Title

User Problems with Access to Fictional Characters and Personal Names in Online Public Access Catalogs

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/30g6z446

Journal

Information Technology and Libraries, 10

Authors

Yee, Martha M
Soto, Raymond

Publication Date

1991-03-01

Peer reviewed

User Problems with Access to Fictional Characters and Personal Names in Online Public Access Catalogs

Martha M. Yee and Raymond Soto

Reference librarians in libraries with online public access catalogs were polled to determine what indexes they thought most patrons would use to look for fictional characters. Most thought users would choose a name index over a subject index, but that they would choose a subject index over an author index. In addition, reference librarians were asked their own preferences. They said that the best kind of index to give users for such searches would be a general index in which no particular kind of search need be specified. Based on the descriptive statistics from this research, current system design practices for online public access catalogs and current tagging practice in the MARC format are evaluated, and recommendations are made for modification of those practices.

An examination of the forty-eight online public access catalogs described in Matthews' *Public Access to Online Catalogs*, 2nd edition[1] reveals that all but four require users to choose a particular index prior to conducting a search. Most of these catalogs offer the user a choice between an "author" index and a "subject" index. Only four offer the user a choice between a "name" index and a "subject" index. Four other systems do not require the user to choose a particular index; instead, all searchable fields are searched for a match with input search terms.

The choice between author and subject indexes or between name and subject indexes can be a difficult one for users who are searching for fictional characters. Take, for example, a user who is searching for any avail-able Sherlock Holmes film or book. When the user is presented with the choice of a name index or a subject index, he might choose the name index. Currently, fictional characters are tagged in the MARC format[2] as topical subject headings (650 field). Since there is no way for a machine indexing program to distinguish fictional character names from other topical subject headings, there is no way for systems to include fictional character names in a name index. Thus, they must be indexed in the same way that other topical subject headings are indexed. When presented with the choice between an author index or a subject index, the user might be stymied, since Sherlock Holmes is clearly not an author and might not seem to be the "subject" of a fictional work either.

To the authors' knowledge, no research has yet been done on potential difficulties that users might have when choosing among the indexes offered in various online public access catalogs. Recent articles by Ross, Sanders, Klugman, and Pilachowski and Everett have discussed possible difficulties, but these articles have not reported any research results.[3] None of these articles discusses possible problems presented by fictional characters.

By means of tagging, the MARC format identifies a number of potentially indexable categories (see table 1). While each of these categories is available for separate indexing, most systems offer only name, title, or subject indexes. Each index combines several MARC-tagged categories. The development of these categories, both of the MARC format and of existing online systems, was intended to fulfil the system needs and the needs of catalogers. To the degree that MARC and the systems that use it have attempted to address the needs of end-users, intuition rather than research has been employed in decision making about system design.

Recently, the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) of the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS), which is part of the American Library Association (ALA), formed a subcommittee to produce national standard guidelines for the provision of subject access to individual works of fiction. At the ALA Midwinter Meeting in 1990, the

Table 1. Indexable Fields Currently Available in MARC Format.

600	Subject added entry—personal name
610	Subject added entry—corporate name
611	Subject added entry—meeting name
630	Subject added entry—uniform title
650	Subject added entry—topical term
651	Subject added entry—geographic name
655	Index term—genre/form
656	Index term—occupation
657	Index term—function
700	Added entry—personal name
710	Added entry—corporate name
711	Added entry—meeting name
730	Added entry—uniform title
740	Added entry—variant title
752	Added entry—hierarchical place name
753	Technical details access to computer files
754	Added entry—taxonomic identification
755	Added entry—physical characteristics

standards were approved and subsequently published by ALA.[4]

Although the Library of Congress does not currently provide access by means of fictional characters to individual works of fiction, the subcommittee's guidelines recommend providing such access. The subcommittee also recommended that the Library of Congress attempt to provide fictional character access to current fiction, although it is not yet known whether the Library of Congress will be able to follow this recommendation. The research described in this paper was designed to give more detailed information about user needs in this area in support of a national effort to improve subject access to fictional materials.

It can be argued that fictional character access through indexes to online public access catalogs is part of a larger problem. Fictional characters are not the only entities that do not fall neatly into one of two or three broad categories that are currently offered for searching. There are other similar problems that may need investigation. Systems that allow users to search author/name and subject authority files are undoubtedly indexing uniform titles in the author/name authority file. It is doubtful that users know to look for them there.

Proper names as subjects can be given any of the following tags in the MARC format: 600, 610, 611, 650, 651. Even catalogers need help deciding which tag to use for a given name. Thus, catalogers consult a Library of Congress rule interpretation which is fondly known as the "dividing the world document."[5] According to this rule interpretation, the Empire State Building is tagged as a corporate name (610), and Ellis Island Immigration Station is tagged as a topical subject heading (650). This means that the former is indexed in the author/name index and the latter in the subject index. Again, it is doubtful that users know these differences. In the MARC format, geographic names are sometimes tagged as corporate names (when they correspond to governmental jurisdictions) and thus are indexed in most systems in the name/author index. Sometimes they are tagged as geographic names (when they are strictly geographical) and thus are indexed in the subject index in many systems.[6] Given the somewhat arbitrary scatter that librarians create by this kind of tagging, users may have

trouble deciding how to search for proper names in general. Unless a system has a general index, there frequently is more than one place to look for proper names given the current structure of the MARC format.

Finally, users may have problems searching for names as subjects, since some systems index them with names/authors, and other systems index them with subjects. Users might be expected to look for them in either place.

Since the authors of this paper were studying access to real people in fiction, they decided to include one question on nonfiction about real people just to see how the answers differed. They hoped this one question might provide some clues as to problems users may have with access to names as subjects.

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The authors polled reference librarians rather than library patrons for several reasons. First, reference librarians have constant contact with users, training them in searching strategies, conducting searches on their behalf, and assisting users with difficult or failed searches. Therefore, we can assume that reference librarians have some insight into user needs and behavior. Secondly, reference librarians belong to professional organizations, which makes sampling easier. Naturally, the authors would have preferred to study user behavior directly, but if they had attempted to question library patrons, their sampling would likely have been confined to their own institution. Thus, the findings would not have been representative of the many kinds and sizes of libraries and types of patrons. Thirdly, it can be difficult to develop questions using terms that naive users can understand or interpret in the same way that the questionnaire designers or other users interpret them. Reference librarians are more familiar with the problems being addressed and are more likely to understand questions on a questionnaire. Therefore, the questionnaire can give more reliable and accurate results.

A questionnaire was designed and tested. It contained five questions concerning where users would be most likely to look for fictional and nonfictional characters in fictional and nonfictional works.

The authors sent the questionnaires to the

heads of reference of 556 U.S and Canadian public and academic libraries that were likely to collect fictional materials and that are institutional members of the Library Information Technology Association (LITA) of the ALA. Since membership includes a subscription to *Information Technology and Libraries,* a major source of news and information about online public access catalogs, this would seem to be a viable assumption. The authors excluded business, corporate, law, or science libraries from this study on the assumption that such libraries do not serve users of fictional materials. Each head of reference was asked to give the questionnaire to a librarian who was likely to encounter users of fictional materials. The authors had a response rate of 85% of questionnaires returned, and 79% of questionnaires filled out and returned. Thirty-three percent of nonrespondents were in public libraries, and 62% were in academic libraries. These proportions are close to the proportions of respondents in both types of libraries; thus, there is no evidence of bias in the results due to a response failure of one type of institution. This impressive response rate is significant in its own right, in that it seems to indicate a strong concern on the part of reference librarians about the design of online public access catalogs and a willingness to be consulted. Table 2 provides data about respondents, their libraries, and catalogs.

FINDINGS

When users are looking for fictional characters, most reference librarians think they would choose name searches over subject searches, and subject searches over author searches (see tables 3 and 4). This means that the current tagging of fictional characters as subjects probably works better (i.e., is less confusing for users and elicits the correct choice on their part) in the majority of systems that call the index an "author index" than it does in the minority of systems that call the index a "name index." One might speculate, though, that in either type of system, the correct choice would not be self-evident to most users. Despite the fact that reference librarians thought the choice was less confusing when the index was called the author index, many of them chose to recommend the use of a name index (see table 5). Most reference librari-

Table 2. Characteristics of Respondents, Their Libraries, and Catalogs

Characteristic	%
No. of years as a reference librarian (N = 429)	
1–10	47
11–20	43
21 or more	10
Frequency with which users seeking fictional materials are encountered (N = 432)	
Once or more per day	30
1–4 times a week	27
Less than once a week	42
Proportion who think their patrons would find it useful to be able to search under fictional character names (N = 434)	
Not at all useful	5
Somewhat useful	42
Useful	27
Very useful	27
Types of library (N = 437)	
Academic	67
Public	30
Other	3
Size of libraries (N = 412)	
100,000 or fewer volumes	16
100,000 to 1 million volumes	62
More than 1 million volumes	22
Types of catalog (N = 438)	
Card	73
Microform	19
Online	55
Other (e.g., CD-ROM—3%)	9
Searches available on online catalog (N = 204)	
Author	93
Name	10
Subject	95
General search that does not require specifying search type	26
Search used for names as subjects (N = 202)	
Catalogs index as a subject in the subject index (e.g., works about Abraham Lincoln)	93
Index a name as a subject in the author/name index	7

Table 3. Where Reference Librarians Think Users Will Look When Choice Is between Subject Index and Name Index

	Sherlock Holmes as character (book) (%) (N = 433)	Bugs as character (nonbook) (%) (N = 434)	About Bugs (book) (%) (N = 434)	Lincoln in fic- tion (book) (%) (N = 435)	Lincoln in non- fiction (book) (%) (N = 434)
Users will look under subject	12	18	54	19	37
Users will look under name	88	88	46	81	63

Table 4. Where Reference Librarians Think Users Will Look When Choice Is between Subject Index and Author Index

	Sherlock Holmes as character (book) (%) (N = 431)	Bugs as character (nonbook) (%) (N = 434)	About Bugs (book) (%) (N = 438)	Lincoln in fic- tion (book) (%) ()N = 437)	Lincoln in non- fiction (book) (%) (N = 435)
Users will look under subject	83	96	97	92	93
Users will look under author	17	4	3	8	7

Table 5. Type of Index Recommended by Reference Librarians

	Sherlock Holmes as character (book) (%) (N = 433)	Bugs as character (nonbook) (%) (N = 431)	About Bugs (book) (%) (N = 432)	Lincoln in fic- tion (book) (%) (N = 432)	Lincoln in non- fiction (book) (%) (N = 436)
Author	2	0	1	1	1
Name	28	22	18	31	24
General	37	39	32	26	21
Works about	7	6	21	16	31
Fictional character	23	27	15	17	0
Subject	3	5	13	8	21
Other	1	1	1	2	0

ans think that the subject index is not a very good place for fictional characters and that the best solution would be a general index that does not require the specification of any index in the search (see table 5).

A number of people wrote passionate statements in the margins of their questionnaires about how difficult it is for users to deal with the categories created. For example, "people...do not know what author or subject mean, much less the differences between fiction and nonfiction or biography and autobiography." Several commented that a fictional character index would be more confusing than helpful to users. Reference librarians give different answers when the character is real rather than fictional (e.g., Lincoln). A name index was preferred for Lincoln in fic-

tional works (between 27% and 35% at a 95% confidence interval), and a "works about" index was preferred for nonfiction works about Lincoln (between 27% and 35% at a 95% confidence interval). Chi square tests revealed no significant association between the answers reported above and characteristics of the respondent, type of library, or type of catalog available.

Some caveats about the findings: those who think users will look for Sherlock Holmes under author (see table 4) may have been slightly inflated by those who misunderstood and thought the question asked how many would look under Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. One respondent felt that librarians would be more likely to check the subject index than users would.

It was apparent from some of the respondents' comments that not all online catalogs are public access catalogs. The authors should have specified for respondents to include CD-ROM catalogs as well; many of the questions about online catalog searches could have been asked equally well about CD-ROM

searching software. The general searches available may differ quite a bit from each other. Many checked the general search box when they had what they referred to as a "keyword" search. It is not clear, however, what might be indexed in a keyword search. Some keyword searches may search only titles

but not subject headings (where fictional characters would be found) or names. Also, some keyword searches may require specification of indexes (e.g., keyword subject search vs. keyword name search).

DISCUSSION

The authors' findings indicate that users are probably having difficulty choosing the correct index or type of search in systems that require such a choice. Currently, catalogers divide indexed terms in cataloging records into three broad categories generally referred to as titles, subjects, and authors. Online catalog designers create indexes based on these categories, usually requiring users to specify an index in a search. Unfortunately, there are types of headings that do not fall neatly into one of these broad groups. Fictitious characters are just one example of such headings. It is likely that a user looking for one of these types of entities (e.g., a fictitious character) will have difficulty deciding which type of index to pick.

It could be argued that the ideal solution to the problem of fictional characters (and other entities with proper names that fall into online catalog indexes in ways that are unpredictable to the hapless user) is to create a general index. This probably could and should be done in smaller catalogs. If, however, systems cannot afford the general index, which would be extraordinarily large, librarians must ask whether they need different categories for indexed terms, or whether terms currently indexed need to be put into different categories. In other words, they must ask whether change in the MARC format is required for a solution.

One solution that can always be considered is that of double indexing. For example, fictional characters could be indexed in both the name/author and the subject index. For this to be done, categories of terms that were candidates for double indexing would have to be separately tagged or labelled in some way. Otherwise, computer programs would have no way of distinguishing fictional character names, or other candidates for double indexing, from other purely topical subject headings that should not be double indexed.

Currently, library practice is to divide access point fields into three categories based on the MARC format: the 6XX fields, the 1XX/7XX fields, and the 8XX fields. The 8XX fields, designed for series, will not be discussed here. The 1XX, or main entry fields, while related to the 7XX fields, will not be be discussed either. The 6XX fields are titled "Subject added entry," and the 7XX fields are titled "Added entry." No statements are made explicitly about the principles behind the division into 6XX and 7XX fields, other than the general statement in the *USMARC Formats: Underlying Principles*[7] that the first character of the tag "identifies the function of the data within a traditional catalog record (such as main entry, added entry, subject entry)." One could roughly differentiate them as follows: 7XX fields are generally formulated based on the descriptive part of the cataloging record, including the physical description, while 6XX fields are based on a judgement of the cataloger as to what the work is about. As more and more indexable fields are added to the MARC format to accommodate various kinds of special materials, the distinction between 6XX and 7XX becomes more difficult to describe logically. For example, it can be hard to draw the distinction between the 655 and the 755 field. However, the original distinction between works about and works by is a valuable one to maintain, as it allows users to include or exclude one or the other category at will. Thus, a user who knows that he wants works by George Eliot, but not works about her, can narrow his search appropriately.

Under the 700 field, "Added entry—personal name," the following description is given: "This field contains personal names associated with the work which are not used as the main entry. This category includes (1) names of actual persons, capable of authorship, but not used as a main entry, e.g., editors, translators, etc., and (2) titles of works entered under personal author that are added entries." Thus, for deciding if a personal name belongs in the 700 field, the only real criterion the MARC format offers is whether or not the name is "capable of authorship."

It could be argued that one of the fictional characters in the study, Bugs Bunny, is a performing fictional character. *AACR2* recognizes most performers as authors. Thus Humphrey Bogart's name is placed in the 700 field for one of his movies. However, as noted above, Bugs Bunny goes into a topical subject heading 650 field. It seems conceivable that

some users, knowing that Bogart was in the name/author index, would expect to find Bugs Bunny there, too. Performing animals are also placed in 650 fields.[8] Thus, one unwritten rule seems to be that only human beings go into 700 fields; no animals are allowed.

The fact that performers are placed in 700 fields, and therefore placed in indexes called "author" indexes in most online public access catalogs, may be another source of confusion for the users. Would a user looking for Humphrey Bogart films realize that the author index should be chosen for his or her search? The authors suspect that most users would consider the term "author" to refer only to a person who writes a book and not necessarily to the artists, photographers, performers, etc., who are placed in 700 fields in current cataloging practice.

The word "name" may cause users problems as well. The authors work with an online public access catalog that calls its three indexes "name," "title," and "subject." One of the authors found users searching for journals in the name index because they were using the name of the journal in their search. Since uniform titles are indexed in the name index in the system, the user could have run across titles that would reinforce this practice and have failed to realize that he or she was missing journals that do not have uniform titles. The authors have already alluded above to the fact that many proper names will be in the subject index, not the name index.

No one would argue that fictional characters other than performing ones are capable of authorship and that is probably the basis on which fictitious characters are excluded from the 700 field. Some creatures of doubtful factuality are allowed into the 700 field when admitted into authorship, for example, spirits.[9]

Within the 6XX fields, a distinction is made between the 600 field ("Subject added entry—personal name") and the 650 field ("Subject added entry—topical heading"). The 600 field contains "Biblical characters except 'God,' the 'Devil,' angels and archangels, and gods such as 'Baal'; clans; families; and personal name subject headings with dates containing a phrase other than 'in fiction, drama, poetry, etc.'"[10]

The 650 field contains the Biblical characters excluded above, as well as many proper names, such as the Ellis Island example al-

luded to earlier in this article, fictional characters, and performing animals. One could argue that it has become a kind of "everything else" field.

Note that not only does the MARC format distinguish between the 7XX (descriptive cataloging) and 6XX (subject cataloging) fields, but it also distinguishes between X00 and X50 fields. X00 fields (600 and 700) are used only for real people (and their spirits). One question this research raises is whether or not it is important to exclude fictitious characters from X00 fields. If fictitious characters were placed in X00 fields, they could be indexed along with other personal names rather than with subjects. However, this solution would preclude double indexing as both name and subject and would fail to address the broader problem of the scattering of proper names between the two types of indexes.

The creation of a new tag in both the 6XX and the 7XX fields for proper names other than geographic, personal, or corporate would allow systems more freedom to index all proper names, including fictitious characters. Those systems that call the indexes "name" and "subject" could put all proper names in the name index. Systems might also opt to provide both a name index and an author index: the first to accommodate users who are searching for names that are neither author nor subject, such as fictional characters, and the second to accommodate users who know that they are searching for an author in the narrow sense of the word. Another solution might be to double index some proper names in both the name/author and subject indexes. It would be important to create both a 6XX and a 7XX field to allow users to distinguish between works about the proper name and works associated with the proper name in some other way (e.g., works featuring the proper name as a character in fiction). It might be useful to have a different tag for performers than for authors in the narrow sense of writers of books. This would allow systems to put performers into broader "name" indexes rather than narrow "author" indexes.

Even if general indexes are widely adopted, the suggested change above to the MARC format would allow the design of system features to permit those users who know the MARC format to limit searches and specify more precisely the name and/or subject of interest.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Joseph R. Matthews, *Public Access to Online Catalogs*, 2d ed. (New York: Neal-Schuman, 1985).
2. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, *USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data, Including Guidelines for Content Designation* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1988–   ).
3. James E. Ross, "Artists and Poets Online: Issues in Cataloging and Retrieval," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 7, no.3:91–104 (Spring 1987); Thomas R. Sanders, "Uniform Title as Author: A Problem in Online Catalogs?" *Library Resources & Technical Services* 31, no.3:231–38 (July/Sept. 1987); Simone Klugman, "Failures in Subject Retrieval," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 10, no.1/2:9–35 (1989); David M. Pilachowski and David Everett, "What's in a Name? Looking for People Online—Social Sciences," *Database* 8, no.3:47–65 (Aug. 1985).
4. *Guidelines on Subject Access to Individual Works of Fiction, Drama, Etc.* (Chicago: American Library Assn., 1990).
5. "Headings for Certain Entities," *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 43:2–11 (Winter 1989).
6. "Guidelines for Tagging Geographic Names," *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 47:60–61 (Winter 1990).
7. *USMARC Formats: Underlying Principles* (Chicago: Library and Information Technology Assn., 1989), rule 6.4.
8. Ben Tucker has pointed out to the authors that most performing animals' names are obscure and less well-known to the public than the names of the animal characters that they portray. For example, Lassie is the name of a fictitious character played by a number of different dogs with names of their own. These dogs are probably not widely known by their real names.
9. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2d ed., 1988 rev., (Ottawa: Canadian Library Assn.; Chicago: American Library Assn., 1988), 350, rule 21.26.
10. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, *USMARC Format for Bibliographic Data*.

APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRE

Does your library collect fiction, drama, films, or other materials with fictional characters?
_____ 1) Yes
_____ 2) No; if your answer is no, please do not continue with the questionnaire.
In answering the following questions, please make the following assumptions:
1. Access to individual works of fiction, drama, or other materials with fictional characters by means of fictional character names is widely available.
2. The library being used by the hypothetical user in the following questions does have the materials desired.
Please note: In the following questions, we have purposefully *not* defined terms such as 'name search' or 'author search.' We are interested in what users will *think* are retrievable in searches or indexes called by these names. In fact, definitions vary from system to system, and most users probably don't know our definitions.
Also please note: The pages of this questionnaire have questions on both sides!

1. A user would like to see what books featuring Sherlock Holmes as a principal character are available in the library.
   a) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a subject search vs. a name search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Sherlock Holmes?
   _____1) Subject search
   _____2) Name search
   b) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of subject search vs. an author search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Sherlock Holmes?
   _____1) Subject search
   _____2) Author search

   c) If a library patron looking for Sherlock Holmes stories were able to choose from the following categories, which do you think he or she would be most likely to choose? (Please choose just *one.*)
   _____1) Author search
   _____2) Name search
   _____3) General search which does not require specifying the type of search at all
   _____4) "Works about" search
   _____5) Fictional character search
   _____6) Subject search
   _____7) Other (please write in): _____
2. A user would like to see what cartoons featuring Bugs Bunny as a principal character are available in the library.
   a) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a name search vs. subject search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Bugs Bunny?
   _____1) Name search
   _____2) Subject search
   b) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of an author search vs. a subject search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search on Bugs Bunny?
   _____1) Author search
   _____2) Subject search
   c) If a library patron looking for Bugs Bunny cartoons were able to choose from the following categories, which do you think he or she would be most likely to choose? (Please choose just *one.*)
   _____1) Author search
   _____2) Name search
   _____3) General search which does not require specifying the type of search at all
   _____4) "Works about" search
   _____5) Fictional character search
   _____6) Subject search
   _____7) Other (please write in): _____
3. A user would like to see what books that discuss Bugs Bunny, give his history, etc., are available in the library.
   a) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a subject search vs. name search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Bugs Bunny?
   _____1) Subject search
   _____2) Name search
   b) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a subject search vs. an author search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Bugs Bunny?
   _____1) Subject search
   _____2) Author search
   c) If a library patron looking for books about Bugs Bunny were able to choose from the following categories, which do you think he or she would be most likely to choose? (Please choose just *one.*)
   _____1) Author search
   _____2) Name search
   _____3) General search which does not require specifying the type of search at all
   _____4) "Works about" search
   _____5) Fictional character search
   _____6) Subject search
   _____7) Other (please write in): _____
4. A user would like to see what works of fiction that feature Abraham Lincoln as a character are available in the library.
   a) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a name search vs. subject search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Abraham Lincoln?
   _____1) Name search
   _____2) Subject search

b) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of an author search vs. a subject search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Abraham Lincoln?
_____1) Author search
_____2) Subject search

c) If a library patron looking for books with Abraham Lincoln as a character were able to choose from the following categories, which do you think he or she would be most likely to choose? (Please choose just *one*.)
_____1) Author search
_____2) Name search
_____3) General search which does not require specifying the type of search at all
_____4) "Works about" search
_____5) Fictional character search
_____6) Subject search
_____7) Other (please write in): _____

5. A user would like to see what biographies of Abraham Lincoln are available in the library.
a) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of a subject search vs. a name search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Abraham Lincoln?
_____1) Subject search
_____2) Name search

b) If an online public access catalog presented this user with the choice of an subject search vs. an author search, which do you think most users would choose *first* in order to search for Abraham Lincoln?
_____1) Subject search
_____2) Author search

c) If a library patron looking for a biography of Abraham Lincoln were able to choose from the following categories, which do you think he or she would be most likely to choose? (Please choose just *one*.)
_____1) Author search
_____2) Name search
_____3) General search which does not require specifying the type of search at all
_____4) "Works about" search
_____5) Fictional character search
_____6) Subject search
_____7) Other (please write in): _____

6. In what type of library do you work?
_____1) public   _____2) academic
_____3) other; please explain: _____

7. How useful would it be for the patrons you serve to be able to search for individual works of fiction, drama, or other materials with fictional characters, by means of fictional character names?
_____1) Not at all useful   _____2) Somewhat useful
_____1) Useful   _____2) Very useful

8. What type(s) of catalog(s) does your library have? (Choose all that apply)
_____1) card   _____2) microform   _____3) online
_____4) other (please specify) _____

9. How frequently do you encounter users who seek individual works of fiction, drama, or other materials with fictional characters (whether they ask for them by fictional character name or not)?
_____1) 1 or more times a day
_____2) 1–4 times per week
_____3) less than once a week

10. How many years have you been employed as a reference librarian? _____
11. How many volumes does your library contain? _____
12. How many titles does your library contain? _____
If your library has an online catalog, please answer the following question. If not, you are finished!

Thank you very much for your help in this research.
13. Please answer the following two questions about your online catalog:
13a. Which of the following sets of searches most nearly approximates those available on your online catalog? (*Please check all that apply*. Also, we are not interested in the various title searches which may be available on your system.)
_____1) A search called author search, or a close equivalent, such as "A" or "AU."
_____2) A search called name search, or a close equivalent, such as "NA."
_____3) A search called subject search, or a close equivalent, such as "S" or "SU."
_____4) A general search that does require specifying the type of search at all (regardless of what it is called)
_____5) Other (please describe): _____

13b. Which of the following searches would have to be used to find a name as a subject in your system, for example, a book about Abraham Lincoln? (Check as many as apply.)
_____1) Name search
_____2) Author search
_____3) Subject search
_____4) Not applicable (system does not require choice of a type of search).
_____5) Other (please explain): _____

Thank you very much for your help in this research.