Thanks to all who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. The Newsletter is an occasional publication of the Music OCLC Users Group. Editors: A. Ralph Papakhian, Sue Stanau, Music Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., 47405. Communications concerning the contents of the Newsletter should be addressed to the editors. Correspondence on subscription or membership should be forwarded to Richard P. Smiraglia, Treasurer, Music Cat. - 2150A Music Building, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801. Subscription is by membership (dues: $3.00 for individual members, $5.00 for institutional members).

FROM THE CHAIR

It is a great pleasure to greet you for the first time as the new Chair of MOUG and to extend to you the greetings of the rest of the Executive Board. You will find our names and addresses elsewhere in this issue. Please do not hesitate to pass along to us any problems, suggestions or questions which you may have.

Our third annual meeting in San Antonio offered beautiful weather (a real treat for those of us from the frozen north) and a chance to sample the culture and food of the area. The meeting, and the MLA meeting which followed were marked by several auspicious events. The announcement of the publication of the long-awaited Music OCLC Users Group Tagging Workbook and Reference Manual prepared by Karl Van Ausdal and Ruth Patterson Funabiki and published by NELINET created quite a stir and Fae Hamilton of the NELINET office did a brisk business during coffee breaks.

The meeting also marked the beginning of a formal relationship with the Music Library Association. Garrett Bowles, chairman of MLA's Automation Committee announced a reorganization of that committee as an umbrella over a number of sub-committees. One of those sub-committees is to be concerned with users groups and will include representation from MOUG. This sub-committee also will offer the exciting opportunity to form relationships with our fellow MARC users in RLIN, WLN and UTLAS.

At this point, the Executive Board would like to express our thanks to the program committee for the San Antonio meeting -- Robert Cunningham, chair, Pamela Starr and Ralph Papakhian -- and to Judy Weidow who so ably handled the local arrangements. Without their efforts, the meeting could not have happened.

We would also like to thank the nominating committee -- Karl Van Ausdal, Jan Cody and David Knapp -- for their efforts in the preparation of a slate of candidates and in the counting of ballots.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to
the retiring officers -- Olga Buth, who assumed the chair on Karen Hagberg's resignation and who provided forceful leadership at a critical point in MOUG's formative stages; Ralph Papakhian, who was appointed Vice-Chair and who, even after learning what it's like to edit the newsletter, agreed to be a candidate for secretary/newsletter editor; Pamela Starr, secretary, who got the newsletter off to such a fine start; Ann Hess, who has managed the organization's finances so capably; and Karl Van Ausdal, who has been such an important force in the development of MOUG.

We also appreciate the efforts of OCLC staff members Helen Hughes, Robert Cunningham and Pat Mullin and the duplication services which OCLC provided for the meeting.

Finally, we would like to introduce to you the program committee for the February 1981 meeting in New Haven: Chris McCawley, chair, Beth Christensen, David Knapp, Joseph Scott (local arrangements) and Civia Tuteur.

--Glenn Patton

REPORT ON THE ANNUAL MEETING, FEB. 24-25, 1980, SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

The following are summary reports on the annual meeting held in San Antonio, Texas. Since the editors have tape recordings of several of the sessions, we would be pleased to try to answer any specific questions regarding the meeting.

A. The third annual meeting of MOUG began with a tour of the city on Sunday. The tour took an enthusiastic group to the Alamo, Institute for Texan Culture, the San Jose Mission and other places of historical interest in the city. The view of the city from the Tower of the Americas during lunch provided a spectacular visual orientation.

127 members registered for the meeting. Coming from the four corners of the country, they represented 31 states. All but 3 persons attended the MLA AACR 2 workshop on Tuesday.

Olga Buth presided over a brief business meeting. Although a relatively recent immigrant to Texas, she heartily welcomed the gathering to San Antonio. David Knapp (Oberlin), representing the Nominations Committee, reported the results of the recent election of officers for 1980-1982:

Chairperson: Glenn Patton, Thorpe Music Library, Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, IL 61701 309-556-3003
Vice-Chairperson: Ruth W. Tucker, Catalog Dept., Olin Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853 607-256-4247
Secretary and Newsletter Editor: A. Ralph Papakhian, Music Library, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405 812-337-8541
Treasurer: Richard Smiraglia, Music Cataloging, 2150A Music Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801 217-333-2713
Continuing Education Officer: Christina Wolcott McCawley, Green Library, West Chester State College, West Chester, PA 19380 215-436-2454

Because the Newsletter is one of the major means of communication for the group, members were urged to submit articles and reports. It is important to share new modes of problem solving and report anything that might be useful to other music catalogers using OCLC. Local studies, plans and procedures for dealing with the adoption of AACR 2 would certainly be of interest to all members. The questions and answers on tagging that appear in the Newsletter were regarded as useful.

Ann Hess reported on MOUG's financial condition. The organization is solvent. This would suggest that the group can continue with low membership dues and relatively small registration fees for the annual meetings.

Other matters discussed in the business meeting are reported elsewhere in this Newsletter.

B. Report by Helen Hughes on Acquisition and ILL sub-systems.

The Interlibrary Loan Subsystem is OCLC's newest subsystem. It has been available to all OCLC users since 1979. Interest in this subsystem is growing as shown by increasing use. The ILL subsystem supports OCLC goals by increasing the availability of library resources and decreasing the rate of rise of per unit costs for ILL transactions. Members have written telling of increased fill rates and decreased time spent in getting materials for users.
At the present time ILL phase 2 is being installed. Changes are being made to the system in response to suggestions and comments from users.

A slide-tape was shown that describes the operation of the ILL subsystem. The slide-tape is available from OCLC for 30 dollars. It is also available via ILL from OCLC and many network offices.

The Acquisition subsystem is still in the planning process. It will be evaluated by 20 OCLC member libraries this fall. As with ILL, OCLC will install a basic system and plan to enhance it based on users' suggestions.

The Acquisition subsystem version 1 will be able to process single title orders (including subscriptions and continuations).

The Acquisitions user will be involved with 4 interactive files:
- On-line Union Catalog
- Name-Address Directory
- Fund file
- Order file

These interactive files provide:
- access to shared bibliographic and address information
- ability to determine in-process status of any title in the OLUC
- access to LC Name-Authority file
- immediate access to current and secure information about local fund activity, commitments, and in-process status
- management information (as a by-product of acquisition activities)
- hard-copy cumulative reports

The Acquisition subsystem will increase:
- integration of library technical processing
- resource availability, internally and regionally
- communication among Acquisitions, Cataloging, Interlibrary Loan, and Serials Departments
- applications and usefulness of existing investments in OCLC and local resources, including equipment

It will reduce:
- repetitive typing of bibliographic, order, and address information
- manual file maintenance
- verification time for Acquisitions and Cataloging staff
- time span between patron requests and availability of item
- receipt of unintentional duplicates
- time required for correspondence with vendors
- local mailing operations

For further information on the ILL subsystem or the Acquisitions subsystem, please contact your network office of the Users Services Division of OCLC.

--Helen Hughes
OCLC, Inc.

C. Open forum and Mini-topics 1.

Ralph Papakian and Richard Smiraglia reported on "A survey of problems music users are having with OCLC." The results of the survey/questionnaire that appeared in MOUG Newsletter no. 4 are printed on pages 12-19.

Part 2 of the morning Mini-topics, how changes occur in the MARC format for music, was presented by Marie Griffin. She began with a brief history and structure of the MLA Automation Committee and MARBI, and covered MARBI's responsibilities. Good news to us is that the MLA Automation Committee must now approve changes to the Music and Sound Recording MARC formats. The changes will in turn appear in the MLA cataloging bulletin (both those approved and those under consideration). Changes can be sponsored by LC, MARBI, MLA and other interest groups. She said political considerations greatly affect which changes are made and when. LC will be publishing MARC formats and addenda in loose leaf form for updating. Changes that affect LC processing needs, that are needed to adapt to AACR2, or that affect several formats, as well as changes that are valid and necessary for other reasons go before MARBI for discussion and possible implementation. Ms. Griffin discussed other changes in the Music MARC format that will be issued before January 1981. It will be up to OCLC to implement the changes and to create the new indexing and searching capabilities provided by these changes.

Part 3 was presented by Helen Hughes and Robert Cunningham of OCLC. OCLC, in July 1980, will implement improved search methods. A searcher will be able to limit the search by type code and date, page through screens 99 at a time (eliminating the current limit of 256 entries), and access the 705 and 715 fields. Change requests point out the need for quality control. A suggestion of a retrospective cooperative project for cataloging music materials was discussed. This could possibly begin to clean up the data base and fill in large gaps in
bibliographic records. 'Enhancement' is still a viable alternative. It will probably consist of three levels of authorization: libraries who can add new fields to records, 20 libraries (librarians) or so who can make changes to member input records, and those who will operate in a "master mode" (do most anything). Discussion then continued with a possible 'record merge,' which would require an extensive match of LC brief cataloging with member input records.

--Katheryn Meinschein Lewis
Saginaw Valley State College

D. Address by Michael Gorman.

Michael Gorman (co-editor of AACR2 and director of Technical Services Departments, University of Illinois) was the featured speaker of the meeting. He discussed AACR2 and OCLC, and offered some insights regarding the adoption of the new rules. Mr. Gorman noted that OCLC functions as a national network. While any change in standards affects OCLC operations, the success of such changes also depends on OCLC.

According to Mr. Gorman, AACR2 is not important in itself. What is important is the end of superimposition, and the fact that for the first time we will have a single cataloging code which will be in use. In an inconsistent catalog, it takes a long time to check for a heading that is not there. This checking process would be much more efficient in a catalog using a single code.

Mr. Gorman then discussed some of the aspects of AACR2: 1. this is the first attempt to provide an integrated approach to all library materials, allowing for a uniform content designation scheme using a single MARC format; 2. the options may appear more numerous than in AACR, but this is a "grammatical illusion." In AACR2 there is no passive voice. The same number of options exist in AACR, it is just that they are more clearly marked in AACR2. Mr. Gorman recommends to OCLC that it divide the options into two classes: those which are important and those which are not. Then OCLC can address those options that affect access and require standardization; other options can be taken locally.

Mr. Gorman takes exception to LC's decision to adopt the option of non-systematic romanization (i.e. Tchaikovsky instead of ChaYkovskii). He maintains this option was intended for smaller libraries, and that the editors never dreamed LC would opt to change their long established practice. (Ben Tucker from LC defended their decision the next day at the MLA AACR2 workshop, saying that entries for famous names in all other languages except those in the Cyrillic alphabet are currently the well-known forms of names; taking the option for names in the Cyrillic alphabet will bring these entries into conformity with current practice).

Mr. Gorman objects to LC's decision to place titles after the surname (e.g. Sloan, Albert, Sir). He maintains this is an example of bending the cataloging to cope with local limitations in automation. It would be just as simple to give the title a subfield code which is non-filing.

Mr. Gorman also objects to LC's decision not to change "Smith, John Edgar" to "Smith, J. Edgar" if the name is neither American nor famous. This is LC continuing a secret practice, Mr. Gorman suggests.

Noting the deletion of rules 98 and 99 in AACR1, Mr. Gorman says this is a precedent proving that LC's decisions can be modified with time. He implied that reason does prevail over the long run, even at LC!

Mr. Gorman has also noticed what he calls "Creeping adoption" in the OCLC data base. He feels that the rate of conflict caused by the adoption of AACR2 will be about 15 per cent. One third to one half of new titles will have entries new to catalogs, and 2 out of 3 authors only produce one work, therefore their headings will never have to be recataloged.

In cases of conflict, Mr. Gorman envisions libraries setting an arbitrary cut-off number, deciding to change the heading if there are less than 10 entries in the catalog; setting up a new heading with a cross reference between the two, if there are more than 10. He does not see the need for "reCutting." The library clientele does not generally seem to know the system anyway.

Some activities are underway to assist in the adoption of AACR2. OCLC is providing machine access to LC authority records that contain AACR2 forms (these should number nearly 500,000 by January, 1981). While OCLC is investigating shared authority control systems, it also intends to provide automated conversion of some of the records in the data base.

--Chris McCawley
E. Open forum and Mini-topics 2.

The afternoon "Mini-topics 2" open forum (chaired by Robert Cunningham) opened with a brief talk by Fae Hamilton, NELINET Member Services Librarian, in which she outlined the methods for dissemination of music information within the network. Along with regular network publications and individual member contact, a major forum for sharing music information is the NELINET Music Users Group. Formed when the MARC music format was first implemented on-line, the group continues to meet four times a year. Its threefold purpose is to: 1) facilitate communication among its members, OCLC and NELINET 2) establish information links between itself and MOUG (regional meetings are held immediately prior to and after national meetings) and 3) promote quality control for music in the OCLC data base by agreeing upon standards for input.

The second speaker was Michelle Duffy of AMIGOS who explained the less formal system for music training in AMIGOS libraries. While no formal training is available to new members when they come on-line, music workshops are offered several times a year at the regional level. AMIGOS members depend primarily on expertise developed by member librarians and on direct contact with OCLC. Ms. Duffy noted the great inconsistency in the application of tagging standards and suggested that MOUG members should abandon waiting for LC to implement the format and proceed with member creation of national level bibliographic records. She also suggested that members might benefit from the development of a CONMUS project for retrospective conversion of music records.

The final speaker was Ann Hess of the University of Cincinnati who reported on the progress of the Sound Recordings Analytics Project. The project, which Ms. Hess directs, was begun in October 1979 and promotes addition of composer-uniform title analytics to OCLC records for sound recordings. Project members input fully analyzed records when no bibliographic record is in the data base; for existing records, additional fields are forwarded to OCLC for updating. Lists of the recordings each member has analyzed are exchanged the first of each month. The six members (University of Cincinnati, Oberlin Conservatory, Indiana University, University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin at Madison, and University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee) follow no strict guidelines except to analyze at least four recordings each month and to avoid collective uniform titles (e.g. Works, Selections) when possible. When system limits are encountered contents notes are deleted; if that fails, collective uniform titles may be used as a last resort. A suggestion from the floor was made that the OCLC numbers for augmented records should be published in the MOUG Newsletter.

During the discussion session which followed, Robert Cunningham announced a project underway at OCLC to update music catalog records in the data base according to the changes announced in the Music Cataloging Bulletin. [This is of course an extremely valuable service to OCLC users throughout the country--the changes made centrally at OCLC eliminate a great deal of duplicate effort.]

--Richard Smiraglia

F. Tagging workshop (Glenn Patton and Robert Cunningham).

The tagging workshop, in the space of two hours, discussed fields 048 and 245. In addition, a set of tagging questions with answers was distributed. From the beginning it was apparent that there were differences of opinion about how to tag field 048 as well as many suggestions about how to improve the field. Topics discussed included tagging of alternate instruments, operas, orchestras, choruses, continuo, and percussion. Retrieval use should be a consideration in coding specificity.

The concept of more music user input into tagging decisions has motivated the development of a cooperative system by which OCLC and MOUG members can reach solutions to problems together. This will be presented in a future newsletter.

--Robert Cunningham

REPORT ON OCLC USERS COUNCIL

MOUG was invited to send a representative to the Feb. 3, 1980 OCLC Users Council Executive Committee meeting. Mr. Joseph Boykin, President, opened the session with an explanation of the composition of the Users Council and its role in OCLC governance. The Council, made up of members elected from the networks, serves as a vehicle of communication between all OCLC users and OCLC management. Task forces are formed to deal with the larger issues such as: 1) AACR2, 2) the impact of RLIN on OCLC and 3) the enforcement of standards. Less complex issues are
handled with resolutions or memoranda.

After Mr. Boykin's opening remarks the representative from each users group gave a brief presentation. Maps, music and law users in particular have a lot of similar problems, especially with searching. It was apparent from the presentations that if the users groups combined their common concerns and submitted them formally to the Users Council that OCLC would probably take greater notice of special interest groups.

We were encouraged to submit the completed MOUG questionnaire to the Users Council for their consideration of our special problems. It was emphasized that we, as individuals, also have a strong voice at OCLC. Letters of complaint, suggestions for change, requests for clarification, etc. carry a lot of weight if written on institutions' letterhead and submitted to OCLC via the network offices.

It is mandatory that as individuals, special interest groups, and as combinations of special interest groups that we make our voices heard. The system will not meet our needs without our help in identifying the problems.

—Ann E. Hess
Past MOUG Treasurer

RECORD MANUFACTURER NUMBERS: PART II

In the October 1979 MOUG Newsletter I discussed some of the principal numbering systems in use by American recording manufacturers. In this issue, we will go abroad with an eye towards the mechanics of how foreign recordings come into the U. S., and their relationship to our own labels.

There are several ways in which recordings made outside of the United States become available here. The most common is through our own American labels, who re-press or reformat the performances for domestic consumption. In some cases there may be, or may once have been, an actual corporate relationship between the American and foreign label, such as with English Decca and American London, or English EMI and American Angel.

Another method is for foreign labels to license a portion of their repertoire to one or more unrelated U. S. companies by giving first-refusal rights to one label, or to several firms, on an individual disc or otherwise limited basis. In some cases this licensing is extensive enough to warrant the creation of a "bifurcated hybrid": for example, Connoisseur Society/Pathe, BASF/Harmonia Mundi, Melodiya/Angel, and Columbia Melodiya (not all of which have had equal permanence). A more traditional course is for the U. S. label to retain its own identity. Caedmon's Arabesque discs are a recent example; Musical Heritage Society, Turnabout, Westminster, Nonesuch, Vanguard, and Vox are a few of the other domestic labels which have sold foreign material in this manner. Unlike the more permanent agreements described above, these licenses can expire after a few years causing the discs to disappear from the domestic catalog even though still available in the country of origin.

If in the case of Decca-London, EMI-Angel or the other large labels the reciprocal recordings are both more numerous and perhaps longer "lived," it is still worth noting two points: first, not everything available on British Decca, for example, will be released here on London (and, if it is, there may be a considerable time lag); and, second, the couplings on the American discs may be different. For example, recordings sold here as a multiple set might be released individually abroad. Or, in a few cases a filler, present on the foreign disc, will be omitted on the domestic one. And, even if the records themselves remain the same, the accompanying liner or textual material may be different.

One possible consequence of these licensing agreements is that the same recording may be available in the United States on more than one label, or will change labels when affiliations switch. The former case is exemplified by Rachmaninov's "The Bells" as sold on Everest. Everest had this performance in its catalog for several years before Melodiya/Angel was formed and made the recording available. Both discs are still in Schwann. The Musical Heritage Society, to cite another example, has had in its catalog for some time releases that, a few years back, began to be imported on the Oryx label by CMS Recordings. The explanation for this was that MHS had a license for mail order sale only. But ironically, some MHS material had also been available on the Ravenna label, distributed by the University of Washington Press, who also made these available by mail!

A related method of foreign performances being distributed to the U. S. market is through direct importation of the original discs by an American label or conglomerate. Thus, German DG and Dutch Philips are available here as direct imports. Some companies do it both ways. Most London discs, for example, are re-pressings of English Decca releases, but some Deccas are
imported directly, notably on the HEAD label which features contemporary music. Additionally, McGraw-Hill, which is U. S. London's owner, directly imports a number of lines familiar to music librarians: e.g., Argo, L'Oiseau Lyre and Telefunken. An example of the process in reverse involves Mercury which once had in their catalog a number of discs of American music. These have been off the market except as cut-outs for the last few years, but some are now available again on the Mercury Golden Imports label which is being pressed in Holland.

The final two methods by which foreign recordings arrive in this country are also related. Both involve their direct importation, this time not by domestic record companies, but either by record stores directly or by jobbers and distributors (e.g., Peters International). Because of the difficulties involved with importation, several of these importers have become record producers themselves, using licensed foreign material (e.g., Peters International and HNH).

In part 3 of this article, we will briefly examine the corporate history of some of the principal foreign labels, and then look at some of the major types of numbering systems (with particular emphasis on the EMI conglomerate: HMV, Electrola, et al.) As usual I would welcome any suggestions for topics to be covered in future issues, or questions on what is presented here.

--Robert Skinner, Owen Arts Center
SMU, Dallas Texas 75275

FINANCIAL REPORTS

4th Quarter 1979
October 1 - December 31
BALANCE end of 3rd quarter: 1730.57
INCOME 4th quarter: 220.00
EXPENDITURES 4th quarter: 345.00
BALANCE end of 4th quarter: 1602.50

1st Quarter 1980
January 1 - March 31
BALANCE end of 4th quarter: 1602.50
INCOME 1st quarter: 3660.95
EXPENDITURES 1st quarter: 2402.24
BALANCE end of 1st quarter: 2861.21

Membership as of March, 1980:
Personal: 182
Institutional: 163
            345
When cataloging an excerpt, is the code for the excerpt entered, or is code "mu" used and codes for both the excerpt and the piece as a whole given in the 047 field? When cataloging an excerpt, code for the excerpt in the fixed field. If the piece as a whole is considered important enough to code, code "mu" in "Comp" and use 047 for both codes.

When cataloging an arrangement, is the code for the arrangement entered, or is code "mu" used and codes for both the arrangement and the original composition given in the 047 field? Code for the arrangement in the fixed field. If the original composition is considered important enough to code, code "mu" in "Comp" and use 047 for both codes.

Variable field 045

In the 045 field, when cataloging an arrangement, is the date of the arrangement only given or is the date of the original composition also cited? If both dates are cited, are they given in one or two 045 fields? For example, original composition 1940; arrangement 1953—should this be coded 045 x4x5 or, 045 x4x4

or, 045 x4x4 #a x5x5?

In the 045 field, when cataloging a revised composition, is the revision date only given, or are the original and revision dates given, and if so, how?

If a composition was written in 1910, revised by the composer in 1920, and arranged by an arranger for chamber orchestra in 1930, the most common resulting 045 would be x1x2. The purpose of 045 in music is to specify style periods. Therefore, it is important to record the date when the piece was written. Revisions by the composer are usually also coded. Arrangements which do not change the style of the piece are usually not coded; but arrangements which radically change the style of the piece are coded. Most libraries will want to enter a four character code as in the current instructions even though #a is repeatable and could be used. (Using the above example: 045 x1x1 #a x2x2 #a x3x3 would not be incorrect.)

Variable field 050

If the LC Classification number has changed due to revisions in the M schedule, and if you are inputting old LC copy, is the outdated LC class number put in the 050 field or can it be modernized with a code "m" in fixed field "Mod rec"?

Do not change an LC call number. Enter as is and submit an error report. A library may then enter a 050 for its record.

Variable field 240

If an LC uniform title has been updated, and you are inputting old LC copy, is the old uniform title input in the 240 or can it be modernized with a code "m" in the fixed field "Mod rec"?

An LC uniform title may be updated and an "m" coded in "Mod rec".

Variable field 260

Is the "d" subfield repeatable? The OCLC format date 1979 April indicates "yes" but previously it had not been repeatable.

The #d is repeatable but rarely needed.

If old LC copy includes the plate number in a note, can libraries move it to a "d" subfield or can they include it also in a "d" subfield? Should "Mod rec" be coded if this can be done?

In old LC copy, move plate numbers in a note position to 260 #d and remove the 500 note. Code "m" for "Mod rec".

Variable field 505

Is it true that libraries can add a 505 field to LC copy not having one and code "Mod rec" "e"? Can libraries also add to an incomplete contents note on LC copy and code "e" in "Mod rec"?

Libraries may add contents notes or complete contents notes on LC copy and code "e" in "Mod rec".
The following examples indicate solutions by the workshop leaders. Solutions which vary from these are possible. Your questions, answers, and comments are welcomed.

Tag Ø48: Number of Voices or Instruments

1. Noel for brass quartet or brass quintet. Note reads: "For trumpet, horn, trombone and baritone or 2 trumpets, horn, trombone and baritone."
   - Ø48 ø bbØ1 ÷a baØ1 ÷a bdØ1 ÷a bfØ1
   - Ø48 ø bbØ2 ÷a baØ1 ÷a bdØ1 ÷a bfØ1

2. Deux suites pour 2 hautbois (violins, flutes), 2 cors (clarinettes), bassoon (violoncelle/contrebass) et basse continue. Subject headings: SUITES (BASSOON, HORN (2), OBOES (2)). SUITES (Horns (2), Oboes (2), CONTINUO). SUITES (CLARINETS (2), VIOLINS (2), CONTINUO)
   - Ø48 ø wbØ2 ÷a baØ2 ÷a wdØ1 ÷a ke
   - Ø48 ø wbØ2 ÷a baØ2 ÷a wdØ1
   - Ø48 ø wbØ2 ÷a baØ2 ÷a ke
   - Ø48 ø saØ2 ÷a wcØ2 ÷a ke

3. Concerto I: for 3 clarini (trumpets), 2 oboes, strings, timpani and basso continuo. Subject heading: CONCERTI GROSSI.
   - Ø48 1 bbØ3 ÷a wbØ2 ÷a oc ÷a paØ1 ÷a ke

   - Ø48 1 oc
   - Ø48 ø kaØ1
   - Ø48 ø saØ1 ÷a tbØ1
   - Ø48 ø wcØ1 ÷a kaØ1
   - Ø48 2 ÷b wdØ1 ÷a oc ÷a taØ1

5. "For chorus (SATB, SATB), percussion, harp, and organ."
   - Ø48 1 caØ8 ÷a pz ÷a taØ1 ÷a kbØ1

6. "For 2 trumpets, horn (or fluegelhorn or, trombone), trombone (or horn) and tuba (or bass trombone)"
   - Ø48 ø bbØ2 ÷a baØ1 ÷a bdØ1 ÷a beØ1

7. A piece for oboe without accompaniment. Subject heading: OBOE MUSIC.
   - Ø48 ø wbØ1

8. Beethoven's Symphony no. 5 Subject heading: SYMPHONIES.
   - Ø48 1 oa

9. "Three pieces for flute, clarinet, violin, cello, and piano" Subject heading: QUINTETS (PIANO, CLARINET, FLUTE, VIOLIN, VIOLONCELLO)
   - Ø48 ø waØ1 ÷a wcØ1 ÷a saØ1 ÷a scØ1 ÷a kaØ1

10. "Concerto for piano and strings" Subject heading: CONCERTOS (PIANO WITH STRING ORCHESTRA)
    - Ø48 2 ÷b kaØ1 ÷a oc
11. "Concerto for piano and strings"; accompaniment reduced for a second piano. Subject heading: CONCERTOS (PIANO WITH STRING ORCHESTRA)--2-PIANO SCORES.

12. Note reads: "For female voice, 2-5 pianos, and various numbers of radios, record players, and tape recorders." Subject headings: SONGS (MEDIUM VOICE) WITH INSTRUMENTAL ENSEMBLE. ELECTRONIC MUSIC.

13. Trio sonata for 2 oboes and continuo. Continuo realized for harpsichord and bassoon. Subject heading: TRIP-SONATAS (OBOES (2) AND CONTINUO)

14. Solo song for soprano and piano. Subject heading: SONGS (HIGH VOICE) WITH PIANO.

Fixed Field LANG & Tag 041: Languages

1. Score of a French opera, text in German only.
   Lang: ger 041 1 gerfre

2. Recording of instrumental music; notes on the container in English, French, and German.
   Lang: N/A 041 0 4 engfreger

3. Recording of excerpts of the speeches of President Carter.
   Lang: eng 041 4

4. Recording of French opera, sung in English; notes and libretto in English and French.
   Lang: eng 041 4 4d engfre 4e engfre

5. Score of Haydn piano sonatas; parallel footnotes in English and Spanish.
   Lang: N/A 041 0 4e engspa

6. Recording of Swingle Singers singing arrangements of Bach works.
   Lang: und 041 4

7. Full score of an opera. Note reads: "Prefatory matter in Russian, Georgian, English and French; text in Russian and Georgian."
   Lang: rus 041 0 rusgeo 4e rusgeoengfre

8. Score of an opera originally in Russian. Text in the score is in French, German and English; the original language is not present.
   Lang: fre 041 0 fregereng

9. Score of a work of soloists, chorus and orchestra. Note reads: "Words in Latin or Greek (transliterated) also printed as text with German, English, French and Polish translations.
   Lang: lat 041 0 latgre 4e latgeregrefrepol

10. A recording of the above work. Note reads: "Sung in Latin and Greek; text with German, English, French and Polish translations (6 p.) inserted in container.
    Lang: lat 041 0 4d latgre 4e latgeregrefrepol

11. A collection of folksongs with texts in Slovenian and Italian.
    Lang: slv 041 0 slvita

12. Title: Dimensionen der Zeit und der Stille, für vierzigstimmigen gemischtem Chor ... Note reads: "Without words."
    Lang: und 041 4
Tag Ø50: Library of Congress Call Numbers with Alternative and Supplementary Class Numbers

   M1997 +b B397 +a M1681.J3
2. M1010.H53T7 [M1473]
   M1010.H53 +b T7 +a M1473
   M947.H32 +b S8 +d M947.2 +d M104.12 +a ML96.5.H332
   M5 +b J38 +d M13.4 +a M21 +a M23 +a M219

Tag 240: Uniform Titles

1. [Sonata, piano, no. 14, op. 27, no. 2, C# minor]
   Sonata, +m piano, +n no. 14, op. 27, no. 2, +r C# minor
2. [Pièces, organ (1878) Pièce héroïque] [Sound recording]
   Pièces, +m organ +n (1878) +p Pièce héroïque +h Sound recording
3. [Concerto, violin & violoncello, op. 102, A minor; arr.]
   Concerto, +m violin & violoncello, +n op. 102, +r A minor; +o arr.
   Chorale preludes. +k Selections +h Phonodisc
5. [Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg. Piano-vocal score. English & German]
   Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg. +s Piano-vocal score. +1 English & German
6. [Works, chamber music] [Sound recording]
   Works, +m chamber music +h Sound recording

Tags Ø55 & Ø07: Physical Description of Sound Recordings

1. 3Ø5 on sides 1-2 of 1 disc. 33 1/3 rpm. stereo. 12 in.
   3Ø5 on sides 1-2 of 1 disc. +b 33 1/3 rpm. stereo. +c 12 in.
   ØØ7 d +b b +c s +d m +e e
2. 3Ø5 4 discs. 33 1/3 rpm. 12 in. (5ØØ note: In 2 containers.)
   3Ø5 4 discs. +b 33 1/3 rpm. +c 12 in.
   ØØ7 d +b b +d m +e e
3. 3Ø5 5 reels. 7 1/2 ips. 4-track. stereo. 7 in.
   3Ø5 5 reels. +b 7 1/2 ips. 4-track. stereo. +c 7 in.
   ØØ7 t +b o +c s +e c +f a +g c
4. 3Ø5 1 cassette. 4-track. stereo.
   3Ø5 1 cassette. +b 4-track. stereo.
   ØØ7 s +b l +c s +f z +g c
RESULTS OF THE MOUG OCLC MUSIC CATALOGING SURVEY

Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University
Richard Smiraglia, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The MOUG Newsletter no. 4 (Sept. 1979) included a survey questionnaire intended to solicit the opinions of MOUG members concerning the problems they encounter in cataloging music materials. A brief preliminary report on the results was presented at the annual meeting in San Antonio. The following is a summary of the survey results. A complete report will be submitted to the MOUG Executive Board and the OCLC Users Council.

DEVELOPMENT OF QUESTIONNAIRE: The idea of preparing a list of OCLC system problems was first raised in late 1978. Subsequently, the MOUG Executive Board agreed that it would be useful to survey the opinions of the membership in order to develop a list of problems in priority order; it was particularly important to obtain the opinions of music catalogers who were using the system on a daily basis. Such a list hopefully would stimulate interest in discovering solutions to these problems by individual users as well as by OCLC. Preliminary lists of problems were circulated to OCLC users at the Music Library Association annual meeting in February 1979 and at the MOUG annual meeting in March 1979. These drafts were accompanied by requests for additional suggestions or modifications; several individuals responded to the requests with extremely useful recommendations. The final questionnaire was based on the preliminary lists incorporating the suggestions received. However, the problems to be considered were limited to OCLC system use. Problems associated with music cataloging independent of the system, and problems related to the Music MARC format were excluded (the Music MARC format was implemented by OCLC, but OCLC was not responsible for its development or "authoritative" interpretation). The final list resulted in 17 problems designated by the letters a to q in the questionnaire (there was no particular order or grouping in the listing of the problems).

SURVEY METHOD: In the questionnaire, MOUG members were requested to evaluate the problems in two ways: first by selecting what they regarded as the most serious, second most serious and the third most serious problems; then by providing a numeric evaluation of each of the problems on a scale from 1 to 7 (with the definition of 1 being "an insignificant problem" and the definition of 7 as "an extremely serious problem that always interferes with effective use of the system"). These two ways of evaluating the problems would ideally provide a means of verifying the results. While the goal of the survey was to identify what users perceived to be the most critical problems (those problems that OCLC should address as top priority), users were also invited to submit additional problems not included in the list (see Appendix).

RESPONSE: 335 copies of Newsletter no. 4 were mailed (the issue in which the questionnaire appeared). At that time, the personal (as opposed to institutional) membership numbered about 160. The instructions which accompanied the questionnaire indicated that there was no limit on the number of responses from any given institution; the questionnaire could be freely duplicated and completed by any and all individuals interested in submitting their opinions. After one reminder in the next Newsletter, 84 responses were received by the end of 1979. This number, although qualified by the possibility of several responses from one institution, represented over half the number of personal memberships and over a fourth of the total subscriptions to the Newsletter. Such a response to a questionnaire appearing in a newsletter can be regarded as relatively high and is certainly indicative of the concern MOUG members have in improving the OCLC system for the cataloging of music materials. Of the total 84 responses, 81 contained information that could be tabulated; 3 were not usable.

TABULATION: To tabulate results for the first section of the questionnaire (1st, 2nd and 3rd most serious problems) the number of responses per problem per degree of seriousness
were recorded in columns on a chart (TABLE 1; the problems are designated by the letters a to q). In order to determine which problems were regarded as most serious in terms of the total response, each individual response was weighted. That is, a response in the first column (most serious) received three points; in the second column, two; and in the third column, one. In this manner the weighted response per problem (t) was obtained. Where:

- \( r_1 \) = responses in column 1
- \( r_2 \) = responses in column 2
- \( r_3 \) = responses in column 3

\[
t = 3r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3
\]

Similarly, the total possible number of weighted points (x) was calculated. That is, if each individual provided a response to the three possibilities of the questionnaire's first section then the total possible number of weighted points could be calculated. Where:

- \( s \) = number of respondents
- \( x = 3s + 2s + s \)
- \( x = 6s \)

In order to calculate the percentage (p) of the total possible number of weighted points (x) represented by the weighted response per problem (t), t was divided by x%:

\[
p = \frac{t}{x\%}
\]

For example, 81 usable responses to the questionnaire were tabulated (\( s = 81 \)). Therefore, \( x = 486 \).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{s} & = 81 \\
\text{x} & = 6s \\
\text{x} & = 6 \cdot 81 \\
\text{x} & = 486
\end{align*}
\]

For the problem designated "b" there were 35 responses in the "most serious" column, 23 responses in the "second most serious" column and 4 responses in the "third most serious" column. The weighted response (t) was then calculated:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{r}_1 & = 35 \\
\text{r}_2 & = 23 \\
\text{r}_3 & = 4
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
t & = 3r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 \\
t & = (3 \cdot 35) + (2 \cdot 23) + 4 \\
t & = 105 + 46 + 4 \\
t & = 155
\end{align*}
\]

The percentage (p) was calculated:

\[
\begin{align*}
t & = 155 \\
x & = 486
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
p & = \frac{t}{x\%} \\
p & = \frac{155}{486} \times \% \\
p & = 31.89\% \\
p & = 32\%
\end{align*}
\]

(Quotients are expressed to the second decimal and rounded off to the nearest whole number in all tables.)

It is the value of (p) calculated for each problem which is used to determine the ranking of the responses to the questions about the most serious problems facing users of the system. In TABLE 2, the letters designating the problems are listed in order of the percentage.
of the total weighted points.

The second section of the questionnaire, the list of seventeen problems (designated by the letters a to q) which were to be evaluated by assigning to each a value from 1 (least important) to 7 (most important) was also tabulated. For each problem the number of responses for each numerical value were recorded (TABLE 3). A weighted total response \( d \) per problem was calculated by multiplying the number of responses \( r \) of each numerical value by the value itself, and adding the results.

\[
d = r_1 + 2r_2 + 3r_3 + 4r_4 + 5r_5 + 6r_6 + 7r_7 + 0r_0
\]

The value zero \( (0) \) was assigned to each response to a problem which was blank. In tabulation, a "no response" received 0 points so was essentially excluded from the weighted total response \( d \).

An average rank \( a \) was then determined for each problem by dividing the weighted total response \( d \) by the total number of responses \( s \).

\[
a = \frac{d}{s}
\]

For example, problem "a" received the following response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The weighted total \( d \) was determined:

\[
d = r_1 + 2r_2 + 3r_3 + 4r_4 + 5r_5 + 6r_6 + 7r_7 + 0r_0
\]

\[
d = 8 + (2 \cdot 10) + (3 \cdot 18) + (4 \cdot 12) + (5 \cdot 10) + (6 \cdot 8) + (7 \cdot 3) + (0 \cdot 12)
\]

\[
d = 8 + 20 + 54 + 48 + 50 + 48 + 21 + 0
\]

\[
d = 249
\]

The average rank \( a \) with a total of 81 responses was:

\[
s = 81
\]

\[
d = 249
\]

\[
a = \frac{d}{s} = \frac{249}{81} = 3.07
\]

\[
a = 3
\]

The value \( a \) was calculated for each problem and is given in TABLE 3.

At this point in the tabulation there was concern that the number of "no response" answers would bias the data. While the value zero \( (0) \) was imposed by the tabulators on blank responses to any given problem, the reasons for the blank responses were not evident (they could possibly have implied no opinion, uncertainty, or an assumption that the problem had been solved). Therefore, it was deemed wise to perform a series of calculations to act as a check on the average ranked response figures. Each was recalculated by subtracting the number of blank responses \( n \) from the total responses \( s \).

\[
a_1 = \frac{d}{s - n}
\]

For problem "a":

\[
s = 81
\]

\[
n = 12
\]

\[
d = 249
\]

\[
a_1 = \frac{d}{s - n} = \frac{249}{81 - 12} = \frac{249}{69} = 3.60
\]

\[
a_1 = 4
\]
Since it is considered that this procedure yields a more realistic average of the actual responses given to the questionnaire, and since it does alter the results in many instances, these figures were used to establish the final numeric ranking of the seventeen problems, arranged in decreasing order in TABLE 4.

RESULTS: The overwhelming importance of the difficulties users have searching the system is obvious from TABLE 4. Of the first eight problems (those with an average rank \( a_i \) above the median (4)) six are problems with gaining access to system catalog records for music materials. This is, of course, not surprising. The works of prolific composers, often with generic titles are precisely those which are most difficult to retrieve and of which new editions and recordings are continuously acquired and cataloged by all types of libraries. Nearly as remarkable is the apparent disinterest respondents displayed in the system's mechanical problems and the sort of vague interest in quality control problems.

The accuracy of the data is confirmed by the results of the "most serious problems" section of the questionnaire in TABLE 2. Respondents fairly consistently chose the problems they had ranked the highest as those which were regarded as most serious. The five problems receiving the highest percentages in this category are "b", "j", "q", "i", and "c". Although not in exactly the same order, these are the problems which receive the highest five numeric rankings.

As for specific problems, it seems apparent that improved access to titles (245) and uniform titles (240) is the technical problem OCLC must address first. The problem centers on prolific composers and titles beginning with generic terms such as "symphony" or "sonata". Some means of speedy access to the subfields in field 240 (in conjunction with composers' names) must be found if the system is going to remain viable for the cataloging of music materials. The system and practice of the use of uniform titles was developed for dealing with the problems of file arrangement. Access to the file should be improved, not hindered, in an automated system. Problems "i" and "j" relate primarily to sound recordings. Entries for performers (including ensembles) are currently completely inaccessible as are manufacturer's numbers. Since manufacturer's numbers are relatively unique identifiers of sound recordings, access to these numbers would be a major improvement in bibliographic control and efficient use of the system. Problem "n" refers to the use of the data base for information retrieval probably for both cataloging and non-cataloging purposes. Since there is no access to the title subfield in 7xx fields, access to a great amount of analysis is simply unavailable. This kind of information is extremely useful to library clientele as well as to catalogers seeking authority information.

The appearance of problems "q" and "e" among the most highly ranked seems to indicate dissatisfaction with the quality of the music records in the OCLC data base. Problem "h" would be eliminated by the implementation of the Music MARC format at the Library of Congress. The OCLC Users Council has addressed this matter (see MOUG Newsletter, no. 5, p. 7, and the Music Cataloging Bulletin, vol. 10, no. 8). However, the Library of Congress seems to have decided administratively to increase the scope of MARC coverage in terms of internal efficiency and to improve its own automated system instead of implementing the Music MARC format. (With regard to internal efficiency, it is clear that LC decided to convert into MARC format catalog records for materials in Icelandic, Urdu and other languages on the basis of internal expediency; obviously not because these materials are more useful than music materials in an automated national shared cataloging system (see Library of Congress Cataloging Service, Bulletin 120, p.3).)

Problem "q" is more complex and involves several factors. Since LC issues catalog copy for a much smaller portion of published scores and recordings than it does for monographs, the proportion of non-LC based cataloging for music materials is higher than that for monographs. Obviously, since this non-LC cataloging in the OCLC data base is not produced centrally under uniform policies, the possibility of variation in cataloging practice is great. (On the other hand, the OCLC on-line union catalog provides the first efficient means of sharing this cataloging information among thousands of libraries.) The fact that many OCLC participating libraries do not have large
enough music collections to justify hiring specialist music catalogers would also contribute to inconsistency. Finally, the cataloging rules require personal judgment in interpretation and application (catalogers have been known to disagree occasionally on such matters!). One of the functions of MOUG is to improve the standards and quality of the OCLC data base. It is hoped that the Newsletter and the annual meetings and workshops have helped in this regard.

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>problem</th>
<th>r₁</th>
<th>r₂</th>
<th>r₃</th>
<th>total (t)</th>
<th>percentage of total possible (p)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>32 (31.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8 (7.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4 (3.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3 (2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5 (4.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5 (0.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9 (8.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12 (11.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 (1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 (2.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 (2.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4 (3.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>11 (10.69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>problem</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>( r_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average rank ((a_1))</td>
<td>problem (letter designation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS SUPPLIED BY RESPONDENTS

Lack of access to local bibliographic data

Delay of LC's implementation of MARC for music

Extreme variations in quality of member input records

Member errors

Numbered series not displayed in numerical order

Delay of type code changes when reported on error report forms

Lack of automatic brackets in $h

Members should be told not to catalog things which LC will get to

Inability to search corporate entries for microfilms of music manuscripts for headings with many entries

Lack of a way to find out if a record you've already used has been corrected on-line through an error report from some other library

Lack of rewards for sending in error reports and/or making corrections

Inability to tell what has been changed in a modified record

Lack of authority control

Lack of updating for LC MARC records
The initial phase of the Institute of Jazz Studies project, "A Computerized Catalog of the Recorded Sound Collection of the Rutgers Institute of Jazz Studies," has now been completed. Cataloging records for more than 2,000 recorded performances have been entered on the OCLC data base and cumulated in the IJS Jazz Register (COM register of cataloged entries with indexes by Performer, Performing Group, Composer, Title, and Label Name and Issue Number). All of the major jazz labels of the acoustical recording period (1917-1925/29) have been completed. These labels are: Gennett, Columbia, Okeh, Paramount, Vocalion, Brunswick, Victor, Harmony, Black Swan, Emerson, and Cameo. In addition, the cataloged entries include more than 200 entries for long-playing (33 1/3 rpm) recordings. These entries serve as a model of archival cataloging for jazz recordings.

The IJS Jazz Register and indexes have been produced and distributed under grant RC-30601-78-597, funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities in cooperation with the Institute of Jazz Studies, Rutgers University, and the Technical Services Dept. and Computer Support Group of the Rutgers University Libraries. The Institute has announced that this project will be continued with NEH support under grant RC-0105.

With the April 1980 cumulation of the indexes, the Institute will expand its performer index to two indexes: a performer/title index and performer/performing group index. The one-line indexes provide direct access to the essential information needed for reference and research and refer the user to the basic bibliographic record, either on COM or on-line, if further data is required. The components of the indexes are fixed-length access points, each identified in the machine record by a distinctive field and subfield location. The flexibility of this approach permits many permutations of the data in a variety of configurations, thus making it possible to provide specialized discographical information needed for research with very little additional programming.

Because a MARC analytics format has not yet been approved, the Institute has negotiated a special arrangement with OCLC, Inc., which permits the cataloging for the disc as a whole and the cataloging for each individual track to remain on the data base. The cataloging for the disc as a whole will include complete contents, composer(s), and title of each selection on the recording, in the Contents note field 505. Performer(s) and/or performing group(s) will be listed in the "Participant, Performer, and Medium" note field 511 unless each selection is performed by different performer(s) and/or performing group(s) in which case the performers and performing groups will be included in the contents note. Added entries will be provided for performers and/or performing groups whose performances relate to the disc as a whole; for example, on the New World Records NW 295 recording When Malindy Sings; Jazz Vocalists 1938-1961, the ten featured vocalists will be given added entries. The cataloging records can be identified on the OCLC data base by the inclusion of the IJS number in "Local System Number" field 035.

EXAMPLE: 035  D000808.00 f IJS

The cataloging records for the individual tracks will be linked to the cataloging for the disc as a whole by including a "Source of title" note as the first 5XX note and an added title tracing in field 740.

EXAMPLE: 500 Title on container:
When Malindy sings
740 01 When Malindy sings. 4h [Sound recording]

Therefore, a title search on the OCLC data base will indicate the number of cataloging records available for the title.

As an adjunct to the jazz cataloging project, the Institute has developed a name authority file covering jazz performers, directors, composers, arrangers, and performing groups. Moreover, users of the performer, performing group, and composer indexes report that they are finding these lists useful as an authority tool. Indeed, the Music Section of Library of Congress' Descriptive Cataloging Division will be using these indexes as an authority resource; in a cooperative arrangement with the Library of Congress, the necessary "see from" and "see also" references will be provided to LC's Music Cataloging Section as they are needed.

Samples of the current IJS Jazz Register and Indexes are available upon request to Marie P. Griffin, Librarian, Institute of Jazz Studies, Rutgers, the State University, 135 Bradley Hall, Newark, NJ 07102. There is no charge for these samples. However, because of continually increasing reproduction and mailing costs, the renewal grant contemplates distributing the COM register and indexes at cost. Subscriptions for the 1980-81 quarterly cumulations (April, July, October, 1980, and January, 1981) are ten dollars.

Marie P. Griffin
THE MUSIC OCLC USERS GROUP
TAGGING WORKBOOK
and
REFERENCE MANUAL

by
Ruth Patterson Funabiki
and
Karl Van Ausdal

This beginner's manual provides explanations, examples, and tagging exercises for using the OCLC/MARC music and sound recordings formats. The authors are experienced music cataloguers who have presented workshops in music tagging for OCLC and for regional networks. A music bibliography and sample workforms are included. The workbook is organized by field and is self-indexed, with field numbers in boldface type at the bottom of each page. It is 3-hole punched to allow easy additions. The workbook is available for $5.25, PREPAID (includes postage and handling).

ORDER FORM

Please send me ______ copies of the Music OCLC Users Group Tagging Workbook and Reference Manual. Enclosed is a check for $5.25 for each copy, made out to NELINET, Inc.

NAME

ADDRESS

Return this form with your check to: Music Tagging Workbook
NELINET
385 Elliot Street
Newton, MA 02164
617/969-0400
MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION/INFORMATION FORM

NAME: ____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS: _________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________

TELEPHONE: (____) - _____-____ ext. _____

NETWORK: _________________________________________________________

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION: ________________________________________

Check one:

____ Enclosed is a check for membership dues: $3.00 individuals
      $5.00 institutions

____ Please bill (institutions only)

Are you presently a member of the Music Library Association?

____ yes

____ no

Please return completed form and check made payable to Music OCLC
Users Group to:

Richard P. Smiraglia, Treas.
Music Cat. - 2150A Music Building
Univ. of Ill. at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, IL 61801

VOTE ON CHANGE IN BY-LAWS

The Nominations Committee has suggested that membership voting rights be clarified. Art. III of the by-laws (MOUG Newsletter, no. 1) provides that membership is open to all individuals and institutions. Art. IV describes the procedure for electing officers but does not explain voting rights. In order to remedy the situation the Executive Board proposes this amendment to the by-laws:

Insert the following sentence before the final sentence in Art. IV, Section 2:

Each individual member and each institutional member shall have one vote.

The by-laws can be amended only by a two-thirds vote in a mail ballot. Please vote by checking one of the alternatives below and sending the ballot to Ralph Papakhian, Indiana University, Music Library, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

____ I am in favor of the proposed amendment

____ I oppose the proposed amendment