

## **BCC Comments on draft of AMIM Cataloging Manual Submitted to Tom Yee on April 8, 1999**

### **LARGE OR OVERARCHING ISSUES**

**Definition of Archival Moving Image Materials.** The BCC felt very strongly that a definition of archival moving image materials must be developed and included. We struggled in our discussions over what could and could not be cataloged using this manual. This was exacerbated by many of the commercial release videotape examples that are used throughout the Manual. For these, many catalogers would not think to refer to this Manual and would instead go straight to AACR2 Chapter 7. Realizing that defining what makes something “archival” is both difficult and contentious, we nevertheless feel that such a statement is essential to the utility and functionality of these Guidelines.

There is a good start on a working definition in 0A. Scope; we noted additional language that could be adapted from the Definitions section of chapter 2, Version, edition area. One member suggested that a “one of a kind” physical piece might be a useful starting point for a definition.

**Congruence with AACR2r.** The BCC viewed this manual, in the terms of the Toronto Conference, as a separate, supplementary manual to AACR2. The Introduction to the Second Edition seems to confirm this, and describes the manual as “within the framework of the ISBD and Chapter 7 of AACR2.” It seems to follow, then, that the basic principles of this manual should not conflict with the basic principles of AACR2. The BCC has very serious concerns about the draft as it now stands which has several clear and direct areas of conflict with AACR2, such as chief source of information, transcription, the definition and use of parallel titles, and the physical description area. We strongly urge you to consider rewriting these (and other) areas of conflict to conform with AACR2 principles, so that users of integrated library and archives catalogs are presented with clear and consistent bibliographic descriptions across all formats of material. In an environment where technology is aiming toward performing searches across multiple databases and presenting the results in a consistent format, idiosyncraticity becomes more problematic than ever for users trying to make sense of what they find.

**Options in the rules.** It is fitting and right that cataloging manuals have options, but we were troubled by the number of rules that first said one thing, and then gave the exact opposite as an option. Examples of this occur in rules 0E, 1E, 1G1, 1G2, 1G4, 3C5, 4C, and 4D. We are concerned that this in effect means there is no standard. If several methods of data presentation and encoding are acceptable (and these are not just subtle divergences) then there are serious implications for consistency in our catalogs. While we recognize that these records are not often shared among catalogs, it is conceivable that a record may be cloned for a variant, non-archival commercial release. The proliferation of options may make a record which follows a less-popular option less compatible within the catalog and less useful (and more work!) in the world of shared cataloging. An egregiously outrageous option to us was at the end of the Definitions section on chapter 2, Version, edition area. This should be revisited!

**Parallel titles.** Music catalogers know and love parallel titles (in the AACR2 sense), so it will come as no surprise that we wish to register a strong objection to the redefinition and usage of that term in the AMIM revision. While we understand intellectually the realities of title changes in moving image materials, to use ISBD terminology and punctuation and MARC subfielding for your redefinition is a perversion of the original intent and meaning. We think it will be extremely confusing to users, who through AACR2 cataloging have been “trained” to expect a foreign language equivalent title. We would expect that many archival moving image bibliographic records will reside in catalogs shared with many other formats. We think the divergence in definition and practice in the area of parallel titles is needlessly perplexing and in fact is just plain wrong.

Might we suggest a new term for your meaning (a title proper in the same language ... other than the original release title)—perhaps coextensive title or collateral title? If only we could find some punctuation other than the equal sign to help differentiate its role and function! (We understand this would be an ISBD and AACR “enhancement” and may not

be possible to implement here.)

Chief source of information. As you already know, saying that there is no chief source of information for archival moving image materials is wildly divergent from AACR2 cataloging practices. While we understand that there may in fact be no textual information in some of these materials (home movies, various clips, etc.), there is probably a large subset which will yield credits and other textual information that could be used as a chief source. The BCC recommends again that these guidelines conform to AACR2 and that the concept of chief source (or chief source substitute) be instated. If AMIM is meant to be used in conjunction with AACR, it must be in agreement with AACR's basic principles.

Authority records versus added entries. The BCC has some concern about the use of bibliographic records for information that we perceive would be better handled by authority records. Examples include varying forms of personal names, varying forms of series, and parallel titles. We would support a fuller use of authority records as a mechanism for preserving and encoding this information once, rather than redundantly in multiple bibliographic records.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

### Introduction to the Second Edition

"For archival moving image cataloging, filmographic data for the original manifestation of the work is used as the basis for cataloging all subsequent manifestations of that work "

\*\* But from 5.1C:

"If a work originally had a sound track but the copy in hand lacks a sound track, describe the work as silent and give a note to that effect."

Is there a contradiction here?

### 0A. Scope

\*\* I was wondering where things like a video of a concert performance would go in the list.

### 0A1. Organization of the description

\*\* Why all of this obsession with the term "version"? Why not just say that if the content hasn't changed, but the format has, it's a new manifestation (same bibliographic record, and standardized library terminology). If it calls itself a new edition, then it's a new edition (new bibliographic record). And if the content has changed, then it's a new edition (new record).

### 0C2. Omissions

"Do not abridge the title proper or uniform title. Long titles appearing within other areas, such as other title information and titles given in notes, may be abridged following the first five words. Indicate these omissions with ellipses. Record the ellipsis with a space on both sides of it."

\*\* In the absence of a chief source of information, the injunction not to abridge seems a bit curious.

### 0D. Levels of detail in the description

\*\* Yikes! Do we really want an archive's level of automation to determine its level of cataloging? Isn't that leaving them open to say "since we can only afford to generate one card set (main entry) from our MARC record, why should we bother with all of those pesky added entries?" They need to be thinking about shared cataloging, and the possibility

that these records may be copied or derived for other (commercial) releases.

#### 0E. Language and script of the description

“For credit function, wherever they occur in the record, substitute English language terms for non-English language terms, if there is a direct translation....”

\*\* This is quite contrary to the principles of transcription, and is related to the discussion of chief source, above. I do not understand the rationale for doing this. If one were to be consistent with AACR2 principles, the option should be the rule, and the rule should be an option. For all other classes of materials, we expect our users to understand functions in various languages imbedded within basic description. Why not here?

#### 0F. Inaccuracies

508 ## \$a Executive producer, Stephen [i.e. Steven] Jones ; photography, Arnold Swenson.

500 ## \$a Executive producer on end credits listed as Stephen Jones; research indicates correct spelling is Steven Jones.

\*\* Here and elsewhere in the document, the draft advocates added entries and notes for information that would normally be covered in authority records. Is authority control such an uncommon thing in archives that bib records are expected to be so selfsufficient? See also 1B1 for the same principle applied to a series title.

#### 1A1. Punctuation

“When the title proper includes a colon, a slash, or the equal sign, do not use any of these three marks unless, according to normal practice, the space may be closed up on both sides. Usually, a comma or a dash (with space closed up on both sides) can be substituted for a colon. “

245 04 \$a The story of the space shuttletriumph, tragedy & rebirth.  
(On film: The story of the space shuttle: triumph, tragedy and rebirth.)

\*\* Another example of the cart before the horse. I would probably have considered "triumph " to be other title information. Later in the document (1E, I think), there is some statement about having the title proper be more inclusive if it is felt necessary, which did clarify this somewhat (though I'm not sure I agree). Such a general principle should probably be mentioned earlier in the document.

#### 1B. Title proper [Numeric designation examples]

\*\* Shouldn't all of these numbers be subfielded in \$n? And why isn't "the wrath of Khan" considered to be other title information, in \$b?

#### 1B1. Title proper of television series....

“When variant forms of the series title(s) are found on the work(s) and or in ...”

\*\* Missing a slash (and/or) or else you have an extra word here.

#### 1B1.1.1 Episode titles, numbers and dates used to distinguish episodes within a series

\*\* The placement of this, while perhaps logical from a linear view of the record, is peculiar in light of the extensive discussion of the same principles which has preceded it. This sort of foreshadowing happens several times in this

chapter.

“If the episodes are intended to be viewed sequentially, include the associated numbers.”

\*\* As a criterion for including episode numbering as part of the title proper, this might be stated more broadly than it should be to achieve the intended effect.

#### 1B1.1.6 Sports events

“For sports events use as the title found on the work and/or secondary sources as the title proper ...”

\*\* Huh? (I think the first "as" needs to be tanked)

#### 1B1.3. Newsreels

“Capitalization and punctuation: Capitalize the first word of the series and episode titles and any proper noun. Do not confuse the name of the corporate body that produced the newsreel with the newsreel title.”

\*\* An example to illustrate the second sentence would be helpful.

#### 1B2. Works with a collective title

245 00 \$a Popples. \$n Vol. 1.

505 0# \$a Popples. Treasure of Popple Beach / produced by Jean Chalopin and Tesuo Katayama – Popples. Poppin' at the beach / produced by Jean Chalopin and Tesuo Katayama.

\*\* The titles in 505 look a mite peculiar because of the presence of the series title as part of the title proper of the episode. While this is technically correct, it seems redundant in this particular case.

#### 1B4. Titles of versions

“The title main entry heading for a version should be the title of the version itself and not the title of the original work. The version is connected to the original work through a uniform title added entry heading if the original release title is different from the title of the version. See Chapter 2.”

\*\* A niggly point I don't see any guidance on what to give as the title entry for an untitled version (i.e. the title did not come from the item or from a reference source). Not a likely situation, I suppose.

#### 1D. Parallel titles

"Rerelease and reissue titles are as parallel titles."

\*\* Is the verb incomplete here?

#### 1E. Other title information

“Other title information is any phrase appearing in conjunction...[snip]...however, archives more often use the term

subtitle...”

\*\* I don't think you really mean “archives” here, the notion is one from the film/video community. Word change?

## 1F. Structuring titles

“When an excerpt of a television program has been given a separate segment title, but remains unpublished in this form, construct the title as an excerpt. Include the segment title in a explanatory note. 245 00 \$a [20/20. \$n 19910614excerpts]. (On accompanying paperwork, this segment is titled 20/20. Killer fat; however, research indicates that this segment was never aired separately from the original broadcast.)”

\*\* Why is "excerpts" plural when the item is a single excerpt?

### 1F1. Structuring titles for works associated with a titled work

\*\* In the web version, starting here the formatting of the examples goes kerfluey (font doesn't change; data all strung together as one paragraph, making it hard to read). This continues through the end of the chapter.

\*\* 1F3.2 and 1F3.3 have examples that are missing internal delimiters.

## 1G. Statement of responsibility

### Introduction

"Give companies or persons in the statement of responsibility when they have made an important contribution to a particular work, but whose type of responsibility is one that may not be considered major in other types of work."

\*\* Would "even if" be a better substitute for "but" to convey the sense?

These paragraphs as a whole didn't seem to offer clear statements as to the main points being conveyed.

### 1G1. Choice and placement of credits

“When a credit term is probable, bracket the term. If it is great questionable, include a question mark in the brackets.”

\*\* "Great questionable"!!!

“Persons credited as coproducers should be placed in a credit note, unless it has been determined that they are performing the production company function or no producer is found for the work, in which case coproducers should be placed in the statement of responsibility. See also 7B5. 245 00

\$a Skyscraper / c PM Entertainment Group, Inc. ; directed by Raymond Martino ; coproducer, Scott McAboy ; written by William Applegate, Jr., John Larrabee. (No producer found for this work.)”

\*\* I don't understand this example. Is it saying that PM Entertainment Group Inc. is not the producer?

### 1G4. International co-productions

“Optionally, use credit terms transcribed...”

\*\* Typo in the word “transcribed”

### 1G5.3 Home movies

\*\* Is the form of the example really right? [Meyer, Eugene and Agnes–home movies...] as a title? Would anyone ever really search this way?

## 2. VERSION, EDITION AREA

### Definitions

“Editions are treated as versions which are described as editions on the works themselves or in secondary sources.”

\*\* This sentence, even if grammatically correct, could be worded more clearly.

"An incomplete work should not be considered a version."

\*\* Am I correct in assuming that the "incompleteness" refers to the physical state of an item, and not to a work that was left uncompleted? If the second situation is also intended, isn't this a silly statement? Or am I missing a subtlety here?

\*\* So, if I'm reading correctly between the lines, something can call itself an edition (e.g. Beta edition – different format) and not be one (same content). Is that correct? What if it's “50th anniversary Beta edition”?

\*\* And, if I'm understanding the definitions correctly, broadcasts with different commercials require separate records, but colorized vs. b&w does not. This seems counterintuitive.

### 4A1. Punctuation

“If more than one adjacent element of this area country of original release, distributor, and date of original release are to be enclosed in square brackets, or square brackets with a question mark, enclose them all in one set of brackets.”

260 ## \$a [United States : \$b Universal?, \$c 193?]

260 ## \$a [United States] : \$b [Universal?], \$c [193?]

\*\* Is there a "not" missing before the 2nd example?

### 4D2. Uncertain distributor, releaser, broadcaster

245 04 \$a The phantom bandit / c Eclair.

\*\* missing subfield delimiter

### 4E1. Date of distribution, release for nontelevision works

245 00 \$a Do the right thing / c a Forty Acres and a Mule

\*\* missing subfield delimiter

#### 4E2. Dates for television broadcasts

245 00 \$a Eyes on the prize : \$b America's civil rights years, 1954-1965. \$p Fighting back, 1957-1962 / \$c a production of Blackside, Inc.

\*\* My understanding of USMARC standards for 245 is that \$p cannot follow \$b, despite the AACR2 example in 1.1E5 that suggests otherwise.

#### 4E4. Approximate dates

“If a copyright date or a production date is not used as a probable release date, they may be placed in a note, as appropriate. See 7B11.”

\*\* This strikes me as ungrammatical. The number of the subject in the independent clause ("they") does not agree with that of the dependent clause ("xxx or yyy") The "or" does not produce a plural subject, as has been recognized by the singular verb "is not used" in that clause. Nitpicky.

### 5. PHYSICAL DESCRIPTION AREA

#### Introduction

\*\* In general, this section plays “fast and loose” with AACR by adding in many more descriptive elements than required by the rules. We can understand why this is necessary for archival collections, and perhaps this should be articulated within the definition statement that we recommend. Specifically, the video playback mode, projection characteristics, and number of copies have other “homes” in AACR2, and we are concerned about standard data being identified and placed differently in records in a shared database. Other data, such as the number of units in a complete work and generations, have a more compelling case for remaining in the physical description area. Again, our concern is in adhering to the general principles of AACR2 and extending them where necessary, but not putting descriptive information in a different place.

245 00 \$a I led 3 lives. p Phoney brother / \$c Z

\*\* missing subfield delimiter

#### 5B2. Specific formats

\*\* I disagree that “film” is implied merely by the fact that the material resides in a film archive. Certainly there cannot be that many film archives which have not (or will not) integrate their records into a catalog with other formats? The option in AACR2 (7.5B1) allows the deletion of both “film” and “video” when a GMD is present. So why the split here? And shouldn’t there be a mention of the GMD requirement, either referring to AACR2 or to 1C. in the Manual?

\*\* Film archives may hold items other than archival moving images, such as stills, scripts, posters, copies of press releases, reviews, etc., so having the specific term “film” included (as in “film reel,” “film loop,” etc.) for specificity may be meaningful even in a film archive.

#### 5B6. Works never intended to be distributed

“For works never intended to be distributed... do not indicate completeness.”

\*\* The omission of the number of units in a complete work here is a pretty subtle mechanism for indicating that the work was never intended to be distributed. Especially since many AACR2 AV records (which are, in fact, complete) look like this, users may be very confused.

#### 5D. Dimensions

300 ## \$a 1 cartridge of 1 (ca. 200 ft.) : \$b sd., col. ; c super 8 mm. ref print.

\*\* missing subfield delimiter

#### 5G. Copy number

\*\* Why here? Recording copy holdings should not be the function of a bibliographic record.

#### 6A1. Punctuation

“Enclose each series statement in parentheses. (Unless parentheses are automatically generated).”

\*\* The conditional clause should not be treated as a sentence.

#### 6D. Parallel titles of series

“Although a parallel title is defined by traditional library usage as the title proper in another language and/or script, for moving image cataloging, only rerelease or reissue titles in the same language and/or script will be used as parallel series titles. Uniform title added entries will always be given for parallel titles of series. For guidance, see Appendix D, M/B/RS Policy on Uniform Titles.”

\*\* Does the nexttolast sentence mean that all forms of series titles on an item will be traced in the bib record? Another example where authority records are not considered?

#### 6E. Other title information

440 ## \$a Effective oneonone training : \$b the key to success

\*\* Er ... I wasn't aware that \$b was valid in 440 field in USMARC. Am I missing something?

#### 6J. Subseries

440 0# \$a Mathematics for elementary students. Whole numbers ; \$v no. 10

\*\* Is this example missing subfielding following "students"?

#### 7B4. Variant and other titles

\*\* It would seem desirable that there be at least one example of a variant title using the 246 1 \$i technique.



#### 7B10. Copyright registration information

“Optionally, use a “c” enclosed in parentheses...”

\*\* The last sentences has two successive circled “c”s– it seems like one of these should be a (c).

#### 7B32. Genre and form terms.

\*\* We understand why this note is included here, but it may be confusing since subject (and form/genre) access is not considered within these guidelines. Adding to the confusion is the possibility of using these terms within the cataloger-supplied, structured title. This note would not be needed if the term was used in a 245, right? If in a 655? Perhaps more text is needed here.

#### Appendix A. Example of complete descriptive records

\*\* A quibble. I would argue that these are not complete, because none show full added entries. And it’s really too bad the examples can’t be really full examples to include all the fixed fields (and fields above the 130), as well as subject and form/genre headings. A lot of work to add, I know, but it sure would be useful....

\*\* It should be stated that these examples are cataloged at Level 1.

#### Appendix D. M/B/RS policy on uniform titles

\*\* The phrase “connect each version with the uniform title added entry heading...” is used frequently throughout this section. We find this phrase difficult to understand. We also wondered if again this might be a different between archivists and other catalogers in their use of authority control. It seems that many times added entries are used when the cross-reference function might be more appropriate. It seems that the bib record is having to work too hard here.

\*\* In D1, there should be some sort of reference from the first paragraph to the example of the same principle in D4 (or perhaps they should be placed under the same rule number).

\*\* In breaking a conflict, point #3 says to select the production company that is the first one recorded in the statement of responsibility in the title area. How consistent would this transcription be? If I’m cataloging another manifestation, will I be able to find/identify my item in hand with the previously cataloged version?

#### D2. Uniform title main entry headings

\*\* I personally don’t understand D2, although perhaps it just needs rephrasing. Does this mean that if the work being cataloged has already been referenced in a related work through a uniform title added entry, you should use the form established in the previously cataloged work? The current wording is ambiguous and raised the following question in my mind: What if I’ve already cataloged James Kahn’s book with a

240 10 Return of the Jedi

245 10 Star wars. \$p Return of the Jedi

and now I’m cataloging the motion picture? There has to be some difference between these uniform titles, and this is not explicitly stated in D2.

#### D5. Analytical title added entries from contents notes

505 0# \$a Monkey melodies – The spider and the fly – peculiar penguins ...

\*\* Capitalize Peculiar. (Picky, picky!!)

## D7 and D8. Television series

\*\* The first examples in each section here seem rather peculiar and out of character with the rest of the draft. They seem to be a message for score and book catalogers about how to make a related work added entry for a television series episode or program. Yet regular score and book catalogers will probably not be looking at these guidelines for such information.

\*\* In the first example (for the score), most score catalogers would have a 240 in the record.

\*\* It also seems like you might want to add an example in D7 for the circumstance described in the second paragraph.

## Appendix G. Glossary

### Answer print.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

### Bloopers.

\*\* Number should agree between term and its definition

### Collective title.

A title proper that is an inclusive title for a work containing several works.

\*\* Is the larger unit truly a work if its components are works? I recognize that mileage may vary.

### Compilation.

A work with a distinct organization using existing footage from other film materials. Compilations may include published or unpublished works; whole works or parts of works.

\*\* This is another example of confusion caused by using the term "work" for the larger unit as well as its constituent parts.

### Disc.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

### Duplicate magnetic track.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

### Original negative track.

\*\* typo in usually

Parallel title.

\*\* typo in origianl

Picture negative.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

Picture positive work print.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

Prop tests.

\*\* typo in third word: "to"

Romanization.

\*\* Add: "See also Transliterate." (?)

Set of elements.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

Successive exposure negative.

\*\* Don't forget to add the definition here

Transliterate.

\*\* Add: "See also Romanization." (?) Should both these words use the same ending?

Viewing copy.

\*\* Add definition for this term here??

Appendix J. Collection Level Cataloging

J4.1.3 Physical description

\*\* Is there a technical difference between a viewing copy of a videocassette and a master copy of a videocassette? How would one know if they had a master? External evidence?

#### J4.1.5.1 Contents notes

\*\* “bibliographic indicia” (!!!) Pretty esoteric term!

#### J6.2 Electronic location and access of finding aids

\*\* It might be useful to include an http example (noting the new indicators!) To include a \$u and \$3

---

*Last updated February 4, 2000*