Title
Subject Access to Moving Image Materials in a MARC-Based Online Environment

Journal
Beyond the book, 1(1)

Author
Yee, Martha M

Publication Date
1990

Peer reviewed

19. The *AAT* defines a *facet* as a mutually exclusive, fundamental class of terms whose members share characteristics that distinguish them from the members of other classes. Facets play an important role in how *AAT* thesaurus terms are applied. *AAT* facets are predicated on the types of knowledge concerned with the recording of and access to information in art, architecture, and related disciplines. The seven facets that have been identified thus far are listed below, along with sample terms from each facet.

1. Associated Concepts (access, copyright, heat, pose)
2. Physical Attributes (blue, square, monumental, motifs)
3. Styles and Periods (Baroque, Nicaraguan, Ancient)
4. Agents (editors, archivists, associations, youth)
5. Activities (analysis, engraving, psychology, painted)
6. Materials (marble, gold, lapis lazuli, solvents)
7. Objects (drawings, maps, murals, arches, chairs)

Because the *AAT* is organized into facets, multiword terms consisting of two or more facets are generally not enumerated because they can be synthesized, or postcoordinated, from the existing vocabulary. These include, for example, terms consisting of:

- Material term plus an Object term (stone walls).
- Style term plus Object term (Ionic columns).
- Activity term plus Object term (prefabricated houses).
- Physical Attribute term plus Object term (round houses).

20. BS 5273, p. 5.

21. Multiword terms, such as adjectival phrases, are allowed if they are considered to be single concepts (e.g, CABINET PICTURES). Such terms are sometimes called *bound terms,* which means that separating, or factoring, them into their component parts would lead to ambiguity when they were rejoined or combined. A Boolean search on the individual terms CABINETS and PICTURES would yield results quite different than a search on the single term CABINET PICTURES.

■ Subject Access to Moving Image Materials in a MARC-Based Online Environment

MARTHA YEE

The category of moving image materials is a diverse one, covering fictional or dramatic film and television; news programs and newsreels; documentaries; educational films in all subject areas; moving image materials used as a recording medium in specialized subject areas such as medicine, engineering, science, dance, and anthropology; and, finally, art film and video. Naturally, users' needs for subject access are equally diverse, and it is probably impossible to generalize effectively about all of these materials.

The following discussion will first consider the basic principles to be followed in the design of any system for providing subject access and the ways they apply to moving image materials and will present some of the basic decisions that must be made in the design of such a system. Then I will examine some specific types of subject access useful for moving image materials. Finally, I will discuss some problems with the use of the MARC format to provide subject access to moving image materials in online systems.

PRINCIPLES

In designing any type of subject access system, one must consider the needs of the users and potential users of the system, the nature of the subject matter to which access is to be provided, the concept of *aboutness* as it applies to the materials in question, and the depth of indexing necessary.

Users

The needs of users and potential users of the system should be the primary consideration in the decision as to the nature of the subject access to be

provided. For example, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), Film and Television Archive inherited the Hearst newsreel collection several years ago. Originally, Hearst newsreel footage was shot and edited to create newsreels that would draw the public and thus have box office value. Later the newsreels were cut down into stories, and the stories were indexed so that they could be reused as stock footage; the indexing reflects this use, with emphasis on objects, geographic areas, and persons depicted. We inherited the indexing along with the footage. We would like to encourage scholarly use of the collection and anticipate interest in such things as the portrayal of women, the coverage of particular events including how much and what the American people were told, and the kinds of bias exhibited in the commentary. It is very likely that our users will need different index terms than those needed by stock footage users.

Depth of Subject Coverage

In evaluating existing lists of subject headings, including *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (*LCSH*),[1] to see how well they would adapt to moving image materials such as newsreels, it quickly became apparent to us that particular media tend to vary in their depth of subject coverage. The subjects covered by monographs, which *LCSH* was designed to handle, tend to be more general than the subjects covered by a newsreel story, for example. Thus, many specific headings needed for newsreel stories are not in *LCSH*. Ferris reports findings that educational moving image materials may require more specific headings than books do. A comparison of PRECIS strings needed for educational nonbook materials with those already created by the British Library revealed that 80 percent of the nonbook materials required new PRECIS strings; however, much of this was because of the existence of inappropriate form terms in the existing strings.[2]

On the other hand, a monograph can go into a very specific subject in much more depth than a newsreel story can, and there are times when a more general subject is probably more useful for a newsreel story than the most specific subject heading available in *LCSH*. For example, one of our newsreel stories concerns a prize bulldog with a record-size litter of puppies. *LCSH* contains headings for a number of different breeds of bulldog. It is doubtful that our users would benefit much from our spending the time necessary to identify the breed of bulldog featured in our newsreel story and indexing it!

There is some evidence that users of some types of moving image materials require both specific and general headings.[3] At UCLA, our policy is to use *LCSH* as a source for subject headings but not necessarily to follow the LC practice that calls for choosing the most specific heading; when we judge that a more general heading would be more useful, we use it. We are

not planning to use very broad subject headings for all nonfiction materials because the provision of educational nonfiction films for elementary and high school curriculum support is not one of our goals.

Ofness, Aboutness, Etc.

Sara Shatford has written two excellent articles on the cataloging of still image materials. Much of what she discusses is relevant to moving image materials as well.[4] I am indebted to her for the conceptual framework of much of what follows.

There are a number of different subject-like aspects of moving image materials in which users are interested. We must, therefore, consider trying to bring them out in the course of subject analysis. First of all, as pictorial or image materials, these materials depict subjects; there is actually a visual image of the subject. Shatford refers to this aspect as what the picture is *of*. Second, like textual materials, pictorial or image materials may be used to discuss or refer to, to parody or caricature, or to express meanings, themes, moods, or points of view. Shatford refers to this aspect as what the picture is *about*. Finally, pictorial or image materials, like textual materials, can themselves be instances of a category of materials sought by users. To use moving image examples, they can themselves be westerns (genre), animated cartoons (form) or imbibition dye transfer Technicolor prints (physical characteristics).

It is important to be aware of these aspects for two reasons. First, they can remind us of decisions we must make in the design of any subject access system. How important is it to the users being served to bring out ofness, aboutness, genre, form, and physical characteristics? Should all or just some of these be brought out in a given situation? Second, an issue that will be considered further below is the degree to which it is useful to distinguish among these aspects in our systems in such a way as to enable users to specify that a search should be for a particular subject from just one of these aspects, excluding the others. For example, is it useful to allow users to search for materials that actually depict Martin Luther King, excluding materials in which he is discussed but not depicted? Is it useful to allow users to search for animated cartoons themselves, excluding works about the making of animated cartoons?[5] Related to this is the question of how distinctions should be made, if it is felt that they are useful. The headings themselves can be designed to bring out these different aspects, as when we add form subdivisions to topical subject headings for such things as pictorial works (of) or parodies (about, in a particular way). Alternatively, MARC tags can be used to distinguish these aspects, as when genre or form headings (the thing itself) are put in 655 fields, and topical subject headings (both of and about) in 650 fields. The distinctions among these aspects may appear

relatively straightforward at first glance, and often they are. However, there are some gray areas, which might bear some examination.

A special case of ofness occurs when a pictorial work depicts another work. Shatford refers to the latter as the Represented Work. A film of a house designed by Frank Lloyd Wright is an example of a work containing a Represented Work: The film is the representation, and the house is the Represented Work. Shatford's discussion of the question of when the Represented Work rather than the representation should be described is well worth reading.[6] The border line between descriptive cataloging and subject cataloging is not always clear-cut, and as we will see in discussion below of problems with MARC format cataloging, this can sometimes create problems in the choice of MARC tags and in the design of indexes. Depending on what one chooses to describe, the representation or the Represented Work, the heading for the Wright house could end up in either the name/title index or the subject index.

Moving image media can easily be used to record performances of various kinds, for example, musical and dance performances. The border line between a performer involved in the creation of the work, and therefore indexed as an Author, and a performer being depicted in the work, and therefore indexed as a Subject, can sometimes be a hard one to draw; the decision will usually hinge on how the work represents the participation of the performer. Moving image materials can record performances of nonhuman creatures, including performing animals like Lassie, or of animated fictitious characters, like Bugs Bunny. Currently in the MARC format, such nonhuman creatures are deemed incapable of authorship and therefore are indexed as topical subjects, more discussion of which will follow below.

The aspect of aboutness covers a lot of territory. When applied to works of art, it can include expressional meaning. In other words, aboutness may encompass an abstract concept expressed by a work of art. Shatford suggests, for example, that Dorothea Lange's *Migrant Mother* might be considered to be "about strength, or suffering, or determination."[7] This meaning, specific to works of art, is relevant to moving image materials as well. Certainly art film and video contain expressional meaning in the same way that still photographic materials do. Dramatic or fictional moving image materials are also full of expressional meaning. This kind of aboutness can be very difficult to bring out, first, because it is so subjective, and second, because one of the differences between a work of art and a factual work is that the former tends to take as its subject the world entire and life itself while the latter tends to map out a relatively narrow single subject. Thoroughly indexing just one work of art could take the lifetime of a diligent indexer!

Aboutness can have its more conventional meaning when applied to factual materials with a textual or discursive aspect. Unlike still image

materials, moving image materials often contain both picture and sound and therefore both pictorial material and textual material. While the pictorial material may be "of" particular objects and events, the textual material may consist of a factual discussion of what is depicted and may therefore be "about" what is depicted in the way that a nonfiction monograph is "about" a subject. Some users may wish to limit a search to things actually depicted while others may be mainly interested in the discussion on the sound track.

The question also arises as to whether users would be interested in distinguishing among different kinds of aboutness. If the decision is made to index expressional meaning in works of art (e.g., themes, or concepts such as courage), should we allow users to specify works that discuss the concept of courage in an explicitly discursive way, excluding those that depict it in an expressional way, or vice versa? Currently, this can be coded in the MARC format only for books, using the fiction code in the 008 field. Form subdivisions such as FICTION or DRAMA added to topical subdivisions also fulfill this function to a certain extent for some materials. At least, the user who is *not* interested in expressional aspects can say AND NOT DRAMA or something similar in a system with Boolean searching capability.

It can be hard sometimes to distinguish between the thing itself and a depiction of the thing (ofness). An example may help. One could argue that "baseball game" is a particular television format and as such belongs in a list of genre and form terms to be applied to television programs. In a televised baseball game, there is almost always an announcer who follows certain conventions of sports announcing that can be parodied or caricatured; certain camera techniques are commonly employed; the program takes up a certain amount of broadcast time, divided into innings; and televised baseball games are a category of materials that users may well wish to study as a category. However, one could also argue that such a program depicts a baseball game–that it is "of" a baseball game. Depending on how one analyzes this situation, one would choose a different tag in the MARC format (655 versus 650). The implications of this will be discussed further in the section on problems with the MARC format.

Depth of Indexing

Purely visual materials tend not to be on a single subject or in a single discipline. For example, film footage of Los Angeles in 1900 may interest historians, engineers, filmmakers, costume designers, if people are present, and even ornithologists, if a particular bird can be identified in the footage. For this reason, one may be tempted to provide great depth of indexing for visual materials. Shatford suggests the useful thresholds of detail and pertinence to temper excessive zeal in this area.[8] The *LC Thesaurus for*

Graphic Materials (*LCTGM*) also suggests some useful guidelines, such as historical significance, novelty, and prominent depiction.[9]

ONLINE SYSTEM DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

What follows are some of the system design decisions one will have to make in the design of any subject access system. All of these decisions should affect choice of indexing terms or subject headings to be used.

Integration

For a system that integrates records with those for many other types of materials, it might be wise to choose subject headings that are appropriate to various types of materials. The UCLA Film and Television Archive is planning to make its records available through ORION, an online public access catalog that also serves scholars and researchers looking for textual materials in the UCLA libraries. Thus, our decision to use *LCSH* will benefit scholars and researchers who could use our materials because it is used to provide subject access to textual materials at UCLA. Users are required to learn just one system.

In integrated systems, decisions must be made about how to communicate to users that many different formats are available. Techniques that allow one to limit a search to a broad format category may be helpful in extensively integrated collections but useless in a collection of a single kind of material. As our records are searchable as a separate file on ORION that contains only motion pictures, video recordings, and sound recordings, we are less interested in access by format than we might be if our records were intermingled with all UCLA library records.

Co-occurrence Rules and Decisions about Pre- and Postcoordination

Co-occurrence rules is a term this writer has invented to refer to the rules that online public access catalogs follow when searching for two or more terms specified by a user. Some systems look for the two or more terms to occur in the same field; other systems look for the two or more terms to occur in the same record; and other systems allow the user to specify which rules the machine should follow. The rules the system is following can have a profound effect on the success of a user's search. No research has yet been done on this issue, but intuitively one can see that the rule that two terms need only co-occur in the same record undoubtedly produces more false drops than the rule that two terms must co-occur in the same field.

The co-occurrence rules the system follows should affect the decision as to whether to adopt a precoordinated or a postcoordinated subject access system. In a precoordinated system, more than one term can be given in a single field. This approach allows the relationship between the terms to be indicated. For example, the *LCSH* heading CHILDREN AND ART refers to the effect of art on children, while CHILDREN IN ART refers to the depiction of children in art. If a user's search has been done using the rule that two or more terms must occur within a single heading, the results can be arranged on display in order by the headings matched, allowing users to discriminate among the results and choose those that best match their information needs.

In the simplest version of a postcoordinated system, each field contains a single term. The only relationship between terms that is demonstrated is that both occur on the same record. In the simplest system, CHILDREN would occur in one field and ART in another. In such a system, it would be imperative to allow co-occurrence in the same record to be specified. This would mean that results of a search could not be displayed by heading matched because a given search might easily match more than one heading. The best that could be done on display would be to display all matched fields; records still could not be arranged by matched headings.

In a sense, the *AAT*[10] is a hybrid between a precoordinated and a postcoordinated system. In the most sophisticated use envisioned of the *AAT*, the cataloger would encode the relationships between single terms, and in a sense the machine rather than the cataloger would actually precoordinate the terms. It is not yet clear whether implementations of this sophisticated approach would display the terms as coordinated headings or whether searching rules would allow specification of co-occurrence within one heading string, but if both display and searching involved coordinated heading strings, the *AAT* would actually be indistinguishable from a precoordinated system from the user's point of view.

One of the problems we noted with *LCTGM* when we investigated its possible use for providing subject access to our newsreel materials was that it tends more than *LCSH* to be a single-term system, designed for postcoordination in the simplest sense described above.[11] This means that searching would produce more false drops and that the system does not allow as much specification of the relationship between two terms. The more in depth the indexing, the more likely false drops are to occur. In other words, the more index terms provided per record, the more likely it is that a search on two keywords will bring up an irrelevant record, one in which the two keywords do not have the meaning or the relationship to each other desired by the user. This also means that it is not possible to arrange retrieved records by headings matched for searches on more than one term, thus making it much harder for a user to browse through a large retrieval.

We are beginning to notice similar problems with *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms*, which has also taken the approach of avoiding use of subdivisions (precoordination). For example, one heading is PARODIES and

another heading is BASEBALL GAMES.[12] A cartoon parody of a baseball game would be given both headings and would come up on a search for baseball games, under the heading BASEBALL GAMES. There would be no way to distinguish parodies from actual baseball games in the heading displays. (Of course, a knowledgeable user could use Boolean ANDs or AND NOTs to exclude or include parodies as soon as he or she realized what was going on; however, there is no way for a user to look at *only* parodies of baseball games without seeing the games themselves.)

Searchable Fields

The MARC format has fields that contain controlled vocabulary of various sorts (topical subject headings in 650 and 690, genre terms in 655, etc.) and descriptive fields that can contain subject-rich vocabulary (contents notes in the 505 field, summaries in the 520 field, etc.). In any given system, decisions must be made as to which fields to make searchable. Maintenance of a controlled vocabulary can be expensive. The creation and maintenance of authority files require trained staff. A quick and dirty method of providing a kind of subject access would be to write summaries and let users search summary fields. This puts the burden of thinking of all synonyms on the user and forces the user to sift through many more false drops. It also means that displays arranged by matched terms will probably not be possible. If the user's search matched one term in the first sentence of the summary and another term in the last sentence (or another term in the title, if that is indexed as well), it would probably not be possible to instruct the computer to display fifty retrieved records in any other order than that determined by the main entry of each record.

Definition of Indexes

Many online catalogs maintain a subject index that is separate from the name/title index and require users to specify which index is to be searched by any given search.[13] As we will see below, this can cause problems for users if they cannot pick the correct index for their particular search. Probably the best solution would be to give the user at least the option of searching a general index; this might also make searching costs rise, however. Another option would be to index in more than one index the types of headings that cause problems, such as names as subjects that some users would search as names and others search as subjects. This option would require that all problem headings be tagged or coded in some way so that the computer could distinguish them from headings that should be indexed only as names or only as topical subject headings. This option might present problems for systems that link authority records to bibliographic records, unless methods could be devised to link the heading in one bibliographic record to two authority records, one in the subject index and the other in the name index.

Displays of Headings from Multiple Lists

A number of existing lists might be candidates for use in providing subject access to moving image materials, either alone or in combination. The decision to use more than one list should be made with full awareness of the problems such a decision is likely to cause users. Currently, most systems that do this seem to display headings with qualifiers to indicate the source of the terms; see, for example, the systems examined by Carol Mandel.[14] If two lists being used employ the same term and if catalogers make two authority records to record this fact, the display of the same heading twice (identified as belonging to two different lists) may confuse users. Most users probably do not know what *LCSH* means. More serious problems occur when two different lists being employed use two different terms for the same concept. The classic example is the heading CANCER in *LCSH* as opposed to the heading NEOPLASMS in *MeSH*. If cross-references are not edited to reflect the fact that both terms are in use, users may discover only half the material available on the subject. Even if cross-references are edited appropriately, users may still find it very confusing that materials on the same subject are located in two different places in the file, indexed under two synonyms.

TOPICAL SUBJECT ACCESS

Nonfiction

In this section, we will consider several types of nonfiction moving image materials: news and newsreels, documentaries and educational works, and record film and video. Because these materials tend to have different bibliographical "behaviors" and their users have different needs, they will be considered separately.

The first thing to be borne in mind in designing a system for providing subject access to news materials is that subject access is of *primary* importance to users of these materials. Rarely do they have the names of specific news programs with broadcast dates or citations to volume and issue number of a newsreel. They are almost always looking for footage of some particular event, personage, place, and the like. If you are not providing subject access to these materials in some fashion, you are probably not providing access to the collection at all!

If it is possible to provide direct access by means of a controlled vocabulary, a number of possibilities exist. Use of *LCSH*, at least when appropriate headings are available in *LCSH*, does have the advantage of

providing access similar to that provided to books and journals about the same events, personages, and so on. LC is currently exploring the possibility of instituting cooperative subject cataloging similar to the cooperative name authority work being done through NACO, so institutions providing subject access to news materials by means of *LCSH* may want to consider using this mechanism (or other cooperative mechanisms) for sharing work on establishing new headings for events and other topics not yet found in *LCSH*. If the *LCTGM* is preferred, ongoing revision of that list might be possible as well if the staff of the Prints and Photographs Division at the Library of Congress can handle the volume of work.

A more expensive alternative would be to design a controlled vocabulary locally, specifically for the purpose of providing access to news materials. Such a vocabulary could be tailored specifically to news materials, but it would have the disadvantage of being yet another system for users to master.

A cheaper and less satisfactory method has been mentioned above: that of providing free-text searching of summaries and contents notes of story titles. If this could be offered in addition to access by means of a controlled vocabulary, however, it might actually improve access by providing more lead-ins to the controlled vocabulary than are already provided by whatever cross-references have been made. As one might imagine, indexing of current news is plagued by the problem of devising terminology for events and activities that are in the process of being named as they occur.

Another shortcut might be to encourage users to use existing indexes, such as the Vanderbilt index, or the New York Times index, to determine a span of time when a particular subject was being covered in the news and then to provide direct access under broadcast date to news materials. An indexable broadcast date has recently been added to the MARC format to provide this type of chronological or historical access. This method of providing subject access would shift the burden to the users' shoulders to a considerable extent, as they would have to view many programs that do not cover the topic of interest in order to find those that do.

At UCLA, we are using *LCSH* to provide subject access to each story in a cataloged Hearst newsreel issue. We have not yet determined how we will be able to provide subject access to a recently acquired collection of news programs taped off the air. We will probably use the Vanderbilt index to provide access to the national news. The local news is another matter. We currently have the report of a consultant under consideration. He has discovered that the rule of thumb in similar collections is that it takes ten hours to describe and index one hour of news!

LCSH may be better suited to provide subject access to documentaries and educational works, as they tend to cover subjects similar to those covered in monographs. There is some evidence (cited above), however, that users of these materials may also require access under broad categories. For example, a teacher may need a film on science for her science class, not caring which more specific scientific topic is being covered.

A collection specializing in a particular kind of record film, such as film recordings of dance performances or film recordings of anthropological data, may need quite specialized subject access and may be more likely to develop special local lists or to use lists special to their subject areas. The use of local lists commits the institution to expensive and ongoing maintenance and makes difficult the integration of the resulting records with records from other institutions in a subject-searchable database, so the decision to create a local list should be made with care.

Fiction

The American Film Institute (AFI) catalogs of feature films released in the United States provide extensive subject access to fiction films. Following their lead, the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress is also adding a number of topical subject headings to fully cataloged films being distributed on the MARC tapes. We have discussed above some of the problems with bringing out the aboutness of works of art: the inevitable subjectivity and the large number of concepts that could be brought out. Research on the frequency with which scholars and researchers need subject access to these materials has never been done, but my suspicion is that they need access to the names of creators more frequently than they need subject access. For these reasons, at UCLA we have chosen instead to devote our efforts to bringing out the names of all people involved in the creation of a work, hoping that those who need subject access can use the AFI catalogs.

GENRE AND FORM

The National Moving Image Database (NAMID) Standards Committee has recently completed work on a national standard list of genre and form terms to be used by moving image collections to provide access under genre and form terms in the 655 field in the MARC format.

The term *genre* is used somewhat differently for moving image materials than it is for still image materials; its use for moving image materials is more akin to its use for literary materials. The definition in *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* is as follows: "any recognized category of fictional works which is characterized by recognizable conventions, i.e., a group of works all of which tend to explore the same themes and use the same plot formulae, character-types and icons."[15] We attempted to distinguish genre from form (any recognized category of works characterized by a particular format or purpose), physical format (which can change from one copy to

another), and subject (pertaining to what a work is about, without regard to form or genre).

The NAMID Standards Committee recognized that moving image collections are diverse, that is, they include highly specialized collections as well as very general ones. It was decided that the list should be designed for use in collections at three levels of generality. Those collections that need only a short list of very broad terms can use the broad term list, a subset of the more detailed list. Those collections that need more specialized terms can use the detailed list. The detailed list contains *see* references from unused Narrower Terms. For example, a whole array of specific types of experimental films is listed in the form of unused Narrower Term references to the Broader Term PERSONAL/INDEPENDENT WORKS. The third level of generality available to very specialized collections would be to convert these unused Narrower Terms to used headings. For example, a collection of nothing but personal/independent works could convert the cross-references mentioned above to used headings. The hope is that records from institutions employing any level of generality could be integrated into one national database.

Terms in the list were derived from scholarly literature and from existing lists. We tried to select the most commonly used terms. Sometimes compromises were necessary in order to create terms that were properly inclusive in a hierarchical structure. Terms were designed to cover both film and television. Rather than use the more commonly used phrase, such as, for example, GANGSTER FILMS, we used the somewhat artificial construction GANGSTER DRAMA so that the term would cover television programs as well.[16]

The list is constructed like a thesaurus, with Broader and Narrower Term relationships clearly laid out. This is particularly useful for genre categories because there frequently are narrower subgenres that have grown out of broader ones.

The plan is to produce revised editions of the list to incorporate new terms as necessary.[17]

Because it is so easy to use moving image formats to record music and dance performances, as well as to reproduce works of art such as sculpture and architecture, there was a temptation to include form and genre terms for all these kinds of works in the list. We were quickly disabused of the notion that this would be possible, however, by the enormity of the undertaking, and our lack of expertise in all of these areas. Instead, it is highly recommended that other lists, such as *LCSH*, be used to provide access to music, dance, and the like.

Some of the problems with the use of more than one list have been alluded to above. It should be noted that currently *LCSH* terms go into the 650 field in MARC, even when they are form and genre terms, while terms from our list go into the 655 field. This means that there is not yet a clear distinction made in MARC among aboutness terms, ofness terms, and terms that identify the thing itself, as genre and form terms do. The situation is confused further by the fact that genre and form headings included in our list may also be present in *LCSH*; in the latter, they are meant to be applied only to collections and critical works, but this distinction may be lost on users.[18]

Form subdivision is not used in the genre list. We have discussed some of the problems this causes above in the section entitled Co-occurrence Rules and Decisions about Pre- and Postcoordination.

The form subdivision DRAMA is used when *LCSH* terms are used to provide subject access to fictional moving image materials. At UCLA, we use the form subdivision CARTOONS AND CARICATURES to provide access under the names of persons caricatured either by means of cartoon caricatures or by actors who do imitations. We use the form subdivision PARODIES AND IMITATIONS under the names of parodied works.

If it is desired to clearly separate form and genre access from topical subject access, one issue that must be addressed is that of the disposition of the hybrid headings created by adding form subdivisions to topical subject headings. I would hope that these would still be considered topical subject headings because the emphasis usually is still on their aboutness or ofness and the form subdivisions serve mainly to subdivide large files into subcategories for the user to choose among.

We have recently run across another problem whose source is our use of different lists for providing topical and genre access. When cataloging a film about westerns, one must either use the topical subject heading in *LCSH*, WESTERN FILMS, or one must use the heading from our list, WESTERNS, as a local subject heading (690 in MARC); we have decided on the latter solution.

PHYSICAL FORMAT

The 755 field has not yet been implemented for moving image materials, although the Standards Committee is currently working on a project to create a list of physical format terms, together with definitions and hints on how to identify them. These are meant to be appropriate for inclusion in the 755 field, if desired. The enterprise promises to be a difficult one as there is very little standardization in the use of terminology in the industry, or in the archival world for that matter.

Direct access online under physical format may not be as useful for moving image materials as it is for still image materials. In still image materials, a greater variety of physical processes have been employed to produce the images–for example, painting, print-making, engraving,

photography, and drawing. In moving image materials, the basic process is photography.

Format is important, however. It affects access, in that one must ensure that appropriate equipment is available to view particular formats. We plan to use MARC physical format codes to print out offline lists of categories, such as 16-mm films or 1/2-inch videocassettes, to enable us to encourage use of particular formats or to help us in planning storage space. Some sound and color processes may be quite interesting to those doing research in the history of film technology and, in particular, in the history of sound, color, and wide-screen techniques. We have users who might need to see examples of two-color Technicolor prints, for example. It is possible that users might eventually find it helpful to be able to limit searches to material in a particular format, and terms in the 755 field might be helpful for that purpose. For example, the easiest material to book for a viewing appointment at UCLA is 1/2-inch VHS video. If a user is not interested in materials that are more restricted in access, he or she might find it helpful to be able to limit a search to 1/2-inch VHS video. There is a danger, though, with any of these physical formats, that we will have so many items that our online system will not be able to bring up everything online or will bring up so many things that no user in a hurry would browse through all of them. Those stubborn users who persist despite large retrievals can monopolize a limited number of public terminals and increase searching costs.

The general material designation (GMD) is sometimes mentioned as a possible substitute for direct access under physical format. It is part of the title field and so is often indexed along with words from the title. At UCLA, we do not use GMDs for two reasons: First, we often have both a video and a film copy attached to the same bibliographic record; second, much of our television collection is on 16-mm film, and it would be very misleading to put the heading MOTION PICTURE after the title of a television program. In our world, the term MOTION PICTURE refers to the medium of distribution, not to the physical format.

Medical libraries that use *MeSH* add terms such as VIDEOCASSETTES to subject headings as form subdivisions. *LCSH* has few such form subdivisions based on physical format and Jean Weihs, an expert on the cataloging of nonbook materials in libraries and a proponent of integrated collections, warns against using them because it is easy for a patron interested in a particular subject to miss nonbook materials that may be available on that subject when they are segregated in the file because of use of form subdivisions.[19]

PROBLEMS WITH USE OF THE MARC FORMAT TO PROVIDE SUBJECT ACCESS TO MOVING IMAGE MATERIALS

In the course of the discussion so far, we have identified several problems, or potential problems, with the provision of subject access using the MARC format in its current state. They involve cases in which the fact that different kinds of data are tagged differently requires catalogers to make the distinction among the different kinds of data. Requiring such choices is legitimate if it serves user needs, but if users have no need for the distinction, cataloging efficiency might be served by dropping the distinction. In each case, it might be informative to consider the following questions:

1. Is the distinction necessary; does it serve user needs?
2. Is the distinction being made in the best possible way? Are users having trouble predicting what will be found where? Do we in fact make the distinction consistently?
3. Should online systems require users to make the distinction in order to do any search?
4. Is it useful for online systems to allow users the option of specifying the distinction in a search?
5. Is it useful for online systems to make the distinction only at the time of display, to allow users a choice at that time without requiring them to make the choice ahead of time?

The first distinction the MARC format requires us to make is the one between entities a work is about or of (6xx fields) and entities capable of authorship (or of being the primary work cataloged) (1xx/7xx fields). Thus, in the case of Represented Works, we must decide whether to treat the Represented Work as the primary work cataloged (1xx), as a related work or work capable of being the primary work cataloged (7xx), or as the "subject" of the work being cataloged (6xx). In the case of performers, we must decide whether a performer is an "author" (7xx) or is being depicted (6xx). Note that this means that the name of a performer in a 700 field indicates that the person is both an "author" and depicted. The user who is looking for a depiction of a performer would have to search both ways. In most online systems, our decision will cause the entry for the Represented Work or the performer to fall into one index or another, and users will be required to specify the correct index to find the Represented Work or performer.

Related to this is the distinction the MARC format requires us to make between a real person (600 or 700 field) and a fictitious character or per-

forming animal (650 topical subject heading field). Because of the tag given fictitious characters and performing animals, they must be indexed in all systems in the same way that other topical subject headings are. In systems in which users must choose between either a subject index or a name/author/title index, they will surely have difficulty understanding why they must search Humphrey Bogart as **FIND NAME** Bogart but must search Bugs Bunny or Lassie as **FIND SUBJECT** Bugs or **FIND SUBJECT** Lassie. The performing animal issue is complicated by the fact that often an animal is portrayed by a number of different animals over time, as Lassie was. In such cases, perhaps we are talking about both a fictitious character (Lassie) and a performing animal (name of a dog that played Lassie). It should also be remembered that topical subject headings currently include a number of other proper names, such as artists' groups, athletic contests, events, and tribes, that users might expect to find in a Names index.[20] If we had some way of indicating proper names to the computer, by either tag or subfield code, systems that create Name indexes could create a more logical and predictable index.

Another distinction the MARC format requires us to make is the one between a topical heading (of/about: 650/690) and a genre/form heading (the thing itself: 655). Because *LCSH* contains many genre/form headings, all of which are currently tagged 650, our practice is clearly not consistent. The main question becomes whether the distinction is useful and whether users need to be able to limit searches to one type of heading or the other. We have indicated some cases, such as baseball games, in which the distinction between "thing depicted" and "thing itself" cannot be clearly drawn, but experienced catalogers realize that it's the gray areas that make us a profession. If we backed away from making distinctions every time we ran into gray areas, we would not be able to catalog at all.

One distinction we *don't* make consistently now that might be useful is the distinction between of (subjects depicted) and about (subjects discussed or alluded to). Another is the distinction between expressional versus discursive, or factual, treatment of subjects. If we can devise tags and codes in the MARC format to make these distinctions, we can have the option of building separate indexes in online systems. If it is felt that users merely need to be able to limit searches or to be able to choose among these categories, we could probably deal with the problem by means of such things as subdivisions.

CONCLUSION

Moving image materials are too diverse for this essayist to feel sure that all possible issues pertaining to all kinds of moving image materials have been addressed here. It is hoped, however, that the preceding remarks will provide at least a start in thinking through some of the stickier problems to be encountered in designing online systems to provide subject access to these materials that are so rich in source material for the study of twentieth-century history and culture.

NOTES

1. *Library of Congress Subject Headings in Microform* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1989).

2. Dave Ferris, "Developments in the Bibliographic Control of Audiovisual Materials: The BL/ILEA Learning Materials Recording Study," *Education Libraries Bulletin* 22, no. 2 (Summer 1979): 33-34.

3. Donald Bidd, Louise de Chevigny, and Margo Marshall, "PRECIS for Subject Access in a National Audiovisual Information System," *Canadian Library Journal* 43 (June 1986): 181; James R. Dwyer, "Getting Down to the Reel Thing: Improved Access to Films and Videos through Subject Headings, Added Entries, and Annotations" in *Cataloging Special Materials: Critiques and Innovations*, ed. Sanford Berman (Phoenix, Ariz.: Oryx Press, 1986), 1-12; Dominique Saintville, "La Gestion Documentaire," *Problemes audiovisuels* 22 (November/December 1984): 45-57.

4. Sara Shatford, "Describing a Picture: A Thousand Words Are Seldom Cost Effective," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 4, no. 4 (Summer 1984): 13-30.; Sara Shatford, "Analyzing the Subject of a Picture: A Theoretical Approach," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (Spring 1986): 39-62.

5. For an impassioned plea from a library user for the usefulness of allowing this type of search, see: Alexandra Herz, "Scientific Illustration in Some Boston Area Libraries: An Art historian's View of Library Subject Analysis," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 31, no. 3 (July/September 1987): 239-48.

6. Shatford, "Describing a Picture," 13-30.

7. Shatford, "Analyzing the Subject," 43.

8. Shatford, "Analyzing the Subject," 58-59.

9. Elisabeth Betz Parker, *LC Thesaurus for Graphic Materials* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 1987), xiv.

10. *Art and Architecture Thesaurus*. [Information regarding this portion of the Getty Art History Information Program is available from the offices, located at 62 Stratton Road, Williamstown, MA 01267; telephone, 413-458-2151.]

11. Interestingly, Betsy Betz Parker, in a phone conversation, has pointed out that *LCTGM*, which is subject to continuous revision, is moving over time in the direction of precoordinated phrases and has even begun to use subdivisions in a limited fashion.

12. Actually, BASEBALL GAMES is an unused Narrower Term that we have chosen to use at UCLA.

13. Joseph R. Matthews, *Public Access to Online Catalogs*, 2d ed. (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1985). Of forty-eight systems described in Matthews's *Public Access to Online Catalogs*, 2d ed., forty require the user to choose between author or subject indexes, four require the user to choose between name or subject indexes, and only four do not require the user to choose an index.

14. Carol A. Mandel, *Multiple Thesauri in Online Library Bibliographic Systems* (Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1987).

15. *Moving Image Materials: Genre Terms* (Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress, 1988), 11.

16. At its October 1988 meeting, the Standards Committee decided to revise the list to match our users' vocabulary better; thus, for example, we will now use the heading GANGSTER FILMS AND PROGRAMS.

17. Revisions decided upon at our October 1988 meeting will be distributed and published by the National Center for Film and Video Preservation. It has not yet been determined when a second edition of the list will be published.

18. I am currently a member of the Subcommittee on Subject Access to Individual Works of Fiction, Drama, Etc., Subject Analysis Committee, Cataloging and Classification Section, Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Association. The subcommittee is in the process of preparing guidelines for publication, along with recommendations for the Library of Congress that, in the current draft, recommend that all genre and form headings from *LCSH* be placed in the 655 field when applied to either collections or individual works. Much will depend on whether LC decides to implement this recommendation.

19. Jean Riddle Weihs, "Problems of Subject Analysis for Audio/Visual Materials in Canadian Libraries," *Canadian Library Journal* 33, no. 5 (October 1976): 455.

20. "Headings for Certain Entities," *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 38 (Fall 1987): 2-9.