

Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access

Future Issues Discussion

Contents

Summary of Discussion, 1/22/96
Agenda for Discussion (Swanekamp), 4/10/96
Rule 0.25 (Turitz), 4/10/96
Object of the Record (Yee), 4/11/96
Is Corporate Authorship Really Dead? (Yee), 4/22/96
Is Corporate Authorship Really Dead? (Jizba), 4/24/96
Articles about Bibliography Relationships (Young), 4/25/96
Articles about Bibliography Relationships (Yee), 4/25/96
Definition of a Work (Wise), 4/30/96
Definition of a Work (Jizba), 4/30/96
Navigating the Future of the Catalog (Smiraglia)
PCC Task Group on AACR2 Report

Summary of Discussion on the Future Directions of CC:DA Monday, January 22, 1996

The following is a summary of the discussion held at CC:DA prepared by Carol Hixson. I have added several additional comments relevant to the discussion that we sent to me after the meeting. I suggest that we take the next week or so to look this over. I encourage you to add to this list of issues and voice your concerns. Around Mar. 1, I'll summarize and redistribute the discussion with a list of issues and a schedule for their CC:DA list discussion.

*Joan Swanekamp,
Chair, CC:DA*

At the Midwinter Conference in San Antonio, Texas, Joan Swanekamp opened the discussion on the future focus of CC:DA by listing other groups that are looking at issues of concern to CC:DA. She posed the question of how best to coordinate with the activities of the other groups. She expressed the concern that if CC:DA were to drag out discussions of some issues too long that practitioners would simply accept de facto guidelines and that CC:DA could lose its leadership role.

Brad Young indicated that CC:DA might need to move backward in order to move forward, by which he meant that philosophical discussions need to take place. He noted that we need a conceptual schema of AACR2 -- which concepts does it describe? We need research on bibliographic relationships.

Martha Yee noted some fundamental problems with AACR2, starting with the cardinal principle and the way the chapters are organized in 1-13. She wondered if we could do a cleaner analysis taking into account elements such as publication pattern, content, and physical format.

Brian Schottlaender felt that the idea of a schema of AACR2 was a good one and noted that there are certain questions/issues that have continually been posed in various forums, such as: what is a work? An examination of the cardinal principle is needed. He noted a need to identify 5 or 6 basic questions that warrant discussion and start working on them now because the summer of '97 with the international conference is just around the corner.

Mitch Turitz returned to an earlier point made by Frank Sadowski to consider throwing out the concept of the main entry altogether. He noted that the rules were written for description on catalog cards, with no mention of tags or anything automated. The rules do spend a lot of time dealing with punctuation. In the long run, we should be aiming at integrating the rules with the MARC code.

Brad Young noted that the code never addresses the sorting and filing; it never addresses relationships. However, there are a lot of assumptions about filing and relationships built into the rules that are never explicitly stated.

Martha Yee noted that we have lost control over the design of catalogs that we used to have. She felt that we could perhaps explore a way to affect the software underlying catalogs now and regain some of that control.

Sherry Kelley felt that there is the need for at least one task force to study this issue but wondered if there were a time frame. Would it be possible to have an open forum?

Joan felt that it was imperative to work to begin as quickly as possible. We could use the CC:DA listserv more than we have in the past, noting that we need to have a lot done by the time we meet this summer.

Laurel Jizba expressed a desire for multiple position papers that would allow us to explore the issues thoroughly.

Frank Sadowski was not happy with the idea of a single task force because its membership would be too small. He liked the idea of an open forum covering a topic and noted that a lot of groundwork could be done on the list ahead of time.

Brad Eden expressed the opinion that we needed to be exploiting both the CC:DA and other listservs more and to take the lead to get different groups together to discuss the issues. He suggested that CC:DA sponsor discussion forums with other groups. Brad also noted that the idea of CC:DA hosting a forum during Annual and Midwinter dealing with continual discussions/opportunities for input on electronic resources/cataloging/standards with all ALA committees dealing with these issues, would be an excellent way for CC:DA to participate and guide all work in this area, as well as to become more involved and interested in these areas. It would also show the cataloging community that CC:DA is interested in more than just rule interpretations.

Ed Glazier noted that it is probably too late to schedule an entirely new session for the summer meeting but suggested that we might use one of the regularly- scheduled CC:DA meeting times rather than have so many task force reports given.

Joan asked for a straw poll on using some of the CC:DA regular meeting times at ALA to discuss broader issues and possibly to put task force reports on the list ahead of time to free up the necessary time for those discussions. There was general agreement for this approach. Joan then asked for volunteers to help moderate discussions on various issues. Brad Young volunteered to cite and summarize published reports of interest. Martha Yee and Jo Lynne Byrd also volunteered to help.

Agenda for Discussion

Date: Wed, 10 Apr 1996 14:51:26 -0400 (EDT)
From: Joan Swanekamp <js109@COLUMBIA.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: CC:DA Future Issues Discussion

Members of CC:DA ...

The following is the agenda for discussion of issues facing CC:DA. The discussion periods are Friday -Thursday with the expectation that a summary of the previous discussion can be posted the Monday following the discussion. Please let me know if you have any questions or favorite topics that you would like added. Based on our Mid-Winter discussion, I will post the summaries to a listserv and attempt to generate some broader discussion. One question I have is whether to post to both Autocat and CoopCat, or choose one over the other. I welcome your thoughts. Those of you that represent special interests may want to post the summaries to your more focused list and forward comments back to CC:DA.

Joan Swanekamp
Chair, CC:DA

CC:DA discussion topics:

1. April 11-18

The cardinal principle:

- the organization of Chapters 1-13
divide by the following instead?

published vs. unpublished (*choose one*)
types of publication pattern (*choose one*)
 serial
 monograph or equivalent
 loose-leaf or equivalent
types of management (*choose one*)
 standard library management
 archival management
types of physical format/type of carrier
(*choose one*); reproductions go here?

Agenda for Discussion

Date: Wed, 10 Apr 1996 14:51:26 -0400 (EDT)
From: Joan Swanekamp <js109@COLUMBIA.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: CC:DA Future Issues Discussion

Members of CC:DA ...

The following is the agenda for discussion of issues facing CC:DA. The discussion periods are Friday -Thursday with the expectation that a summary of the previous discussion can be posted the Monday following the discussion. Please let me know if you have any questions or favorite topics that you would like added. Based on our Mid-Winter discussion, I will post the summaries to a listserv and attempt to generate some broader discussion. One question I have is whether to post to both Autocat and CoopCat, or choose one over the other. I welcome your thoughts. Those of you that represent special interests may want to post the summaries to your more focused list and forward comments back to CC:DA.

Joan Swanekamp
Chair, CC:DA

CC:DA discussion topics:

1. April 11-18

The cardinal principle:

- the organization of Chapters 1-13 divide by the following instead?

- published vs. unpublished (*choose one*)
- types of publication pattern (*choose one*)
 - serial
 - monograph or equivalent
 - loose-leaf or equivalent
- types of management (*choose one*)
 - standard library management
 - archival management
- types of physical format/type of carrier (*choose one*); reproductions go here?
 - simultaneous releases in different formats go here?
 - examples:
 - microfilmed materials
 - digitized materials
 - audiocassette copies of sound recordings
 - video copies of motion pictures
- types of content (*choose one*)
 - textual
 - cartographic
 - music
 - moving image
 - still image
 - computer programs
 - numerical data
 - interactive multimedia
 - three-dimensional artefacts and realia
- the object of a record
- what is an edition? what is a near-equivalent? what is a copy in a different physical format?
- how should we best express part-whole relationships (i.e., the current Chapter 13 on analysis)?

2. April 19-25

Corporate authorship--is it really dead?

conference proceedings
entry of more serials under corporate body?

3. April 26-May 2

What is a work?

serial works
works intended for performance/works of mixed authorship
works realized through performance

4. May 3-9

What relationships between works needs to be demonstrated, and what is the best way to do this?

(Part of the question of bibliographic relationships; since the function of the main entry is to demonstrate relationships, the issue of whether the main entry continues to have a function may belong here too.)

How should we best express part-whole relationships? (current Chapter 13 on analysis)

5. May 10-16

Pseudonyms

Should the AACR2 approach be followed internationally? (currently violates Paris Principles)

6. May 17-23

USMARC and AACR2 merge

conceptual schema:

- transcription vs. normalized access vs. coding
- authority (work) vs. bib. (edition) vs. holdings vs. item level description
- local vs. national data standards for indexing and display?

Rule 0.24

Date: Wed, 10 Apr 1996 15:54:53 -0700 (PDT)
From: Mitch Turitz <turitz@SFSU.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: Re: CC:DA Future Issues Discussion

Joan:

I would like to see added to the discussion, Introduction (to the discussion of Chapters 1-13). I guess my main reason is rule 0.24:

"...In short, the starting point for description is the physical form of the item in hand, not the original or any previous form in which the work has been published."

This is the cardinal principle of the use of part 1 and it certainly seems to me that it should be discussed if we are going to discuss the rest of AACR2R.

-- Mitch

Object of the Record

Date: Thu, 11 Apr 1996 07:14 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Martha M. Yee" <EFS4CMB@MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: Re: CC:DA Future Issues Discussion

I agree with Mitch that the cardinal principle is up for re-examination. In drafting my list of issues, I meant "the object of a record" to cover this question, but I can see that that was rather too cryptic a formulation. To my mind, the question of "the object of a record" is that of "when do you make a new record?" In the past we have established a practice of making a new record for each new edition of a work. Does a mere change in physical format (without underlying change in intellectual content) create a new edition, i.e. justify making a new record? I would also like to ask whether a mere change in distributor (without underlying change in intellectual content, reflected most reliably in a change in statement of extent) create a new edition, i.e. justify making a new record? If we can answer no to these two questions, we can reduce the number of records for near-equivalents in our databases significantly, and as a result improve our service to users--they can be more sure that each record represents some significant change in edition from the other records representing the same work.

Martha Yee
efs4cmb@mvs.oac.ucla.edu

Is Corporate Authorship Really Dead?

Date: Mon, 22 Apr 1996 08:00 -0700 (PDT)
From: "Martha M. Yee" <EFS4CMB@MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: Is corporate authorship really dead?

A year or two ago, I served on the Advisory Committee of an NHPRC-funded project to create an oral history cataloging manual (published in 1995 by the Society of American Archivists). The oral history folks wanted to enter the oral history interviews undertaken as part of a project under the heading for the project as a corporate body. In order to do this, they had to invoke archival provenance, rather than using AACR2 rules, which would have required entering the interviews under title, e.g. "Oral history interviews of the Suffragists Oral History Project, 1959-1974," a title similar to most of the titles that would be found in any oral history collection.

This points up what I consider to be a major flaw in AACR2, that I would like to see addressed, if there is an international conference. AACR2 denies a major fact of bibliographic life, that is, that corporate bodies are created in order to do work such as collecting statistics, conducting oral histories and carrying out other kinds of research that can easily result in publication. The resulting publications are going to be known by and sought under the names of those corporate bodies. Frequently these types of publications (works) have nondistinctive titles, which makes the title main entry a frail reed from which to hang related works, works about the work in question, and new editions of the work with different titles.

I am not a serials cataloger, but I am a serials user, and I can testify to the difficulty of finding journal uniform titles in most online public access catalogs. Dependence on title main entry leads to frequent duplicate main entries (due to different serial works having the same title), and therefore frequent qualification of the title. Since our current rules call for qualification most frequently under place, a search can fail if you don't happen to know the city in which the journal you seek is published. This is rather arcane information to require of our poor users, who are much more likely to know the corporate body that published the journal, if there is one. Even the titles that are unique are buried in page after page of entries beginning with "Journal of the," and woe betide the poor user who gets one preposition wrong ("Journal of" not "Journal for"). Corporate main entry could often strengthen these weak titles, creating main entries that are more likely to be unique and more likely to be known to the user.

Looking forward to a little more discussion on these big issues than we have had so far,

Martha M. Yee

Is Corporate Authorship Really Dead?

Date: Wed, 24 Apr 1996 11:52 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Laurel.Jizba" <20676LJ@MSU.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@ala1.ala.org
Subject: Is corporate authorship really dead?

Martha Yee's insightful comments of 4/22/96 have lead me to add my own. One of the problems affecting all areas of the rules is that we have not looked at the rules within a truly systematic framework. Taking a philosophical step back back and looking at corporate authorship in its systematic relationship to the rest of the cataloging record, corporate authorship may be said to be an entity bearing responsibility for a work which is the focus of a bibliographic record, of a library user's need. The name assigned to any given corporate entity usually represents an unique characteristic for that entity, but not always.

Characteristics beyond name may or may not also be unique. If we then place corporate bodies into a spacial continuum or model within the bibliographic universe, as the set of all corporate bodies (based on any and all characteristics), we would see differences in behavior of corporate entities due to the particular aggregations of characteristics they hold. There would be entities with common, standard characteristics and those with more specialized characteristics, behaving differently. The latter would lie at various edges of the continuum, or set of corporate bodies.

Sticking with a systematic model, one way to view one of the points Martha makes in her memo of 4/22/96 is that there are corporate bodies with a combination of characteristics, such that they bear a greater significance in relationship to the work described in the bibliographic record than would some other corporate entities in relation to their works. Such specialized corporate entities would be found at the edges of the corporate spacial continuum, so they might seem to be exceptional in nature.

Currently AACR2R, in treating certain corporate entities, as Martha says "denies a fact of bibliographic life." I would argue conditions like this occur because the entire schema of bibliographic entities, relationships and behaviors are not, as a matter of course, wholly taken into account, gathered, and named during the rules creation process. Here is where the still-in-process-not-yet-available draft IFLA *Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records (FRBR)* document may be able to give us a start on thinking more conceptually about rules creation. On the basis of the *FRBR*, perhaps secondary models accounting for behaviors of entities -- like those corporate bodies on the edge of the set of all corporate bodies -- can systematically help rectify current finding problems (i.e., oral history works with known corporate authorship and generic titles).

Martha also points to issues revolving around generic titles and filing/sorting/indexing. A related systematic model showing relationships between titles and works might also be useful. However, when filing/sorting/indexing schemes are taken into account (perhaps AACR2R should recognize and account for filing rules, a request made off and on throughout this century from various quarters), there may well be no solutions, or multiple solutions, to generic title behaviors within the bibliographic universe. Having systematic models would at least help us better define the problems, for then we are better able to seek solutions.

Shoichi Taniguchi has just published "A System for Analyzing Cataloging Rules: A Feasibility Study" in *JASIS* 47 (5):338-356, 1996. The system she suggests may be a workable first step in untangling the current rules as we build rules more systematically for the future.

Laurel Jizba
Principal Cataloger
Michigan State University Libraries
East Lansing, MI 48824-1048

20676lj@msu.edu
Voice: 517-353-8715
Fax: 517-353-8969

Articles about Bibliographic Relationships

Date: Thu, 25 Apr 1996 12:25:14 -0400 (EDT)
From: J Brad Young <jbyoung@POBOX.UPENN.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: Listing of articles about bibliographic relationships

I had agreed to supply a selective listing of articles about the emerging body of historical, empirical and theoretical research about bibliographic relationships. The following items are readily available and easily comprehensible to the average cataloging expert. They present the conceptual background, a literature review, empirical observation and propose a functional model for demonstration of the application of current theory.

- "Bibliographic relationships : implications for the function of the catalog" by E. O'Neill and D. Vizine-Goetz in *The conceptual foundations of descriptive cataloging* p. 167-179
- "A taxonomy of bibliographic relationships" by B. Tillett in *LRTS* 35:2 p. 150-159
- "History of linking devices" by B. Tillett in *LRTS* 36:1 p 23-36
- "A conceptual schema for the control of bibliographic works" by G. Leazer in *Navigating the networks* (ASIS mid-year 1994 proceedings) p. 115-135
- "Derivative bibliographic relationships: linkages in the bibliographic universe" by R. Smiraglia in *Navigating the networks* (ASIS mid-year 1994 proceedings) p. 167-183
- "Toward the bibliographic control of works: derivative bibliographic relationships in an online union catalog" by R. Smiraglia and G. Leazer in Digital Libraries Conference (Washington : 1996) proceedings

More detailed and less readily available are the following dissertations which can be recommended highly:

- Bibliographic relationships among musical bibliographic entities by S. Vellucci (Columbia 1995)
- A conceptual plan for the description and control of bibliographic works by G. Leazer (Columbia 1993)
- Authority control and the extent of derivative bibliographic relationships by R. Smiraglia (Chicago 1992)
- A taxonomy of bibliographic relationships by B. Tillett (UCLA 1991)

Articles about Bibliographic Relationships

Date: Thu, 25 Apr 1996 14:24 -0700 (PDT)
 From: "Martha M. Yee" <EFS4CMB@MVS.OAC.UCLA.EDU>
 To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
 Subject: Listing of articles about bibliographic relationships

Dear CCDA:

I know this is going to sound shamelessly self-promoting, but I did so much work on the dissertation behind the articles in the following bibliography, that I can't stand to see the articles go unconsulted! The following articles are about the bibliographic relationships among the near-equivalent copies of an edition of a work, among the editions of a work, and among a work and its related works, and they often take a different tack from the articles listed in Brad's bibliography, so I hope I can encourage

some of you to take a look and ruminate upon the issues introduced . . .

- Martha M. Yee. "The Concept of Work for Moving Image Materials." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 18:2 (1993), p. 33-40.
- Martha M. Yee. "Manifestations and Near-Equivalents: Theory, with Special Attention to Moving-Image Materials." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 38:3 (1994), p. 227-255.
- Martha M. Yee. "Manifestations and Near-Equivalents of Moving Image Works: a Research Project." *Library Resources & Technical Services* 38:4 (1994), p. 355-372.
- Martha M. Yee. "What is a Work? Part 1, The User and the Objects of the Catalog." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19:1 (1994), p. 9-28.
- Martha M. Yee. "What is a Work? Part 2, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 19:2 (1994), p. 5-22.
- Martha M. Yee. "What is a Work? Part 3, The Anglo-American Cataloging Codes." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20:1 (1995), p. 25-46.
- Martha M. Yee. "What is a Work? Part 4, Cataloging Theorists and a Definition." *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 20:2 (1995), p. 3-24.

Martha Yee

Definition of a Work

Date: Tue, 30 Apr 1996 10:40:30 -0500 (EST)
From: Matthew Wise <WISEM@elmer1.bobst.nyu.edu>
To: ala-ccda@ala1.ala.org
Subject: Definition of a work

To get this week's discussion started, I'm going to forward to the list my own definitions of "work" and "manifestation", which I developed (just to keep the concepts straight in my own mind) during my participation on the Music Video Task Force. I would appreciate some feedback as to whether these theoretical definitions are truly accurate and how useful (or confusing) they would be to cataloging practitioners.

A "work" is an abstract entity; an intellectual/artistic creation, which is mentally **created** over a period of time, but which at some point in time assumes a "form" in the mind and reaches a stage of completion. The "work" is created by one person (or several persons simultaneously), who I will refer to as the "creator". An initial, physical "manifestation" of the work is **produced** by the "creator" (e.g. manuscript of the novel, typescript of the play, ms. score of the symphony, collaborative materials for an original film, etc). Although a manifestation is a physical representation of the work, this is not to assume that any manifestation, even the initial one, does or will ever completely represent the work which the creator has created in his/her mind.

Further manifestations of the work may then be *produced* (e.g. the published novel, the staged play, the recorded symphony, the filmed movie) by a diverse category of persons who I will refer to as "producers". Such "producers" include persons responsible for the production of the performance and physical aspects of the manifestation (e.g. editors, typesetters, binders, directors, set designers, costumers, conductors, musicians, cameramen, etc.). If each of these further manifestations merely serve to reproduce the *form* of the work which was the original intent of the creator (i.e. novel, play [staged, dramatic work], symphony [audio work], or feature film [audiovisual, dramatic work]), then the "work" has remained unchanged. If, however, the producers have changed the originally-intended form (not to be confused with format, i.e. manifestation), then a new, "related" work has been created. Only in this second case could some of the "producers" be considered as possible "creators". For example, this is to say that the "added" visual elements found in video manifestations of operas would not in themselves be justification to suppose a new (or even related) "work", since they have not changed the creator's originally-intended *form* of the work [staged, musico-dramatic work].

Occasionally, however, it is not clear what constitutes a new form. This is left to the cataloger's judgement. Perhaps a list of intellectual (literary/artistic/dramatic) forms needs to be generated to offer guidance, similar to the Music Library Association's list of types of compositions. Obviously, Verdi's *Macbeth*, whether in score format, on a CD (audio only), or videotaped at the Metropolitan Opera, is still an opera. And a feature film [audio-visual, dramatic work] which has been adapted from Jane Austen's *Sense and Sensibility* [novel] is a new work, although related. But what about contemporary and experimental forms, such as Peter Sellar's productions of Mozart operas; are they still operas? And a video of a Beethoven symphony being played by an orchestra seated in a pastoral setting; has the form changed, but to what? Also there's the question about how one determines the creator's original intent. For example, who's to say that when Michael Jackson ... [et al.] created *Thriller*, his intended form was a song [audio work] or a music video [audiovisual, dramatic work]?

Comments, please?

Matthew W. Wise
New York University
(212) 998-2485
wisem@elmer1.bobst.nyu.edu

Definition of a Work

Date: Tue, 30 Apr 1996 18:40 -0400 (EDT)
From: "Laurel.Jizba" <20676LJ@MSU.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@ala1.ala.org
Subject: Definition of a work: long (sorry)

I'm pleased Matthew Wise's start with a definition of work (1st message of 4/30/96). It's important to keep the discussion going as there are so many complex issues which

need a period of time for analysis and reflection.

There are other definitions (and near-definitions) of work within the history of cataloging literature. Martha Yee points this out in her writings. Also, other bibliographic models incorporate definitions of work -- Brad Young cited a portion of them. There is also the definition of work supplied in the *Interactive Multimedia Guidelines*, about which more later.

The salient points in Matthew's definitions, in my opinion, are as follows: A work is:

- a. abstract -- a non-physical entity
- b. created by one person only
- c. an intellectual/artistic creation that assumes an [intended] form
- d. complete in itself after a period of time
- e. manifest in one or more physical forms, however fully/incompletely

To continue:

- f. if further/other manifestations are created through production by a producer or producers, it is a new work
- g. if another manifestation recreates/reproduces the same form, it's the same work
- h. if another physical manifestation results in a different form, then a new "related" work has been created, i.e. producer(s) can create differing forms, or new works
- i. cataloger's judgement is called into play when the situation is unclear
- j. MW question: Is Michael Jackson's *Thriller* intended to be a [song], or, an [audiovisual, dramatic] work?

The merits I see in MW's definition are:

- a. concentration on a intellectual/artistic entity, rather than the physical
- b. acknowledgement of producer(s) in creating new works
- c. use of cataloger's judgement in unclear situations -- an open definition
- d. call for creation of a form [or genre/type] list (metaphysical)

Questions I have about this definition are:

- a. Is it reflective of reality to say only one person creates a work? Is it not a contradiction if "producers" can create new works when they create differing "forms", yet not be able to create original works?
- b. Does mention of the [metaphysical form] also address changes in intellectual content? Does content change need also to be mentioned, as when the intellectual form remains stable (i.e., internet web pages, interactive multimedia)?
- c. If separate works are created every time "producers" alter the "form", then might we not build up, in certain unique circumstances, a large body of "related" works? If "maybe", is that ok? Would we have, in certain unique circumstances, a collection of bib. records beginning to resemble a multiple versions bib. collection?
- d. Did Michael Jackson perhaps intend both a song and multimedia work -- an [audio, audiovisual/multimedia, dramatic work]?

Martha Yee proposes a definition of work in her article number four in *CCQ*, v. 20 (2),

as follows (see her article for a fuller discussion).

"Work: product of the intellectual or artistic activity of a person or of a named or unnamed group expressed in a particular way. A work has a name and can stand alone as a publication; however, its name can change without its necessarily becoming a new work. The person(s) or group responsible can change without the work necessarily becoming a new work. The work can be translated into another language without necessarily become a new work. If two items are represented as the same work, consider them to be so unless there is some overriding reason not to do so. As a rule of thumb, consider two items to be the same work if they would be considered interchangeable by most users, or if a user seeking one would actually find the other preferable (as in the case of a later revised edition).

Do not consider two items to be the same work if the particular way in which the intellectual or artistic activity is expressed has changed in order to adapt to a new medium of expression. Examples would be the novelization of a film, or the dramatization of a novel."

The merits of Martha's definition, in my opinion, are:

- a. concentration on an intellectual/artistic entity, rather than the physical
- b. acknowledgement of the reality that a name (title) change may not mean a new work, and often does not -- though at times it may
- c. acknowledgement that not only one but more than one person or a group(s) do create works, a reality
- d. not considering a different particular expression to be a new work, when in doubt -- especially if a majority of the user population would agree that it is not (cataloger's judgement using common sense). This is open ended in favor of making such a doubtful entity the same work.

Questions I have about Martha's definition:

- a. Does it accommodate works which are highly susceptible to intellectual or artistic change and instability, i.e., interactive multimedia works to which text or visual images, etc. are added by the user (when the physical manifestation/title remains unchanged)?
- b. If separate works are indeed created every time the intellectual or artistic activity is expressed differently to adapt to a new physical medium, then might we not, in certain instances, build up a large body of related works? (Same question asked about MW's definition). Is this ok?
- c. Is "particular way an intellectual/artistic activity is expressed" the same as MW's "form"? Is it a metaphysical entity? A genre?

Here is the definition of work from the *Interactive Multimedia Guidelines*:

"Interactive multimedia work. In the context of these guidelines, a work of interactive multimedia includes the whole intellectual content, which maybe comprised of one or more kinds of entities or a collection or

compilation of various entities; this content forms the basis for a single bibliographic description. It does not matter whether or not some parts of the interactive multimedia work have or have not been published or issued at the same time or by the same issuing body, or whether only some of the parts are interactive multimedia."

What this has in common with MW's and MY's definitions is:

* Emphasis on the abstract entity: the intellectual/artistic content Also, there is a clear statement that parts some parts may be entities in their own right, published separately or not.

In addition, the definition for interactive multimedia (IM), (separate from interactive multimedia work) supports the reality that one intellectual work may be physically manifest in one, or more than one, physical carrier. Also, the user, in the presence of two or more media, actively manipulates the intellectual content to control the order and/or nature of the presentation. (The multimedia kit in cyberspace concept).

It's a looseleaf-for-updating, bibliographic hermaphrodite situation. Because users control the data and programs in IM works, particularly in high-end IM works, users change and alter the intellectual/artistic content. At the high end users can add new programs and data, including text, still or moving images, etc. The user becomes a creative force and may, or may not, need some acknowledgement. What is not clear with a high-end IM work is whether or not a new work has been created, because much of the time it is the intent of the original creator(s) that the user be involved in content creation. It's a loose-leaf-for-updating situation where the user, not the publisher, adds the new leaves/new content. On our campus, faculty alter interactive multimedia content by adding lesson plans, self-tests, additional still or moving images, audio, etc. -- through added programming and added data. It is questionable whether the degree of alteration is great enough to require revision of the bibliographic record which was created prior to faculty amendments to the work, especially when it is known that the original creators intended these works to have a certain degree of unstable content which depends upon user interaction.

Such high-end works (as well as some more moderately "souped-up" interactive multimedia works) do not have a highly defined state of completion, as they are intended to change over time. These are works with permeable boundaries, which perhaps could be a new bibliographic garden variety related to loose-leaf-for-updating texts or even monographic/serial bibliographic hermaphrodites (thanks to Crystal Graham for the latter term).

Any definition of work that purports to encompass the known bibliographic universe of works must take into account this intended-to-be-incomplete, permiable set of works, that is, high-end multimedia works. Internet web sites may well be viewed as yet another variety of works where content mutates while outward manifestation attributes (i.e, title, URL, etc.) may, or may not, remain stable.

The point is that the bibliographic garden, to use the garden as a metaphor, must include acknowledgement of certain odd varieties, not as weeds to be ignored and discarded, but as interesting new wild flowers in good standing with other flowers growing within the borders of the garden. If a print text is a rose -- then it is a flower (a

form of work in the garden). If an interactive multimedia work is a rare orchid -- then it is also a flower (a form of work in the garden), and not a rose. We need to arrive at a broad enough definition so that bibliographic orchids, and other rare species, are defined as bibliographic flowers, not defined narrowly, in terms of bibliographic roses. Only a rose is a rose. We need a certain level of open-endedness in the definition of work -- in order to be able to welcome new technological and conceptual entities as part the bibliographic universe.

Laurel Jizba
Principal Cataloger
Michigan State University Libraries
East Lansing, MI 48824-1048
20676lj@msu.edu

Navigating the Future of the Catalog

Date: Mon, 06 May 1996 16:14:49 -0400 (EDT)
From: J Brad Young <jbyoung@POBOX.UPENN.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@ala1.ala.org
Subject: Navigating the future of the catalog

Here is the report I had mentioned of a recent informal talk Richard Smiraglia gave about the work he and Greg Leazer are doing, and the potential for improving online bibliographic control which the study of bibliographic relations offers. It may be of use in preparing a statement about the goals CC:DA would like to see addressed in the Conference. Richard gives permission to quote from it.

Navigating the Future of the Catalog

Dr. Smiraglia presented a model for reconceptualizing the library catalog, based on both empirical research and theoretical sophistication. He began with a humorous overview of the development of computing and its changing relationship with cataloging. In the early 1970s, computing was "a realizable fantasy", but difficult to apply to library use. By the middle of that decade, OCLC terminals began to appear in library school lounges, but operated at "coffee-break speed." In the next phase, many libraries were cataloging online, using hardwired terminals. At this stage, the dominant beliefs were that most libraries would never own automated systems, nor would retrospective conversion ever take place. Today, library systems, utilities and databases are becoming internationally linked. This, plus Internet access to online services and non-library databases, brings us closer to the possibility of Universal Bibliographic Control.

One consequence of these developments is that the function of local catalogs changes, with regard to locating desired works. Networked resources can be used to identify the works required, and the local catalog consulted to find a copy of that work. The latter becomes a kind of holdings file for the larger virtual catalog formed by the confluence of the utilities and the Internet. This is turn points to the possibility of

reconceptualizing the entire bibliographic apparatus, beginning with the assumption that the utilities, local catalogs, and other resources can be developed as integrated parts of a single system.

The evolving unity between local and international resources would allow for greater exploitation of the relationships existing between members of a "bibliographic family," the aggregated manifestations and relatives of a work. For the bulk of his presentation, Dr. Smiraglia drew on research conducted by him and Gregory H. Leazar over the past decade, and summarized in several recent publications (see Leazar 1994, Smiraglia 1994, Smiraglia and Leazar 1995). The explicit linkages now possible promise greater utility in discovery and retrieval of previously-unknown items, advancing the catalog as a tool for the second kind of power, "exploitative control," advocated decades ago by Patrick Wilson in *Two kinds of power* (1968).

In order to realize this potential, we need to adjust some of our working assumptions and adopt some new vocabulary. A basic concept is that of the bibliographic entity: a unique instance of recorded knowledge having both physical and intellectual properties. A work consists of the intellectual content of a bibliographic entity, and in turn has the properties of ideational content and semantic content (the specific expression of its ideas). Only exact copies can be regarded as duplicates of a work; translations, for example, are considered different works.

A variety of relationships exist among bibliographic entities. Dr. Smiraglia has focussed on "derivative relationships", which include:

1. simultaneous derivations (such as publication in two countries at the same time),
2. successive derivations (editions or versions),
3. translations,
4. amplifications,
5. extractions,
6. adaptations, and
7. performances.

A work and its derivations constitute members of a bibliographic family. Under existing cataloging practice, these relationships may be implicitly controlled if the cataloger causes the works to collocate in a file. This practice may not, however, provide access to some 63% of the derivative relationships existing between works.

To develop this access, we need to operationalize the substantial differences between works and physical items, recognizing that controlling the two requires fundamentally different sorts of effort. Gregory Leazar's work on a conceptual model for simultaneous but separate control of works and items describes the relationships which apply to one or the other category, or to both. Description of relationships depends on recognizing, and making explicit, shared attributes. Data elements defined by *USMARC Format for Bibliographic Description* (UFBD) include all of those needed to describe the relevant attributes of items, and most of those needed to describe attributes of works. Some of the latter, such as historical information about a work and critical assessments, need to be supplied. Significantly, then, UFBD and the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd Edition* provide a platform on which the reconceptualized catalog can be built.

Drs. Smiraglia and Leazar are currently developing a front-end searching tool for use on OCLC, to make practicable this evolved concept of the bibliographic universe. In this project, explicit links between the members of twenty-five very large bibliographic families will be created. When a record for a "family member" is retrieved, the system will offer the user the possibility of selecting among the other members of the family. (The project will be available for testing by the public in late 1996 or 1997.) While a "front end" of this sort may be of value in a local catalog, as an enhancement to standard bibliographic data, this is not the main outcome envisioned. Local catalogs, used for locating items, could also be linked to a larger database or utility which brings together bibliographic families.

In response to audience questions, Dr. Smiraglia emphasized that the research and current project focus on the concept of the catalog itself, not on workflow or management issues. Distributed local expertise is assumed, however, as compared with a change to totally centralized cataloging or completely outsourced operations. A NACO-like model might prove most viable for training and creation of standards. To prepare ourselves for this future, we need to follow the work as it develops, become advocates for this new vision, help design and test the systems which will implement it. The transition to a new bibliographic universe will take time, and nobody's being left behind yet.

References:

- Leazar, Gregory. "A conceptual schema for the control of bibliographic works." In Andersen, Galvin, and Giguere, eds., *Navigating the Networks: Proceedings of the ASIS Mid-Year Meeting, Portland, Oregon, May 21-25, 1994*. Medford, NJ: Learned Information, 1994, p. 115-135.
- Smiraglia, Richard P. "Derivative bibliographic relationships: linkages in the bibliographic universe." In *Navigating the Networks*, p. 167-183.
- Smiraglia, Richard P. and Gregory H. Leazar. "Toward the bibliographic control of works: derivative bibliographic relationships in the Online Union Catalog." *Annual Review of OCLC Research 1994*. Dublin, OH: OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc., 1995, p. 56-59.

PCC Task Group on AACR2 Report

Date: Mon, 24 Jun 1996 15:20:39 -0400 (EDT)
From: Joan Swanekamp <js109@COLUMBIA.EDU>
To: ala-ccda@alal.ala.org
Subject: PCC Task Group of AACR2 Report

CC:DA Committee Members and Representative . . .

Barbara Tillett has asked me to forward this to you for discussion at ALA. Please bring this copy with you, since it was not enclosed in the last packet of materials mailed on Friday.

Date: 24 Jun 1996 10:48:10 EST
From: BARBARA B TILLET TILLET@MAIL.LOC.GOV
To: js109@columbia.edu
Subject: PCC TG AACR REPORT-FYI

Joan: Please send this on to CC:DA members for information and further background for the discussions on the 0.24 rule on cataloging the item in hand. Although labelled "position paper", it's a discussion paper that PCC ExCo has given us permission to forward to CC:DA for information. -- Barbara Tillett, Chair PCCTGAACR

- [Report of the Task Group on AACR2R](#)
- [Position \(Discussion\) Paper:
Cataloging from the piece in hand in an electronic age](#)

Wayback Machine - <https://web.archive.org/web/20211023015424/https://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jc...>

www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/ccdafuture.html

Copyright © 2021 American Library Association

Last updated 07/07/2024 15:16:13 – jca