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Why is searching for music so challenging?
Challenges in musical description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Work” vs. manifestations</th>
<th>Musical naming conventions</th>
<th>Musical compilations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple resource types</td>
<td>Generic titles</td>
<td>Anthologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various editions, formats, arrangements, transcriptions, etc.</td>
<td>Nickname titles</td>
<td>Compilation recordings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign language titles &amp; translations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A new era in resource discovery?
Research Questions

1. What challenges have music librarians witnessed their patrons experiencing when using web-scale discovery tools to search for musical resources?
2. What characteristics of web-scale discovery tools may serve as barriers to music information seeking?
3. What customizations have music librarians made to their institutions’ web-scale discovery tool or ILS to support music information seeking?
4. What additional work is needed to optimize web-scale discovery tools to support music information seeking within academic music libraries?
Methods

- 6 semi-structured interviews
  - April – June, 2022
- Snowball sampling
- Informal quota sampling
  - Primo, Ebsco Discovery Service, Blacklight, Sierra
1. What challenges have music librarians witnessed their patrons experiencing when using web-scale discovery tools to search for musical resources?
Patron’s struggles

• Novice users expecting “Google-like” experience
  – Difficulty reading bib records
• Difficulty distinguishing resource types
• Information overload
• Spelling
  – Foreign-language titles
  – Composers’ names
• Query formation
2. What characteristics of web-scale discovery tools may serve as barriers to music information seeking?
Discovery tools – barriers to music searching

• Challenges in combining records from disparate sources
  – Messy metadata
  – Muddled relevancy rankings
• Underutilization of authority records
• Improper indexing and display of fields
3. What customizations have music librarians made to their institutions’ web-scale discovery tool or ILS to support music information seeking?
Bento Box Display

- Articles are separated from ILS content (scores, recordings, books, streaming audio, local repositories)
- Allows for greater customization within ILS
Music-specific facets
Medium of Performance

- Two institutions had a dedicated “Instrument” facet
- Pulled from MARC 382, 048, or subject headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard--Piano</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings, bowed--Violin</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings, bowed--Violoncello</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger ensemble--Full orchestra</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings, bowed--Viola</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwinds--Clarinet</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more »</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Genre facet

- Pulled from MARC 655 (LCGFT) and 650
- Definition of “genre” differs between developers and musicians
Score format facet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature score</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accompaniment reduced for keyboard</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple score formats</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condensed score</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performer-conductor part</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Created using combination of:
  - Record type
  - Cataloging rules (040 $e)
  - FMus fixed field
Relationship Designators

Composer
- Brahms, Johannes (1,425)
- Brahms, Johannes, 1833-1897 (1,043)
- Beethoven, Ludwig van (505)

Performer
- London Symphony Orchestra (89)
- Berliner Philharmoniker (86)
- Wiener Philharmoniker (81)

Director
- Simonnet, Olivier (14)
- Petri, Hans (5)
- Coles, Bob (4)
Barber, Samuel, 1910-1981

Samuel Osmond Barber II (March 9, 1910 – January 23, 1981) was an American composer, pianist, conductor, baritone, and music educator, and one of the most celebrated composers of the 20th century. The music critic Donald Henahan stated, “Probably no other American composer has ever enjoyed such early, such persistent and such long-lasting acclaim.” Principally influenced by nine years of composition studies with Rosario Scalero at the Curtis Institute and more than twenty-five years of study with his uncle, the composer Sidney Homer, Barber’s music usually showed the experimental trends of musical modernism in favor of utilizing traditional 19th-century harmonic language and formal structure that embraced lyricism and emotional expression. However, elements of modernism were adopted by him. He was named one of the “Twelve” modernist composers. His compositions include the Adagio for Strings, the Violin Concerto, the Piano Concerto, the Opera Lulu, and the Symphony No. 1.

Occupation: Composer
Place of Birth: West Chester, PA
Place of Death: New York (NY)
Citizenship: United States of America
Educated at: West Chester Henderson High School, Curtis Institute of Music

Reference Information

Heading Types: Personal Name

Alternate Forms:
- Barber, S. O. (Samuel Osborne), 1910-1981
- Barber, Sam, 1910-1981
- Barber, Samuel Osborne, II, 1910-1981
- Barbür, Samuel, 1910-1981
Supplementing record contents notes

- Enhancing album records with data from Discogs database
Experience customizing

• Advocating for music’s specific needs
• Cross-sectional collaboration
  – System developers
  – Reference services
• Need for education on system settings
4. What additional work is needed to optimize web-scale discovery tools to support music information seeking within academic music libraries?
Work still to be done

• Adding LCGFT and LCMPT to legacy records
• Discovery tool indexing
  – Appropriate indexing and display of MARC fields
  – Authority files
  – LCGFT / LCMPT beyond keyword indexing
Implications

Record enhancement

Education on system configuration

Library instruction

Continued progress sharing
• “We won’t see real, permanent change until a critical mass of all music libraries start to move into this new era and bring up new technologies. We can learn from each other, but it’s going to be incremental for a long time until we can all move on as a large community.”
Thank you!