numbers to create subject maps of the Internet. As it turned out, getting authors to supply classification has been problematic and search engines like Google have become the preferred method for information retrieval on the Web. On the other hand, Edward Gaynor's paper debating the usefulness of Standard General Markup Language (SGML) versus the MARC format written in 1996 raises many of the same points later made by Roy Tennant in his call for the end of the MARC format and a switch to catalogs using eXtensible Markup Language (XML) in 2002.[1]

Some of the papers contain information that is still relatively current and provide good introductions to their topics. Karen Calhoun and Bill Kara do an excellent job of presenting the two ways to catalog electronic journals and articles in aggregator packages (single versus multiple records), and Beth Guay discusses ways to use the MARC linking fields to make either approach more comprehensible to the user. Sharon Farb's paper on universal design illustrates the problems faced by users with disabilities. Martha Yee provides a summary of the International Federation of Library Association and Institution's (IFLA's) guidelines for OPAC displays. Both papers have recommendations that would make our online catalogs much more user-friendly, yet are not widely discussed today. Larry Dixson presents two papers on how Z39.50 actually works, and William Moen explains why it does not work as well as it should because of interoperability problems. Barbara Tillet's paper is an excellent primer on the problems of name authority control in an international environment. Colleen Hyslop has two articles describing the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and the reasons behind its creation.

If the book has a flaw, it is the fact that the papers only go through 2001. No mention is made of why the CFFC decided to end the series. It is interesting to note that none of the papers discuss Google even though it debuted in 1998. The members of the CFFC did not foresee today's furious debate about the need for online catalogs and cataloging when users prefer to search Google to find information. Yee's paper on online catalog displays makes a passing mention of IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), which also came out in 1998. Again this is a topic of keen interest to catalogers in the new millennium. To a cataloger in 2006, the absence of these topics makes the collection of papers seem incomplete and dated, even though much of the information is still current today. The collection's main value is that of historical source.—*Dana M. Caudle, (caudlda@auburn.edu), Auburn University Libraries, Auburn, Ala.*

Reference

1. Tennant, Roy, "MARC Must Die," *Library Journal* 127, no. 17 (2002): 26–27.

Guidelines for Online Public Access Catalogue (OPAC) Displays: Final Report, May 2005. Recommended by the Task Force on Guidelines for OPAC Displays; approved by the Standing Committee of the IFLA Cataloguing Section. München: K. G. Saur, 2005. 34 cloth (ISBN 3-598-24276-X). IFLA Series on Bibliographic Control, v. 27

This brief work is divided into two sections: principles (16 pages) and recommendations (23 pages), the latter largely composed of examples of online public access catalogue (OPAC) displays.

The focus of the guidelines (not standards) is on the display of bibliographic and authority records for the public in general libraries. There is some discussion of searching, but creating standards for searching is not a purpose of the report, nor does it address displays for library functions, e.g., acquisitions or serial check-in.

Although bibliographic records and current integrated library systems (ILS) are not yet equipped to handle Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) recommendations concerning showing relationships among manifestations of works, samples are included of what such displays might be.

There is an extensive international bibliography (5 pages), which had insufficient editing. For example, two research projects produced at the University of Toronto as a requirement for the Master of Information Science degree are listed, but neither is identified as such. One has the University as publisher (Chan), the other gives no publisher (Luk). The bibliography lists me under my middle name (McRee) rather than my surname (Elrod). Professor L. C. Howarth was faculty reader for both of the research projects mentioned above and is also the chair of the task force that produced this report. These two research projects, like this final report, fail to consider an International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) display.

With the move from card catalogs to online catalogs, library system developers and vendors have largely taken over from catalogers the role of catalog building, reducing catalogers to individual record creation. The ISBD has been largely abandoned as a standard for display.

This publication might have represented an effort by catalogers to resume their traditional role as catalog builders, and to restore the ISBD as a standard, a standard that rests on over a century of cataloger experience in catalog creation. But not one of the examples in this work is of an ISBD display, which is strange for an International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) publication, since IFLA created the ISBD.

For the most part, in our OPACs, labeled displays have replaced paragraphed ISBD displays, taking up valuable display space, and mislabeling elements, such as criminal defendants, composers, illustrators, translators, editors,

and so on, as "Authors." This report does not question that development.

All examples in this work assume labels, and most use "Author," although there are examples in languages other than English, and one example uses "Personal Name" (6). The closest to an ISBD display is one labeled "Brief Description" (13), although elsewhere "Description" is used to label collation.

The *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules,* Second Edition (*AACR2*), their proposed replacement Resource Description and Access (RDA), and MARC21 could all mandate ISBD display. Instead, the RDA creators seem to have decided to relegate ISBD to an appendix as an option for description and display. That does not bode well for availability of ISBD-compliant software from vendors, who seem to find it preferable to make fun of ISBD punctuation and design over more elaborate labels to help the catalogue user. As Bernhard Eversberg has repeatedly stated in Autocat postings, labels work less well where not everybody speaks English, unless the patron has several sets of labels from which to choose. But even then, some data elements refuse to be neatly labeled. If MARC were to say "records are to be displayed in ISBD order and with ISBD punctuation," that's what everybody would do. There is a good example of a MARC display (fig. 14 d).

Included in this final report's bibliography is the very useful work by Martha M. Yee and Sara Shatford Layne upon which an IFLA recommendation paper was based.[1] On pages 114–15 of that report, Yee and Layne list field labels based on AACR2, MARC, and labels found in existing systems.

The November 24, 1998, Draft IFLA publication called "Guidelines for OPAC Displays," prepared for the IFLA Task Force on Guidelines for OPAC Displays by Martha Yee, unfortunately was withdrawn. It is included in a paper that Yee gave at the 1999 IFLA Council and General Conference.[2] It has helpful sorting suggestions missing from this final report.

My only reservation concerning Yee's earlier recommendations is that I have found inverse chronological display, particularly under subject, to work best, regardless of subject matter. Most patrons select an item from among the first five or so displayed. Long arts and social science retrieval lists are helped by inverse chronological arrangement as are science ones. Authors whose surnames begin A–M, who circulate more frequently, are no more authoritative than authors whose surnames begin N–Z, who circulate less frequently. The same reservation applies to the final report. A sample display allows clicking for sorting results by ascending or descending date (10), but it is not the default subject set sort.

Another Yee paper that should become a landmark in our effort to find a tool to use in dealing with vendors concerning our requirements for good library online cata-logue software, and patron friendly displays, and which is vastly superior for this purpose than IFLA's final report is "Principles for the Display of Cataloger-Created Metadata" (February 15, 2002, draft), an expansion of her withdrawn IFLA paper.[3] There are copious examples, including (Figure 14, p. 112) of ISBD displays.—*J. McRee (Mac) Elrod (mac@slc.bc.ca), Special Libraries Cataloguing, Inc., Victoria, B.C., Canada*

References

1. Martha M. Yee and Sara Shatford Layne, *Improving Online Public Access Catalogs* (Chicago: ALA, 1998).
2. Martha M. Yee, "Guidelines for OPAC Displays," 1999. www.ifla.org/IV/ifla65/papers/098-131e.htm (accessed Oct. 15, 2006).
3. Martha M. Yee, "Principles for the Display of Cataloger-Created Metadata," Feb. 15, 2002, draft. http://slc.bc.ca/yee/pdf (accessed Oct. 15, 2006).

Brief Reviews

MARC21 for Everyone: A Practical Guide. By Deborah A. Fritz and Richard J. Fritz. Chicago: ALA, 2003. 188p. $48 ($43.20 for ALA members) paper (ISBN 0-8389-0842-X).

Fritz and Fritz stress repeatedly—and appropriately—that their book is intended as a general overview of MARC, not as a detailed MARC manual. Given its stated purpose, *MARC21 for Everyone* provides a remarkably thorough introduction to MARC coding for bibliographic records. Its only significant weakness is that it was published in 2003, and some of the information and examples are already outdated.

But is it really for everyone, as the title claims? And is it really a practical guide? The answer to both questions is yes, with some qualifications.

The titular "everyone" encompasses most library staff. Chapter 6 delineates "Who Needs to Know What" for staff in all areas of public and technical services, as well as systems and administration. The information in this book will satisfy the needs of most of these groups but not all. For example, the authors note that "catalogers need to know everything about MARC, in much more detail than we will cover here" (61). However, even for (new) catalogers, the work could be a useful introductory training tool.

The claim that *MARC21 for Everyone* is a practical guide is subject to a stronger qualification. The book is divided into Part 1, "MARC: The Underlying Fundamentals," and Part 2, "MARC21 Codes You Should Know." Part 1 contains background information on cataloging in general and MARC in particular. While not exactly impractical, it probably contains more historical information than some readers care to know, particularly those who want to understand just enough about MARC to perform their jobs.