

Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access

Task Force on Music Moving Image Materials

Documents

Charge
Roster
Report

CC:DA/TF/Music Moving Image Materials/1

Charge

The Task Force on the Cataloging of Music Moving Image Materials is charged with the review of the substantive issues identified in the discussion paper CC:DA/MuLA/1995/1. Specifically, the Task Force is charged with reviewing the cataloging rules regarding the main entry for moving image materials with prominent musical content (such as music videos, videorecordings of live orchestral performances and operas, and including music interactive multimedia and computer files), determining the specific areas of AACR2 which give rise to the existing conflicting interpretations, and making recommendations regarding what course of action CC:DA should take, including the proposal of rule changes, etc.

The Task Force shall present CC:DA with an interim report at the 1996 ALA Midwinter Meeting. The final report of the Task Force shall be presented to CC:DA at the 1996 Annual Conference, and shall be sent to the Chair of CC:DA no later than 1 June 1996. A copy of all materials distributed to the members of the Task Force shall be sent to the Chair of CC:DA.

CC:DA/TF/Music Moving Image Materials/2

Roster

Daniel Kinney, Chair
Philip Schreur
Matthew Wise
Catherine Gerhart
Mary Beth Fecko
Steve Squires
Ingrid Mifflin, Consultant

CC:DA/TF/Music Moving Image Materials/[3]
April 26, 1996

Report

Please note that the purpose of this page is to facilitate the work of the Committee and to provide a means for outreach to both library and non-library cataloging communities. This document is intended for the exclusive use of CC:DA and its cataloging constituencies, and is presented as a discussion document in the ongoing process of rule revision. Under no circumstances should the information here be copied or re-transmitted without prior consultation with the current Chair of CC:DA.

FROM: Daniel Kinney, Chair,
Task Force on Music Moving Image
Materials

SUBJECT: Draft Report of the Task Force on Music
Moving Image Materials

DATE: April 26, 1996

Background

The task force was formed in response to a document that Philip Schreur, Music Library Association Liaison, submitted to CC:DA at the 1995 Midwinter Meeting (CC:DA/MuLA/1995/1). The document contained two position papers dealing with main entry for music moving image materials: "The Case for Composer Main Entry for Videorecordings of Musical Works" by Grace Fitzgerald and "Choice of Entry for Moving Image Materials with Musical Content" by David H. Thomas. The latter paper presented the case for the entry of music moving image materials under title. The

authors of the position papers were members of a working group formed by the Music Library Association's Bibliographic Control Committee to deal with the issue of cataloging music videos.

In 1993, the MLA working group issued guidelines for cataloging music moving image materials, which in some cases, applied 21.23, the rule for entry of sound recordings, to music videos. The guidelines were reviewed by the AV cataloging community. OLAC's Cataloging Policy Committee supported the application of 21.23 to videorecordings of concerts and recitals, but did not agree with the wording that diminished the significance of the visual element. The ALCTS Audiovisual Committee and the Association of Moving Image Archivists supported entry under title for almost all moving image materials. All of the organizations within the AV cataloging community maintained that moving image materials were usually works of mixed responsibility. The Music Library Association will publish a version of the guide that takes into account the objections of the other AV groups.

In 1986 a CC:DA task force was established and charged with studying the treatment of popular music by AACR2 (the report was appended to 2JSC/LC/66/ALA response). The report resulted in the Library of Congress Rule Interpretation that instructs catalogers to apply 21.23C1 and 21.23D1, the rules for entry under principal performer, to music videos and popular music folios. More recently, The Interactive Multimedia Guidelines Review Task Force dealt with the problems of entry for new works of mixed responsibility and the issue of intellectual versus physical categories of information.

The charge to the task force was twofold. The rules for entry of music moving image materials were to be reviewed and the areas that cause conflicting interpretations identified. The task force was also charged with making recommendations to CC:DA.

The Causes of Conflicting Interpretations

The one area of agreement among the various groups in the AV cataloging community is that music moving image materials are generally works of mixed responsibility. However, AACR2 lacks rules dealing with moving image materials of all kinds. Catalogers have used either the rules for sound recordings (21.23) or rules placed under the rubric of shared responsibility (21.6C2) to determine the main entry for music moving image materials. Assumedly, the background of the cataloger (i.e., music cataloger or AV cataloger, etc.) often colors the catalogers judgment and decisions in this respect, which contributes to the inconsistent application of the rules. Moreover, neither of these rules was intended to apply to new works of mixed responsibility. The rules for cataloging sound recordings are found in the section of Chapter 21 dealing with works that are modifications of other works. Entry under title is prescribed when the personal authorship is diffuse or shared (i.e., all collaborators perform the same activity) among more than three persons or corporate bodies with no indication of principal responsibility (21.1C1a and 21.6C2).

The problems with the rules as they are applied to music moving image works have been clearly stated in the two position papers contained in the document CC:DA/MuLA

/1995/1. The conflicts arise with two differing views of the nature of the authorship of these works, and since the concepts of authorship and work in the Anglo-American cataloging tradition are intertwined, the different interpretations of authorship result in the corresponding conflict of "work" versus "manifestation."

The placement of the rules upon which catalogers have based their decisions for main entry adds to the confusion. The definition of personal authorship is placed both within the rules (21.1A1) and in the glossary. The definition is grounded on the concept of chief responsibility, which appears again in Rule 21.6B as "principal responsibility." Whereas "shared responsibility" and "mixed responsibility" are defined in the glossary, "principal responsibility" is undefined. The meaning must be inferred from the the parenthetical instructions under Rule 21.6B1, which emphasize the wording and layout of the chief source of information, and from the examples under 21.6B.

The general rule (21.1A2) introduces the concept of "principal personal author" in works of shared responsibility (the person more chiefly responsible than the other personal authors?), but the general rule does not apply the concept of principal responsibility to works of mixed responsibility; therefore, the rules do not expressly provide for entering a work of mixed responsibility under a personal author. The case for composer main entry would be strengthened if the chief responsibility clause were to be extended to works of mixed responsibility.

On the other hand, AACR2 does not assign title main entry to those works of mixed responsibility for which there are specific rules. Most of the rules in this section do indeed identify chief responsibility and enter the work under that author: the "principal participant" in an interview (21.25A), the reporter when the words are "to a considerable extent" the work of the reporter (21.25B), the heading for the spirit for a communication presented as having been received from a spirit (21.26), and the praeses for an academic disputation (21.27). In addition, a work that is a collaboration between an artist and a writer--a new work of mixed responsibility--is entered under the collaborator given prominence by wording and layout (21.24A). The name of the composer is frequently given prominence on videorecordings and music multimedia materials, and the introductory rules for Chapter 21 instruct the cataloger to determine the access points based on the attribution of responsibility manifested in the item being examined (21.0B1). It is also clear from the rules that principal responsibility is not synonymous with sole responsibility (e.g., 21.6B), and it can be argued that assigning principal responsibility to the composer for music moving image works does not necessarily diminish the contributions of others.

One member of the task force believes that the confusion over choice of main entry for videos containing significant musical content stems not from the rules but rather from the inconsistent application of Part II due to the lack of a clear definition of the term "work." Such a definition would enable catalogers to distinguish among a manifestation of a work in the originally intended form (e.g., novel, symphony, play, etc.), a manifestation of a work in a new form (a new work) that is related to a pre-existing work, and a manifestation of an original work, unrelated to any pre-existing work.

AACR2 also lacks a definition of "manifestation," and the definition of "musical work" in the glossary has been criticized. CC:DA dealt with a proposal on the use of

the term "work" during the early 1990s (3JSC/ALA/11). In a memorandum to CC:DA dated February 2, 1994 (3JSC/ALA/11/CCC response/ALA response/BL response/MusLA response), Philip Schreur pointed out that the rules themselves confuse the meanings by using "work" to mean "musical work" (25.34C and 25.35F1) as well as "item" (i.e., physical manifestation) (25.35B and 25.35C).

The provision of added entries and the type of added entry depend on whether music moving image works are deemed to be new works or other manifestations of works intended for performance. If they are defined as manifestations, all added entries for musical works in a collection are analytical added entries. If it is a new work of mixed responsibility, the musical work(s) that formed the basis of the moving image work become related works.

In conclusion, it is not a specific rule or rules that give rise to conflicting interpretations, but theoretical issues, such as "principal responsibility," "work," and "manifestation." In fact, the task force was unable to avoid these issues even though our charge advised against becoming bogged down in endless theoretical debates.

Recommendations to CC:DA

Grace Fitzgerald presented three possible solutions in her position paper (p. 12 and p. 14-15). The first suggestion, to develop a broad general approach that would be applicable to all materials, would have to address all the problems of Chapter 21. The need for special rules and the placement of the rules for music and sound recordings should be studied. Other considerations include the absence of language related to works having visual elements and clarification of the role of "manifestation," "work", and the attribution of responsibility in determining access points and main entry for works of mixed responsibility. Any rule revision should be format independent. It would need to be applicable to music multimedia materials and other types of formats that may be developed in the future. Since there are no specific general rules supporting either the application of "principal responsibility" or entry under title for moving image works as works of mixed responsibility, it might be useful to determine what the rules would have to state in order to support one view or the other and make a comparison.

The other two solutions are practical and are more in the nature of additions to the rules rather than wholesale revision: to broaden the scope of the heading for "Musical Works" (21.18) in order to include all formats or to have special rules for videorecordings. The latter approach has been adopted as a solution by many music catalogers who, in the absence of specific rules, have extended LCRI 21.23 to all music videos. These two solutions would at least provide standardization for the purposes of shared cataloging.

Whether they prescribe title entry in all cases or allow for main entry under a person chiefly responsible (principal responsibility), the rules need to provide for works of diffuse, mixed responsibility. One member noted that in the Music Library Association's guide for cataloging music moving image materials, the phrase "As works of mixed responsibility" precedes a prescription for entry under title. Again,

AACR2 does not assign title main entry to all works of mixed responsibility. The phrase the guide should have used was "as works of diffuse responsibility." It is evident that clarification of the rules and/or new rules for works of diffuse, mixed responsibility are needed.

Finally, it is interesting to note that the opinions of the members of the task force regarding choice of main entry were divided with some members in favor of entering music moving image works (or at least videorecordings of concerts and recitals) under the heading for the composer due to the belief that the users of these materials search for them under composer. Discographies, such as the Schwann catalogs, list music moving image materials under composers of classical music and performers for popular music and jazz. This approach heeds Cutter's caveat concerning rules that clash with the public's habitual ways of looking at things. Perhaps a compromise would be to create a rule that incorporates the sentiments found in Rule 0.9, which would allow judgment and interpretation by the cataloger "based on the requirements of a particular catalogue or upon the use of the items being catalogued" (0.9).

In any case, no revision or addition to the rules will be satisfactory unless the theoretical issues that are causing the conflicting interpretations are first examined and explained.

www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/tf-mmim.html

Copyright © 2022 American Library Association

Last updated 12/05/2023 18:25:09 – jca