Title
Integration of Nonbook Materials in AACR2

Journal
Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, 3

Author
Yee, Martha M

Publication Date
1983

Peer reviewed

Integration of Nonbook Materials in AACR2

Martha M. Yee

ABSTRACT. The method of integrating rules for nonbook materials with those for print materials in AACR2 is examined to see how well nonbook materials are handled and whether the treatment of print materials is affected. Both choice of entry rules and rules for description are examined to see whether their provisions are in accordance with the needs of users of these materials, and/or the patterns of publication and identification of these materials. Areas needing further research are identified.

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR took as two of its guidelines in 1974 "commitment to the principle of standardization in the bibliographic description of all types of materials" and "determination of the treatment of nonbook materials primarily from a consideration of the published cataloguing rules of the Canadian Library Association, the Library Association, and the Association for Educational Communications and Technology; and of the ALA revision of chapter 12 of the 1967 text."[1] The method employed in the published code for the treatment of nonbook materials is: 1) the provision of separate chapters of rules of description for different media, all designed to create descriptions with the same elements in the same order in accordance with the ISBD(G) structure, and 2) the provision of a set of general rules for "headings, uniform titles and references," including rules for "choice of access points," which "apply to all library materials."[2]

This paper proposes to examine this method of integrating the rules for nonbook materials with the rules for print materials with two basic questions in view: 1) How well are the conditions that arise among nonbook materials dealt with by a code which takes this approach? 2) How has this method of integration affected the code as a whole and its treatment of print materials? In the process, a number of suggestions will be made for further research to help us answer these questions.

Contrary to the order dictated by AACR2, questions of entry will be considered before questions of description, since in discussing the latter, it will be necessary to refer back to questions raised in the discussion of the former. In considering entry, the discussion will be limited to choice of entry. Nonbook materials raise many interesting questions about form

Ms. Yee is Assistant Head of the Cataloging Department, Biomedical Library, University of California Los Angeles.

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vol. 3(4), Summer 1983

of name and form of uniform titles, but they must be left outside the scope of this paper to keep it within manageable limits.

Since AACR2 does not clearly state the basic principles from which its rules are derived, the extrapolation of principles from the rules as written will be attempted in the following discussion, following the example set by several previous writers (Richmond and Simonton).[3,4] By principles are meant fundamental rules which are particularized by the specific rules in a code, and which can be referred to when the more specific rules fail to address a particular case.

AACR2 has rules to deal with the following types of materials:

1. books, pamphlets and printed sheets
2. cartographic materials
3. manuscripts
4. music
5. sound recordings
6. motion pictures and videorecordings
7. graphic materials
8. machine readable data files
9. 3-dimensional artefacts and realia
10. microforms
11. serials

This paper will consider mainly the non-textual materials, or the materials not created using the written word predominantly, that is, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9, although microforms in their capacity as reproductions will be discussed briefly. A person with expert knowledge of all these materials would be rare indeed, and the writer cannot claim to be such a person. I have had more experience with some than with others. I will attempt to raise issues pertinent to all or many of these materials in the hopes that those with more expertise than I in any particular area will be inspired to enlighten us all with more detailed discussions of these issues as they apply to their particular materials.

In the general introduction to AACR2, it is stated that the rules "are not specifically intended for specialist and archival libraries, but it is recommended that such libraries use the rules as the basis of their cataloguing and augment their provisions as necessary."[5] The recommendation is, in effect, that such libraries use AACR2 rules for description and access, and make more notes and added entries if necessary, or specify in a more detailed way what should be put in various areas of the description. This paper will be examining the elements and order of the elements called for in the description by AACR2, and the rules for choice of entry. Although choice of a main entry is now optional, adoption of the complete code as written would require a specialist or archival library to use the rules examined here, so it has been felt justifiable occasionally to use examples which might be more commonly found in these special libraries than in the general libraries primarily served by AACR2. It is wise to bear in mind, too, that generalizations about what might be collected by a general library are difficult to make. For example, now that many theatrical films are available on videocassette, these may be showing up in the catalogs of general libraries with greater frequency.

I. TREATMENT OF NONBOOK MATERIALS BY AACR2: CHOICE OF ENTRY

In this section an attempt will be made to extract principles from the rules for choice of entry in AACR2 and to examine their value for producing rules for organizing records describing nonbook materials.

A. Authorship

Even though the authorship principle (in the field of cataloging) has been weakened in AACR2 by the death of corporate authorship, it can be seen by looking at the organization of Chapter 21 that the approach to choice of entry for nonbook materials in AACR2 is based on the assumption that the analysis of conditions of authorship in determining the entry for a work will provide an equally effective means of catalog organization for nonbook materials as for monographs. This hypothesis has not, to my knowledge, been tested by research. One of the major buttresses of the principle of authorship is the fact well-known to librarians through experience, and proven in numerous user studies (e.g., Lipetz, Maltby, and Tagliacozzo)[6,7,8] that users look for monographic works most frequently under author. Since in the unit entry card catalog which still predominates in the Anglo-American library world the user finds a complete record at the added entry for an edition of a work, it is particularly important to place the most complete information about the work (holdings cards, added entries for related works or for editions with different titles or main entries, etc.) where the user is most likely to look—at the author main entry; the user may well not look any further once he finds an added entry which is a full record. It is important to realize, by the way, that extant machine systems, which do not as yet provide any other form of linkage for work units other than the fortuitousness of key word searching, still must use main entry to produce consistent display of work units.

Whether users seek nonbook materials most frequently under authors is a question which has not yet been addressed by user studies. Certainly

it can be seen by looking at reference tools devoted exclusively to various kinds of nonbook materials that there are other traditions of entry. For example, I know of no film reference tools (other than catalogs based on AACR revised Chapter 12) which provide primary access under anything other than title.

I hope it is clear that in the foregoing I am raising questions about the value of the principle of authorship in the entry of nonbook materials, but not about the value of displaying the work unit to the user, which I take to be the function of the main entry heading in the Anglo-American cataloging tradition; nor am I questioning the value of gathering together the works of authors who work in nonprint media.

While we are considering the principle of authorship as applied to nonbook materials, it is worth examining the kinds of authorship often found in these materials, and how these conditions have been analyzed and handled by AACR2.

The non-textual materials covered in this paper (see above) have strong visual and aural components which are frequently non-verbal. Their creation usually involves carrying out multiple functions, and these functions may be carried out by different people and corporate bodies. Thus, the making of a map may involve the gathering of data by one person or group of persons and the encapsulation of the data in map form by another or others; one person or group may be responsible for the geographic aspect of a map, and another for the subject aspect. The making of a slide set may involve the taking of photographs, the compiling of appropriate pictures, the writing of an accompanying text, the writing or performing of accompanying music, etc. Visual materials can involve the maker of a picture, and the subject of a picture, which may itself be the intellectual or artistic work of another or others. Films, for example, are the products of the art of photography, and can be used to display all the other arts, including dance, music, drama, sculpture, etc., or they can display a person presenting his or her intellectual work in any subject area. Sound recordings, motion pictures and videorecordings frequently display the performance by one person or persons of the work of another or others. Traditional cataloging codes dealt predominantly with the monograph, originally a text written by a single person, and still usually a text created by the exercise of a single function, that of writing. Thus traditionally authorship has consisted to a large degree of the creation of or the taking of responsibility for that single function. When one considers the number of functions that are performed in creating nonbook materials, it can be seen that it is no easy matter to integrate rules to deal with these complex forms of authorship into a code originally designed to deal with authorship of monographs.

AACR2 recognizes three kinds of works of multiple authorship: 1) works of shared responsibility, 2) collections and works produced under

editorial direction, and 3) works of mixed responsibility. As should be apparent from the characterization of nonbook materials above, logically most nonbook materials belong in the third category. However, the specific rules in the third category have not been expanded sufficiently to deal with all the conditions of mixed authorship which can arise now that nonbook materials are to be entered according to these rules. For example, an animated abstract film with the animation by one person and the accompanying music performed and composed by another (specifically for the film) is clearly a work of mixed responsibility, but there is no rule to deal with it.

Although it is not so stated in the statement of scope for works of mixed responsibility, all the specific rules deal only with works produced by the carrying out of two functions (e.g., writing and translating, writing and illustrating, composing and performing, etc.) Apparently if more than two functions are involved (or if only two functions are involved, but there is no rule to cover it in the third category?), it is to be treated as a work of shared responsibility. When the rule for shared responsibility is applied, it is not clear whether only functions having authorial status according to the 21.1A1 definition are to be counted in determining number of authors, or whether all functions credited in the work, including very subsidiary ones, are to be counted.

There are two kinds of authorship recognized in AACR2 which are frequently exercised in the creation of nonbook materials and cause many problems in the application of the principle of authorship to these materials. These are photography and performance.

Photography was recognized as a kind of authorship in AACR1 as well, but when applied to all nonbook materials with their strong visual components, problems associated with photographic authorship are magnified. The basic problem can be illustrated by contrasting 21.1A1, "Photographers are the authors of the works they create," 21.16B, "Enter a reproduction of an art work (e.g., a photograph. . .) under the heading for the original work." When does photography reproduce the work of another author or authors, and when does it produce an original work? Is it not possible to have a photographic work which both exhibits the work of the photographer and the work of another which is the subject of the photographic work? (This question has been dealt with extensively by Sara Shatford.)[9]

Performance is new to AACR2 as a function of authorship. It is not completely clear in 21.1A1 what the "certain cases" are in which "performers are the authors of sound recordings, films and videorecordings." Presumably a performer is only an author of a work as a whole when either 1) his "responsibility goes beyond that of mere performance, execution, etc." (to quote 21.1B2e), as in the *Indispensable Earl Hines* example in rule 21.4A, or 2) when he performs a collection

of works by different persons (21.23C). Thus, the work units under a performer-author's name will be complete only if he is an author in the first sense, that is, when he performs and improvises. Apparently improvisation here is considered to be a substantial enough change to the nature and content of the original work that it becomes a new work. One might ask, though, is not the true authorship function here improvisation rather than performance? Performance is essentially a condition of mixed authorship—the performer performs something created by someone else; if he created it himself, he is an author by virtue of that alone.

AACR2 does not provide us with an example of a film or videorecording which has a performer as its author. Presumably performance would have to go beyond mere performance here as well, but how far beyond? If a performer in a film ad libs his lines, would he qualify for main entry? What of the photographer(s) who created the film footage? Or is this a way of dealing with cases in which a film or videorecording serves mainly as a recording medium and the intellectual or artistic content of the work is the responsibility of the person displaying intellectual or artistic work before the camera? (An example would be a videorecording of a lecturer in which the videorecording apparatus has been set up on a table and left to run throughout the lecture, with no camera movement or editing to introduce other intellectual or artistic functions into the creation of the work.)

All of these questions arise because the condition of mixed authorship inherent in audiovisual materials has not yet been adequately analyzed in AACR2 to provide rules to deal with the variety of permutations of various authorship functions to be found in these materials. Whether it is even possible to do this is another question, but if we are determined to base choice of entry of nonbook materials on conditions of authorship, we must face up to the problem.

It can be seen that the manner in which nonbook materials are treated in AACR2 necessitates a careful re-examination of our definition of authorship as well. What kinds of functions can, if carried out, create a work, and what kinds of functions are necessarily subsidiary ones? Is it not the case that the same function can be primary in one work and subsidiary in another? Is there any way to devise criteria to allow catalogers to make such judgments? Is it worth doing the work necessary to analyze these conditions of authorship for materials for which primary entry based on authorship may not correspond to the way users approach these works? Is it possible to analyze these conditions to produce author entries which are consistent and predictable, so that users can learn to look where we have put the primary entry or work unit? Is there any hope for assembling complete work units for all the works of an author under that author's name, if the author works in a nonbook medium where mixed authorship is so prevalent?

B. The Work

Although the application of the principle of choice of a main entry heading in order to display the work unit to the user is now optional in AACR2, when the option is exercised by the use of Chapter 21 rules for choice of entry, another unspoken principle can be deduced from the rules in AACR2, that is, that works transcend medium. Another way of saying this would be that a film or a map, for example, can be an edition of a work which originally manifested itself in another physical medium. Has this principle ever been carefully examined? Certainly in entering a sound recording of Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony* under Beethoven and the uniform title for the *Fifth Symphony*, we are asserting that the sound recording is an edition of Beethoven's original score, and this is a fairly traditional way of treating such a recording. Is a film of the New York Philharmonic playing Beethoven's *Fifth* also an edition of Beethoven's score? Is a film of a performance of Shakespeare's *MacBeth* (with text unadapted) an edition of MacBeth? If we answer yes, how can we assert in the definition of personal authorship in AACR2 that "photographers are the authors of the works they create?" A film is, after all, essentially a moving photograph. Is a performance of Beethoven's *Fifth* really the same work as the musical score for the symphony? Does the name Beethoven and the uniform title for the *Fifth Symphony* really completely represent and identify the sound recording work? Do we need to start thinking of ways to deal with works within works, works depicted within works, or works represented in works?

Can a map be an edition of a work which was originally not a map? Can a piece of music or sculpture, or a plastic heart? Certainly many nonbook materials are related to monographic works, but we need to do more research to discover how often they are editions of, rather than adaptations of, monographic works. If we discover that adaptation is the overwhelmingly predominant condition for a particular material, or that works in a particular medium are never editions of works in another medium, might this not provide at least a partial justification for devising separate rules for choice of entry for that particular material? Of course, such research could not be done until we came up with some workable definition of work and edition (and perhaps version?) which would apply to all materials. An adequate definition of authorship would also be necessary, one which would answer such questions as whether photography or performance are more akin to translation or to adaptation, for example.

The last question, of course, concentrates on the problem of building work units. It could equally well be argued that even if adaptation is predominant for a particular medium, the works of an author should be identified and cited using his or her name, and displayed together under

his or her name, no matter what the medium of the works. However, if the rules for entry of monographs do not work to collocate the works of an author in another medium, this would provide another argument for separate rules. For example, a film of Hans Selye speaking on stress would most likely be entered under title according to AACR2, while his monographic works are entered under him. In this case, it could be argued that an integrated code works against an integrated catalog. (I am indebted to Elizabeth Baughman for helping me to identify the arguments in this paragraph.)

AACR2 asserts, in 21.23C, that a collection of musical works by different composers is the work of the performer, yet a collection of works by the same composer is the work of the composer. What kind of a definition of work would cover the concept of work underlying these rules?

With maps, we have the problem of a previously published map being republished as a base map with a new thematic overlay. Is this an adaptation?

In AACR2, a reproduction of an art work is treated sometimes as a new work, e.g., a lithograph of a painting, and sometimes as an edition of the original, e.g., a photograph of a painting. I have dealt with the problem of photography as authorship above, but obviously the issue also has to do with the question what is a work and what is an edition of a work.

In works of mixed authorship, since different functions can be performed by different people, it is sometimes possible for the work of one person to be extracted from the work as a whole and published separately. This is very common with films. For example, the screenplay of a film may be published as a monograph, or the sound track of a film may be published as a sound recording. Thus, the sound track of *Manhattan*, all music by George Gershwin, becomes in AACR2 a work by Gershwin entitled *Manhattan*. In a way, this is not a new problem. For example, we have a specific rule, 21.11B, for illustrations published separately from the work illustrated, and, in truth, it is questionable whether a separate rule is needed, since rule 21.4A, the general rule for works of single personal authorship, would give the same result. Underlying this approach is the principle that when a conflict arises between the work principle and the authorship principle, the latter is predominant. Another way of putting this is that when a part of a work of mixed authorship, consisting of the work of the performer of one of the mixed functions is published separately, it becomes a new work.

C. Title Page Representation

The rules for entry of monographs of multiple and mixed authorship have relied heavily in the past on the criteria of title page representation, e.g., whether on the title page one author's name is the first of two or three, or whether one author is represented as principal author. AACR2, in applying these same rules to nonbook materials without changing the criteria for entry, is revealing another unspoken principle—that title page representation has the same power in the field of nonbook materials as it does for monographs.

The argument for using title page representation in the case of monographs is that, as Lubetzky says, "The most important characteristic of the book, for the purposes of cataloging, is that fact that it is provided with a prominent identification tag in the form of a title page. The cataloger can thus anticipate how a particular book will normally be cited and looked for and provide for it accordingly."[10] Thus, if a monograph title page reads "by X," it is likely it will be cited under X's name. The title frames on a film, slide set or videotape may sometimes read "by X," or, for example, "a film by X." However, this is haphazard; one film directed by Antonioni may read "a film by Michelangelo Antonioni," and another, just as indubitably an Antonioni film, will not. The title frames of *Public Enemy* read "by Kubic Glasman and John Wright [the screenwriters]; directed by William Wellman."

As Ronald Hagler points out, many nonbook materials have no title pages.[11] Responsibility may be variously attributed on the work itself, on its container, or in accompanying material, or there may be no attribution at all, as with many graphic materials. Maps are notorious for bearing the names of corporate bodies without indicating the nature of their responsibility, and with maps the whole map is the title page. Attribution of principal responsibility in a work of mixed authorship may take the form of attributing the major functions to one person, e.g., "Directed, produced, written and photographed by. . ." but accepting this as an attribution of principal responsibility requires judgment as to what the major functions are, and leads to problems with many borderline cases.

But besides all these problems, the fundamental question is whether the principle of title page representation works for nonbook materials the way it is felt to work for monographs. Does it influence citation? This brings us back to the need for research on the strength of the principle of authorship in the field of nonbook. Do users cite and seek these materials under author primarily, and, as a corollary, will they be more inclined to cite under an author to whom primary responsibility is attributed?

II. IMPACT ON THE CODE AND ITS TREATMENT OF PRINT MATERIALS: CHOICE OF ENTRY

Let us review the ways in which the rules for choice of entry have changed in AACR2 in response to the inclusion of nonbook materials in

the corpus of works to be entered according to these rules, and examine some of the ways these changes affect the structure and logic of the code as a whole. We have discussed above the inclusion of performance as a kind of authorship, and the way in which the inclusion of a function which is inherently a function of mixed authorship introduces a degree of inconsistency and lack of clarity in the definition of authorship in AACR2. The fact that this kind of authorship is limited to sound recordings, films and videorecordings in the definition is in conflict with the general statement a few pages earlier that "the rules in Part II apply to all library materials irrespective of the medium in which they are published."[12] In fact, the same point can be made about the inclusion of sound recordings, films and videorecordings (and recently, by revision, maps) as types in 21.1B2, and the inclusion of rules entitled "Art works," "Musical works," and "Sound recordings" in the rules for mixed responsibility. Isn't this a rather significant intrusion of rules for types of publications in a code which purports to be the second edition of the first code to base entry (of monographs only, of course) on the analysis of conditions of authorship rather than types of publication? If it is argued that sound recordings as a group exhibit unique conditions of authorship, why not rules for maps, films, etc., as exhibiting unique conditions of authorship?

The problems in applying the rules for multiple authorship to nonbook materials have been discussed above, but the fact that many works of mixed responsibility must be entered according to rules for shared responsibility is another example of impaired logic in the code due to the indigestibility of these materials. The division of the rules for mixed responsibility into rules for "works that are modifications of other works" and rules for "mixed responsibility in new works" indicates some work was done in this area to try to create more general rules to try to accommodate nonbook materials in a logical fashion, and art works, music and sound recordings are indeed included here. (This supposition on my part was verified recently by Michael Gorman in conversation.) However, only one general rule was written (21.9). There is no general rule for mixed responsibility in new works. It is interesting that rule 21.9 shows a shift in emphasis from the relative importance of different authorship functions in AACR1, to the degree of modification of a work. Could this be because of a reluctance to deal with the many functions of authorship carried out in the creation of nonbook materials, and the complexities and varieties of their combinations? What is the impact of this shift in emphasis on the entry of print materials?

One of the major changes in AACR2 is the fact that the choice of a main entry is now optional. This revolutionary change, if carried out, would have a monumental effect on both the organization of records for print materials in our catalogs, and on the organization of the materials

themselves on the shelves, and it is very likely that this change can be laid on the doorstep of nonbook materials. One of the source codes for nonbook materials cited in the Preface of AACR2 is the LANCET code developed in Great Britain, which called for title unit entry. This is, in effect, an option now in AACR2, in that it is now possible to elect not to choose main entries and still claim to be following an international standard. Title unit entry as a solution to the problems of mixed authorship would appear to be rather a case of throwing the baby out with the bath water, since it does not allow the choice of a standard citation for a work, necessary in present day systems to create work units. I have seen no evidence to prove that work units are not as functional for organizing records for works of mixed authorship as for the records for any other works. At any rate, this paper raises questions only about the utility of the principle of authorship as a basis for creating work units for some nonbook materials. It would be ironic if the attempt to apply to nonbook materials principles originally designed for the organization of monograph records were eventually to provide ammunition for those who advocate title unit entry for all materials, including monographs of single personal authorship, an approach which would atomize the catalog organization so carefully designed by monograph catalogers over the centuries.

III. TREATMENT OF NONBOOK MATERIALS BY AACR2: DESCRIPTION

The approach to description in AACR2 is to provide separate chapters of rules for the description of different "classes" or "types" of materials, in addition to a general chapter of rules which apply to all materials in the absence of specific rules in the particular chapters. The application of any chapter(s) will produce a description with the same elements of description in the same order. The only exception to this is the provision of an extra area for maps and serials.

The unspoken principle here is that (with the exception of maps and serials), the description of different kinds of materials does not require more or fewer elements of the description, or a different ordering of these elements than the description for books. In other words, the only necessary variation is in the rules for what to put in each of these areas. This principle will be examined further below.

A second principle has been made explicit, as follows: "It is a cardinal principle of the use of Part I that the description of a physical item should be based in the first instance on the chapter dealing with the class of materials to which that item belongs."[13] AACR2's cardinal principle addresses a problem introduced into cataloging with the advent of new

methods of exact reproduction by means of photography or sound reproduction with magnetic tape. Before the advent of these methods, a work was reissued by means of resetting type, a procedure which was likely to introduce variation in the text, or which provided an opportunity for revision of the text. Therefore, it was important to be able to identify and describe various editions because of the possibility for change in content. These new methods create exact copies of the original. Textual content remains the same, although visual and aural components may exhibit slight variation in terms of quality of reproduction. When reproduction involves change in the physical medium, as in the case of a microform of a book, a videorecording of a motion picture, an audiotape of a sound recording, etc., the cataloging problem is not that of indicating change in content, but of indicating that different equipment must be used to gain access to the content, and that the content may be acquired from different sources. This forces us to set priorities in terms of the objectives of descriptive cataloging. Is the primary objective to differentiate between editions which are likely to exhibit change in content and to identify (i.e., indicate that they are the same) physical manifestations which are copies of the same content? Or will we allow a change in distributor or physical medium to abscure the identity in content between two copies of the same edition? AACR2's cardinal principle follows the latter course. The act of copying becomes the act of publishing an edition of a work. A microform of the 1898 edition of a work is identified as a new 1981 edition of the work.

Another related question raised by AACR2's cardinal principle is that of the nature of the classification principle which lies behind this division into "classes of materials." Are serials a class of materials in the same sense that maps are? Is a map any less a map because it is issued as a slide? Are we not perhaps dealing here with types of materials, and certain conditions which can obtain with any type of material? AACR2 itself seems to recognize this to a degree when, elsewhere in the code, Chapters 2-10 are characterized as rules for "specific types of materials," while Chapters 11-13 (microforms, serials, analysis) are termed "rules of partial generality."[14] It is perhaps unfortunate that the codemakers did not follow along this line of reasoning a bit further. Is it possible that better results could be obtained if general rules were devised for the modification of various elements of the description of an item in any physical medium which was issued serially, required analysis, or was a reproduction?

Another unspoken principle in AACR2 is that title page transcription is as useful a principle of description for nonbook materials as for monographs. The assumption behind this principle for monographs is that different monograph editions will exhibit differences somewhere on the title page, from the title through the imprint, and that copies of the

same edition will have identical title pages. This, of course, is not always the case, and sometimes only the physical description will indicate that two books are actually different or identical editions. However, usually trade publishers will follow standards set over the centuries for identifying new editions somewhere on the title page. Many nonbook materials do not have true title pages. As Hagler puts it, "By beginning with the assumption that there must be some booklike bibliographic characteristics in every nonbook, we committed ourselves to creating title pages where none existed."[15] The question then arises whether such transcription of nonexistent title pages serves the original function of title page transcription, or perhaps some other function. Research on nonbook materials along the lines of that carried out at the Library of Congress in the 1940s for monographs is in order. For example, with films, how often are abridged or cut versions, versions with subtitles or revised editions of informational films identified through transcription of their title page equivalents? What elements of the description tend to provide clues indicating such changes have taken place?

We might also ask whether transcription of aural information may be necessary or useful for those nonbook materials which have audio components, e.g., sound recordings, films and videorecordings. Films and videorecordings fairly commonly display a name on the screen and give the relationship of the name to the work only aurally, e.g., the word "presents." Sometimes titles are given only aurally. Is it wise to transcribe such information without indicating that it was not printed out somewhere? Or are we to forego transcribing it?

Let us now look at the various elements of the description in AACR2 and examine how well these elements in this order are fitted for the description of nonbook materials. In addition, we will examine how well the rules for description in general are designed to handle conditions found among the nonbook materials.

The inclusion of films and videorecordings in the body of materials to be given ISBD-based descriptions according to the general rules in AACR2 has pointed up more clearly than ever before the way titles are obscured by the ISBD rule for transcription of integrally linked statements of responsibility as part of the title (rule 1.1B2 in AACR2). Statements such as the following are quite common on films:

Paramount presents
the four Marx Brothers in
Monkey Business

When the ISBD rule is applied to monographs, at least works are more frequently hidden within a smaller author file, subfiling under the author's forename or surname, for example, rather than under what most

people would consider to be the title proper. Since most films and videorecordings will probably still be entered under title in AACR2, the ISBD rule, when followed literally, would produce main entries which would probably never be consulted. The Library of Congress has found it necessary to issue a rule interpretation to prevent the occurrence of the most blatant cases,[16] but one of their examples in which the rule should continue to be applied, *Neil Simon's Seems like old times*, still is a most unsatisfactory main entry.

The rationale behind the ISBD rule has never been made explicit, but surely the desire was to create a rule which could be applied mechanically and uniformly. If it is necessary to produce interpretations to save the rule from producing ridiculous results, perhaps the time has come to reevaluate the rule itself, since with the interpretation, mechanical uniformity is no longer possible. To my knowledge, no one has yet done any research to determine the average amount of time it takes a cataloger to recognize the title of a work under the old rules versus the ISBD rule, the relative degree of uniformity produced by these rules, or the correspondence between ISBD-produced titles and titles cited and sought by users.

The statement of responsibility area has proven to be a problematic one for many nonbook materials. AACR2, in several cases, has taken the approach of listing functions, the performers of which should be listed in this area. However, the functions listed do not correspond in all cases to the kinds of authorship functions now recognized as qualifying for main entry. Thus films, videorecordings or sound recordings can be entered under performers who do not qualify for inclusion in statements of responsibility.

Many of the nonbook materials, as discussed earlier in this paper, are products of mixed responsibility in which many functions are performed. When monographs are described, statements of subsidiary authorship can serve to identify editions, and are thus transcribed even when not traced. With nonbook materials created by the performance of multiple functions, it is apparently not considered feasible to list even the names of all those who have carried out primary functions in some cases. Therefore, a different kind of judgment is required. Perhaps a better approach than listing functions would be to provide some statement of the purpose of this area of the description, to allow catalogers to use judgment in choosing names to place in it. Such a statement would be particularly helpful in dealing with the problem common with films, videorecordings and slide sets, of trying to determine whether the name of a corporate body belongs in the statement of responsibility area or the publication/distribution area. (This problem will be discussed further below). When we construct a statement of responsibility for nonbook materials, are we trying to list names which we wish to trace? Are we trying to identify and characterize a work by listing the names of those primarily responsible for it? What is the function of this area?

The provision of a publication/distribution area for nonbook materials creates many problems, perhaps stemming from the fact that many of these materials do not carry statements instantly recognizable as imprints, as most monographs do. These materials obviously are published and distributed, but frequently by companies which have a good deal of responsibility for the work as a whole. Films and videorecordings, for example, are, to my knowledge, rarely, if ever, published in multiple editions by different publisher-equivalents. A production company produces a work, not a new edition of a work previously produced by another company. If subsequent versions of the film appear, it is very rare for there to be any correlation between a version and a publisher equivalent.

In AACR2, a production company can be placed in either area 1 or area 4, or both. The distinction between the two areas becomes purely arbitrary, serves no discernible purpose for the user, and when two different catalogers make two different decisions, produce descriptions which can seem to distinguish films which are, in fact, copies of the same edition. This is particularly significant in on-line systems in which unintelligent computers are relied on to recognize duplicate records. The provision of a publication/distribution area, as distinct from the statement of responsibility, for films came in with ISBD, and is an example of the unspoken principle that the same elements of the description in the same order as in the description designed for monographs provides an adequate description of nonbook materials as well. As far as I know, no research was done prior to implementing ISBD(NBM) to determine the value of recording distribution information separately in the cataloging record for films and videorecordings. For example, how often does a film or videorecording have a distributor or publisher which is different from the production company?

All these problems force us to re-examine the purpose of area 4, as well. Is it still that of identifying editions (as was explicitly stated in codes prior to AACR2)? Does it function this way for various nonbook materials? Or are we now simply trying to indicate where someone can obtain a copy? The latter function may be a valid one for a national bibliography to carry out, but in a catalog it is rather ephemeral information which takes up space and quickly becomes unreliable. By the way, area 4 for a microfilm reproduction cataloged according to AACR2 rules also seems to have as its primary purpose the indication of where one can obtain a copy of the microform, rather than the identification of an edition of a work.

Several writers (Weintraub and Shinebourne)[17,18] have commented adversely on the fact that AACR2 fails to provide clear principles for

description or adequate definitions. Nonbook materials tend to be cataloged not by transcribing statements of responsibility and imprints from title pages, but by pulling out names from a number of areas in the item and its accompanying material and placing them into areas of the description. Thus, clear principles and definitions would be particularly helpful in helping catalogers to decide which names belong where, and in ensuring that such a description carries out its proper function.

IV. IMPACT ON THE CODE AND ITS TREATMENT OF PRINT MATERIALS: DESCRIPTION

In AACR2, we are directed to prepare a description of a physical item without reference to its nature as a particular manifestation of a particular work. Then, to this description, we are to add a main entry and added entries (or access points, as the case might be), based on its nature as a work.[19] We are not directed to complete area 7 of the description after we have determined entries, although if we don't, we can on occasion be left with entries, the reason for which is not apparent from the description. At any rate, the revelation in the description of relationships between the item and other editions of a work and other works becomes merely fortuitous unless the cataloger goes beyond what is called for by AACR2. This approach to description is the corollary to allowing title unit entry as an option in AACR2, and as such can be said to stem, at least partially, from the inclusion of nonbook rules, as stated earlier in the paper. As far as description goes, this is a subtle change, but it might be worth doing some research to discover how often the description of the physical item is in fact inadequate for revealing relationships and justifying access points, requiring contravention of the strictest application of AACR2. Is it wise to abandon the principle of identifying and distinguishing works and editions of works for that of describing a physical item, revealing no relationship to any other item other than that revealed fortuitously in the course of the description? Has the integration of rules for nonbook materials perhaps contributed to our unwillingness to look past the physical nature of these bulky, hard to store items, to their relationship to the other works and editions of works in our collections?

With the advent of ISBD description of monographs, the rules for choosing a "chief source of information" for various elements of the description have broadened considerably. This occurred before the development of ISBD's for nonbook materials, so cannot be entirely attributed to the advent of nonbook. However, as noted above, nonbook materials do not have title pages in the same way monographs do, and the approach to transcription with these materials has tended to allow

the picking and choosing of information to place in the description with much less regard to indicating in the description where it was found (i.e., less use of bracketing). Thus it could be argued that the integration of nonbook rules into the code at least encourages the continuation of this approach to monographs. To my knowledge, the expansion of the chief source of information for monographs was carried out without doing any research on the impact of such a change on the identification and distinguishing of monograph editions, and it might be well to do such research, if only to assess the results of our actions.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper we have been examining a particular approach to the integration of nonbook materials into our catalogs, that of AACR2. Michael Gorman describes this method as "a general application of truly general principles to all materials."[20] It is important to remember that this is not the only approach possible. There is no reason records drawn up according to different principles based on different conditions found among nonbook materials can't be interfiled among records for monographs. In fact, when we had separate rules for nonbook materials, records were interfiled. There is especially no reason why varying descriptive formats cannot be interfiled. Indeed, the format itself, if truly designed to identify and describe editions and works in the particular medium cataloged, could in itself serve as a kind of GMD, as the serials format used to be instantly recognizable before the advent of AACR2.

The main advantage to the AACR2 approach, if it could be carried out successfully, would be simplicity. One would have to learn only a few basic principles in order to find and be able to read descriptions of works and editions of works in all media. The creation of these records would also be simplified. A further economic benefit would be that computer programming and inputting costs could be kept down by the use of the same format and tagging conventions for all materials.

All of these advantages, however, depend on the discovery of those elusive "truly general principles" mentioned by Gorman. This paper has tried to demonstrate areas in which we still have work ahead of us to discover them. When making cataloging rules, it is important to remember that the ultimate purpose of the rules is to create a catalog organization which will serve as an intermediary between users with certain conventional expectations as to where the things they seek will be found, and objects which exhibit certain patterns of identification on their title-page equivalents. If research were to discover that users of particular kinds of nonbook materials tend to seek them differently, and that particular kinds of materials do not identify themselves in the same ways,

this would call into question whether it is possible to discover "truly general principles."

Surely now is the time to carry out such research before we go further in the attempt to unravel the various complex conditions of authorship and publication patterns found among nonbook materials. Such a research program could be a healthy process, helping us to rediscover why we do what we do, and how our rules are related to the needs of our users and the behavior of the materials we catalog. In the process, we may find ourselves better able to clarify and formulate the basic principles behind our rules, and we may discover ways of doing what we are trying to do better than ever before. Then perhaps, instead of cursing at nonbook materials and putting them back on the to-be-cataloged-later shelf, we will bless them for providing the impetus for a cataloging renaissance.

WORKS CITED

1. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2d ed. (Chicago: American Library Association, 1978), p. vii (hereafter cited as *AACR2*).
2. *Ibid.*, p. 277.
3. Phyllis A. Richmond, "AACR2: A Review Article," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 6, no. 1 (March 1980).
4. Wesley Simonton, "AACR2: Antecedents, Assumptions, Implementation," *Advances in Librarianship* 10 (1980).
5. *AACR2*, p. 1.
6. Ben-Ami Lipetz, *User Requirements in Identifying Desired Works in a Library* (New Haven: Yale University Library, 1970), p. 3.
7. A. Maltby, *U.K. Catalogue Use Survey* (London: the Library Association, 1973), p. 13.
8. Renata Tagliacozzo, Lawrence Rosenberg, and Manfred Kochen, "Access and Recognition: From Users' Data to Catalogue Entries," *Journal of Documentation* 26 (September 1970): 248.
9. Sara Shatford, "A Thousand Words Are Seldom Cost Effective: Thoughts on a Theoretical Basis for Providing Access to Pictures" (Specialization paper, University of California, Los Angeles, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1982).
10. Seymour Lubetzky, *Cataloging Rules and Principles* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress Processing Department, 1953), p. 41.
11. Ronald Hagler, "Nonbook Materials: Chapters 7 through 11," in *The Making of a Code: The Issues Underlying AACR2*, ed. Doris Hargrett Clack (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980), p. 73.
12. *AACR2*, p. 277.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
15. Hagler, p. 73.
16. *Cataloging Service Bulletin* 13 (Summer 1981): 15.
17. D. Kathryn Weintraub, "AACR 2: A Review Article," *Library Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (1979): 438.
18. J. A. Shinebourne, "A Critique of AACR," *Libri* 29, no. 3 (1979): 244.
19. *AACR2*, pp. 1 and 277.
20. Michael Gorman, "AACR2: Main Themes," in *The Making of a Code: The Issues Underlying AACR2*, ed. Doris Hargrett Clack (Chicago: American Library Association, 1980), p. 43.

The Principle of Uniform
in Descriptive Catal
Ideal and Realit

Lois M. Chan

ABSTRACT. The principle of uniform head headings in descriptive cataloging in the Ame ale and the evolution of the principle are exa discussed in terms of the history of cataloging in the principle of uniform heading has been cation in recent codes and considerably comp tice today.

INTRODUCTION

In the course of deliberations on, and plan tion of the second edition of the *Anglo-Am* (AACR2) in recent years, a central issue has catalog. The crux of the matter appears to ha Part II of AACR2 which relate to headings a cally those rules predicated on the principle c quire the listing of all the works by a given heading.[1]

In implementing a new or revised cataloging question of how to maintain the integrity of established according to the new code are other words, how to reconcile the conflict of author listed under different headings resultin codes. In the implementation of each of the Congress established a policy to cope with *American Cataloging Rules* (1967), the pol instituted. For AACR2, the solution was to rely on a "new" catalog while striving to ma ings within each catalog. Both of these devi to avoid conflicting headings, i.e., differen thor in the same catalog.

Dr. Chan is a professor at the College of Library Scienc

Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, Vo