

On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers NEWSLETTER
Volume 3, Number 3
September, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE CHAIR

NOTICE OF SUBMISSION DEADLINE

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING

THANKS TO ALL WHO WROTE

"THE MOVIES" : RTSD AV, ACRL AV, OLAC SPONSOR ALA PROGRAM

LC ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON 508 "CREDITS" RI

AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY : SOME NOTES

MRDF FORMAT AT OCLC

JOINT OLAC - MOUG CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN APRIL

AACR2, DISTRIBUTOR'S DATE, AND LC

ISBN NUMBERS FOR MICRO SOFTWARE

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE CATALOGING DISCUSSED AT CC:DA MEETING IN
LA

PERMISSION TO COPY

CLINIC ON AV EDITIONS HELD DURING ALA

"PUBLICATION" DEFINED

OCLC CHANGES POLICY ON LC's GENERIC CATALOGING FOR VIDEORECORDINGS

AUTHOR COMMENTS ON BOOK REVIEW

ONLINE UNION CATALOG STATISTICS FROM OCLC FOR THE AUDIOVISUAL
FORMAT

MEDICAL AV USERS URGE CONSISTENCY

MEET YOUR OFFICERS

CATALOGING NONBOOK MATERIALS : PROBLEMS IN PRACTICE AND THEORY
(REVIEW)

FROM THE TREASURER

MEMBERSHIP FORM

FROM THE EDITOR
Verna Urbanski

ALA in Los Angeles was a real success for AV catalogers. As you'll see from the articles in this *Newsletter* and the next, there were many AV issues under consideration in various committees and several nonprint programs featured as part of the LA "happenings". As a result of ALA in LA I learned a great deal about motion picture collections in the area and fostered an unfortunate addiction to granola topped with frozen raspberry yogurt by breakfasting at the "Natural Feast" daily. Don't knock it if you haven't tried it!

I need to bring members attention to an ugly fact. I will be sending out renewal notices in October. To those of you who received renewal notices in March, this may seem a bit too soon. But the fact is that due to not automating the mailing list until March, we could not send out renewals before the end of the year. This year should allow us to begin a regular schedule of reminding members to renew in the fall. Keep in mind we are on an annual January 1 renewal schedule. Members who join between January 1st and August 31st are made current year members and receive the current year's issues. Memberships received between September 1st and December 31st are usually applied to the next year with the final *Newsletter* of the current year going to them gratis. It isn't a perfect system but we're hoping everyone will finally adjust, just as we all have adjusted to ALA's January 1 membership schedule.

We encourage members to submit articles for the *Newsletter*. There is so much that needs to be shared and said about cataloging AV. Mail contributions, questions, requests and comments to:

VERNA URBANSKI, EDITOR,
ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS NEWSLETTER
THOMAS G. CARPENTER LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

P. O. BOX 17605
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA 32245-7605

For membership and renewal information contact:

CATHERINE LEONARDI TREASURER, OLAC
3604 SUFFOLK
DURHAM, NC 27707

FROM THE CHAIR

Laurel Jizba

Many things have happened since my last "From the Chair" column in the June issue. We held a productive meeting in Los Angeles and afterwards heard some brief yet very important and enlightening talks from OLAC representatives from four bibliographic utilities: Sydney Jones, UTLAS; Ed Glazier, RLG; Gwen Culp, WLN and Glenn Patton, OCLC. Sydney Jones and Gwen Culp were substituting for our official liaisons, Mary Magrega and Earlene Rickerson of UTLAS and WLN respectively. Brief summaries of their talks will appear either in this *Newsletter* or the next. Katha Massey's notes from the Los Angeles meeting on [p.3](#) detail the discussions held and votes taken on a couple of key issues, and are worth reading.

Of prime interest to those interested in further involvement in OLAC is that an OLAC committee on cataloging will be forming within the year. More discussion of it will be taking place at the midwinter business meeting. Before, then, however, I would ask that if you are interested in being considered by the Board for membership on this committee, that you send me your name and some background information on your cataloging experience and skills. Your name will then be up for consideration when the Board meets to discuss how best to proceed in developing this committee. We need names!

And surprise! We have a meeting coming up in April of 1984! The OLAC Board met after the general business meeting with Richard Smiralgia, Chair of MOUG, and agreed to co-sponsor a meeting with MOUG, the Music OCLC Users Group, in Columbus, Ohio, at OCLC on Monday April 30 and Tuesday May 1, 1984. I had first been approached by Timothy Robson, MOUG Continuing Education Coordinator and invited Richard to tell us more about it in person. The OLAC Board members thought it sounded like a fine idea, so we agreed to co-sponsor the meeting, with the understanding that costs will be kept to the minimum and that it is not a substitute for our regular meetings scheduled for January 7, 1984 in Washington, D.C. and June 23, 1984 in Dallas. Perhaps in the future similar special meetings can be held with emphasis on the other bibliographic utilities.

Finally, the latest amendment did pass, but with very little participation from the membership in the vote. Please be sure to watch for upcoming elections and further amendments, and send in

your ballot as soon as you receive the *Newsletter*. We really do want everyone to participate in the affairs of this multi-system user group. Your vote does count.

NOTICE OF SUBMISSION DEADLINE

The next *Newsletter* will be the December issue, vol. 3, no. 4. Items should be submitted no later than **October 28, 1983**. Early submissions are greatly appreciated by the editor.

ON-LINE AUDIOVISUAL CATALOGERS, INC. BUSINESS MEETING June 25, 1983

The business meeting of On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. was called to order by Chair Laurel Jizba at 8:10 pm in the Roman Room of the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, California.

The minutes of the January 8, 1983 meeting were approved as published in the March 1983 *OLAC Newsletter*.

The mail balloting on the proposed amendment to the bylaws to change the term of office for both chair and vice chair/chair-elect to one year and to stagger the two-year terms for secretary and treasurer resulted in a 45 to 1 vote of approval. The amended by-laws now read:

ARTICLE V. OFFICERS. Section 2. Except for the editor whose term is indefinite and the Past-Chairperson who serves as a voting member of the Executive Board for one year beyond completion of her/his term as Chairperson, officers are elected biennially by mail ballot at least two months prior to the annual meeting. **The Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson/Chairperson-Elect are elected for a term of one year, and the Secretary and Treasurer are elected for staggered two year terms. All current officers must remain in office until their successors are elected.** In the event of a vacancy, the remaining officers shall select a-replacement until the next election.

Catherine Leonardi reported a treasury balance of \$3,498.90 with 384 paid members for 1983. There was no old business.

Under new business the Chair announced the establishment of liaison to the OLAC board from the four major bibliographic utilities. The three new representatives (or substitutes) were introduced at this time: Gwen Culp substituting for Earlene Rickerson, Bibliographic Services Librarian, WLN; Sydney Jones for Mary McGrega, Coding Manual Editor, UTLAS; and Ed Glazier, Bibliographic Quality Assurance Specialist, RLG. Glenn Patton, Instructional

Coordinator, OCLC, continues as the OCLC representative to OLAC. At the conclusion of the business meeting, each liaison spoke briefly about her/his organization in general and in particular about the handling of audiovisual materials by the utility.

Martha Yee, program chair, gave a progress report on OLAC's program meeting to be held at ALA in Dallas in June 1984. The topic, the origin of and thinking behind the development of the rules in AACR2's chapter 21 ("Choice of Access Points") as they relate to audiovisual items, is set. In addition, Michael Gorman will accept OLAC's invitation to speak, while Peter Lewis has indicated interest in speaking if he attends the Dallas meeting. The RTSD Audiovisual Committee will act as co-sponsor. Suggestions for other possible speakers were also made. Martha will have a further report at ALA Midwinter in Washington, D.C.

Laurel then asked for suggestions from those present for an OLAC midwinter program meeting. Cathy Leonardi suggested that Nancy Olson's slide/tape show might be viewed and discussed. [A proposal for the cataloging of microcomputer software was on the agenda at CC:DA in Los Angeles. To aid in the discussion, Nancy had prepared a slide/tape presentation for CC:DA members showing several kinds of microcomputer software with its varied packaging and labeling information. Because of the lack of viewing equipment in the meeting room, the show could not be used.] The question was also asked at this time: Shall OLAC take an official stand on the microcomputer software proposed guidelines that are before CC:DA now and will be brought up again in January? A committee consisting of Sheila Intner, chair, Verna Urbanski, and Dick Thaxter was appointed to review the guidelines (which are to be reworked by December 1983) and formulate a draft of an official OLAC statement of opinion. The statement will be used as a starting point for discussion at OLAC's January meeting which could possibly lead to a vote of endorsement. It is hoped that the statement can be published in the *Newsletter* before that time. Nancy Olson will expand her slide show and present it as a tryout before the first RTSD Nonbook Materials Institute to be held in San Diego in February 1984.

Sheila Intner brought up OLAC's need for increased visibility in order to attract more members; she suggested placing ads in publications such as *Library Journal*, *American Libraries*, and *LRTS*. Laurel will investigate the cost of placing such ads and also of purchasing the ALA/RTSD mailing list for sending out individual notices. She will describe the proposal in writing for the *Newsletter* and ask for member comments before the final decision is made at Midwinter.

Nancy Olson encouraged everyone to write articles, notes, informational and/or news items, etc., for the *Newsletter*. It can only be as good as we make it!

Verna Urbanski initiated a discussion from the floor about OLAC's long-term role and what steps should be taken to move in the direction of such goals. Some of the major questions are: What kind of influence do we want OLAC to have in the formulation of cataloging codes, rule interpretations, MARC formats, and implementation strategies used by bibliographic utilities? How much time, energy, effort, and money is OLAC willing to invest in reaching those goals? The example of the Music Library Association's Cataloging Committee which wields much influence in music cataloging decisions and makes recommendations to MARBI and CC:DA on relevant topics was mentioned. It would take time to develop a committee of committed and knowledgeable individuals, but eventually such a group might insure that OLAC would be

regarded as a primary source of recommendations on A/V cataloging rules and formats. Glenn Patton pointed out that MLA's Cataloging Committee and its MARC Format Committee have been very stable groups, and that MLA has contributed to the financial support of its representatives to MARBI and CC:DA.

Following the wide-ranging discussion, Martha Yee moved that OLAC create a Cataloging Policy Committee of seven members and that the Executive Board formulate a mission statement and charge for the group as well as a method of soliciting the initial members. The motion carried. Laurel will be in touch with Board members about this.

A motion was made by Sheila Intner to have OLAC subsidize one MARBI representative to attend all the quarterly MARBI meetings to the extent that the OLAC budget can allow. In the discussion that followed, Verna Urbanski stated her intention to bring up this matter as an issue of concern to her as one of the two OLAC MARBI liaisons. Effectively representing OLAC interests to MARBI is a time-consuming and expensive duty. She pointed out that the liaison(s) need(s) to attend all four meetings to make needed contacts, participate in the give-and-take in the discussion, and remain up-to-date on current developments. The original motion carried in a voice vote. The decision to appoint one official liaison and one alternate to MARBI (rather than two liaisons) was also made at this time. Dick Thaxter moved to amend the wording of the previous motion to say that OLAC will subsidize "one MARBI representative or alternate" to the MARBI meetings; this amendment was approved. Dick also suggested that the Executive Board include in the Cataloging Policy Committee's charge the responsibility for overseeing the MARC format for audiovisual materials and place the MARBI liaison on that committee.

Laurel announced several other meetings to be held in Los Angeles which would be of interest to audiovisual catalogers.

Robert Boyer, incoming chair of the RTSD/CCS Subcommittee on Cataloging Children's Materials, announced his attendance as an observer and the interest of the Subcommittee in questions relating to the cataloging of a/v for children. Laurel suggested that he write a note for the OLAC Newsletter asking for comments and suggestions.

Having no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 pm.

Katha D. Massey
Secretary

Persons attending the meeting were: Laurel Jizba, Indiana University; Sheila Intner, Columbia University School of Library Service; Catherine Leonardi, Duke University; Katha Massey, University of Georgia; Nancy Olson, Mankato State University; Verna Urbanski, University of North Florida; Martha Yee, UCLA Film, TV & Radio Archives; Richard Thaxter, Library of Congress; Glenn Patton, OCLC; Sydney Jones, UTLAS; Ed Glazier, RLG; Gwen Culp, WLN; Chris McCawley, West Chester State University; Janice Woo, Pacifica Radio Archive and *LITA Newsletter* AV column editor; Carmela Di Domenico, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Margaret A. Farber, University of California at Irvine; Barbara Ritchie, University of Texas at El Paso; Dorothy

McGarry, UCLA; John Riemer, University of Georgia; Sukmoon Yoon, University of Georgia; J. O. Wallace, San Antonio College; Keiko Cho, University of Houston; Robert E. Boyer, Arlington (TX) Public Library; Marilyn Craig, University of Houston; Bob Mead-Donaldson, Florida International University.

THANKS TO ALL WHO WROTE

Nancy Olson, member of the RTSD CC:DA task force on guidelines for cataloging of microcomputer software, has sent along a note to say thanks to all who wrote the task force with comments on the proposed guidelines. Nancy says: "A number of top people commented on the intelligent letters [that were received] ... Words I heard included articulate, non-emotional, well-reasoned." So all you articulate, non-emotional, and reasonable folks who wrote should know - ya done good!!

"THE MOVIES" : RTSD AV, ACRL AV OLAC SPONSOR ALA PROGRAM by V. Urbanski

"The Movies: Organization of Film Libraries and Libraries about Film" was the title of an excellent program jointly sponsored by On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers and the Audiovisual Committees of the Resources and Technical Services Division and the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association, as part of the ALA 102nd annual conference held in Los Angeles. The program was moderated by Sheila Intner, Chair of RTSD AV Committee. Program participants included: Edward Richmond and Martha Yee, UCLA Film, Television and Radio Archives; Linda Harris Mehr, Academy of Motion Picture Art and Sciences; Margaret Herrick Library; Margie Hanpt, California Institute of the Arts Library; Michael Karne, MGM-UA Library.

Eddie Richmond of UCLA led off the presentations with a description of some of UCLA's holdings and concerns. The film collection consists of approximately 20,000 films and 18,000 TV programs produced between 1890 and 1980. UCLA also has an extensive collection of historical film instruments and a collection emphasizing film technology. Mr. Richmond shocked the audience by saying that 50% of films made before 1950 no longer exist. For this reason film libraries feel a special urgency to preserve what does exist and are actively transferring nitrate products to safety film. Films produced on nitrate are vulnerable for two main reasons. Nitrate based film generates its own oxygen and is therefore very flammable. Plus, nitrated based film is

very unstable and left to its own devices will turn into useless brown powder. This is an issue of concern to UCLA because they have 63 vaults of nitrate film with about 1,000,000 feet of film per vault. UCLA's collection is organized by physical characteristics. One of their unique collections features the photographic copies of films which were submitted for copyright between 1895 - 1915.

Linda Harris Mehr of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences Margaret Herrick Library began her presentation by saying that her library tries to collect "every work in print in English on film". So far they have about 16,000 monographs! They also subscribe to all English language periodicals on films. The periodicals are indexed in house and the monographs are cataloged according to a modified LC system. The library has an extensive collection of fan magazines. It also contains a collection of 8,000 scripts used during the shooting of the motion picture. For 2,200 productions all script material is available including rewrites at all stages of production.

The Library maintains several unique files. The clipping file is updated constantly from 75 current periodicals which are ordered in multiple copies. Staff are currently embarking on a project to microfilm this valuable resource. Future plans may make this microfiche copy available outside the library. Biographic files follow the career of persons from the motion picture industry both stars and production people. There are collections of stills, original scores from motion pictures, posters, and lobby cards. A special cross referencing card file keeps track of all the mutations a production's names goes through. The Library is the depository for the papers of famous columnists Louella Parsons and Hedda Hopper as well as the designer Edith Head. Current projects include a union list of the holdings of AMPA&S, UCLA, USC and the American Film Institute.

Margie Hanpt, California Institute of the Arts discussed her institution's strong emphasis on performance. Much of their collection focuses on supporting the students participation in learning how to make films. The collection includes feature films, experimental films and films produced by faculty and students.

Michael Karne of the MGM-UA Library emphasized his background as a part of the process of producing motion pictures. The motion picture industry has spent little effort, collectively, preserving their history and products. Recently MGM has spent 20 million dollars converting nitrate based films to safety film. They now video tape a lot of the old films.

[At this point in the program time was running short so Martha Yee's presentation was summarized. We include below a complete copy of Martha's remarks which she very kindly, supplied. -- editor]

CURRENT STATE OF ORGANIZATION AND CONTROL OF THE UCLA FILM, TELEVISION AND RADIO ARCHIVES, AND FUTURE PLANS

Over the last two years prior to my arrival at the Archives, the staff has been working to create an inventory of the Archives' holdings. One inventory record is filled out for each print or copy of a TV program or film (with some exceptions). The records are filed by title and give a brief physical description, the location number, and a code for the donor or depositor. The inventory process was a quick and dirty one. Titles were taken from containers, so must be approached with caution. Dates were not always added to distinguish different works with the same titles. Nevertheless, the degree of control this gives the staff over the collection is far superior to what was available before. Something is usually better than nothing! We hope to automate the inventory process (performing as much record verification before input of records as is possible without going back to the materials themselves) and are looking into the possibility of incorporating a film traffic system, as well.

The use of a copy-based record, with only title and date to identify the work, may merit some comment. There are several reasons for this. One is that one of the top priorities of the Archives is preservation. Preservation work demands a great deal of copy-specific physical information about the condition of specific prints (e.g., whether they are deteriorated or not), their film base (nitrate or safety), etc. The preservation officers also need to see clearly all the various elements owned by the Archives (sound tracks, negatives, positives, etc.) Another reason for gravitation toward a copy-based record is that availability for various uses (viewing on a Steenbeck or Moviola, projection, or commercial reuse) varies from print to print, and depends on copy-specific information such as condition of print, completeness, film base, element, and source of acquisition for the print. (One reason for the latter is that certain donors and depositors have made special conditions about the kind and amount of use to which their prints can be put.) Finally, the storing of the various prints of a film work vary based on their physical format. Nitrate must be stored in special vaults, 1200' 16 mm cans are stacked together, etc.

There is a good deal of interest in the film archive world in the possibility of designing systems to allow the exchange of machine-readable cataloging data between archives. However, there is also a long tradition of cataloging according to in-house rules, and it continues to be a strong one. At the moment, each archive seems to be busily designing its own machine-readable format! Eventually we plan to develop a cataloging system. Because we can't send people to the shelves to browse, descriptive and subject cataloging records will be the only access we can offer to our collection, and we recognize the importance of moving to this stage as soon as possible.

We will be investigating the systems developed by other archives, considering the possibility of designing our own in-house machine-readable format and cataloging rules (!), and looking at the MARC format as a possible vehicle for our records. It is the only machine-readable format for films and television programs which can plausibly claim to

be a national standard, although in many ways MARC, and its companion, AACR2, are too book-based to be the ideal basis for a cataloging system for nonprint. On the plus side, though, use of MARC and AACR2 would enable us to use ORION, the fine on-line technical processing system at UCLA. It would also enable us to display our holdings along with other film- and television-related materials held in libraries at UCLA. In addition, it might eventually enable us to make our holdings known to scholars throughout the United States through one of the MARC-based national bibliographic data bases.

I mentioned one film archive cataloging tradition previously. Another tradition is to create a work-based record. Film and television cataloging records are very long, largely because of the lengthy credits. Thus, even though the copy-specific information can be very bulky, as I mentioned previously, it does not make sense to have a copy-based record and repeat all the information about the work each time. However, I find a work-based record too generalized. It does not allow one to identify various versions or editions of a film work held by an archives. In our cataloging system, whether based on AACR2 or not, we hope to emulate one of the better aspects of the Anglo-American cataloging tradition, and base our records on the edition, transcribing the title from the version in hand, and using uniform titles to assemble all the editions of a work, and all related works.

As part of the program the three organizations sponsored production of a 52 page booklet "Directory of Archival Collections on the History of Film in the United States" compiled by Richard A. Matzek. Copies of this booklet are available. Write: **William Bunnell Executive Director, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association, 50 East Huron St. Chicago, Illinois 60611.** There may be a modest per copy cost.

LC ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON 508 "CREDITS" RI V. Urbanski

Dick Thaxter at LC provided the following comments to some questions I had about use of the credits note.

Urbanski:

CSB 13 had a rule interpretation headed 7.7B6, 8.7B6. It suggests who LC will include in a "credits" note. Chapter 8 of AACR2 does not authorize use of the caption "credits".

Does LC's RI authorize such use or is "credits" used in a more generic sense? In view of the fact that Chapter 8 does not authorize using the caption "credits" should format users at LC and in the networks be told to apply the 508 only to Chapter 7 materials? My OCLC format limits the 511 to motion pictures and video-recording but not the 508.

Thaxter:

The answer to your question is yes, LC's rule interpretation 8.7B6 was intended to show that we will continue to use formally captioned "Credits:" notes for filmstrips, slide sets, etc. Chapter 8 encompasses a wide range of materials, most of which would never have a "Credits:" note. We have used "Credits:" notes for filmstrips and slides prior to AACR 2 and will continue to use such notes with AACR 2, when the item in hand has "Credits:" statements. One of the advantages of the integrated structure of AACR 2 is that one can usually borrow from one chapter when a provision is lacking in another.

In terms of the MARC format I would use a 508 field for a "Credits:" note for both chapter 7 and chapter 8 materials. I can't think of a situation where a "Cast:" note would be given for chapter 8 materials, so I agree with OCLC's limitation on the use of the 511 to motion pictures and videorecordings in the Films format. I would note that 511 with a first indicator value of 1 (for Cast:) could be used for sound recordings in the Music format. Most music 511's however, will have a first indicator value 0--as in the last two examples in MFBD.

By the way, one of the proposals I made at the Feb 14-15 meeting on the proposed changes to the Films format was to delete the first indicator values 2 and 3 for the 511 field. These two indicators were added based on two examples in AACR2 7.7B6 and 8.7B6. Since these examples were never meant to be prescriptive, and in fact just about any introductory phrase might be used in formulating this type of note, I felt that "Presenter:" and "Narrator:" should be included in the general category (first indicator value=0). By including the introductory wording in the \$a of the field and not relying on print constants the notes become more intelligible to users of online systems.

Urbanski followup:

Regarding the use of a "credits" note for chapter 8 materials. The real point of my inquiry rests on how I think 7.7B6 was intended to be used and how I interpret LC's RI. The language of 7.7B6 seems to focus clearly on artistic and technical aspects of an item. The terms allowed for in LCRI also seem oriented to chapter 7 material. Though LC may have the most opportunity for using credits on projectable graphics, I think it is equally likely that non projectable graphic items could be seen to have persons involved in artistic and technical aspects. That is why I've not been comfortable with the expansion of 7.7B6 to chapter 8 material. I understand from the RI and your letter that although LC principally uses the chapter 8 application for graphic projectable, you would not see a problem with

using it for graphic items. Is the list of persons to include (LC RI 7.7B6, 8.7B6) and the order in which they should go, intended to prescriptive?

Thaxter followup response (Reconstructed from a phone conversation):

For LC's purposes expanding 7.7B6 to apply to chapter 8 materials poses no problem because LC catalogs only slides, transparencies and filmstrips. If LC were to catalog other chapter 8 material, they would probably limit in some way the material with which "credits:" note could routinely be used. Other cataloging agencies which follow LC rule interpretations and which catalog a variety of chapter 8 material may want to customize the application of 8.7B6 to their needs.

The list of persons to include and the order in which they should go (RI 7.7B6, 8.7B6) is neither prescriptive nor exhaustive. The list in rule interpretation 7.7B6, 8.7B6 was designed to solve data sheet cataloging problems at LC. As a sidelight LC will be applying 1.1F5 to credits notes. That is, if more than three persons perform the same function only the first will be listed, marks of omission and the phrase "et al." will be used.

AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY: SOME NOTES

V. Urbanski

In recent communications with Richard Thaxter, LC's Head of the Audiovisual Section of the Special Materials Cataloging Division, I raised some questions about the area of responsibility for motion pictures. Even with the rule interpretations in chapter 1 and 7, it is still sometimes confusing to determine the "prominence" or "overall responsibility" of a person or group.

Question 1:

I was working with noncurrent films from the Agency for Instructional Television and browsed the AV NUC to see how LC is treating AIT in the area of responsibility with AACR2. I *seem* to be seeing a variety of usage. What I am interested in, is that sometimes the Agency is in the area of responsibility and sometimes it is not. It is not conspicuous to me from the cataloging why this would happen.

Answer 1:

AIT participates in the production of some of their titles, and for others only acts as the distributor. Cataloging from data sheets we take AIT's word for their role in a particular series. A glance at their catalog show that they sometimes have very complex production arrangements with the bodies that produce their materials; we hope that we get it right most of the time.

Question 2:

I have been using a fairly strict interpretation of 7.1F1 (and following LC's RI from CSB 13 for 7.1F1) and have been putting in the area of responsibility groups

and people who participate in the production of the film. The cataloging in the NUC appears to show in the areas of responsibility both agencies which cause the film to be made and those who actually participate in the production. Am I misinterpreting what I see? Also, I distinguish between someone who "sponsors" and someone who causes a film to be made. Does LC distinguish one from the other? (Sponsors = Sponsored by = made possible by a grant etc., are the phrases I refer to.)

Answer 2:

There is a larger issue here; that is, whether an agency which causes a film to be made should be given in the statement of responsibility. In general I think the answer is yes. If one body hires another to produce a film one can usually assume that the originating agency will have a role in determining the intellectual and artistic content of the finished product. If we decide this is the case then we give both bodies in the statement of responsibility. Again, since we work from data sheets we have to take the contributor's word as to the production of the film.

At the other end of the spectrum from those works created by one body under the direction of another, are films, etc., for which one agency merely provides funding for another body, or individual, who then produces the work. In this case we do not usually record the name of the sponsor. This would almost always be true in the case of "Made possible by a grant from ..." There are, of course, many situations that fall between the two obvious cases mentioned above, and in the borderline situations catalogers must make a judgment based on interpretation of statements in the work and knowledge of the bodies involved.

The problem of interpreting such information is not restricted to data sheet cataloging. Statements found on the actual items are often ambiguous; it often is difficult to determine the relationship of a body to the work in hand. Nor is the problem restricted to AV cataloging a glance at LC RI 1.1F shows an attempt to deal with a similar problem in book cataloging. An example of an ambiguous statement is "Presented by ..."; this can mean authorship, or merely monetary sponsorship, or publication/distribution information.

Question 3:

Another troublesome phrase frequently found on AV material is "produced in cooperation with". Sometimes it appears to indicate a 50-50 collaboration and sometimes merely an obliging use of mutual facilities. I find I am frequently willing to put it in the statement of responsibility but don't feel a sufficient commitment to their role to trace the agency as an added entry. Does that seem legitimate?

Answer 3:

An agency of this sort should be given in the statement of responsibility when the cataloger believes there to be some degree of overall responsibility for the item. An "obliging use of mutual facilities" would not qualify an agency for inclusion. Whether the agency should be traced as an added entry is a cataloger's decision

and should be guided by the cataloger's anticipation of how useful it would be as a retrieval mechanism for this film.

Editor's comments: It is important to ALWAYS keep in mind that LC catalogs from data sheets supplied by the producers for AV material. They therefore rely on a middle person's information and interpretations as to the functions of the agencies involved. This means that institutions which use LC copy need to make policy decisions about how they want to handle information conflicts between the item in hand and LC's cataloging for that item. Also keep in mind that LC RI 7.1F1 (*CSB 13*) advises LC catalogers to "be liberal about making exceptions to the general policy..."

MRDF FORMAT AT OCLC

Solinet Memorandum 1983-16 had a report from OCLC's Marilyn Nasatir on the current status of the format for machine readable data files. We reproduce this below:

OCLC's Eighth Format to be Implemented

OCLC is embarking on the implementation of its eighth bibliographic format -- the Machine-Readable Data Files (MRDF) Format. The MRDF Format will be designed to describe data stored in machine-readable form, programs used to process data, and microcomputer software. Catalog records of MRDF will be based on AACR2 Chapter 9 and the forthcoming LC rule interpretation relating to microcomputer and videogame software, an outgrowth of the CC:DA MRDF Task Force decisions on physical description. In addition, the content designation of the data elements will be designed to accommodate a variety of products, such as data inventory, a data abstract, and a union catalog.

LC has no current plans for cataloging MRDF but is incorporating the format into the composite *MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data* which will provide the basis for the development of the OCLC format. As experience is gained from testing the format on different kinds of files, revisions will be made to meet the needs of the users. It is estimated that the OCLC MRDF Format will not be operational before the end of 1983.

JOINT OLAC - MOUG CONFERENCE TO BE HELD IN APRIL

OLAC board members approved a plan to hold a conference in conjunction with the Music On-Line Users Group annual conference in Dublin, Ohio, April 30 - May 1, 1984. The groups will take advantage of OCLC's generosity and hold the conference at OCLC. Tentative plans call for AV workshops and discussion groups. Nancy Olson has offered to conduct a program on cataloging machine readable data files. By that time the OCLC format for MRDF should be available. The program is being planned by Nancy Olson, Sheila Intner and Laurel Jizba. Watch the *Newsletter* for later developments and registration information.

--Editor

AACR2, DISTRIBUTOR'S DATE, AND LC V. Urbanski

While browsing recent issues of *Audiovisual Materials* (LC's NUC for AV), I came across some distributor's names which appeared after the date of publication but were not followed by a date of distribution. AACR2 rule 1.4F4 states:

If the publication date differs from the date of distribution, add the date of distribution if it is considered to be significant by the cataloging agency. If the publisher and distributor are different, give the date(s) after the name(s) to which they apply ... If publication and distribution dates are the same, give the date after the last named publisher, distributor, etc.

Reading (and rereading) the rule did not furnish information sufficient to explain why some areas of publication in LC's cataloging read:

Washington : The Administration, 1979
Distributed by National Audiovisual Center.

While others read:

Washington : The Administration : Distributed
by National Audiovisual Center, 1980.

(These samples are from p. 126 Ap-June 1982 first and last entry from the middle column, but they are not isolated cases.)

Being unable to resolve the question on my own, I wrote Dick Thaxter, Head of Audiovisual Section of the Special Materials Cataloging Division at LC, for help. Dick explained:

Your question concerning LC's application of AACR rule 1.4F4 requires me to explain the significance of the dates given in cataloging National Audiovisual Center materials. The data sheets submitted by NAC show both the date an agency originally releases a film and the date NAC begins distributing the title. The date of primary importance is the agency's publication date; this date is given regardless of date of distribution. If NAC's date of distribution is the same, the date is given at the end--per the second paragraph of rule 1.4F4. If NAC's date of distribution differs by only one or two years, only the publication date is given--cf. the last example on p. 35 of AACR 2--and this date is given following the publishing agency. If NAC's date of distribution differs by more than two years (a difference which LC considers "significant") then both dates are given after the name of the agency to which they apply.

My confusion over 1.4F4 arose from an inattentive reading of the examples. It is intriguing to see the provisions of 1.4F4 applied to actual cataloging situations. In consequence of 1.4F4 the position which the distributor's name occupies on the cataloging will signal that an "insignificant" date difference exists. Presumably rule 1.4F4 was intended to relieve catalogers of needing to deal with minor date differences of one or two years. Applying 1.4F4 has the unfortunate consequence of recognizing indirectly an insignificant distribution date difference while making the cataloging appear to be inexplicably inconsistent. It would seem to be more sensible to either record **all** variations between publication and distribution dates no matter how minor OR to treat minor differences as if they didn't exist, i.e., to put both publisher and distributor information BEFORE date of publication.

Recording the distributor in two different locations depending on whether the dates of publication/distribution are exactly the same or differ by one or two years when that explanation for the placement of the distributor's name cannot be deduced by users of LC's cataloging is most unfortunate. It seems to be an unnecessary rule refinement in a rule which should simplify the cataloging process. In follow-up comments Dick notes:

In the case of National Audiovisual Center materials, the date of distribution is something that NAC and LC know, but would never be on the item. Catalogers in the field might be more confused if we gave the distribution date which in many cases does differ by one or two years--the time which elapses between a govt. agency's release of a film and NAC's distribution. We feel it is significant when an imprint like this is involved:

Bethesda, MD : NIH, 1966 ; Washington : Distributed
by National Audiovisual Center, 1983.

AACR2 dictates the placement of the dates, not LC policy.

ISBN NUMBERS FOR MICRO SOFTWARE

Library Journal, v. 108, no. 13, July 1983 contained the following notice (P. 1304).

Microcomputer software and publishers are now being assigned ISBNs (International Standard Book Numbers) by the R. R. Bowker Company, which operates the International Standard Book Numbering Agency. Major bookstore chains are currently using ISBNs to control software sales and inventory in the same way that they are using them for books.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question: *Is there anyway to code for the presence of closed captioning in the current AV format?*

Answer: I have consulted with Richard Thaxter of the Audiovisual Section at the Library of Congress and with various staff in the MARC Standards Office. Dick was able to provide some further information about closed captioning. I had thought, as Dick had, that closed captioning was limited to TV broadcasts. However, according to the National Captioning Institute (5203 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041), it is becoming increasingly available on videocassettes. In addition, any off-air taping of a closed-captioned broadcast will record the captioning. A decoder is of course necessary for playback but it is not necessary for recording.

All of us are agreed that there is no way to code for the presence of closed captioning in the present AV format and, given the complexities of current coding, I am reluctant to propose a means of coding. Dick and I are also agreed, however, that it is important to indicate the presence of closed captioning in a note in the bibliographic record. Such a note could be quoted from the item--the phrase "Closed-captioned for the hearing impaired" seems to appear frequently. In any case, it would be treated as a language note (AACR2 rule 7.7B2).

Libraries might also find it useful to use a subject heading to bring closed-captioned materials together. The Library of Congress has used the heading "Deaf, Films for the" for captioned films as well as films using American Sign Language. Other libraries might wish to create a local subject heading (tag 690) such as "Closed-captioned motion pictures" or "Closed-captioned videorecordings".

-- Glenn Patton

Question: *What does one do with scanning shots or radiographs contained within a video or a slide set. B&W pertains to positive images. What goes in the collation?*

Answer: If you are asking about how to apply 7.5C4, I would describe the predominant situation and mention the occurrence of radiographs in a note if you believe it to be significant.

EX: 1 videocassette (58 min.) : sd., col. ; 1/2 in.
Includes sequences of radiographs.

You could also incorporate this as part of the summary note. If the **entire** videorecording or slide set is scans or radiographs, I'd take my cue from 8.511 and not elaborate beyond: 1 videocassette (29 min.) : sd. ; 3/4 in. I'd provide a note that indicated that the content was radiographs or scans.

-- Verna Urbanski
(Dick Thaxter at LC concurred)

MICROCOMPUTER SOFTWARE CATALOGING DISCUSSED AT CC:DA MEETING IN LA

Nancy Olson, OLAC's representative to RTSD Cataloging Committee Section: Description and Access (CC:DA) and member of the CC:DA Task force considering guidelines on cataloging of microcomputer software, has sent along a summary of CC:DA decisions made during the meeting at ALA. The summary contains the parts of the task force report which were acted on during the meeting. Portions of the report were referred back to the task force for further work. The task force is expected to present more options and information to CC:DA during Midwinter. Nancy's summary follows.

1. Scope (as approved by CC:DA)

Chapter 9 and the projected guidelines cover data files and program files coded in machine-readable form and carried by cassettes, cartridges, disks, etc., of the types that are used with microcomputers. The projected guidelines should also cover electronic toys or games that are typically issued in cartridge carriers and are manipulated by hand controls. These latter materials are technically under chapter 10 and a GMD from chapter 10 should probably be used, but for matters of transcription of bibliographic data, the projected guidelines shall include special provisions, examples, etc., as necessary to cover the toys and games also.

2. Sources (as approved by CC:DA)

The preferred source of bibliographic description is information recorded internally on the program file itself. Title information may be recorded internally as the first item to be displayed, as part of the program's description, or as part of the listing of the program and its statements.

If adequate bibliographic information is not available internally or if the cataloger does not have access to the microcomputer necessary, use in this order of preference:

1. label on the storage medium itself, such as a disk, cassette, cartridge, tape, etc.;
 2. label on the container such as a folder or box (if there are several items in the container, and only the label on the container has a collective title; use it rather than the labels on the individual items);
 3. accompanying documentation issued by the producer or distributor of the program such as a teacher's guide, student manual, etc. (Exercise care in distinguishing between information applying to the accompanying documentation and that pertaining to the program file itself.);
 4. other published descriptions such as a sales catalog, bibliography, brochure, etc.
3. GMD

The term machine-readable file was approved by CC:DA.

Reminder: the use of a gmd is optional.

4. Edition statements (as approved by CC:DA)

Where a statement of change in the content of a program is indicated, generally accept the statement as an edition statement if it has resulted in a new issue of the program. Some generic words indicating a statement of change are the following: edition, version, level, release, or update, appearing singly or in combination with or without numbers. (Also numbers may be used to indicate these editions.) The new issue referred to here may be either when the content amalgamates additions, changes, etc. to the original file, or when the content repeats all of the existing content and contains newer material added or appended to the existing content.

If the newer material is issued separately and neither repeats or changes the existing content of an issue, but is instead intended to supplement it, then do not consider the statement of numbers and/or generics and numbers as an edition statement. (Instead, the statement may be a part designation, a numerical designation indicative of a serial volume, etc. The item may be described separately or as an accompanying part of the existing content described on the record for the original.)

5. Area 5

5a. The first element of area 5 is to take the form (voted on by CC:DA)

1 program file on 1 computer disk

5b. A list of specific material designations (smd's) will be developed to include:

computer disk
computer cassette
computer cartridge
etc.

The term computer is to be used in the smd (as approved by CC:DA)

5c. Addition of make and model designation of machine (approved by CC:DA)

The task force recommends that, as an option, the manufacturer's name and the model number of the machine be added within parentheses after the smd, whenever there is a one-to-one relationship between software and machine. All other system and use requirements, including multiple machine/model designations, should be placed in a note or notes.

1 program file on 1 computer disk (Apple II)

[Editor's Note: The task force will prepare statements on other aspects of area 5, including: addition of language; use of b&w and col.; and size.]

5g. Accompanying material

This is permitted in chapter 9.

5h. "In container"

Some chapters of AACR 2 allow this phrase, others do not. There was considerable discussion at CC:DA on allowing this, as an option, in all chapters.

6. Notes

The specifications of what is required to operate a given program is listed in chapter 9 in a note beginning "Mode of use:"

MARBI had changed this to a print constant "Technical details:" in the MARC MRDF format.

CC:DA approved the wording "System requirements:"

7. Standard number

Several numbering systems are being developed; until one is officially adopted as the computer software standard number, none should be used as such.

Any numbers appearing on an item may be recorded in a note.

8. Access points

The proposal to make an added entry for the make and model number of the machine was rejected by CC:DA.

This type of access, CC:DA says, will have to be done through subject headings of the form

IBM Personal computer--Computer programs--Specimens.

9. Definitions

A glossary to accompany the task force report will be developed.

PERMISSION TO COPY

Feel free to copy and disseminate anything printed herein as long as the source is acknowledged. **REMEMBER:** Some information dates quickly. Watch later issues for updates. Assure receipt of later issues by keeping your membership current.

=====

TIME TO RENEW TIME TO RENEW TIME TO RENEW

=====

**CLINIC ON AV EDITIONS
HELD DURING ALA
V. Urbanski**

The RTSD AV Committee sponsored a clinic on identifying and handling editions of nonprint material. Dick Thaxter of LC and Glenn Patton of OCLC were featured speakers. Below is a summary of the points presented.

Dick Thaxter (LC):

LC's policy is to not give an edition statement unless one appears on the item. Something is not an edition unless it has been edited. A film doesn't have an "imprint" in the same sense that a monograph does. Area 4 can be as volatile as the film industry itself, since quite often the body given in area 4 is the distributor not the publisher. LC doesn't update or change records because a distributor changes. For foreign films with a foreign distributor LC will create a second record for that film with its U.S. distributor LC also creates two records for items having the same intellectual content when a different GMD would be used for each format. For instance, a videorecording, motion picture, and filmstrip having the same intellectual content would each get its own catalog record. Whereas a videorecording issued in several formats would have one "generic" catalog record to represent the content. The users of the cataloging then complete the collation using their item specific information. Special materials such as iconographic films are also governed by the general rule of "different GMD gets its own cataloging". (Iconographic films are filmstrips produced in a motion picture format.) Double frame filmstrips are most frequently cut apart and made into slide set by U.S. purchasers. Nonetheless LC would catalog it in its issued form as a filmstrip.

Glenn Patton (OCLC):

Glenn announced that a document on when to input a new record is currently being distributed by OCLC. It is being published as an appendix to OCLC's *Bibliographic Input Standards*. In general, a new record should be input for each different format of an item, or, whenever the material has been edited from an original form, or, whenever there is a change in the title, publisher, distributor or a difference in dates. For OCLC participants, when only the distributor changes, the agency may want to edit an on-line record for the same item and not input a new record. Agencies have the option to do either. When the form of an item is changed locally (for instance, cutting a filmstrip up for slides) the item should be cataloged on-line using a record which represents its physical form when it was issued by the publisher. That record can then be edited to the local format. A new record should not be made to permanently represent what is essentially a local "binding" practice.

On-line records must fulfill several functions: interlibrary loan, acquisition, cataloging, etc. Local archive tapes support one or more of these functions. For this reason, not putting in a separate record for each format version of an item could be misleading both to those outside your library (interlibrary loan

borrowers) and to those inside (circulation, on-line catalogs, acquisitions). When processing archive tapes, vendors usually recognize the most recently used record as the one to be retained. If an agency has produced cataloging for several different formats using one record, it may cost them quite a bit to have a vendor sort out different uses made of the same record. Likewise, using one record for copy information when formats differ can adversely affect using archive tapes as a basis for a circulation system. (That is, you'd want to circulate a video recording and a motion picture as separate, identifiable items, but if one has been bibliographically "hung" on the other's record as a copy 2, the copy 2 would need an individual circulation record generated.) The one exception to this policy is the "generic" records Dick Thaxter discussed earlier. When these are made available on-line from LC Marc tapes, OCLC wants participants to edit them for production of the particular format being cataloged. Generic records typically say I videorecording rather than I videocassette or I videoreel in the extent of item and they **do** not specify a size, i.e., 1/2 inch, 3/4 inch. In addition, the 500 note on the formats available usually begins with "Issued **as**" rather than "Issued **also as**". If no generic LC record exists, participants can enter records as needed to accommodate varying formats. [*****Please note: OCLC's Policy on LC's generic records has changed since this ALA meeting.** See an article on this change on page 21 of this *Newsletter* issue.--VU ***]

At the end of the program Nancy Olson announced that tentative dates and cities have been established for the RTSD institutes on cataloging nonprint material. Each set of programs will present nine different workshops with participants able to select six of the nine to attend during a three day period. Scheduled times now are: San Diego, February 24-26, 1984; Seattle, September 1984; Washington, DC, October 1984; Chicago, Spring 1985; Boston, Fall 1985. Forthcoming issues of the *Newsletter* will publish details as they become available.

"PUBLICATION" DEFINED

V. Urbanski

In a recent letter to me LC's Dick Thaxter explained what constitutes publication. I am passing Dick's information along in the hope that it will be useful to others.

"...broadcasting does not constitute publication either in a legal sense or from the standpoint of cataloging theory. The statutory definition of publication from the copyright law (title 17, United States Code, section 101) is as follows:

"Publication" is the distribution of copies or phonorecords of a work to the public by sale or other transfer of ownership, or by rental, lease, or lending. The offering to distribute copies or phonorecords to a group of persons for purposes of further

distribution, public performance, or public display, constitutes publication. A public performance or display of a work does not of itself constitute publication."

OCLC CHANGES POLICY ON LC's GENERIC CATALOGING FOR VIDEORECORDINGS V. Urbanski

OCLC's policy on inputting records on-line for videorecordings which LC has cataloged using a "generic" pattern, has undergone some changes. The change is in part a result of the discussions which took place during the RTSD AV Clinic on Editions held during ALA. [See article this edition, "Clinic on AV Editions Held During ALA"]. Glenn writes:

There has ... been a change in OCLC policy in the time since ALA. As I think I indicated at the meeting, I have been uncomfortable about the exception we had made for LC generic record for videorecordings. Since ALA, I have gotten my colleagues to agree to our allowing users to create new records to represent each of the physical formats of a videorecording for which there is an LC generic record... I have included a copy of the statement...

LC CATALOGING FOR VIDEORECORDINGS

If a producer or distributor makes a videorecording available in more than one physical format, Library of Congress audiovisual catalogers usually create a single bibliographic record with a "generic" physical description and a note describing the available formats. If all are cassettes, a sample physical description and note might be:

```
300    1 videocassette (30 min.) : $b sd., col.  
500    Issued as U-matic 3/4 in. or Beta 112 in. or  
        VHS 1/2 in.
```

If other video formats are involved, the physical description is even more "generic":

```
300    1 videorecording (15 min.) : $b sd., col.  
500    Issued as cassette (U-matic 3/4 in. or Beta 112 in.  
        or VHS 112 in.) or reel (Quadruplex 2 in.)
```

In the past, OCLC policy has been that users who wish to catalog a videorecording described in one of these records must use the "generic" record and edit it to reflect the format which they own. Since the LC record, in effect, describes all available formats, any new record would be a duplicate. That policy has unfortunately created a situation where records must be extensively edited for all uses including Acquisitions and it is impossible to tell which institution owns which format.

In light of these considerations, OCLC staff have agreed that a change in policy is needed. Under the new policy, OCLC users may create new records for each of the physical formats of a videorecording for which there is an LC "generic" record. These records will not be considered duplicates.

-- 21 July 1983

AUTHOR COMMENTS ON BOOK REVIEW
June 2, 1983

LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

Providing reviews of materials published to aid audiovisual catalogers is a worthwhile activity for OLAC, and I thank the editor for the complimentary review of my book *Nonprint Cataloging for Multimedia Collections: A Guide Based on AACR 2*. Littleton, Colo: Libraries Unlimited, 1982. (OLAC June, 1983, p. 19). I must disagree with the content of one paragraph of the review which begins "Rogers has misinterpreted AACR 2 in such a way that kits are handled as Chapter 10 materials." Actually, I devote several pages to the discussion of the rules for kits first under the definition of "kit" on p. 45-46 where it is clearly stated, "It should be noted that the rules for the initial description of kits appear in Chapter 1, General Rules for Description under 1.10...." Again on P. 55-56 under the discussion of 1.10, I state "These rules which apply to multimedia kits are of prime interest to nonprint catalogers." Following this is a discussion of the rules in Chapter 1 to catalog kits. Probably the reviewers misunderstanding of my interpretation of the way in which AACR 2 tells us to catalog kits is a result of either not reading these parts (both sections are cited in the index under "kits", however) or assuming that because certain examples following the rules for Chapter 10 use the GMD "kit", I am implying that kits should be cataloged only according to 10. That is not the case. The examples in question are in fact kits and also contain three dimensional items, the reason they are included here.

The fact that the reviewer, an experienced AV cataloger, made this error points out that the placement of these examples must be misleading, which is unfortunate. It also suggests that in future editions, kits should be discussed and examples given in a separate section. The reason that this was not done is that my text follows exactly the structure of AACR 2 itself which does not give rules for kits in a separate chapter but in Chapter 1. As no examples were given for any of the rules in Chapter 1, the general rules, no examples of kits were included under my discussion of the rules in 1.10. Of this omission, I am guilty. Of misinterpretation, I am not.

Dr. JoAnn V. Rogers
Associate Professor
College of Library & Information Science
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

REVIEWER'S RESPONSE:

The author's attention is directed to the following pages: 146 (3rd example), 152 (1st example), 153 (1st example). These examples of physical descriptions for kits use a format not authorized by AACR 2 for kits. (Ex: 1 modeling kit (ca. 1000 popit beads, 50 hydrogen bonds, 4 pairs centromeres, 3 DNA rods, 5 amino acid units) : col. + 1 teacher's guide). The example cited on page 153 is prefaced by a bold face heading "Physical description for above item using 10.5B2". The sample begins " 1 kit ... " In both of these examples the GMD is [kit].

The reviewer would consider it highly unethical to review a book which she had not thoroughly read. To do so would betray the trust of the author and those who rely on the review for unbiased guidance.

--V. Urbanski

**ONLINE UNION CATALOG STATISTICS FROM OCLC
FOR THE AUDIOVISUAL FORMAT
1983 June 17**

Percentage of Type of Material Total		Number of Records
Principal Audiovisual Media (Type "9")		
	Filmstrip ("f")	60,174
26.01%	Motion picture ("m")	69,309
29.96%	Slide ("s")	31,298
13.53%	Transparency ("t")	4,254
1.84%	Videorecording ("v")	42,133
18.21%	Other ("z")	3,596
1.55%	Unknown ("u")	1,165
0.50%		
	Subtotal	211,929
91.60%		
Special Instructional Material (Type '.n.')		
	Diorama ("d")	23
0.01%	Game ("g")	2,820
1.22%	Chart ("n")	1,313
0.57%	Flash card ("o")	470
0.20%	Microscope slide ("p")	33
0.01%	Model ("q")	733
0.32%	Relia ("r")	2,422
1.05%	Other ("z")	3,345
1.45%	Unknown ("u")	1,691
0.73%		
	Subtotal	12,850
5.56%		

Kit (Type "o", Type of material "b")	6,587
2.85%	
GRAND TOTAL	231,366
100.01%*	

*Total is greater than 100% because of rounding off.

MEDICAL AV USERS URGE CONSISTENCY

Tamara Joy Szarka

The National Library of Medicine (NLM) has been operating a Cataloging-in-Production (CIP) program for audio visuals (similar to the one the Library of Congress uses for book publishers) since 1977. The program has not been widely adopted. We who work in health sciences libraries are hoping this will change.

I have written a letter which will be used by purchasers of medical audiovisual materials to send to Producers when problems with the item occur. These problems may range from lack of information necessary for cataloging to improper packaging. The objectives for sending the letter are: to obtain the information needed to process the purchased item; to encourage producers to be complete and consistent when providing information; to urge them to begin using the National Library of Medicine's CIP program. Both the Health Sciences Communication Association (HESCA) and the Health Sciences On-Line Library Center Users'Group (HSOCLCUG) support this project.

Alice Jacobs, NLM's AVLINE coordinator, will work with me in sending a follow-up letter to these producers along with information which explains and demonstrates the CIP program. Those of us concerned with cataloging and processing medical audiovisual items anticipate an increase in the number of producers using the program. For further information and/or comments, my address is: **Tamara Joy Szarka, The University of Texas Health Science Center at Dallas-Library, 5323 Harry Hines Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75235 (214) 688-3906.**

MEET YOUR OFFICERS

CHAIR

Laurel Jizba
Cataloging Department
Indiana University Libraries
27707
Bloomington, Indiana 47405

TREASURER

Catherine Leonardi
3604 Suffolk
Durham, North Carolina

VICE-CHAIR/CHAIR-ELECT

Sheila S. Intner
School of Lib. Service
Columbia University
Libraries
New York, New York 10027
30602

SECRETARY

Katha Massey
Catalog Department
Univ. of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

PAST CHAIR

Nancy Olson
Memorial Library
Library
Mankato State Univ.
Mankato, Minnesota 56001
32245-7605

NEWSLETTER EDITOR

Verna Urbanski
Thomas G. Carpenter
Univ. of North Florida
P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, Florida

Please feel free to contact any of us for information of with your suggestions.

CATALOGING NONBOOK MATERIALS: PROBLEMS IN PRACTICE AND THEORY

By Carolyn O. Frost

A REVIEW

Several features of this lengthy cataloging manual set it apart from similar works of recent vintage. First are its opening two chapters devoted to a detailed account of the historic background and theoretical framework in which current nonbook cataloging may be understood. Next is its treatment of two cataloging codes currently in use, AACR2 and Weihs' 1979 edition of *Nonbook Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collections*, as well as some additional explanations from a third popular system of cataloging media, the 1976 edition of Hicks and Tillin's *Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials*. This broad coverage, which includes attention to LC rule interpretations, too, makes *Cataloging Nonbook Materials (CNM)* a valuable teaching tool for student catalogers or for practicing catalogers who want to learn more than how to catalog the most recently

acquired thingamajig. *CNM* is well-organized, written in lucid prose, and thorough in its discussion of media rules. Before offering any further comment, this reviewer wishes to emphasize its overall excellence.

No book is without some negative features, however, and *CNM* is no exception. First, it does not cover all nonbook media included in either code, since it excludes manuscripts, music, and machine-readable data files (AACR2's chapters 4, 5, and 9). While it is an author's prerogative to select what (s)he will cover, omissions inevitably detract from potential maximum value. Second, insofar as it is intended for practicing catalogers, its limited number of examples has little appeal for day-to-day consultation. For example, the chapter on sound recordings has only six examples -- three spoken word recordings, one of which is a serial; two popular and one classical music album. The selection is certainly good, but not exhaustive. There are no illustrations showing how the original data looked, although their texts are reproduced. Many problems occur when catalogers can't figure out, from placement or typography, what is "predominant" or "prominent". Also, it is unlikely any practicing cataloger would use both cataloging codes; therefore, the multiple code interpretations are extraneous, in part, to their needs. Finally, Frost's decision to omit any treatment of online cataloging, i.e., coding bibliographic data for machine entry, is unfortunate. Including either finished MARC-formatted worksheets for the examples in the book, or, at least, discussing the differences among the several nonbook MARC formats would have added considerably to *CNM*'s usefulness as both a teaching tool and practical aid.

Frost's easily-followed and easily-understood explanations of particular rule applications and discussion of the many difficult decisions catalogers must make are the book's best feature. These brief "Comment" paragraphs sprinkled throughout the pages of the manual are its real meat. They discuss such fine points as when to name a performer in the statement of responsibility for a film (see pages 177-178) or whether flash cards with musical notation on them should be cataloged according to the rules of Chapter 5 or 8 (see pages 228-229). Much more of the space in the 300-odd pages of rule explanations is given to fairly straightforward and repetitious references to individual rules, sometimes with actual quotes. For practitioners, once they learn that nonbook titles proper are transcribed "...as instructed in 1.1B," they do not need to have it repeated for every item cataloged. In teaching, however, this repetition may have more importance as a reinforcement of the initial learning process.

CNM is a welcome addition to the growing literature on the subject. It provides a carefully-structured immersion into the cataloging of those nonbook forms covered. Its fine index enhances its usability. It has much to offer the neophyte be they library school students, or practicing catalogers suddenly thrust into the world of media. We can all learn from the eminently readable first two chapters which set the stage for the manual. Though it requires a hefty investment, *CNM* will undoubtedly repay its owner many times over.

Cataloging Nonbook Materials: Problems in Practice and Theory by Carolyn O. Frost is available from Libraries Unlimited, Littleton, Colo., 1983. \$28.50 in the U.S., \$34.00 elsewhere. Index, bibliography, 390 pages.

Reviewed by:
SHEILA INTNER, Assistant Professor
School of Library Service, Columbia University

FROM THE TREASURER
Catherine Leonardi

Reporting period:
April 1, 1983 through July 11, 1983

Account balance 4-1-83 \$2,717.96
Income

New memberships	262.00
Renewal memberships	972.40
Back issues	67.50
Interest paid on account	38.76

 Total Income -----
\$1,340.66

TOTAL \$4,058.62

Expenses

Newsletter vol. 3, no. 2	339.22
ALA expenses (OLAC executive board)	300.00
Postage	17.30
Miscellaneous	8.00
Bank charges	13.20

 Total Expenses -----
\$ 677.72

ACCOUNT BALANCE 7-11-83 \$3,380.90

CURRENT MEMBERSHIP 396

RENEWAL FORMS WILL NOT BE SENT. USE THE FORM BELOW

Cross out any incorrect information:

I wish to (renew my membership / join) the On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers.
I am enclosing dues of (5.00 / 7.00 / 10.00 / 12.00) for calendar year **19**.
(Dues include subscription to the quarterly *Newsletter*.)

NAME:
ADDRESS:

Make check payable to On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers and mail to:

Catherine Leonardi
3604 Suffolk
Durham, North Carolina 27707

MEMBERSHIP RATES:

U.S. Memberships: \$5.00 personal ; \$10.00 institutional
Non-U.S. Memberships: \$7.00 personal ; \$12.00 institutional*
* includes \$2.00 for postage and handling.

On-Line Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc.
Thomas G. Carpenter Library
University of North Florida
P.O. Box 17605
Jacksonville, Florida 32245-7605

ISSN: 0739-1153

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

Last modified: December 1997