Introduction

The purpose of cataloging is to provide access to library materials. Indeed, cataloging serves no function other than to identify items for those who seek information. Since cataloging codes and practices continue to develop, this process suggests that there is not yet a consensus as to what constitutes the perfect cataloging record. It also suggests, however, that professionals in the field are working to improve methods of accessing information and that cataloging is a dynamic function of the information process. Information remains dormant unless channels are established which provide a means of making it usable. Cataloging becomes the key which unlocks and organizes the realm of information.

The search for an adequate cataloging record has been particularly evident in recent years with respect to the development of audiovisual (AV) cataloging, resulting in significant advances in cataloging theory and practice. The development of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2d ed. (AACR2) has been of primary significance in providing a uniform treatment of description. Other recent trends have included the revision of the MARC Films Format, and currently the project to provide cataloging-in-publication (CIP) for microcomputer software. This paper will discuss some of these advances and will argue that the rules and practices which have evolved are an outgrowth of the needs of the community the profession seeks to serve.

Paul Graham is Cataloger for Special Formats, Alexander Library, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
Background

In 1949 the Library of Congress published *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress* and later issued supplements to cover items such as motion pictures and filmstrips (1965); phonorecords (1964); and pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional representations (1959). Manuals of standards and procedures also have appeared during the last thirty years. While various historical treatments of nonbook cataloging make it unnecessary to treat that subject here, it is worth noting that from Eunice Keen's *Manual for Use in the Cataloging and Classification of Audiovisual Materials for a High School Library* (1949) through AACR2, there have been many improvements in audiovisual cataloging.

AACR2 and Audiovisual Materials

The most significant feature of AACR2 with regard to audiovisual materials is its attempt to standardize areas of description. It is well known that the rules for description are patterned after the framework of the General International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD[G]). Chapter one of AACR2 is devoted to a general explanation of the areas of description while the remaining chapters in part I are devoted to specific types of material. The authors of AACR2 treat print and nonprint on an equal basis, assuming that nonprint should not be dependent on books as the standard for description. Yet the implementation of this idea has not been totally successful.

AACR2 in part views the book as a basis for forming the standard areas of description, although it acknowledges that audiovisual materials have unique qualities which need to be considered. In applying descriptive principles, it unfortunately becomes necessary at times to work from a monographic point of view in order to achieve some uniformity of description.

The title and statement of responsibility area perhaps causes the least confusion, although there is still some. Consider for example the general material designation (GMD). No GMD is used for books. While AACR2 provides the GMD "text" for use by North American agencies, the Library of Congress, as explained in the *Cataloging Service Bulletin*, chooses not to use this GMD, but does employ GMDs which apply to other materials.

It seems that this practice would bias users when they seek information. At present there is still disagreement at the international level over what terms are appropriate for the GMD. This could and should be worked out. It only represents a difference in vocabulary and a
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compromise would profit not only users who must contend with the differences, but also would promote the concept of shared cataloging.

The publication and distribution area also causes some confusion. The word *published* is essentially a book trade word, and it is not, strictly speaking, accurate to apply this term to audiovisual materials such as sound recordings and films. In general, it is customary to think of a disc or tape recording not as being published, but rather as being cut or recorded and then released. The point is even more relevant for films, especially with the proliferation of videocassettes and the companies that make them. There is a vast difference between the production company—i.e., the company responsible for making the film—and the company which manufactures the video product (VHS, Beta, U-matic, etc.). What is most important is the releasing agent of the material type one has in hand along with the distributing agent. This information is obscured by naming the area publication and distribution since they are clearly print-related terms.

The note area is particularly significant for audiovisual cataloging, more so than for printed materials. Printed materials can usually be browsed, unlike AV materials. Even with open access shelving, browsing among AV materials is difficult simply because of their nature. Unlike monographic cataloging, where access only can suffice, the cataloger must present a clear and complete content description of what media contain.

AACR2 provides for this by allowing for the summary note, as well as other notes, but the summary and contents notes are probably the most helpful means of giving users a clear idea of the scope of a particular item. Rule 7.B17 states: "Give an objective summary of the content of an item unless another part of the description provides enough information." Yet, important as the summary note is, there are few guidelines for writing a clear and precise note for AV materials and the term *summary* itself is noticeably missing from the glossary of AACR2.

The *Cataloging Service Bulletin* addresses this issue to some extent. Although it is not written from a media point of view, a description of what a summary note should include might be:

1. The purpose of the summary is to provide an objective and succinct statement of the content of the material (cf. AACR2 7.7B17).
2. In making a concise statement mention only major points. Phrases rather than sentences may be used when clarity and good taste permit.
3. Avoid explicit or implicit evaluation of the contents from any point of view. If it is the contents of the work that show a bias, which it is important for the subject to bring out, word the note carefully so that it is clear that the author's bias is the one being related.⁷
Further refinements of the principles to follow in writing a summary note are needed. For example, what kind of language should be used? If the piece is about a colloquial or folk topic, should summaries be patterned or structured with that kind of vocabulary? To what extent should publishers' summaries be quoted—with or without quotation marks? Some have contended that they cannot use a summary note because certain words are slang. To what extent should the tone of the summary reflect the tone of the material? Should some summaries be evaluative or critical? Guidelines in writing summary notes would help to improve them and benefit users seeking to assess material.

Access points also have been affected by the development of AACR2. The great compromise of the last decade may be the label given to the decision to retain the main entry concept. While main entry remains part of AACR2, it is much less important than in previous codes.

At one time the main entry concept may have helped to provide a mechanism for standardization among bibliographic records within manual catalogs. The automated catalog, however, makes the main entry controversy a moot issue. Access points are the chief area of concern. As long as users find what they need, they are little affected by the form of entry the cataloger chooses to employ.

Films present a unique set of problems when it comes to providing added entry access. As practice now stipulates, added entries are made only for people who have an overall responsibility for the production of the work. Added entries for actors in a film or other personnel in a creative role are made at the discretion of the cataloging agency. A more consistent policy of making added entries for significant participants would be of greater service to the shared cataloging concept than is the present practice. Participants in a film are like performers on a sound recording and all should be traced.

Clearly, AACR2 has been an important development in the bibliographic control of AV materials, but it is not a final step nor was it written with that purpose in mind. The preceding comments are meant to highlight certain topics which need closer scrutiny in order to achieve an improved bibliographic record.

Subject Access to Media

The question of what constitutes adequate subject access for AV materials is a topic little discussed in library literature. Subject cataloging is complicated by the fact that it most often must be done through sources external to the AV material itself such as publishers'
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catalogs, data sheets, and other kinds of information. The Library of Congress presently assigns subject headings to films based on summary notes and sometimes in conjunction with the Dewey number when more information is needed than just the summary note.

Are there any guidelines on how to apply subject headings to media? Are the same principles as those applied to monographic subjects valid for media? Should there be a limitation on the number of subject headings used? One project which has focused on enriched subject access is *Analysis of Subject Heading Lists Applied to Nonprint Materials* by Susan A. Nesbitt.8

General monographic subject heading application procedure requires placing the most specific heading(s) on an item. This practice stems largely from principles formulated by Charles A. Cutter in *Rules for a Dictionary Catalog*:

Enter a work under its subject heading not under the heading of a class which includes that subject. Ex. Put Lady Cust's book on "The cat" under *Cat*, not under *Zoology* or *Mammals*, or *Domestic animals*....9

This principle was later reaffirmed by David Judson Haykin, former Chief of the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division. Bohdan S. Wynar summarizes Haykin's principle of specificity as: "The heading should be as specific as the topic it is intended to cover."10

When this rule of specificity is applied to many AV materials and especially to films, much of the content does not receive adequate subject access points. This is due both to the nature of AV materials and the ways people plan to use them.

AV materials generally have a broad-based interdisciplinary applicability and require users of these types of materials to search by broad subjects such as philosophy, science, literature, and war as well as by specific subject. Providing references does help although they do not seem to be adequate in meeting users' needs. Particular studies should be done to focus on the relationship between subjects and users' requests and the way the media item will be used. When enough data are available, specific conclusions regarding subject heading application may be drawn. Subject access is viewed to be of great importance when compared to other access points, and continued study in this area would be a valuable service.

Visual Materials Format

The MARC *Films Format* recently has been changed to accommodate two-dimensional materials, and renamed the *Visual
Materials Format. The changes in this format will affect such opaque materials as those in chapter 8 of AACR2 and in Graphic Materials: Rules for Describing Original and Historical Collections compiled by Elisabeth W. Betz. Examples of materials which are particularly affected by the revisions to the format include prints, posters, drawings, paintings, photoprints, photonegatives, transparencies, and other graphic types.

The change is a current example of how cataloging practices have evolved to meet the needs of the community. Until now there has been no officially sanctioned way of inputting two-dimensional graphics in the databases of the bibliographic utilities because these materials could not be properly tagged in a machine-readable form. While some cataloging agencies did in fact input two-dimensional materials, OCLC has consistently asked that this not be done until proper procedures are established:

OCLC has repeatedly asked that users not input records for two dimensional items until there is a place to put them, that is, until the proposed changes to the A-V format to accommodate these materials have been approved and have been implemented by OCLC....

Now that the Visual Materials Format does provide an adequate method for tagging these types of graphics, utilities such as OCLC and RLIN will soon permit them to be entered into their systems.

Changes in cataloging generally come slowly. The Machine Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI) Committee gave final approval to the changes in the MARC Films Format during the American Library Association's midwinter meeting in 1983, although some catalogers had been seeking changes to the format since it appeared in 1976.

However, the most intensive revision efforts began with proposal number 82-21, entitled Additions/Changes to the Film Format So As to Accommodate Two-Dimensional Material. This document was first sent to MARBI for preliminary discussion in October 1982 and received its final review by the Library of Congress on 15 August 1984.

The period between proposal and approval was approximately twenty months. In its final form the revised document reflects the ideas of many groups representing the library community at large. As such, the document should meet cataloging needs with respect to two-dimensional materials.

Of great significance was the change in name from the Films Format to the Visual Materials Format. The change was recommended as early as February of 1983 for the obvious reason that it would more
accurately reflect the scope of the format. In its new version it will include two-dimensional graphics and perhaps be expanded to cover three-dimensional materials as well. It is interesting to consider some of the specific changes in the format in order to appreciate the significance of the changes.

MARC formats require that the "type" of record be identified. These "types" of records are identified by alphabetic symbols which represent such kinds of records as language material, manuscripts, sound recordings (music and spoken), and maps. Currently, the code designations in the Films Format are "g" which stands for principal audiovisual material, "n" which stands for special instructional material, and "o" which stands for kits. Under the Visual Materials Format, "g" was changed to "projected media" (a change of name); "k" was designated for "pictures, designs and other two-dimensional non-projectable graphic representations"; and "r" will represent three-dimensional artifacts and realia. The designation "n" has been made obsolete and "o" remains unchanged.

Of particular significance is the difference between projected and two-dimensional materials. Projected media (code "g") includes every kind of visual which needs a screen in order to be viewed, whether it be a CRT or an overhead screen. Examples of projected media include motion pictures, videorecordings, filmstrips, slides, and transparencies.

Two-dimensional materials (code "k") include such items as activity cards, charts, collages, pictures, postcards, posters, prints, spirit masters, transparency masters, and technical drawings. Three-dimensional artifacts and realia (code "r") include such materials as models, dioramas, games, sculptures, toys, and microscope specimens.

In conformity with the changes which occurred under "type of record," the "Physical Description Fixed Field" (007) has many additions/changes as well. This field is used to describe the broad category of material, and while similar to the GMDs of AACR2, the list was not specifically patterned after them. The name for the field itself has been changed from "General Material Designation" to "Category of Material." The category of material code is used as a point of reference from which to assign the "Specific Material Designation" (SMD) and subsequently list the physical description characteristics. Note here the interrelatedness of the value "k" under "Type of Material Code," where it is equated to pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional representations, and "k" under "Category of Material," where it refers to "graphic, non-projected."

When the category of material is "k," there are twelve special designators defined for that area and a definition is provided for each of
the terms. For example, a photoprint is defined as:

a positive image made either directly or indirectly on a sensitized surface by the action of light or other radiant energy. The term "photoprint" (rather than "photograph") is used here as a more precise term than "photograph," which technically can cover both the print and the negative. Radiographs and opaque stereographs are included here.16

A picture is defined as:

a two-dimensional visual representation accessible to the naked eye and generally on an opaque backing. This term is used when a more specific designation is unknown or not desired.17

Other terms receiving values in "k" and a definition statement include collage, drawing, painting, photomechanical reproduction, photonegative, photoprint, chart, picture, print, flash card, technical drawing, and other graphic types.

Since "k" had become a new code, this necessitated establishing elements to expand further descriptions of physical characteristics. For example, color in 007/byte 03 has as newly defined meanings code "a," one color; code "c," multicolored (the name of the code was modified); and code "h," hand-colored. Codes already existing in the field were made applicable to the new graphic materials.

Field 007/byte 5 represents secondary support material (nonprojectable graphics), and includes eighteen separate categories. A secondary support graphic is "the material (other than normal museum matting) to which the primary support is attached; mounting."18 Examples of the secondary support materials include canvas, bristol board, cardboard, glass, synthetics, and skins (e.g., leather, parchment, vellum).

In the type of material code (to be distinguished from the type of record code) 008/33 has new codes for "a," art original; "i," picture; "k," graphic; and "l," technical drawing. The information for this field is obtained from the medium designation following the title.

On 29 July 1983, the Library of Congress USMARC Review Group met to consider decisions made by the MARBI Committee. Discussions ensued regarding the use of field 655 (General/Form Headings) and field 755 (Physical Characteristics Access). The decision reached was that the fields should not be combined since they contain different types of information. Field 655 is for an intellectual category and field 755 is for physical characteristics not formalized in the description.19

There also were discussions over whether to combine fields 581 and 585. The group eventually recommended not combining them on the
grounds that here too there existed a major interpretive difference. Field 581 is used to cite intellectual usage and 585 consists of an exhibition note that identifies where material has been displayed.20 Other fields were also discussed—such as 508, 520, and 555—regarding how to structure the indicators. The 520 note is the summary note with three possible indicator values determining display constants: blank for "summary," "zero" for "subject," and "8" for no display constant.

The 555 field is the "Cumulative Index/Finding Aids Note." Indicator one is the "display constant controller." The 581 field is the "Publication Note." Here the display constant indicators are blank for "Publications" and "8" for no display constant.

The display constants did cause concern on the part of the utilities because it would involve restructuring their records. The Library of Congress considered their comments and managed to arrive at a workable solution.

Finally, on 9 January 1984, "the MARBI Committee approved the proposal with the proviso that field 009 not be deleted at this time."

Here agreement was reached between MARBI and the Library of Congress that the field would remain intact until accommodations were established in the 007 field to meet the needs of the archival community.

In April 1984, the Library of Congress reviewed and approved the specifications of the proposal. They will be published as MARC Formats for Bibliographic Data, Update number 10, 1983.

Through examining the Visual Materials Format, one can see that establishment of principles for cataloging—and in this case, cataloging audiovisual materials—is truly collective in nature. The major networks had significant input into the outcome. The Library of Congress, with its own expertise, drew on recommendations from the utilities plus the significant input from MARBI.

Most important, these committee members and networker employees represent the general library community. The needs of users should be assessed at the grass-roots level and communicated through channels so that changes can be made which will reflect those needs. Ultimately the worth of a cataloging document is measured by the degree to which it satisfies that requirement. If an item fails to communicate information to a user which is meaningful, the reason for providing that element is itself questionable.

The significance of the changes in the Films Format is obvious in this case. Prior to this time there was no authorized way to catalog two-dimensional graphics using a MARC format. Institutions with collections of this nature were at a loss to provide standardized access. The implementation of the Visual Materials Format will remedy this situation.

summer 1985
Audiovisual Cataloging-in-Publication

The most recent development in audiovisual cataloging is the Cataloging in Publication project which in early 1985 was in the information-gathering stage. It is interesting to reflect on how and why such a project evolved. In response to the belief of most librarians that the AV-CIP project is important, the American Library Association, on the advice of the Library of Congress, established an interdivisional ALA committee consisting of representatives from the American Association of School Librarians (AASL), the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), the Library Information and Technology Association (LITA), and the Public Library Association (PLA). The committee's goals were:

1. to demonstrate strong interest and a unified demand on the part of librarians that the Library of Congress make AV-CIP a priority;
2. to facilitate the Library of Congress' planning for AV-CIP by answering certain questions;
3. to explore and advocate adequate funding for AV-CIP.

The interdivisional committee met in January 1985 at the ALA midwinter meeting where it was decided that AV-CIP would be limited to microcomputer software. This decision was reached as a result of polling representatives from the various sections who felt that there was less expertise in software cataloging and that cataloging them would fill the greatest need. The deadline set for implementing the pilot project is January 1986. Until then, individual representatives will be consulting their constituencies regarding the needs of the general community.

This process reflects the heart of the evolving cataloging structure. The community expressed its need, administrative organizations responded, and now the community is being asked to provide specifics. The most significant question concerns the kinds of material each agency is acquiring—i.e., what is the agency's collection development policy and from whom does it purchase materials?

Manufacturers of software will undoubtedly be interested in how a library uses their product before they commit themselves to participation in the program. The Library of Congress is also asking other important questions such as what bibliographic elements should be included and where on the item should the CIP data be placed.

AV-CIP is not something that is new to the library world. The National Library of Medicine has had an AV-CIP program since 1977. There have been a total of 304 titles cataloged with CIP and thirty-three different publishing organizations have participated in the program. AV-CIP is a major step forward in the bibliographic control of AV
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materials. It will both help to reduce cataloging costs and emphasize to producers the importance of providing standardized information on their material to improve access and to promote the material's use.

Conclusions

Audiovisual cataloging continues to be a dynamic function of the information process in that it seeks to discover the methods of search inquiry, to analyze them, and then to structure systematic descriptive and access principles in cataloging them. This dynamic function has been illustrated by considering the contributions of AACR2, the revisions of the Films Format and the inception of the AV-CIP program for microcomputer software.

Clearly, audiovisual cataloging, like cataloging of other materials, continues to develop with the aim of offering better access to users. Audiovisual cataloging practices do not derive from a rigid structural definition but rather constitute an expression of stylistics to meet needs. It is more difficult than monographic cataloging only because of the nature of the medium and because of the way that material is controlled in the commercial market. Nevertheless, the philosophical principles involved in cataloging AV materials are the same as those for books.

In view of this, general monographic catalogers should not be reluctant to catalog AV materials. The practice of cataloging all forms, regardless of medium, would help break down the barrier that many library personnel still confront. The cataloger's function is to make all information available, and only when that responsibility is accepted without qualification or prejudice is the profession well served.
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