OLAC NEWSLETTER
Volume 13, Number 4
December 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FROM THE EDITOR
Sue Neumeister

I was all set to give a presentation on November 5 concerning access to audiovisual materials at the joint conference of the New York and Ontario Library Associations in Niagara Falls. I had seven months to prepare and as usual I waited until the final week to start my preparations. Fortunately, who should make a surprise visit to the NF Convention Center on the same day, at the same time as I was to give my speech--Hillary Rodham Clinton! Needless to say, all the programs at that time were canceled and I got the chance to see her in person.

After the conference I started to compile this issue of the *Newsletter*. I pictured it to be very small (no conference reports, no OLAC meeting minutes). As is turned out, however, it does have a few interesting bits of information. There is a report on the 1994 OLAC Joint Conference with MOUG, an update on Interactive Multimedia Guidelines, some commentaries on "Main Entries for Film and Videos," a report on the OCLC Users Council meeting, and a book review

of Ellen McGrath's *Guidelines for Cataloging the Files Available Through LEXIS*. Not too bad for a "skimpy" issue!

The OLAC membership directory collection data forms were mailed out to personal OLAC members in early October with a deadline date of October 31. Brian McCafferty has been working on the compilation of data and should have a report by Midwinter.

MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship has issued its second publication. Included is an article on "Cataloging the Internet" by Judy Brugger. Available from: FTP ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu cd mcjrnl/brugger.mcj01006.

Due to the fact that Midwinter is later than usual (early February), the AV related programs will again be listed on Autocat and Emedia. Anyone not on either listserv can obtain a copy from me by mail or deadline for the March issue (usually the last Friday in January) will be extended until February 18 so that some Midwinter reports can be included in the first issue of 1994. I hope to have the issue mailed by the 1st of March but expect perhaps a week delay.

DEADLINE FOR MARCH 1994 ISSUE: FEBRUARY 18, 1994

FROM THE PRESIDENT
Karen Driessen

Hello again from the part of the country where "A River Runs Through It". As each little stream contributes and becomes a tributary to the river as a whole, so each of you contribute to AV cataloging and to the organization of Online Audiovisual Catalogers. For me, membership in OLAC has meant being able to share my questions and thoughts with others who may have similar yet different issues to resolve. Together there is a sense of community in OLAC that makes the sum of the parts as strong as a river at high water. I urge you to draw on your fellow members of OLAC for guidance and support as you wrestle with the daily mysteries of AV cataloging.

It is my pleasure to announce a new liaison appointment to OLAC. Ann Caldwell of Brown University has been appointed to a two year term as the OLAC liaison to MOUG. Because this is a joint liaison position, the MOUG board has also approved Ann's appointment. Ann will be reporting on OLAC activities to MOUG, and on MOUG activities to OLAC.

Speaking of the two organizations, plans for the 1994 joint conference between OLAC and MOUG are picking up momentum. Ellen Hines, of Arlington Heights Memorial Library, Hal Temple, of the College of DuPage, and Connie Streight, Naperville Public Library are busy at work with their committees to make the October 1994 Conference in Oak Brook, Illinois, one you will not want to miss.

You may still wish to submit your name or a colleague's name (with his or her permission, of course) in writing to Bo-Gay Tong Salvador for nominations for Secretary and Vice-President/President Elect of OLAC. Nominations are due by January 10, 1994 to Bo-Gay. Her address is Library Information Systems, 11617 URL, UCLA, 405 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, CA 90024-1575.

Room assignments for the OLAC meetings to be held at ALA Midwinter have not yet been made. If you will be attending ALA in Los Angeles, do not forget to come to the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee meeting at 8:00 p.m. Friday evening, the OLAC Membership meeting at 8:00 p.m. on Saturday evening, and the Executive Board meeting at 8:00 p.m. on Sunday. All meetings are open to OLAC members. Exact room listings will be in the ALA Conference Program under the appropriate times as UNA (unauthorized). I hope to see you there.

FROM THE TREASURER
Johanne LaGrange

```
Reporting period:
July 1, 1993-Sept. 30, 1993

ACCOUNT BALANCE:  July 1, 1993

   City National Bank, Baton Rouge      13,437.00
   Ready Assets Trust                    1,779.78
   CD at 7.20% matures 7/94             10,000.00

INCOME                                                 25,216.78

   Back Issues                            91.00
   Dividends--WCMA Account                50.68
   Interest--Bond                        362.00
   Mailing List Rental                    50.00
   Memberships                         1,946.00

   TOTAL INCOME                                         2,499.68

EXPENSES

   ALA--1993 Conference                             120.00
   Banking Fees
      Annual Fee                     80.00
      Activity Fee                   10.60
                                              90.60
   Board Dinner ALA 1993 Conference     262.18
   Labels and Envelopes                  42.15
   OLAC Newsletter (v. 13, no. 3)     1,059.32
   Photocopies (hndbk, bk iss, rnwl nts)    120.52
```

```
   Postage                                 74.28
   Publication (Smyth/Driessen book)      275.00
   Tape Recorder                           53.04

   TOTAL EXPENSES                                    (2,097.09)

ACCOUNT BALANCE: Sept. 30, 1993

   Merrill Lynch WCMA Account                12,182.37
   City National Bank, Baton Rouge     3,437.00
   CD at 7.20% matures 7/94                  10,000.00
                                                        25,619.37
```

OLAC CONFERENCE 1994
NEW TECHNOLOGIES, NEW CHALLENGES

Hal Temple (708-858-2800, x2662) and
Ellen Hines (708-506-2644), Conference Co-Chairs

It's time to begin making plans for the 1994 OLAC National Conference. The meeting will be held October 5-8, 1994 at the Marriott Oak Brook Hotel in Oak Brook, Illinois. To commemorate OLAC's first National Conference ten years ago, we are planning another joint conference with the Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG). General sessions dealing with our ever-evolving cataloging environment and how education, training and re-training strategies for librarians are attempting to keep up with this "new world", will be presented along with a number of practical workshops. Tours of local libraries and museums will also be offered during the Conference.

The Marriott Oak Brook Hotel is located about 25 miles west of Chicago and across the street from Oak Brook Center, a shopping center with many stores (Marshall Fields, Nordstroms, Borders Books) and restaurants. Room rates at the hotel are $75.00-80.00 per night. Further information about hotel and Conference registration will appear in the June *OLAC Newsletter*.

We are still looking for people to help us with the Conference, particularly with publicity mailings and in identifying and contacting potential corporate sponsors. If you can help, please contact:

Marlyn Hackett
Cook Memorial Public Library
413 N. Milwaukee
Libertyville, IL 60048
(708) 362-2330

UPDATE: INTERACTIVE MULTIMEDIA GUIDELINES

- **ALA is working on interactive multimedia cataloging guidelines.** ALA, through its ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force, has been working on interactive multimedia cataloging guidelines for the American cataloging community. These guidelines incorporate descriptive details for interactive multimedia works, including definition, chief source, title, edition, dates, physical description, and notes. Also being prepared and proposed are accompanying appendices with fully cataloged examples in compliance with the guidelines, a brief technical glossary, and other guidance.

  Integrated in the guidelines are concepts from the *Anglo American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 1988 revision, particularly from the chapters for computer files, visual materials, sound recordings and kits/multimedia (Chapters 9,7,6 and 1). Interactive multimedia is the result of recent rapid technological change, employs highly sophisticated computer technology, and is available in a variety of physical formats for a variety of machine environments. Interactive multimedia allows the user, with a high level of control, to navigate randomly through many kinds of media, almost conversationally with the machine, customizing each presentation. It is the differences between interactive multimedia and already existing formats which have led the cataloging community to request cataloging guidance for interactive multimedia materials.

- **Draft document not available.** The ALA/ALCTS/CCS/- CC:DA interactive multimedia guidelines draft document, distributed during late fall 1992 and early spring 1993, is under review and in revision by The Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force. Copies of the first or revised draft documents are, therefore, not currently available through the ALCTS office.

- **Progress report.** A revised draft is about to be sent out to all AV experts, bibliographic network representatives, and others for editorial review and comment (not for publication or general distribution). The Task Force is aiming for final revised guidelines within two months, by the 1994 February ALA Midwinter meeting in Los Angeles. At that time, if there is a general vote of approval, the Guidelines can be forwarded to the ALCTS office in the first quarter of 1994, with a guesstimated ALA publication date of summer 1994.

  ALA (ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA) has approved publication of the guidelines as a document separate from AACR2R (yet in accordance with it) for use by the American community, until appropriate discussions on revision for placement, etc. in AACR2R take place among Joint Steering Committee (JSC) members (the JSC is the body responsible for approving changes to AACR2R).

- **More background and thanks to the library cataloging community.** The *Interactive Multimedia Guidelines* were reviewed by the ALA/ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA Interactive

Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force based on comments received in the late spring and summer of 1993. Thanks go to nearly forty people from the library cataloging community for excellent, thoughtfully considered feedback!

Written and oral interim progress reports were made to (and input received from) several groups during the 1993 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans, including the Task Force Friday Meeting, CCS/CC:DA, ALCTS AV, OLAC CAPC and the Computer Files Discussion Group.

In September 1993, twenty-five ALA New Orleans attendees volunteered to participate in a cataloging experiment with the revised guidelines to see how well the guidelines worked in practice. These catalogers represented a variety of libraries and levels of cataloging expertise. For the experiment we employed randomly selected titles in packets (with surrogate labels, title screens, containers, textual material, etc.) from a pool of twenty interactive multimedia works, as well as a questionnaire. Many thanks go to those who signed up at ALA in New Orleans and put several hours into participating in the September experiment!

As a result of the Task Force's October analysis of the practical cataloging experiment results, the guidelines are undergoing one more revision prior to a mailing to all audiovisual experts, network representatives, and others for editorial review and comment (once again, not for publication or general distribution). We, the Task Force members, are working as fast as we can to deliver workable, practical guidelines for interactive multimedia cataloging, as we are aware of the increasing need for the guidance they provide.

- **Upcoming Forum 2/4/94 Interactive Multimedia Task Force.** The Task Force will again hold a meeting at ALA Midwinter, Friday February, 4, 1994, Los Angeles, 4:30 - 6:00 PM. Please plan to attend this update session if you are interested. We would be very happy to correspond with you before then, however, and indeed, encourage you to correspond with us prior to the forum.
- **Questions and/or comments?** If you have questions or comments, please direct them to me as soon as possible at the address below. Thank you for your interest in interactive multimedia cataloging!
-
- `Laurel Jizba, Chair,`
- `CC:DA Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force,`
- `Principal Cataloger              / Fax: 517-336-1445`
- `Michigan State University Libraries  / 20676lj@msu.bitnet`
- `East Lansing, MI 48824            / Voice: 517-353-8715`
-
- `Task Force Members and Consultants:`
-
- `    Eric Childress        Elon College Library`
- `    Nancy Davey           Indianapolis Marion-County Public Library`
- `    Josephine Davidson     University of Georgia Libraries`
- `    Sherry Kelley          University Research Library, University of`

- California, Los Angeles
- Ann Sandberg-Fox	Saint Michael's College, Vermont
- Joan Swanekamp	University Libraries, Columbia University
-

MAIN ENTRY FOR FILM AND VIDEO COMMENTARIES

The following are comments made by Jean Weihs (Technical Services Group) on items in the OLAC Newsletter's June 1993 issue.

On page 7 Nancy Olson states that "to be considered for shared responsibility, no more than two or three persons are named in the chief source of information, and no corporate bodies are named anywhere". There are instances where this statement would not apply. For example, I have on my shelves a videocassette that was performed and produced by two people and distributed by a corporation. The address of the performers/producers is listed on the label. It is obvious that the corporation has no intellectual responsibility, but rather merely found a suitable item to use as a sales "come-on". This item should be entered under the person first named. The same would be true when the one, two, or three persons involved are producing and marketing an item under their own label. A hypothetical example is a videocassette made by me and marketed under Technical Services Group, my own company.

On page 7 also Nancy states that "if the corporate body is the only name appearing in the credits, the corporate body would be chosen as the main entry. If any persons are named for any functions, responsibility would be mixed, or diffuse, and entry would be under title". This is not always the case. For instance, there are "talking heads" videos of conferences where the camera is aimed at the speakers without any seeming attempt to do anything other than record the event. No matter how many people are listed as having a function in its production, they really did not add to the intellectual content, and this item should be entered under the conference. Another example might be where a corporation has developed a video, made by its staff, as a statement of its policies and/or procedures. In such a case, the corporation would have total control of the intellectual content. The credits may list the persons involved and their functions, but the item should be entered under corporate body. Sometimes, the list of functions is used as a goodwill gesture.

Nancy Olson response:
Thank you for allowing me to expand on the points Jean Weihs raises in her comments on my article on main entry.

Her first comment related to the distributor, a corporate body. She is correct; a corporate body named on the item and identified there as being a distributor would be ignored when choosing main entry. If, however, the corporate body is named in the credits and not identified as functioning solely as a distributor, the corporate body would be assumed

to perform some function in the production of the film and would be considered in the main entry decision.

Her second comment included an incomplete quote from my article -- I am referring to two specific cases in which one may consider corporate body main entry.

When cataloging any film, video, or other item, we must use the information given in the chief source of information. If people are named there, for whatever reason, their names are in the chief source, and must be considered in main entry decisions.

It is true that we may know the people named in the chief source did nothing of any importance in the overall creation of the finished product, but they are named in the chief source. We cannot ignore those names, no matter what we know about them. Indeed, one of the strengths of AACR2 is that it establishes a chief source of information for each type of media and provides rules for dealing with the information provided, without having to know more about the item than it tells us.

As I reread 21.1B2, if a video clearly is about a corporate body (policies, procedures, staff/members, resources, products, etc.) and is issued/distributed/sold by the corporate body, we would use main entry for the corporate body. If, however, it had prominent credits for persons not identified with the corporate body, we might consider responsibility diffuse. I suspect such items are rare [outside corporate libraries or special libraries] as I can think of only three that I've considered for corporate main entry under AACR2. One needs to consider each item on a case-by-case basis, with item and rules in hand.

A conference video raises other questions. The rule covers items "emanating from" the conference. Does an independent company recording meetings and selling copies qualify here? I would say probably not, unless the company indicates it is functioning for the "conference" in some capacity. Items considered here must report the "collective activity of a conference." Does one meeting at a conference qualify? I think not. However, when the "conference" arranges for its meetings to be filmed or recorded, and distributes the complete package, and prominently names the conference in the item being distributed, then all parts of 21.1B2 are satisfied and the conference could be chosen as main entry. Again, it is difficult to make such decisions without item and rules in hand. One may generalize in documents such as this, but each actual item presents its own set of information, and decisions must be based on the item in hand.

These are the kinds of questions we used to resolve with the help of Ben Tucker and AV catalogers at LC. We miss their advice and interpretations. When they issued a rule interpretation, those of us in the United States had their wise guidance to follow.

A related matter: I have seen discussions on Autocat and elsewhere about the need to have composer main entry for opera videos (Shakespeare videos, etc.) so the items can be classified with the works from which they are derived. May I remind readers that classification is not controlled by network, national, or international rules. Items can be

classed together if you want them classed together regardless of main entry. The LC literature tables have provision for adaptations, dramatizations, etc. This pattern may be used elsewhere.

OCLC USERS COUNCIL MEETING
Reported by Mary Konkel

The Fall meeting of the OCLC Users Council was held October 10-12 in Columbus and Dublin, Ohio. I attended as an observer representing the Online Audiovisual Catalogers. An observer, while not an official voting member of the Council, is welcome to attend open sessions, programs, and social functions and is free to participate in forum and small group discussions. I'd like to share with you some of the highlights. The theme for 1993/94 is "The Bibliographic Commons and Beyond: Electronic Publishing and Knowledge Management."

To kick off this theme, the keynote address delivered by Gerald Lowell, University Librarian at the University of California, San Diego, presented historical perspectives of the "bibliographic commons" or OCLC Online Union Catalog with his concerns on realities and the future.

Six possible threats to the viability of the commons were outlined.

- Ownership, roles, and responsibilities (Whose grass is it anyway and what right do we have to partake?)
- Goals and objectives (What grain do we want to plant and how are we going to cultivate this common land?)
- Data and record exchange obstacles (Can I get my cattle to the commons as fast as you and what if you get there before me?)
- Local systems and regional networks (My grass is cheaper than yours, so why do I need the commons? What's in it for me?)
- Fiscal issues (My grass is cheaper than yours, so why should I pay more to use the commons?)
- Electronic arena (Can cows continue to traverse the interstate? Our mechanisms for navigating the electronic highway must be retooled.)

In order to maintain the viability of the bibliographic commons we must continue to support its upkeep through research, creativity, and contribution.

Arnold Hirshon, University Librarian at Wright State University gave a thought-provoking talk on the future of Technical Services and posed the following questions for librarians.

What do we do?
Why do we do it?
Are we the best ones to do it?
Is Technical Services core to the mission of the library?

Mr. Hirshon believes the business of Technical Services is to enable library users to obtain the information they need. Libraries need materials purchased and accounted for. Libraries need bibliographic catalogs. Libraries need collections built and tended. But are these tasks best accomplished through Acquisitions, Cataloging, and Collection Management Departments?

Wright State University has recently disbanded their Cataloging Department and has outsourced their cataloging to OCLC. The estimated $200,000-250,000 saved will be shifted to direct public services operations and collections.

While this presents a radical approach, especially to those of us who have lived and breathed cataloging for many years, it is nevertheless a response to the need for change in the way we view and do business in Technical Services.

Martin Dillon, Director of the OCLC Library Resources Management Division gave an introduction to the OCLC Cataloging Strategy which focuses on major cost-cutting in the cataloging arena. OCLC has been working on 2 new products in that vein.

PromptCat is a proposed service (on or before January 1995) for providing express cataloging for approval plans. OCLC will contract with your approval plan vendor to obtain specific information on the titles you receive. OCLC will then select the appropriate record from the OLUC and deliver your cataloging to you based on your library profile. PromptCat testing with Michigan State University and Yankee Peddler has already begun.

InfoSmart is a proposed service for one-stop selection, ordering, and cataloging. Bibliographers would peruse a selection database containing availability, pricing, reviews, and table of contents information and would make purchase selections directly. Electronic vending to the library's profiled jobber would take place and upon confirmation of the order, cataloging information would be shipped to the library. OCLC and Bowker have begun dialogue concerning Books in Print as a possible selection database for InfoSmart.

Dr. K. Wayne Smith delivered his OCLC President's report highlighting key OCLC successes, in particular FirstSearch, the purchase of IDI, a company which greatly enhances OCLC's endeavors in full-text electronic publishing and information management, and the expansion of services in the international arena. OCLC has also introduced (September 1993) a new IBM 486-based workstation which is compatible with all OCLC products and services.

Small group discussions and working sessions focused on several alternatives for the restructuring of OCLC tapeloading pricing. The Cataloging, Communications and Access, Reference Services and Resource Interest Groups also met.

Attending the OCLC Users Council meeting enabled me to hear firsthand of the future developments and expansions of OCLC systems and services. It presented a unique

opportunity and forum to represent OLAC in discussions and decision-making which will guide OCLC into the future.

BOOK REVIEWS
Frank T. Wheeler, Column Editor

Guidelines for Cataloging the Files Available Through LEXIS
by Ellen McGrath
A Review

In praise of catalogers...!! These guidelines, produced by the cataloger on the project, are helpful and clear-cut examples that will be useful to any professional considering a cataloging conversion project. The project from which they resulted, aimed at cataloging the files available on LEXIS and WESTLAW, is thoroughly covered and serves as an excellent example for similar project applications. Not only are the bright spots highlighted, but also the pitfalls and reasons for why things did not work as planned. Information of this nature is always important to those seeking project funding and serves to help all librarians involved in cataloging projects with additional insight and information.

The guidelines cover the history of the cooperative cataloging project, the LEXIS project itself, termination of the LEXIS project, and an honest conclusion including both positive and negative results. The second half of the work is appendices including: project applications based on AACR2R, subject analysis, bibliographic record examples, LEXIS project procedures, list of cataloged LEXIS libraries, and a bibliography.

This book is an excellent asset to libraries interested in conversion projects of any nature and should be consulted. It is especially useful to management with no cataloging background who seek a better understanding of procedures, pitfalls, and the need to make a cataloger head of such a project.

Published by: American Association of Law Libraries, Chicago Occasion Papers, No. 11, June 1992.

Reviewed by

Anne S. Salter
Library/Archives
Atlanta History Center

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
V. Urbanski, Column Editor

QUESTION: I'd like some advice as to whether I should create a new record on OCLC for the "Fraction Factory Starter Set." This consists of two items: the book *Fraction Factory Games and Puzzles*, which has an OCLC record #19037961, and 3 sets of "Fraction Factory pieces," plastic pieces of different sizes. The "starter set" is named only in the manufacturer's catalog (Creative Publications). There is no unifying container and the plastic pieces came in unmarked containers. The plastic pieces are therefore also only named in the catalog. So, should I:

1. create a new record with the catalog as the source for the title?;
2. edit the existing record by adding a 590 field noting that we have the plastic pieces?

ANSWER: I don't have access to the Creative Publications catalog, so I can't look directly at the presentation you describe. I have searched the title on OCLC and looked at all the records. Given these caveats and the information you have supplied, I would input a new record for the "starter set" and use the title from the catalog.

You could edit the OCLC record for the text and add the fraction pieces, but I see two difficulties. First, if the game pieces are an integral part of fully utilizing the text, then you probably want to catalog what you have as a kit rather than a text with accompanying material. Therefore, you could not use OCLC record #19037961 because it is a record for the text and is input using the book format rather than the audiovisual format. Second, if you have ordered and received a package that the manufacturer is calling a "starter set" -- even if they do that with infuriating obscurity -- other agencies will also be ordering it and walking the same tortured path to discover information. That being the case, it is not only more accurate to do a new record for the item with an accurate title and physical description, but it is fulfilling your role as part of a larger cooperative cataloging family.

QUESTION: We are having a discussion in our library regarding the handling of the 530 field ("Issued also as...") in OCLC records. I was hoping that you could let me know whether you leave the 530 as is or adjust them when copy cataloging. There is a record on OCLC that we are looking at (OCLC #20088190). Although it has two 530 fields, this record does not have a separate note regarding the VHS format.

ANSWER: The record that you refer to on OCLC is one of LC's generic records. It does not represent any one specific version of the title. It can only be used to clone a "real" record for a specific version (such as the VHS format version).

We have never used a 530 on local records, that is, we avoid saying "Issued also as Beta 1/2 in. and U-matic 3/4 in." even when we know this to be the case. In a local database, it can lead users to assume that you have three copies of the title in varying formats.

QUESTION: I am writing concerning the answers given by Ben Tucker, Sheila Intner, and you in your column in the December 1992 *OLAC Newsletter* to the question about cataloging the videocassette without a title on the video itself or on the container.

My reading of rule 7.0B1 is that the chief source of information for a videorecording can be only one or the other of: "a) the item itself (e.g., the title frames)" or "b) its container (and container label) if the container is an integral part of the piece (e.g., a cassette)." Title and statement of responsibility information taken from the other sources listed in rule 7.0B1 would necessarily be bracketed (7.0B2) since it would not be taken from the chief source. I know of no rule permitting accompanying textual material to be used as a "substitute" chief source. Information is either from the chief source or it is from another source, but not from a source "considered" to be the chief source.

ANSWER: The crux of the matter you ask about may be the notion of substitute chief source of information. You will note that Ben says in his answer that the chief source is where you find the title. Wherever the title is becomes the "substitute" chief source. Rule 1.0A attempts to explain this. The primary way that we identify a bibliographic item is by its title. When you have selected a title, wherever that title is found becomes the chief source and information taken from other locations should be bracketed to indicate that it was not found in proximity to the title.

It is my understanding that the list of chief sources should be viewed in descending order of importance and that all these sources are authorized to be "substitute" chief sources when the "chief sources" above it fail to provide the needed information. In identifying a title, look first at the item itself and its container and label. If the information is not there, move down the list to (first) accompanying textual material, (second) a container that is not integral to the piece, and then, to "other sources." Any of these can be the "substitute" chief source once the chief sources above it prove unequal to the task!!

Rule 2.0B1 uses the term "substitute" to explain what I have tried to get at above. Likewise, the footnote on the same page. *OLAC Newsletter* v.12 no. 1&2 Question and Answer column also addressed concerns along these lines. The last question is pretty near what I am trying to explain here, especially regarding the priority order of chief sources as expressed in Chapter 7 of AACR2R.

Back in the early eighties when we were just starting to use AACR2, I really had a tough time with this. Ben reduced it down to a fairly simple concept. The only title that should be bracketed was a title that was supplied by the cataloger. Even titles found in reference sources and the content of the item itself were not bracketed. But, a note is needed to indicate where the title came from so that others would be able to match their item with your description of your item.

This is a fair representation of what I understand to be the standard interpretation of the function of chief sources and prescribed sources. I think Sheila's and Ben's answers reflect this same understanding.

QUESTION: I am trying to identify the name of the publisher for two videocassettes. Both are produced, directed, and edited by Dan Sperling. The first *Guardians of Adults* says: "produced by Don Sperling Video & Film for the *Guardianship* Videotape Committee." The second, Guardianship says just: "Guardianship Videotape Committee." On the inside of both containers there is a statement, "Furnished compliments of the Institute of Continuing Judicial Education of Georgia." The Institute is located in Athens, GA. What should I transcribe in the publication area?

My feeling is that the Guardianship Videotape Committee is the publisher and that the Institute is the distributor.

ANSWER: This is sort of tricky and probably no one could condemn a cataloger for treating the Institute as a distributor. I would probably treat the Guardianship Video Committee as the publisher with "S.l." in the place of publication and add a note "Furnished compliments of the Institute of Continuing Judicial Education of Georgia." Either treatment could be justified from the pieces and either treatment provides sufficient identification that an added entry could be made for the Institute. The printouts you furnished with this question also indicate that the Georgia Probate Judges Association is involved with the production of the item, so the Guardianship Video Committee may well be a committee of this group.

QUESTION: We have received a "big book" version of *The Three Little Pigs* for our curriculum collection. We also got six copies of the regular kid-size text at the same time. They are exactly the same except that the "big book" is intended to be used by the teacher in front of the class so everyone can "read" the book together. Should this be cataloged as a kit? There is also a brochure with it, but it really is more of a publisher's blurb than an instructor's guide or unifying element.

ANSWER: I would catalog the kid-size text and treat the "big book" as an accompanying material. In our curriculum collection we have always tried to keep the focus on the material used by the children and to treat additional teacher oriented materials as augmenting, enhancing items.

Last modified: December 1997