A number of questions are raised and discussed with reference to displaying for the library client the relevant facts about a work in microform in such a way that the client knows exactly where to find it. The following questions are addressed: 1) whether to use a subject-classification system, a form-code/accession-numbering system, or some combination of these; 2) to what extent analytics should be provided for microform series, sets, or projects; and 3) whether an index should be prepared nationally to provide author/title/subject access to microform series or sets. Although no conclusions are reached, indications are that the cataloging of microforms varies widely from library to library. Examples of many cataloging systems are included, along with a 30-item bibliography. (Author/KKC)
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Foreword

This paper was given as a discussion starter for the Non-Print Media Institute, sponsored by the Southwestern Library Association at Galveston, Texas, October 15, 1974. It has been slightly revised for submission to the Educational Resources Information Center but still includes much of the flavor of an oral presentation. Therefore, the discussion outline is included.

The author expresses particular appreciation to Jay Clark, Chairperson, and Robert Poland, Program Chairperson (whose responsibilities became Marilyn Craig's due to his untimely death prior to the institute), for including microforms in the Non-Print Media Institute. While librarians think of microforms as print media, which in a real sense they are, yet they are like audio and video media in that special equipment is required for their viewing. Computer output microfiche, of course, is never first "in print."

Development and presentation of this paper was made easier through the assistance and encouragement of several members of the North Texas State University Library staff, particularly David A. Webb, Director of Libraries, and Joe H. Bailey, Associate Director of Public Services. Preparation of the several versions of the typescript and of the sample catalog cards derived from readings of the several authorities was the cheerfully accepted work of Marguerite Jost and Jacqueline Lynch. Cards from the North Texas State University Library catalog provided the other sample cards.

In the discussion which ensued the presentation of the paper, the following points were made: librarians using media codes saw no need for
the media designator, but those not using media codes very much wanted
the designator included as early on the card as feasible, usually after
the title. Those using the codes preferred the code be the name of the
media in full, to avoid confusion with the Library of Congress classi-
fication system, and to make explicit what was the form of the media.
There definitely was support from approximately half the group, particularly
academic librarians, for some sort of national index to microforms in sets.
MICROFORMS: LEGERDEMAIN IN THE LIBRARY

The metaphor in the title refers to the sleight of hand practiced with microform, perhaps more than most formats, by many of us librarians sometimes "hiding", as our clients put it, and sometimes revealing the existence of works contained in the collection. The basic question is how do we display for the library client the relevant facts about a work in microform in such a way that the client knows exactly where to find it. Answering this question involves decisions in several areas where practice varies widely from library to library or even within a library.

Libraries must decide whether to use a subject-classification system, a form-code/accession-numbering system for the call number or some combination of these. In the Association of Research Libraries survey of 190 major libraries, the investigators, Felix Reichmann and Josephine Tharpe, found that almost 60 used a sequential numbering system, with each type of microform having its own sequence and with periodicals and newspapers filed together by titles. However, 30% of those surveyed did classify, 6% used the first two letters of LC or the first three numbers of Dewey, and two libraries used both sequential numbering and classification, shelving sequentially but classifying the cards "to preserve their shelflist as classed catalogs" (19, p. 9). Illustrative of the variety of approaches to microforms are the examples in Figure 1 of call numbers drawn from Lois Bebout's Texas Information Exchange Union List of Major Microform Sets in Texas Libraries (3, p. 16).

The argument for subject classification is cogently stated by Kennerly (13, p. 239-40), who argues that librarians have agreed that non-book materials are "normal" library holdings and therefore should be classified and shelved.
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together with all other material (or located by a symbol above the class number if not shelved with the class). She reasons that classification facilitates the search via shelf or shelflist for any form material on a subject or a related subject.

The alternative to subject classification is use of some type of serial numbering system, which, as outlined by Foster (12, p.12), permits location together of material physically and/or bibliographically similar. In this view serial systems are seen as a sufficient means of classification for academic research libraries since the largest part of holdings are not discrete monographs or serials but collections, often containing on one roll of film several titles on widely varying subjects.

Related to the classification decision are questions about the use and location within the entry of medium codes and designators, whether the copy cataloged should be the original or the microform, and whether the entry should be by title or author. In regard to these points recommendations vary in the following four codes: Canadian Library Association (Weihs; 25), Association for Educational Communication and Technology (AECT; 2), Library Association Media Cataloging Rules Committee (LA; 17), and Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American Text, Chapter 6, "Separately Published Monographs" (AACR; 1).

Medium codes are not mentioned in AACR or LA and recommended against in the other two codes, since the concept of the integrated collection prefers classification and the intershelving thus permitted. Intershelving may very well be appropriate for smaller collections. As the examples from Bebout show, university collections frequently have chosen to use medium codes as part of the call number, and/or not to classify. Perhaps to allow for this AECT provides for use of the medium code as separate from the call number.
and suggests a list of codes (2, p. 3) [see figure 2]. Certainly these codes would be confused with LC call numbers in an LC classed library.

Medium designators to follow immediately the title are recommended by two of the four codes; AACR and LA being the exceptions. CLA and AECT agree that the designator used should be microform, with further description in the collation and notes as to type of microform, size, pieces, etc. It does not seem necessary to be explicit in the designator itself as to whether a microform is fiche, film, card, etc.; since the main point of the designator is to tell the user early that the material referenced cannot be used without special apparatus, requiring some extra time to see and evaluate as to usefulness.

AACR does not suggest the medium designator in Rule #156B3, perhaps because it is thought that since most microforms are copies of items originally appearing in print form, it is the original form which should be cataloged. Certainly it is anomalous to use the designator and then catalog the print form. On the other hand, it is misleading, particularly if the library classifies film, not to tell the user early and plainly that he cannot view the item without special equipment. AACR's alternative Rule #152C does provide for this, though not in parentheses or square brackets. Ways of handling this problem, in accordance with the various rules - plus as suggested by Elrod (8) and by my own modification of Elrod - are illustrated on Figures 3 and 4.

Particularly useful seems the AACR system of handling the microform as a dashed-on entry, placing the call number opposite the dashed-on description, and then including the medium designator in the description.
CODE SYMBOLS

PA  Art Print
RT  Audiotape (includes reel-to-tape, cassette, and cartridge tapes)
PC  Chart
DF  Data File (Machine-readable)
ED  Diorama
FS  Filmes (includes soundstrips and filmstrips)
PS  Flash Card
DM  Globe
PC  Map (includes relief maps)
FM  Microform: Microcard: includes opaque microprints
FM  Microform: Microfilm (includes microfiche, aperture cards, ultramicrofiches, etc.)
DM  Mock-up
DM  Model
MP  Motion Picture (includes reel-to-reel, loop and cartridge films, etc.)
RD  Phonodisc
PP  Picture (includes photographs, postcards, posters, etc.)
KT  Kit (includes programmed learning materials)
TS  Slide (includes microscope and stereoscope slides)
DS  Specimen (includes realia)
PS  Study Print
TR  Transparency
MV  Videorecord (includes videorecording on film, videodiscs, etc.)
MV  Videotape
Archer, William, 1856-1924.
Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting, by William Archer. London and New York, Longmans, Green and co., 1888.

Microfilm. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1956. — 1 reel; 35 mm. — (Source materials in the field of theatre)

AACR 156B3

Archer, William, 1856-1924.
Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting, by William Archer. London and New York, Longmans, Green and co., 1888.

Microfilm. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1956. — 1 reel; 35 mm. — (Source materials in the field of theatre)

AACR 152C

Archer, William, 1856-1924.
Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting (Microform) University Microfilms, 1956.
1 film reel. 35 mm. (Source materials in the field of theatre)

Originally published by Longmans, Green, 1888. 235 p.

1. Acting. I. Title.
Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting (Microform) University Microfilms, 1956.

1 reel. 35 mm.


Film J678

Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting. New York, Longmans, Green and co., 1888.

3p. l., 232p. (Source materials in the field of theatre)

Microfilm. Ann Arbor, Mich., University Microfilms. 1 reel. 35 mm.


Film J678

AECT, GW reading
Archer, William, 1856-1924.

Reel 1  Masks or faces: a study in the psychology of acting ... 1888. [Microfilm copy]

SOURCE material in the field of theatre. Ann Arbor, Mich. University Microfilms, 1956. 22 reels, 35 mm.

1. Acting. 1. Title.

Elrod (adapted by GM)

Figure 4
Unfortunately, it is my understanding that at this time one of the largest bibliographic data systems, OCLC, does not permit this procedure, although there probably is no very weighty reason why this system could not be programmed to permit this option. Understand the whole left hand side of the card is available for imprinting the call number.

The only code generally preferring title entry is AECT, and this primarily serves to avoid the anomaly just mentioned. This does result in not bringing together in the subject catalog different editions of the same work, a circumstance we generally hope to avoid.

A second large decision area is policy for analysis in the catalog of microform series, sets, or projects, compiled by micro-publishers from previously published or unpublished manuscript material in monograph or serial form. The principle questions here are to what extent analytics should be provided; but if provided, should these be full sets of cards or partial sets; and if partial sets, which secondary entries should be made, if any. Library practice varies from cataloging only the set as a whole, as in Figure 5 to providing full sets of cards for each and every bibliographically distinctive title as in Figure 6. In the Reichmann survey fifteen libraries did not file microform entries in the general catalog; 89 did; but 75, though filing in the general catalog, made such exceptions as not filing analytics for series (48), not filing all cards (22), or not filing subject cards (5). Thus half of the respondents provided less than full sets (19, p. 10). This is how it is, but how should it be?
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Contents.
- r.1-2. Drama and theatre: acting.
- r.3. Drama and theatre: ballet and opera.
- r.4-5. Drama and theatre: dictionaries and directories.
- r.5-12. Drama and theatre: history.

[See next card]
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Source materials in the field of theatre. Ann Arbor, Mich. n.d. (Card 2)

Contents (cont.)

- r.13. Production and stagecraft: architecture.
- r.17-22. Periodicals.

---

Source materials in the field of theatre.

Film
J678


Contents.
- r.1-2. Drama and theatre: acting.
- r.3. Drama and theatre: ballet and opera.
- r.4-5. Drama and theatre: dictionaries and directories.
- r.5-12. Drama and theatre: history.

Contents listed on main card

Figure 5
Nineteenth century English and American drama. (Microfiche ed., Louisville, Ky., Falls City Microcards, 1972-)

Contents:
no.4085 Aeschylus. The Agamemnon. 2 cds.
no.4086 Aeschylus. The house of Atreus. 3 cds.
no.4087 Archer, W. The green goddess. 1922. 2 cds.
no.4088 Aristophanes. Four plays translated into English verse, by John Hookham Frere. 4 cds.
no.4089 Arkell, R. Colombine: a fantasy, and other verses, by R. Arkell.
Archer, William, 1846-1924
The green goddess.

MicF Nineteenth century English and American
41 drama. [Microfiche ed.] Louisville,
o.4087 Ky., Falls City Microcards, 1972-
v.

Continues the numbering sequence
arbitrarily assigned by the Library for
the Microcard ed., Mic 53.
Mackenzie, Sir Alexander. Voyages from Montreal 1801.

Mackenzie, Sir Alexander. A narrative, or journal of voyages and travels, through the north-west continent of America. 1802.
**Manitoba - Description and Travel**

**Mic 34** Mackenzie, Sir Alexander, 1763-1820.

no. 2

A narrative, or journal of voyages and travels, through the north-west continent of America; in the years 1789 and 1793, by Mr. MacLauries. London, J. Lee, 1802.

2 v. L., 91 p. 18 cm.

Abstract from Mackenzie's Voyages from Montreal, with slight changes in proper names.

Microcard. 2 cards. (The Plains and the Rockies microcard series, no. 2)

1. Manitoba—Descr. & trav. 2. MacLauries, Mr.

Library of Congress F1000.7.M184 1-18950 Revised 1963c

---

Maclauries, Mr.

**Mic 34** Mackenzie, Sir Alexander, 1763-1820.

no. 2

A narrative, or journal of voyages and travels, through the north-west continent of America; in the years 1789 and 1793, by Mr. MacLauries. London, J. Lee, 1802.

2 v. L., 91 p. 18 cm.

Abstract from Mackenzie's Voyages from Montreal, with slight changes in proper names.

Microcard. 2 cards. (The Plains and the Rockies microcard series, no. 2)
From the acquisitions point of view, as the number of microform sets published increases and as the number of microform sets in a library increases, when there is no catalog access to each distinctive title, the task of verifying library holdings before purchase becomes nearly impossible. The decision whether to buy a particular set becomes a matter of an educated guess regarding possible duplication of one set of material in another.

Even if the library checks holdings in separate indexes provided for the set, such as in Sabin for the microcard set, this only doubles the acquisition work involved since both the catalog and index must be checked, and if there is more than one such relevant index to check, the work increases proportionately. As the years go by and acquisition of sets continues, one can imagine having to check a whole series of such indexes to ascertain finally holdings.

The same problem exists for the library client wishing to know whether a library has an item or material of a certain vintage on a subject. Even assuming most such users are graduate students or faculty members, sophisticated in use of the library, one can imagine the client asking to borrow via Interlibrary Loan a work already in the library in microform but not shown in the library's catalog or not finding through the catalog considerable material relevant to the subject of his inquiry.

I can only conclude that every bibliographically distinctive title should be listed in the catalog, possibly only with a single main-entry card but hopefully with a full set. Yet the difficulties of accomplishing even this are well-known: "lack of centralized cataloging or indexing... with the result that libraries are expending an unnecessary amount of duplicate effort" in cataloging (22, p. 383, quoting the 1959 statement of A.L.A.-R.T.S.D. Copying Methods Section Executive Committee) the cost of...

\[\text{1See also the statement in 1970 of Veaner (24) and in 1974 of Salmon (21).}\]
filing entries already made (19, p. 12; 18, p. 181), and even more than this "the work of adjusting the entries to fit the local catalog" (29, 255²), or even Library of Congress practice. And one may mention the sheer physical catalog or machine-storage space analytical entries can take. Both the need and the difficulties in attaining quality bibliographic control of microforms are evident.

In the face of these difficulties some would argue that purchase of microform sets is primarily for scholars doing research specifically in the area of the set's compilation, that avoiding duplication of material is not worth the cost, and that adequate notice of holding the material is accomplished by the library's purchasing bibliographies on which the set is based, by providing full sets of catalog cards rich in subject entries only for the set as a whole, and by publishing bibliographies and guides to the library's holdings, or participating in area union lists of such sets. We have an excellent example of such a title union list in the one compiled by Lois Bebout under aegis of the Texas Information Exchange (6). A union list which includes a subject index is by Suzanne Dodson's group at British Columbia (23), and an example of a library guide with a subject approach and liberal cross references is A Guide to Some Research Collections in the University Library published by the University of Nevada Library (16).

I must confess to a certain logic in this approach. It is economical yet serves the scholar reasonably well. Still, as a reference librarian in a research library, I want access to an individual title, and while I would look only one place, the library catalog, to know whether the library has an item or monographic material on a subject, I might be nearly as happy to

² Rebuldelo (18) found that 12 of the 26 libraries purchasing Library of American Civilization cards did not use them as received.
look in a separate, frequently updated, project-coded catalog to complete my bibliographical search. Of interest here is the proposal of Reichmann to establish nationally "a machine-readable index for analytics of series in microforms ... capable of providing a complete index to all the series any given library possesses" (19, p. 32). This author/title/subject index would be placed on computer-output microfiche to reduce output cost and enable frequent revision and updating. As Tuttle comments, this solution appears to recognize both "catalog and staff limitations" (29, p. 255).

At best, however, the output cost of an index representing only a single library's holdings, would appear to be as much as $5,000 (4) for a 100,000 title index. One wonders how many libraries will want to spend something like this for an annual update of such an index, though $5,000 may be cheap at the price for many libraries. Even lower in cost to libraries might be duplicates of a master copy, accompanied by a locally prepared outside index of projects held by that particular library. Or, this outside index might consist of a union listing of area, state, or regional library holdings of the projects. Some libraries no doubt would wish to subscribe to such a master-copy service anyway. Still another halfway-house would be obtaining the index only as a subject-title list in one alphabet, with each library filing a single main-entry card in the General Catalog for titles in microform.

Nor should the possibility be overlooked that such a national data base as OCLC's might include and analyse all microform projects, with input on a mass basis by the center itself upon receipt of information that a library had purchased a set. Such a solution would answer Joseph Netecki's objection that "forcing the entries into bibliographies or indexes that list exclusively a particular format, its availability and location, is precisely a procrustean attempt to impose partial bibliographic control by differentiation in form" (28, p. 1791).
Admittedly, all of these latter suggestions are futuristic, though some group, such as Association of Research Libraries, well may be working on one or more of them. In the meantime, what shall we do, what actions shall we recommend?
MICROFORMS:
Discussion Outline

1) To classify or not to classify? Does the size library affect this decision?

2) If to use medium-codes/accession-numbering systems of arrangement, which codes?

3) If the medium designator is to be used, where in the body of the card should it be placed? After title; in collation; in notes?

4) Which copy of a work in microform should be cataloged, the original print edition or the microform?

5) Can this group recommend whether an index should be prepared nationally to provide author/title/subject access to microform series or sets?
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