral binding that stands open at the desired place. Another good possibility is the format employed for user manuals manufactured by some hardware and software companies, in 6 x 9 inch 3-ring binders, where pages can be added and deleted, too. In its favor, however, the type font is clear and legible, though single-spacing between notes makes the pages rather full. Book publishers, like software publishers, need to give user needs a higher priority and consider them in their future plans.

The book is highly recommended for your reference shelf.

Renew Now !!

If your mailing label says "Expires 12-86" -- **RENEW NOW!!!**

If you do not, the December issue of the *OLAC Newsletter* will be your last. (At least until the organization sees some green stuff.) See inside the back cover of the newsletter for renewal information. Make checks payable to ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS and mail to the OLAC Treasurer:

Catherine Leonardi
3604 Suffolk
Durham, North Carolina 27707

(N.B.: Individual renewal notices on postcard were mailed during the second week of November. Please forgive the production editor for her misspelling of University (Univesity) in the return address. It must have been a brief computer [operator?] failure.)

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS
Verna Urbanski, Editor

The first seven questions were posed during a Q & A session held after the business meeting at the ALA annual conference in New York. Panel members included: Glenn Patton, Ben Tucker, Sheila Intner, Dick Thaxter. Susie Koch moderated.

QUESTION: I am cataloging a VHS videocassette. It has different distributors listed on the film itself, its cassette labels and the container the cassette came in. How do I know which of the three distributors is the appropriate one to use in the 260?

ANSWER: In making a choice among these possibilities, you should prefer information from the item itself on the film/tape) or closest to the item (i.e., use integral labels on the cassette over the labels on the box and so on).
--- Sheila Intner

Do the best you can and remember that what goes in the subfield c of the 245 is more important than the 260 because distributors of materials change so frequently.
--- Dick Thaxter

QUESTION: I am cataloging a stuffed toy. It has a label on it with the manufacturer's name and a copyright date. How do I construct the 260?

ANSWER: According to 10.4G1, the 260 would be formulated: . -- c9999 (Place of manufacture : Name of manufacturer). As always, it is necessary for the cataloger to transcribe the information based on what is available from the item in hand and to use his/her own best judgment.
--- Ben Tucker

QUESTION: It isn't always clear to me when I need to It is input a new record on OCLC. Can you give me any guidelines to help?

ANSWER : The best thing to do is to review the latest edition of Appendix A ("When to Input a New Record") of *Bibliographic Input Standards*. There is quite specific guidance provided there. Be sure you don't focus just on one aspect of the record but consider the whole record before you decide if a new record is needed.
--- Glenn Patton

QUESTION: I am cataloging compact discs. I have two which are the exact same recording (i.e., each contains the same songs) but each disc has been issued with its own title. Do I need a separate bibliographic record for each?

ANSWER: Yes. Do a record for each unique title.
--- Glenn Patton

QUESTION: What do you do with a copyright date on a container which you know doesn't apply to the item itself?

ANSWER: Use such a date only to "suggest" a date if none exists outright.
--- Dick Thaxter

Remember that copyright dates don't mean as much as they used to due to the change in copyright law. Manufacturers think they are not covered unless they put on a new copyright date so they add them all the time when it isn't appropriate.
--- Ben Tucker

QUESTION: I noticed in the last OCLC *Technical Bulletin* (no. 164) that the 300 is now repeatable.

ANSWER: Yes, the 300 became repeatable when OCLC implemented update 12 to the MARC formats. Be sure to note that the print programs will still only print the first 300.
--- Glenn Patton

QUESTION: My university is getting some large data bases but the library only wants to catalog a few of the units within the large data base. Can we do this, or should we catalog the entire title and do analytics for the portion we want to provide access to?

ANSWER: It would be necessary to create a record for the data base as a whole so that you can then catalog the portions to which you wish to provide more detailed access. You need the main record to link the analytics to. Keep in mind that until Chapter 9 is revised, this can only be applied to data bases which are physically held by the library.
--- Glenn Patton

QUESTION: I have a kit made up of 2 videocassettes. The videocassettes are really video versions of filmstrips. The "filmstrips" (i.e., the "item itself") have c1983. The container (which I suspect originally held the filmstrip version of the set) has c1983. The exterior label on the videocassette says c1984. Both of the books are c1985. What do I do for a date?

ANSWER: I talked with Glenn Patton at OCLC about this. Glenn indicated that he would use an "inferred" date of 1985 as the publishing date since we know the set could not have been available in this combination before 1985. I would add a note listing the variant dates so that other online users of the record will know what I was working with. For example, a 500 note : Container has date c1983. Videocassette label has date c1984.

Books have date c1985. I would also add a note to indicate that this is a video version of a filmstrip set. This might help some potential purchasers avoid duplication or disappointment.
--- Verna Urbanski

QUESTION: I know from the 670 notes of the online name authority record that the distributor of a videorecording has its business office in Los Angeles and its manufacturing and shipping in New Jersey. The video used only the Los Angeles address internally and on its container. Which place of distribution should go in the 260?

ANSWER: Use the place indicated on the item. Using the place from the 670 notes could cause confusion for other libraries looking at your record.
--- Verna Urbanski

QUESTION: I am unsure how to handle LC's generic cataloging records. Is the solution offered several years ago of creating a new record for each physical format still valid?

ANSWER: Yes, it is still correct to input a new record for each specific physical format, i.e., Beta, VHS, Umatic. I appreciate the generic LC record being there as a model for my new record. The lack of holding symbols attached to LC records on OCLC does not indicate that those records are never used. A lot of us do use those records as sources for "build on" records for specific physical formats.
--- Verna Urbanski

QUESTION: There are two records on OCLC for a title. Each has cataloged the title as a filmstrip with accompanying material. The pieces I have in hand include: 1 filmstrip, 1 sound cassette, 7 transparencies, 5 flash cards, 1 poster, 3 duplicating masters, 1 Corning Ware Grab-it bowl and 1 teacher's guide. Neither of the filmstrip cataloging records mentions the Grab-it bowl. Would this title be better served (no pun intended!!!) by inclusion in type "o" for kit? How would the 300 read and what 500 notes would be appropriate?

ANSWER: Decisions of this type cannot be made in isolation. If the materials all serve to support a central filmstrip, then it should be done as a filmstrip with accompanying material. If each of the units could be used independently, then catalog as a kit. Follow AACR2 in either case for physical description. I would not hesitate to just add the GRAB-IT bowl as a piece of accompanying material and would not input a new record just to add that item.

If you decide to do this as a kit, it is not necessary to input a new record for a type change from "g" to "o". Both media are covered by the Visual Materials format in OCLC so you can make appropriate changes to the fixed field and cataloging data and produce kit cataloging from the filmstrip record.
--- Verna Urbanski

CORRECTIONS TO THE *OLAC NEWSLETTER*, V. 6, NO. 3

From Ed Glazier, reporting for RLIN:

In reference to the issue of subfielding of parenthetical qualifiers (CAPC report, p. 7), I did respond to questions on handling of such qualifiers on behalf of the RLIN system. I must admit that at present I can't find a copy of the response, so it may have been in answer to a question at an OLAC meeting.

RLIN capabilities were not addressed in the answer to the question about field 300 physical description for kits (pp. 24-25). The RLIN system allows repeatable 300 fields in the visual materials format in support of AACR2 1.10C2 for the description of separate components in a kit and also as used in Wendy White-Hensen's - *Archival Moving Image Materials : A Cataloging Manual* for the description in a single bibliographic record of multiple versions of an archival film in a single bibliographic record. Cards produced from such RLIN records correctly print all 300 fields in the record.

LAST CHANCE RENEWAL NOTICE

Special notice for those of you with mailing labels reading:
"Expires 12-86."

Don't let the new year begin with an expired subscription to the *OLAC Newsletter* and lapsed membership in the Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. Who knows what you'll miss in 1987 !!!!

MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

Membership in Online Audiovisual Catalogers is available for single or multiple years. The membership year is from January 1 through December 31. Membership includes a subscription to *OLAC Newsletter*. Membership rates are:

```
                single year - US - $7.00 personal ; $13.00
institutional
                      Non-US - $9.00 personal ; $15.00
institutional
```

```
                two year -   US - $13.00 personal ; $25.00
institutional
                        Non-US - $17.00 personal ; $29.00
institutional

                three year - US - $18.00 personal ; $36.00
institutional
                        Non-US - $24.00 personal ; $42.00
institutional
```

An index will appear in Fall 1986. This is the reason for the price increase. It will be an annual cumulative index. Payment in US funds only, please. Make check payable to ONLINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS and mail to:

Catherine Leonardi
OLAC Treasurer
3604 Suffolk
Durham, NC 27707

* *
* *

TO APPLY FOR MEMBERSHIP IN OLAC OR TO RENEW YOUR MEMBERSHIP XEROX THE FORM BELOW

* *
* *

Circle the correct information:

```
 I wish to ( renew my membership in // join ) OLAC

 I am enclosing :    $7    $9   $13  $15       for 1987
                     $13   $17  $25  $29       for 1987/1988
                     $18   $24  $36  $42       for 1987/1988/1989
```

CHECK HERE IF YOU **DO NOT** WANT YOUR NAME ON A MAILING LIST WHICH IS SOLD TO AV RELATED ORGANIZATIONS ___

NAME:
ADDRESS:

OLAC Newsletter EDITORIAL STAFF

Materials for publication in the *OLAC Newsletter* should be sent to the appropriate editor. Persons wishing to review books are invited to write to Anne Salter indicating their special areas of interest and qualifications. For AV cataloging questions, contact Verna Urbanski. Articles should be typed, double spaced, and consistent in length and style with other items published in the *Newsletter*. The submission deadline for the March issue is January 25, 1987.

For membership renewal and change of address contact:

Catherine Leonardi
OLAC Treasurer
3604 Suffolk
Durham, NC 27707

For general information about OLAC, contact:

Richard J. Thaxter,
OLAC Chair
Head, Audiovisual Section,
Special Materials Cataloging Section
Library of Congress,
Washington, D.C. 20540

Permission is granted to copy and disseminate information contained herein, provided the source is acknowledged.

Last modified: December 1997