Cataloging Practices and Access Methods for Videos at ARL and Public Libraries in the United States

Jeannette Ho

Libraries may vary in the level and fullness of cataloging they give to video recordings and in the methods they use to provide access to them. This paper reports the results of a survey exploring the level of cataloging and access methods applied to videos, the degree to which catalogers view screen credits, and how often various credit information is included and used to create access points in catalog records in selected U.S. public and Association of Research Libraries member libraries. Resources for cataloging videos also were examined. Results showed that most libraries cataloged videos at the full level and provided access points to similar types of information in catalog records. Academic librarians reported viewing videos and providing access points to certain information to a greater extent than public librarians did. This study offers a general picture of the credit information libraries include or omit in video catalog records.

Libraries in the United States have collected video recordings for more than three decades, but few surveys have examined their cataloging practices regarding this format. Video recordings (hereafter, videos) encompass video tapes and video discs in all formats (e.g., VHS, DVD, laser discs). In 1993, Kristine R. Brancolini and Rick E. Provine examined the extent to which members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) classified videos and included them in their online catalogs; because their investigation was part of a broader survey of video collections and services, other aspects of cataloging practices were not examined in depth.[1] Other research projects include Anna T. Slawek's analysis of video cataloging practices in Canadian public libraries and, more recently, a survey by the Association of Moving Image Archivists of archival moving image cataloging practices.[2] Furthermore, in a subsequent study, Brancolini and Provine concluded that many ARL libraries did not meet the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) *Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries*.[3] The purpose of the present study is to examine issues related to video cataloging and access at selected public and ARL academic libraries in the United States and to explore issues related to the ACRL guidelines' first three recommendations for bibliographic access and cataloging.[4] In particular, the study examines the following areas:

1. The extent to which libraries use the online catalog versus other methods to provide access to videos;

Jeannette Ho (jho@lib-gw.tamu.edu) is Special Formats Cataloger, Texas A&M University Libraries.

2. The degree to which catalogers view screen credits of videos to obtain bibliographic information, as well as the availability of viewing equipment and full-time staff for cataloging videos; and

3. The level of fullness at which libraries catalog videos, including the degree to which various types of credit information are included and used as access points in records.

According to the first recommendation in the ACRL guidelines' bibliographic control and cataloging section, "Bibliographic and holdings information about media resources should be made accessible through the same retrieval mechanisms available for other library materials."[5] A review of the literature shows that libraries have been slow to integrate nonbook materials into online catalogs. According to James C. Scholtz, early video collections were organized by annotated lists.[6] In 1993, Kristine R. Brancolini and Rick E. Provien found that 30 percent of ARL libraries with video collections included either only some or none of their videos in their online catalogs.[7]

In 1995, Jean Weihs and Lynne C. Howarth found that 10.7 percent of Canadian libraries still had not cataloged their videos and that libraries with smaller collections (100,000 items or fewer) were least likely to catalog them according to AACR2.[8] Even libraries that have integrated videos into their online catalogs may still retain older means of access for the format. In 1994, Rebecca M. Adler described how individual campus media centers at the City University of New York (CUNY) retained their media catalogs after the adoption of a campus-wide online public access catalog (OPAC).[9] The study reported in this paper examines the degree to which public and ARL academic libraries in the United States include records for videos in their OPACs. This study also examines alternative methods of providing access to videos, such as offering separate catalogs or lists of titles, or shelving videos in public where they may be browsed.

According to the ACRL guidelines, catalogers should have access to "playback equipment in all formats represented in the collection, and the Web."[10] Equipment is necessary for video catalogers to obtain bibliographic information from the credits. According to AACR2 rule 7.0B1, the preferred chief source of information for videos is "the item itself (e.g., the title frames)."[11] Not viewing the title frames may result in the omission of important information from the catalog record and be a disservice to users. For example, video containers or labels may not always contain information about a title in a foreign language or the language of the soundtrack. This study examines the extent to which cataloging units have viewing equipment and to which video catalogers view credits as the chief source of information. Since viewing habits may depend on staffing, this study also examined the number of full-time personnel available to perform both copy and original cataloging of videos.

The ACRL guidelines recommend that "media resources should be cataloged in accordance with current national standards and practices, including full subject access, description, system requirements, and classification to provide maximum information to the user of the library catalog."[12] This study focuses on the fullness of the description and added entry coverage. According to Paul Graham, complete bibliographic descriptions are especially important for audiovisual media, since they cannot be browsed without the use of special equipment.[13] In libraries that shelve videos in closed stacks, users may rely solely on the OPAC to learn about titles in this format. While some libraries apply minimal-level cataloging to videos to reduce costs, Gary Handman has criticized this approach for reducing access.[14] More recently, a core record for moving-image materials has been proposed.

This study examines the extent to which libraries include specific credit information in the statement of responsibility and notes, as well as provide access points in records for videos. Catalogers have greater flexibility with audiovisual media than for books regarding what to include in records and use as added entries. According to AACR2 rule 7.1F1, catalogers are to transcribe data from the chief source of information relating to individuals or corporate bodies with a major creative role, such as producers and directors, and to put other credit information in notes. Rule 7.7B6 states that credit notes may include "featured players, performers, narrators, and/or presenters."[15] The former Library of Congress Rule Interpretation (LCRI) 7.7B6 included a prescribed list of functions to include in a note, such as photographer, artist/illustrator of graphics, editor, narrator, music, and advisor/consultant, and specified the order in which they were to be given. As this rule interpretation is now obsolete, catalogers may have more freedom to decide what to include in the description. It is of interest to find whether ARL academic and public libraries differ in the extent to which they include and create added entries for information commonly found in video credits. Because catalogers may find that different information is relevant for fiction and nonfiction videos, this study examined the extent information is employed in records for documentaries and feature films. According to the *Moving Image Genre-Form Guide* cited in the authority record for "Documentary videos," a documentary is defined as

> the creative treatment of actuality. Grounded in some aspect of real life, documentaries may vary from a very deliberate account of facts to an extremely interpretive rendering of a subject, advocating a particular viewpoint on a political, social, or

historical issue. In Documentary, actuality should still be dominant over the creative treatment, which, while often staged for the camera, should not go so far as to be dramatized for emotional impact and belong to such genres as Historical fiction or Propaganda. Documentaries may include re-enactments, such as showing the movements of armies, or brief scenes of individuals and dialogue, but do not include films that merely use a realistic technique in telling a fictional story.[16]

Finally, according to the OCLC Online Computer Library Center's *Bibliographic Formats and Standards* manual, librarians cataloging at the full level should provide "full added entry coverage according to the latest revision of AACR2 and LCRIs."[17] LCRI 21.29D provides guidance on when to make added entries (for example: "Make added entries for all featured players, performers, and narrators.").[18] By examining how often librarians create added entries for these elements, this study seeks to determine how closely respondents follow this rule interpretation. In particular, this study focuses on three specific statements of LCRI 21.29D.

1. Do not make added entries for persons (producers, directors, writers, etc.) if there is a production company, unit, etc. for which an added entry is made, unless their contributions are significant.
2. In the absence of a production company, unit, etc., make added entries for those persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers.
3. Make added entry headings for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc., area.[19]

Examples of "significant" contributions given in LCRI 21.29D include "the animator of an animated film, the producer/director of a student film, the director of a theatrical film."[20] Despite the presence of these examples, the definition of what constitutes a significant contribution remains flexible and open to interpretation. This study examines the frequency with which libraries apply these statements and the degree to which they find them useful.

Method
Sample

In the spring of 2002, questionnaires were mailed to the heads of cataloging or the library directors of ninety-three ARL libraries and seventy-four public libraries within the United States. The public libraries were selected from those that had contributed OCLC video records found in the Texas A&M University Libraries' online catalog. This

was done to ensure that the sample would include only public libraries that collected and cataloged videos. In the cover letter, participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire only if their library cataloged videos, and to give it to the librarian who had the greatest responsibility for cataloging them.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire is presented in the appendix to this paper. Respondents to the questionnaire first indicated whether they were affiliated with an academic or public library and answered a series of questions about the nature and shelving of their video collections. They were asked to estimate the approximate number of titles in the VHS, DVD, and laserdisc formats that their library owned, and the approximate percentages of their video collection that consisted of the following genres: feature films, documentaries, instructional videos, and "other," an open category for which they were asked to list any additional genres. Participants were then asked to indicate the extent to which videos were included in their catalogs (all, some, or none) and whether they provided alternative means of access to their videos besides the catalog (separate catalog for media resources, printed list, electronic list, none, or other). They were also asked whether their video collections were shelved in closed stacks, interfiled with books, or shelved in a separate public area. If in closed stacks, they were asked if they shelved containers or container art for the videos in public areas where they could be browsed. Finally, participants indicated the number of full-time professional and support staff involved in both original and copy cataloging of videos and noted the percentage of time spent on those tasks.

Participants then responded to a series of questions regarding video cataloging practices. They were asked whether they cataloged all videos at the same level and, if so, at what level (minimal, core, full, other). If they did not catalog all videos at the same level, they were asked to explain. Participants were asked about the extent to which they viewed videos for original and copy cataloging and whether they had access to viewing equipment in their departments. They were presented with a list of twenty-seven elements commonly found in catalog records for videos. These elements were based on information cited in AACR2 and found in OCLC records as elements in notes and the statement of responsibility. The elements included director, producer, narrator, and summary. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they included each element in records for feature films and documentaries (never, sometimes, always). Following this section, participants were presented with a list of twenty-one elements commonly found as access points for video records. Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they

included each element as an access point in records for both feature films and documentaries (never, sometimes, always). Finally, they were presented with three statements from LCRI 21.29D and asked to indicate how closely they followed them (always, sometimes, not at all); if not always, they were asked to explain why. The statements were:

- Do not make added entries for persons (producers, directors, writers, etc.) if there is a production company, unit, etc. for which an added entry is made unless their contributions are significant.
- In the absence of a production company, unit, etc., make added entries for those persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers.
- Make added entries for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area.[21]

Results

Background Information

Respondents

Forty-four (47 percent) of the ARL libraries surveyed and forty-one (55 percent) of the public libraries surveyed responded. Of the eighty-five respondents, 52 percent were from ARL academic libraries and 48 percent were from public libraries. All libraries reported belonging to a bibliographic utility. All academic libraries and 90 percent of public libraries reported contributing original records to their utilities. A total of eighty-five libraries responded to the survey; the number of respondents to each question varied, depending on the question, and does not always equal eighty-five.

Format

While not all librarians responded to each question, among those who did it was apparent that public librarians perceived that their video collections contained a larger number of DVDs, while ARL librarians perceived that their collections contain a larger number of VHS tapes. On average, public libraries reported having 2,108 VHS tapes and 868 DVDs, while ARL libraries reported having 6,387 VHS tapes and 344 DVDs. Both ARL and public libraries estimated that feature films and documentaries made up the greatest percentage of their collections. On average, ARL libraries reported that feature films made up 44 percent of their collections while public libraries reported 52 percent. ARL libraries reported that documentaries made up 39 percent of their collections, while public libraries reported 25 percent. Fewer than 70 percent of libraries responded to questions about other types of videos (such as instructional, plays, juvenile films, short films, television programs, and lit-

erary readings); those that did respond estimated that these types made up less than 20 percent of their collections.

Staffing and Work Assignment

ARL respondents reported a slightly higher number of full-time professional librarians who did original cataloging of videos than public library respondents. Thirty-eight ARL libraries reported an average of two full-time professionals, while thirty-seven public libraries reported one full-time professional. Thirty-two ARL librarians reported that full-time professionals who did original cataloging of videos devoted an average of 13 percent of their time to this task, while thirty-four public libraries reported that they devoted 15 percent of their time. Twenty-seven ARL and thirty-two public libraries reported having, on average, one professional who performed copy cataloging. Some libraries commented that this was the same person who handled both the copy and original cataloging of videos. Professional librarians spent less time copy cataloging videos in academic libraries than in public libraries. Twenty ARL libraries reported that professionals spent an average of 15 percent of their time copy cataloging, while thirty public libraries reported that they spent an average of 28 percent of their time.

ARL respondents reported having a slightly higher number of full-time support staff who did original cataloging of videos than public library respondents. Yet ARL and public library respondents reported the same number of support staff who did copy cataloging. Nineteen ARL libraries reported that an average of two full-time support staff members performed original cataloging, while twenty-three public libraries reported one full-time support staff member. Twenty ARL librarians reported that their support staff spent an average of 17 percent of their time doing original cataloging of videos, while ten public libraries reported that support staff spent an average of 11 percent of their time on this task.

Meanwhile, thirty-five ARL and twenty-four public libraries both reported an average of two support staff members who copy cataloged videos. Thirty-two ARL libraries reported that support staff devoted an average of 36 percent of their time copy cataloging videos, while twenty-one public libraries reported that their support staff devoted an average of 38 percent of their time doing copy cataloging of videos.

Methods of Providing Access to Videos

All eighty-four respondents reported that they include records for all videos in their online catalogs. Forty-eight percent reported that they provided no other means of access besides the online catalog (that is, no supplemental lists or catalogs). An equal proportion of libraries provided

printed lists (19 percent) and Web-based lists (19 percent) of titles in their video collections. While a greater proportion of ARL libraries reported providing electronic lists, a greater proportion of public libraries reported providing printed lists. Ten percent of libraries reported that they used other methods to provide access to videos, including lists of newly acquired videos and DVDs, finding aids for videos on selected topics (for example, women filmmakers or foreign-language films) and a separate online database of video titles. Meanwhile, only 7 percent reported maintaining separate catalogs for videos. Table 1 shows the numbers and percentages of ARL and public libraries that used each method of access.

Shelving Practices

The study examined the extent to which libraries allowed users to browse videos on shelves. Of eighty-three respondents, 39 percent reported shelving videos in closed stacks and 39 percent reported shelving them in a separate public area. More ARL libraries than public libraries shelved videos in closed stacks, with thirty-one (73 percent) ARL libraries and one (3 percent) public library reporting doing so. A greater percentage of public libraries were likely to shelve videos in a separate public area, with twenty-six (65 percent) public libraries and six (14 percent) ARL libraries reporting this practice.

The remaining nineteen (22 percent) respondents reported a mixture of practices, with less than 5 percent responding to each of the following categories: interfiling videos with books, a mixture of closed stacks and interfiling, a mixture of closed stacks and shelving in a separate public area, a mixture of interfiling and public shelving, and a mixture of all three practices.

Level of Cataloging

Sixty-eight participants reported cataloging all videos at the same level. In this group, 89 percent reported cataloging videos at the full level, with a greater proportion of ARL libraries reporting this. Eight percent of respondents cataloged videos at the minimal level. Finally, only 3 percent of respondents cataloged them at the core level. Table 2 shows the numbers and percentages of ARL and public libraries cataloging at each level.

All respondents that did not catalog their entire video collections at the same level (eight ARL libraries and eight public libraries) wrote descriptions of their procedures. Slightly more than half reported applying less than full cataloging to certain kinds of videos (such as films shot in foreign languages or containing obscure subject matter, or popular feature films) while applying full-level cataloging to others (such as documentary and educational videos).

Table 1. Methods used by ARL and public libraries to provide access to videos

	ARL libraries		Public libraries		Total	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Online catalog	43	(100)	41	(100)	84	(100)
Separate catalog for videos	4	(9)	2	(5)	6	(7)
Printed list of titles	5	(12)	11	(28)	16	(19)
Electronic list of titles	12	(28)	4	(10)	16	(19)
Other method	2	(5)	6	(15)	8	(10)

Table 2. Level of cataloging applied to videos by ARL and public libraries

	ARL libraries		Public libraries		Total	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Full	34	(97)	24	(80)	58	(89)
Core	0	(0)	2	(7)	2	(3)
Minimal	1	(3)	4	(13)	5	(8)

Note: This table includes data from libraries that reported cataloging videos at the same level.

Others reported that they accepted the level found on OCLC records during copy cataloging, had varying policies at different library branches, or let the extent of information in the video determine the level of fullness at which they coded the record.

Viewing of Credits

A greater proportion of ARL libraries than public libraries indicated having access to viewing equipment in their cataloging departments, with thirty-nine (89 percent) ARL libraries and twenty-seven (68 percent) public libraries reporting this. ARL libraries reported viewing credits of videos to a greater extent than public libraries for both original and copy cataloging. Thirty-eight (88 percent) ARL libraries and eighteen (46 percent) public libraries reported viewing credits for all videos that needed original cataloging, while twenty (45 percent) ARL libraries and three (8 percent) public libraries reported viewing credits for all videos that needed copy cataloging. Consistent with this pattern, a greater proportion of ARL libraries reported viewing both beginning and ending credits for original and copy cataloging. Tables 3 and 4 show the numbers and percentages of ARL and public librarians that viewed credits.

Libraries that did not view all videos specified the following reasons: lack of time, insufficient staffing, not having access to equipment, finding adequate OCLC records for copy cataloging, and having sufficient bibliographic information on video containers and cassette labels. Some respondents commented that they only viewed videos for

copy cataloging if they could not find an OCLC record with the full bibliographic level code "I," or if they suspected that the record did not match the item in hand.

Information Included in Records

A majority of respondents indicated always including the following elements in original records for feature films in the following descending order: language, director, actors, year produced as a motion picture, producer, author of work the video was based on, production company, summary, narrator, distributor, writer, and country of original release as a motion picture. Table 5 presents data for only those elements always included in catalog records for feature films by at least 50 percent of all responding libraries. Since none of these elements is always used by any libraries, data on libraries that never use or sometimes use these elements is also presented.

The greatest percentage of respondents reported always including the following elements in original records for documentaries in the following descending order: language, year produced as a motion picture, director, author of work the film was based on, narrator, producer, summary, production company, host, distributor, interviewer, lecturer, actors, writer, and interviewee. Table 6 presents data for only those elements always included in catalog records for documentaries by at least 50 percent of all responding libraries. Since none of these elements is always used by any libraries, data on libraries that never use or sometimes use these elements is also presented.

Respondents reported including the following elements the least frequently in records for feature films and documentaries: costume designer, artist/illustrator of graphics, advisor/consultant, audience level, awards, executive producer, and film editor. Table 7 shows the numbers and percentages of total respondents including these elements in records for both feature films and documentaries. Some elements in the table reflect less agreement regarding whether they should be included in records. For instance, 49 percent of respondents reported sometimes including executive producers for feature films, while the rest of the respondents were evenly divided between never (25 percent) or always including them (25 percent). Other elements in the table showing similar patterns include: audience level, awards, and film editor for both feature films and documentaries, and photographer for documentaries.

A majority of ARL and public libraries included most of the elements at least some of the time (either sometimes or always). Tables 8 and 9 show the numbers and percentages of elements for which the differences between percentages of ARL and public libraries including them at least some of the time were ten or greater. A greater percentage of public libraries reported including audience level, illus-

trators of graphics, and executive producers for both feature films and documentaries, as well as country of origin for documentaries and award notes for feature films. Meanwhile, a greater percentage of ARL libraries reported including choreographers, photographers, and film editors for both feature films and documentaries, as well as summaries for feature films.

Table 3. Videos viewed at ARL and public libraries for original and copy cataloging

	ARL libraries		Public libraries		Total	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Original Cataloging						
All videos	38	(88)	18	(46)	56	(68)
Some videos	5	(12)	15	(38)	20	(24)
No videos	0	(0)	6	(15)	6	(7)
Copy Cataloging						
All videos	20	(45)	3	(8)	23	(27)
Some videos	15	(34)	23	(58)	38	(45)
No videos	9	(20)	14	(35)	23	(27)

Table 4. Extent of credits viewed at ARL and public libraries for original and copy cataloging

	ARL libraries		Public libraries		Total	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Original cataloging						
Entire credits	43	(100)	28	(85)	71	(93)
Beginning credits only	0	(0)	5	(15)	5	(7)
Copy cataloging						
Entire credits	34	(94)	24	(83)	58	(89)
Beginning credits only	2	(6)	5	(17)	7	(11)

Table 5. Catalog information included most often for feature films

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Language	0	(0)	2	(3)	75	(97)
Director	0	(0)	4	(5)	74	(95)
Actors	0	(0)	6	(8)	73	(92)
Year produced	0	(0)	9	(12)	69	(88)
Producer	3	(4)	12	(15)	64	(81)
Author	1	(1)	15	(19)	63	(80)
Production company	1	(1)	15	(19)	63	(80)
Summary	4	(5)	14	(18)	61	(77)
Narrator	0	(0)	22	(28)	57	(72)
Distributor	2	(3)	23	(29)	54	(68)
Writer	2	(3)	25	(32)	19	(53)
Country	13	(16)	25	(32)	41	(52)

Note: This table includes elements that were reported as always included by at least 50 percent of respondents. Elements in this table are ranked from most frequently reported to least frequently reported in the "always" category.

Table 6. Catalog information included most often for documentaries

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Language	0	(0)	3	(4)	77	(96)
Year of production	0	(0)	10	(12)	68	(87)
Director	1	(1)	11	(14)	68	(85)
Author	0	(0)	12	(15)	67	(85)
Narrator	0	(0)	17	(21)	63	(79)
Producer	2	(3)	15	(19)	63	(79)
Summary	2	(3)	18	(23)	60	(75)
Production company	2	(3)	18	(23)	60	(75)
Host	0	(0)	22	(28)	58	(73)
Distributor	2	(3)	23	(29)	55	(69)
Interviewer	1	(1)	24	(30)	55	(69)
Lecturer	0	(0)	28	(38)	46	(62)
Actors	1	(1)	29	(38)	47	(61)
Writer	2	(3)	30	(38)	47	(60)
Interviewee	1	(1)	38	(48)	41	(52)

Note: This table includes elements that were reported as always included by at least 50 percent of respondents. Elements in this table are ranked from the ones reported most frequently to the ones reported least frequently in the "always" category.

Table 7. Elements included least frequently in records for feature films and documentaries

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Feature Films						
Costume designer	39	(49)	34	(43)	6	(8)
Artist/illustrator	32	(41)	40	(51)	3	(7)
Advisor	22	(29)	50	(66)	4	(5)
Audience	23	(29)	37	(47)	18	(23)
Awards	20	(25)	45	(57)	14	(17)
Executive producer	20	(25)	39	(49)	20	(25)
Film editor	19	(24)	35	(45)	25	(32)
Documentaries						
Costume designer	44	(56)	29	(37)	6	(8)
Artist/illustrator	32	(40)	43	(54)	5	(6)
Awards	21	(27)	44	(56)	14	(18)
Audience	20	(25)	43	(54)	16	(20)
Executive producer	20	(25)	39	(49)	21	(26)
Film editor	19	(24)	40	(50)	21	(26)
Advisor	18	(23)	53	(67)	8	(10)
Photographer	16	(21)	46	(59)	16	(21)

Information Added as Supplemental Access Points

In contrast to the information included in records, fewer respondents seemed to consider any particular access point as essential for all feature films or documentaries. A majority of respondents reported always creating added entries in records for feature films for the following information listed in descending order: director, actors, production company, related work, distributor, and narrator. The greatest percentage of respondents reported always creating added

Table 8. Catalog information included by ARL and public libraries at least some of the time for feature films

	ARL Libraries		Public Libraries	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Audience level	24	(56)	31	(89)
Photographer	39	(91)	26	(72)
Film editor	36	(84)	24	(66)
Choreographer	39	(91)	27	(75)
Illustrator of graphics	23	(54)	23	(66)
Summary	43	(100)	32	(88)
Executive producer	30	(70)	29	(81)
Award notes	30	(70)	29	(81)

Note: Includes elements where the difference between percentages of ARL and public librarians sometimes or always including them in records was ten or greater.

Table 9. Catalog information included by ARL and public libraries at least some of the time for documentaries

	ARL Libraries		Public Libraries	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Audience level	27	(61)	32	(91)
Illustrator of graphics	23	(52)	25	(70)
Country of origin	34	(77)	34	(94)
Choreographer	39	(90)	27	(76)
Photographer	36	(86)	26	(73)
Film editor	36	(82)	25	(69)
Executive producer	31	(70)	29	(80)

Note: Includes elements where the difference between percentages of ARL and public librarians sometimes or always including them in records was ten or greater.

entries for documentaries for the following information listed in descending order: director, production company, writer, host, distributor, narrator, interviewers, related work, actors, and lecturers.

Fewer than 50 percent of respondents indicated that they always created added entries for producers or interviewees. Approximately half of respondents reported that they created added entries for interviewers all of the time. Tables 10 and 11 show the numbers and percentages of ARL and public libraries for elements that were reported as sometimes or always used to create added entries for feature films by at least 50 percent of the respondents.

Compared to information included in records, respondents indicated greater consensus regarding elements that were never used to create added entries. The majority of respondents reported never creating added entries for the following elements for either feature films or documentaries: film editor, costume designer, artist/illustrator, photographer/cameraperson, and advisor/consultant. Table 12 presents data for only those elements where at least 20 percent of respondents reported never using them to create added entries for feature films and documentaries.

Table 10. Catalog information used most often in added entries for feature films

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Director	1	(1)	10	(13)	67	(86)
Actors	3	(4)	9	(12)	66	(85)
Production company	6	(8)	17	(22)	55	(71)
Related work	6	(8)	21	(27)	51	(65)
Distributor	13	(17)	19	(25)	46	(59)
Narrator	5	(7)	28	(37)	43	(57)

Note: This table includes elements that were reported as always included by at least 50 percent of respondents. Elements in this table are ranked from the ones reported most frequently to the ones reported least frequently in the "always" category.

Table 11. Catalog information used most often in added entries for documentaries

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Director	2	(2)	17	(21)	62	(77)
Production company	5	(6)	21	(26)	55	(68)
Writer	3	(4)	27	(34)	49	(62)
Host	3	(4)	27	(34)	49	(62)
Distributor	12	(15)	20	(25)	49	(60)
Narrator	5	(6)	28	(35)	47	(59)
Interviewer	4	(5)	31	(39)	45	(56)
Related work	4	(5)	20	(25)	70	(55)
Actor	3	(4)	35	(44)	41	(52)
Lecturer	4	(5)	33	(43)	40	(52)

Note: This table includes elements that were reported as always included by at least 50 percent of respondents. Elements in this table are ranked from the ones reported most frequently to the ones reported least frequently in the "always" category.

Table 12. Catalog information used least often in added entries for feature films and documentaries

	Never		Sometimes		Always	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Feature films						
Film editor	52	(67)	18	(23)	8	(10)
Costume designer	51	(65)	24	(31)	3	(4)
Artist/illustrator	48	(61)	28	(35)	3	(4)
Photographer	46	(60)	26	(34)	5	(7)
Advisor	45	(58)	29	(38)	3	(4)
Executive producer	36	(46)	34	(44)	8	(10)
Choreographer	27	(35)	44	(56)	7	(9)
Documentaries						
Costume designer	51	(69)	9	(21)	4	(5)
Film editor	52	(64)	20	(25)	9	(11)
Photographer	45	(56)	30	(38)	5	(6)
Artist/illustrator	45	(56)	32	(40)	4	(5)
Advisor	39	(49)	38	(48)	3	(4)
Executive producer	38	(47)	33	(41)	10	(12)
Choreographer	28	(35)	44	(56)	7	(9)
Animator	24	(31)	40	(51)	14	(18)

Note: This table includes elements that were reported as "never" being used by at least 20 percent of respondents.

Table 13. Catalog information used by ARL and public libraries at least some of the time in added entries for feature films

	ARL Libraries		Public Libraries	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Writer	39	(91)	24	(66)
Producer	39	(93)	26	(74)
Choreographer	32	(74)	19	(55)
Distributor	38	(91)	27	(75)
Costume designer	13	(30)	14	(40)

Note: This table includes elements for which the difference between percentages of ARL and public libraries sometimes or always using them as added entries was ten percentage points or greater.

Table 14. Catalog information used by ARL and public libraries at least some of the time in added entries for documentaries

	ARL Libraries		Public Libraries	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Producer	39	(90)	25	(69)
Distributor	38	(91)	27	(75)
Choreographer	29	(70)	22	(59)
Costume designer	11	(26)	14	(37)

Note: This table includes elements for which the difference between percentages of ARL and public libraries sometimes or always using them as added entries was ten percentage points or greater.

The majority of ARL and public libraries created added entries for most of the elements at least some of the time (both sometimes and always). Tables 13 and 14 show the numbers and percentages for elements where the differences between percentages of ARL and public libraries creating added entries for them at least some of the time was ten or greater. A greater percentage of ARL libraries reported creating added entries for producers and choreographers for both feature films and documentaries, and for writers and distributors for feature films. Meanwhile, a greater percentage of public libraries created added entries for costume designers for both feature films and documentaries.

Rule Interpretation 21.29D Statements

ARL and public libraries were compared on the extent to which they followed the LCRI 21.29D statement: "Do not make added entries for persons (producers, directors, writers, etc.) if there is a production company, unit, etc. for which an added entry is made, unless their contributions are significant." The majority of respondents reported following this practice only some of the time. Meanwhile, approximately a quarter of respondents reported never following this practice.

Written comments referred to the need for exercising judgment in this situation. As one public librarian wrote, "Significant contribution is not always clear and agreed among everyone." Both academic and public librarians wrote that they did not always follow this rule interpretation because they perceived personal names as useful access points. Some librarians stated that it was appropriate to create added entries for directors, producers, and writers because these roles (especially director) were "nearly always significant." A public librarian reported following this rule interpretation on a case-by-case basis, only adding entries for persons who were "nationally prominent, well known, or [likely to get] searched [by patrons]." Librarians from both types of libraries wrote that they often did not create added entries for production companies.

ARL and public libraries were compared on the extent to which they followed the statement "In the absence of a production company, unit, etc., make added entries for those persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers." The majority of respondents reported always following this statement, with a greater proportion of academic librarians than public librarians reporting doing so. ARL librarians wrote that they sometimes omitted producers because their contributions seemed less significant than writers and directors. Some public librarians wrote that it was their library's policy to only create added entries for directors, since this reduced the time spent cataloging.

Finally, ARL and public libraries were compared on the extent that they followed the statement "Make added entries for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area." Consistent with the pattern in the previous paragraph, the majority of respondents followed it all the time, with a greater proportion of ARL librarians reporting this. ARL and public librarians who did not always follow this statement wrote that they were selective when creating added entries for production companies and distributors, especially when many were involved. ARL librarians wrote that it was necessary to exercise judgment, since not all distributors had significant roles in the creation of the video. Some public librarians commented that they only created added entries for well known companies because this helped reduce the time spent cataloging and doing authority work. Table 15 shows the numbers and percentages of respondents who followed each LCRI 21.29D statement.

Discussion

Overall, respondents from ARL and public libraries were similar regarding the extent to which they included records

Table 15. Extent libraries follow LCRI 21.29D statements

	ARL libraries		Public libraries		Total	
	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
"Do not make added entries for persons (producers, directors, writers, etc.) if there is a production company, unit, etc., for which an added entry is made . . ."						
Always	10	(23)	7	(19)	17	(22)
Sometimes	23	(54)	16	(44)	39	(49)
Not at all	10	(23)	13	(36)	23	(29)
"In the absence of a production company, unit, etc., make added entries for those persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers . . ."						
Always	36	(82)	17	(46)	53	(65)
Sometimes	7	(16)	14	(38)	21	(26)
Not at all	1	(2)	6	(16)	7	(9)
"Make added entries for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area."						
Always	34	(77)	20	(54)	54	(67)
Sometimes	10	(23)	12	(32)	22	(27)
Not at all	0	(0)	5	(14)	5	(6)

for videos in the online catalog, the level of cataloging applied to videos, and the extent to which they included certain credit information in records for both feature films and documentaries. They differed regarding the extent to which they treated title frames as the chief source of information and to which they provided certain access points.

All respondents fulfilled the first ACRL recommendation for bibliographic control and cataloging by including records for their entire video collections in the online catalog. This result is encouraging, compared to results from the 1993 ARL survey (not limited to libraries within the United States) that found 30 percent of libraries did not include records for their entire video collections in the catalog.[22] Slightly more than half of respondents reported using additional means to enhance access to videos, with more ARL libraries using electronic lists of titles and more public libraries using printed lists. The majority of public libraries reported shelving videos or containers in a separate public area where patrons could browse them, while ARL libraries were more likely to use closed stacks.

The majority of respondents from both types of libraries reported cataloging all videos at the full level, while few cataloged them at minimal or core levels. A greater proportion of ARL libraries reported applying full-level cataloging. Yet some respondents who cataloged at minimal or core levels only did so for a portion of their video collections. These respondents applied less than full cataloging for certain kinds of videos for which they lacked time or expertise (such as foreign language films or films with difficult subject matter).

The survey provided evidence that the ACRL recommendation to provide "playback equipment in all formats"

may not be fully met. Although this survey did not ask respondents to list types of viewing equipment available, ARL libraries reported having greater access to viewing equipment within their departments than public librarians did. A greater proportion of ARL libraries reported viewing all videos for both original and copy cataloging, and viewing both the beginning and ending credits. However, the gaps between ARL and public libraries' viewing patterns also may have been due to additional factors such as level of staffing and workload. On average, ARL libraries reported a slightly greater number of original video catalogers. With fewer staff and larger backlogs, public library respondents with access to equipment may have less time to view credits.

Interestingly, although many public library respondents may have fewer resources to examine credits, the majority still reported cataloging videos at the full level. It is unknown whether alternative sources, such as the container and cassette labels, contained a sufficient level of detail to create full-level records. A study by Katherine Hart Weimer comparing bibliographic data for videos in audiovisual sourcebooks (that were not obtained from the chief source) with data in the National Library of Medicine's Audiovisual On-Line Catalog (AVLINE) records (cataloged from the chief source) found that AVLINE records contained fuller information than records in the sourcebooks.[23] Weimer concluded that her findings did not support cataloging from eye-readable materials. Examining this issue further would be of interest.

This study examined the extent to which respondents included and created access points for certain types of information when they were available and the rules made them applicable. Few differences emerged between the academic and public librarians. Most respondents reported including most of the elements in the statement of responsibility or notes at least some of the time, with the greatest proportion always including language for both feature films and documentaries. Interestingly, respondents reported including writers more often for documentaries than for feature films. The few differences that existed between ARL and public librarians regarding what to include in records tended to be for the least popular elements among respondents as a whole (such as audience level, awards, and film editor). Findings indicating that more public librarians include audience level and award notes may reflect their emphasis on helping users select feature films for entertainment purposes. That more ARL librarians reported adding entries for cinematographers, film editors, and writers may reflect the more specialized needs of their clientele.

Few elements were reported as being used to create added entries for all videos. While LCRI 21.29D provides guidance on when to add entries for production companies, distributors, writers, and producers and directors, respondents created added entries for the director most often but did not always perceive the other roles as important. Fewer than 50 percent of respondents always created added entries for producers for feature films and documentaries. Although the majority of respondents created added entries for production companies and distributors, a quarter indicated doing this only some of the time. Respondents reported creating added entries for writers more often for documentaries than for feature films. Meanwhile, the fact that catalogers created added entries for feature film actors with the second highest rate of frequency was consistent with the LCRI 29.29D statement "Make added entries for all featured players, performers, and narrators."[24] Yet respondents made added entries for actors less often for documentaries and more than 40 percent indicated they did not always create added entries for narrators. There was evidence that respondents did not always follow the LCRI 21.29D instruction to "make added entries for persons in a production who are interviewers or interviewees, delivering lectures, addresses, etc. or discussing their lives, ideas, work, etc."[25] Approximately half reported not always creating added entries for interviewers and lecturers, and less than half reported always doing so for interviewees.

Meanwhile, respondents from ARL libraries reported creating added entries for elements more frequently than respondents from public libraries and following the three LCRI 21.29D statements to a greater extent. Greater proportions of ARL respondents reported always following the statement instructing them to create added entries for persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers in the "absence of a production company." This result was consistent with the finding that ARL libraries created added entries for producers and feature film writers more often than public libraries. A greater percentage of ARL libraries reported creating added entries for "all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area." These results are consistent with the findings that ARL libraries created added entries for distributors more often than public libraries. ARL libraries were especially likely to report basing their decisions on whether they judged the contributions of such entities as significant according to the rule interpretation, while public libraries were more likely to report omitting such added entries in order to save time and to avoid the need for authority work. Finally, the majority of both types of libraries reported not creating added entries for persons in the presence of a production company only some of the time, citing the difficulty of judging whether a person had a significant role in the creation of a video.

Conclusion

This study provides a snapshot of certain issues related to video cataloging and access at a single point in time. It

found that the majority of public and ARL libraries in this survey group included records for all of their videos in the online catalog, applied full-level cataloging to videos, and included similar types of information in records. It found that ARL libraries were more likely to view the title frames of videos for cataloging purposes, catalog videos at the full level, and create access points for certain types of information, such as producers, distributors, and feature film writers. They were more likely to follow LCRI 21.29D statements, which instruct catalogers to create added entries for persons in the absence of a production company, and for all bodies in the publication, distribution, etc. area. Yet neither ARL nor public libraries followed all LCRI 21.29D statements. They did not always create added entries for interviewees, interviewers, and lecturers, and did not always omit added entries for persons not judged as having a significant creative role when making added entries for a production company.

Based on the above findings, it may be useful to reexamine the current cataloging rules for videos, particularly LCRI 21.29D, to more accurately reflect the actual practices and concerns of librarians and the needs of users. Many respondents wrote that they perceived persons (especially directors) as more useful access points and were more likely to create added entries for persons than production companies. They frequently perceived persons as playing a more significant role in the creation of a film than production companies. Respondents expressed the difficulty of judging when a person's role is considered significant. It may be helpful to revise this rule interpretation, as well as have better guidance on how to judge the significance of a contribution.

While ARL and public libraries seemed to find similar types of information useful to include in records, public libraries had less access to viewing equipment and fewer full-time original cataloging staff. Lacking resources needed for viewing all videos, they did not always obtain credit information from the title frames and were less likely to apply full-level cataloging to videos. At the same time, they were more likely to shelve videos or containers in public where users could browse them. As containers often contain information commonly included in bibliographic records, they may serve as another method of conveying information about videos to the public. Thus, public libraries tended not to rely solely on the catalog for this purpose.

Videos remain a vital part of library collections and continue to require high standards of bibliographical control and access. In the future, it may be useful to replicate this study using larger, more representative samples, as the present study's samples were not randomly selected and did not include all ARL institutions. Public libraries in the sample may reflect a bias, since they were selected for the sample based on the presence of their records in Texas A&M University Libraries' catalog. In the future, compiling a comprehensive directory of U.S. academic and public libraries that collect videos might be useful. Such a directory would include information about the size and scope of their collections and methods of bibliographic control. A resource of this nature could serve as a useful tool for future researchers to obtain samples from. Furthermore, since this study focuses on video credit information included in notes and the statement of responsibility, future studies may include other areas of the catalog record outlined by ACRL's *Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries,* including subject access, system requirements, and classification. Finally, since public libraries provided ways to let users browse videos and created fewer access points in the catalog, a future study might examine whether the needs and searching habits of users in public libraries differ from those in academic libraries.

References

1. Kristine R. Brancolini and Rick E. Provine, *Video Collections and Multimedia in ARL Libraries*, ed. C. Brigid Welch, SPEC Kit 199 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, 1993).

2. Anna T. Slawek, "Bibliographic Records for Video Recordings in Online Public Access Catalogues in Canadian Public Libraries" (master's research paper, University of Toronto, 1996); Association of Moving Image Archivists, *AMIA Compendium of Moving Image Cataloging Practice,* ed. Abigail Leab Martin (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Assn. of Moving Image Archivists, 2001).

3. Kristine R. Brancolini and Rick E. Provine, *Video Collections and Multimedia in ARL Libraries: Changing Technologies,* ed. Laura A. Round, OMS Occasional Paper, no. 19 (Washington, D.C.: Assn. of Research Libraries, Office of Management Services, 1997), 14; Association of College and Research Libraries, Media Resources Committee, *Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries* (Apr. 1999). Accessed Oct. 15, 2001, www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/guidelinesmedia.htm.

4. Association of College and Research Libraries, Media Resources Committee, *Guidelines.*

5. Ibid.

6. James C. Scholtz, *Video Acquisitions and Cataloging* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Pr., 1995).

7. Brancolini and Provine, *Video Collections and Multimedia in ARL Libraries: Changing Technologies,* 11.

8. Jean Weihs and Lynne C. Howarth, "Nonbook Materials: Their Occurrence and Bibliographic Description in Canadian libraries," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 39 (Apr. 1995): 184–97.

9. Rebecca M. Adler, "Media Cataloging: Whither?" *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship* 3 (Fall 1994). Accessed Feb. 4, 2002, http://wings.buffalo.edu/publications/mcjrnl/v2n2/adler.html.

10. Association of College and Research Libraries, Media Resources Committee, *Guidelines.*
11. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2d ed., 2002 rev. (Ottawa: Canadian Library Assn.; London: Library Assn.; Chicago: ALA, 2002).
12. Association of College and Research Libraries, Media Resources Committee, *Guidelines.*
13. Paul Graham, "Current Developments in Audiovisual Cataloging," *Library Trends* 34 (summer 1985): 55–66.
14. Gary Handman, "I Lost It (or Found It) at the Movies: Public Service Implications of Minimal Level Cataloging of Audiovisual Materials," *Technical Services Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (1991): 39–47.
15. *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules,* ch. 7, p. 6.
16. Library of Congress, Motion Picture/Broadcasting/Recorded Sound Division, *The Moving Image Genre-Form Guide,* comp. Brian Taves, Judi Hoffman, Karen Lund (Feb. 1998). Accessed Dec. 29, 2003, www.loc.gov/rr/mopic/migintro.html.
17. OCLC Online Computer Research Center, *Bibliographic Formats and Standards,* 3rd ed. (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC, 2002).
18. Accessed Feb. 17, 2003, www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/about/index.shtm.
18. Library of Congress, Cataloging Policy and Support Office, *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations,* 2d ed. (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1998–); available from *Cataloger's Desktop,* issue 1 (2003).
19. Ibid.
20. Ibid.
21. **QY: Need reference.**
22. Brancolini and Provine, *Video Collections and Multimedia in ARL Libraries: Changing Technologies,* 11.
23. Katherine Hart Weimer, "A Citation Comparison of Sourcebooks for Audiovisuals to AVLINE Records: Access and the Chief Source of Information," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 38 (Apr. 1994): 119–31.
24. Library of Congress, Cataloging Policy and Support Office, *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations.*
25. Ibid.

Appendix
Questionnaire

I. Background Information

1. Please indicate what kind of library you are affiliated with: _____Academic   _____Public

2. Approximately how many titles of the following formats are currently in your collection?
   VHS: _____
   DVD: _____
   Laserdisc: _____

3. Approximately what percentage of your video collection (all formats) consists of:
   _____Feature films   _____Other (Please list the types:_____
   _____Documentaries   _____
   _____Instructional videos   _____)

4. At your library, are catalog records for videos included in the same catalog as books?
   _____All are included   _____Some are included   _____None are included

5. What other means of access do you provide for videos? (Check all that apply):
   _____Separate catalog for media resources   _____None   _____Printed list of video titles
   _____Other (Please specify)   _____Electronic list of video
                                                       titles on the Web
                                                       (not a catalog)

6. Is your video collection:
   _____Behind closed stacks
   _____Interfiled with book collection
   _____Shelved in separate public area

7. If you shelve videos behind closed stacks, do you shelve containers or container art in a public area so they are browseable by patrons?
    _____Yes   _____No

8. Do you have an automated system?   _____Yes, the vendor of my system is:_____   _____No

9. Do you belong to a bibliographic utility?
    _____Yes   _____No
    If you do belong to a utility, which one? _____

10. If you belong to a bibliographic utility, do you contribute original video records to it?
    _____Yes   _____No

11. How many full-time professional librarians and support staff catalog videos and approximately what percentage of their time is spent on this task?
    Original cataloging of videos:
       Number of FTE professionals: _____   % time:_____
       Number of FTE support staff: _____   % time:_____
    Copy cataloging of videos:
       Number of FTE professionals: _____   % time:_____
       Number of FTE support staff: _____   % time:_____

II. Cataloging

1. Do you catalog all your videos at the same level?   _____Yes   _____No (skip the next question)

2. At what level do you catalog your videos?   _____Minimal   _____Core   _____Full   _____Other (please explain):

3. If you do not catalog all videos at the same level, please explain how you decide to catalog them at different levels (for example, level may vary by video format, genre, etc.):

4. At your institution, are videos viewed in order to transcribe descriptive information from the screen information?
    When doing original cataloging of videos:
       _____Yes, we always view videos
       _____Yes, but we only view some of the videos
       _____No, we don't view videos (please explain why not):
    If videos ARE viewed for original cataloging:
       _____We view both beginning and end credits
       _____We only view the beginning credits
    When doing copy cataloging of videos:
       _____Yes, we always view videos
       _____Yes, but we only view some of the videos
       _____No, we don't view videos (please explain why not):
    If videos *are* viewed for copy cataloging:
       _____We view both beginning and end credits
       _____We only view the beginning credits

5. Do you have viewing equipment in the cataloging department?
    _____Yes   _____No (If viewed elsewhere, where is the equipment located?_____)

6. If videos are viewed, who *normally* views the videos for original cataloging?
    _____The original cataloger
    _____Support staff in cataloging dept.

_____Student worker
_____Audiovisual dept./media center staff
_____Other (please specify):_____

7. Do you classify your videos (i.e., LC or Dewey)?   _____Yes   _____No

The following questions apply to the original cataloging of videos at your institution. Please fill out the remaining questions if your library does original cataloging of videos.

8. Generally, when applicable and available, how often do you *include* the following information in the catalog record (either as notes or in statement of responsibility) for *feature films* versus *documentaries*)?

	Feature Films			Documentaries		
	Never	Sometimes	Always	Never	Sometimes	Always
Author of work the video is based on	1	2	3	1	2	3
Actors/actresses	1	2	3	1	2	3
Interviewers	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	3
Interviewees	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	3
Director	1	2	3	1	2	3
Lecturers	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	3
Language (if not English)	1	2	3	1	2	3
Year produced as motion picture (if more than two years ago)	1	2	3	1	2	3
Advisor/consultant	1	2	3	1	2	3
Photographer/ cameraperson	1	2	3	1	2	3
Film editor	1	2	3	1	2	3
Animator	1	2	3	1	2	3
Narrator	1	2	3	1	2	3
Producer	1	2	3	1	2	3
Executive producer	1	2	3	1	2	3
Distributor	1	2	3	1	2	3
Production company	1	2	3	1	2	3
Composer	1	2	3	1	2	3
Screenwriter	1	2	3	1	2	3

9. Generally, when applicable and available, how often do you *include* the following information in the catalog record (either as notes or in statement of responsibility) for *feature films* versus *documentaries*)?

	Feature Films			Documentaries		
	Never	Sometimes	Always	Never	Sometimes	Always
Summary	1	2	3	1	2	3
Audience	1	2	3	1	2	3
Award note	1	2	3	1	2	3
Host/presenter	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	3
Choreographer	1	2	3	1	2	3
Costume designer	1	2	3	1	2	3
Artists/illustrators of graphics	1	2	3	1	2	3
Country of original release (if not U.S.)	1	2	3	1	2	3

10. Generally, when applicable and available, how often do you *include* the following information in the catalog record (either as notes or in statement of responsibility) for *feature films* versus *documentaries*)?

	Feature Films				Documentaries		
	Never	Sometimes	Always		Never	Sometimes	Always
Related work added entry	1	2	3		1	2	3
Actors/actresses	1	2	3		1	2	3
Interviewers	N/A	N/A	N/A		1	2	3
Interviewees	N/A	N/A	N/A		1	2	3
Director	1	2	3		1	2	3
Lecturers	N/A	N/A	N/A		1	2	3
Advisor/consultant	1	2	3		1	2	3
Photographer/ cameraperson	1	2	3		1	2	3
Film editor	1	2	3		1	2	3

11. Generally, when applicable and available, how often do you *include* the following information in the catalog record (either as notes or in statement of responsibility) for *feature films* versus *documentaries*)?

	Feature Films				Documentaries		
	Never	Sometimes	Always		Never	Sometimes	Always
Animator	1	2	3		1	2	3
Narrator	1	2	3		1	2	3
Producer	1	2	3		1	2	3
Executive producer	1	2	3		1	2	3
Distributor	1	2	3		1	2	3
Production company	1	2	3		1	2	3
Composer	1	2	3		1	2	3
Screenwriter	1	2	3		1	2	3
Host/presenter	N/A	N/A	N/A		1	2	3
Choreographer	1	2	3		1	2	3
Costume designer	1	2	3		1	2	3
Artists/illustrators of graphics	1	2	3		1	2	3

12. *Library of Congress Rule Interpretation* 21.29D says, "Do not make added entries for persons (producers, directors, writers, etc.) if there is a production company, unit, etc. for which an added entry is made, unless their contributions are significant." How closely do you follow this rule interpretation?
_____Always　　　　　　　　_____Sometimes　　　　　　　　_____Not at all
If you do not *always* follow this LCRI, please explain why not:_____

13. The rule interpretation also says, "In the absence of a production company, unit, etc., make added entries for those persons who are listed as producers, directors, and writers." How closely do you follow this rule interpretation?
_____Always　　　　　　　　_____Sometimes　　　　　　　　_____Not at all
If you do not *always* follow this LCRI, please explain why not:_____

In addition, LCRI 21.29 says, "make added entries for all corporate bodies named in the publication, distribution, etc. area." How closely do you follow this rule interpretation?
_____Always　　　　　　　　_____Sometimes　　　　　　　　_____Not at all
If you do not *always* follow this LCRI, please explain why not:_____

Thank you for filling out the survey.