FROM THE CHAIR

I am pleased to report that at long last we plan to implement the first phase of the REMUS/NACO project, that of training selected libraries in the LC name authority procedures so that they may contribute music headings to the LC Name Authority File. Because of the impact of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act on available staff at the Library of Congress, LC requested that MOUG revise its proposal for NACO training from five institutions to three. Progress on our original proposal has been further complicated by the fact that Richard Jones, REMUS Project Director, has been promoted to Head of Acquisitions at the University of Wisconsin/Milwaukee Library, and plans to withdraw from the project as soon as others are trained to replace him. I would like to thank Rick for his continuing efforts in the negotiations with LC, OCLC, MOUG, and the participating libraries.

Five libraries had previously been identified to receive the initial NACO training: University of Illinois; Indiana University; Oberlin College; Eastman School of Music, University of Rochester; and University of Texas. From this pool of five libraries, under the revised proposal three libraries will be selected for training. The selected libraries must be approved by LC. Upon successful completion of NACO training, these three music libraries will be considered as one NACO participant.
The Council of Library Resources and OCLC had previously agreed to fund travel expenses for the trainees. We are currently negotiating with those two organizations to reaffirm this funding.

If all goes as planned, training should begin in early Fall 1986. Participants will travel to Milwaukee to receive training. Although it will be some time yet before you begin to see REMUS-contributed authority records in the OCLC online authority file, we are taking important steps forward in this project.

The MOUG Executive Board will assemble in Cleveland in mid-August for its annual midsummer meeting. Among the agenda items will be discussion of MOUG's 1987 budget and preliminary plans for our 1987 Annual Meeting in Eugene, Oregon, preceding the MLA annual meeting. There is no MLA preconference workshop this year, so MOUG will meet on Tuesday and Wednesday, February 10-11, 1987. Mark your calendars and watch future newsletters for further details.

In this issue you will find a continuation of the summaries of sessions at the Milwaukee meeting as well as an article by H. Stephen Wright. Thanks to Candace Feldt for preparing the summary.

Tim Robson
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FINANCIAL REPORT

1st Quarter 1986

Balance end of 4th quarter $4420.33

Income 1st quarter:
- Memberships (1986) 1400.00
- Back issues 25.50
- Interest 67.61
- Registration 1720.00
- Meeting luncheon 480.00
TOTAL INCOME 3693.11

Expenditures 1st quarter:
- Meeting (Milwaukee) 949.52
- Board expenses 2515.75
- Other 1566.23
- Back issues postage 9.94
- Supplies 66.18
- Stamps 19.18
- Membership PVPCUG 5.00
- Bank charges 12.45
TOTAL EXPENDITURES 2628.50

Balance end of 1st quarter $5484.94

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

The Music Library Association is now accepting applications for the second Walter Gerboth Award, in the amount of $200, in memory of the esteemed professor of music and former music librarian who died in 1984. Eligible are members of the Association who are music librarians in the first five years of their professional career, seeking assistance for a research project in progress whose focus is music bibliography or librarianship. It is desirable but not required that the research be destined for publication.

An application should be accompanied by two letters of support, one for the person and one for the project, and should include a vita as well as names of further references who might be consulted. It should describe the project and its significance, and show the total budget, specifying the amount requested from the Association, sources of other funds if any, and the purpose of the funds requested. No funds will be awarded for capital purchases. Applications should be submitted by January 1, 1987, to Gerboth Award, Sibley Music Library, Eastman School of Music, 26 Gibbs St., Rochester, NY 14604.

Contact: M. W. Davidson
Sibley Music Library
Eastman School of Music
26 Gibbs St.
Rochester, NY 14604
716-275-3046

SUMMARY OF THE 1986 ANNUAL MEETING (CONTINUED)

PLENARY SESSION II

The second part of Plenary Session II was introduced by Dawn Thistle of Holy Cross College. She emphasized that as automated library systems have evolved and become more sophisticated and complex, we are faced with more options for automation than ever before. It is therefore incumbent upon us as music librarians to know our fields as well as we possibly can in order to be able to communicate what we know to the computer professionals who will be designing, programming or implementing the computer systems we will be using in our libraries.

Jeff Rehbach, Systems Librarian, formerly Music Librarian at Middlebury College, was the first speaker. He focused on three main areas of concern to the music librarian in our rapidly changing information world: First, the general environment in which we operate; next, particular concerns of the music librarian in planning for and using online systems; and finally, questions relating to potential uses of computing in the music library.

As we plan for automation, we need to keep in sight the broader environment in which we are automating, and the basic rationale for achieving online access to our collections. Library and computer worlds are converging. We have much
more ready access to computing than we had only a few years ago, and decreasing computer costs are making it possible for us to acquire microcomputers for our libraries. Microcomputer work stations have become reality, as evidenced by the fact that OCLC will soon no longer support the 100 series of terminals--within a year, most of us will be using M300's. We are reaching the point where we must adopt the new technology or be left behind.

From a systems point of view, we need to clearly define our reasons for automating. The overall goal in adopting computer technology in our libraries is to provide our users more efficient and effective access to our collections, and to make our libraries more effective and productive as organizations.

In order to evaluate the appropriateness of the technology, we must learn something about it. As we familiarize ourselves with the technology, we will develop our own applications for music library patrons (such as song indexes, through spreadsheet or index programs). It is easier to describe to someone else what we need or want when we understand the basic concepts of input, output, processing and data base management.

Can we afford not to exploit the new technology? We will have to justify the cost in terms of services to users, through clearly presenting our objectives, stating our needs and analyzing our options.

Can or should music user needs take precedence over more general system enhancements? How large is the music user base and what are the benefits relative to the costs of providing special services or enhancements to a small group of users? Are music libraries or their parent institutions able to afford the improvements and services desired? How do we set priorities for our future development? Our challenge as music librarians is to be sensitive to the changing technological environment in which we operate, to educate ourselves about how systems work in order that we can properly evaluate how we should use those systems, and to define as clearly as we can the needs of our users.

Our definition of needs and objectives for an online catalog at the local level must accommodate the uses of the system by both library staff and patrons. In many cases, the needs of the music library will parallel those of the general library in terms of basic requirements for cataloging, circulation control, public access catalog and acquisitions.

Library needs are communicated to vendors through various means. The Request for Proposal (RFP) for an automated system includes specifications for the basic library functions. Additional needs and specifications can be communicated at vendor demonstrations and discussions. Once the contract is signed, we can communicate through the vendor directly and/or through user groups, depending on the size of the company. Communication is vital! Involvement in automation committee work and/or user groups is extremely important. We should try to present music library needs in the light of providing opportunities for viewing general library needs from a different perspective. Solutions to specific music problems may have broad applications in the total online system.

Particular concerns to music users which need to be conveyed to vendors are being addressed by the MLA Automation Subcommittee. A set of standard specifications for local systems is being developed, which should be used consistently in RFPs and user group lists. For those searching catalogs, we need the standard author, title and subject access. Additionally, we need indexes for uniform titles (240 and 700 subfield t); 028's and publishers numbers in 260 and 262 fields; performer entries in 700, 705, 710 and 715 fields; author/title in 100 & 240, 100 & 245 and 700 subfields a & t. In keyword searches, we need to be able to search thematic index numbers and keys for musical works. We need provisions for keying in music symbols, such as sharp or flat signs. Uniform titles attached to name headings should be indexed together and displayed in tandem. It would be very confusing to a patron to see a uniform title displayed with a performer's name.
with no reference to the composer!

For music use, display screens showing multiple matches must include enough information, including main entry, uniform title, title proper and material type (i.e. score or sound recording) so that the user can select the item wanted. In a brief record display of an individual bibliographic record, the uniform title, publication area and specific material designator (300 or 305 subfield a) must appear. For sound recordings cataloged using AACR2, it is necessary that the entire 245, including subfield c display, since it might contain title content information not found in subfields a or b.

Many systems have problems alphabetizing or "filing" bibliographic records, due to programming of sort routines. Some sort multiple hits first by date cataloged, then alphabetically by title. This creates huge problems for something like Haydn symphonies. In those systems that do subsort by title after main entry, it is often the 245 and not the 240 that displays and is the basis for sorting. For music users this is not acceptable. Once a system is programmed to sort by uniform title, make sure it sorts subfields containing numbers in sequence as integers, rather than in ASCII sequence.

Authority control is not yet fully implemented in many systems. As music librarians, this may be our opportunity to contribute to the design process. For example, it is desirable to have the system generate automatic linkages created from subfield p and subfield n of the uniform title fields to the authorized name/uniform title for the work, without the cataloger having to type in every cross-reference.

In the acquisitions subsystem, publishers numbers (028) and uniform titles must be accommodated in order records. For circulation, make sure the system supports all MARC formats, including scores and recordings. It should also accommodate multiple bibliographic records for a single item ("withs"). Also, the system should be able to handle multi-part items, checking for all parts at check out and again when the item is returned.

Additionally, Rehbach suggests the following areas to check on: Screen display is critical to the "friendliness" of a system. Uniform titles should display at all levels. Catalogers should be concerned with the flexibility of editing bibliographic records in a local system. We need to be able to add any number of fields and change the order of fields. The ability to scan related editions and transfer information from one bibliographic record to another and move information from an authority record to a bibliographic record (through windowing) without rekeying it letter by letter is very important. Performing global search and replaces for revised headings is also an essential function. An "audit trail" would be useful to track where users are having trouble searching the catalog. As user failures in the online catalog are analyzed, changes can be made in indexing and heading selections; more or less analytics, subject headings, or cross references can be used, etc. Rehbach reminds us that there is more than one right way to do things. We may wish to reconsider how we use OCLC for cataloging, versus our local systems. Should contents notes be accessible online? Will our systems have enough storage and processing capacity for hundreds of dozens of analytics? Is it possible to confuse the user with too much information? How will systems accommodate the equivalent of Heyer's indexing of monuments, series and collected works? Keyword access using Boolean operations can provide new ways of accessing title, author and subject information, but what more can we derive beyond this? Being open to all kinds of solutions to problems is necessary.

In closing, Rehbach stated, "As we implement and use systems and define and set priorities for development, use these processes as opportunities to question past and current practices and assumptions, to re-evaluate your service goals, and to begin to look creatively (and I hope enthusiastically) at new methods and future possibilities in providing automated access to our music library collections."

Susan Dearborn of CLSI was the second speaker in this session, speaking on "How to twist a vendor's arm." MLA librarians think automation vendors aren't paying much attention to their unique requirements. This is mostly true, because
vendors aren't hearing very much from us. How can we make our voices heard? People involved in the process of selecting automation systems in libraries, or in upgrading systems they already have, have leverage—they can tell systems vendors, “If you don’t give us what we need, we won’t buy your system.” Following is a look at how vendors approach the sales situation. We need to learn their point of view so that we can manipulate them and get what we need from their systems.

The first thing the vendor looks at is the library’s selection process. The steps are fairly standardized in the library marketplace. 1) A long range plan is put into place. 2) Needs are defined. 3) Funding is approved. 4) An RFP is issued. 5) Vendors submit responses to the RFP. 6) The library evaluates the vendors’ proposals. 7) The library looks at demonstrations of the vendors’ systems, possibly makes some site visits, sees other presentations from the vendors. 8) The library selects the system. 9) A contract is negotiated. 10) The system is implemented. 11) The whole process starts over again when it’s time to update the system.

Vendors try to get involved early in the process so that they will have more of a chance of convincing the people involved in the decision-making process that theirs is the right system for them. They identify individuals playing key roles in decision making—this is where music librarians can make a real impact. Who will decide about the system? Usually it is one individual, with others influencing him or her. The vendor’s success depends largely on how well they succeed in determining who will ultimately make the decision and those others of influence. Sales people must focus on these people because time is limited. Key people must know what they want the system to do for their library and what they want to accomplish with their automation. Vendors focus on the needs of the influential individuals and try to convince them that their system will supply desired solutions. Music librarians need to be identified as one of these key people so that their ideas and needs will be addressed.

To earn a position of influence we need to do our homework: read literature, go to conferences, talk to vendors, make them show us their systems, try them out, visit sites. We must spend time familiarizing ourselves with what is available, keeping in mind the mission of our organizations and what we are trying to accomplish with automation. We have to know what we want to provide for our patrons, learn to anticipate their needs. What are our unique needs as music librarians and how do these differ from the general users of the system?

The person who will be deciding must be made aware that you have this information—that you are an expert and are willing to participate in the project to install an automated system in your library, and that you would be a valuable person on the planning committee. Once you are on the committee, be an active participant in the long range planning, so that your needs are down on paper from the start. Help to write specifications so that they are in the RFP. Help to draw up lists of questions to ask vendors when they come to visit for demonstrations or presentations. Participate in contract negotiations so you get firm commitments from vendors for special software, etc.—get it in the contract! Help with the implementation of the system. Make sure fields you want access to in the MARC records will be indexable.

Convince the committee that you are making an important contribution to the automation program. It is essential to clearly articulate your needs. Lobby the other members of the committee so that they will recognize the validity of what you say and will work to make sure your needs are met by the system chosen. By participating in each stage of the process, you will get the vendor’s attention. Time is limited in evaluation sessions with vendors, so make sure they understand what you expect and can show you how they expect the system to meet your needs. The vendor must be able to convince you that a solution has been found, or that they can provide you with an alternative you can live with. Call, write, be a pest, but get answers—be thorough and don’t accept vague answers.

The system you choose should be able to take advantage of all the information in
your MARC records. Music MARC records are bigger than for other materials. Ask to see storage calculations—what figures did they use to calculate storage requirements for your system? If you don’t think it is high enough, ask them to recalculate. Get it into the contract that they will guarantee your system to have enough storage.

With circulation systems, vendors may not be aware of the variety of items that you circulate. Laser scanners only allow a small amount of space to insert the item to read the bar code label. It couldn’t read the label for A/V equipment, for example. Music materials are frequently in foreign languages, so it is important for terminals to display the full ALA character set for diacritics.

Be certain that the person making the decision about the system knows your preference and your reasons for it. Once the contract is signed you give up a lot of power, but you can still influence things as a user. Be active in user groups. Organize committees dealing with the needs of music libraries. Address proposals to the person in charge of marketing. Volunteer to be a customer consultant. All of these are ways to let the vendor know what you need. If you let your colleagues select the system for your library you are taking a big risk. You cannot assume that they will select one which meets your needs as a music librarian. If you are active in the process, even though it requires a big commitment of time and effort, you stand a much better chance of getting the system you want.

Finally, Kitty Skrobela of Marathon Software Services, Inc., formerly Music Librarian at Middlebury College, spoke about the communication that should occur between the music librarian and the computer professional. "Communication is the imparting or interchange of thoughts, opinions or information by speech, writing or sign." What are the barriers to communication? It is not enough to speak the same language ... you have to understand the same language in the same way. The same terms or expressions may mean different things to different people.

The following steps should be taken for effective communication: 1) Know yourself (your own operation, your own business, how you fit in). 2) Know the computer professional. 3) Know the differences between you and the computer professional. 4) Communicate. This is an iterative process, being repeated over and over again, working back and forth, as in a project life cycle.

The music library usually does not stand alone. You are a small fish in a big pond with a big problem. Computer professionals say that 20% of the system is used 80% of the time. In music librarianship we know that 20% of the materials cause 80% of the headaches. You need to know what you want before talking to the computer professional. Know clearly what you are doing now, including hard facts such as the volume of work you're doing. You need to define the processes you're doing off line so that you can think about automating them. What is the ideal world you're after? What would be acceptable? Have concrete examples of what you want, both common and unusually complex problems. Have realistic expectations—expect the unexpected. Try to learn from people in similar situations, but don't expect miracles. The automated environment will not cost less or take less staff.

Computer professionals have difficulties communicating among themselves. The worlds of micro, mini, and main frame computers have little to do with each other. The same is true for academic vs. scientific vs. business computing. Library computing is different from all of these. Non-library computer people are astounded at how much library software does. But even library vendors don't understand music library needs. You need to find out how much they know. Look at their installations and systems. Is the package you are considering adaptable?

Computer people are practical, librarians are philosophical. Business people tend to be parochial, librarians philanthropic. Business people are competitive, librarians are cooperative. Business people focus inward while librarians look outward. Business people fear cooperation and this is a barrier to
communication.

Programming is very expensive and takes a long time to do. It is very important to get everything you want in writing. In communicating with vendors, draw pictures or diagrams if necessary, but make things very clear. What are your acceptance criteria? What will the system have to do in order to prove to you that is does what you want it to do? How do you know if you have a good program or system? 1) It does what it is supposed to do. 2) It does it on time. 3) It is adaptable (not locked in) 4) It is efficient (uses little space, few resources)

Planning for automation is very important. Should you even use a computer? Consider the equipment needed to plan space. Allow time for every aspect: for planning, implementation, training, slow down during adjustment, human problems. There are many staff problems associated with automation. People are frightened of machines, etc., and getting them actively involved in planning helps them to overcome some of their fears. Getting help from others, possibly even consultants who could give advice or guidance might be helpful. Vendors often say they can do things for you, but can they? If they've done it for you, will they continue to support these features in the future?

Candace Feldt
Tufts University

SINGLE-UNIT VS. MULTIPLE-UNIT CATALOGING ON OCLC

With the advent of AACR2, there was a profound change in the rules governing description of sound recordings lacking collective titles. Under the provisions of AACR1 rule 250B2, the cataloger was required to describe each work by a different composer on a separate bibliographic record if there was no collective title; these records were then linked using "with" notes. AACR2, however, presents a choice of two approaches in such situations; 6.1G1 allows the cataloger to "either describe the item as a unit ... or make a separate description for each separately titled work." As with AACR1, a provision for "with" notes was included for catalogers selecting the second option.

At the time, many catalogers probably assumed that the multiple-unit, "with" note style of cataloging would, as the traditional method, predominate; this is demonstrated by the early expressions of concern over a perceived defect of AACR2 rule 6.7B21, which governs the construction of "with" notes (see Music Cataloging Bulletin, August 1980, page 7). However, the Library of Congress announced in early 1980 that they would follow the first option of 6.1G1 and describe all sound recordings as single bibliographic units (MCB, February 1980, page 6). The typical music cataloger would immediately suspect, as I did, that most libraries would follow LC's lead and likewise choose the first option. Predictably enough, after August 1980 the supposedly faulty "with" note rule, 6.7B21, was never again mentioned in MCB. Two widely used music cataloging manuals, A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Music and Sound Recordings of Music by Wesley Simonton et al. (Lake Crystal, Minn.: Soldier Creek Press, 1981) and Cataloging Music: A Manual for Use with AACR2 by Richard Smiraglia (Lake Crystal, Minn. Soldier Creek Press, 1983) mention the option provided by 6.1G1, but give examples of only the first, LC-sanctioned option.

Of course, a library which belongs to no network and produces all of its own cataloging could follow either option of 6.1G1 according to its whim. But in this era of bibliographic networks, the adoption of divergent cataloging practices is a more serious matter, since it could conceivably reduce a library's ability to take advantage of shared cataloging. What would be the consequences of an OCLC member library's decision to follow the second, multiple-unit option of 6.1G1 exclusively, without regard to what cataloging might be available in the OCLC database? I recently found myself in a unique position to discover the answer.

Shortly after I began my job as Music Librarian at Northern Illinois University, I learned that the cataloging
The department's policy was to follow the second option of 6.1G1 in cases where a recording contained up to four works by different composers. The rationale for choosing this method was compelling: the library's automated circulation system, which can also function as a crude online catalog, does not allow for added entries of any kind; thus any analytics made in the card catalog would not be accessible through the circulation system. By producing a separate bibliographic record for each work, author and title access was provided through the computer system as well as the card catalog.

Although I sympathized with the desire to expand online access to the record collection, I instinctively felt that adherence to such a policy would greatly increase the amount of original OCLC cataloging that would be needed; I therefore discontinued the practice. (The loss of online access was later ameliorated when we developed a method for adding "dummy" bibliographic records, corresponding to the analytics on the MARC records, to the local circulation system database)

Later, I conducted a study to determine the true effects of the library's previous practice. I surveyed all sound recording cataloging done in January, February, and March of 1984 (the library's quarterly accessions list, an OCLC offline product, provided a convenient list of items cataloged during this period). The OCLC record for each sound recording was examined for the following elements: 1) Is the record original cataloging input by Northern Illinois University? 2) If original, was the record created to satisfy the requirements of the second option of 6.1G1? 3) If so, was there a single-unit record for the same item available at the time? I suspected that this survey would reveal that the local policy had, in fact, increased the quantity of original sound recording cataloging required.

The conclusions are both simple and obvious. The second option of rule 6.1G1 is, for all practical purposes, dead; it was effectively killed by the Library of Congress's decision to follow the first option. OCLC member libraries that choose the second option do so at the risk of greatly increasing their load of original cataloging. This study also suggests that where AACR2 offers an option, libraries should carefully consider the possible consequences of choosing the method that LC has shunned, lest they create additional work for themselves.

H. Stephen Wright
Northern Illinois University

CORRESPONDENCE FROM OCLC

Duplicate records have always been the bane of our existence here in the Online Data Quality Control Section (ODQCS). Ever since the installation of the Merge Holdings capability in September 1983, we have been diligently merging records, over 87,000 as of the end of June 1986, comprising those in our own backfiles and those reported by Enhance libraries. Now, as I reported in the previous MOUG Newsletter, and as Carol...
Davis, Manager of ODQCS, detailed in a recent OCLC Newsletter (no. 163, June 1986, p. 14-15), we are accepting from all members duplicate reports of the following types:

- LC MARC records duplicating member input
- O-level records duplicating bibliographic records
- Records with "Do not use" notes in fields other than 043
- Tape-loaded duplicates (Enclosing Level: L)

With the loading of LC Music records on a regular basis and the recent tape loads of some music records from RLIN libraries, duplicates in the first and last of the above categories are likely to be common, given differences in cataloging practices. Processing of most change requests and duplicate reports is usually completed within 24 hours of receipt.

More attention is now being paid to the processing of Pre-MARC LC updates, one of the few substantial backlogs remaining in my files. Because more ODQCS time is being devoted to updates and duplicates, less time is left for other more routine OLUC changes, a fact reflected in the shorter-than-usual list of changes that follows. New capabilities which we expect to be available under the redesigned OCLC Online System should allow us to deal with things like authority changes in a much more efficient manner, so some of that work is being set aside until the system's reimplementation.

Changes to the physical description field and the addition of certain notes to accommodate compact disc (CD) sound recordings have been described in various places (Cataloging Service Bulletin no. 28 (Spring 1985) p. 23-26; and no. 30 (Fall 1985) p. 24-27; Music Cataloging Bulletin 15:5 (May 1984) p. 3, and 16:10 (October 1985) p. 2-4), but still seem to cause confusion. Perhaps this mini-lesson will clear up some of it.

The physical description field presents information on the playback method, so, as the new first element of the subfield b, the designation "analog" or "digital" is added as appropriate. "Analog" refers to the traditional vinyl, plastic, or shellac discs which usually play at speeds such as 33 1/3 rpm, 45 rpm, or 78 rpm. "Digital" refers to the newer technology of digital compact discs, which have the standard diameter of 4 3/4 in. and are read by lasers.

If the recording method differs from the playback method, a note is added to indicate this (i.e., a digitally recorded LP disc would have "analog" in the 300 field and "Digital recording" or an appropriate quote as a 500 note; an analog-recorded CD would have "digital" in the 300 field and "Analog recording" or an appropriate quote as a 500 note). At least until compact discs become the dominant recording medium (which may be sooner than anyone expected just a year or two ago), the note "Compact disc" might be a wise addition to bibliographic records for such discs.

Example for a CD made from an analog master:

1 sound disc (67 min.) : $b digital, stereo. ; $c 4 3/4 in.
   500 Compact disc.
   500 Analog recording.

Example for an LP made from a digital master:

1 sound disc (45 min.) : $b analog, 33 1/3 rpm, stereo. ; $c 12 in.
   500 Digital recording.

As of the end of June, some 28,000 Enhanced music records reside in the Online Union Catalog. There will be no full formal round of Enhance until sometime after the new OCLC Online System is brought up, although some individual projects and libraries are under consideration for Enhance status before then. Work loads and priorities in Online Data Quality Control over the next few months will not allow us to devote the time needed to launch, evaluate, and monitor another full round of Enhance.

Following is a list of recent changes to headings in the Online Union Catalog. The Name Authority File changes almost
weekly, so it should always be consulted for the official word on the currency of any heading. The forms of headings and the lists of NAF, ARN, and MCB references are not necessarily complete. As usual, if we have missed or incorrectly converted any headings, please inform us through the usual change request route.

Jay Weitz
OCLC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>UT or Change</th>
<th>NAF Number</th>
<th>ARN</th>
<th>MCB Refs</th>
<th>Flds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfab'ev, A. (Aleksandr), 1787-1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84224427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1253511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campo, Frank, 1927-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82159248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>855205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers, H. A. (Herbert Arthur), 1880-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85110429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1342084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaminade, Cécile, 1857-1944</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81076989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>622269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etler, Alvin, 1913-1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81071435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>616749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofmann, Leopold, 1738-1793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80086157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>467347</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hullah, John, 1812-1884</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81007061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>553118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay, Ulusses, 1917-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(correct AACR2 form)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81019573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>565405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kipnis, Alexander, 1891-1978
(correct AACR2 form)
82162707
858617
---
48

Kongelige Kapel (Denmark)
(correct AACR2 form)
81089958
635162
---
55

LaSalle Quartet
(correct AACR2 form)
81140238
685054
---
10

Macfarren, G. A. (George Alexander), Sir, 1813-1887
(correct AACR2 form)
82227321
881680
---
18

Müller-Blattau, Joseph, 1895-
(correct AACR2 form)
82154625
850622
---
46

Nulman, Macy
(correct AACR2 form)
85146937
1459011
---
2

Rascher, Sigurd
(correct AACR2 form)
84040491
1199259
---
62

Scriabin, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, 1872-1915
(correct AACR2 form)
80086161
467351
11:10:9
39

Société des concerts du Conservatoire...
(correct AACR2 form)
82166880; 82166881
862737; 862738
16:7:12
382
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Music OCLC Users Group

APPLICATION FOR NEW MEMBERS

Personal membership is $5.00; Institutional membership is $10.00 ($15.00 outside the U.S.). Membership includes subscription to the Newsletter. New members receive all Newsletters for the year, and any mailings from date of membership through December (issues are mailed on receipt of dues payment). Personal members please prefer home address. Institutional members, please note four line, twenty four character per line limit.

NAME: ________________________________________

MAILING ADDRESS: ____________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

TELEPHONE: ( ) ___________________ ext. ______________________

NETWORK: ________________________________________________

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION: ________________________________

BILLING ADDRESS: _________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Check one:

Enclosed is a check for membership dues: $5.00 Personal

$10.00 Institutional

Please bill (Institutions only) $15.00 Institutional (outside U.S.)

Are you presently a member of the Music Library Association?

Yes ______ No ______

Please complete form and enclose check payable to Music OCLC Users Group to:

Pamela Juengling
Treasurer, Music OCLC Users Group
Music Library FAC 149
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003