

WorldCat Enhancement Recommendations for Music

Music OCLC Users Group (MOUG)

Reference Services Committee

July 2004; updated September 2005 and January 2006

I. Background: Past Reports and Enhancement Requests

MOUG's WorldCat evaluations go back to 1991 with Robert Acker's review of the EPIC service. Evaluations and enhancement recommendations of FirstSearch's WorldCat began with the February 1998 MOUG panel discussion, "A Comparison of FirstSearch WorldCat Functionality with MLA's Automation Requirements for Music Information," which resulted in the February 1998 "Final Report of the FirstSearch WorldCat Review Task Force." Recommendations were approved by the MOUG Board and presented to OCLC in 1998. Martin Jenkins presented his report, "Evaluation of WorldCat Functionality in the New FirstSearch Interface" at MOUG's 2001 meeting. Cheryl Taranto gave a "WorldCat Update" at the MOUG 2002 meeting. This report was prepared by MOUG's Reference Services committee in July 2004 (Tracey Rudnick, principal author, with contributions by Robert Acker, D. J. Hoek, Cheryl Taranto, and other committee members), presented to the board in spring 2005, and updated in September 2005. It draws selectively from the previous reports and recommendations, and makes new observations. OCLC's Deb Bendig (Product Manager, WorldCat in FirstSearch, OCLC) and Dawn Hendricks (OCLC Reference and Resource Sharing) graciously provided comments regarding this document on 19 September 2005 via phone conversation with Tracey Rudnick (see below).

WorldCat users and MOUG members are encouraged to propose new items or send corrections/updates. It is hoped that many of the points below will be implemented as part of WorldCat's "FRBRization" (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records).

II. Improvements Made by OCLC

MOUG's Reference Services Committee is pleased to report that music searchers have been well-served by several recent enhancements to WorldCat. It is now possible to limit to specific formats (e.g., compact discs rather than just sound recordings). In April 2004, OCLC updated its indexes: title keyword searches now include 240, 7xx, and all subfields; the keyword index now includes the title and author keywords, and other important fields. This removes some of the most serious criticisms, that of indexing, from our enhancement suggestions. See documentation at http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/firstsearch/z3950/z3950_databases/specs/worldcat.htm. The hyphenation problem, particularly of authors (e.g., Mendelssohn-Bartholdy), has been fixed. Subfield 4 is now helpfully spelled out in the bibliographic displays. Search terms are now highlighted in the bibliographic displays, and names have been "de-dupped" in the summaries.

III. Summary of Requested Enhancements

	Page
1. Display of bibliographic record fields: re-unite Title and Responsibility.	2
2. Make added entries easier to read.	4
3. Display uniform titles (240) at the top of the record (with labels).	5
4. Sort order: offer drop-down menus on search and results pages.	5
5. Implement a name/uniform-title heading search with cross references.	6
6. Allow adjacency and phrase search across subfields.	9
7. Summaries: add uniform titles to summary lists and individual summaries.	9

8.	Individual record summaries: simplify the displayed authors.....	10
9.	Provide MARC displays or highlight search terms.	10
10.	Provide “all/any/phrase” drop-down menus for search boxes.....	11
11.	Stopwords	11
12.	Synonym Lists, “Concept” Searches, and Background Authority Record Searching.....	11
13.	Advanced Search (RILM and WorldCat)	12

IV. Recommendations for Improvement

In priority order.

1. Display of bibliographic record fields: re-unite Title and Responsibility.

Problem: Seemingly scrambled fields make it difficult for users to identify the musical works and composers (many users have trouble identifying the works at all). Adherence to AACR2r display order (or at least MARC order) would eliminate most of these problems. This is what many users see in their own catalogs. If AACR2r order is not possible, several enhancements could at least help users decipher records.

At the 2004 MOUG Public Services AskMOUG session, OCLC representative Deb Bendig asked attendees about the possibility of implementing AACR2r order in just the score and sound recording formats. Neither the MOUG Reference Services Committee nor the AskMOUG attendees favored this solution since users are likely be confused by inconsistencies between various records, especially since a single search can bring up scores, recordings, books (e.g., libretti), and videorecordings (e.g., operas).

Examples: In WorldCat, the main author (100) appears *after* the 245|a (the transcribed title) in a mish-mash of other added entries, and the 245 field breaks at the statement of responsibility (245|c). If there is unique information in |c, it now displays in a field at the bottom labeled “responsibility.” Here is a typical confusing recording:

OCLC 32983675

Title: Trio for piano, clarinet and cello in A minor, op. 114

Author(s): Brahms, Johannes, 1833-1897. ; Beethoven, Ludwig van,; 1770-1827. ; Trios,; piano, clarinet, violoncello,; op. 11,; Bb major.; Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus,; 1756-1791. ; Trios,; piano, clarinet, viola,; K. 498,; Eb major;; arr.; Ax, Emanuel. ; (Performer - prf); Stoltzman, Richard. ; (Performer - prf); Ma, Yo-Yo,; 1955-; (Performer - prf)

Other Titles: Trios, piano, clarinet, violoncello, op. 114, A minor; Trios for piano, clarinet & cello

Responsibility: Johannes Brahms. Trio for piano, clarinet and cello in B- flat Major, op. 11 / Ludwig van Beethoven. Trio for piano, clarinet and viola (cello) “Kegelstatt” in E-flat Major, K. 498 / Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart.

The title above does not give a hint that there are more titles on this CD (but a full Title/Statement of Responsibility would). The Author(s) are impenetrable. Did Brahms and Beethoven compose the op. 11 trio together? In the Author(s) field does Mozart go with the work listed before or after his name? Is the K. 498 trio arranged by Emanuel Ax? (The answer is no.) The “Other Titles” field gives no indication of which work goes with

which composer. In the Responsibility field (located way at the bottom of the record where users are least likely to look), it appears as if Brahms wrote the op. 11 trio (he did not). It is all too confusing for users. Even librarians have difficulty unwinding the information! (At least this record has a 505 contents field to help clarify content. Many records do not, e.g., #23233493.)

In the next example, the split 245 (title and responsibility) is clear enough, but these two descriptive elements should be closer to one another. While the Responsibility field may seem to repeat other author fields (“stuttering”), it has critical details that describe the item and should be placed next to the main title statement for full context. It should not be buried below subject headings with seemingly miscellaneous data.

OCLC: 11981110

Title: Klaviersonaten /

and near the bottom of the record . . .

Responsibility: Beethoven ; nach Autographen und Erstdrucken revidiert und mit Fingersätzen versehen von Heinrich Schenker = Piano sonatas / Beethoven ; edited from the autographs and first editions by Heinrich Schenken ; fingering by Heinrich Schenker.

The committee recognizes that the MARC record provides many challenges (and we struggle with this in our own catalogs), but leaving the 245 statement in one field (or at least in adjacent Title and Responsibility fields) clarifies some of those relationships:

Ideal:

Title [& Responsibility]: Balladen op. 10 / Johannes Brahms. Klaviersonate a-moll D. 537 (op. 164) / Franz Schubert [sound recording]

Alternative adjacent fields (this still is unclear to users):

Title: Balladen op. 10 /

Responsibility: Johannes Brahms. Klaviersonate a-moll D. 537 (op. 164) / Franz Schubert [sound recording]

Recommendation: list 245|c information with title information in one field or immediately adjacent, rather than as a separate field toward the bottom of the record so that users have a complete, instant picture of what the item contains. Also see Recommendations #2 (on added entries) and #3 (on uniform titles) to help clarify the record.

9/7/5 Update: Bendig/Hendricks indicate that they need to look at some more examples and get a further sense of how this is appearing in other places. There is still some talk at OCLC of perhaps having a “music view” or “realm,” but the challenge is in knowing what to pull in (for example, including scores/recordings but excluding books would exclude libretti or pedagogical materials). Could limit scope by LC class or some other criteria (they did this in the CD 450 library). Need further discussion in MOUG for ideas.

2. Make added entries easier to read.

Added entries are run together in one field just under the title, with poor punctuation. It is hard to read and make sense of for both novice and experienced users. Many users cannot determine which author goes with which title, and they are baffled by all the extra marks. The added punctuation obscures the punctuation provided in the original record, making it difficult for even expert users to properly read the titles. (Removing all that extra punctuation is also annoying when assembling bibliographies.)

Recommendation: List each added entry field (with all its name and title subfields) on its own line, as most online catalogs do. Use only the punctuation provided in the original cataloging (this will help provide cleaner displays). The increased clarity will by far compensate for the extra vertical scrolling. For implementation examples, see “full record” displays in Endeavor’s Voyager catalog (e.g., the University of Connecticut at <http://homerweb.lib.uconn.edu>). (Ideally, name/title added entries would also be clickable and run a new name/uniform-title headings search, but that is a separate issue; see Recommendation #5 below for comments about name/title searches.)

Example of current display:

OCLC: 24020832

Author(s): Bourgeois, John R. ; (Conductor - cnd); Beethoven, Ludwig van,; 1770-1827. ; Marches,; band,; WoO 24,; D major.; Bach, Johann Sebastian,; 1685-1750. ; Toccatas,; organ,; BWV 564,; C major;; arr.; Saint-Saëns, Camille,; 1835-1921. ; Orient et Occident.; Grainger, Percy,; 1882-1961. ; Room-music tit-bits.; Children’s march,; band.; Benson, Warren,; 1924- ; Solitary dancer.; Grainger, Percy,; 1882-1961. ; Marching song of democracy,; band.; Piston, Walter,; 1894-1976. ; Tunbridge Fair.; Camphouse, Mark,; 1954- ; Elegy.

Same display, but faster and easier to read:

Bourgeois, John R. (Conductor - cnd)
 Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Marches, band, WoO 24, D major.
 Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Toccatas, organ, BWV 564, C major; arr.
 Saint-Saëns, Camille, 1835-1921. Orient et Occident.
 Grainger, Percy, 1882-1961. Room-music tit-bits. Children’s march, band.
 Benson, Warren, 1924- Solitary dancer.
 Grainger, Percy, 1882-1961. Marching song of democracy, band.
 Piston, Walter, 1894-1976. Tunbridge Fair.
 Camphouse, Mark, 1954- Elegy.

Another example (from the trio example above):

OCLC 32983675

Author(s): Brahms, Johannes, 1833-1897. ; Beethoven, Ludwig van,; 1770-1827. ; Trios,; piano, clarinet, violoncello,; op. 11,; Bb major.; Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus,; 1756-1791. ; Trios,; piano, clarinet, viola,; K. 498,; Eb major;; arr.; Ax, Emanuel. ; (Performer - prf); Stoltzman, Richard. ; (Performer - prf); Ma, Yo-Yo,; 1955- ; (Performer - prf)

Redone:

Brahms, Johannes, 1833-1897.
 Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Trios, piano, clarinet, violoncello, op. 11, Bb major.
 Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756-1791. Trios,; piano, clarinet, viola, K. 498, Eb major; arr.

Ax, Emanuel. (Performer - prf)
 Stoltzman, Richard. (Performer - prf)
 Ma, Yo-Yo, 1955- (Performer - prf)

9/7/5 Update: Bendig/Hendricks agree that this is a good suggestion and they will look at it.

3. Display uniform titles (240) at the top of the record (with labels).

Problem: Uniform titles (especially the 240 field) are extremely helpful in identifying the contents of an item, and they are an important descriptive element. For example, OCLC #23840801 has an ambiguous title (“Three Symphonies”). Is that all of Leduc’s symphonies or just a selection of three symphonies? The uniform title “Symphonies” instantly answers the question, implying that it is all of them. The uniform title is difficult for users to find, and is not labeled so that users know that it is a uniform title. Also, the more educated users study uniform titles so they know just which terms to search (WorldCat even provides uniform title searches), but if users cannot identify the uniform titles, they cannot study or search them.

In another [not atypical] example, the “Other Titles” field is unclear:

OCLC: 18474225

Title: Three string quartets

Author(s): Haydn, Joseph, 1732-1809. ; Haydn, Joseph,; 1732-1809. ; Quartets,; strings,; H. III, 43,; D minor.; Haydn, Joseph,; 1732-1809. ; Quartets,; strings,; H. III, 83,; D minor.

Contents: String quartet in E flat op. 0 -- String quartet in D minor op. 42 -- String quartet op. 103.

Other Titles: Divertimenti, H. II, 6, Eb major

Is “divertimenti” another work that is on the disc? Where *is* the uniform title in this record? The relationship between the uniform title and the Title field is simply not clear.

Recommendation: Display uniform titles (i.e., 240 fields) immediately after author and before the 245 title field in a field labeled “Uniform Title” to help users more easily identify the two titles and understand the relation between the two types of information. (The committee recognizes the MARC record is not perfect, and that users require some education. Enhancing the record arrangement would make record displays more intuitive and facilitate user education. The committee also recognizes that uniform titles may seem redundant, but redundancy is better than chaos, and many records do not even have uniform titles, so those users would not be affected by a revised field order.)

9/7/5 Update: as OCLC personnel move forward with streamlining displays via FRBR implementation, they will see how uniform titles can be incorporated.

4. Sort order: offer drop-down menus on search and results pages.

Results are now sorted by “Number of Libraries.” This can be very useful, especially when identifying editions most likely to be available for interlibrary loan or collection development. Still, other sorts are useful and appropriate. Users frequently ask about display

order and expect something alphabetical or chronological. While they can use a post-search button, applying a sort for every search is inconvenient. In addition, sorts are not retained when a user clicks on a format limit tab (e.g., a user who sorts a set by title, then clicks on the Serials tab, would probably expect the serials to continue displaying in title order). An appropriate sort order will of course be essential should a true name/uniform-title search be implemented. (We would expect sorting by name/title heading.)

The five-hundred item limit and ban on date sorts are inconvenient, but are less important than the other sort-related comments above.

Recommendation: Put a drop-down sort menu (rather than a button) on the search results list screen and the initial search screen. The former allows for faster, more intuitive post-search sorting without going into an extra page (this is especially nice if one has to re-apply the sort with each display). The latter allows for pre-search sorting and saves a step. Also, clicking on a format limit button should retain the sort order. Finally, it would be nice if users could set a session sort order.

9/7/5 Update: Bendig/Hendricks find this to be an interesting idea and are willing to float this past the interface designer. It is probably not possible on the search screen due to system limits. Perhaps some sorting options could be applied based on a format.

5. Implement a name/uniform-title heading search with cross references.

Problem: There is no way to browse a clean, easy-to-read list of name/uniform titles (100/240 or 700|a with the matching 700|t). A name/title phrase search would sort works into meaningful groups that users can easily explore. There are also no cross-references for name/uniform titles. For example, searching for a musical score of Beethoven's Moonlight Sonata yields no cross references to its uniform title or the broader heading of "sonatas" (i.e., sets that would have the sonata):

Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Sonatas, piano

Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770-1827. Sonatas, piano, no. 14, op. 27, no. 2, C# minor

Users currently manage to find some editions or performances, but without this search they miss dozens of others. This feature is available in many local library catalogs, where users can enjoy the benefit of browsing name/title headings and cross references, and painlessly identify works that have multiple titles.

Example: it can be very difficult finding Bach's Orchestral Suite No. 3 (uniform title: suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major). A regular keyword search strategy using au: bach and (ti: suites orchestra BWV 1068) and dt= "sco" yields over 200 hits, with no arrangement to facilitate item selection (e.g., complete scores, arrangements, excerpts, etc.). Indeed, a good number of these hits are individual movements (e.g., Air or Gavotte) or arrangements for other instruments. Adding "not air" (etc.) to this search is inadvisable because then relevant hits are eliminated. A more precise name/uniform-title phrase search would make it possible to easily find and select the appropriate work. For example, a name/title heading search on Bach...Suites, orchestra might display as follows:

	No.	
<u>Line</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Name/Title</u>
1	45	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1066-1069
2	30	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1066-1069; arr. [snip]
12	58	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major
13	29	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major. Air
14	84	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major. Air; arr.
15	25	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major; arr.
16	29	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major. Gavotte; arr.
17	4	Bach, Johann Sebastian, 1685-1750. Suites, orchestra, BWV 1068, D major. Selections; arr.

Users could easily see which items have the complete work (lines 1 and 12), which are arrangements (line 2 et al.), and which are excerpts (lines 13, 14, 16, and 17). They would then easily select one or more headings and display a title list as usual. Ideally, the headings list above would allow the application of limits (so if there are only ten recordings under line one, the number of items would say “10” if limited to recordings).

Recommendation: Create a browseable index for paired author/title entries (e.g., 100/240 and 700a/700t) with “see” and “see also” references drawn from name/title authority records. Results should be displayed alphabetically by name/title authority entries with the option to click and see actual records, follow cross references, or limit by format before viewing records. Very likely this would require the creation of a new name/title index; criteria can be further discussed and refined. Any such search would need to have an effective browse mechanism that allows users to quickly and easily navigate all of a composer’s uniform titles. (For example, users will need a way to quickly jump to a specific title in an author’s name/title headings list.) For an example of a partially developed name/title search, see Endeavor’s name/title browse search in Voyager’s WebVoyage OPAC (e.g., <http://homerweb.uconn.edu/>, where the search is entitled Prolific Author/Composer). There has been some indication that OCLC is implementing such a name/title index, but the committee will want to evaluate the search’s effectiveness once it is implemented.

Further Note About Headings Searches: Such an index and search could pave the way for a true name/title keyword search. Only the matching paired name/title phrases (e.g., 100/240 or a 700a/700t, plus subfields, plus the equivalent authority fields) would be retrieved. Ideally, the headings (and any cross references), rather than records, would display first, allowing the users to make some choices and apply limits if needed. Such a keyword search would greatly enhance users’ success, since the results would include relevant cross-reference headings that have many more keywords than the bibliographic records themselves. Here is an example:

au: beethoven and ti: symphonies

Normally this search might accidentally retrieve items with Beethoven overtures and Brahms symphonies (the desired author does not match the desired title). If the two keywords were limited to bound phrases, e.g., 100 Beethoven WITH 240 Symphonies or 700|a Beethoven

WITH ITS MATCHING 700\$t (not some other 700\$t in the record), the results would be much more accurate.

Example: au: beethoven and ti: moonlight sonata

If regular keyword and headings keyword searches were combined, this search would find all bibliographic records with the words moonlight sonata(s), as well as cross reference headings that lead to any items that use just the collective title (“sonatas”) or the uniform title for this work.

Endeavor’s Voyager version 5 now supports this very search, but at this writing few (if any) institutions have implemented it.

Comment on Uniform Title (UT) Searching in WorldCat: Sometimes users encounter problems with WorldCat’s existing UT search options. The good news is that two problems seem to have improved over the last year: formerly, users could not do a phrase or proximity search across subfields (this seems to be fixed, at least for some searches) and the UT search did not seem to pick up all subfields (it seems to now). The following challenges remain: (1) the UT searches are only visible to users under the Expert window (most users are not experts and they often rely on the drop-down menus in Advanced mode for index selection); (2) the UT search does not have a way to “match” the correct uniform title to the correct author; and (3) uniform titles can be found under the “Advanced Options” in the full record display, but they do not list the complete uniform title. For example, an incomplete UT of “suites” (#8904306) or “concertos” (without the instrument or connection to the correct author) retrieves items from ALL composers of that particular genre. This leads to thousands of irrelevant hits.

In a more specific example, a user might search for Bach’s Orchestral Suite no. 3 (D major), find a likely record, click on Advanced Options, and want to click on the specific uniform title. It only shows \$t, so the specific suite or composer cannot be selected. One option would be to click on “suites” and get a list of all Bach’s suites headings, in alphabetical order, so that the appropriate Bach orchestral suite no. 3 could be selected. Perhaps OCLC and the committee could talk about enhancing the Advanced Options feature with regard to UTs, especially if a true name/title search is years away.

9/7/5 Update: Bendig/Hendricks indicate that the name/title search remains important. “We do still most definitely have ‘implement a name/uniform-title heading search with cross references’ on our list” (email correspondence from Deb Bendig to Tracey Rudnick, dated 24 January 2006). It is high in the “FirstSearch wish list” but lower in the overall wish list in which FirstSearch participates. Even then this search/display requires actual development (scoping, specifications, etc.) and probably will not happen soon; other immediate functionality ranks higher. Bendig/ Hendricks agree that this search is extremely valuable, want it, and will keep it on the list of things to do. [The phone conversation did not include discussion about Advanced Options enhancements.]

6. Allow adjacency and phrase search across subfields.

[1/23/6 note: this problem has been partially or completely fixed, however, it is left in this report since MOUG has not fully tested it, and questions remain regarding functionality.]

Adjacency operators and phrase searches do not seem to cross subfields. Example: for the book, *The Jazz Exiles: American Musicians Abroad*, neither “jazz w1 exiles w1 american” (no quotes) nor “jazz exiles american” (in quotes) works, though one can use different search boxes for different subfields (e.g., “exiles” in one box and “musicians w1 abroad” in another box). (Thus one cannot even do a title phrase search using the first three words of the title. Users would never dream that they must omit the subtitle.)

In another example, adjacency or phrase searching would not work for a uniform title containing |t|p|o etc. since these would also have to cross subfields. For example, ut:concertos w piano w orchestra w k w 491 (Mozart is the author) fails because of the above problem.

Recommendation: Find some way to allow searches to cross subfields yet retain some control over proximity (via adjacency searches, phrase with quotes, or phrase indexes). Crossing subfields in a name/title phrase search (as suggested in Recommendation #5 above) will be critical. (This would also be a helpful feature in subject headings indexes containing all of the subfields.)

9/7/5 Update: cross-subfield proximity and phrase searching now works under some circumstances. The examples given above, “jazz w1 exiles w1 american” (no quotes) or the search “jazz exiles american” (in quotes), now find the correct book. Uniform titles were harder to pin down in testing. Some proximity/phrase tests seemed to find uniform titles (UTs) only in 240s, but not 700|t’s, but this result was inconsistent when applied to different musical works. Searching UT keywords in the UT searches was slow but seemed to capture both the 240 and 700|t’s. Quite often, a plain keyword search (with no proximity/phrase) using UT keywords was sufficient; using proximity/phrase indeed narrowed the results to a very relevant set, but also seemed to omit dozens of relevant items. This is clearly an area that needs more information gathering by MOUG and discussion with OCLC. At this point, the most important questions (arguably) are “what are the proximity and phrase searches actually searching, are they still essential, and how could these searches be used to best advantage by average and expert users? Only then can MOUG determine whether this is still a worthwhile pursuit. (WorldCat’s Help should at least answer the first question for users.)

7. Summaries: add uniform titles to summary lists and individual summaries.

The uniform title (240 at least) does not display in the summary results lists or individual summaries, making it difficult to quickly assess an item or know why an item was pulled up in a search. (See further comments about uniform titles in Recommendation #3.)

Recommendation: display 240 fields (if they exist) in summary results lists and individual summaries. While this will not answer all questions (since hits are often based on 505 or 700|a|t fields), displaying the 240 fields often helps make the contents of an item clear at a glance, thereby reducing some confusion.

9/7/5 Update: unchanged. MOUG might want to consider revisiting this item, especially if Recommendation #3 (“display uniform titles at the tops of records”) were to be implemented.

8. Individual record summaries: simplify the displayed authors.

[1/23/6 note: this problem has been partially fixed, however, it is left in this report since questions remain regarding readability.]

Problem: In the newly created summary information at the top of the display, multiple authors are listed just below the title, even those which must have been derived from a 7xx field. Subfields have been stripped, resulting in confusing and meaningless displays, with the same author often displayed several times (e.g., records #36145911 and #30265499).

Example of summary (where 700|a composers repeat several times):

OCLC: 36145911

Berühmte Klaviersonaten
Famous piano sonatas /

Ludwig van Beethoven; Ernst Gröschel; Léon Spierer; Ludwig van Beethoven;
Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart; Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart; Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart;
Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart
1992

Sound Recording : Music : Multiple forms : Compact disc 1 sound disc : digital ; 4 3/4 in.
Kranzberg : Pilz,

Recommendation: Ideally, “de-dup” names that appear in summary. If possible, include the |4 subfield. Otherwise, consider displaying only the authors listed in 1xx fields and include all subfields to minimize confusion.

9/7/5 Update: this has improved. The summary has been simplified to include 245|a|b, single (not duplicate) occurrences of name in 1xx or 7xx|a (a marked improvement), and basic 007/300 information. The omission of |4 still makes names confusing (see record #24020832 for an example where conductors and composers could be clarified). MOUG might want to consider dropping this item if Recommendation #2 (“make added entries easier to read”) were to be implemented.

9. Provide MARC displays or highlight search terms.

It would be nice to have MARC record displays as an option. Users often use MARC records now in their bibliographic management software. An added benefit of seeing the MARC display is to see how records are retrieved by a search. OCLC has implemented a staff (i.e., MARC) view but this is only available to staff who know the institution’s login, not to the general public or reference personnel. If OCLC is reluctant to display MARC records in fear of unscrupulous use of the data, perhaps a compromise would be to highlight search terms in the display so users can see how records are retrieved. (AACR2r display order with tags more similar to those found in online catalogs would also make it much easier for librarians to help their users “decode” their searches; see Recommendation #1.)

9/7/5 Update: search terms are now highlighted (to very good effect). Bendig/Hendricks confirm that MARC view will probably not appear in the public interface. (This author still wonders if a secure button for use under certain conditions might allow convenient access to MARC records for appropriate subscribers, while protecting OCLC's property.)

10. Provide “all/any/phrase” drop-down menus for search boxes.

Many online catalogs and bibliographic databases now have drop-down menus next to each search box that let users indicate how or which terms should be searched: “all of these,” “any of these,” or “as a phrase.” Example: Endeavor's Voyager OPAC (Advanced or Guide search).

9/7/5 Update: this is interesting to Bendig. She has seen it and would like to explore it.

11. Stopwords

Stopword “a” cannot be overridden, so works in the keys of A major, A minor, A-flat major, A-flat minor cannot be searched. This ability has been implemented for some other stopwords by using quotation marks, e.g., “no” for Japanese drama or work numbers (e.g., “no. 34.”). There was some interest at OCLC in making this available in certain indexes (e.g., 240 and 7xx title subfields only). This may not be such an issue if an effective name/title index with cross-references from the authority file is created.

Deb Bendig and other OCLC representatives commented in a 2/9/04 phone conversation with Tracey Rudnick that they have examined this problem, especially in Oracle, but do not yet have a solution. While it is possible to allow specific indexed phrases (e.g., “a major,” “a minor,” etc.), there are too many such phrases to effectively implement this solution (e.g., “in vitro,” “vitamin A,” etc.), let alone teach users which phrases work and which do not. OCLC continues to work toward a solution.

9/7/5 Update: Bendig indicated that for a long time the answer was “we can't,” but that some developments may open up new possibilities (no promises at this time however).

12. Synonym Lists, “Concept” Searches, and Background Authority Record Searching

This item is suggested in hopes of increasing users' successful “hit” rates (considering that most users just want to type in *their* search terms and not bother with fussy search strategies). Consider investigating Grove Music Online's “concept” search, in which the system substitutes synonyms or common multilingual terms (e.g., oboe or hautbois; symphony or symphonies or symphonie) on the user's request, or PubMed, which supplies alternative spellings, words and phrases from a thesaurus and synonym list in addition to the terms input by the user. Such a search, combined with keyword searching of headings (e.g., subject headings or name/title headings, complete with cross references) could significantly increase users' success since they would be more likely to hit upon search terms that actually work. For example, a user searching for the Moonlight Sonata (Beethoven) often does not find it because s/he does not realize that the word “moonlight” does not actually appear in the bibliographic record. A keyword search that automatically searched the authority record would pull up the appropriate cross reference. (This idea needs more fleshing out and

conversation than can be expressed here, but the point is that the users often do not type the terms that will find what they need. We need to make the system compensate.)

9/7/5 Update: Bendig has the integration of thesauri into search functionality “in her list”; at this writing it is interesting but not high priority.

13. Advanced Search (RILM and WorldCat)

The word “advanced” is misleading; this search is just as easy as a single keyword box (or the new multi-box Basic Search offered after the July 2003 interface update), and presents several useful options that users seek when they first log in (e.g., limiting by format or language). Many librarians teach the Advanced search to their novice users as the “easier and more effective” search method. The search could have a more inviting name (e.g., “Guided Search”). (Readers of this report are reminded that local systems administrators can set the Advanced search as the default.)

By extension, the Basic Search screen (in WorldCat for example) could simply be combined with the Advanced screen by setting the default index searches to Keyword, Author, Title, ISBN, and Year. Users could still change the indexes if needed, and would have the Limit options from the start.

Final Note: WorldCat and OCLC offer many exciting opportunities, as evidenced by Deb Bendig’s motivating words at the 2004 and 2005 MOUG meetings. No matter what the project—old or new—MOUG looks forward to continued conversation and collaboration with OCLC.