

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Manifestations and Near-Equivalents of Moving Image Works: a Research Project.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/95x1t10f>

Journal

Library Resources & Technical Services, 38

Author

Yee, Martha M

Publication Date

1994

Peer reviewed

Manifestations and Near-Equivalents of Moving Image Works: A Research Project

Martha M. Yee

The frequency of occurrence of moving image versions, here called manifestations, on the types of differences that can occur from one moving image manifestation to another, and on the kinds of visible indicators, accessible to catalogers, that are associated with these differences was measured. It was found that continuity, i.e., intellectual and artistic content, varies frequently, 39% of the time; an additional 7% of works have added subsidiary matter, and an additional 12% of works have differences in language and sound track. In other words, a total of 58% of the works sampled had at least one instance of difference in intellectual and artistic content between two items. Only 8% of the works in the sample were mentioned as having manifestations in standard reference sources such as Maltin. Visible indicators and physical format of films are very unreliable indicators of actual difference in intellectual and artistic content; 48% of the time, visible indicators vary with no underlying difference in continuity; 23% of the time, continuity varies with no difference in visible indicators. Length differences of three minutes or more are the most reliable indicators of actual difference in intellectual and artistic content. Of the titles with difference in continuity, 72% of these manifestations were detectable by means of length difference. This corresponds to previous findings for books, which indicate paging is the most reliable indicator of true differences in manifestation.

The research problem discussed here concerns motion picture versions or editions. The recent restoration of footage to and reissue of films such as *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962) and *Intolerance* (1916) have alerted the public to a situation that film scholars have known about for a long time—that films exist in different versions or editions (here called *manifestations*) just as books do. The research described here was designed to determine (1) how frequently moving image works exist in multiple manifestations, (2) what visible indicators such manifestations tend to

MARTHA M. YEE is Cataloging Supervisor, UCLA Film and Television Archive, Los Angeles, California. Much of the information in the article about motion picture preservation projects was imparted to the writer over the years by film archivist Michael Friend, whose contribution to her education in this matter is gratefully acknowledged. Based on portions of the author's dissertation (Yee 1993). Manuscript received November 30, 1993; accepted for publication February 24, 1994; revised April 11, 1994.

present to catalogers in archives and libraries to allow them to recognize differences between two manifestations and to enable them to describe these manifestations for users of their collections, and (3) how often the visible indicators are misleading.

Certain definitions are needed at the outset. A moving image work is any work that is composed of visual images that move; examples are motion pictures and video recordings. The term *manifestation* is used here instead of the more common term *version* in order to achieve greater precision in terminology. *Manifestation* means a version of a work with significant difference from another version of the same work; an example would be a restored version with footage that is not present in the versions that were commonly seen prior to the restoration. Until recently, the term *version* was always used with this meaning. However, in the last several years, some catalogers in the library community have begun to use the term *version* to refer to a copy of a particular manifestation of a work in another physical format, e.g. a microform copy of a particular edition of a textual work, which will here be called *near-equivalent*. *Item* is used here to mean a particular film or videorecording that is being examined to determine what work and what manifestation of that work are represented. *Physical format* refers to the actual material housing for a manifestation of a work.

The time is ripe for scholars in the film field to develop scholarly techniques similar to those practiced in the branch of literary scholarship known as textual criticism. By effective communication about extant manifestations, catalogers could help support the development of such techniques. Textual criticism deals with fashioning definitive editions of an author's work based on examination of physical evidence found in the actual published editions and issues in order to determine the author's original intent (Gaskell 1972, 336). Equivalent scholarly methods have not yet been developed for the relatively new film art form. However, restoration projects have already begun

that have defined the concept of original manifestation implicitly, as will be demonstrated in the following review of such projects. (See Slide [1992, 110] for a discussion of the difference between restoration and preservation.)

Some projects implicitly define original manifestation as the state the film was in at the time of original release. *Intolerance* (1916), *Way Down East* (1920), *Lost Horizon* (1937), *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962), and *A Star is Born* (1954) were restored to as close to the original release state as possible, including, in some cases, use of stills to represent missing scenes (Everson 1990, Gunning 1984, Haver 1983, Holt 1984, Rothman 1989, Stanbrook 1989). However, some critics, apparently following *auteur* theory, argue that restoration ought to attempt to discover the director's intent. The original release manifestation of *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962) was also the director's cut. However, the two don't always coincide so conveniently. Everson argues that the fact that Griffith later re-edited *Intolerance* (1916) is evidence that the original release manifestation did not correspond to the director's intent (Everson 1990); such an argument implies that Everson considers the director's final intent as the proper aim of restoration. The original release manifestation of *A Star is Born* (1954) was not necessarily exactly as Cukor would have liked it, either; it included the "Born in a Trunk" number, for example, which had been added prior to release but after Cukor had considered the film to be finished (Haver 1988, 190; Taylor 1985a, 34). *Blade Runner* presents an interesting case. In 1991, Warner Bros. rereleased, as "the original director's version," a print that was closer to Ridley Scott's original version than the original release. However, it was repudiated by Scott, who, in 1992, released the true director's cut, with a unicorn scene he had been forced to cut by his financial backers (Turan 1991, Turan 1992). Taylor seems to agree with Everson, considering the aim of restoration to be "restoration of a major filmmaker's final considered intention" (Taylor 1985a, 34). This is surely a problematic

position to defend, however, in a field in which corporate-created art is so prevalent. Schatz's argument that producers and studio executives were the authors of their films (Schatz 1988) could be used to construct an *auteur*-based argument for considering the original release manifestation to be the definitive manifestation. Louis B. Mayer put the same argument somewhat more entertainingly when he said, "When you have a good story, the right star and a smart producer, . . . then any director with a brain and two months' experience could shoot the blasted thing."

Other restoration projects seem to assume that the longest possible manifestation is desirable. *Napoleon* (1927) was originally released in three different manifestations: an abridged three-hour manifestation, a widely shown two-hour manifestation, and a full six-hour manifestation. Kevin Brownlow restored it to the longest original release manifestation (Abel 1982, Alexander 1989, Brownlow 1981, Everson 1981). Gance, like Griffith, created several later manifestations of *Napoleon* (1927). It would seem that if director's intent were to be the aim of future restoration projects, a method for discovering director's intent would have to be developed that dealt with changes in the director's intent.

Universal's restoration of *Frankenstein* (1931) seems to define *original manifestation* implicitly as the longest, as they restored a sequence that had been dropped prior to release, at Laemmle's orders; they were not aiming at director's cut, apparently, as they did not restore the sad ending preferred by Whale (Bilyeau 1986). The reconstruction of *The Physician of the Castle* (1908) also involved putting together the longest possible film from all available footage (Salt 1985). This can be dangerous, however; Enno Patalas, the German archivist, located almost twenty minutes of footage that did not exist in any known print of *New Babylon*, a Soviet film by Trauberg and Kosintsev. He created a restoration of the film that included this footage. When Patalas showed Trauberg his restoration in Moscow, Trauberg indicated that this was ma-

terial he had purposefully cut from the film prior to its release because he considered it inferior. He was quite annoyed that Patalas had replaced it.

Some seem to feel that the "best" manifestation ought to be chosen for restoration. *Lost Horizon* (1937) was three hours long pre-release, was released at 132 minutes, and then trimmed to 116 minutes for general release, then released again in 1942 at 108.5 minutes. Stanbrook argues that the film ought not to have been restored to the 132-minute original release manifestation, but to the 116-minute later release manifestation, because he feels it plays better, and Capra, the director, apparently agreed (Stanbrook 1989, 29; Capra 1972, 220-221).

Several film restorers have attempted to use logic and experience to restore original manifestations. Eileen Bowser uses logic to argue that a particular sequence of scenes is likely to be the original release sequence of *A Corner in Wheat* (1909) (Bowser 1976). *The Bargee's Tale* and *Queen Kelly* (1929) represent attempts to restore manifestations that were never created (Brownlow 1984, Koszarski 1985, Milne 1985, Taylor 1985b).

Preservation decision making is complicated when a film was simultaneously released in more than one manifestation, as in the case of *Napoleon* (1927) discussed above. *The Big Trail* (1930) was released in both a 70 millimeter manifestation and a 35 millimeter manifestation that had been shot simultaneously; the 70 millimeter manifestation used different takes from different cameras than the 35 millimeter manifestation. The Museum of Modern Art restored the 70 millimeter manifestation but took some sound from the 35 millimeter manifestation (Haver 1986). An implicit preference for the rarer, more expensive, more spectacular manifestation seems in evidence here.

It might well be that the most useful approach would be to restore and preserve all versions when more than one exists. Preservation of all versions would allow scholars and researchers to view all versions and make up their own minds about which is preferable. Preservation of

all versions would also mean, however, that scarce preservation dollars would pay for preserving even fewer titles.

This debate surrounding film restoration projects might indicate that the time is ripe to develop scholarly techniques analogous to those of textual criticism in the literary field. For this to occur, the following are among the issues that need scholarly discussion. What physical evidence is available to reveal the "printing" and distribution history of a film work? How reliable is it? What are the dangers of misinterpretation to be avoided? What types of documentary evidence, such as studio records and personal papers, are available? Where can they be found? How reliable are they? What are the dangers of misinterpretation of documentary evidence to be avoided? Is there such a thing as a "definitive manifestation" for film, or should the term *definitive* perhaps be applied to a set of manifestations, including original release manifestation and director's cut? For director's cuts, how should director's intent be determined? Should latest intent be preferred? Can the original release manifestation be considered to embody the studio's "intent"?

The development of cataloging methods that can communicate to scholars the existence of various manifestations of a work in the archives of the world, can help to further the development of scholarly approaches to film similar to those of textual criticism and descriptive bibliography for texts.

The research described here is also important because it demonstrates the frequency of unlabeled manifestations. Film creators are increasingly concerned about various manifestations of their films circulating without any indications on the title frames about the relationship of the manifestation to the film as originally released. In 1988, the National Film Preservation Act was passed, requiring that "no person shall knowingly distribute or exhibit to the public a materially altered version of a film included in the National Film Registry unless the version is labeled [as follows]: . . . This is a materially altered version of the film originally mar-

keted and distributed to the public. It has been altered without the participation of the principal director, screenwriter, and other creators of the original film" (United States 1988). Unfortunately, this law applies only to the twenty-five titles added to the National Film Registry each year, and the regulations were first rendered toothless by the Librarian of Congress (Wharton 1990) and then dropped altogether at the time of renewal of the law (Wharton and McBride 1992, AMIA 1992). Now, however, a new effort has been launched to create a law requiring labeling (Wharton 1992c, Bollek 1992). Such activities present evidence of a growing concern on the part of film creators and the public and suggest that labeling in the cataloging for all such manifestations of films held by archives would be useful to archive patrons. Unfortunately, the fact that the labeling requirements were opposed so vigorously by the industry indicates it will be a long battle to get adequate labeling on the films themselves (Harwood 1990, Wharton 1991, Wharton 1992a, Wharton 1992b, Wharton and McBride 1992). (Admittedly, archives themselves rarely adequately label their own reconstructed manifestations created in the process of preservation.)

The research can also help in determining how best in the cataloging rules to deal with manifestations. The fact that film works exist in different manifestations has been taken into account for the first time in film cataloging rules in *Archival Moving Image Materials: a Cataloging Manual*, or *AMIM*, compiled by Wendy White-Hensen and published by the Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division of the Library of Congress in 1984. *AMIM* prescribes creating a new catalog record for a "version with major changes," but calls for describing several "versions with minor changes" on the same record. However, the difference between "major" and "minor" change is never defined, and catalogers are given no guidance as to what indicators to look for to decide whether "major" or "minor" change has taken place between one item and another representing the same film

work. *The FIAF Cataloguing Rules for Film Archives*, published by the Federation Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF) follows *AMIM* in the treatment of "versions with major changes" and "versions with minor changes," and gives considerably more guidance to the cataloger than does *AMIM* (FIAF 1991). However, no research has yet been done on the types of difference that can occur from one film manifestation to another, and the kinds of indicators accessible to catalogers that are associated with these differences. Also, while it is known that films exist in different manifestations, it is not known how frequently they do, and thus the extent of the problem is not known. If it is very uncommon for films to exist in various manifestations, perhaps elaborate measures need not be taken to deal with the problem, or perhaps elaborate measures need to be taken only in these rare cases.

Multiple manifestations present particularly difficult problems for large databases that contain records from many different sources. There has been increasing concern at the OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. over the growing size of the database, and over the increasing number of cases in which multiple records have been input that probably represent the same manifestation of a given work. It is becoming increasingly difficult for interlibrary loan clerks to locate the manifestation requested by a library user, for acquisitions clerks to locate the correct manifestation to order, and for copy catalogers to locate the correct record to use to catalog a particular item. As a result of this concern, OCLC has recently rewritten its guidelines on when to input a new record, in an attempt to cut down on the number of records input that are near duplicates of records already in the database (Saylor 1988; OCLC 1993, 37-49). The growing output of videocassettes of films in the last twenty years has contributed to the problem. For example, there are seven records in the OCLC database for *Patton* (1970) as distributed on videocassette by CBS/Fox Video; the records differ only in their dates, 1970 to 1986.

The question arises, Are these seven videocassettes different from one another in any significant way that justifies maintaining seven separate records in OCLC's database?

The research presented here includes an investigation of the degree to which difference in physical format, such as that involved in the transfer from film to video, is associated with difference in the intellectual and artistic content of a moving image work, i.e., a difference in manifestation. The library world is currently wrestling with this question. The Multiple Versions Forum, sponsored by the Council on Library Resources and organized by the Library of Congress, was held in December 1989 and was charged with recommending a better solution to the problem of how to describe near-equivalents, or copies of a particular manifestation of a work in different physical formats—a better practice, that is, than the current one of making a new record for every difference in physical format (Multiple Versions Forum 1990). As can be imagined, the current practice is clogging the national databases with multiple records for items that contain the same intellectual and artistic content. The Forum recommended a solution, involving the use of the USMARC holdings format to make possible the description of both the original and the near-equivalents in one catalog record.

However, the Multiple Versions Forum referred back to the library field the decision as to how broadly to apply this technique. The library world decided to take a conservative approach at first, and the technique of recording near-equivalents in a holding format will be applied only to reproductions (American Library Association 1992). For example, when an institution makes a videorecording of a film for conservation purposes, this videorecording will now be considered a near-equivalent that can be described on the same catalog record as the original. However, the conservative approach still leaves many questions unaddressed: When the rights for videocassette distribution of a film are sold, does the mere

fact of distribution as a videocassette by a new distributor create a new manifestation of the film work, if the intellectual and artistic content of the film is not altered? (The definition of *edition* in the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2d ed. [1988, 617] [AACR2] says no, but in practice a new record is made.) Does difference in physical format tend to be associated with difference in intellectual and artistic content? It would be useful to determine how often videocassettes of feature films prepared for release to video stores and libraries are different manifestations from the original release manifestations. One would suppose that video releases are frequently original release versions. On the other hand, one could imagine that the transfer from 35 millimeter to 16 millimeter film gauge might be frequently associated with difference in manifestation, because 16 millimeter films were often made for broadcast on television, where editing to fit the television format was frequent.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research was designed to illuminate the nature of moving image manifestations, including their rate of occurrence and the clues available to catalogers that two items differ significantly enough to be considered different manifestations. The following specific research questions were posed:

1. How frequently do manifestations occur?
 - a. How frequently do items differ in continuity, i.e., actual intellectual and artistic content as revealed by shot-by-shot analysis?
 - b. How frequently do items differ in language?
 - c. How frequently do items differ in subsidiary matter?
 - d. How frequently do items differ in title and presentation of credits?
2. To what extent are visible indicators associated with actual differences in continuity? By visible indicators are meant:
 - a. Explicit manifestation indicators such as manifestation statements

(e.g., "restored version," etc.) or censorship or other approval body statements

- b. Title frame differences, such as: title; series; credits; graphics; distributor, distribution, or copyright date; copyright holder
- c. Physical format variation
- d. Length; length is a somewhat special case, because, to the degree length measurement is reliable, length is necessarily linked to actual difference in continuity
- e. Statements of subsidiary authorship (e.g., the name of the person who wrote the subtitles, the name of the person who created a restored version, etc.); these, too, are a special case, because they are necessarily linked to a difference in intellectual or artistic content

METHODOLOGY

A random sample was taken, consisting of 119 film works held by the UCLA Film and Television Archive. The main emphasis of that collection is American commercially released sound films. For each work in the sample, an attempt was made to locate a commercially available videocassette copy.

All items representing the same work were cataloged; that is, the title frames were transcribed and the length was measured. Available techniques for length measurement were crude and unreliable. A brief experiment revealed that a measured difference in length of two minutes or less could occur between two copies identical in continuity as often as it occurred between two copies with different continuity. Thus, difference in length was operationally defined as more than two minutes.

Next, a shot-by-shot analysis of each work was done, and each copy was compared with it, in order to determine actual differences in continuity, operationally defined as two more or more shots present on one item that were not present on the other. Differences in continuity were categorized as to whether they were due to editing of some kind (e.g., to create

television manifestations, airline manifestations, censored manifestations, etc.) or whether they appeared to be due to damage. Difference in continuity was counted as being due to damage when, in the judgment of the researcher, the loss of footage was arbitrary, e.g., in the middle of a scene, or at the beginning or end of a reel, where damage often occurs.

The results of the shot-by-shot analysis were then compared to the differences that occurred in the indicators collected at the time of cataloging, such as title frame differences and differences in physical format.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION OF THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR HOW TO INDICATE DIFFERENCES IN RECORD-STRUCTURING PRACTICE

MANIFESTATIONS WITH ACTUAL DIFFERENCE IN CONTINUITY AND TEXT: TRUE MANIFESTATIONS

One research question concerned the frequency with which true manifestations occur (the findings are detailed in table 1). It can be seen that the frequency of occurrence of various types of manifestation is high. Of the works sampled, 39% existed in different continuity manifestations. Yet only 8% of the works in the sample are mentioned as having multiple manifestations in standard reference works such as *Maltin* (1991).

It is not controversial to recommend that separate records be created for manifestations created by editing, e.g., for manifestations with different endings, or for manifestations that have been edited to shorten or to remove offensive material or to create restorations. Nor is it controversial to recommend that separate records be made for manifestations made with slightly different casts in different languages. The new FIAF rules (FIAF 1991) recommend making separate records for both these types of manifestation, and *AMIM* should probably be read to support this practice as well. AACR2 has recommended this practice all along.

In the survey sample, damage was the cause in 16% of the cases in which difference in continuity occurred. Damage is gen-

TABLE 1
FREQUENCY OF TYPES OF
MANIFESTATIONS (N = 119)

Manifestation	Frequency
Difference in continuity	.39 ± .09
Editing	.23 ± .08
Damage	.16 ± .07
Different subsidiary matter*	.07 [†] ± .05
Accompanying advertising	.06 ± .04
Entrance and exit music [‡]	.02 ± .03
Different language	.06 ± .04
Different text in subtitles	.03 [§] ± .03
Different soundtrack	.03 ± .03

*Added subsidiary matter was not counted as a change in continuity, but length measurements included subsidiary matter.

[†]Using Lehmann's test, a more accurate confidence interval for findings of .07 and .08 would be:

Lower Bound	Finding	Upper Bound
.028	.07	.123
.035	.08	.136

(This conversion table can be used for all findings reported below.)

[‡]Differences in entrance and exit music were not counted as changes in continuity, but entrance and exit music were included in measurement of length.

[§]Using Poisson's test for np or $n(1-p) < 10$, the upper bounds of the confidence intervals for findings of 0 to .06 would be as follows:

Finding	Upper Bound
.03	.075
.04	.087
.05	.097
.06	.105

(This conversion table can be used for all findings reported herein.)

erally holding-specific. However, once damage has occurred to a negative, all reproductions made from that negative will be damaged in the same way; thus, damage can come to be associated with a particular released manifestation, so it is necessary to be on the lookout for such

situations. The safest assumption to make, however, until one knows differently, is that the damage is holding-specific. It is certainly important to report the damage to the user. It makes no difference to the film scholar whether a scene is missing due to damage or due to editing; if it is missing from the print on which he bases his critical study, he may come to erroneous conclusions in either case. However, it seems safe to add a description of the damage to a holding-specific note, rather than creating a whole new catalog record to explain it. Archives collect nitrate film that is in a continuous process of disintegration, requiring gradual removal of bits of the film in order to save the remainder. The prospect of having to create a new record every time this is done to a known copy would be daunting and would serve little purpose for the user; a simple statement that such-and-such footage was removed due to nitrate deterioration would be much more concise.

Subsidiary Authorship and Manifestations with Material Appended

The FIAF rules do not require making a new record for dubbed or subtitled manifestations, for manifestations with new music tracks, for manifestations with prologues or epilogues, or for manifestations with commentary added by a film scholar. This is a mistake. From the user's point of view, these are significant differences. These works are not purely visual works—they are *audiovisual* works, and the text or music on the soundtrack is an integral part of the work. Screenwriter and music credits are of great interest to researchers. The manifestation with a prologue or epilogue, or a commentary by a particular person might well be sought out or preferred over other manifestations by a particular user. As far as cataloging technique goes, these are the types of difference in manifestation that affect more than one area of the description. For dubbed or subtitled manifestations, title and credits can be in different languages, and these need to be shown; the USMARC format coding needs to be changed; and the person who wrote the subtitles needs to be

credited. The composer of a new music track or the film scholar who wrote the commentary should probably be given an access point, or at least described prominently to allow the user a proper choice as to manifestation. In other words, these are all types of manifestation difference that (1) are of potential use to scholars and (2) potentially require multiple areas of the description to communicate them adequately.

Films that are issued with extensive appended material, such as interviews with filmmakers, outtakes, rehearsals, shot set-ups, auditions, story-boards, trailers from the original release of the film, etc., should be described on a new record so that the appended material can be clearly reported to users. Some appended material should probably be analyzed in its own right, either by means of added entries, or by means of full analytic catalog records. Films with closed captioning, accompanying trailers advertising other films than the work contained, or entrance or exit music are borderline cases. If it is desired to provide access under the trailers, a separate record would be best. If it is enough just to note these differences for users, a holding-specific note would be more concise and economical.

Length

Previous research has shown that extent, measured as paging, is a very reliable indicator of difference in manifestation in textual works. Thus length was looked at very carefully to see whether it was an equally reliable indicator for moving image works. As noted earlier, measurement of length is crude for some types of moving image materials, notably 35 millimeter film, and thus an operational definition of same length was used that considered two items to be the same length if they differed by two minutes or less. An underlying premise is that any item that differs by more than two minutes from another item does so because of a difference in continuity of some sort. It was found that 28% of works had at least one pair that differed in length, and 7% of works had at least one pair in which length was the only indicator of an actual difference in continuity. Note

that 39% of works (see table 1) had pairs that actually differed in continuity. The discrepancy between these two figures, 28% and 39%, indicates that not all differences in continuity are revealed by differences in length, because measurement is so crude. Thus, a difference in length should always be taken as significant, keeping in mind that apparently equal lengths (within two minutes) can conceal differences in continuity, because of the unreliability of the measurement devices. This finding about the significance of length was one of the more interesting results of the research, showing that for film, as for texts, extent is the most reliable visible indicator of actual difference in manifestation.

If length is the only difference between two items, it could be argued that the most economical approach would be to indicate the difference on one record. However, to be useful to the user, the cataloging should include a version note indicating the nature of the difference, e.g., that a particular sequence is missing, or that the work appears to have been censored; the best way to clearly link the

version note to all copies of that version under current practice is to make a separate record. Also, making a separate record is a clear signal to the user that there are significant differences in the intellectual and artistic content.

DIFFERENCE IN IDENTIFICATION WITHOUT DIFFERENCE IN CONTINUITY OR TEXT: TITLE MANIFESTATIONS AND NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

Another research question concerned the extent to which visible indicators on the title frames, either explicit manifestation indicators, or other title frame differences, were associated with actual difference in continuity. Research findings concerning visual indicators are summarized in table 2A.

It is clear that visible indicators are not reliably associated with difference in continuity. Twenty-three percent of works examined had unlabeled manifestations. Forty-eight percent had near-equivalents with misleading visible indicators: there was no underlying change in continuity. Explicit manifestation indicators occur in-

TABLE 2A
RELIABILITY OF VISIBLE INDICATORS ON TITLE FRAMES: SUMMARY

Indicator	Frequency
All visible indicators, including both explicit manifestation indicators and title frame differences	
Difference in indicators with actual difference in continuity	.32 ± .08
Difference in indicators with no difference in continuity	.48 ± .09
No difference in indicators, but actual difference in continuity	.23 ± .08
Explicit manifestation indicators	
Difference in indicators with actual difference in continuity	.10 ± .05
Difference in indicators with no difference in continuity	.08 ± .05
No difference in indicators, but actual difference in continuity	.33 ± .08
Title frame differences*	
Difference in title frames with actual difference in continuity	.29 ± .08
Difference in title frames with no difference in continuity	.47 ± .09
No difference in title frames, but actual difference in continuity	.25 ± .08

*"Title frames" should be taken to mean *chief source*, as defined by AACR2, i.e., for publication and distribution information, the film or video itself, its case or can, and accompanying materials.

TABLE 2B

RELIABILITY OF VISIBLE INDICATORS ON TITLE FRAMES: SPECIFIC INDICATORS

Visible Indicator	A	B	C	D
Explicit manifestation indicators				
Statement of subsidiary authorship	.03 ± .03	0	.03 ± .03	0
Manifestation statement	.14 ± .06	.03 ± .03	.08 ± .05 [†]	0
Censorship or approval body statement	.03 ± .03	.01 ± .02	.02 ± .03	0
Title frame differences				
Different title [†]	.07 ± .05	.02 ± .03	.05 ± .04	0
Different series [‡]	.16 ± .07	.01 ± .02	.10 ± .05	.01 ± .02
Different credits	.25 ± .08	.05 ± .04	.15 ± .06	.01 ± .02
Different traced credits	.21 ± .07	.04 ± .04	.13 ± .06	.01 ± .02
Different order of credits	.04 ± .04	.01 ± .02	.03 ± .03	.01 ± .02
Different graphics	.08 ± .05	0	.05 ± .04	0
Different distributor [#]	.48 ± .09	.10 ± .05	.23 ± .08	.03 ± .03
Different distrib. or copyright date ^{**}	.36 ± .09	0	.21 ± .07	0
Different copyright holder	.24 ± .08	.02 ± .03	.12 ± .06	0
Different MPPDA or similar statement ^{††}	.06 ± .04	.01 ± .02	.02 ± .03	0

Key:

A = Visible indicator is present on only one member of a manifestation pair

B = Visible indicator is the only^{*} indicator that differs between the members of at least one manifestation pair

C = Visible indicator is associated with an actual difference in continuity

D = Visible indicator is the only indicator associated with an actual difference in continuity

*When the term "only" is used here, and in D, it means the only indicator besides a change in physical format, such as a change from 16 millimeter to video; title frames were examined separately from physical format.

[†]Two 35 millimeter items containing *God's Little Acre* had identical manifestation statements, but different continuities. This possibility had not been taken into account when the questionnaire was designed. The videodisc and the 1/2-inch VHS items containing *King Kong* had (a) the same footage, (b) different subsidiary matter, and (c) a manifestation statement on the one *without* the subsidiary matter; this was counted as a change in manifestation statement without change in continuity.

[‡]When one item was missing the title frame, this was counted as a "different" title. When two items had the same title, but one had a different variant title on the part title frames, this was counted as a different title, since it could affect access.

[§]Numbering unassociated with a series statement was ignored in determining if two items were identical copies.

^{||}*Different credits* includes the following differences between items:

- one item lists the same names, but there are different *forms* of name
- one item has end credits missing
- one item has one frame of credits missing
- one item lists the same names, but different functions are given, e.g., the same person is given an editing credit on one item and a screenwriting credit on the other
- two items differ in untraced credits, e.g., caterer, transportation coordinator, or dentist to the star

Different traced credits were counted both here and in the next category.

frequently, and are very unreliable when they do occur. Thirty-three percent of the time, difference in continuity occurs without accompanying explicit manifestation indicators. Eight percent of the time that manifestation indicators do occur, they are misleading in that there is no underlying difference in continuity. Title frame differences on the other hand, occur frequently, but 47% of the time they are not associated with actual difference in continuity, and 25% of the time that there is difference in continuity, there is no corresponding difference in title frames.

We learn from table 2B how often a specific type of visible indicator on the title frames occurs on only one member of a manifestation pair, how often it is the only indicator that differs between the members of a pair, how often it is associated with an actual difference in continuity, and how often it is the only visible indicator associated with actual difference in continuity. Title varies from one item to another only 7% of the time. Credits vary frequently, 25% of the time. Difference in series is frequent, 16%, but associated with actual difference in continuity only 10% of the time. Differences in graphics, copyright holder, and MPPDA statement are never the only difference associated with a difference in continuity. In general, these findings reveal that none of these visible indicators are reliable indicators of actual difference in continuity.

Some title frame indicators are so important in identification, i.e., in matching users' citations to catalog records, that differences in them should probably be recorded on separate records even when there is no underlying difference in continuity or text. Title differences and billing order differences are of this nature. Items

that differ in title or credits are referred to here as *title manifestations*.

Explicit manifestation statements on the films themselves were rare and unreliable. Explicit manifestation indicators were never the only indicator associated with difference in continuity. There was always another indicator as well. In only 8% of the cases were there manifestation statements associated with actual differences. In another 8% of the cases there were different manifestation indicators (including statements of subsidiary authorship, manifestation statements, and censorship or approval body statements) on the films, but no actual underlying difference in continuity. This would seem to indicate that manifestation statements should be viewed with suspicion by the cataloger, and that new records should be made only when the manifestation statement seems to correspond to actual difference in intellectual and artistic content.

There is little evidence in the literature of an interest on the part of film scholars in distributors after the original distributor. Distributor and distribution date were frequently different, in 48% and 36% of the cases respectively; but in only 3% of cases was the distributor difference the only indicator associated with a difference in continuity, and in no case was the date difference the only such indicator. These findings would seem to support the AACR2 approach of ignoring difference in distributor when deciding when to make a new record, if it is the only difference, and to support a change in practice so that difference in distribution date could be treated in the same way. Items that differ only in distributor or distribution date, unconnected to difference in intellectual and artistic content, are near-

[#]Collector's logos, such as the UCLA Film and Television Archive logo, were ignored in determining whether or not two items were identical copies.

^{**}When one item said "© 1958" and another said "© 1958, © 1963 renewed," this was counted as a different copyright date. However, when one item said "© 1958" and another said "© 1988, package design © 1989," this was not counted as a different copyright date.

^{††}Whether or not a rating frame (e.g., "This film has been rated R") was present was ignored in determining whether two items were identical copies. MPPDA stands for Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, which gave films certificates of approval based on the famous Hays Code, as part of Hollywood's attempt to censor itself to avoid censorship by society at large.

equivalents. If the USMARC holdings format were to be used to record such near-equivalents, as it is already being used for reproductions, distributors and distribution dates could simply be recorded as holdings-level information. If this one provision of AACR2 were to be put into practice, it could rid OCLC of an immense number of catalog records for essentially the same videocassette release of a motion picture.

Series differences occurred in 16% of the cases, but were associated with actual difference in continuity only 10% of the time. Series statements on shorts can be quite important in citation practice among film users. Many shorts are better known by their series titles than by their actual item titles. Everyone has heard of the Looney Tunes cartoons released by Warner Brothers, but how many people can think of a single cartoon title in the series? For film users, it would probably be best to provide access under series titles, either by making separate records, or by allowing indexable access points for series to be attached to holdings records in the USMARC holdings format.

Sometimes one can tell from the graphics on the title frames that the title frames are later replacements, no longer in the same graphic style as the original title frames on the original issue of the film. This occurred in 8% of the cases in the research, but this difference in graphics was never the only difference associated with a difference in continuity. Such a difference is probably of some interest to users; it would probably be adequate just to indicate a difference in graphics in a note, either copy-specific or otherwise, depending on whether it was connected with difference in intellectual or artistic content or not.

DIFFERENCE IN PHYSICAL FORMAT WITHOUT DIFFERENCE IN CONTINUITY OR TEXT: NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

A question that was looked at was whether difference in physical format tended to be associated with difference in continuity. Format differences are differences in medium, i.e., film vs. video, or differences in

TABLE 3A
ASSOCIATION OF CONTINUITY
DIFFERENCE WITH PHYSICAL FORMAT
VARIATION: SUMMARY

Continuity/Format Variation	Frequency
Physical variation with actual difference in continuity	.28 ± .08
Physical variation with no actual difference in continuity	.42 ± .09
No physical variation, but actual difference in continuity	.19 ± .07

color, sound, aspect ratio, or film gauge. Format varies frequently without any associated difference in continuity (42%) (table 3A). Conversely, 19% of the time, difference in continuity takes place without accompanying difference in physical format. Thus, these findings indicate physical format difference is an unreliable indicator of difference in continuity.

Details are shown in table 3B. Again, physical format difference is rarely the only indicator of a difference in continuity.

Physical format differences, e.g., monophonic track of a film originally stereophonic, panned-and-scanned manifestation of a film originally wide-screen, or black-and-white manifestation of a film originally color, are definitely of significance to users. These types of difference do not tend to be associated with subsidiary authorship; in other words, the person who did the panning and scanning is usually not given a credit. Thus, they can usually be readily communicated with a single phrase in the physical description area of the bibliographic record. This concisely communicates to the users a significant difference; at the same time, this method is economical, in that it allows one record to be used to describe more than one manifestation or near-equivalent without confusion to the user.

No colorized films were studied in the research reported here. However, colorization tends to be accompanied by subsidiary authorship credits for the colorizers. The same is probably true for "stereo-ized" films. In these cases, as in all cases where conditions of responsibility

TABLE 3B
ASSOCIATION OF CONTINUITY DIFFERENCE WITH PHYSICAL FORMAT VARIATION:
SPECIFIC INDICATORS

Physical Format Variation	A	B	C	D
Different color characteristics*	.09 ± .05	.01 ± .02	—	—
Difference in stereo/monophonic	.09 ± .05	.03 ± .03	—	—
Other physical format difference	.57 ± .09	.06 ± .04	.28 ± .08	.05 ± .04
16 millimeter	.37 ± .09	.03 ± .03	.21 ± .07	.03 ± .03
Video	.36 ± .09	.02 ± .03	.16 ± .07	.02 ± .03
Presentation format†	.11 ± .06	.01 ± .02	.05 ± .04	0

Key:

- A = Physical format variation is on only one member of a manifestation pair
- B = Physical format variation is the only indicator that differs between the members of at least one manifestation pair
- C = Physical format variation is associated with an actual difference in continuity
- D = Physical format variation is the only indicator associated with an actual difference in continuity

*This was coded as "yes" when one item was black and white and the other was color, but "no" when one item was Technicolor and the other was Eastman color.

†"Different presentation format" was taken to mean missing image due to change in presentation format. Thus, a wide-screen 16 millimeter print and a video that had been put into letterbox format in order to get all of the wide-screen image onto the video screen were counted as having the same presentation format.

change, it probably would be best to create separate records so that all differences between manifestations can be clearly recorded.

One might suspect that commercially released videocassettes would tend to be very close in continuity to the original release manifestations most of the time, other than for differences in wide-screen image that might occur between a manifestation on film and a manifestation on video. As a quick test of this supposition, those titles for which a commercially released videocassette had been found were looked at. Of 44 works for which commercially released videocassette copies were found, 39, or 80%, were released commercially in the original release manifestation.

Users are definitely interested in whether they are going to be viewing a videocassette or a motion picture, as the image quality varies considerably from one medium to the other. However, this difference can be concisely indicated in the physical description; normally no

other areas of the bibliographic record are needed to express it.

One complication, however, is the GMD, or general material designation, a brief physical description inserted in brackets after the title, e.g., [video recording]. The GMD is an option in AACR2, but an option that is followed by the Library of Congress, so a powerful one. Because archives frequently make video copies of motion pictures, and because the GMD [motion picture] would be confusing on our many 16 millimeter television prints, the GMD is not used in archives. It would seem that film and television study collections would have the same problem. The GMD has never been well liked by all members of the audiovisual community. Perhaps the tendency of GMDs to cause a proliferation of records for what are essentially copies of the same film might be another good reason for getting rid of the GMD.

As was mentioned above, it was frequently the case, 42% of the time, that there was a physical variation between

two items without there being any accompanying difference in continuity. In only 3% of the cases was a transfer to 16 millimeter format the only difference associated with an actual difference in continuity. In only 2% of the cases was a transfer from film to video format the only difference associated with an actual difference in continuity. This would seem to indicate format difference is rarely the only indicator of an actual difference in content, and therefore the OCLC practice of making a new record for every variation in physical format is not providing very good user service. Again, the use of the US-MARC holdings format to solve the problem of physical variants could reduce the number of records in OCLC.

RECOMMENDED TREATMENT

Based on these findings, the following treatment for moving image materials is recommended.

TRUE MANIFESTATIONS

If there is any difference in the intellectual or artistic content, a new record should be made. There are three ways that true manifestations with actual difference in intellectual and artistic content can be created: by editing to change the continuity or track; by appending new material; and by changes in sound track and subtitles and cast carried out by identifiable subsidiary authors. The following are examples of such difference:

Edited manifestations:

Difference in continuity (indicator: difference in length of more than two minutes; note that this would include items that differ in film speed due to time compression or expansion)

Revoicings on sound track

Different sound effects on soundtrack

Manifestations with material appended:

Addition of prologues, epilogues, or other subsidiary matter, such as storyboards, posters, trailers, etc., on a videodisc

Accompanying advertising, if it is desired to provide access under it

Subsidiary authorship:

Colorization

New music track

New narration

Commentary by particular critic or filmmaker on separate soundtrack

Translation:

New subtitles

Dubbing

Other difference in text:

New subtitles in the same language

New intertitles on silent film

Restorations completed by particular preservationists or scholars

Partial difference in cast, e.g., the Spanish versions of Laurel and Hardy films, or the future envisioned by Spielberg in which new actors can be substituted for old

TITLE MANIFESTATIONS

If there are significant differences in the title frames, a new record should be made, even if the films beneath the title frames are identical. It is recommended that a difference in title or a difference in the order or inclusion of the production or cast credits be considered such a significant difference, unless such a difference is due to holding-specific damage.

NEAR-EQUIVALENTS

Explicit manifestation statements (e.g., domestic version) and censorship board certificates should be viewed with suspicion by the cataloger. At least one film studied in this research was represented by two items with identical manifestation statements but different continuity. If a manifestation statement is accompanied by a difference in length of over two minutes, it should be assumed to be connected with an actual difference in manifestation until proven otherwise. Otherwise, the statement should just be quoted in a copy-specific note.

It is recommended that no new record

be made when the only things that vary between two items are:

The distributor

The date of distribution

The copyright statement

The series

Closed captioning

Accompanying advertising when no access is desired

Entrance or exit music

Title frame graphics

Note that this recommendation is very similar to one made by O'Neill and Visine-Goetz, who suggested that a better object for a single catalog record might be what they refer to as a *text*, which they define as "a set of editions with the same content" (O'Neill and Visine-Goetz 1989, 172-174). According to this concept, two items that differ only in publisher, date of publication, publisher's edition statement, paper, typography, binding and price, with no difference in intellectual content, could be described using the same record.

It is also recommended that the following physical variations be considered to create near-equivalents, which also could be described on the same record:

Videotransfer of motion picture film

Wide-screen vs. letterboxed vs. panned and scanned

3D vs. non-3D

Black-and-white vs. tinted

Color vs. black-and-white print

Stereophonic vs. monophonic vs.

Dolby

35 millimeter vs. 70 millimeter vs. 28 millimeter

Nitrate film vs. safety film

FURTHER RESEARCH NEEDED

It would be useful to repeat this research in different types of moving image collections, particularly film study collections that contain many commercially released videocassettes and videodiscs, to see whether the findings are different for these newer materials. It is hoped that similar research will be done for other types of non-book materials, such as sound recordings, maps, computer files, etc., to see whether they vary by type of material.

THE FUTURE

It is already apparent that a greater awareness of the value of labeling is permeating the film distributing world, at least when the fact that a film item contains a particular manifestation is seen as a selling point. Many currently released videocassettes and videodiscs contain well-labeled director's cuts or restored manifestations or manifestations with audio tracks by noted film scholars, etc. Caveat emptor is still the rule, however, as unlabeled short television manifestations do crop up on videocassette.

The advent of the digitized image opens up all kinds of intriguing possibilities for the future. If we could ever afford to digitize every copy of a film in existence (a big "if" in the current state of the art of digitization), we could envision computer programs that could number every frame of a film (paging for films at last!), and even flag variations in continuity for inspection by film scholars or catalogers.

SUMMARY

The major findings of the research reported above were as follows: Continuity, i.e., intellectual and artistic content, varies frequently in films. Visible indicators and physical format are very unreliable indicators of actual difference in intellectual and artistic content. Length differences of over two minutes are the most reliable indicators of actual difference in intellectual and artistic content.

The research findings are somewhat discouraging for catalogers, showing that the title frame indicators on which standard library cataloging is so dependent are woefully unreliable. However, on the bright side, extent is shown to be a relatively reliable indicator, just as it is for textual materials. Another positive aspect to these findings is that they could be used to support changes in cataloging practice that could lead to the creation of far fewer catalog records for the same work. This would save money for technical processing departments, hard-pressed to find resources to keep up with the flood of publications arriving every day. At the same

time, fewer records could be to the benefit of the users of large databases, who would not have to wade through so many records that represent essentially the same manifestations of a work.

For film scholars and archive preservation officers, the findings reported above should present a dire warning: when doing a critical study of a film or making decisions about which item to preserve, every available item should be viewed to make sure all the manifestations have been sorted out. Thirty-nine percent of the works sampled showed differences in continuity. Only 8% of the titles in the sample have been reported in the literature to have different manifestations. Eleven percent of the works sampled had continuity differences that were not accompanied by measurable differences in length. Archives do not have the resources to do shot-by-shot analyses on every copy of every work they collect, so inevitably archive catalogs will not necessarily report reliably on manifestations held.

WORKS CITED

- Abel, Richard. 1982. Charge and countercharge. *Film quarterly* 35, no. 3: 2-14.
- Alexander, Max. 1989. Napoleon campaigns in the battle for preservation. *New York times*, June 18.
- American Library Association. Association for Library Collections & Technical Services. Cataloging Committee: Description and Access. Task Force on Multiple Versions. 1992. *Guidelines for bibliographic description of reproductions*. May 17, 1992 draft prepared by the Task Force, and adopted for further review in June 1992.
- Anglo-American cataloguing rules. 1988. 2d ed. 1988 rev. Chicago: American Library Assn.
- Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA). 1992. Copyright Amendments Act of 1992. *AMIA newsletter* (Spring/Summer): 10-12.
- Bilyeau, N. 1986. Frankie's back. *American film* 11, no. 6: 10.
- Bollek, Brooks. 1992. Labeling debate heats up. *Hollywood reporter* 323, no. 49: 23.
- Bowser, Eileen. 1976. The reconstruction of a corner in wheat. *Cinema journal* 15, no. 2: 42-52.

- Brownlow, Kevin. 1981. Abel Gance's epic Napoleon returns from exile. *American film* 6, no. 4: 28-32, 68, 70-72.
- . 1984. The bargee's tale. *Sight and sound* 53, no. 3: 163, 196-97.
- Capra, Frank. 1972. *The name above the title*. New York: Bantam.
- Everson, William K. 1981. The many lives of Napoleon. *Film comment* 17, no. 1: 21-23.
- . 1990. Intolerance. *Films in review* (Jan.-Feb.): 1-20.
- Federation Internationale des Archives du Film (FIAF). 1991. *The FIAF cataloguing rules for film archives*, comp. and ed. Harriet W. Harrison for the FIAF Cataloguing Commission. Munich: Saur.
- Gaskell, Philip. 1972. *A new introduction to bibliography*. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr.
- Gunning, Tom. 1984. Rebirth of a movie. *American film* 10, no. 1: 18-19, 93.
- Harwood, Jim. 1990. Pic Preservation Board wants to shed labeling. *Daily variety* 229, no. 46: 1, 31.
- Haver, Ronald. 1983. A star is born again. *American film* 8, no. 9: 29-33, 59.
- . 1986. Trail blazing. *American film* 11, no. 7: 17-19.
- . 1988. *A star is born*. New York: Knopf.
- Holt, C. 1984. A star is reborn. *American cinematographer* 65, no. 2: 38-48.
- Koszarski, R. 1985. A film that almost got away. *American film* 10, no. 5: 15-16, 18.
- Library of Congress. Motion Picture, Broadcasting and Recorded Sound Division. 1984. *Archival moving image materials: A cataloging manual*. Comp. Wendy White-Hensen. Washington, D.C.: Cataloging Distribution Service, Library of Congress.
- Maltin, Leonard. 1991. *Leonard Maltin's TV movies and video guide*. 1992 ed. New York: Signet.
- Milne, T. 1985. Sparing no hint of verismo. *Sight and sound* 54, no. 4: 301-2.
- Multiple Versions Forum. 1990. *Multiple Versions Forum Report: Report from a meeting held December, 1989, Airlie, Virginia*. Washington, D.C.: Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress.
- OCLC. 1993. *Bibliographic formats and standards*. Dublin, Ohio: OCLC.
- O'Neill, Edward T., and Diane Visine-Goetz. 1989. Bibliographic relationships: Implications for the function of the catalog. In *Conceptual foundations of descriptive cataloging*, ed. Elaine Svenonius, 167-80. San Diego: Academic Press.

- Rothman, Cliff. 1989. The resurrection of Lawrence of Arabia. *Los Angeles times* Jan. 29, Calendar Section: 22-30.
- Salt, Barry. 1985. The physician of the castle. *Sight and sound* 54, no. 4: 284-85.
- Saylor, Louise V. 1988. Cataloging Advisory Committee. *PAC-news/OCLC* 30: 2.
- Schatz, Thomas. 1988. *The genius of the system*. New York: Pantheon.
- Slide, Anthony. 1992. *Nitrate won't wait*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland.
- Stanbrook, Alan. 1989. As it was in the beginning. *Sight and sound* 59, no. 1: 28-32.
- Taylor, J.R. 1985a. Putting the pieces together again. *Films and filming* 372: 32-34.
- . 1985b. Queen Kelly. *Films and filming* 372: 45.
- Turan, Kenneth. 1991. A prime cut. *Los Angeles times* Oct. 13, Calendar Section: 8, 28.
- . 1992. Blade Runner 2. *Los Angeles times magazine* Sept. 13: 18-24.
- United States. 1988. United States statutes,

- 102 STAT. 1784. Public law 100-446—Sept. 27, 1988, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, appropriations, fiscal year 1989, 2 USC 178c.
- Wharton, Dennis. 1990. Altered pic label rules lenient. *Variety* 228, no. 55: 1, 30.
- . 1991. 20 trade orgs take on film labeling legislation. *Daily variety* 233, no. 4: 1, 19.
- . 1992a. Beatty bolsters film-labeling bill. *Daily variety* 234, no. 55: 3.
- . 1992b. Directors ask house panel to embrace altered-pic labels. *Daily variety* 235, no. 2: 10.
- . 1992c. Pic labeling bill sparks lively debate. *Daily variety* 237, no. 12: 3, 12.
- Wharton, Dennis, and Joseph McBride. 1992. Bush inks pic preservation bill—minus labeling rule. *Daily variety* 236, no. 16: 3, 8.
- Yee, Martha M. 1993. Moving image works and manifestations. Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles.

APPENDIX: FILMS IN SAMPLE

Data analyzed

1. *Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp* (1934)
2. *The Amazing Mr. Blunden* (1972)
3. *Angel and the Badman* (1947)
4. *Animal Crackers* (1930)
5. *Anthony Adverse* (1936)
6. *Apocalypse Now* (1979)
7. *Auntie Mame* (1958)
8. *Balloon Land* (1935)
9. *Blame It On Rio* (1984)
10. *Brats* (1930)
11. *Break of Hearts* (1935)
12. *Casablanca* (1942)
13. *Catalina Interlude* (1948)
14. *Chickens Come Home* (1931)
15. *A Chump at Oxford* (1940)
16. *Cinderella* (1949)
17. *Coming Home* (1978)
18. *The Dark Corner* (195-?)
19. *Darling Lili* (1970)
20. *David Harum* (1934)
21. *Dear, Dead Delilah* (1972)
22. *Diary of a Resistance* (1945)
23. *Dominick and Eugene* (1988)
24. *Down Dakota Way* (1949)
25. *Farm Frolics (Puddy the Pup and the Gypsies* [1936])
26. *Fast and Furry-ous* (1949)
27. *Fiddle-de-dee* (1948)
28. *Field Trip* (ca. 1950)
29. *Finding His Voice* (1929)
30. *Flying Leathernecks* (1951)
31. *Flying Tigers* (1942)
32. *Fort Apache* (1948)
33. *Giant* (1956)
34. *God's Little Acre* (1958)
35. *The Graduate* (1967)
36. *The Greatest Show on Earth* (1952)
37. *Gunga Din* (1939)
38. *Hallelujah I'm a Bum* (1933)
39. *The High Command* (1937)
40. *Hoosiers* (1986)
41. *House of the Damned* (1963)
42. *Hud* (1963)
43. *It's a Gift* (1934)
44. *Jack Frost* (1934)
45. *Joan of Arc* (1948)
46. *Juarez* (1939)

47. *Keyhole Varieties* (195-?)
48. *King Kong* (1933)
49. *Lawrence of Arabia* (1962)
50. *Light Years* (19—)
51. *Lisa* (1962)
52. *Mad Youth* (1940)
53. *Mephisto* (1981)
54. *Mole* (1971)
55. *My Darling Clementine* (1946)
56. *My Favorite Brunette* (1947)
57. *On the Waterfront* (1954)
58. *One Touch of Venus* (1948)
59. *The Palm Beach Story* (1942)
60. *The Phantom Planet* (1961)
61. *The Prince and the Pauper* (1937)
62. *Raging Bull* (1980)
63. *Rhythm and Blues Review* (1955)
64. *Rock Baby, Rock It* (1957)
65. *Seven Brides for Seven Brothers* (1954)
66. *Sing Me Goodbye* (1950)
67. *Ski Devils* (1948)
68. *Sleepy Time Possum* (1951)
69. *Stagecoach* (1939)
70. *Stolen Jools* (1931)
71. *La Strada* (1954)
72. *Stripes* (1981)
73. *Summertime* (1934)
74. *Things to Come* (1936)
75. *30 Years of Fun* (1962)
76. *Tijuana After Midnight* (1954)
77. *Tom Sawyer* (1938)
78. *Tropical Sportland* (1943)
79. *Unusual Occupations L1-6* (1942)
80. *Voodoo Man* (1944)
81. *Whispering Smith* (1948)
82. *Woody Woodpecker* (1941)
83. *Guest Wife* (1945)
84. *Once Upon a Honeymoon* (1942)
85. *The Prairie* (1948)
86. *Second Chance* (1953)
87. *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs* (1937)
88. *That Cold Day in the Park* (1969)

89. *Tidal Wave (Submersion of Japan* [1975])
90. *Unusual Occupations L2-5* (1943)
91. *The Viking* (1931)
92. *What Ever Happened to Baby Jane?* (1962)
93. *Yanks* (1979)

Identical copies (27)

94. *All My Babies* (1953)
95. *Aqua Babes* (1956)
96. *As Our Friends* (1947)
97. *Avalanche* (1978)
98. *Beat Street* (1984)
99. *Beyond Glory* (1948)
100. *Beyond the Forest* (1949)
101. *The Big Flame-up* (1949)
102. *Black Cats and Broomsticks* (1955)
103. *Bombing of Pearl Harbor* (1942?)
104. *Double Rhythm* (1946)
105. *Flivver Flying* (1945)
106. *The Girl Behind the Curtain* (1952)
107. *Hotlip Jasper* (1945)
108. *Jailbirds* (1932)
109. *Little Cut Up* (1949)
110. *Lucky Jordan* (1942)
111. *Objective—Security* (1945?)
112. *The Price of Silence* (1959)
113. *Remember These Faces* (194-?)
114. *Secret of the Incas* (1954)
115. *Sons of the Desert* (1933)
116. *Tails of the Border* (1943)
117. *Velvet Vampire* (1971)
118. *The Whitetail Buck* (1955)
119. *Wild Harvest* (1947)

Catalog records for these films can be examined in the UCLA Film and Television Archive database on ORION, the UCLA Libraries' online information system. Soon they will be available in MELVYL (free on the Internet).

Comparative Results of Two Current Periodical Use Studies

Maiken Naylor

When two current periodical use studies were conducted only four years apart in the Science and Engineering Library at the University at Buffalo, the opportunity arose to make a detailed comparison of results obtained by two different methodologies; one was a reshelving study, the other required users to self-report their use of materials. During the second study, there was concern that users would ignore instructions and either not report use or indicate repeated uses where none had taken place. Final tallies showed that high-use current science periodicals had 40% higher use when monitored by shelver pick-up than by user self-report; overall use in the physical sciences appeared to have dropped under the latter method for a group of 700-plus titles, while use in the life and environmental sciences increased, possibly due to new interdisciplinary programs. The entire collection of journals currently received during both studies had 18% less use when self-reported than when reshelved by library staff, indicating that while over-reporting of favorite titles might take place, it cannot compensate for patron indifference to producing a record of a wide range of use both at the shelf and away. Use study researchers who are trying to identify low use journals need to be aware that this methodology, though cost-effective, might provide results where a considerable portion of use goes unrecorded.

In this study I present a comparison between two current periodical use studies conducted four years apart in the Science and Engineering Library at the University at Buffalo using different methodologies. Given the fact that active user participation was necessary in the second of these studies, I wanted to compare data collected from both to see whether similar volumes of use data were generated, but also what the advantages and disadvantages associated with these methods were, and what concerns with user cooperation would need to be addressed in future studies.

Earlier I reported on an initial comparison of these methodologies, using data generated in a reshelving study in 1987-88, and also from the major study of both current and bound periodical use that was then underway and subsequently completed in August 1992 (Naylor 1993). The preliminary conclusion was that the earlier reshelving, or sweep, method had produced higher counts of journal use than the subsequently employed self-reporting, or check-off, method for high-use current science and engineering periodical titles. This earlier observation of differentially reported use has now been