

**OLAC Newsletter**  
**Volume 13, Number 2**  
**June 1993**

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

FROM THE EDITOR

FROM THE PRESIDENT

FROM THE TREASURER

MAIN ENTRY FOR FILM AND VIDEO

MEMO FROM BOB EWALD RE: PUNCTUATION TO SEPARATE NAMED ENTITIES  
PERFORMING DIFFERENT

FUNCTIONS IN NOTES

ALA ANNUAL CONFERENCE: MEETINGS OF INTEREST

CONFERENCE REPORTS

- Report from MARBI Meetings
- Report from CC:DA
- Report from MOUG

AV CATALOGING WORKSHOPS

BOOK REVIEW: CATALOGING COMPUTER FILES

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

---

**FROM THE EDITOR**  
**Sue Neumeister**

In this issue, in addition to our regular features, we have Nancy Olson's clarification on main entries for film and video. As you will see throughout this issue, Nancy has been (and will be) very busy! Verna Urbanski has also submitted the memo from Bob Ewald found in the *Music*

*Cataloging Bulletin* regarding punctuation to separate named entities performing different functions in notes.

The ALA meeting schedule has been distributed in time to be included in this issue. My thanks to Verna who helped in compiling those meetings which should be of interest to AV catalogers. A description of the LITA/ALCTS ReCon Interest Group program "Retrospective Conversion for AV Media and Microforms" can be found following the list.

Bobby Ferguson, along with her quarterly treasurer's report, has included a financial report of the 1992 OLAC Conference. Johanne LaGrange's column contains the final three reports from ALA Midwinter (MARBI, CC:DA, and MOUG). Barb Vaughan includes in her column detailed information on Nancy Olson's AV cataloging workshops being held this summer. Carolyn Frost's review of *Cataloging Computer Files* by Nancy Olson can be found in Frank Wheeler's Column.

I would like to thank all those who have contributed to this issue and those who have contributed in the past year. I would especially like to thank Barb Vaughan (State University College at Buffalo) and Ellen McGrath (State University of New York at Buffalo, Law Library) for their proofreading skills and useful suggestions. Their help is much appreciated.

**Deadline for September issue: July 30, 1993**

---

## **FROM THE PRESIDENT**

### **Sheila Smyth**

Many things have been happening since my last report to you. Dorian Martyn, Sue Neumeister and Cathy Leonardi have worked very hard to assemble and distribute a nominations ballot to the membership for the election of our Vice-President/President Elect and our Treasurer. Thanks to Dorian, Sue and Cathy.

In addition, the appointees to CAPC were made at our Mid- winter meeting. They include Richard Harwood (Penn State), Lowell Ashley (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), Brian McCafferty (Wabash College) and Diane Bohr (Costabile Associates). Susan Bailey was reappointed for another 1-year term as intern and Patricia Thompson (Southwest Texas State University) was also appointed as an intern. There were many fine candidates and the Board regrets that it didn't have more slots to fill. However there is much work to be done. The Board encourages all to continue to work with us.

OLAC will be meeting at Annual in New Orleans on Friday (June 25), Saturday (June 26) and Sunday (June 27). As usual we will meet from 8-10 in the evening. See the ALA 1993 Annual Conference Meetings of Interest on p. 11 for room assignments.

Best wishes to all as we enjoy a spring filled with bright colors as bulbs and trees remind us that summer is ahead and the cold winter days are behind.

---

**FROM THE TREASURER**  
**Bobby Ferguson**

Reporting period:

January 1, 1993 to March 31, 1993

Account balance Dec. 31, 1992 \$ 19,519.38

**INCOME**

Interest	1,043.76
Memberships	1,337.91
Back issues	52.00
OLAC Conference refund	5,926.69
Royalties for Urbanski book	173.08

**TOTAL INCOME** 8,533.44

**TOTAL** \$ 28,052.82

**EXPENSES**

Newsletter v. 13, no. 1 advance	1,000.00	
Newsletter v. 13, no. 1 remainder		125.44
Board dinner, Denver	224.67	
Subscription/back issue overpayment (3)	9.00	
Ballots and mailing	71.02	
Denver meeting room	90.00	
Returned check for OLAC Conference refund	5,923.51	
Charge for returned check	3.00	
Tapes and batteries for secretary	12.93	
Stipends, ALA Midwinter Denver	800.00	
Stipend for Newsletter index, vols. 11-12	100.00	
Univ. of Maryland shuttle service, Rockville	91.00	
Artwork for Smyth/Driessen book	100.00	

**TOTAL EXPENSES** \$ 8,550.57

Account balance March 31, 1993 \$ 7,730.85

CD at 7.20% matures 7/94 10,000.00

Ready assets trust 1,771.40

**TOTAL OLAC ASSETS** \$ 19,502.25

Current membership: 676

---

**OLAC CONFERENCE 1992**  
**Bobby Ferguson**

The following represents our totals from the OLAC Conference, 1992.

OLAC repayment of seed money	\$ 1,400.00	
OLAC memberships sent with registration		30.00
Conference registration refunds	1,035.00	
Hotel charge for room rentals, etc.	8,024.36	
Speaker expenses (including reimbursement and honorarium)	2,226.45	
Tour expenses (including metro tickets, bus charter, limousine pickup service)	840.00	
Bank charges	30.02	
Supplies (including postage, office supplies, audiocassettes)	888.20	
Tips and miscellaneous (includes tour refunds for oversubscribed tours)	128.00	
Committee dinner	225.00	
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>*** \$ 14,827.03</b>	
Total deposits	\$ 20,496.37	
Interest through 12/92	163.57	
<b>TOTAL DEPOSIT</b>	<b>\$ 20,659.54</b>	
Returning to OLAC	\$ 5,923.51	
Interest added after 12/92	3.18	

\*\*\* One check for \$91.00 did not come through as of closing date of this account. Amount represents University of Maryland charter, which will have to be paid from OLAC funds.

---

**MAIN ENTRY FOR FILM AND VIDEO**  
**Nancy B. Olson**

At the meeting of the OnLine Audiovisual Catalogers Cataloging Policy Committee, June 26, 1992, as reported in the meeting minutes, Ben Tucker said the Library of Congress occasionally does enter works [film/video] under personal name main entry. He went on to say that "works produced by no more than three persons would be entered under personal main entry." What he did not say was that the item would be entered under personal main entry in this case only if there were no other persons or corporate bodies involved in the "creation of the intellectual or artistic content of the work" (AACR2R 21.1A1). His use of the word "produced" led some to believe the item would be entered under the producer, or the first of one, two, or three producers, regardless of any other responsibility that may have been indicated on the chief source of information.

When considering choice of main entry for film or video, we must look at the list of responsibility entities given in the chief source of information for the work. The list of personal and corporate names and functions shown on the chief source of a film or video is not standardized. It varies from the item that has only one person named as writer, producer, and/or director (and with no other functions or persons/bodies named) to the item that has dozens of credits, both individual and corporate. The rule for personal author says "A personal author is the person chiefly responsible for the creation of the intellectual or artistic content of a work" (AACR2R 21.1A1). If one person performs all the creative and artistic functions in the development of a film or video, that person should be chosen as main entry.

If, however, more than one person is named for one of the functions, we must look at the rules for shared responsibility. If each function is performed by a different person, we look at the rules for mixed responsibility. If any of the functions are named as being performed by corporate bodies, we must also look at the rules for corporate main entry.

If it is clear that one person carries most of the responsibility, that person may be chosen as main entry under the rules for works of shared responsibility (AACR2R 21.6). The choice may be indicated by prominence of the person's name in the design of the chief source of information, and/or by the number of times the person is named as performing different functions. If two or three persons seem to share the responsibility equally, and the name of the one is given prominently, that person may be chosen as main entry. If the two or three names are presented in such a way that no one is prominent, the first is chosen as main entry. It must be emphasized that, to be considered for shared responsibility, no more than two or three persons are named in the chief source of information, and no corporate bodies are named anywhere (with the exception of music groups considered under 21.23).

If two or more functions (script, music, cinematographer, producer, director, etc.) are named, and a different person is named for each one, we must consider responsibility for the creative or intellectual content mixed, and consider AACR2R rule 21.8. None of the rules following 21.8 specifically addresses film or video productions, but the principles are clear. We should not attempt to judge from the credits which functions are more important, or which people are of lesser importance. Rule 21.1C1 directs us: when "the personal authorship is ... diffuse" enter under title proper.

Corporate bodies are listed in credits for many films and/or videos. There are few cases for which one may consider corporate body main entry.

1. If a film/video is issued/distributed by a body as well as being "of an administrative nature dealing with the corporate body itself" it may be considered for corporate main entry.
2. The videorecording of a complete conference (exhibition, expedition, etc.), when distributed by the conference, could be considered for corporate main entry.
3. A film/video resulting "from the collective activity of a performing group as a whole ... " 21.1B2e.

In cases 1 and 2 above, if the corporate body is the only name appearing in the credits, the corporate body would be chosen as main entry. If any persons are named for any functions, responsibility would be mixed, or diffuse, and entry would be under title.

Later in the discussion Ben was asked if the performer could be the main entry for a music video as they are for a sound recording. A Library of Congress rule interpretation (Cataloging Service Bulletin 45) directs us to apply rules 21.23C1 and 21.23D1 to music videos. A principal performer may be chosen as main entry for a music video.

It may help to remember that in an online catalog, all access points are equal. Each retrieves the desired bibliographic record equally well. We labor over choice of main entry, an irrelevant decision in the online environment.

Questions about the following types of material are often asked.

### **Shakespeare plays**

A video of a stage production of a Shakespeare play is not entered under Shakespeare. Yes, it is his play, and yes, he wrote the words. There is much more to the stage production than the words, and additional responsibility beyond that in the filming. There are directors, producers, costumes, lights, sets, music, photography, and all the other functions involved in bringing the words of Shakespeare to us in the context of a specific production presented as a specific videorecording. This clearly falls into the "diffuse responsibility" category; entry is under title.

### **Operas**

Some people want filmed operas entered the same as the printed score for the opera. The opera itself usually is a work of mixed responsibility, with one person writing the music, another the words. When it is staged, the stage production needs the talents of musicians and singers as well as conductors, directors, set designers and builders, costume designers and seamstresses, choreographers, people for props, lights, etc. The filming of this stage production requires additional functions: cinematographers, more lighting specialists, and more administrative production/direction involvement. The music and words are still central to the production, but responsibility is diffuse, and main entry is under title.

### **Music videos**

Music videos may have extensive credits, however, according to LCRI 21.23 (CSB 45) rules 21.23C and 21.23D may be considered when choosing main entry.

A music video with a person or body clearly named as principal performer is entered under the principal performer. Examples would be music videos of performances by Michael Jackson or Madonna.

Nancy B. Olson  
Memorial Library  
Mankato State Library  
Mankato, MN 56002  
nbolson@msus1.msus.edu

---

**From: *Music Cataloging Bulletin* (v.23, no.12)**

**MEMO FROM BOB EWALD,  
CATALOGING POLICY AND SUPPORT OFFICE**

In the 1978 AACR2, one example under rule 6.7B6 and two examples under 7.7B6 used prescribed punctuation, space-semicolon- space, to separate in the note named entities performing different functions.

6.7B6:Genevieve Warner, Lois Hunt, Genevieve Rowe, sopranos ; Elizabeth Brown, Virginia Paris, contraltos ; Frank Rogier, baritone ; Columbia Chamber Orchestra, Leon Engel, conductor

7.7B6:Credits: Screenplay, Harold Pinter ; music, John Dankworth ; camera, Gerry Fisher ; editor, Reginald Beck

Credits: Script, John Taylor ; calligraphy and design, Alan Haigh ; commentator, Derek G. Holroyde

The same examples in the 1988 AACR2 used standard punctuation, semicolon-space, to separate the functions.

6.7B6: ... Rowe, sopranos; Elizabeth ... contraltos; Frank ... baritone; Columbia

7.7B6: ... Pinter; music ... Dankworth; camera ... Fisher; editor ...

... Taylor; calligraphy ... Haigh; commen- tator ...

But the 1988 AACR2 contained a new example under rule 9.7B6 that used prescribed punctuation, space-semicolon-space.

9.7B6: Systems designer, Henry Letow ; sound, LF Acoustics

The punctuation discrepancy was brought to our attention by an outside library which asked for clarification. Also, the 1978 version of the 6.7B6 example had been published in *Music Cataloging Decisions* in March 1989. The issue was discussed at the November 5, 1992 meeting of the Music and Sound Recording Cataloging Roundtable.

The consensus of the discussion was that prescribed punctuation in the note was not required by rule 1.7A3 since the note does not necessarily reflect exact transcription from the source from which the data are taken. On the other hand, the presence of prescribed punctuation in the 1988 rule 9.7B6 indicates that prescribed punctuation is not forbidden, and in fact may be useful when the note contains a long listing of entities performing a number of different functions.

**CONCLUSION:** Standard punctuation (semicolon-space) or prescribed punctuation (space-semicolon-space) may be used when making the notes called for in AACR2 rules 6.7B6, 7.7B6, 9.7B6.

---

## **ALA 1993 ANNUAL CONFERENCE MEETINGS OF INTEREST**

Data are taken from preliminary conference schedules. Please confirm all dates, times, and locations in the final conference program.

### **OLAC**

CATALOGING POLICY COMMITTEE  
Friday, June 25th, 8-10 pm, Marriott / Mardi Gras ABC

OLAC BUSINESS MEETING  
Saturday, June 26th, 8-10 pm, Sheraton New Orleans / Oakley

OLAC EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING  
Sunday, June 27th, 8-10 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 11

### **ALCTS**

PROGRAM: CATALOGING IN THE ELECTRONIC  
ENVIRONMENT, Sunday, June 27th, 2-4 pm  
Marriott / Bissonet

### **ALCTS AV COMMITTEE**

MEETING, Sunday, June 27th, 8-9 am  
New Orleans Hilton Riverside / Durham

MEETING, Tuesday, June 29th, 2-4 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 99

AV PRODUCER/DISTRIBUTOR--LIBRARY RELATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE, Tuesday, June 29th, 8-9 am  
New Orleans Convention Center / 16

AV STANDARDS SUBCOMMITTEE, Monday, June 28th,  
2-4 pm, Marriott / Balcony K

### **CC:DA**

MEETING, Saturday, June 26th, 2-4 pm  
New Orleans Hilton Riverside / Elmwood



MEETING, Monday, June 28th, 9:30 am-12:30 pm  
LeMeridien / Il deFr BR II

INTERACTIVE MEDIA GUIDELINES REVIEW TF  
Friday, June 25th, 2-5:30 pm, Fairmont / Bayou I

MULTIPLE VERSIONS GUIDELINES TASK FORCE  
Friday, June 25th, 2-5:30 pm, Doubletree Hotel / Oak Alley

**COMPUTER FILES DISCUSSION GROUP**

Saturday, June 26th, 11:30 am-12:30 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 21

Sunday, June 27th, 9:30 am-12:30 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 102

**LC AND NATIONAL LIBRARIES REPORTING SESSION**

Friday, June 25th, 2-4 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / Rm. 38

**LITA/ALCTS RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION INTEREST GROUP**

PROGRAM: RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION FOR NON-  
PRINT MEDIA AND MICROFORMS, Sunday, June 27th,  
2-4 pm, New Orleans Convention Center / 10

**MARBI**

MEETING, Saturday, June 26th, 9:30 am-12:30 pm  
Clarion Hotel / Audubon D

MEETING, Sunday, June 27th, 2-5:30 pm  
Hyatt Regency at Superdome / BR E

MEETING, Monday, June 28th, 2-5:30 pm  
Fairmont / Bayou I

**MAGERT (MAP AND GEOGRAPHY ROUNDTABLE) CATALOGING AND  
CLASSIFICATION COMMITTEE**

Sunday, June 27th, 9:30-11 am,  
New Orleans Hilton Riverside / Grand Salon N6

**MAP CATALOGING DISCUSSION GROUP**

Sunday, June 27th, 4:30-5:30 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 29

**SUBJECT ANALYSIS COMMITTEE**

MEETING, Sunday, June 27th, 9:30 am-12:30 pm  
Raddison Suites / Bayou Jean LaFitte I

MEETING, Tuesday, June 29th, 9:30 am-12:30 pm  
New Orleans Convention Center / 103

## **VIDEO ROUNDTABLE BUSINESS MEETING**

Monday, June 28th, 9:30am-12:30 pm

CLARION HOTEL / Audubon D

\*\*\*\*\*

## **RETROSPECTIVE CONVERSION FOR AV MEDIA AND MICROFORMS**

The LITA/ALCTS Retrospective Conversion Interest Group is planning a program for the ALA Annual Conference to be held on Sunday, June 17, 1993, from 2-4 p.m. The program aims to provide a forum to discuss broad guidelines in converting bibliographic records for audio-visual material, including videorecordings, graphics, slides, photographs, kits, technical drawings, etc. and for microforms, including microfiche, microfilm, microcards, microopaque, etc. For most libraries, these types of materials present special needs and problems in initiating a retrospective conversion project. A panel of two or three speakers will focus on "what to do" and "what not to do" based on their particular experiences in dealing with these formats. The session is designed for school, public, and academic libraries.

---

### **CONFERENCE REPORTS** **Johanne LaGrange, Column Editor**

#### **1993 ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE** **January 23-25** **Denver, Colorado**

**Submitted by Nancy Olson**  
**OLAC Liaison to MARBI**

**Proposal 92-7.** *Addition of subfield 8 (link and sequence number) in field 852 of the USMARC holdings format.* The addition of this subfield will allow a display sequence to be specified for related holdings records; holdings will display in a logical sequence rather than a random one. After discussion at several ALA meetings over the past two years, it was approved.

**Proposal 92-21.** *Addition of fields 876-878 (item information) to the USMARC holdings format.* This proposal would add new fields for item level information, related to the copy identified in field 852 in the holdings record. This proposal was discussed last June, and was rewritten to reflect that discussion. The proposal was approved with a number of minor changes.

**Proposal 93-1.** *Make computer files 008/18-19 obsolete in the bibliographic format.* OCLC asked for the serial characteristics frequency and regularity to be made obsolete in the computer files format in anticipation of format integration. The proposal was approved.

**Proposal 93-2.** *Make the second indicator in authority fields 1xx, 4xx, 5xx (excluding fields 130, 430, 530) obsolete.* This proposal would treat the nonfiling indicator in these fields the same as those in the bibliographic format. It was approved.

**Proposal 93-3.** *Additions/changes to bibliographic/holdings 007/04 (videorecording format) for videorecordings.* This proposal adds seven new codes to the list of videorecording formats, and changes the description of one of the existing codes. It was approved. Codes are added for Betacam, Betacam SP, Super-VHS, M-II, D-2, 8mm, Hi-8mm. Quadruplex is changed for 1 or 2 in. reel to 2 in. reel.

**Proposal 93-4.** *Changes to the USMARC bibliographic format (computer files) to accommodate online information resources.* This was moved to the beginning of the first day of MARBI. We were meeting in a tiny "room" (temporary walls around a table next to the exhibit area, where exhibits were being set up and opened), with almost no room for observers, and many observers wanting to be present. We couldn't hear each other around the table; observers who wanted to speak couldn't even get into the room (some appeared through doorways from adjacent rooms), and tempers grew short in this two-hour discussion.

This proposal was developed as part of the OCLC Internet Resources Project, and is related to several earlier MARBI discussion papers on electronic resources. The major parts of the proposal included adding codes to 008/26 for certain types of computer files, and adding a new field 856 to the holdings and bibliographic formats for electronic location and access information. The expanded list of codes for the 008/26 was approved, except the term "representational" was not changed to "graphic." Field 856 was approved provisionally with some editorial changes, and some minor modifications. The suggestion to make field 516 obsolete was not approved.

**Proposal 93-5.** *Addition of subfield 2 (source of classification or shelving scheme) in field 852 of the USMARC holdings format.* Option 1, to define value 7 in first indicator (shelving scheme) as source specified in subfield 2, was approved.

**Discussion paper 58:** *Possible changes to 008/39 (cataloging source) in the bibliographic format, and Discussion paper 59: Possible changes to 008/39 (cataloging source) in the authority format,* brought forth the questions "Is it broken? Does it need fixing?" There were not strong feelings that these changes were needed, so both papers were set aside.

**Discussion paper 60.** *Curriculum information in USMARC bibliographic records.* The Northwest Ohio Educational Technology Foundation contacted LC about encoding curriculum-related information in the bibliographic format. They would like grade level information, terms describing learner characteristics, formal curriculum objectives or goals, motivation levels, and other curriculum-related information included. They would also like a curriculum-specific subject access. This was the last item to be discussed. Someone from the Ohio group was there to describe what they are doing, and what they hope to accomplish. Some MARBI members volunteered to work with him to identify appropriate MARC fields for the information, and to develop a proposal. After the meeting quite a number of people gathered around him to discuss this -- the Ohio group seems to have identified a need that we'll hear more about.

**Discussion paper 61.** *File label specifications for electronic files of USMARC records.* There was discussion as to whether this information should go into a separate file, or be the first record in a file. Questions will go out on USMARC-L, and a proposal will be developed.

**Discussion paper 62.** *Accommodating the USMARC language code associated with a language heading in the authority format.* The Cataloging Committee of the African Studies Association, Africana Librarians Council requested this discussion. The MARBI group pointed out there was not a good correspondence between subject headings and language codes, and suggested some avenues the requesting group might explore that would provide easier access to this information.

**Discussion paper 63.** *Possible new fields needed in the authority format.* The Amon Carter Museum Library suggests new fields are needed in the authority format for genre/form, occupation, function, and physical characteristic headings. A proposal will be developed.

**Discussion paper 64.** *Accommodating numbers published on an item in the bibliographic format.* This paper presented several options for accommodating numbers such as the International Standard Music Number, Universal Product Code, other barcodes, etc. A proposal will be developed to redefine field 024 as "other standard number."

**Discussion paper 65.** *Input conventions for LC classification numbers in the USMARC classification format.* This paper calls for some simplification based on the experience LC has gained in working with classes H-HJ. The simplification was approved, and the format will be revised.

---

**REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING:  
DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS  
1993 ALA MIDWINTER CONFERENCE Submitted by Catherine Gerhart,  
OLAC Audience Observer to CC:DA**

CC:DA met twice, January 23 and January 25, at the Denver ALA Midwinter meeting. They talked about many things that, while interesting, do not necessarily affect the AV cataloging community. I will try to inform you here of the discussions and decisions that will be of interest to this community.

First, CC:DA is looking into the possibility of electronic distribution of some of the information discussed at CC:DA meetings. This topic garnered lots of discussion, not all in favor of the idea. The main opponents felt that if public, documents that were in draft form might be taken for final decisions and implemented before finalized. Given the difficulty OLAC has in getting copies of drafts of proposals discussed at this meeting, I think we would wholeheartedly support easier and timelier opportunities to comment on proposals before CC:DA.

CC:DA is planning a preconference, possibly for Summer '94, on multiple versions. The draft of the Multiple Versions Guidelines is out for review now and comments on the draft guidelines will be discussed at the summer '93 ALA meeting both at a public meeting on Friday, June 25 and at the CC:DA meeting. There will be a need to put forth a rule revision for AACR2R 0.24 before implementing the technique but this should be able to happen before the preconference. The meetings at this summer's ALA will still be leading up to determining final rule revisions. The preconference will address the need for implementation information after the final decisions are made.

A topic that was discussed last summer returned to CC:DA again at this meeting, namely the Australian proposal to add information about the presence of closed captioning to the GMD for videos. OLAC had participated in the earlier decision to reject this proposal and CC:DA again supported our view, indicating that while this information was appropriate and needed in the cataloging record, the GMD was not the place for it. One solution CC:DA saw was to put this kind of information in the language note, providing access to it through subject headings and possibly some kind of MARC coding to increase machine limiting and searching. CC:DA plans to draft a rule revision that would add a sentence or example to 7.7B2 (language note) to submit to the Joint Steering Committee. It is quite possible then that we will see this proposal again in the future.

The revisions that are being made to the footnote for kits returned again in a slightly different incarnation. ALCTS AV supported the change in wording, which was minor.

CC:DA continues to work toward making AACR2R available in a machine-readable form. A separate meeting was held at ALA to talk about the plans for the product which will use SGML, the ISO developed standard for encoding text. It is still not clear when they will be done with the project.

OCLC recently did a cataloging experiment to discover how the current cataloging rules and MARC format handled the cataloging of Internet resources. Based on this experiment, a proposal (93-4) was sent to MARBI and a set of guidelines developed to begin addressing the particular problems identified in the experiment. In response to this, CC:DA set up a task force that will look at Proposal 93-4, the guidelines and the final report of the OCLC experiment. They will report back to CC:DA about any changes they see that may be needed in the rules.

Another task force was also set up to gather comments and report back on the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Interactive Media. This task force will be chaired by Laurel Jizba. The task force will hold a public meeting at ALA in New Orleans on Friday, June 25, 1993.

---

**REPORT FROM MUSIC OCLC USERS' GROUP (MOUG)**  
**Submitted by Ian Fairclough**  
**MOUG/OLAC Liaison**

MOUG held its annual conference at the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco Feb. 2-3, prior to the meeting of the Music Library Association (MLA). Eighty-two people were in attendance. On the opening evening, Jay Weitz, OCLC liaison to MOUG, reported extensively on OCLC activities of interest to the music librarianship community. Jeffrey Earnest presented an update on the NACO Music Project, and Deta Davis reported on news from the Library of Congress.

Providing dates in bibliographic description is often problematic for music materials, both print and non-print. Joan Swanekamp reviewed the questions, gave guidance, and provided a bibliography. In small group sessions, Greg Doyle of OCLC demonstrated the OCLC Micro-Enhancer software, and Cheryl Taranto discussed searching in PRISM. Leslie Bennett presented an introduction to OCLC's reference product, FirstSearch, and Neil Hughes discussed authority work. In the final plenary session, Jeffrey Earnest presented the ramifications of format integration as they will affect music libraries, noting that the maps format field for scale and projection will now be valid for scores; however, no codes have yet been provided for musical scales! (His remark generated laughter and groans.)

Is a new edition of *The Best of MOUG* needed? This question was discussed at the MOUG business meeting. The publication is now in its 4th edition (1991) and has proven, over the years, to be an invaluable tool for both catalogers and reference librarians in providing access by browsing through the established forms of name-uniform title headings of works by Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Handel, etc. One can also look up titles like *The Rite of Spring* and *Flight of the Bumble Bee* and find the Slavic-language headings. Entries list the OCLC authority record number for easy retrieval of the online record. Support for a new edition was expressed. (Meanwhile, about ten copies of the 4th edition are still available at \$6.50, prepaid by check to MOUG; order from: Judy Weidow, Cataloging 55453, University of Texas, P.O. Box P, Austin, TX 78713-7330).

In the program committee meeting, discussion of future MOUG meetings focused on how the upcoming joint meeting with OLAC will affect the pattern of MOUG meetings. The past several meetings have been in conjunction with the annual meetings of MLA -- usually just before. MOUG will endeavor to continue to hold some sessions jointly with MLA, possibly as part of the actual MLA program.

---

## **NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Barbara Vaughan, Column Editor**

#### **AV Cataloging Workshops**

Nancy Olson will be teaching AV cataloging this summer in two separate workshops. The first will be at Longwood College, Farmville, VA July 19-23 (5 days); the second at the University of Pittsburgh July 26-31 (6 days). Both workshops will cover cataloging of all types of nonbook

materials, with lots of hands-on practice. Participants will need AACR2R (1988) and the 3rd edition of Nancy's book *Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials* (1992) and are invited to bring things that need to be cataloged. For more information, contact Nancy at:

Memorial Library  
Mankato State University  
Mankato, MN 56002  
Phone: 507-389-5088  
E-mail: nbolson@msus1.msus.edu  
or

Contact the appropriate school:

Longwood College  
Farmville, VA 23901  
Contact person:

Dr. Vera Williams  
Graduate and Continuing Studies Office  
804-395-2707  
or

Frances R. Hellmuth  
804-395-2633  
fax: 804-395-2453

University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh Campus  
4200 Fifth Ave.  
Pittsburgh, PA 15260  
Contact person:

Mary Kay Biagini  
Associate Dean, Continuing Education, SLIS  
412-624-5230  
fax: 412-624-5231

---

**BOOK REVIEWS**  
**Frank T. Wheeler, Column Editor**

*Cataloging Computer Files*  
**by Nancy B. Olson**  
**A Review**

Olson's book is part of the now familiar Minnesota Trainer Series, and is also the latest of a number of previous books on the cataloging of computer software. Earlier editions of the book

reflect the history of the AACR2 rules for cataloging computer files, beginning with Olson's first edition in 1983, (*A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Microcomputer Software and Video Games*) which addressed problems related to AACR2's chapter 9 and the process leading up to the 1984 *Guidelines for Using AACR2 Chapter 9 for Cataloging Microcomputer Software*. A second edition in 1986 (*A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Microcomputer Software*) followed the Guidelines, with comments on changes leading to AACR2's Chapter 9. The current book is a revision of Olson's 3rd edition (*A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Microcomputer Software With MARC Tagging and Coding*, 1988) and follows the 1988 revision of AACR2. Olson's *Cataloging Microcomputer Software: A Manual to Accompany AACR2 Chapter 9, Computer Files*, (1988) gives a history of the rules and detailed bibliography, but was published before the revised 1988 rules, which appeared later that year.

The present book deals with computer software of various kinds, and is comprised largely of examples (p. 23-123). There is a general chapter which takes the reader step by step through the components of the catalog record, using AACR2's sequence of rule areas. Examples are provided for each rule or topic, and some commentary. There is a brief subject access section (one page) and a section on MARC coding and tagging for OCLC.

Examples given are primarily Apple/Mac, but are varied in the type of bibliographic problem presented. The majority of examples are of computer disks, but there are also some compact disks and interactive disks, as well as examples of remote access. Examples also vary in that some include multi-format items, e.g., a book accompanied by disk, disk accompanied by a book, and one with no predominant medium.

Examples show some source data, attractive and crisply presented, a catalog record, MARC tagging and a brief commentary (usually a few sentences) indicating the rationale behind decisions, and major rules used. In most instances, the reader does not have the complete sources of information used in cataloging. All told, there are about 45 different examples, of which 17 give title screen information only, 17 give information from the container or label, and 11 which give information from both title screen and label or container. In the examples for compact disk, all sources are from the container. Thus, for the most part, the source data can only account for part of the record, and decisions on what and how to record other information are not available. It would have been helpful to have had a representation or at least a description of other sources of information. For example, in example 14, the record reflects a distributor in the publication area, but the source of this information is not included in the title screen, which is the sole source listed. Without this, the reader is left to guess as to the cataloger's decision-making on aspects of the record which are not taken from the title screen, such as the physical description area and note areas.

The commentary is illuminating and instructive, but brief. The novice cataloger or those with modest subject expertise will need supplementary material to explain in more detail and substance how the AACR2 rules are structured and the particular challenges and decision areas posed by cataloging computer software. For further reading, the reader must turn to Olson's more detailed *Cataloging Microcomputer Software* or the like. A brief bibliography would also have been useful. The comments are helpful and interesting-more would be even better.



For example, in example 21B, the title screen shows an edition statement which is not reflected in the record. Since the commentary gives only rule numbers, there is no explanation for the omission. In contrast, example 28 explains a decision on how to handle ambiguous title information.

A similar lack of explanation occurs in example 26, where there is a subtitle which is given in a note rather than given as other title information, as the cataloger did in example 30. Examples 20A and B show title screens with a statement of responsibility, yet this is not reflected in the record, and no explanation is given in the brief commentary. If there is a rationale for this decision, the reader is not informed, in contrast to example 3 which explains a decision to place a title screen statement of responsibility in the note area. A few discrepancies were noted (example 40A does not contain a source of title note, and in example 11, the date recorded is not a copyright date, although the only dates on the title screen are copyright dates), but these are relatively rare exceptions to otherwise soundly constructed records.

The book has many strengths, chiefly in the variety of examples and extensive selection of cataloging problems. The crisply presented source data, while not complete, is nevertheless useful and illustrative. Another major area of strength is the inclusion of MARC tagging and catalog records for each example. Ms. Olson's expertise in the area of cataloging nonbook materials is highly regarded by her colleagues, and with good reason. Because of this expertise, it would be all the more valuable for readers to have more of her experience and judgement in the discussion of cataloging decisions.

The book is recommended, and will be useful to library school instructors, trainers, and for professional development for those who do not work extensively with this format.

Published in 1992 by: Soldier Creek Press, P.O. Box 734, 642 S. Hunt St., Lake Crystal, Minn. 56055-0734. ISBN 0-936996-47-1. (123 p.) \$25.00

Reviewed by Carolyn O. Frost  
Professor, School of Information and Library Studies  
University of Michigan

---

## **QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

### **V. Urbanski, Column Editor**

The questions below were asked and answered during the Question and Answer session at the OLAC conference in Rockville, MD in October 1992. Remarks have been edited from notes of those in attendance. Panelists for this session include: Ben Tucker (LC retired); Glenn Patton (OCLC); Ed Glazier (RLIN); Nancy Olson (Mankato State U); Jay Weitz (OCLC); Ann Sandberg-Fox (LC retired). The moderator was Verna Urbanski.

**QUESTION:** Would it ever be appropriate to use one bibliographic record and one physical description to describe a range of formats for a videorecording, such as: \$c 1/2-3/4 in.?

**ANSWER:** No. You need very different equipment to run these and it could cause real confusion among your users.---GP

You might think back to LC's generic records. The ones that had the note regarding the formats the item was issued in but not describing any specific format. It was acceptable (and still is) for you to use a generic record for a model, but you needed to input a new record for each different format in which the title was available.---JW

**QUESTION:** What is the current policy for recording information on closed captioning in the bib record?

**ANSWER:** LCRI 7.7B2 says to use a note "Closed captioned for the hearing impaired." Then add an appropriate 650 such as "Video recordings for the hearing impaired."---JW

[*OLAC Newsletter v.7,no.3, p.20-21* had an article which discusses the use of these subject headings for film materials for the hearing impaired, for those of you who would like to review this information--vu].

**QUESTION:** When will the 538 field on OCLC be available for video?

**ANSWER:** It already is available for the Visual Materials Format. It was part of the upgrades covered by USMARC update 3 and was covered by OCLC Technical Bulletin 194 in July of 1991. ---JW

**QUESTION:** When is something a kit when there is a book and a cassette issued together?

**ANSWER:** It is up to the cataloger to judge. You make the decision based on your library and your experience.---NO

In general, OCLC prefers this material to be treated as a book with an accompanying sound cassette. In a few cases it is a sound recording accompanied by a book.---JW

When members call in to OCLC to ask about this, it is often difficult for OCLC to give very good advice. It depends on how clearly the item in hand is described and what OCLC can extrapolate from that description. You may not get the same answer twice! And, the answer you get may not be what you wanted to hear!! You probably had the right answer in the first place and didn't trust your "inner voice."---GP

**QUESTION:** When cataloging electronic journals, should anything go in the 300 field, and what goes in the 260 field (the computer getting the information or the computer giving the information)? And, who is the responsible person--the editor, writer, hacker who retrieved the text? And, do you make a note about the e- mail address?

**ANSWER:** OCLC is looking into cataloging Internet resources with the end object to be establishing guidelines to help OCLC users catalog this material using OCLC. A lot of the record must be generated by cataloger's judgment. How do you make an estimation of whether it is published (if it is readily available to the public like a magazine is?); if there is an associated responsible entity producing it (such as, AN2 the electronic ALCTS newsletter)? You do not put any information in the physical description area regarding a remotely obtained file. There may be a new MARC field coming that will help store information about how the file is accessed.---GP

Glenn is right. You must first rely on your best judgment as a cataloger. This is a totally new experience for all of us and we must just do our best to follow existing rules. They are rather constricting to use right now because they were written without knowing what lay ahead for computer files. My advice is to consult with other catalogers especially if you have access to experienced ones and be consistent.---AS-F

**QUESTION:** What is the difference between stereo and hi- fi on video and sound recordings?

**ANSWER:** In your catalog record do not indicate that it is stereo unless it says so on the item. Being stereo is a definite plus in both formats so if it is stereo the producers of the item will splash it all over. LP producers may try to get people to buy another "version" of a monaural hi-fi by remastering it to stereo, but these are not actually stereo recordings.---EG

Hi-fi relates to the sound quality of an item. Stereo relates to how the item is recorded and played back. Stereo has two channels of sound with different portions of the whole on each speaker.---VU

**QUESTION:** Please comment on the publisher, distributor area of the catalog record. It is so confusing to know who to put where in the 260 \$b.

**ANSWER:** You are dependent to a certain extent on how the item presents itself and how the company producing the item labels it. Book publishers pretty much behave because there is a NISO standard relating to the presentation of the title page information and how things get expressed there. Sound recordings and videorecordings generally are not so well-behaved. You have to use your judgment as to what is on the item and be consistent.---GP

It is hard to tell what the person is asking, but it may relate to when to treat something as manufactured and when to treat it as published. A manufacturer is not a publisher or a distributor. The only one that does NOT belong in the 260 is the manufacturer. Copy the statement on the piece, not necessarily what is true. Most of the time it is clearly stated. If the function of the entity is not clearly stated, the entity is probably not all that important anyway.---BT

I have gotten much less paranoid about this in recent years. As long as the record provides the information needed to clearly identify it, it is hard to be declared totally wrong regarding the transcription. You need to be accurate, but it is of utmost importance that the item can be distinguished from another similar item and that it can be retrieved by predictable access points.--VU

**QUESTION:** The phrase "presented by" seems very vague. How should it be treated?

**ANSWER:** It is better to not make too many interpretations with phrases like this. Record it as found so that others using your record can see accurately how the phrase was used.---EG

Use words and terms as found on the item, the box, whatever.---NO

Don't agonize.---JW

I usually put the body accompanied by this phrase in the area of responsibility unless it repeats a name that will appear as the distributor in the publisher, distributor, etc. area.---VU

### **This concludes the questions from the OLAC conference.**

**QUESTION:** I have a video that was made in New York, NY of a film made in Italy. Should I code the fixed field "Ctry" for New York or for Italy? According to the OCLC AV media format I should code for the place of production. But the AV media format also says if the work is a reproduction to code for the place of reproduction. Is a video of a film considered a reproduction? It is not in the FF Dat Tp, which is why Dat Tp is coded "p" not "r".

**ANSWER:** Ctry should be coded for the place of production "Italy" for both records. With videos and films we think in terms of re-release or reissue rather than reproduction. The Dat tp "p" and "r" explanations (see subsection (7) in the OCLC AV format) make it pretty clear that a video copy of a film is to be treated as a new item. But in either case production of the content of the item (information acknowledged in the \$c area of the 245) stays the same and so does the Ctry code. Code for the country of production and that remains the same from format to format. -  
--VU

### **SPECIAL QUESTION AND ANSWER**

Several months ago MLA-L discussion list had a question regarding what was available for shelving CDs. Nyal Williams of Ball State University provided a very good answer and has given me permission to "reassemble" her information to share with OLAC readers. Nyal's answer indicates that the shelving could also be used to shelve videocassettes quite nicely. Nyal notes that she is not a "sales rep" and owns no stock in the company!!!

Library Bureau advertises shelving for paperback books that does a wonderful job for shelving CDs. Each shelf will hold 84 separate CD jewel cases. The shelves are designed so that the CDs are tilted slightly backward (8 degrees), making the titles easier to read. The shelves have slots on one inch centers that will accept dividers wherever one believes support is needed (we put about four to each shelf). The shelves can be hung as closely as eight inches (bottom to bottom), which makes for very compact storage. The same shelving will work very well for videocassettes, but the shelves would have to be farther apart.

In a later communication directly with me, Nyal cited Library Bureau Item No. 3506-7 6" deep shelving, but she cautions that this is from a three year old catalog. A more current flyer shows the shelving being used for videocassettes and comments that each shelf hold 28 videocassettes.

---

Last modified: December 1997