

New Perspectives on the Shared Cataloging Environment and a MARC 21 Shopping List

Martha M. Yee

This paper surveys the cataloging literature to collect problems that have been identified with the MARC 21 format. The problems are sorted into (1) problems that are not the fault of MARC 21; (2) problems that perhaps are not problems at all; (3) problems that are connected with the current shared cataloging environment; and 4) other problems with MARC 21 and vendor implementation of it. The author makes recommendations to deal with the true MARC 21 problems that remain after this analysis.

A number of writers in our field have suggested recently that it is time to move our cataloging data out of the MARC 21 format and into something else, perhaps XML.¹ XML (Extensible Markup Language) is a subset of SGML (Standard Generalized Markup Language) in which tags are unlimited and not redefined. Even quite knowledgeable MARC 21 leaders recognize that MARC 21 has a much smaller installed base than does XML and that, at some time in the future, we may have to plan for a migration of our data into something like XML or one of its successors in order to have access to a broader marketplace of software and hardware solutions to the problem of bibliographic control.² In fact, the Network Development and MARC Standards Office at the Library of Congress has made it quite easy for any institution that wants to switch their MARC records to XML to do so today by providing both a full MARC 21 XML schema and an abbreviated "MARC XML lite," known as the Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS).³ There is also evidence that the world at large is turning to examine the issues and problems that for the past several hundred years have occupied only librarians.⁴ Given this situation, now is a good time to consider whether a future transition might provide the opportunity for beneficial changes to be effected in our shared cataloging environment and in our methods of tagging and coding cataloging data for the purposes of sharing it.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the various problems that the writers have associated with the MARC 21 format. There are actually four categories of problems.

In the first category are problems that are not actually the fault of MARC 21, but rather lie with the cataloging rules and practices that provide content for the MARC 21 data structure standard, such as the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* 2nd ed., revised, (AACR2R) and Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). Such problems will be identified but not discussed extensively, as the need for change in cataloging principles and the rules based on them is much too broad a subject to be covered here. One exception to this approach is made for problems associated with multiple versions and FRBR (Functional

Martha M. Yee (myee@ucla.edu) is Cataloging Supervisor, UCLA Film and Television Archive, University of California at Los Angeles.

John Attig and Diane Hillmann were kind enough to read this paper and make many valuable suggestions for improvement. Any completely crazy ideas or mistakes are my own, however.

Requirements for Bibliographic Records), on the grounds that MARC 21, the cataloging rules, and the shared cataloging environment are so entwined in their effect on possible solutions that they cannot be separated from each other.

In the second category are problems that perhaps are not really problems at all, but rather solutions to problems that are imperfectly understood by many writers.

In the third category are problems that are due to the shared cataloging environment that MARC 21 was designed to support. Simply changing MARC 21 without also changing the context in which it operates cannot solve these problems. Here we must deal to a certain extent with possible changes in the cataloging rules.

Finally, in the fourth category are some known problems that are either caused or partially caused by MARC 21 and that perhaps could be solved in the process of migrating our data to some new data structure standard in the future. These latter problems I have referred to as a MARC 21 shopping list. It is possible that a number of these latter problems would be better solved in vendor software implementation than in the MARC 21 format itself. In these cases, it is hoped that this paper will stimulate discussion in the vendor community about better ways to use existing MARC 21 data to provide better user service. Unfortunately, many of the problems that are blamed on MARC 21 are problems that derive from the failure of vendors to support full MARC 21 capabilities. Sometimes this is due to financial considerations (development is done only when a significant number of customers will benefit from them); sometimes it is due to vendors' lack of understanding of MARC 21, of cataloging records, of problems that arise in large complex databases of bibliographic records, and of problems the public faces in accessing online public access catalogs.

The third category, problems due to the shared cataloging environment, and the fourth category, the MARC 21 shopping list, will be the focus of this paper.

Category 1—Problems That Are Not the Fault of MARC 21

For the most part, MARC 21 is a data structure standard, not a data content standard or a data value standard, and this seems to be imperfectly understood by some writers.⁵ A data structure standard provides a standard for the labeling of data and, as such, for the isolation of particular kinds of data for particular purposes such as indexing or display. The data itself (or the semantic content), however, is determined by data content standards (cataloging rules such as AACR2R) and data value standards (lists of authorized headings, such as the National Name Authority

File or LCSH). Thus, some commentators have identified problems as being associated with MARC 21 when they are actually associated with cataloging rules (data content standards) and authority files (data value standards). For example, Miller and Fiander note what Fiander describes as an "overemphasis on description, especially in considering the growing availability of fulltext."⁶ Fiander discusses the need to ease the creation of analytic catalog entries and the question of abandoning the main entry.⁷ A joint meeting of the American Library Association's MARBI (Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information) Committee with the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) Library Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Committee concerning the relationship between MARC 21 and XML posted a long list of concerns that were identified as primarily cataloging problem areas, rather than MARC 21 problems per se or problems with MARC 21 alone.⁸ These cataloging problem areas were also sometimes not necessarily problems, but rather solutions imperfectly understood. As stated above, these cataloging issues will not be discussed here, as the topic is too broad to be covered in these confines. However, much work needs to be done in educating our fellow librarians about the value of controlled vocabularies and uniform headings, and the value of the main entry as a work identifier that demonstrates relationships among all of the expressions of a work, works about it, and works related to it.

Numerous writers accuse MARC 21 of being "flat," rather than "hierarchical" like XML. For this reason, it is claimed that there is an "underemphasis on relationships," as Miller puts it.⁹ As John Attig has pointed out, MARC 21 has a flat structure because of the shared cataloging environment in which we are currently operating.¹⁰ The current shared cataloging environment derives cost efficiency from the fact that each record is independent so that we can move it in and out of different systems.¹¹ Since the object of the bibliographic record is the manifestation, this means that there is an over emphasis on manifestation at the expense of expression and work.¹² This is an unfortunate situation, as it means that the most difficult and labor intensive part of cataloging, the demonstration of relationships, is the hardest part to share. However, the solution to the problem lies in changing the shared cataloging environment, not in changing the MARC 21 format. This will be discussed further below in the section on category 3 problems, those due to the shared cataloging environment.

The claim that XML is superior to MARC 21 in its degree of hierarchicality is something of a red herring. The tag and subfield structure in MARC 21 is hierarchical, though not as open to complex hierarchy as XML, and the data content housed in MARC 21 is highly hierarchical. The real problems are not with MARC 21 itself, but rather

with (1) underutilization of the hierarchical data on the part of software vendors, and (2) limits on the degree of hierarchicality that can be supported in the current shared cataloging environment, in which there are thousands of different catalogs, each with a different set of manifestations of expressions of works. Underutilization, the first problem, is likely to continue in any XML implementation if system designers are not better educated in cataloging principles. As John Attig puts it: "The MARC structure supports communication of records; that communication process does not create a catalog."¹³ The creation of the catalog, with all of the demonstration of relationships that implies, is up to the catalog software that indexes and displays the MARC 21 records. Limits on hierarchicality that can be supported in the current shared cataloging environment, the second problem, also will not go away in a hypothetical XML shared cataloging environment that is in every other way similar to the current environment with thousands of different subsets of records to index, display, and maintain over time.

Category 2—Problems Identified That Perhaps Are Not Problems

A number of writers complain of the complexity of MARC 21 formats. Tennant, for example, claims that "There are only two kinds of people who believe themselves able to read a MARC record without referring to a stack of manuals: a handful of our top catalogers and those on serious drugs."¹⁴ However, these writers then go on to suggest that further complexity be added to MARC 21; for example, they complain that the functions carried out by people whose names are noted in bibliographic records are not adequately differentiated (thus an author is not distinguished from an editor or a translator). The implication is that MARC 21 actually needs tagging that is more complex, so that an editor or translator is given a different tag from an author. There are two unexamined assumptions here: (1) that catalogers will always know what function(s) were carried out by a person whose name appears in a statement of responsibility connected with a particular work or expression, and (2) that it is possible to create a complete and exhaustive list of all potential functions that a person could carry out in the creation of a work of any kind, whether image, sound, text, or some combination of those. There is also a failure to recognize that designating functions performed using relater codes in MARC 21 is already possible but not widely done, mainly for economic reasons, but also because of the complexities alluded to above.

MARC 21 is complex because it serves so many different communities, including academic libraries, public libraries, school libraries, special libraries, and archives in

all disciplinary areas. One institution's complexity is another institution's lack of granularity!

Commentators fail to recognize that most of the complexity in MARC 21 is optional. Nothing requires that MARC 21 users use every field and subfield, and very few of them do. A local implementation almost always will be a subset of MARC; this subset or "level of description" (to use AACR2R's term) will be governed by the content standard or standards followed locally. Also, as noted above, for those who desire less complexity, the Library of Congress is providing a short version of MARC 21 XML, known as MODS. In considering the reasons for MARC's complexity, one should recognize that, to some extent, the complexity is driven by the content standards supported by MARC 21, not by MARC 21 itself. MARC 21 must provide a place for all of the data elements required by content standards such as AACR2R.

MARC 21 also has been criticized for redundancy.¹⁵ When the charges are examined more closely, however, it is apparent that critics do not understand as much as they should about the reasons for the redundancy. Leazer, for example, claims that place of publication is recorded in twenty-four different fields.¹⁶ When one examines his tables more closely, however, it becomes apparent that he has equated with "place of publication" such various other types of data as country of original production of motion pictures (257), place of manufacture (260 \$e), and place of publication data in linking fields that apply not to the item described in the bibliographic record in question but to items described in other bibliographic records that are related to this item. He also fails to recognize the function of the 044 field that provides space for coding more than one place of publication when necessary (since the 008 fixed field only has room for one).

Those who charge MARC 21 with redundancy also do not seem to recognize the value of having the same piece of data in coded form, transcribed form, normalized form, and in a form suitable for subarrangement, linking, and precoordination. Having the data in coded form allows the piece of data to be used in rapid batch processing of millions of records. Having the same data in transcribed form allows use of the data as evidence of variation in the naming of authors, works, and subjects that is valuable in making decisions about forms of name for access points as well as historical evidence concerning how various expressions of a work were presented to the public at the time of publication. Having the same data in standardized and normalized form facilitates the collocation of all of the works of an author, all of the expressions of a work, and all of the works on a subject. Also, having the same data in standardized form precoordinated as parts of linking headings aids the demonstration of relationships with other entities (as, for example, when the expressions of a work are subarranged by language using language subfields in uniform titles, one

of Miller's examples of redundancy). Consider the following example of this so-called redundancy:

Indexable field (e.g., 651 _0 \$a London (Eng.))

Descriptive field (transcribed) (e.g., 260 __
\$aLondinum . . .)

Coded data for rapid batch processing (e.g., xxk)

Many would consider this type of redundancy not just useful but one of the major sources of the power of a catalog to provide superior precision, superior recall, and superior recognition value for scanning, as compared to a Web search engine.

Some charge the MARC 21 format with not being flexible and extensible enough.¹⁷ Flexible would seem to imply that two different catalogers do not need to try to catalog in the same way. Extensible would seem to imply that changing a standard or adding to it should be easy. If we move too far in the direction of flexibility and extensibility, the resultant data may be so little standardized that library catalogs will not be able to differentiate their "look and feel" from that of Google (with the disadvantage of continuing to be much more expensive than Google, as they are now).

Fiander complains that the 1XX, 2XX, 3XX, and continuing sequence of MARC 21 field blocks "jumbles" description and access points.¹⁸ This order precedes the MARC 21 format by hundreds of years and is by no means obsolete in the computer era. It has the effect of ordering the description in such a way that the work is identified first (1XX and 2XX), and then the expression/manifestation (2XX to 5XX), with those fields first that are most likely to differentiate the expression/manifestation from other expression/manifestations of the same work (such as the statement of subsidiary authorship, e.g., translator or editor, the edition statement, and the statement of extent, that is, paging for books or playing time for moving images). Online systems that ignore this fundamental ordering of fields in the bibliographic record create very confusing displays that are difficult for users to scan through quickly.

Category 3—Problems Connected with the Current Shared Cataloging Environment

Note: Numbers in parentheses in the following two sections refer to *MARC 21 Discussion Papers (DP)* and *MARC Proposals* that have been prepared in the past to deal with these problems.¹⁹

Two major problems have hitherto proven to be intractable in the current shared cataloging environment. Keeping thousands of catalogs under authority control has

proven to be so expensive and labor intensive that, in fact, most of them are under rather poor authority control. The other is the problem referred to as "multiple versions" (89-9, 91-13, 2002-DP04). Even before the digital revolution came along, we had technology to reproduce the same intellectual content in different physical formats or to distribute the same intellectual content under different title pages. This is known as the "multiple versions" problem. Our catalogs do a very poor job of differentiating for users between the situation in which two records represent two different expressions of the same work with different intellectual content and the situation in which two records represent the same expression of the same work with the same intellectual content and only minor variation in physical format or distribution history of little interest to most users (two manifestations of the same expression).

Recommendation: Change the shared cataloging environment to enable solution of the multiple versions problem and to enable better and more cost effective authority control, in order to demonstrate hierarchical and other types of relationships between records for both catalog users and library staff in the most cost effective manner.

1. *Re-examine our concept of "communication" of records. Consider whether or not the shared cataloging environment could be changed in some way such that changes in headings and bibliographic records could be made once and immediately appear everywhere.*

One possible model might be a master record concept for both bibliographic and authority records in which the master record is "mirrored" in some way in local systems, and any change made to the master record is immediately visible to all users of all systems everywhere. Master authority records must be globally linked to master bibliographic records so that a change in an authority record automatically changes headings in all linked bibliographic records. Editing privileges on master records must be tightly controlled so that they are limited to those who are educated and experienced in the complexities of the bibliographic universe.²⁰

This solution could potentially solve both major problems described above. It could save us millions spent on staff time to move records in and out of local catalogs and to edit local catalogs to bring them under authority control. Instead of moving records back and forth wholesale and editing the local catalog, copy cataloging staff would spend their time adding holdings symbols to records in the master database, and catalogers would spend their time adding new manifestation records, expression records, work records, and authority records for authors, corporate bodies, and subjects to the master database. It also could allow catalogers to efficiently share with users information they often have about identical intellectual content contained in different manifestations represented by different bibliographic records (multiple versions).

This solution would require a major change in the business model of the utilities, however, as they probably would no longer be able to charge on the basis of record use. The utilities could consider transitioning to the kind of licensing practiced by abstracting and indexing services. This solution also would mean a different marketplace for system vendors, one in which software design would be limited to that required to design local systems (such as circulation, acquisitions, and binding) and link them to master records. It appears that the complexity of software design currently required by libraries and the inability of libraries to pay high software development costs may have already driven many vendors out of the marketplace, so perhaps such a narrowing of scope might be welcomed. The master record approach could have the advantage of leading to the one-time development of complex software for indexing and display of complex hierarchical relationships that could then be shared by all.

If such a major change in business model is impractical, an alternative to explore might be use of authority record numbers (rather than text strings) to link bibliographic records to authority records. This approach, if designed carefully, might allow local systems continually to refresh their authority files with much less frequent editing of bibliographic records than is currently necessary to keep catalogs under authority control. It would solve the first problem above, but not the second (that of multiple versions), as we still would have thousands of different catalogs each demonstrating a different set of relationships among the bibliographic records contained in it.

Since the editing of catalogs to bring them under authority control and to ensure that they demonstrate relationships provides the greatest service to our users and is the most expensive part of our work, it is a shame we cannot apply our experience of the cost benefits of shared creation of bibliographic records to solve the problem of how to make the editing of catalogs as efficient as possible. Solving this problem would have the potential to save us millions of dollars every year and to provide better service to our users, a win-win situation.

2. Consider defining the bibliographic record as an expression-based record to which all manifestations of that expression should be linked.

This solution is under consideration by the Joint Steering Committee for AACR but likely will be rejected in favor of continuing with the current practice of creating manifestation-based records, given the difficulty of creating and using expression-based records in the current shared cataloging environment.

3. If it is not practical to define the bibliographic record as an expression-based record, at least allow use of the MARC 21 holdings format to attach all different manifestations of the same expression to one expression record in audiovisual archives that have a preservation mission.

Holdings in an audiovisual archive with a preservation mission tend to be unique (not held by other institutions), and these archives do not tend to practice shared cataloging in the same way that the library world does; rarely does one institution use bibliographic records created by another. Because the process of audiovisual preservation is a process of creating reproductions, the cataloger can be certain that an item in one format is an exact copy of the intellectual content contained in another item in a different format. Without the solution recommended above, conveying this valuable information about content identity to users is difficult to impossible. Current library standards require making a separate bibliographic record for every change in format; this could lead to the creation of fifty or more bibliographic records for one preserved title; if there are other records for different versions or expressions of the same film that actually differ in content, the situation becomes hopelessly confusing to the user. The appendix presents an example of an expression-based record for a film preserved at the UCLA Film and Television Archives in which manifestations are described as holdings appended to the expression record.

4. Consider other ways to create a sufficiently hierarchical data structure for the general library world.

The key requirement is an ability to define the work, expression, and manifestation levels clearly, and an ability to link in order to demonstrate relationships appropriately across and between these levels.

5. Clean up the MARC 21 format to make a clearer distinction between coding for the carrier and coding for the content.

One example of a problem area (there are others) is that of moving image materials. The content (work/expression) is moving image, but no code in the 008 currently exists for moving image. Instead, MARC 21 has codes for two types of moving image carrier (manifestation) in the 008/33: “m” for motion picture film and “v” for video-recording. Since a video copy can readily be made from any motion picture film (and often is in an audiovisual archive with a preservation mission), the current coding of the 008 in MARC 21 effectively precludes the creation of an expression-based record even for known reproductions of moving image materials. If the move to an expression-based record is allowed for preserving audiovisual archives, as recommended above, carrier coding must be removed from the 008 in the bibliographic record (e.g., 008/33 code m or v) for audio and visual archival materials—which are described on expression-based records with manifestations described in holdings records—and placed in the holdings records instead. As Miller has noted, “The fixed fields also illustrate the difficulty in changing overlapping values during format integration.”²¹

Current work on the AACR2 data content standard to clarify which kinds of data go into area 3, area 5, and area 7

may lead to clearer distinctions between carrier and content in the bibliographic description, which may in turn lead to demands for clearer distinctions in MARC 21.

6. *Design the best possible record-relationship mechanism to enable the inclusion in holdings displays of identification information drawn from bibliographic records, such as main entry (author and title) and date.*

Currently, this is a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21, but that might change if the shared cataloging environment were to change as recommended above. The solution, by the way, is *not* to store the same data in two or more places. This creates insupportable data maintenance problems in the long term.

7. *Consider whether it might be possible to create identifiers such as URNs for the logical entities "work," "author," and "subject."*

URN stands for uniform resource name, which is defined as "persistent identifier for information resources." URNs are being developed by a working group of the Internet Engineering Task Force.²² For this to work in our field, we would have to agree on common definitions for the FRBR entities, and then we would probably have to designate an agency, perhaps the Library of Congress or a consortium of national libraries, to assign URNs to those entities.

8. *Consider defining the authority record for a work heading as a work record to which all expressions of that work should be linked (DP72).*

CONSER is currently working on proposals to use authority records to cluster the successive expressions of a serial work.²³ The Joint Steering Committee for AACR also has charged its Format Variation Working Group with addressing the use of work authority records. The group has recommended the creation of an authority record for each expression of a work. If this follows the pattern of Bible headings whereby the expression heading always begins with the uniform title for the work, it could at least create a hierarchically related cluster of headings that represent the work.²⁴ The Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR) Working Group of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions also is studying the role of authority records within the catalog.²⁵

9. *Separate work headings from transcription that identifies a particular expression or manifestation of a work.*

Titles and series titles in current MARC 21 do double duty as transcribed forms and as headings. Many people are using systems that allow global updating for authority control. In other words, a heading in an authority record is linked to all occurrences of that heading in bibliographic records; when a change to the heading is necessary, it is made once in the authority record and that change automatically generates changes in all associated bibliographic

records. MARC 21 tags for transcribed titles and series, such as 245 and 440, need to be protected from simple global updating, but they need to link to authority records for the purpose of heading displays and more complex global updating that can retain the transcribed form but substitute a different normalized form for heading display purposes.²⁶

10. *Consider migrating all variant title access (currently in 246 fields in the bibliographic format) to cross references on work authority records.²⁷*

11. *Change the 245 first indicator to make unambiguous the question of whether the title should go into the title index.*

Currently, the meaning of first indicator 0 in the 245 field is determined by the presence or absence of a 1XX field. If a 1XX field is present, the first indicator 0 means the title should *not* be put into the title index. If a 1XX field is not present, the first indicator 0 is an indication that the 245 title is the main entry; as such it *should* be put into the title index. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate problems that arise in the sorting of moving image materials with 130 title main entries when the 245 titles cannot be suppressed from the title index based on MARC 21 indicator value of 0. Figure 1 shows an online public access catalog (OPAC) display example that does not work due to the failure to suppress titles from title indexes based on MARC 21 indicators. Note how the display of the title that is marked for suppression renders the authority record display meaningless and confusing.

Figure 2 provides an example of an OPAC display that includes titles that have been coded for suppression. Other types of titles that need to be suppressed from indexing in this way include transcribed titles that include "sic" or interpolations to correct them, titles with varying orthographies, and generic/numeric nondistinctive music and law titles that should be superseded by a more structured uniform title in a 240 field.²⁸

This may be a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem that requires a MARC 21 solution; however, a MARC 21 solution could make the local solution much easier. Most local systems are accustomed to tying display to the presence or absence of indicators. The current MARC 21 requirement that the meaning of an indicator for display be linked to the presence or absence of another field is logically a much more cumbersome approach, and it is not surprising that local systems currently do not enable the accurate reading of 245 first indicators in the construction of title indexes.

12. *Design the best possible record relationship mechanism to enable keyword searching of bibliographic records to include a search of cross references found in linked authority records.*

This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21. It might become a MARC 21 problem, though,

Headings	Records	Authority
Adventurous blonde Search under: Torchy Blane, the adventurous blonde [This line is derived from a uniform title authority record]	0	Yes
The adventurous blonde [This line is derived from a 245 00 field in a bibliographic record with a 130 field.]	1	

Figure 1. OPAC display that does not work (due to the failure to suppress titles from title indexes based on MARC 21 indicators)

Current display in all online public access catalogs known to the author that allow the building of a title index using both authority records and bibliographic records

*The rebel. A dash of gray
*The rebel. Absolution
Rebel de solitario
Rebel doctor
Rebel girls
Rebel (Motion picture)
Search under: Call me genius
*Rebel. Night on a rainbow
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Absolution
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Dash of gray
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Night on a rainbow

Example of the correct display

Rebel de solitario
Rebel doctor
Rebel girls
Rebel (Motion picture)
Search under: Call me genius
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Absolution
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Dash of gray
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Night on a rainbow

Even better display (no. 3 on the MARC 21 shopping list following)

Rebel (Motion picture)
Search under: Call me genius
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Absolution
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Dash of gray
Rebel (Television program : 1959–1962). Night on a rainbow
Rebel de solitario
Rebel doctor
Rebel girls

Figure 2. OPAC display that includes titles that have been coded for suppression (marked with a *)

if the shared cataloging environment were to be changed in the ways recommended above.

13. *Determine the optimum way to record the hierarchical relationships among headings so that a single change can cascade to all relevant headings. For example, a change in a main subject heading should be able to cascade to that heading with any subdivision appended to it.*

This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21. It might become a MARC 21 problem, though, if the shared cataloging environment were to be changed in the ways recommended above.

14. *Determine the optimum way to record hierarchical relationships among headings in a way to ensure the success of a user who does a search on variant forms of name found in two hierarchically related authority records.*

Consider the following example—the authority record for the FBI:

110 10 \$a United States. \$b Federal Bureau of Investigation

410 20 \$a FBI

410 10 \$a United States. \$b Dept. of Justice. \$b Federal Bureau of Investigation

410 20 \$a Federal Bureau of Investigation (U.S.)

410 20 \$a FBR

410 20 \$a Federalnoe biuro rassledovanii

510 10 \$a United States. \$b Bureau of Criminal Identification

510 10 \$a United States. \$b Dept. of Justice. \$b Division of

Investigation \$w-a

The following is the authority record for a section of the FBI.

110 10 a United States. b Federal Bureau of Investigation. b Uniform Crime Reports Section

Note that the *see* reference from “FBI” to “United States. Federal Bureau of Investigation” occurs only in the parent record. If a user were to search for “FBI Uniform Crime Reports Section,” the search would fail unless the system were smart enough to recognize the hierarchical relationship between these two records.

This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21. It might become a MARC 21 problem, though, if the shared cataloging environment were to be changed in the ways recommended above.

15. *Consider the possibility of using a different record structure than the current one to deal with “change of*

name as change of identity,” for example, change of name of a corporate body (earlier and later names), use of pseudonyms by an author, serial title changes, title changes in monographic works entered under title, and main entry changes in works that are published in sequential revised editions.

What is desirable is to allow users the choice of seeing either (a) only those works done under one identity or (b) all works done by one person or body under any identity. The two options also would be desirable for works with uniform titles, such as serials that have changed title. The current structure does not differentiate between a 500 for a pseudonym (same person) and a 500 for another person with the same name as a variant name for this person. The current structure simply chains together the corporate name and serial title changes. If one link is broken, the user cannot follow the chain back. A user will have difficulty assembling all of the works of a corporate body that has changed its name many times.

This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21. It might become a MARC 21 problem, though, if the shared cataloging environment were to be changed in the ways recommended above.

Category 4—The Marc 21 Shopping List

The following is a discussion of other miscellaneous problems with MARC 21 and vendor implementation of it.

1. *Devise a methodology to allow for switchable preferred forms of headings (2001-DP05).*²⁹

Essentially, a user of an English-language catalog should be able to define a language preference for his or her language (Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, or otherwise) so that, for example, if a user is a Spanish speaker and a Spanish form of name is present for a particular author, work, or subject that user seeks, the Spanish form will be substituted for the English-language preferred form wherever that heading appears, whether as a heading display, a multiple bibliographic record display, or a single record display.

A method should be developed to enable a language of preferred heading to vary based on language of catalog, language of catalog user, or script or transliteration preference of user. It should allow suppression or highlighting of categories of cross references in the OPAC by language, script, category of heading, or rules used in formation of heading. It should be possible to designate a particular form of heading as the preferred form for more than one language, as when two different languages actually use the same name for the same person, corporate body, work, concept, and so on. When more than one form is available

in a given secondary language, it should be possible to designate one as the preferred form for that language for all users who speak that language.

If we can solve this problem for users who speak different languages, we might be able to devise similar solutions for speakers of the same language whose usage differs, for example, experts who use technical language and lay people who use common language for the same concept. The desire to serve both types of users creates a constant tension in the data value standards, such as LCSH, used in both public and research libraries.

This is a complex set of record design (MARC 21) problems and system design (local vendor) problems. Before the local solutions can be devised, however, the MARC 21 records must be designed to support them. Data content standards come into play here as well. Currently AACR2R, for example, prefers the name by which an author, corporate body, or work is commonly known in the country of origin, rather than the name by which it is known in English-speaking countries. This was deemed necessary in order to share cataloging internationally. If MARC 21 record structure can be redesigned to support multiple preferred forms as described above, the data content standard will be more closely aligned with its own principle, that is, the principle of using the name commonly known by users of the catalog, regardless of country of origin of the named entity.

2. *Ensure better access to data currently coded in fixed fields.*

Put coded information currently in 006, 007, and 008 fields in MARC 21 bibliographic and holdings records in the best possible place to allow ready access to both librarians and the public for direct searching of dates, language, country of origin, and physical format categories, for example, general material designations (GMDs) such as leader byte 6, code j for musical sound recordings, specific material designations (SMDs) such as 007, byte 1, code s for sound cassettes, and all types of data coded in 007 fields, separately and in combination. This may be a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem solvable in MARC 21.

3. *Ensure adequate content designation to enable complex sorting of headings in OPACs for those institutions that desire to do so.*

The sorting of bibliographic records and headings is an oddity in the shared cataloging world—an area in which there are no standards or so many standards that it amounts to having none. Institutions are free to do what they like, and many would like to perform the complex sorting described below.

They would like to be able to code (or mark in some way) parenthetical qualifiers in headings that should be ignored in filing until there are two identical strings that

differ only in qualifier (DP57). For subject headings, this would help users improve both the precision and recall of their searches by allowing them to readily select the particular meaning of a term that most closely matches their need (for example, *power* as used in the political sciences, not as used in mechanical engineering). In the case of serial uniform titles, users could see right away that more than one journal has the title for which they are looking as well as an array of all those journals, enabling the users to easily scan the records for the right one. Figures 3 and 4 offer examples of headings with qualifiers.

Vendors of local systems could possibly resolve this sorting issue without requiring a change to MARC 21 if their sorting algorithms were made to pay attention to parentheses in normalized headings, since catalogers restrict their use of parentheses in headings to use with qualifiers only—this concept should be tested, however. If parentheses are ever used in headings for elements other than qualifiers, a MARC 21 change would be required, as no system solution would be available. It appears that OCLC is confident enough to sort parenthetical qualifiers in this recommended way in OCLC authority files. To see an example, scan the corporate name “Greens” in the OCLC authority file.

Institutions would benefit from being able to ensure that the optimal way to code chronological subdivisions on subject headings always file chronologically in heading indexes. The usefulness of this for history headings is self-evident. The headings are artificial constructs created by catalogers and are not likely to be known in advance by users. If users are not given a chronological array, they may never find the correct time period in a large file, such as the one for U.S. history. Figure 5 provides examples of history headings with chronological subdivisions.

Vendors of local systems could solve this problem in part without requiring a change in MARC 21 if their sorting algorithms would pay attention to subfield codes and accommodate a rule requiring all \$y subfields in 6XX fields to be sorted by the first number encountered in the string, skipping over all preceding text. An ideal machine-driven solution for the problem of B.C. dates and dates that are not in four-digit form (e.g., 19th century) may not be possible.

Institutions would like the ability to enable title fields (including 130, 630, 730, 830, and 246) and subfields, corporate name fields (including 110, 111, 610, 611, 710, 711, 810, and 811), and subject and geographic heading fields (including 650 and 651) in both bibliographic and authority records to contain articles with non-filing indicators or other markings to signal that they should be displayed, but skipped over for purposes of heading arrangement. For example, the famous Fellini film is called *La strada*, not *Strada*. (DP102, DP118, 98-16R, 2002-DP05). On

Ideal display

Power (Christian theology)
 Power (Mechanics)
 Power (Philosophy)
 Power (Social sciences)
 Power (Theology)
 Search under Power (Christian theology)
 Power amplifiers
 Power electronics
 Power of attorney
 Power resources
 Power spectra

Current display in all online public access catalogs known to the author

Power amplifiers
 Power (Christian theology)
 Power electronics
 Power (Mechanics)
 Power of attorney
 Power (Philosophy)
 Power resources
 Power (Social sciences)
 Power spectra
 Power (Theology)
 Search under Power (Christian theology)

Figure 3. OPAC displays of subject headings with qualifiers

January 30, 1999, MARBI did approve the use of control characters (98-16R) to indicate non-filing characters and has recently issued guidelines for their use.³⁰ While these guidelines are somewhat conservative and restrictive, they do essentially throw the ball back into the court of the content standards, which need to change to allow inclusion of articles in heading fields, as well as that of the system designers, who need to retool their software to use the new MARC 21 control characters to achieve proper matching and sorting.

Consider the following examples. The episode of the television program *The Courtship of Eddie's Father* titled *A Little Red* currently must have the article dropped to file properly:

```
130 0_ $aCourtship of Eddie's father (Television program: 1969-1972). $pLittle red.
```

```
245 04$aThe courtship of Eddie's father. $pA little red . . .
```

In another example, the musical group Los Lobos has a cross reference in its authority record to add the article back to its name!

```
010 __ $an91017885
```

```
110 2_ $aLobos (Musical group)
```

```
410 2_ $aLos Lobos (Musical group)
```

Ideal display

Health (Canberra, A.C.T.)
 Health (Chicago, Ill.)
 Health (New York, N.Y. : 1981)
 Health (San Francisco, Calif.)
 Health advocate
 Health alert
 Health care costs
 Health care management review
 Health cost review
 Health news
 Health reports

Current display in all online public access catalogs known to the author

Health advocate
 Health alert
 Health (Canberra, A.C.T.)
 Health care costs
 Health care management review.
 Health (Chicago, Ill.)
 Health cost review
 Health (New York, N.Y. : 1981)
 Health news
 Health reports
 Health (San Francisco, Calif.)

Figure 4. OPAC displays of serial uniform titles with qualifiers**Ideal Display**

United States—History—Colonial period, ca. 1600–1775.
 United States—History—Revolution, 1775–1783.
 United States—History—1815–1861.
 United States—History—Civil War, 1861–1865.
 United States—History—1969–

Current display in all online public access catalogs known to the author

United States—History—1815–1861.
 United States—History—1969–
 United States—History—Civil War, 1861–1865.
 United States—History—Colonial period, ca. 1600–1775.
 United States—History—Revolution, 1775–1783

Figure 5. OPAC displays of history headings with chronological subdivisions

4. Consider differentiating proper names from other topical subject headings.³¹

Currently, topical subject headings include many proper names, such as performing animals, fictitious characters, pyramids, ethnic groups, and computer systems.³² Users, including many reference librarians, are confused about which index (“subject” or “author”) to use to search for a proper name. The creation of a new tag in both the 6XX and the 7XX fields for proper names other than geographic, personal, or corporate names would allow systems more freedom to index

all proper names (including fictitious characters, performing animals, and so on) in a “name” index or the option of indexing them in both a “name” and a “subject” index.

5. *Ensure a separately tagged note is available for expression information composed by the cataloger.*

Catalogers often have information about the expression of a work they are cataloging that does not fit into standard bibliographic record fields for expression information and instead must place that information in a cataloger-composed note. This is particularly common with non-book materials such as moving images. For example, the cataloger may know that a film being cataloged is a short airline version, but the item usually does not have an edition statement that can be transcribed into a 250 field. The 562 field is currently used in a limited fashion to hold a cataloger-composed expression note, so perhaps more widespread use of the 562 field is all that is required. Separate tagging is valuable because it can ensure that this note can be placed ahead of all other notes in displays (98-02).

6. *Enable the encoding of item barcodes so that one barcode can be shared by multiple holdings records.*

In order to support the creation of analytics in library catalogs, library systems need to allow one barcode to be shared by multiple holdings records. This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem requiring a solution in MARC 21.

7. *Enable multiple bibliographic records to attach to one holding record.*

In order to support the creation of cataloging records for multiple works contained in a single physical item, the so-called “bound-with problem,” library systems need to allow multiple bibliographic records to be attached to one holding record (DP116). This is currently a problem that must be solved by vendors of local systems, rather than a problem requiring a solution in MARC 21. Cornell has a local solution, for example.³³

8. *Create a subfield code to differentiate the forename from the surname.*³⁴

Name searching could be made more precise if the user were allowed to specify whether a particular search string was a surname or a forename, for example, when using fill-in search boxes such as those offered on the Amazon.com Web site.

This may be a problem that could be solved by vendors of local systems by using the presence of a comma in a personal name heading to indicate that what follows is a forename—rather than a problem that requires a solution in MARC 21. However, such a solution should include the ability to recognize those cases in which the entire name is a forename, as signified by MARC 21 indicators.

9. *Try to ensure that catalogers have to supply as little ISBD (International Standard Bibliographic Description) punctuation as possible.*³⁵

This may be impossible in current MARC 21 format, as there may not be enough subfields in 245 to support an alternative to ISBD punctuation. A substantial retrospective conversion of existing data also would be necessary, of course, even if it were possible to change MARC 21 to do this.

10. *Add codes for method of distribution (e.g., theatrical distribution of motion pictures, television and radio broadcasting, print publication, Internet distribution).*

The ability to limit moving-image searches to works theatrically distributed as motion pictures, excluding works broadcast as television programs, would be very useful. For moving images, such codes would be needed at the work level. Now that methods of distribution are changing so radically for materials more commonly collected by libraries than motion pictures and television programs, letting users limit their searches to works and expressions of works available over the Internet (as opposed to print publications), or vice versa, might also be useful. When the same expression of the same work is distributed both as a print or other offline publication and over the Internet, the coding would be needed at the manifestation level.

11. *Add content designation to classification number fields to allow catalogers to differentiate between classification numbers that are used as both location devices and as discipline-based subject access devices, and classification numbers that are not used as location devices but still are valuable as discipline-based subject divisions. Examples are classification numbers assigned to materials shelved in remote storage in barcode sequence, or classification numbers assigned to electronic documents.*

Wilson has done research demonstrating that only 20 percent of Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member institutions are applying classification numbers to electronic documents, which means that users are missing out on discipline-based subject access to these information resources.³⁶ Wilson does not suggest that a reason for this negligence may be that libraries are afraid to confuse users with classification numbers, fearing that they will expect to find items they seek on the shelf at the classification number location. However, this explanation for the decision not to classify seems a distinct possibility. Content designation might allow us, however, to suppress a classification number for an electronic document in an online shelflist but include it in an online classed catalog. It might also allow us to develop display constants in single record displays that better explain to users how the classification number is being used (whether as both location and subject access, or as subject access only and not as a location).

Summary

One reason various commentators are predicting the demise of the MARC format is a fear that if we allow our bibliographic data to be “segregated” from data in the rest of the world, we will be marginalized. Miller warns, for example, that “business interests recognize that users prefer to search a single resource and are working around the clock to prepare enticing information portals complete with their ‘brands’ of information,” implying that if libraries cannot produce similar portals we will lose the competition with the business world for patrons’ information dollars.³⁷ A caveat is in order, though. Many of the resources that would have to be merged into this “single resource” are not under the kind of authority control that allows libraries to help users find the authors, works, and subjects they seek. If our normalized data is not searched and displayed separately from non-normalized data, all of the expensive work we do to link and demonstrate relationships (which seems to be admired by most of these writers) is lost in a sea of mud. Or, as Gorman puts it: “I did a search on ‘Michael Gorman’ on Google. It yielded ‘about 7710’ results. Three in the first 10 (supposedly the most relevant) related to me. The other references were to a philosopher of that name in Washington, DC; a historian at Stanford; an Irish folk musician; and a consulting engineer in Denver, Colorado. The remaining 7700 entries are in no discernable order and some do not even relate to anyone called Michael Gorman.”³⁸ If Gorman had done his search in a typical library catalog, he would have found his works listed separately from those of the philosopher, the historian, and the musician, each set of works under its own author heading.

The rest of the world is champing at the bit for a chance to mark up their data to support more complex display and indexing.³⁹ We should consider ourselves fortunate that thanks to the foresight of people like Henriette Avram, catalogers have been creating a semantic Web for almost forty years, a Web that day in and day out allows users to explore the riches in our libraries, archives, and museums.⁴⁰ Let us be careful not to destroy what we have in a rush to emulate the rest of the world, which may be on the threshold of recognizing its own need to develop solutions similar to the ones we in the library world already employ.

References

1. F. H. Ayres, “Time for Change: A New Approach to Cataloguing Concepts,” *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 28, no. 2 (1999): 3–16; David Dorman, “Metadata Preconference Views Post-MARC World,” *American Libraries* 31, no. 9 (2000): 70; David Dorman, “Technically Speaking: The End of MARC?” *American Libraries* 31, no. 4 (Apr. 2000):

- 80; David Dorman, "Technically Speaking: Marking Progress, Part Two," *American Libraries* 30, no. 8 (Sept. 1999): 94; David Dorman, "Technically Speaking: Marking Progress, Part Three," *American Libraries* 30, no. 9 (Oct. 1999): 74; David Dorman, "Technically Speaking: Marking Progress, Part Four," *American Libraries* 30, no. 11 (Nov. 1999). Accessed July 14, 2000, www.ala.org/alongline/ts/ts1199.html; David J. Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 33, no. 2 (2001): 17–28; Dick R. Miller, "XML: Libraries' Strategic Opportunity," *Library Journal Netconnect* (summer 2000). Accessed Aug. 16, 2000, www.libraryjournal.com/xml.asp; Dick R. Miller, "XML and MARC: A Choice or Replacement?" 2000. Accessed Mar. 2, 2003, http://xmlmarc.stanford.edu/ALA_2000.htm; Dick R. Miller, et al., "Restructuring Serial, Circulation, and Traditional Bibliographic Data for Deployment in Changing Digital Environments," 1999. Accessed Sept. 6, 2002, <http://xmlmarc.stanford.edu/Speech.htm>; Roy Tennant, "MARC Exit Strategies," *Library Journal* (Nov. 15, 2002): 27. Accessed Nov. 26, 2002, www.libraryjournal.reviewsnews.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA256611; Roy Tennant, "MARC Must Die," *Library Journal* (Oct. 15, 2002): 26. Accessed Oct. 17, 2002, www.libraryjournal.reviewsnews.com/index.asp?layout=articlePrint&articleID=CA250046; Roy Tennant, "Building a New Bibliographic Infrastructure," *Library Journal* (Jan. 15, 2004): 1. Accessed Mar. 14, 2004, www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA371079.
2. Bruce Chr. Johnson, "XML and MARC: 'Which Is Right?'" *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 32, no. 1 (2001): 81–90; Sally McCallum, "Extending MARC for Bibliographic Control in the Web Environment: Challenges and Alternatives," in *Proceedings of the Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium, Washington, D.C., November 15–17, 2000*, ed. Ann M. Sandberg-Fox (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, Cataloging Distribution Service, 2001): 245–61; Jackie Radebaugh, "MARC Goes Global—And Lite," *American Libraries* 34, no. 2 (Feb. 2003): 43–44.
 3. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, *MARC 21 XML Schema*. Accessed Apr. 2003, www.loc.gov/standards/marxml; Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, *Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS)*. Accessed Apr. 2003, www.loc.gov/standards/mods.
 4. Tim Berners-Lee, James Hendler, and Ora Lassila, "The Semantic Web," *Scientific American* (May 17, 2001). Accessed Aug. 6, 2003, www.scientificamerican.com/print_version.cfm?articleID=00048144-10D2-1C70-84A9809EC588EF21&SC=1100322; Paul Bonner, "The Semantic Web," *PC Magazine* 21, no. 13 (July 2002): IP01-04; World Wide Web Consortium, *W3C Technology and Society Domain Semantic Web Activity*, 2003. Accessed Aug. 6, 2003, www.w3.org/2001/sw.
 5. Victoria Irons Walch, *Standards for Archival Description: A Handbook* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1994).
 6. Miller, "XML and MARC"; Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 26.
 7. Ibid.
 8. "Monday July 10, Joint Meeting with CC:DA, 2000," *MARBI Meeting Minutes: ALCTS/LITA/RUSA, ALA Annual Conference, Chicago, IL, July 8–10, 2000*. Accessed Mar. 14, 2004, www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/an-00.html.
 9. Miller, "XML and MARC"; Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 25; Tennant, "MARC Must Die."
 10. John C. Attig, "Descriptive Cataloging Rules and Machine-Readable Record Structures: Some Directions for Parallel Development," in *The Conceptual Foundations of Descriptive Cataloging*, ed. Elaine Svenonius. (San Diego: Academic Pr., 1989), 141.
 11. Ibid.
 12. IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records, *Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records: Final Report* (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1998). Accessed Apr. 2003, www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf.
 13. John C. Attig, comments on a previous version of this paper, 2003.
 14. Miller, "Restructuring Serial, Circulation, and Traditional Bibliographic Data"; Tennant, "MARC Must Die."
 15. Gregory H. Leazer, "An Examination of Data Elements for Bibliographic Description: Toward a Conceptual Schema for the USMARC Formats," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 36, no. 2 (Apr. 1992): 189–208; Miller, "XML and MARC"; Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 18.
 16. Leazer, "An Examination of Data Elements for Bibliographic Description."
 17. Dorman, "Metadata"; Tennant, "MARC Exit Strategies."
 18. Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 22.
 19. *MARC Discussion Papers* and *MARC Proposals* from 1995 to date can be found on the Library of Congress MARC Web site: MARC Standards: MARC Development. Accessed Mar. 14, 2004, www.loc.gov/marc/development.html.
 20. Martha M. Yee, "Viewpoints: One Catalog or No Catalog?" *ALCTS Newsletter* 10, no. 4 (1999): 13–17.
 21. Miller, "XML and MARC."
 22. Uniform Resources Names (URN) [working group], Internet Engineering Task Force. Accessed Mar. 28, 2004, www.ietf.org/html.charters/urn-charter.html.
 23. "CONSER Task Force on FRBR and Continuing Resources Begins Explorations," *ConserLine* 22 (2003): 4.
 24. Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR, Format Variation Working Group, *Third Interim Report* (Aug. 9, 2002). Accessed Apr. 2003, www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/forvarwg3rep3.pdf.
 25. International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions, Cataloguing Section, *Minutes of the Standing Committee Meetings, 17 and 23 August, 2002*: section 6.2. Accessed Apr. 2003, www.ifla.org/VII/s13/meet/0802.htm.
 26. George E. Gibbs and Diane Bisom, "Creating an Interactive Authority File for Names in the UCLA ORION System: Specifications and Decisions," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 9, no. 3 (1989): 153–69; Martha M. Yee and Sara Shatford Layne, *Improving Online Public Access Catalogs* (Chicago: ALA, 1998): 53–58.
 27. Michael Heaney, "Object-Oriented Cataloging," *Information Technology and Libraries* 14, no. 3 (Sept. 1995): 135–53.

28. The author wishes to thank Sherman Clarke and Elhanan Adler for suggesting these other conditions in a discussion of the problem on the MARC Forum electronic discussion list; Sherman Clarke, "Re: 245 first indicator," online posting, Feb. 3, 2004, MARC Forum; Elhanan Adler, "Re: 245 first indicator," online posting, Feb. 3, 2004, MARC Forum. Both accessed Mar. 14, 2004, <http://listserv.loc.gov/listarch/marc.html>.
29. Ayres, "Time for Change," 9; Miller, "XML and MARC"; Tennant, "MARC Exit Strategies."
30. Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress, *MARC 21 Formats: Guidelines for the Non-Sorting Control Character Technique*, 2003. Accessed May 5, 2003, www.loc.gov/marc/nonsorting.html.
31. Martha M. Yee and Ray Soto, "User Problems with Access to Fictional Characters and Personal Names in Online Public Access Catalogs," *Information Technology and Libraries* 10, no. 1 (1991): 3–13.
32. Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, *MARC 21 Format for Authority and Bibliographic Data: Alphabetical List of Ambiguous Headings*. Accessed Feb. 5, 2004, www.loc.gov/marc/ambiguous-headings.html.
33. Cornell University Libraries, Central Technical Services, *Procedure for "Bound With" Materials*, 2001. Accessed Apr. 28, 2003, www.library.cornell.edu/voyager/Holdings/BoundWith.html.
34. Miller, "Restructuring Serial"; Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 24; Tennant, "MARC Must Die."
35. Fiander, "Applying XML to the Bibliographic Description," 23.
36. Mary Dabney Wilson, "Flying First Class or Economy? Classification of Electronic Titles in ARL Libraries," in *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 1:3 (2001): 225–40.
37. Miller, "XML and MARC."
38. Michael Gorman, "Authority Control in the Context of Bibliographic Control in the Electronic Environment," International Conference on Authority Control: Definition and International Experiences, Florence, Italy, Feb. 10–12, 2003. Accessed Feb. 2003, www.unifi.it/universita/biblioteche/ac/relazioni/gorman_eng.pdf.
39. Berners-Lee, Hendler, and Lassila, "The Semantic Web"; Bonner, "The Semantic Web"; World Wide Web Consortium, *The Technology and Society Domain: Technical Building Blocks That Help Address Critical Public Policy Issues on the Web*, Semantic Web Activity, 2003. Accessed Mar. 14, 2004, www.w3.TandS/#Semantic.
40. Henriette Avram was a systems analyst hired by the Library of Congress in 1965 to work on developing the MARC format and was the key person in the development effort. She also published many articles about MARC and thereby spearheaded the process of making MARC a de facto standard in our field. Some call her the "mother of MARC." She retired from the Library of Congress in 1992.

Appendix

Example of an Expression-based Record for a Film Preserved at the UCLA Film and Television Archive with Manifestations Described as Holdings Appended to the Expression Record

One hour with you / Paramount Publix Corp. ; an Ernst Lubitsch production ; produced and directed by Ernst Lubitsch ; assisted by George Cukor ; screenplay by Samson Raphaelson. — United States : Paramount Publix Corp., 1932. — Romantic comedy with songs; feature.

Based on the play Nur ein Traum, Lustspiel im 3 Akten (Only a dream) by Lothar Schmidt, which opened in Munich in 1909. Remake of The marriage circle.

CAST: Maurice Chevalier (Dr. Andre Bertier); Jeanette MacDonald (Colette Bertier); Genevieve Tobin (Mitzi Olivier); Charlie Ruggles (Adolph); Roland Young (Professor Olivier); Josephine Dunn (Mlle. Martel); Richard Carle (Detective Henri Pomier); Barbara Leonard (Mitzi's maid).

CREDITS: Photography, Victor Milner; camera operators, William Mellor and William Rand; assistant cameramen, Guy Roe and Lucien Ballard; gowns, Travis Banton; interpolated music, Richard A. Whiting; sound, M. M. Paggi.

Playing time on release was 75 or 80 min., according to: AFI catalog, 1931–1940.

Copyright notice on videodisc sleeve: c1932, Paramount Publix Corporation, renewed 1959 by EMKA, Ltd.

HOLDINGS:

1. Inventory number: VA11168 M

1 videocassette of 1 (VHS) (80 min.) : sd., b&w and col. ; 1/2 in.

Los Angeles, California : UCLA Film and Television Archive, March 1994. Reproduced from 3/4 in. videocassettes (M56801). Reproduction for preservation purposes permitted by Universal.

Tinted sequences transferred as color on videotape.

2. Inventory number: M56801

2 videocassettes of 2 (80 min.) : sd., b&w and col. ; 3/4 in.

Los Angeles, California : UCLA Film and Television Archive, March 1994. Reproduced at Video Craftsmen from 35 mm. prsv safety print (M32578). Reproduction for preservation purposes permitted by Universal.

Tinted sequences transferred as color on videotape.

3. Inventory number: M32578

5 reels of 5 (80 min.) (ca. 9000 ft.) : opt sd., b&w with b&w (tinted) sequences ; 35 mm. safety print.

Los Angeles, California : UCLA Film and Television Archive, 1986. Reproduced from 35 mm. safety prsv dupe pic neg (XFE2240 -2248 M) and dupe track neg (XFE2250 -2258 M). Reproduction for preservation purposes permitted by Universal.

4. Inventory number: XFE2240 -2248 M

9 reels of 9 (80 min.) (ca. 9000 ft.) ; 35 mm. safety prsv dupe pic neg.

Los Angeles, California : UCLA Film and Television Archive, March 1994. Reproduced from 35 mm. nitrate print (M2993). Reproduction for preservation purposes permitted by Universal.

5. Inventory number: XFE2250 -2258 M

9 reels of 9 (80 min.) (ca. 9000 ft.) : opt sd. ; 35 mm. safety prsv dupe track neg.

Los Angeles, California : UCLA Film and Television Archive, March 1994. Reproduced from 35 mm. nitrate print (M2993). Reproduction for preservation purposes permitted by Universal.

6. Inventory number: M2993

5 reels of 5 (80 min.) (ca. 9000 ft.) : opt sd., b&w with b&w (tinted) sequences ; 35 mm. nitrate print.

CONDITION: Fragile; shrunken.