

GENERAL MATERIAL DESIGNATIONS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: RESULTS OF A SURVEY BY JEAN WEIHS

In April 2000 the Online Audiovisual Catalogers Inc. (OLAC) awarded its research grant to Jean Weihs for a study of general material designations (gmds) in the twenty-first century. The purpose of this study was to determine whether the gmds developed in the middle years of the twentieth century were still a meaningful addition to the bibliographic record.

Procedures

The first step in this project was the development of a survey form that was then mounted on a website. The survey's URL was advertised broadly to the library profession and particularly to technical services staff. J. Weihs sent a notice about the survey to 54 professional associations and professional journals in Australia, Canada, Europe, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, the United States, and contacts in South Africa requesting that the notice be published. Thirty-four returned a positive response; 10 declined to do so; and 11 did not reply to the request (it is possible that some of these did publish the notice).

J. Weihs also conducted a literature search from 1990 to the present. This did not produce much input. AUTOCAT proved to be a more fruitful source of information. However, the discussions and opinions found there did not differ from those reflected in the survey responses.

Responses Received

Responses to the survey could be made in three ways: electronically by clicking the send button at the end of the survey form, and by mailing or faxing the printed survey form.

Of the 157 responses received, 131 respondents returned a completed survey form; 12 preferred not to complete the form but rather to comment on certain aspects of gmds; 12 indicated that they would be sending the form, but failed to do so despite reminders.

All but two of the replies that identified country came from the United States, Canada, and Australia. The vast majority of the responses were sent from the United States (112). Canada with a tenth of the U.S. population provided slightly more than its share of responses (16), while Australia with approximately 60% of Canada's population was underrepresented with 4 replies. Eight people did not complete the personal information on the survey form and their e-mail addresses did not provide any clues about the source of the responses.

68 (48%) replies were received from academic libraries; 39 (27%) from public libraries; 4 (3%) from school libraries; and each of the following contributed 8 replies (almost 6% each): government libraries, special libraries, other including cataloguing vendors, bibliographic utilities, networks, and professors. It is not surprising that the majority of responses came from technical services or cataloguing departments (93 responses, 65%)

The number of responses did not represent the number of people involved in completing the survey form. In some cases the person sending the response stated that it was a group response from the technical services department or a group response from both the technical services and public services departments. In another case, a library administrator stated that she was sending three separate survey forms that represented three different opinions from her staff members. See Appendix A for statistics about the response numbers.

Library Collections and GMD Use

The responses from "Library Collections and the "GMD Use" sections of the survey did not give an accurate picture of the use made of particular gmds because either one of the sections or both

of the sections were not completed on some survey forms. For example, on some forms a particular medium was not included in a library's collection, but the respondent indicated that the gmd for that medium was used by the library. Either the respondent had neglected to click the medium/media in the "Library Collections" section or clicked the gmd in the "GMD Use" section by mistake.

The responses indicated that "videorecording" was the most used gmd (96%) followed by "sound recording" (94%). The least used gmds were "manuscript" (35%) and "music" (41%). Statistics about the use of gmds for particular media are found in Appendix B.

Three gmds were not considered in this report. "Technical drawing" and "microscope slide" were excluded because few responses indicated their inclusion in a collection and these responses expressed general satisfaction with the gmd. The gmd "text" was also excluded because most respondents ignored it on the survey form, and several respondents displayed ignorance or confusion about its meaning, e.g., 12 respondents claimed that "text" was used as a gmd, in some cases for textbooks. Although "interactive multimedia" was not an AACR2-sanctioned gmd, it was added to the survey at the suggestion of several librarians to whom the survey was submitted during its development stage.

Understanding of the Terminology Used in GMDs

"Globe" received 100% understanding from both library users and cataloguers. "Braille," "filmstrip," and "slide" also were 100% understood by cataloguers. These three gmds were in the 90-99% range when the understanding of both cataloguers and users were considered. Joining them in this range were "art original," art reproduction," "map," "transparency," and "videorecording."

The gmds least understood by library users were "realia" (understanding by 15%), "diorama" (35%), and "interactive multimedia" (37%), while those least understood by cataloguers were "interactive multimedia" (understanding by 53%), "activity card" (66%), and "picture" (67%). It is interesting to note that six gmds were reported better understood by library users than by cataloguers: "art reproduction" (users 94%, cataloguers 89%), "chart" (users 73%, cataloguers 69%), "game" (users 93%, cataloguers 91%), "map" (users 99%, cataloguers 94%), "picture" (users 71%, cataloguers 67%), and "toy" (users 88%, cataloguers 76%). Statistics about the understanding of gmds for particular media are found in Appendix B.

The Convergence Problem

Media designations, later called general material designations, were developed when library collections contained nonbook materials that could be readily differentiated and assigned a gmd based on the item in hand. Many media that were once discrete items are now part of a single item, e.g., CD-ROMs. The survey form asked two questions about convergent media.

Question #1: A multimedia CD-ROM has the same content as a kit that your library has on the same topic, e.g., a map, a chart, a sound recording, and a visual presentation of the topic, none of which is the dominant medium. In your opinion, should the CD-ROM be catalogued as an electronic resource, a kit, or other (please specify)?

77 people chose electronic resource because a computer was needed for access (23 responses); the function of a gmd was to provide an early warning about equipment (8 responses); AACR2 required the choice to be based on physical format (11 responses); could be used in ways that a kit could not (1 response); "kit" had a different definition and this item had only one piece (12 responses); told patrons the location of an item (4 responses); gmd "kit" was too vague (2 responses); CD-ROMs were the dominant medium presently marketed and other media would fade (1 response). One person noted that locally CD-ROMs with linear presentations were

catalogued as “electronic resource” and those where interaction was required were catalogued as “interactive multimedia.”

9 people chose kit because subject matter should take precedence over form (4 responses); different types of materials were covered in one item and “kit” was therefore more meaningful and specific (4 responses); only Internet resources were catalogued locally as “electronic resource” (1 response).

35 people chose “other.” 14 people preferred “CD-ROM” because this was the most specific terminology and the one used by marketers and patrons. 2 chose “CD-ROM (electronic resource).” 6 chose “interactive multimedia”; one chose “interactive multimedia (electronic resource)”; four chose variations of this: “multimedia,” “electronic multimedia,” “electronic multimedia kit,” “interactive CD.” One person suggested “electronic kit,” another “computer program,” and a third wanted to combine appropriate terms to indicate content.

Question #2: A CD-ROM can be played on a compact disc player as a sound recording. It can also be used in a computer to produce a music video. In your opinion, what gmd should be applied to help catalogue users understand the varied uses of this item? In your opinion, should the CD-ROM be catalogued as an electronic resource, a sound recording, or other (please specify)?

36 people chose electronic resource because a computer was needed for access (16 responses); it is better to define the most technologically advanced use (3 responses); AACR2 requires the choice to be based on physical format (3 responses); tells patrons the location of an item (1 response); gmd chosen for the department that ordered it (1 response); “sound recording” is too narrow and imprecise (5 responses); not the traditional definition of a sound recording (1 response). 5 people chose “electronic resource” but stated if primary information is aural, the gmd should be “sound recording”; one who chose “electronic resource” was not certain of the best answer.

38 people chose sound recording because the sound recording was dominant – it could be played on both CD player and computer and the music video could only be accessed on computer, therefore, the video was supplementary to the music, and the primary purpose was to convey music (21 responses); an “enhanced CD” was primarily a sound recording (3 responses); purchased by the Music Department (3 responses); marketed as a sound recording (1 response); “sound recording” is more understood than “electronic resource” (1 response); “electronic resource” was too broad (1 response); to differentiate it from an interactive CD (1 response); followed the AACR2 definition (1 response).

29 people chose “other.” 8 people selected “CD-ROM” because this was the term users understood (3 responses), the term preferred by the Reference Department (4 responses), and the term signals the physical format (1 response). 2 chose “music CD” because it was preferred by users. There was one suggestion for each of the following: “interactive multimedia,” “interactive media,” “multimedia,” “electronic multimedia,” “electronic multimedia [CD-ROM],” “electronic resource: music,” “compact disc,” “audio CD-ROM,” “sound recording – CD,” “videorecording.” One person suggested “electronic kit,” another “computer program,” and a third wanted to combine appropriate terms to indicate content. 5 people would catalogue the item by the predominant part, 4 of these as either a videorecording or a sound recording, one as either an electronic resource or a sound recording. 3 people wanted some sort of combined name, one wanted a new name, and one could not make a decision.

Possible GMD Solutions

When the responses in Appendix C were added (highly acceptable + acceptable and highly unacceptable + unacceptable; the “no opinion” answers were disregarded), solution #3, *qualified gmds such as now given to braille media (1.1C1), e.g., game (electronic)*, emerged as the one

most favoured by respondents; It had an overall approval rating of 86%. Solution #1, *establish a table of precedence for the choice of a gmd*, was second with an approval rating of 80%, solution #4, *compound gmds, e.g., electronic game*, was third with an approval rating of 79%; solution #2, *for items that consist of, or contain, two media, assign both gmds, e.g., braille + sound recording*, was fourth with an approval rating of 76%. The last four solutions failed to reach 50% approval: solution #8, *retain present gmd list*, 42% approval; solution #5, *compound gmds inverted, e.g., game, electronic*, 31% approval; solution #6, *no gmd, use area 3, such as is done in ISBD(ER) International Standard Bibliographic Description (Electronic Resources) extended to all media*, 23% approval; and the least favoured solution # 7, *no gmd, allow MARC coding to provide*, 14% approval.

In the final comments section many people stressed the importance of gmds and remarked that they are needed more now because of the increasing use of webcatalogues. One response mentioned that remote users now outnumber on-site users of that library's catalogue and remote users needed all the help that library could provide. GMDs were also a very helpful addition to title lists and a great time saver.

The conclusion that one might draw from the solutions responses is that gmds are still a useful addition to the bibliographic record, but the present list of gmds needs to be modified or rethought. Many respondents mentioned the need to have more specific and more understandable gmds. This was reflected in their choice of solution #3, qualified gmds, a solution that would limit a threat to the integrity of the catalogue by using the same, or many of the same, gmds, with qualifications that would satisfy the desire for more specificity.

Issues Arising From the Survey Responses and Some Personal Opinions

1. General vs. specific gmds. A difference of opinion about the function of, and terminology used in, gmds has existed since the idea of gmds was first discussed many years ago. The survey responses revealed that these divergent opinions are still very firmly held.

On one side of the controversy are people who want to retain the function of gmds as general early warning signals, if not the exact terminology in the present list now used in most North American and Australian libraries. This point of view was thoughtfully expressed by Verna Urbanski.

“While newer media might not be considered to be well served by the current system of GMDs, that would not necessarily indicate that the current systems does not continue to be useful in the control of the existing media. While the GMD computer file does not tell us all there is to know about the item, neither does the author entry tell us all there is to know about the content of a book. It is just one element. Meaning, in my mind at least, that the GMD is a component that should not be asked to bear too much descriptive burden, just like we would not expect to know the title or extent of the item merely by knowing the author's name.”

Some respondents found a “general gmd” to be useful for deselection; i.e., in looking at a title list a catalogue user knew immediately which titles were not wanted, thereby saving time that might have been wasted in accessing a fuller bibliographic record. Other people who wanted more general gmds than those found in AACR2 list 2 recommended the adoption of the gmds in AACR2 list 1; some followed the broad gmds recommended by the Anglo-American Committee on Cataloguing Cartographic Materials and the *Graphics Materials* manual.

On the other side of the controversy were the many respondents who wanted very specific gmds, such as “DVD” and “CD-ROM.” These people expressed concern about the need for their catalogue users to easily understand the specific format of the item described in the bibliographic record. Some of these respondents went beyond the early warning function in using gmds as location devices by assigning a gmd based on an item's placement in the library's collection.

While the concern for users' needs is very admirable and should be the primary focus of the library profession, my nine years as a member of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) lead me to believe that it would be extremely difficult to establish a consistent list of officially-sanctioned specific terms (they could not longer be called "general" material designations). International agreements take time and, while e-mail has undoubtedly speeded the process since my day, it has not lessened the need to consult constituencies. The development of new media and formats is rapid, the agreement on terminology slow – not a good mix for a stable, consistent list of terms to be applied universally.

Three of the four top choices for possible solutions would make the present list of gmds somewhat more specific. Can the most favoured choice of survey respondents, qualified gmds, bridge the gap between the general and the specific? Would one of the other three solutions be more effective? A satisfactory resolution of this controversy would be cost-effective for those libraries that now change the gmd on derived bibliographic records to more specific terms.

What role gmds would play if AACR2 rule 0.24 were eliminated? Five respondents mentioned this as a possible problem. Would the same controversy of general vs. specific terms still be valid?

2. Media definitions. Many respondents expressed confusion about the appropriate gmd for certain groups of materials, e.g., activity cards, games, models, realia, and toys. Another group that caused confusion was pictures, art originals, art reproductions, charts, flash cards, posters, and study prints. JSC, OLAC, or another group might study the definitions in AACR2's glossary to decide if this confusion has any basis and, if so, suggest more effective definitions or ways of making the choice of gmds easier.
3. Electronic resource. Unfortunately, in changing the gmd "computer file" to "electronic resource" throughout the survey after it was mounted on the website, "electronic resource" was mysteriously dropped from the "Library Collections," "GMD Use," and "Media Types" sections. This was not noticed until many survey responses had been received. This was not a serious error, however, because it was evident from the many comments throughout the survey and particularly at the end of the survey that most, if not all, respondents catalogued electronic resources. It was also evident that many respondents believe the gmd "electronic resource" to be a problem area.

Several people suggested that there be one gmd for electronic resources that are physical items and a different one for remote access items because they are different types of materials. If the assignment of gmds is based on format as AACR2 mandates, then these very different formats should have different gmds. Videorecordings and motion pictures provide the same content, but have different formats and different gmds. Webcatalogues were cited as another reason for this suggestion because catalogue users should be able to understand immediately whether the item they were seeking could be accessed from home or borrowed from the library. The lack of area 5 in the bibliographic record of a remote access item meant that the fact of its remoteness was very far down in the record. Suggestions for a gmd included "website," "web resource," and "electronic resource (website)." I recommend that serious consideration be given to creating separate gmds for remote access and physical format electronic resources.

Many people believed that the term "electronic" was too broad because many items that were "electronic" did not require the use of computers. They cited the example of the many stores that advertised "electronics" and stated that the public associated this term with a much broader group of media. (In their *Library Resources & Technical Services*, vol. 42, no. 2 article "From ISBD(CF) to ISBD(ER): Process, Policy, And Provisions" on pages 93-94 Ann Sandberg-Fox and John Byrum described the reasons why "electronic resource" was chosen as the gmd. The present survey results might cause one to question the statement in the article that the gmd is "easily understood outside cataloguing circles.")

Others noted that their libraries had discarded many of the old nonbook formats, e.g., filmstrips, motion pictures, slides, in favour of electronic resources with the result that a large

number of bibliographic records had, and will have, the gmd “electronic resource”. Will the increasingly large number of records with the gmd “electronic resource” become unwieldy and eventually meaningless? Should the gmd “electronic resource be broken down into some major categories similar to film’s breakdown in the present AACR2 list 2 to “filmstrip,” “motion picture,” “slide,” and “transparency”? Or would the creation of separate gmds for remote access and physical format be sufficient?

“Computer file” was also criticized for being not understood by library users. Users were confused by “file” and did not select an item so named until a librarian explained the bibliographic record.

The Survey’s Added Value

The act of completing the survey had positive side effects for some people and libraries. Several respondents mentioned that the survey caused them to either consult their reference and or public service departments or to include these departments in their decision-making about the survey answers. In some cases, they discovered that their cataloguing practices did not meet the needs of these departments, e.g., a public service department did not know that there was a gmd “music” and wanted it applied where appropriate.

The survey also caused some respondents to rethink their views about gmds and associated terminology. Some people reported that this resulted in a change of opinion, e.g., one person, who had for some time advocated the elimination of gmds, changed his mind after considering the pros and cons associated with the eight proposed solutions.

APPENDIX A: SOURCE OF SURVEY RESPONSES

	Australia	Canada	U.S.	Other	Total
Academic Lib Administration			2	1 (South Africa)	3
Academic Lib Tech Services/Cat	2		48		50
Academic Lib Public Services		8	2	1 (Hong Kong)	11
Academic Lib Other			4 (serials, media serv)		4
Total Academic Libraries	2	8	56	2	68
Public Lib Administration			1		1
Public Lib Tech Services/Cat	1	3	32		36
Public Lib. Pub Services			1	1 (unknown)	2
Total Public Libraries	1	3	34	1	39
School Lib Tech Services			3		3
School Lib sole professional			1		1
Total School Libraries			4		4
Government Lib Administration			1		1
Government Lib Tech Services	1	1	5		7
Total Government Libraries	1	1	6		8
Special Lib Tech Services			8		8
Total Special Libraries			8		8
Cat vendor/ Bib Utilities /Net		3	4		7
Professor		1			1
Unknown				8 (unknown)	8
Total	4	16	112	11	143

APPENDIX B: USE AND UNDERSTANDING OF GMDS

activity card

- use of gmd: 18 out of 25 respondents (72%); rank 12 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 13 out of 25 respondents (52%); rank 22 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 21 out of 25 respondents (66%); rank 24 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (59%); rank 22 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 respondent stated that this gmd was not really useful because material often falls between two categories.
- 2 stated that this is confused with flash cards.

art original

- use of gmd: 13 out of 25 respondents (50%); rank 23 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 20 out of 23 respondents (87%); rank 10 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 24 out of 26 respondents (92%); rank 10 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (90%); rank 10 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 3 reported library users confuse this gmd with “art reproduction” and/or “picture.”

art reproduction

- use of gmd: 25 out of 36 respondents (69%); rank 15 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 33 out of 35 respondents (94%); rank 4 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 33 out of 37 respondents (89%); rank 14 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (92%); rank 8 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 reported library users confuse this gmd with “picture.”
- 2 reported that their libraries have adapted their own gmds for this medium – one uses “framed reproduction,” one uses “art print.”

braille

- use of gmd: 25 out of 38 respondents (66%); rank 19 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 40 out of 41 respondents (98%); rank 3 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 40 out of 40 respondents (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (99%); rank 2 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- None pertinent

chart

- use of gmd: 29 out of 43 respondents (67%); rank 18 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 24 out of 33 respondents (73%); rank 18 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 25 out of 36 respondents (69%); rank 22 out of 25 gmds

- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (71%); rank 17 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 6 reported library users and cataloguers confused this gmd with “picture” and cataloguers frequently did not know which gmd to assign to posters and study prints.
- 1 stated that this gmd was poorly defined in AACR2.
- 1 stated that there were different kinds of charts, e.g., flipping charts and hanging charts; some of the latter looked like pictures.

diorama

- use of gmd: 7 out of 10 respondents (70%); rank 14 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 6 out of 17 respondents (35%); rank 24 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 13 out of 18 respondents (72%); rank 19 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (54%); rank 23 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 stated that this gmd is outdated except for museum libraries and it is too 19th century to be understood by library customers.

filmstrip

- use of gmd: 58 out of 66 respondents (88%); rank 3 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 58 out of 62 respondents (94%); rank 4 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 62 out of 62 respondents (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (97%); rank 4 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 5 reported that their libraries had either discarded or were going to discard their filmstrip collections.
- 1 stated that the term was becoming archaic and would be little understood in the future.
- 1 stated that some patrons refer to filmstrips, slides, video, or 16-mm. film as film.

flash card

- use of gmd: 31 out of 43 respondents (72%); rank 12 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 30 out of 36 respondents (83%); rank 12 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 35 out of 39 respondents (90%); rank 13 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (87%); rank 12 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 2 reported library users sometimes confused this with activity cards.
- 1 applied the gmd “game” to this medium.
- 1 stated that this gmd was difficult for foreign cataloguers to understand.

game

- use of gmd: 43 out of 65 respondents (66%); rank 19 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 41 out of 44 respondents (93%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 43 out of 47 respondents (91%); rank 11 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (95%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 2 reported confusion about whether electronic games should be given the gmd “game” or “computer file.”

- 6 expressed difficulty in deciding what is a game, confusion with toys, flash cards, and instructional materials. Some use the gmd “toy” instead of “game.”

globe

- use of gmd: 29 out of 49 respondents (59%); rank 22 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 39 out of 39 respondents (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 39 out of 39 respondents (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- None pertinent

interactive multimedia

- use of gmd: 81 out of 89 respondents (83%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 32 out of 87 respondents (37%); rank 24 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 46 out of 86 respondents (53%); rank 25 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (45%); rank 24 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 8 reported using “computer file” for this type of material either because it was too difficult to determine what was an interactive multimedia item or because they follow AACR2.
- 9 found “interactive multimedia” an inappropriate term difficult to interpret, e.g., “A puppet with cassette is interactive multiple mediums.”
- 4 applied this gmd only to CD-ROMs; and 1 used the gmd {CD-ROM}.
- 1 stated that teachers interpreted this as an AV kit, not software.
- 1 noted that “interactive multimedia” did not conform to the rest of the gmd list. It should properly be “interactive multimediam.”

kit

- use of gmd: 90 out of 105 respondents (85%); rank 5 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 44 out of 82 respondents (53%); rank 21 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 63 out of 88 respondents (72%); rank 19 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (63%); rank 21 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 3 reported that reference librarians think that anything with more than one item was a kit, e.g., a box with 10 books.
- 3 stated that their patrons did not understand the term
- 3 applied this gmd only to special groups of materials, such as book/cassette.
- 5 tried to find a predominant piece rather than use the gmd “kit.”

manuscript

- use of gmd: 20 out of 57 respondents (35%); rank 25 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 18 out of 24 respondents (75%); rank 17 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 28 out of 32 respondents (88%); rank 15 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (82%); rank 16 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 stated that people mistakenly thought of manuscripts as hand-written documents that were very old.

map

- use of gmd: 76 out of 103 respondents (74%); rank 11 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 81 out of 82 respondents (99%); rank 2 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 73 out of 76 respondents (96%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (98%); rank 3 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 asked if an atlas is a map.
- Some expressed confusion with cataloguing rules for cartographic materials.
- 2 used the gmd “cartographic materials” as mandated by Anglo-American Committee on Cataloguing Cartographic Materials

microform

- use of gmd: 92 out of 107 respondents (86%); rank 4 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 64 out of 80 respondents (80%); rank 13 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 82 out of 85 respondents (96%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (88%); rank 11 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 1 reported the use of “microfilm” and “microfiche” rather than the gmd “microform.”
- 9 reported that the public has some problems in relating the various types of microforms to the gmd “microform.”
- 1 person thought that the gmd was very useful in distinguishing microform copies from books.

model

- use of gmd: 24 out of 29 respondents (83%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 17 out of 22 respondents (77%); rank 15 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 21 out of 27 respondents (78%); rank 17 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (73%); rank 17 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 4 reported confusion with realia, toy, and/or game.

motion picture

- use of gmd: 56 out of 70 respondents (80%); rank 8 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 44 out of 58 respondents (76%); rank 16 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 50 out of 55 respondents (91%); rank 11 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (84%); rank 14 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 9 reported that patrons interpreted this gmd as a feature film on video.
- 3 reported that their libraries no longer had motion pictures.

music

- use of gmd: 35 out of 86 respondents (41%); rank 24 out of 25 gmds

- gmd understood by library users: 26 out of 39 respondents (67%); rank 20 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 31 out of 38 respondents (82%); rank 16 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (75%); rank 19 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- It was obvious that 5 respondents did not understand that this gmd is associated with printed music.
- 6 stated that library users equate “music” with recorded sound; few, including some staff members, understood that the catalogued item is printed music.
- 2 lamented the distinction in music circles between sheet music and scores, believing that this complicated arriving at a satisfactory gmd.

picture

- use of gmd: 36 out of 53 respondents (68%); rank 16 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 25 out of 35 respondents (71%); rank 17 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 24 out of 36 respondents (67%); rank 23 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (69%); rank 20 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 9 reported patron confusion with “art reproduction,” “chart,” “art original.” Cataloguers had difficulty with placing posters, photographs, study prints, etc., in proper gmd.
- 2 applied the gmd “graphic” to all pictures and photographs.
- 1 stated her/his users want the gmd “photograph”

realia

- use of gmd: 45 out of 66 respondents (68%); rank 16 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 7 out of 47 respondents (15%); rank 25 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 35 out of 49 respondents (71%); rank 21 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (43%); rank 25 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 13 reported library users confused by this term; suggestions included “three-dimensional object,” “object,” or specific nouns.
- 4 cataloguers confused this gmd with “model.”
- 1 used this gmd for microscope slides.

slide

- use of gmd: 53 out of 70 respondents (76%); rank 9 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 52 out of 56 respondents (93%); rank 6 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 56 out of 56 respondents (100%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (97%); rank 5 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- None pertinent.

sound recording

- use of gmd: 117 out of 125 respondents (94%); rank 2 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 79 out of 102 respondents (78%); rank 14 out of 25 gmds

- gmd understood by cataloguers: 97 out of 104 respondents (93%); rank 9 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (86%); rank 13 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 24 believed this gmd was too general covering everything from talking books to music CDs. Their patrons wanted a more specific gmd. Among the many suggestions were (a) creating two gmds, one for music recordings and one for spoken word recordings; (b) creating three gmds one for older formats, one for CDs, one for audio books; (c) very specific gmds, e.g., DVD, CD, compact disc.
- 1 person reported assigning the gmd “sound recording,” to audiocassettes and music CDs and the gmd “CD sound recording” to audiobooks on CD.

toy

- use of gmd: 27 out of 42 respondents (64%); rank 21 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 28 out of 32 respondents (88%); rank 9 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 26 out of 34 respondents (76%); rank 18 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (82%); rank 15 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 3 reported confusion with “model,” and/or “game.”
- 1 catalogued games, toys, puzzles, jigsaws under this gmd.
- 2 used this gmd only for puppets.

transparency

- use of gmd: 30 out of 40 respondents (75%); rank 10 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 31 out of 37 respondents (84%); rank 11 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 36 out of 37 respondents (97%); rank 5 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (91%); rank 9 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- None pertinent.

videorecording

- use of gmd: 119 out of 124 respondents (96%); rank 1 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by library users: 93 out of 105 respondents (89%); rank 8 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by cataloguers: 99 out of 102 respondents (97%); rank 5 out of 25 gmds
- gmd understood by both library users and cataloguers: (93%); rank 7 out of 25 gmds

Comments:

- 13 reported satisfaction with this gmd until the introduction of DVDs. Some people were using, or suggested gmd change to, “DVD videorecording,” “videorecording (DVD),” “[videorecording (VHS)].”
- 1 public services librarian complained that this gmd added to his/her workload because staff had to educate users to understand “this useless bib. record.”

APPENDIX C: ANSWERS TO POSSIBLE GMD SOLUTIONS

(Choice of respondents given immediately following the solution number)

1. (2nd overall choice) establish a table of precedence for the choice of a gmd
16 highly acceptable; 59 acceptable; 20 no opinion; 14 unacceptable; 5 highly unacceptable
2. (4th overall choice) for items that consist of, or contain, two media, assign both gmds, e.g., braille + sound recording
23 highly acceptable; 59 acceptable; 8 no opinion; 23 unacceptable; 3 highly unacceptable
3. (1st overall choice) qualified gmds such as now given to braille media (1.1C1), e.g., game (electronic)
26 highly acceptable, 58 acceptable; 17 no opinion; 13 unacceptable; 1 highly unacceptable
4. (3rd overall choice; most votes for “highly acceptable”) compound gmds, e.g., electronic game
32 highly acceptable; 52 acceptable; 10 no opinion; 20 unacceptable; 3 highly unacceptable
5. (6th overall choice) compound gmds inverted, e.g., game, electronic
6 highly acceptable; 25 acceptable; 16 no opinion; 53 unacceptable; 16 highly unacceptable
6. (7th overall choice) no gmd, use area 3, such as is done in *ISBD(ER) International Standard Bibliographic Description (Electronic Resources)* extended to all media.
6 highly acceptable; 13 acceptable; 29 no opinion; 42 unacceptable; 23 highly unacceptable
7. (least favoured overall choice) no gmd, allow MARC coding to provide
4 highly acceptable; 11 acceptable; 11 no opinion; 56 unacceptable; 33 highly unacceptable
8. (5th overall choice) retain present gmd list
3 highly acceptable; 38 acceptable; 15 no opinion; 46 unacceptable; 11 highly unacceptable
9. other
 - expand present list (4 responses);
 - add to present list as new formats are developed (1 response);
 - list with more specific terms and terms users can understand (2 responses);
 - combine solutions #3 & #1 to establish which would be the primary term (1 response);
 - revise present list to reflect solution #4 (1 response);
 - use natural language in gmds (1 response);
 - allow libraries to devise own gmds (1 response);
 - use British list of gmds (1 response).