

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 292

IR 001 320

AUTHOR Schrader, Vivian L.
TITLE The Cataloging of Nonprint Media; A Challenge and the Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules to Meet the Challenge.
INSTITUTION Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. Processing Dept.
PUB DATE 15 Oct 74
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the Southwestern Library Association (25th, Galveston, Texas, October 1974)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Aids; *Cataloging; Films; Filmstrips; Information Processing; Instructional Media; Library Science; Library Technical Processes; Phonograph Records; Slides; Speeches; *Standards; Tape Recordings
IDENTIFIERS Anglo American Cataloging Rules; *Cataloging Rules; Library Of Congress

ABSTRACT

The cataloging of nonprint media can be a challenge as well as a problem. Such cataloging at Library of Congress (LC) began with the motion picture project in 1945. Cataloging rules were drawn up which included films, and later filmstrips. LC published its rules in 1965, and in 1967 the rules were included, with minor changes, as Chapter 12 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR). In 1968 the scope of Chapter 12 was enlarged to include slide sets, video tapes, and other audiovisual materials. Since that time there have been numerous international meetings and discussions on forms of entry, terminology, and definitions. LC has drafted new rules which may, after some input and revision from American, Canadian, and British library associations, become a new Chapter 12 of the AACR.
(LS)

THE CATALOGING OF NONPRINT MEDIA--A CHALLENGE
AND THE REVISION OF THE ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

Last March when I received word about this Institute and the role which I would play, it was suggested that I should speak for 45 minutes. I must confess that my first concern was for myself--how could I possibly speak for that length of time! The very next Sunday we had a pastor visiting in our church from East Germany and I was very much interested in what he would be telling us about life in his country and particularly about worship and religion, the role of the organized church in East Germany, and in general his comments about his people living under communism. He spoke for 45 minutes and at the end of his talk several of us looked at one another, tired from sitting so long, and asked "What did he say?" At that very moment I really became concerned about the participants in this Nonprint Media Institute who would be forced to hear my speech for 45 minutes. Recognizing that there is nothing I can do about the hard chairs, I did resolve that I do have a message and after I am finished I don't want you to have to ask "What did she say?" but I want each of you to know what my message is.

Many years ago an unmarried friend of mine was asked to speak to a group of women on the topic "Motherhood, a joy not a chore." We chuckled about the topic and I have never forgotten it. Therefore, as I was thinking about a topic for today I thought of "Audiovisual cataloging, a joy not a chore" but thought that this title would not be accurate. Perhaps cataloging is not always a joy, but it certainly can be a challenge. For that reason, I have selected the topic "The cataloging of nonprint media--a challenge-- and the revision of the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES to meet the challenge." As I have talked to librarians at the Library of Congress and elsewhere, it has become obvious that to many people the thought of cataloging AV materials is upsetting, partly, because the field is relatively new, and partly, because

ED 100292

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATOR. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

3001320

advances in technology add new materials faster than the cataloging rules can be formulated and agreed upon. My message is that working with these materials, that creating rules for the cataloging of the materials, and then adapting the rules to accommodate the technological changes can not only be a challenge but can be interesting and fun!

Most of you are familiar, I am certain, with the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES and in particular with Part III which deals with Non-Book Materials. First I would like to trace for you the history behind the present Chapter 12 which was published in the rules under the heading Motion Pictures and Filmstrips. Perhaps then you can better appreciate the present-day problems which we want to consider here at this institute.

In 1945 a Motion Picture Project became active in the Library of Congress as a pilot project for the selection, service, and storage of films. One of the first activities of the project was to send out a questionnaire in order to elicit the advice from various producers and film agencies, especially their needs for the control of film materials. Unfortunately before the project was completed an economy-minded Congress decided that films were a luxury at the Library of Congress which could be dispensed with and the project was dissolved. But the returns of the questionnaire came in and were subsequently used.

During this same year of 1945, a reorganization was planned in the Copyright Office. Instead of indexing copyrighted materials for copyright reference files and for the CATALOG OF COPYRIGHT ENTRIES, the Copyright Office became responsible for cataloging all materials which were registered for copyright. In the case of books and some selected materials--not AV--the office agreed to prepare printed Library of Congress cards for those works selected for inclusion in the collections of the Library of Congress. As a result of this proposed reorganization, three intensive cataloging courses were held for staff of the Copyright Office and other

divisions of the Library of Congress. It was during these class sessions that I first met Katharine Clugston, whose name has become one of the foremost names associated with the formulating of cataloging rules for motion pictures and filmstrips and with the expansion and adaptation of these rules to cover other audiovisual materials. During our class sessions we became acquainted because both of us liked to tackle what appeared to be difficult. However, we approached the difficult/^{cataloging}from opposite directions. I would finish our class assignment of cataloging three books, selecting those which appeared to be without problems, and then I would devote the rest of the time to something difficult. Katharine, on the other hand, would select the difficult book first and then scurry around at the end of the afternoon to meet the required three titles. It was our interest in tackling the difficult which brought us together as we worked to resolve conflicts, to interpret rules, and to share results.

Because of my earlier work in reference in the Copyright Office, I was slated in the reorganization to work on a cumulative catalog of those motion pictures which had already been registered for copyright. Fortunately for me, Mrs. Clugston, who became the head of the section responsible for the cataloging of motion pictures and filmstrips, was instrumental in getting the Copyright Office administration to assign me to her section where I would be working with the current materials. The new Register of Copyrights, Sam Warner, with the help of Richard Angell who was the first chief of the Copyright Cataloging Division, conceived the creation of a new format for the CATALOG OF COPYRIGHT ENTRIES for films which would serve the bibliographical needs of scholars, as well as fulfill legal requirements for copyright. Mr. Warner authorized that the 1946 annual issue of the catalog be prepared using a code of rules which would be drawn up in the Copyright Office on the basis of the information formulated by the Motion Picture Project and subsequently confirmed by the tabulated answers to the questionnaires.

Tentative rules were developed by Mrs. Clugston with her staff and with advice from the United States Office of Education and the National Archives. Actual motion pictures and filmstrips were used as a basis for the rules and they were applied on a trial and error basis. If any of you have met Mrs. Clugston you can fairly see her blue eyes sparkling as she wrote the rules, tried them out, rewrote the rules, and tried them again, and only if you had been part of the staff could you envision her as she leaned over a cataloger and a typewriter in order to see how an entry would appear. Those were challenging days.

While the cataloging was being done in the Copyright Office from the draft of the rules, many meetings of the Film Cataloging Committee were being held at the Library of Congress. In addition meetings were held with various film centers and film organizations to inquire about their bibliographic needs. Early in 1951 a draft of the cataloging rules which reflected the results of these meetings as well as the cataloging done in the Copyright Office was distributed to audiovisual specialists, producers, editors, lawyers, and others requesting that they give advice and comments. The rules were studied by the Committee on Descriptive Cataloging of the Division of Cataloging and Classification of the American Library Association, and the committee recommended their approval / by the Division for ALA. An international film conference was held at

Rochester, N. Y., in September of that year, suggestions were made for the rules, revisions were made, and the Library of Congress was urged to proceed with the publication of rules.

By that time the rules had been in use on a trial basis for six years in the Copyright Office. They were published as a preliminary edition in 1952 under the title RULES FOR DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS: MOTION PICTURES AND FILMSTRIPS. This preliminary code of rules called for entry under title, the inclusion of limited cast and credits, and a major innovation--a brief synopsis of the content of the film. It was felt that the summary would contribute to the general objective of reducing to a minimum the occasions for consulting and handling films. It was further agreed that no evaluative words or phrases, either commendatory or condemnatory, should be given in the summary, and that in some cases it would be valuable to state explicitly the particular audience for which a film was appropriate or to which a film was restricted--for example, "for primary grades," or "prepared for use in special education," or "for medical personnel." These rules present the basic principles which are still followed by LC in the writing of summaries for nonprint materials.

In 1953 a second preliminary edition of the rules was published with the approval of ALA. This second preliminary edition ~~which~~ served as a basis for discussion at the Unesco Conference on International Film Cataloging held in Washington in May 1953. Following that conference / minor changes were made in these rules in order to meet the international standards agreed upon. For example, the Unesco rules called for the inclusion of the country of origin for all works and the inclusion of the Dewey decimal classification and the Universal classification numbers. The group at the Unesco conference went on record recommending that each film be cataloged under its own title with added entry for the original title and they also questioned whether it was advisable to give information about a magnetic sound track,

a practice which is still recommended in the latest draft of the rules in this country

1965 saw the first edition of the rules being published by LC. This edition of the rules was the result of concentrated use of the preliminary editions of 1952 and 1953 which had been followed at the Library of Congress in cataloging approximately 50,000 motion pictures and filmstrips.

1967 was the year in which the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES was published jointly by the library associations of the United States, Canada, and Great Britain and the Library of Congress. In these rules the first edition of the RULES FOR DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGING IN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS: MOTION PICTURES AND FILMSTRIPS was adapted with minor textual changes and with changes in format to be compatible with other chapters in the AACR and became Chapter 12.

Shortly after Chapter 12 in the AACR appeared, media librarians expressed concern about their need for cards to cover video tapes and sets of slides and transparencies, and work was started at LC on a draft revision of Chapter 12 to include rules for the cataloging of these materials. A draft was completed and in the September 1968 bulletin of CATALOGING SERVICE which is published by the Processing Department at the Library of Congress, a list of additions and changes to the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES which were approved by the ALA Descriptive Cataloging Committee and by LC were listed. Included in the items was this statement: "Chapter 12, Motion Pictures and Filmstrips. The scope of Chapter 12 has been enlarged to cover slide sets, video tapes, etc., and its title has been changed to 'Motion Pictures, Filmstrips, and Similar Audiovisual Works.' This expansion has required so many changes in text that it is expected that the entire chapter will be printed in revised form as a separate publication and will be available from the American Library Association."¹ To date this revision has not been published even though the draft has been used internally at LC.

1. Cataloging Service Bulletin 83, (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, Processing Dept., Sept. 1968) p. 2.

In June 1970 the Library of Congress took the position that "The Library of Congress should not be involved in the development of cataloging rules for special types of instructional media, such as dioramas, flash cards, flip charts, games, kits, models, realia, etc., the use of which is normally confined to the classroom, school libraries, and educational media centers. Such materials are primarily educational materials and are library materials only in the restricted context of the school library. This is not to deny the very real importance of such materials or the very real need for proper controls for such materials. The Library of Congress, however, does not collect such materials; has no competence to aid or advise in their proper control; and does not catalog any instructional materials below the college level except for motion pictures, filmstrips, and related audiovisual material requiring projection."² In 1972 this was still the position of the Library of Congress.

Let us back up now and see how the cataloging of nonprint media has been handled at LC. Leaving Chapter 12 until last, let us consider each chapter in Part III of the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES.

Chapter 10 deals with manuscripts. The manuscripts in the collections in LC are cataloged by the Manuscripts Division of the Reference Department. In addition, collections of manuscripts are cataloged by the Manuscripts Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, using data sheets supplied by the custodians of manuscript collections. Cards are printed and are used in the preparation of the NATIONAL UNION CATALOG OF MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS which is published by the Library of Congress, but the cards are not sold to outside libraries.

2. "LC Position on Cataloging Rules for Audiovisual Materials," statement accompanying form letter to AV community. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Processing Dept., June 1970)

Maps and atlases, which are covered in Chapter 11, are cataloged in LC. Cards for atlases are printed and sold in the usual way but cards for maps are not available individually although they can be ordered on a subscription basis. All map entries are also available in machine readable form on MARC tape.

Scores and other musical works added to the collections of the Library of Congress receive regular printed-card cataloging according to Chapter 13. This policy also applies to musical sound recordings which are covered in Chapter 14. Until now very little has been done in acquiring

and cataloging non-music sound recordings at LC, a policy which will soon be changing.

Rules for the cataloging of pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional representations are presented in Chapter 15. It is interesting to note that this chapter covers the cataloging of single slides and transparencies, while sets of these materials are covered in the revised Chapter 12. The Library of Congress has an extensive collection of prints, photographs, posters and other graphic materials for which catalog entries are prepared for use within the Prints and Photographs Division at LC. Cards are not printed for internal use or for sale to other libraries.

As you can see Chapter 12, more than the other chapters, is the concern of this institute. Let us trace briefly its history and its application in nonprint cataloging at the Library of Congress. Let's go back again to 1946.

The expansion of cataloging of films in the Copyright Office starting in 1946 and the complete revision of the CATALOG OF COPYRIGHT ENTRIES, resulted in an unprecedented sale of the copyright lawyers, librarians, and scholars, and others outside the copyright field found that the more detailed entries were an invaluable bibliographic tool.

The interest aroused by this catalog, prompted the Library of Congress to make inquiries regarding the possible need for LC printed cards.

In 1949, Mr. Angell, Chief of the Copyright Cataloging Division, and Al Walter, Chief of the Card Division, traveled more than 20,000 miles flying from the East to the West coast, holding conferences, meeting with producers, and eliciting the support of producing companies in providing data which could be used for cataloging purposes. It took two years to get the program started. By September 1951, however, data sheets had been designed for use in the cataloging program and they had been sent to producers. In 1952 a film-card program was inaugurated at the Library of Congress. The actual cataloging

was handled by two different divisions: the Copyright Cataloging Division cataloged currently copyrighted motion pictures and filmstrips, while the Descriptive Cataloging Division handled non-current copyrighted materials and current materials not registered for copyright.

The staff of the Copyright Cataloging Division cataloged motion pictures and filmstrips from the actual materials at the time of registration for copyright.

These films themselves were supplemented by guides for teachers, brochures, pressbooks, and other materials which accompanied the films when they were submitted for registration.

copyright cataloging
This program continued until 1957 when a new Register of Copyrights decided

that the printing of cards for the Library of Congress was not a Copyright

Office responsibility. It was at this time that I transferred from the Copyright Office to the Descriptive Cataloging Division where the materials cataloged were not actually / handled.

The ^{AV} staff in the Descriptive Cataloging Division used data sheets as a basis for cataloging motion pictures and filmstrips. Perhaps you are asking why the program which was initiated in the Descriptive Cataloging Division required the use of data sheets. Let me explain.

As a large research library the Library of Congress has drawn up criteria for the acquisition of various materials. Because of the needs of LC, there are virtually no materials selected below college level. As librarians you are indeed aware that many motion pictures and filmstrips produced for school use

would therefore not be included in the collections at LC. In order to meet the needs of librarians who were requesting cards for these motion pictures and filmstrips a program was devised whereby a data sheet would be sent to film producers, librarians, and others in the AV field, asking that they submit the information describing the materials. This data sheet forms the basis for the Library of Congress printed cards. Complimentary printed cards are sent to the contributor for each title for which data is supplied. This program, put into effect in 1952 in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, is still in operation

today. Approximately 7,000 titles are cataloged each year. The fact that cataloging is done from data sheets may explain to some of you why the Library of Congress appears to be inconsistent in the

way in which it counts frames for a filmstrip, for example. We don't count them, but we take the count as it is supplied to us on the data sheet.

Let us digress for a moment from the subject of cataloging and cataloging rules, and let me tell you a little something about the motion picture collection at LC. The Motion Picture Section which is a part of the Prints and Photographs Division of the Reference Department has an unusual collection of archival motion pictures. Our oldest film was made on January 7, 1894, when Fred Ott sneezed. There was nothing unusual about Fred Ott, but he did happen to sneeze in front of the new camera of Thomas Edison. Two days later the motion picture was registered for copyright. At this time there was no provision in the copyright law for the registration of motion pictures but there was provision for the registration of prints and photographs. Therefore the early film producers found that they could circumvent the law by printing their films frame by frame on photographic paper and submitting them for copyright registration as prints and photographs which were covered by the law. Therefore because of the inadequacy of the copyright law, LC acquired an invaluable collection of early films, and because they were on paper instead of on nitrate film which would have been perishable as well as explosive, the collection remained intact. In 1912 the copyright law was revised/^{and} the registration of films was initiated. Unfortunately, since the films were printed on nitrate stock/^{they could not be housed at the Library and} they have been lost. Fortunately major film studios, actors, the American Film Institute, and other donors have contributed to the collections and this is helping to fill the gap in LC. In recent years, the Motion Picture Section has also made selections for the collections from the current motion pictures registered for copyright. Some of these films are

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

-11-

housed in the Library of Congress, but many are in vaults in various locations in the East.

We have at LC a Microform Reading Room which as its name implies makes microforms of various sorts available to the user. Filmstrips are included. The collection is very small. It includes selected filmstrips presumed to have research value, those which reflect the present-day culture, and those which exemplify changes in technology in the filmstrip field itself.

By the time the first edition of the rules was published by LC in 1965, the Library of Congress had already printed cards for more than 50,000 AV titles.

In 1967 there were many challenges for the Audiovisual Section at LC. We began a cooperative program with NICEM--the National Information Center for Educational Media at the University of Southern California. NICEM is anxious to provide in a data bank updated information for all nonprint media. As one source for their data bank they requested that they be sent a copy of each data sheet submitted^{by producers} to the Library of Congress. In answer to that request, a data sheet which can be used cooperatively was prepared and it is printed and supplied to LC by NICEM. These sheets with carbon pages are now being mailed to those interested in contributing to our program. As soon as we receive the data sheets the^{titles}/are searched for duplication, a Library of Congress card number is assigned, and then a Dewey number is assigned. Dewey numbers were assigned in the early years of the program but because of budget and the lack of staff they were discontinued in 1963. Because of the urgent requests from school librarians, they were reinstated in 1967, and the responsibility for this work was given to the AV Section where the materials are cataloged. After these numbers have been added, often within 48 hours, one carbon of the NICEM form is returned to the contributor and one carbon is sent to NICEM for its data bank. The original

of the form is used as a basis for cataloging by the descriptive cataloger. The material prepared by the descriptive cataloger is forwarded to the subject catalogers for use in assigning subjects.

As I said earlier, because librarians were asking for cards to cover slide sets and sets of transparencies, work was started in revising Chapter 12 in the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES to include these materials. Because of budget LC could not extend its cataloging program, but in 1971 the expanded rules were agreed upon in LC. The following year, 1972, LC started cataloging slide sets and sets of transparencies, using new data sheets provided by NICEM. Also in 1972 LC classification numbers, as well as Dewey numbers, were added to all cards, and juvenile subjects were also added in brackets for all appropriate materials.

Even before this time / MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) for films was discussed. In 1970 work on a MARC II format for motion pictures and filmstrips culminated in a working document which was circulated for comment. In 1971 the MARC format was completed, to include not only motion pictures and filmstrips, but also the sets of slides and transparencies.

Starting in 1972 all motion pictures, filmstrips, slide sets, and sets of transparencies were put on MARC tape and printed cards were prepared from the tapes. The recently published catalog FILMS AND OTHER MATERIALS FOR PROJECTION was the ^{first} computer-produced catalog at LC. I have learned that the computer is unbending--a comma out of place, an article used at the beginning of a title in an added entry, the omission of inc. or ltd., all result in the misfiling of entries in the catalog. Hopefully we have worked out a system which will help us to catch the human errors which the computer can't correct for us before the next issues of the catalog are published.

We realize that the cataloging rules should be responsive to the needs of those who use them and that they should be brought up to date whenever deficiencies become apparent. The problems involved in standardizing rules

are not insurmountable, but there are difficulties because of the different approaches to the materials by various groups. Also rules which were drafted originally have often come full circle as a result of recent technological developments.

As one example, when the note "loop film" came out in the first draft of the rules I remember asking "What is a loop film?" Now the single-concept loop film in a cartridge has become a part of the collections of almost every media center. I also remember the first demonstrations of magnetic sound tracks in Washington and heard the experts say that magnetic tape would not last, that no producer would want to use it because it could be erased and information not representing the thinking of the producers could be easily substituted. Now I note with interest the increased use of magnetic sound on the longer sound loop films.

After LC decided in 1970 that it should not prepare rules for various audiovisual and instructional materials, what took place elsewhere?

A committee of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology prepared the 3rd edition of its invaluable publication entitled STANDARDS FOR CATALOGING NONPRINT MATERIALS. This manual, which was prepared with emphasis on school libraries, combines rules and a manual with examples for cataloging.

While the AECT group worked on its standards, three young women in Canada--Jean Riddle Weihs, Shirley Lewis, and Janet Macdonald--were preparing a manual which also includes rules and numerous examples and is more detailed than the AECT standards. Since the publication in 1973 of the Canadian manual, . entitled NONBOOK MATERIALS: THE ORGANIZATION OF INTEGRATED COLLECTIONS,

I have seen its bright red cover in many places and I know it is used in many libraries throughout the United States; teachers of cataloging tell me that they are also using this manual in their classes where they teach cataloging of nonprint media.

Last fall saw the publication of the British rules entitled NON-BOOK MATERIALS CATALOGING RULES which were prepared by the Media Cataloging Rules Committee of the Library Association.

Last year the Library of Congress agreed to draft a revision of Chapter 12 taking into consideration the three manuals which I have mentioned along with the NONPRINT MEDIA GUIDELINES published in 1973 by a committee under the chairmanship of Pearce Grove.

In the latest draft prepared at LC, Chapter 12 has become an entirely new chapter, rather than a revision of the chapter as it appears in the AACR. For me personally, I have always felt that the rules in the present Chapter 12 are too closely related to theatrical films, / ^{The emphasis on theatrical films} is understandable if you will recall that the original/draft ¹⁹⁴⁶ upon which these rules was based was prepared as a basis for cataloging films registered for copyright. In 1946 the majority of films copyrighted were theatrical films rather than nontheatrical.

If you compare the standards and rules of the American, British, and Canadian authors, you will find that there is great similarity in the general philosophy as well as in the details of description. Of course, there are differences in approach, wording, structure and style, but the substance does not show much disagreement.

Again the three publications include rules for cataloging such materials as micro-reproductions of books, maps, pictures, and sound recordings--all of which are covered in other chapters in Part III outside of Chapter 12. Items omitted in the revised draft of Chapter 12 which are not covered anywhere in the AA rules are machine-readable data files which are in the Canadian rules, the

AECT standards and the NONPRINT MEDIA GUIDELINES, and laboratory kits and radiographs which are in the British rules.

The final version of the revised Chapter 12 will be the joint work of the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, and the Canadian Library Association. The British Library Association, not approving of an isolated revision of Chapter 12 divorced from an overall consideration of all of Part III of the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES, has elected not to be involved in our present work on Chapter 12. It regards the publication of its rules, which cover all of Part III, as the only contribution it could properly make at this time. Work on the second edition of the AACR will begin in January 1975 and will entail a revision of all of Part III. Both the British Library Association and the British Library will be contributing authors to the second edition of the AACR.

At present the draft of Chapter 12 is being considered by the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee. Earlier this year before the Library of Congress presented its work on the draft to the Code Revision Committee, LC sought comments on the draft which was sent in May to those interested parties in the North American library and audiovisual communities who had expressed interest and concern for the revised draft. The comments received from these interested parties have been studied at LC and they too have been referred to the Code Revision Committee. The ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee is working on the rules and additional changes and drafts can be anticipated.

Let me point out for your consideration some of the trends in the thinking which went into the preparation of the draft.

The draft of May 1974 followed closely the provisions for punctuation and arrangement of details defined in the new International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications (ISBD-M) which is in the revised

Chapter 6 of the ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES. It was hoped that this analogous application of ISBD for monographic publications would contribute to the development of an ISBD for audiovisual and instructional materials.

Last fall I attended a four-day International Conference on Audiovisual Cataloging which was held in London and which was sponsored by the International Film and Television Council of Unesco. On the first day of the conference as guidelines were being given about participation in the three discussion groups planned for the conference, questions were raised by many of the participants about when there would be an opportunity to discuss standards and cataloging rules for audiovisual materials. These questions seemed to come as a surprise to the leaders of the conference, and at no time, even after the interest of the group was expressed, was there an opportunity to mention, much less discuss standards and rules or to point out the already existing rules and manuals which might have answered their questions. The group at the conference did agree that there should be an IFTC bulletin with an international circulation which would act as a vehicle for news of any developments in audiovisual media cataloging and its dissemination. Almost one year later I have not seen the bulletin. Emphasis was placed on the urgent need to define various forms of AV media and it was pointed out at this time that IFLA was considering such definitions along with rules and standards. The group

further recommended that there should be established a standing consultative body under Unesco to provide for trials in institutions where a minimum data list for ^{those} AV materials which had been discussed at the conference could be evaluated. This consultative body was also given responsibility to encourage and coordinate training of AV cataloging specialists/ ^{at national and international levels;} to investigate and develop ^{and} universally acceptable multimedia cataloging standards; /to make a comparative evaluation of current practices in the analysis of subject content of AV materials with a view to positive recommendations of standardization. The members of the conference representing the television industry, urged that every sequence of film in the world be cataloged and input into a computer bank so that TV producers could draw from this ^{data bank} film/rather than having to go around the world in order to shoot on location or to acquire film which, for example, might show the inside of a particular submarine used by the Germans during World War II. These recommendations are all good ones, but you and I can't wait for them

to be implemented before we start cataloging our nonprint media.

This July atALA I participated in a panel discussion with the title "What to do until the answers come." Just what do we do until the answers come? Shirley Lewis one of the authors of the Canadian manual said that many just sit and look at the materials, sound gong\$ ring bells, wring their hands, and say that there is nothing we can do.

First, we must recognize that technological advances in the audiovisual and instructional materials field are constant and that new media will be appearing continually. Formulation and approval of cataloging rules for these materials can not keep pace with developments. Therefore, it is my suggestion that each librarian adapt a basic set of rules for the cataloging of the various types of media in the collection, determine which form of entry best suits the purposes of the library and its users; then as new types of media appear use these

rules as guidelines in developing applicable rules. Perhaps I can give you some guidelines based on some of the proposals in the draft revision of Chapter 12, written at LC after a study of the AV deliberations held between LC and ALA in recent years and an analysis of the AECT standards, the Canadian manual, and the British rules.

First of all, the draft of Chapter 12 recommends for medium designators that

- 1) there always be a medium designator,
- 2) the medium designator be generic, rather than specific, and
- 3) the medium designator be positioned directly after the title on the catalog entry

LC has recommended the use of the media designators "sound recording" and "videorecording" while most people in the AV field have recommended "audiorecording" rather than "sound recording." At ALA in July several committees discussed this one item at length, and I was particularly interested in comments by two of the authors of the Canadian rules. Shirley Lewis expressed her preference for use of the designator sound recording, while Jean Weihs said that it didn't really make much difference to her as long as we came to a decision and all of us worked together. Because of my close connection with AV people, I can appreciate the reasoning behind the use of audiorecording. However, music librarians are also concerned with cataloging their recordings and their opinions must be considered when preparing cataloging rules and standards. In February 1973 at its meeting in Bloomington, Indiana, MLA went on record as favoring the generic term "sound recording" among the various terms which might be substituted for the "phono" family of designators. The rules prepared by the British Media Cataloguing Rules Committee, while not using generic designators, use specific terms for the various types of recordings and all these begin in the word "sound."

Some librarians have questioned the statement in the draft revision of Chapter 12 which provides that all sets and packages of material, including kits, may be broken up and the components cataloged separately, if they are to be used independently. The statement goes on to state that the decisions to analyze a set should be made in accordance with the policies of classification and analysis adhered to by a particular library. Ask yourself, how will one series of filmstrips be used? Will they be used as a unit? Or, is your collection small and will it be necessary, therefore, to use the individual filmstrips in a set in different classrooms at the same time? Only you can make these decisions. I think that it is important to remember that though cataloging rules may provide techniques for analysis, they cannot tell an individual library what it must or must not analyze.

Through the years there has been discussion, agreement, and disagreement about the main entry for motion pictures, filmstrips, and other audiovisual materials. As you know the AECT manual recommends that all materials be entered under title. However, in a proposed draft revision of the AECT standards, there is every indication that the next edition will give an ^{author} option for/entry as the Canadian manual does.

In preparing the draft revision of Chapter 12, the custodians of the motion picture collection at the Library of Congress and the specialists in the Copyright Office made a strong case for retaining the present rule of arbitrary entry under title for motion pictures, filmstrips, and videorecordings. However, after further consideration, filmstrips were removed from the special/^{title-entry} category. As of now the proposed draft of Chapter 12 / ^{specifies that the} main entry for motion pictures and videorecordings will always be under title. This position is based on several considerations. First, it would be difficult for a cataloger to decide which person or body had overall responsibility for the whole of the intellectual or artistic content of a motion picture; and second, motion pictures are known, cited, referred to, and listed under title both within the industry and by the general public. According to the recommendations in the revised Chapter 12 / ^{the motion picture} GONE WITH THE WIND would be entered under title. There are those who might prefer to enter it under the author of the book upon which the movie was based and would choose ^{the author of the book,} / Margaret Mitchell. Antony Croghan of London who recently published his book entitled A CODE FOR CATALOGUING NON BOOK MEDIA, recommends that the film should be entered under the name of the director Victor Fleming, and there are those who know the / ^{film as a} David O. Selznick production, and I feel certain that there are many women who would know it best under Clark Gable, with many men opting for Vivian Leigh.

Always entering filmstrips under title is still being debated, and the present proposal is to determine entry for each filmstrip on its own merit. For years the filmstrips of Weston Woods have served as an example as a need for main entry under author, using as an argument the fact that the filmstrip consists solely of the illustrations and text of the / ^{book which it reproduces.} Recently I have noted, with interest, that the cassettes from Weston Woods which accompany the filmstrips and which become a part of the catalog entry, list credits for the composer of the music and for the adapter. Should the filmstrip entry therefore, go under the author, and if so, should it be the author of the illustrations or the author of the text, which by the way, is the main entry used by the Library of Congress when cataloging the book? As Pearce Grove will remember, when we were at ALA in July, we attended a gala evening at Weston Woods and before we had dinner we had a tour of their most interesting facilities. There on a drawing board was a drawing which was being made from the actual illustration in the book because the picture in the book was too large for their filmstrip and the artist at Weston Woods was re-drawing the picture, making the bears closer together, cutting out some of the trees, etc. This then becomes the decision of the cataloger. Will the main entry for the filmstrip be under title or author or illustrator? The choice is yours to make.

Another arbitrary aspect of the revision of the rules for main entry deals with commercial firms. The draft assumes that commercial firms which manufacture, produce, issue, etc., any materials, whether games, models, filmstrips, slide sets, etc., would always be inappropriate as the main entry..

In order to help, let me quote from the last draft: "Enter motion pictures and videorecordings under title. Enter any other audiovisual work that is substantially a reproduction, without significant adaptation, of a work originally produced in another medium in the same manner as the original work. Note,

however, that the audiovisual presentation should be regarded as a new and different bibliographical entity; main entry should not automatically be made under the author of the non-audiovisual work simply because this work or a portion of it is being transmitted through the audiovisual medium. The transfer to an audiovisual medium normally involves additional intellectual and artistic responsibility which will make it necessary to consider that the original author's work has been significantly adapted. Enter a work for which authorship is clearly attributed in the work or other authoritative source, under author. Enter under title a work whose authorship is diffuse, indeterminate, or unknown."³ As you can see it is up to the individual cataloger to make the choice.

Many have taken exception to the added entries which have been recommended in the rules. What is the need in your library? Are you concerned about relating the nonprint media to the print materials with which it is correlated or upon which it is based? If so, make an added entry. Are you concerned about the title of the original version, or a better known later version, or the foreign language version? If so, make an added entry. If you have archival materials, perhaps you are interested in knowing even a film that has been produced by one man or you may need to know the members of the cast in order to trace the careers of many actors from an insignificant member of a cast to stardom. If so, make the necessary added entries as the catalogers for the American Film Institute are doing. Again, no matter what guides are given you in the rules, you must think about them and relate them to your own needs.

At this time I can not say very much about the statement of sponsorship, production, release, and distribution. First, there are differences of opinion as to what is meant by the term sponsor. The present Chapter 12 states that the sponsor is the company, institution, organization,

3. "Draft Revision of Chapter 12, AACR: Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials." photoreproduced (Washington, D. C.: Library of Congress, Processing Dept., May 1974) p. 5.

or individual who brings a film into existence, not directly but by the employment of a production company and that the production company is the company, institution, organization, or individual who exercises the immediate overall responsibility for the physical processes involved in making a film or filmstrip. At present the new draft of the next edition of the AECT manual differs from the draft revision of Chapter 12. At LC we advocate that the name of the sponsor be given first in an entry and we certainly have not placed on the term sponsor the restricted use of the word as applied to TV and radio when it refers to commercial firms advertising a product or service in conjunction with a broadcast for which it has paid. We do believe that when the United States Office of Education sponsors and releases a film and hires the Emerson Yorke Studio to produce it for them that the most important name is that of the Office of Education. The AECT manual does not agree. It recommends that the producer or the contractual producer be the first name given in the catalog entry. This section of the draft is under consideration and revision.

Perhaps we need to improve our definitions, but it is my opinion that the body responsible for approving the content of the film should be given first in the entry.

For many years we have insisted at LC that we are giving the name of the releaser of the film while in actual practice I feel certain that in most cases it has actually been the distributor. Remember that at LC the bulk of our cataloging is done from data sheets and we cannot always be certain of the relationships of one name to another. If you have the material in hand, you should have no problem in recognizing the company or individual responsible for releasing or distributing the work.

The physical description for nonprint media can pose many problems. In the case of filmstrips the counting of frames can vary from library to library and here again the guidelines set down in the draft have been questioned. The draft suggests that if the frames are numbered the last numbered frame should be given as the total, and that if you count the frames you should start counting with the first content frame and end with the last content frame, counting any non-content frames interspersed.

As you know, various forms of videorecordings are available and there is no standardization in this field. Therefore the rule as written in the draft is flexible, allowing for changes in technology before standardization. For example, the rules call for the form of recording--film reels, tape cassettes, discs, etc., the number of the physical units--such as 2 film cassettes--combined with running time. Also you should indicate whether the recording is ^{with} sound, is in color or black and white, and then give other specifications formulated according to the name of the material, such as 1 inch or 1/2 inch for a tape; 3/4 inch for a tape cassette; 9 inches for a disc; and 9 mm. for a film cassette.

For slides it has been recommended that we give the number of slides, designating whether they are just slides, stereoscopic slides, or slides with glass in parentheses when appropriate. Then we would indicate whether the slides are in color or ⁱⁿ black and white and give the height and width. There is still a question as to whether or not metric measurement will be recommended and thought has been given to indicating that each library should have the option in deciding. Won't the use of the metric system make a difference if we change the familiar 2 x 2 inch slide to 5 x 5 cm.?

Transparencies are described like slides, but the presence or exact number of overlays is noted parenthetically after the number of transparencies. Likewise, charts and flipcharts would be described as 4 charts or 1 flipchart (6 sheets), black and white or color, and the height and width. Flash cards would also be described in the same manner.

Games present a different problem and after studying many games it was recommended that when cataloging a game we should enumerate the component pieces if they are not all contained in a box. However, if the pieces are in a box, we would give the total number if practical, and if not, we would use the phrase "various pieces." Also we would record the dimensions of the box.

For example: 1 box (12 pieces); 12 x 18 cm.
1 box (various pieces); 12 x 18 cm.
28 alphabet cubes (2 x 2 x 2 cm.), 20 flash cards (col., 8 x 8 cm.) and 1 poster (col., 30 x 25 cm.)

I feel certain that most of you have had more experience with dioramas than the staff at the Library of Congress. However, after studying the materials it was recommended in the draft that a physical description for dioramas be omitted and instead that the cataloger should record as the first note an appropriate description, including such data as size of the assembled display, the number of figures, the material of the construction, etc.

For example: A display in color made of cardboard; includes figures of a family of deer (3 pieces) and a group of Iroquois Indians (3 pieces) with a forest background; the assembled display measures 75 x 125 x 50 cm.

In describing models it is recommended that we record the number of pieces, or use the term "various pieces" when applicable, indicating that the

model is colored or actually naming the color when possible, along with the dimensions, height by width by depth or height by width, as appropriate. The rules stated that when necessary we should record specifications which cannot be stated succinctly in the notes. For example:

1 piece; blue; 30 x 23 x 5 cm.

1 box (12 pieces) 20 x 15 cm. And in the notes for this entry the note: Plastic replicas colored to simulate the various types of wood.

In the case of realia an option is given--record the number and type of items, and if significant their dimensions. Or, if preferable, omit the formal physical description area and combine the data and give it in a note. For example, the physical description might read: 15 hats and 36 badges. In another case you might prefer a note which could read: 12 insects displayed in glass tubes in a glass case (30 x 5 x 3 cm.)

As you are no doubt aware, thus far I have not mentioned sound recordings. ^{omission} This/has been intentional. The Library of Congress and other libraries have been cataloging "records" for many years, a term which I am told I must forget as it relates to recorded sound. In the past many of us have become acquainted with the term phonodisc. However, in recent years there have been other forms of recorded sound which have become an important part of a media center. Nowhere in the present ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES are there any rules which tell us how to catalog a tape which is not in reel format, e.g. a cartridge ^{tape.} or cassette/ Last winter at AIA I attended a meeting at which the head of a large library in California told me that he was attending various meetings on media because the media center at his university had just been put under his jurisdiction and when a cataloger came to him and asked how to catalog an audiotape in a cassette he had to admit that he didn't have the foggiest notion.

It was on the tip of my tongue to refer him to Chapter 14 of the AA rules when I realized that we at LC are operating under an internal set of rules which have never been published. Catalogers outside LC must go to the Canadian or AECT manuals or other publications and work out answers for themselves since there are no applicable instructions in the AACR. LC is very much concerned / about this problem and proposed revisions for Chapter 14 are underway at LC. What do we do in the meantime? Just recently a librarian from a Midwest college visited at LC to ask advice about cataloging her media collection. I discussed with her our plans to expand our cataloging program to include the non-music sound recordings which will be added to the collections at LC as a result of a new acquisition policy. Also we are in the midst of working to expand the program at LC to catalog non-music sound recordings from data sheets. We are just as anxious as you are to have the answers, especially since the rules developed for cataloging these materials will also apply to the description of sound recordings which accompany slide sets, filmstrips, and other materials and which should be included in the catalog entry.

LC attempted to define kit for the proposed draft. It stated that a kit is a package of more than one medium designed for use as a unit, with no one of the media being so clearly dominant that all others are merely dependent or accompanying. Various comments were made about the definition but it has become clear that everyone is in rather close agreement as to what constitutes a kit--it is the stated definitions which vary. Most are agreed that visual media such as filmstrips or slide sets with accompanying sound on a recording are not kits. There are other items which everyone considers a kit--for example, a box consisting of a chart, 3 filmstrips, a map, 5 pamphlets, 13 samples of realia, and a student's manual. It is the grey area in between which causes difficulty. Several definitions have used the words dependent and interdependent. In the first example which I cited, the filmstrip must depend upon the recording in order to be useful. Others can say that all of the materials in a kit

on a given subject are interdependent. Have you had difficulty in determining what is and what is not a kit? Perhaps every institution which is cataloging multimedia materials will have to apply the rule in such a way that in the grey area between obvious kits and obvious non-kits, local policy will have to be determined and then move on from there. The Canadian author Shirley Lewis said that her rule of thumb is that when you are in doubt, then catalog it as a kit. At any rate, once you have determined that you have a kit, the revised draft of Chapter 12 recommends that we specify in the physical description the component media, generally in alphabetic order of form designator, indicating the number of items. It also states that the physical description may also include technical specifications prescribed in the other rules for various media if this information can be stated succinctly.

For example: 10 charts, 1 issue of a magazine, 80 slides, 1 reel of tape, and teacher's guide.

 4 charts (col., 15 x 25 cm.), 42 flash cards (col., 6 x 8 cm.), 2 pamphlets (15 p. and 26 p.; 21 cm.), and 4 discs (20 min. each side, 33 1/3 rpm., stereophonic, 30 cm.)

Notes on nonprint media will of course include notes which would be used on any catalog entry whether it is print or nonprint. We would want to give information about the earlier title of the work, the source of the title used in cataloging, variations in the title, details regarding the physical features of the work not included in the physical description, as well as notes which indicate the need for special equipment required for projection or other use, accompanying material, the relationship of the work being cataloged with other works, the purpose of the work, the cast for a motion picture when significant, credits for motion pictures and similar works, and a summary of the content of some audiovisual works.

Some suggested notes are:

Loop film in cartridge.

In cartridge with synchronized sound recording on tape (6 min.)

Magnetic sound track.

Sound accompaniment compatible for manual and automatic operation.

Revised version of the filmstrip issued in 1969 under title: Maps and atlas survey.

Title from container. (A note used when the container is to be destroyed.)

Title on container: The surface of the earth. (A note used when title selected for main entry is different.)

In our present situation of lacking rules approved by all and eagerly awaiting a resolution of this problem, it seems to me that there is some danger that the draft of Chapter 12 in your hands will be taken as a definite promise of the final outcome. It behooves me, therefore, to go over with you the status of this draft. It was prepared unilaterally at LC after a study of AECT standards, the Canadian Manual, the British rules, and other standards. It is extremely dependent on these publications but in its present form in no way has the approval of any of the bodies behind the various publications. Now that LC has prepared the first draft, others will have a chance to react. In particular the Canadian Cataloguing Committee and the American Library Association, as joint authors with LC of the final revision, are expected to make a substantive contribution. All these contributions from others will mean certainly a second draft, which hopefully can be started after the ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee meets next month.⁴ And even a third draft may be necessary before final, unanimous accord is reached. It could easily happen that certain of the provisions found in this first draft will be altered in later drafts.

4. The ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee met in Washington in November. It was agreed that LC will prepare a nearly final draft to be forwarded to the Catalog Code Revision Committee for discussion at the Midwinter meeting of the American Library Association in January 1975.

May I close reemphasizing my opening comments. In spite of the stumbling blocks which appear to be in our way as we work to develop standardization in the rules for cataloging non-print media, I still believe that the cataloging of these materials is a worthwhile challenge.