This study examined library websites for the types of materials provided for end-users for the discovery of streaming media. Focusing on vended and government-provided streaming media, the study sought to establish how libraries are currently handling streaming media materials which were not generated in house. A sample of ARL Member Institutions was taken for analysis, followed by a qualitative content analysis of web sites which focused on several key areas; library home pages, FAQ information, Subject and Class guides, and cataloging.

The study found that discovery tools for streaming video are still at a basic level. Libraries were giving basic information on the contents of streaming media resources, but had inconsistent amounts of information on video format, technical requirements, and low amounts of information on copyright for media materials. A greater need for individual cataloging is recommended for vended resources to promote surreptitious discovery.
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Introduction

Motion picture collections have been integrated into academic libraries from as early as 1924 on a limited scale (Brancolini, 2002, p. 49). With the rise of video formats in the late 1970s, collections began to expand across academic institutions (Brancolini, 2002, p. 48). Other research has identified the need for audiovisual materials in the classroom to support undergraduate and graduate curricula; soon, video collections became more commonplace, and, with the rise of younger faculty, an expected component to education (Brancolini, 2002, pp. 48-49).

Film and video collections — also defined as “media collections” — have raised more problematic issues than other library materials: they require a delivery mechanism that can vary from a film projector to a computer with proper software and an Internet connection to allow a user to stream or download a digital video. Broadly, these concerns can be divided into two major areas: access (e.g., issues of copyright and protection of materials) and delivery (e.g., the best format, the equipment required, and the cost related to information delivery). Not only must librarians and users comply with “fair use” of materials, but they must keep in mind stipulations made by Digital Copyright Materials Act (DCMA) and the TEACH Act, which impose specific limits based on type of film material and the setting in which it is being taught (ALA DCMA, 2010; ALA TEACH, 2010; Hirtle, P., Hudson, E. & Kenyon, A., 2009). With the rise of streaming video materials, an additional layer of complexity has challenged the ways that librarians and vendors think about their work.
Although physical materials are still common in most media collections, with VHS and DVD formats accounting for the majority of holdings, interest in streaming materials is on the rise; many librarians already purchase small amounts of streaming materials for their collections (Bergman, 2010). Streaming video can be described as mounting video clips for network delivery, or more specifically, a “technique for transferring data such that it can be processed as a steady and continuous stream” (Mack, 1999). Streaming video has been created by individual libraries and is also available for purchase from vendors. With formats shifting, many media librarians are waiting to see what the dominant model of sales is going to be for streaming materials (Berman, 2010; Handman, 2010). Also crucial to this discussion is how users are going to be able to discover streaming video materials, which are not necessarily well-integrated into library catalog systems. While the educational worth of streaming media has been generally acknowledged, issues of access and platform remain a barrier to patron use (Shephard, 2003; Bracher, Collier, Ottewill, & Shephard, 2005). There has been little literature in the area of how streaming media is presented, although literature on video retrieval and a few methods of cataloging integration exists. Overall, there is a gap in knowledge for how users may be discovering streaming materials and how these methods align with general trends in searching, particularly in most library OPACs.

This paper explores how academic libraries are integrating and promoting streaming video materials; academic library websites were sampled and examined for evidence about how streaming video is presented to users. Attention was paid to library catalog surrogates for media files and collections, research guides, promotion of collections, and other general methods of highlighting elements of collections. This paper establishes an overview of the current state of this area of professional practice and points to further avenues of research for this topic.
Literature Review

Current State of Media Collections and Access

Media and film collections have been a part of academic institutions as far back as the 1920s and, after films studies became legitimized as a discipline in the 1960s, began to grow in importance, with ACRL guidelines set in 1968 (Carr, 2002; Bergman, 2010). The 1970s saw film take on a greater importance and use in disciplines beyond film studies, and in the 1980s, the introduction of the videocassette format prompted a huge increase in collection of film materials (Carr, 2002). The predominant model for access at this time was restrictive, with materials operating on a closed stack reserve system, mainly due to the expensive and unwieldy nature of original film prints (Bergman, 2010). This practice has continued despite formats becoming less volatile and more commercially available, although some media collections have experimented with open stacks for better browsing (Bergman, 2010). As Bergman notes in her findings from her 2004 and 2009 studies, nearly 50-percent of collections had either completely open or a mix of open and closed stacks (2010).

Circulation of film materials has not received a large amount of detailed study. Barbara Bergman’s work closely follows a previous study by Brancolini and Provine back in 1993 which found that most faculty borrow materials for use outside the library — for the most extent for direct classroom use — and that a smaller percentage of students check out materials for outside library use; it was unclear if the collection was being used more by faculty or students (Brancolini & Provine, 1993). This focus on faculty use was reflected in Bergman’s findings, which showed that all surveyed academic media collections allowed faculty to borrow, while 80-percent supported undergraduate borrowing (2010). Bergman concludes her study by discussing how open stacks have increased circulation across the board, and that media collections should be more open to interlibrary loan, which she found
less than half the libraries did in her study (2010). It is crucial to note that many film collections are still comfortable with maintaining film collections that are restrictive in use, which streaming media does not follow in its distribution to users. Bergman does emphasize the importance of seeking new formats and materials for students, which are dynamically different compared to current practice (2010). The literature has not yet reflected how these new formats are being promoted or distributed amongst users.

**Streaming Video in Educational Context**

The aforementioned Bergman study considers the types of formats and issues surrounding them (2010). As of this study, DVD has become the format of choice, although many collections have extensive VHS holdings (2010). Streaming video was also mentioned as the next significant delivery mechanism that media collection librarians are investigating and beginning to invest in (Bergman, 2010). Bergman found that of the libraries that responded to her survey, 25-percent were actively collecting streaming video for their collections, and most who were not said that they would most likely be collecting streaming video in the future (2010). Streaming video is already a part of many academic collections, and is coming to be viewed, especially by students, as a material that the library will collect (Kaufman & Mohan, 2009).

Two British studies investigated how streaming video is being integrated into classrooms and identified advantages and disadvantages with the format. Kerry Shephard reviewed several case studies of streaming video use with the specific aim of investigating its exact use and functionality (2003). Three main factors were identified as the three major advantages of video education: “narrative visualization,” “dynamic modeling” and “simulation” of key concepts or actions (Shephard, 2003, p. 295). These factors were essential to the study of streaming video use at the University of Southampton’s back care
course for health professionals (Bracher et al., 2005). The study examined the relatively new streaming video materials, which had been adopted to provide better student access to video material and for the potential integration of the video into other online tools (e.g., online quizzes, online communication systems) (Bracher et al., 2005).

The Southampton study was conducted in three parts; the first analyzed how the video assisted student learning in a non-streaming state, and the second and third parts looked at the video content being used in the streaming format in two different contexts: a post-graduate foundation course and a first-year class. (Bracher et al., 2005). It is important to note that there was a serious methodological error made with the data collected; the researchers failed to gain permission to evaluate the group in the first part of the study (who used the non-streaming video format), and the third group of first-year students had a low response rate with which disappointed the researchers (Bracher et al., 2005). While they did not cut the first-year group, the study had to focus on recollections of student feedback from educators instead of direct data (Bracher et al., 2005). The overall result found that students were satisfied with the video content but struggled with the technical aspects of accessing it; many students were confused as to where and how they could stream videos (Bracher et al., 2005). The study also found that the students who spent the most time with the streaming video were the most positive about its functionality (Bracher et al., 2005). Overall, the study identified access and proper engagement as the major barriers to the streaming video service (Bracher et al., 2005). Students primarily struggled with understanding how to find and use the service, with many students complaining about their teachers doing a poor job of explaining or reminding them of the material (Bracher et al., 2005).

Shephard found a similar range of issues surrounding streaming materials but also identified other advantages of the format. Streaming video’s short clip pacing was identified
to be more effective at capturing students' attention and to have an easy-to-navigate
interface for students (Shephard, 2003). Shephard also identifies studies which had more of
a mixed interpretation of some of the pedagogical aspects of streaming video (2003).
Specifically, one study in 2002 compared the relative benefits of learning a procedure by
handouts or by streaming video and found that streaming video was not a satisfactory
substitute for teaching material in isolation (Shephard, 2003). Overall, Shephard
summarizes the major issues for streaming video: a need for extensive IT support, copyright
concerns, and the creation of video player platforms (2003). Both studies highlight the need
for complex finding aids and user education to facilitate the successful use of streaming
video materials.

Video Research Needs and Search Methods

The search needs for users seeking video materials have a variance and complexity
that set them apart from general print reference. Searches split into two areas: textual
searches and visual searches (searching frames of a video for content like color, texture, and
shapes). Textual searches generally revolve around keyword searching, which centers on
major data about the sought item (e.g., the title, creators or director, actors, or time period)
while visual searches can range from general to specific queries (Mehr & Archer, 1994;
Albertson, 2009). General, or interpretive, queries focus on themes, subjects or abstract
ideas while specific queries focus on events, specific images or scenes, named objects or
attributes like people (Albertson, 2009). There are two main issues that searchers of video
materials deal with early in the search process. The first is the lack or inconsistency of
cataloging, which is crucial for video items (Brancolini, 1999). Creating effective metadata
for video is difficult as most items have more complex layers of information that go beyond
title and authorship, such as specific visual information contained within works (Brancolini,
The other issue is that audiovisual collections regularly can be considered “hidden collections” (Yakel, 2005). This label is reserved mostly for archival collections but can apply to regular collections as well and consists of materials that are not cataloged individually or are known under a collective name (Yakel, 2005). Streaming video collections could fall into this category if discrete videos are not cataloged and are instead lumped into a single collection. This could be a major complication on top of the complex nature of video searching.

Search habits of both media professionals and novices reveal key differences centered on duration and tenacity of searches. One research study focused on an audiovisual archive that provided online access to materials used primarily by media professionals (Huurnink, Hollink, Heuvel, & Rijke, 2010). This study used transaction logs to address a set of research questions: what a typical query session looks like (e.g., amount of time, number of queries), how users are issuing queries (e.g., search options, common query types), what type of content is requested, and what materials are actually ordered by the professionals (Huurick et. al., 2010). The information regarding typical habits proved to be informative; typical query length averaged at 18 minutes but with a standard deviation of 4 hours (Huurick et. al., 2010). Most searches used the keyword search option and typically were for a single query, not multiple queries (Huurick et. al, 2010). During the searches, nearly a third of the users modified their original query to seek more results, and many searches consisted of all or parts of an exact title for a program; this kind of searching is referred to here as known-item searches (Huurick et. al., 2010). Also, when faceted searching was utilized in the archive, most users centered on people- or subject-related data (Huurick et. al., 2010).

A study conducted on the multimedia search habits of users using the Dogpile search engine examined a very similar set of questions; how users are searching, the length of time, the reasons why, the number of pages viewed and the size of their queries (Tjondronegoro,
Spink, & Jansen, 2009). Transaction logs were again used to gather information and the researchers examined over a million queries that were gathered from a 24-hour period of data, extrapolating it to a year time period by changing specific time contextual searches on particular celebrities, coded into terms like “general interest in actor” (Tjondronegoro et. al., 2009). This research also highlighted a problem that is discussed in much of the multimedia search literature — the semantic gap. In this case, the semantic gap refers to the gap between specific desired video features (e.g., color, texture, audio) and concepts that can be described clearly in a catalog (e.g., length, language, subject) (Tjondronegoro et. al., 2009; Huang, Fu, & Chen, 2010, p. 892).

The findings echo some of the results found concerning media professionals in audiovisual archives, but emphasize that Dogpile users were not as tenacious and did not search as long as media professionals. The majority of searches conducted lasted 5 minutes or less, and searches consisted of 1 to 3 queries in a single session (Tjondronegoro et. al., 2009). Only the first five results were followed up with and most searches were for specific people (Tjondronegoro et. al., 2009). The recommendations out of this focused on the need for better interface systems for users and also the need for better methods for refining results (Tjondronegoro et. al., 2009). Both of these examples focused on a non-library catalog type of search interface, so much of the functionality may not be directly applicable to the sites that this study is examining. However, it is noteworthy that only expert searchers seem to use subject keyword and exact title searches for materials; most general users need a browsing-style interface for better discovery.

**Video Retrieval**

Video retrieval is difficult as the format dictates more complexity upon the systems, with unique needs and classifications (Albertson, 2010). Video retrieval systems must be able to address issues of granularity for items (length), as well as specific image information
(key frames) and relevance rankings for search results (Albertson, 2010). Albertson’s study of a video retrieval system reveals much of this complexity, and points to effects of user knowledge and task variance as being major factors. The study focused on two video searching techniques browsing and searching with an experimental system created that assigned a task protocol that had user create queries that either utilized textual or visual search techniques as well as hybrid questions which combined the two (Albertson, 2010). The overall findings were that users are generally more comfortable with keyword searching, but Albertson noted this could be due to their familiarity with textual searching (2010). It was also noted that no one technique had a particular advantage for retrieval of materials; this is crucial as it points to the strengths of visual searching which is more rare in library catalogs (Albertson, 2010).

**Current State of OPACs and Video Citation**

OPACs and Integrated Library Systems (ILS) are the methods through which libraries present their physical and digital collections, and are the key focus of this study. There has been much literature since 2005 addressing the need for change in library OPACs and ILS to improve user functionality (Naun, 2010). A review of case studies conducted in 2008 by Jian Wang and Adriene Lim addresses some of the current deficiencies and the current trends for new functionality. As they define it, at its most basic, the OPAC should help facilitate the finding, gathering, and selection of all materials that a library holds (Wang & Lim, 2009). The literature reviewed in this study pointed to several general problems with current search capabilities, which centered around the lack of Web 2.0-style interaction with the library catalog; especially in the ability to tag, have RSS feeds for materials, and create Wikis, which users are accustomed to in their general web searching (Wang & Lim, 2009). The other main issue is that library ILS is still primarily designed to manage print resources and handle digital materials poorly (Wang & Lim, 2009). At the time of this literature
review, another main issue which has been addressed in many ILS is low search functionality problems, such as poor relevance algorithms, lack of spell check and a lack of browsing functionality (Wang & Lim, 2009).

The investigation of case studies revealed that many systems are exploring and addressing some of these deficiencies, in particular the browsing and outside search engine capabilities (Wang & Lim, 2009). The main idea behind next-generation catalogs is for the current ILS services to be kept in place, paired with a social network interface that generates more personalized settings and better search and draws upon broader sets of data to create more intensive indexes to search along (Wang & Lim, 2009). The article also mentions a few examples of new catalogs that have greater functionality using the existing ILS systems. WorldCat Local, which OCLC has been developing for a while, draws upon non-MARC record data to increase the ability to search of records (drawing upon information from the institutions that feed into WorldCat); it also allows users to change the display language and enter non-Roman scripts into searches, allowing for much more specialized searches (Wang & Lim, 2009; Naun, 2010). Endeca is another catalog that encourages keyword-faceted searches, that helps to match keyword terms to controlled vocabulary in the catalog records, helping users recognize both (Naun, 2010). Endeca also allows a visual browsing function that shows items on a virtual shelf, so students can experience the more spontaneous discovery of materials that could previously only be attained in person (Naun, 2010; Wang & Lim, 2009).

Chew Naun’s examination of library catalogs focuses on the cataloging perspective; specifically, on the need for changes in search engines and records. His literature review notes that users need three basic levels of knowledge to successfully navigate online catalogs: conceptual knowledge (transforming an information need into a query), semantic knowledge (the "how and when" we use a catalog effectively, and technical skills (the ability
to express search queries in the correct syntax) (Naun, 2010, pp. 330-331). Two of the most successful recent improvements to searching catalogs, keyword filtering and spelling correction, both draw from cataloging data (Naun, 2010).

Naun asserts that the current field of thought revolving around library catalogs has two main arguments: (1) cataloging standards are broken and (2) the search systems are broken (2010). Naun does not take a side on this but seems to favor making changes to the search systems rather than widespread alterations to how cataloging records are created, although he remains skeptical of authority files (2010). The current issue with authority files is that they tend to interact poorly with more keyword-driven search techniques and can annoy users who do not understand their general format (e.g., making sure any author name inputted is last name first, first name second) (Naun, 2010). One of the other major issues that Naun brings up is that current catalog records do a poor job of indicating bibliographic relationships, which will become more important if libraries are collecting both digital and hardcopy materials and can also refer to discrete editions of the same work (Naun, 2010). Like the previous study, the need for browsing capabilities and faceted searching is recommended after the review of the literature was complete (Naun, 2010).

So what does this mean for streaming video? While there was some mention of the difficulty in tying electronic catalog records to the hard copies of records, these studies have not addressed the unique challenges presented for discovery. Better tagging and other Web 2.0 features will undoubtedly help in discovery streaming video materials, but the issue of the semantic gap was not adequately addressed in these papers.

**Streaming Models & Library Strategies**

The question of how library collections are integrating streaming records in library catalogs was covered in a presentation by Ralph Alberico in 2008. Alberico outlined the process of acquiring PBS's streaming video library for VIVA (Virtual Library of Virginia),
which is the electronic material collection for Virginian academic schools (2008). Their last main step in acquisition was to decide if they wanted to integrate the video records into the existing library catalog or to create a separate repository (Alberico, 2008). VIVA decided to integrate the records, to modify existing OCLC MARC records and to import them into their catalog (Alberico, 2008). These records were also embedded as metadata for when the videos were played and would link to the companion PBS website materials, if applicable (Alberico, 2008). Bandwidth was also a major issue that needed to be addressed, especially for the traffic between servers and the various institutions (Alberico, 2008). Overall, this model of creation of a streaming service has been fairly successful for the collection, although details on use were sparse.

Integration of video records into a pre-existing library catalog is further addressed in the experience of the Tennessee Board of Regents’ purchase of Film Media Group (FMG) on-demand streaming videos for a part of a consortium of four Tennessee universities (McDonald & Johnston, 2008). Before cataloging began, the schools had to solve their access issue; not all of the schools in the consortium were able to use materials purchased by TBR, so secure access had to be provided (McDonald & Johnston, 2008). Unlike Shibboleth access, the solution for TBR was IP authentication, which used IP addresses to identify which institutions patrons were trying to access the video from (McDonald & Johnston, 2008). Once cataloging began, a few key choices were made; explicit notes about TBR schools-only access were inputted into the MARC record, and separate records were created for each video, even if the video existed as a hard copy in the library system (McDonald & Johnston, 2008). The libraries also tried to create original catalog entries for as much data as possible to aid in discovery, going as far as cataloging each URL for reaching the video if links became broken (McDonald & Johnston, 2008).

Another model of incorporating streaming materials into library collections is
illustrated in Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC), which started a streaming initiative to preserve and give wider access to their existing video collection (Eng & Hernandez, 2006). As opposed to the VIVA initiative, BMCC was interested in not only providing streaming material for their community, but also in digitization and upkeep of their digitized material (Eng & Hernandez, 2006). BMCC made sure to involve their technical services early on, and the initiative addressed many similar issues of bandwidth, picking a video player and format, and addressing copyright issues (Eng & Hernandez, 2006). Their solutions differed a bit from VIVA; the library decided to go with Windows Media Player, primarily since their server only coded to that format, and they decided to separate the content from the general library catalog (Eng & Hernandez, 2006). Much like the VIVA experience, there was little information on how much use the collection was getting, or how patrons were discovering content. Further investigation of the differences or relative advantages or disadvantages between an integrated or separately cataloged collection is needed. This is a crucial gap that is exposed between these two examples, as there is a lack of knowledge of how these materials are being discovered.

Gary Handman’s recent paper on licensing for streaming media provides an overview of the various models of institutional collecting and how vendors are currently packaging material. Handman notes upfront that licensing for video on demand content (VOD) is a totally new method of sales; as Shephard noted, rights holders retain far greater power over the material, particularly if they are hosting the content (2010; Shephard, 2003). Film collections currently collect in three major ways: “just in case” collections (which are created to support a broad spectrum of educational needs over a long time period; high maintenance and requires expertise behind it), “just in time” collections (materials acquired to fulfill specific situational or temporal needs; needs could be met outside of the institution), and general circulating collections (material selected for broad
educational and entertainment needs; generally associated with public library film collections) (Handman, 2010, pp. 325-6). Most academic institutions are trying to collect at the "just in case" level, which would be confounded by most streaming media sales as they may not be in perpetuity like current purchases of hardcopies (Handman, 2010). As Handman points out, in film, regular cycles of licensing are a way of life in with the relationship between distributors and creators (2010). For libraries, this would mean regular weeding and cancelation of materials, and few licensing deals would allow institutions to hold hard copies of material, unlike many of the deals that have been struck in the eBook field (Handman, 2010). Handman discusses these models of sale in detail, which fall into 6 general areas, and generally revolve around the vendor's preference in licensing or providing streaming video rights (and file copies) in perpetuity (2010). The main implication for the discovery of streaming video content is that the model it is sold within could affect how the content is shown to the user. The model chosen may dictate that the platform for materials could be through the distributors sever, or, if the videos are individually owned, the library could take the initiative to catalog each video available. While this will not be a primary focus for this study, it is a variable that might yield patterns in the research results.

In conclusion, the literature review has examined not only the history of film collections which are seeing a shift toward streaming video delivery, but the habits and searching needs of video users. While there are trends that are helping to facilitate better searching, the literature has yet to address the specific challenges presented by streaming video material discovery. This study intends to help fill this gap by observing the types of discovery tools and methods that library catalogs and websites are providing to their user populations.
Method

The method that was utilized for this research consisted of collecting publically-available information from library websites which dealt with the discovery of streaming media through the library. For the study, I centered on a few key concepts to observe: explanation of streaming video services, pathfinders/research guides, catalog records, and separate vendor run or created materials. Commercially-licensed streaming video was the focus of the study, as the intersection of how it is packaged and sold would be a better representation of how these materials were being integrated into libraries. After an initial examination of library web pages, I also elected to observe streaming media materials that came from government institutions, primarily as they provided more examples of cataloging styles, and the sample size grew.

The approach was generally qualitative; while there was existing literature concerning searching for multimedia materials, there was not a direct study of discovery types for streaming video from a library website. A qualitative approach was chosen since the study was less concerned with the frequency of the occurrence of discovery tools (although this was noted) but rather sought to describe them. In this study, the online materials were treated as the documents data was drawn from. There were several key advantages to using this method; the primary benefit is that the materials examined were in their “natural” context. The creators of these websites were not aware of this study, and were not able to alter or influence the interpretation of the documents that would have been possible in eliciting direct responses from involved librarians (Wildemuth, 2009; Creswell, 2009 pp. 179-180). Also, by examining websites, the documents represented the library’s content in an “official” context, implying the best organization of these materials and documenting their approach to the topic (Wildemuth, 2009 p. 159). The main
disadvantage of this examination was that a limited amount of content was not available for analysis without holding accounts with all the institutions examined. This gap could have left the data collected incomplete if there were further discovery tools available beyond these access points (Creswell, 2009). These occurrences were limited and the schools with tight restrictions to catalog access were eliminated completely from the study.

An exact observational protocol was created to ensure that the examination of each website was systematic and thorough. The unit of analysis was highly variable in this study, with the overall term being “discovery tool,” which encompasses information that leads directly to video or provides links to a platform that provides video, the platform which the video is delivered (i.e., whether it is vendor or library created), and any guides or pathfinders that will assist users in discovering or navigating streaming videos. Since these discovery tools took many forms, materials that expressed the idea of discovery of streaming video materials, which encompass very different types of information, were considered a unit (Wildemuth, 2009; Minichiello, et al., 1990).

The order of analysis began with the homepage of the institution’s library collection and targeted specific areas to search. Areas such as library FAQs or subject or material guides were targeted from this main page. Media collections or centers were targeted next to seek general streaming video collection information (Pathfinders, descriptions of collections) and information on how to access or use streaming video. Subject guides on the library were also sought within the key areas that film materials are generally mentioned in the literature — comparative literature, instructional videos in the sciences and health care, theatre, communication studies, and journalism — and were expanded as new patterns emerged. Also, a handful of streaming video collections were selected as core collections to search under based on the frequency of occurrence in library collections determined in
initial investigations; these collections are Ethnographic Video Online, PBS Videos, and FMG Master Academic Collection. Discrete videos from these collections were selected as well to note how materials occurred in the catalog. Also, examination of any linked vendor-created online materials will be examined, if accessible.

The sampling method was purposive, and consisted of a sample from the library websites the 126 Associate of Research Library (ARL) members as of late 2010 (ARL, 2010). ARL members were selected for study, as the organization grants membership to institutions that strive for excellence in fostering scholarly output and high-quality policies and service (ARL, 2009). This should reflect the level of service that academic services strive to meet across the country, and provides a representative population to choose from (Wildemuth, 2009). The goal of this study is to attain a representative group of libraries, not necessarily to study a specific case or phenomenon, making the ARL list a convenient sampling limitation on the entirety of academic libraries in the United States (Wildemuth, 2009). From this list, I conducted an initial examination of every single member website, simply noting if vendored or government-provided streaming video materials were available in the library. From this initial study, I determined that 111 ARL member institutions were eligible for study. At this point, each library was assigned a number from 1 to 111, sorted in alphabetical order. Using a random number generator from random.org, a random integer set was created from the number range given. It was decided that 56 schools were to be examined from this set. However, once data collection started, it was found that one school did not have streaming video materials available from the students, but had collected DVD and VHS from collections that were also available via streaming. It was decided to eliminate this library as it did not contain the types of data sought, although it created some error in my sample. It was determined since it was only one library, that the sample remained sufficiently large and that its removal did not affect the overall
randomness and diversity of the group in the sample. The final sample included 55 ARL member libraries.

Collection of data followed a basic qualitative content analysis methodology, using an inductive method to determine the patterns and, in turn, create the codes for my data. Unlike quantitative methodology, this method dictated that analysis was concurrent with data collection and evolved over the course of data collection, which is consistent with the qualitative method (Gibbs, 2002). For this study, open coding was the most logical method since there were no existing codes for this topic. Determination of the appropriate codes was an iterative process; detailed notes were taken of discovery tools being observed, and codes were developed as patterns were observed. Before I began data collection, I outlined my basic methodology (for further reference, see appendix 2), which consisted of searches beginning with the home page, moving into research guides and finding aids, and finished with examining catalog records. The titles of individual streaming videos were also selected based on that initial survey of all ARL websites; several core publishers were selected for simplicity’s sake for searching, and a list of sample videos was created for searches. Finally, right before data collection began, a basic set of codes was created based on what had been observed in the initial survey, and worked as a guide for specific patterns and phenomena to search for. Also compiled was a list of terms for streaming video formats as data collection went along, to assist in keyword and overall site searches.

Data collection fell into two distinct parts; the first consisted of taking notes of the discovery tools for each individual web page. Partway through the note-taking phase, the second phase began, which consisted of the creation of a spreadsheet with a revised set of codes. These new codes were then used to revise the data collected for previous institutions and also guided the remainder of the data collected. I assigned the initial codes based on the
categories that were set based on the order, grouped roughly by the location of the
discovery tools. Once the notes were completed for all of the institutions’ websites, the
actual coding of the data began. A spreadsheet that contained all of the codes created was
once again compared to notes and return visits to the website to confirm observations and
to catch discovery tools that were overlooked. This process yielded a few additional codes
which were applied to the data set, and initial analysis of observations were formed based
on the overall trends observed. Once coding was complete, a few simple statistics were used
to show the rate of certain phenomena. The NVivo software was briefly considered for its
ability to map concepts, but due to the low amount of statistical reporting required,
Microsoft Excel was utilized in inputting codes and calculating simple statistics. (Gibbs,
2002 p.12).

As defined in qualitative research, steps were taken to ensure that the methodology
was trustworthy along the dimensions of credibility, transferability and dependability
(Wildemuth, 2009). For credibility, observations were regularly checked against the data to
determine that codes were matching the concepts. I also took additional notes in my data
collection sheet and in separate files when appropriate to document other concepts that the
codes could not cover or did not occur often enough to create a code. For transferability,
records of the data collection and the codes created have been preserved for further
analysis upon request. These documents should ensure dependability so that other
researchers may understand the steps taken. Any of these materials will be available to any
parties interested in investigating my research.

Ethical concerns were not pressing for this project, since analysis was of freely
available and public websites which have been deemed suitable for public viewing by the
institutions that have posted them for use. For the purposes of this study, the interest is in
determining the various types of discovery tools available to the user, not singling out individual institutions for their practices. The names of institutions have been omitted in my observations when specific discovery tools were mentioned.

**Observations**

Initial observations made for preparation of the sample revealed the main areas where streaming media discovery tools were going to occur. These were centered on the library’s home page, FAQ or how-to areas, research/subject/class guides which mentioned resources, resource descriptions (found on lists of databases mostly), and finally within catalog records. This section of the paper will be grouped around these areas of discovery tool locations.

**Home Page**

The library homepage is the user’s general entry point in research and locating of research materials. My sample of libraries revealed that discovery tools are spotty and inconsistent in their usefulness. The most prevalent discovery tool from this area centered on the catalog search area; nearly all library pages have a basic search link from their home pages and a few highlighted video or media searches from these areas. Of the sampled libraries, 33% mention terms like “video,” “movies” or “media” in this catalog bar or above in tabs that would change the type of format the basic search was examining. The results varied greatly in actual finding of streaming videos from these parts of the catalog. Approximately 33% found streaming video from this specialized or highlighted search, 28% yielded no streaming videos, and 33% only returned government-deposited video. While a helpful label for users to see that specialized video searching was possible, it is disconcerting to see that the actual results were so uneven.
Another discovery tool that was found on a few library home pages were obvious links directly to streaming media resources, in this study, 11% of the sample contained these links. There was variation in what the links provided; 2 sites listed streaming resources under best resources lists, one site included outside streaming media for their best-of list. Another site had a link to a subject guide for “Fun Stuff in the Library,” which linked to outside streaming media resources for students, but no collection available in the catalog. One site had a link to “eMedia,” which took the user to an alphabetical list of all of the streaming resources available through the school. While interesting to have a convenient comprehensive list linked, it would be impractical for browsing. Overall, the best-of lists were one of the more direct discovery tools available to users out of this area.

Another indirect discovery tool from the home page was links to libraries that centered on film and media resources; 7% of the sample had these links. Three of the libraries had clear links to the streaming video resources available in the collection. Of these three, two had extra materials available for streaming video, including guides on how to search, descriptions of streaming media resources, and links to outside streaming media. The final site proved to be less useful, with a guide to the library and a specialized search for media that yielded no streaming video results. It is important to note that the study may have not been comprehensive in locating all of the branch libraries that held information on streaming media. Often determining this involved searching the branch homepages, which did not give information directly of its contents.

The final discovery tool found on multiple library pages were news stories which highlighted streaming video resources that had been added to the collection; 14% of the sample had this tool. These news items ran at the time when the streaming resource was added, meaning that some were years old and no longer located on the current news
listings. All of these pages provided a description of the content and subject area, and in some cases, a description of special features that the resource contained (the creation of annotated playlists for Ethnographic Video Online). In one case the link, was for a resource that was under trial, which was useful to highlight the collection and drive up usage. While the level of description was minimal, these news stories were effective in highlighting these parts of their collection.

It is also worth noting that many of the libraries that were sampled contained prominent information about in-house-created streaming video and services for created streaming video. While this was outside of the purview of this study, this is an important phenomenon to note. However, in a few cases, the term “Digital Collections” could be an obvious term for looking for streaming media contained within the library while it was in fact directing students to a special collection of media. This is not a negative, but it could prove confusing to some patrons.

FAQs

Frequently asked questions, or FAQs, were another area where discovery tools were expected to occur. For the sampled libraries, only 33% had content that was either related to video content or indirectly (such as issues of access and copyright). Most of these sections came under titles such as “FAQ” and “How do I find?”, or simply “find” and provided either brief guides that answered questions about searching, or direct questions about resources. Half of these FAQ entries addressed locating video or streaming video either directly or indirectly and only a quarter actually addressed streaming media. These FAQs focused on how students could create searches in the catalog and highlighted the need to use limiters to find the correct materials in the catalog (almost all of these asked students to limit results to DVD/Video/VHS, or a combination of these terms based on the catalog).
These guides also gave direct links to the streaming resources that were available with a brief description of its contents. A few of the FAQs had features that were not centered on helping users build searches or gave descriptions. One FAQ linked users to a video that explained how to search in the catalog for video titles, using screen captured images and voiceover. This was not specifically centered on streaming resources, but the skills being taught were worthwhile. Another FAQ on video searching sent users directly to a specialized catalog search box which did search all streaming media and hard copies of video in the library. The rest of the FAQs sampled were centered on getting access to electronic resources (with links to proxy log-ins or guides to setting up VPN on personal computers) and a few others addressed copyright issues (mostly links to the larger copyright guides). One FAQ did directly address film copyright, answering questions about reproduction and showings for classrooms.

Guides

There are many types of guides which were expected to contain discovery tools for streaming media; in this sample, the majority of guides were subject or course guides. These guides took on a variety of formats; some were webpages made by the library, while others were created within guide software like LibGuides. Overall, 84% of the institutions sampled had some sort of individual guide to video, whether it was termed “Film and Video,” “Cinema,” “Movies,” or “Streaming Video.” The contents of these guides varied quite a bit, but most at least gave mention to media resources available to students. Of this group, only 8.5% of these guides were specifically centered on streaming video. The difference between having a vendored media resource and only having government media meant the overwhelming majority of institutions with vendored media at least mentioned streaming video in a subject or class guide (98%); only one institution failed to do so.
that lacked vendored resources still had guides to video (75%). This means that despite the kind of guide, the vast majority of schools with vendored resources at least mentioned or linked to streaming media resources to their users.

The mentioning of resources had a wide amount of variation within guides; the level of description could vary from a simple text link to an entire webpage devoted to contents, how to search and restrictions on use. For the institutions that did mention streaming video in their guides, 94% described the resource at a basic level. A basic level of description includes a description of the contents of the resource, the coverage, subject headings and might have a brief explanation of its location or who could use it (usually a note about online use only and how only students at the host institution could get access). Description of contents varied; some guides simply used a brief sentence, others might have a brief paragraph description. Also, while it was impossible to determine for certain, it seemed like most of the descriptions could have come from a vendor as they often matched database descriptions (if the streaming resource was described in these lists as well); very few institutions would create unique descriptions that would describe features of the resources, although a few institutions did.

The final 6% of guides described materials in a detailed manner, went beyond simple descriptions and provided greater context to the resources. Two of the institutions gave detailed breakdowns of the special features within streaming media resources such as creating playlists, where tutorials are located, how to create permanent URLs to videos, synchronized transcripts as well more detailed descriptions of creators and famous individual works that were contained in collections. Two of these detailed guides also gave information on the major vendors of streaming media materials and even provided
summaries of their major collections and how to contact them about getting further information or sales.

Subject and class guides came in all forms, but LibGuides were a very popular format for librarians creating content; 62% of the sample had LibGuides in place for their guide needs. One advantage of the format is that authorship is obvious, giving the patron an easily located librarian who created the subject guide and who might be able to help them. These LibGuides consist of multiple pages and a list of tabs which sort out resources by type along the top; categories were created by the library with streaming video falling into areas such as “Audio and Video,” “Find Film,” “Media Collections,” and many other other descriptions.

While the majority of subject and class guides gave a quick description of streaming media materials, guides solely devoted to film provided additional content. Most guides solely devoted to video content had an emphasis on the physical formats that the library collected, with information on where these materials resided. Many guides had information about searching for materials in the catalog, with many guides identifying the limiters required to look only at video or media materials. Most guides also included lots of links and descriptions to resources that would help in research, such as reference sources, secondary sources for materials like reviews or criticism (Film Index International being the most prominent), as well as links to databases that contained primary documents such as newspapers as another source of film criticism. A few guides contained information on film culture in specific countries, while other institutions chose to separate these into their own individual subject guides. Many institutions also linked to outside resources of streaming media, most popularly to sources of broadcast news, or sources like the Internet Archive, and Library of Congress. Some institutions also linked to more commercial social media sources like YouTube and Hulu. Overall, 84% of the sample institutions linked to an outside
streaming media source. Interestingly, a few institutions added outside resources to lists of databases and multimedia resources as if they were part of the collection; it might have been to get students to go more heavily to certain approved locations (CNN News was a primary example of this).

A few film guides linked to complete catalog listings of streaming media, or grouped these comprehensive listings by the resource. Many institutions also promoted their in-house digitization and streaming efforts for faculty who needed to generate content for classrooms and for library reserves and tools like Blackboard. The digitization guides usually came with a brief explanation of fair use concerns and the limitations on showing and distributing materials. A few guides also gave information on outside collections of physical materials such as film archives, or famous specialized collections. Usually this information was given if the school was close geographically. One institution had use statistics available online for their most-viewed media resources, and a few select institutions had information on the type of video player and browser requirements that were needed for viewing streaming media.

For the handful of guides that were centered on streaming media, a similar range of information was covered: lists and descriptions of resources, information on streaming media use for faculty (and the legal implications of copyright), and information on vendors and how to request materials. There also tended to be slightly more troubleshooting information and links to how to update video players, and issues with getting access to resources fixed.

Slightly tangential but similar to the subject/class guide, were listings and descriptions of databases. Many of the vendored streaming resources were described as databases; 70% of the sampled institutions had their streaming resources described as
databases. Listings for databases usually came in the form of lists either grouped by subject, material type, or, most commonly, in simple alphabetical order. The level of description of databases was similar to resources when they showed up in guides; 80% were described at a very basic level, giving information on the contents and coverage, subject headings, and, very rarely, information on how many users could use a resource at once. The remaining 20% of databases had a high level of description, which typically contained more information about how users could access materials, contact information for assistance with resources, system requirements for playing video, and exception description or generous amounts of subject headings.

Also worth noting for discovery tool resources was the types of information that libraries provided on copyright and access issues. The majority of institutions addressed both, with 96% of the sample giving some kind of information on copyright issues, while 89% gave information about getting access to online materials. For access, most of this information centered on proper procedure to log into library resources using either a proxy link or creating a VPN account to gain access. One institution went into detail in their guide as to why electronic resources were restricted, pointing out that contracts with publishers dictate limited access and the prevention of widespread downloading of contents. This was an important point that would have been helpful to see elsewhere in other guides.

The types of information covered for copyright varied, and did not usually reference copyright restrictions in regards to video. 80% covered basic definitions and terms related to copyright, 74% had links to outside resources (mostly government sponsored) on copyright topics, and devices such as the public domain calculator and fair use slider. 52% of the copyright guides addressed public domain directly; 72% discussed fair use, while only 20% addressed the TEACH act and 15% talked about DCMA, both of which are crucial
to proper video use under copyright law. Overall, 23% of sampled copyright guides specifically mentioned video usage under copyright law; these highlighted subjects such as fair use, and the use of film in face-to-face teaching situations. The level of detail varied for these specific guides, but they typically mentioned avoiding duplicating and unlawful distributions of materials. A few institutions also maintained blogs about copyright which had news stories and articles written about copyright cases, all of which addressed pending cases regarding streaming media materials.

Cataloging

The library catalog could be seen as the key point of discovery for users, particularly for those who are not purposefully seeking video materials in their subject area. The key area of examination for cataloging was with the detail provided to the user and if streaming media resources were cataloged at the collection level, or if they had individual titles cataloged. The sample institutions all had at least some kind of cataloging for resources in their catalog, with the exception of one institution which only linked to streaming resources in their database listings. Overall, 96% of the sampled institutions cataloged individual videos from a collection into the catalog. There was some variation, however, depending on whether the resource was from a vendor or from the government; only 57% of sampled institutions provide individual video level cataloging for vendored resources. The reasons for this are unclear, since most catalog records are likely to be from vendors; descriptions and headings were typically identical from institution to institution with a few exceptions.

For this study, the level of description was split into two categories, basic description and detailed description. The basic description contained information on the title, authorship (which was some time combined with the publisher), related subject headings, a description or summary of the video, video length, a brief description of the
format (usually referring to it as simply a “streaming video”), information on location (usually “Internet” or “Online”), and publisher information. Other details occasionally drifted into basic descriptions such as series information, the title of the overall resource, and information on hardcopies of video if available in the school. Detailed cataloging built upon this information and had more details on the video file format, type of player required for playing video, and system requirements (like the version of web browser required). One catalog also included details might on the proper usage of video, which indirectly referred to the copyright restrictions placed on the material (ability to link to resources, reproduction details, use on Blackboard). Overall, 83% of the sample had records with detailed cataloging, but it is important to note that the majority of these were for the government-supplied streaming videos (only 24% of the vendored sources had a detailed level of cataloging). This seems to indicate that the level of the cataloging depends largely on the source of the streaming videos; in the case of vendored materials, information is mostly at a basic level, while government videos have detailed cataloging from the start. It was difficult to tell when vendored sources at high levels of cataloging came from the institutions’ catalogers, or if the catalog data were in fact a part of the original record. Overall, it was disappointing to see so many of the vendored sources leave out information on format and access.

How catalogs labeled streaming video entries had a wide amount of variation. The phrase most used to describe a source in a list of results was “Electronic Resource,” which usually was placed next to the title of the entry. The next most common label was “Video,” followed by “Online” (which also would describe the location of the item), “eVideo,” and “streaming video.” There were a handful of other terms used as well that did not occur as often, including “audio visual,” “film,” “electronic,” and “ebook.” This inconsistency in description (the most frequent label occurred around 37% of the sampled entries) indicates
that a uniform label for the format might be useful in conveying to users what the format is of the item cataloged.

Occasionally the catalog entries contained a visual symbol that indicated what the format of the item was. Most were related to film imagery; a film reel, a clapboard (which is commonly used on film sets), filmstrip with an image of a DVD, a VHS Tape, and a video camera were all used. Other symbols occurred which were related to the streaming content being available through the Internet; a big red E (for ‘electronic’ perhaps), a computer screen, and a globe (perhaps to indicate World Wide Web). Again, these symbols were moderately useful in conveying what the item might be but were not consistent enough, or unique enough to distinguish the streaming media format.

Placement of information in an individual catalog record had slight variations when it came to the order in which information was sorted on the page. One feature that was observed in 21% of the sample was the use of tabs within the catalog to show different sets of information; tabs usually toggled between a basic and detailed view, which when clicked would reveal new sets of information. The information that was not in tabular form was the title and publisher, with an occasional author listing; the set of tabs would be across the screen below these rows. While there was some variation in the tabs, there was usually a tab that would show only the subject headings related to the item. Other tabbed information included student-produced tags, a tab that opened up the video in the catalog record, and a tab that would reveal “details” which was usually a summary or description of the item. The overall impression of the records was simplified compared to other styles, but the tab interface could also be confusing and obscured valuable information, such as format information (which usually occurred in the notes field for government provided videos).
There were a few other styles of display that occurred once in the sample; one type showed the bibliographic information for a record in a pop-up window, which was confusing and obscured the list of results below it. Two catalogs had the AquaBrowser interface from Serial Solutions, which provided little additional information in the word clouds beyond additional or alternate spellings of words and was not useful. One catalog placed certain entries in a configuration that placed the subject headings at the very bottom right corner of the screen, which was impossible for the patron to observe without scrolling down the side of the page. Other catalog functions included several schools providing students the opportunity to tag items in the catalog which had not been done for any of the items observed. Another catalog allowed records to be sent via text to a patron’s mobile device, and yet another catalog had QR codes for every record. Both were interesting but not necessarily more useful in discovering streaming media.

Overall, observations of the sample indicated that discovery tools for streaming media are at a very basic level. Home pages had inconsistent and occasional promotion of streaming media that relied heavily on catalog labels and news items, while FAQs struggled to mention the streaming video format on its own. Guides did a good job in connecting users via subject to streaming media resources that met their needs, but descriptions of resources were limited to contents and coverage, while rarely addressing format, copyright, and access information. Cataloging at most institutions was fairly robust, with streaming media often cataloged at the individual level, arguably the most effective method of individual discovery of video materials. However, the level and method of cataloging was still dependent on the level of information supplied by vendors, and the willingness of institutions to continue cataloging items.
Conclusion

This study sought to explore what current tools are available to patrons seeking streaming media materials. Assessment of these tools is difficult; there are some phenomena that are tempting to single out as effective but much further study is needed to determine the veracity of these judgments. One area of difficulty is that streaming media is still a relatively young format, to which many libraries are still adjusting. As illustrated in the literature review, libraries are not yet examining in detail how these formats are being integrated into their collections and how they are reaching patrons.

Since definitive assessment is difficult to reach within the scope of this study, there are many avenues which could be taken in further exploration of this topic. Perhaps the most pressing research that could be done is a study of searching habits and discovery rates of patrons using the catalog search to find streaming media. Factors such as the level of cataloging (basic or detailed), and the amount streaming resources were cataloged (a single entry for an entire resource, or individual videos cataloged into the system) would help to clear up which options might lead to greater success. It is the conjecture of this study that individual video cataloging would lead to more surreptitious discovery as more focused subject headings for a title will lead to more discovery as opposed to headings for an entire resource. It would also be interesting to study what types of controlled vocabulary or symbols might work best in expressing the concept of the streaming media format, as this seems to be an area in need of uniform control.

There is a need for experimentation on the part of libraries to attempt new ways of promoting streaming resources. With budgets getting tighter, libraries need to make sure that these expensive resources are being well used. Perhaps having a video of the week that is available for patrons to view that could be tied to recent news or library events could be
an effective way to get users to explore a resource that did not know existed. Also crucial is better promotion and understanding of the unique relationship between videos and copyright which is essential for users to understand. Streaming video is becoming more prevalent format in academic library collections around the country and with its rise, more effective discovery tools will be needed to aid its use.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Final list of Codes

Basic Wayfaring (main page)
CS- Catalog detail for video searching (mention of films/video in catalog search)
ML- tab/link to media resources information
VL- link or link to library that specialized in video resources
NS- News or alert to new resources or specifically to streaming resources

Guides
VG- guides available for video/film (note when there are guides just for streaming video)
MSV- mention of streaming resources in guides
LOR- links to outside streaming resources
BG- description of streaming resources within guides are at a basic level; basic description of contents, coverage of the resource
DG- similar description as BG with additional information on format, technical requirements, information on copyright and access

FAQ
YF- mention of streaming video or relevant info in FAQ (finding, proxy info, copyright, etc)

Description of Resources
VR- institution contains streaming media purchased by a vendor
RDB- streaming resources are listed as databases
BD- basic description of scope and coverage
HD- basic description of scope, coverage, detail on formats (optional); gives context to the work beyond usual description

Catalog
IC- individual videos in a resource are cataloged
RC- streaming resources are cataloged as an overall resource
BC- basic cataloging: title, authorship/publisher info, resource type, and subject headings
DC- detailed cataloging: all of the above with additional information on players for video; exceptional summary or content information

TN- Catalog records for individual records have tabbed interface for showing information

Overall

CI- copyright information is provided for students
  -note if they mention fair use, DCMA

CDI-copyright information specifically related to video or streaming video (most likely related to fair use and performance rights)

PI- information on proxy/VPN issues
  -note if the proxy info goes into firewall and other issues like browsers

LBG-LibGuide is used as a subject/class guide

Note Field: Listing of how streaming videos are described

Appendix 2: Order and Method of Data Sampling

Library Home Page

- Look for Media Resources, Film and Media, Video, streaming video links or information; browse main links and tabs on home page.

- Seek explanation of formats, requirements for access, location of materials, copyright

- Note if the search areas on the webpage (catalog search box) mention video or media directly; note if these searches actually take the user to streaming video

- Look for news stories or sections of the webpage that highlight streaming video resources

FAQ

- Look for general FAQ areas (or terms like Getting Started, How Do I?) on the library homepage to find links to guides or more information on streaming video materials

- Words that might be good to use: streaming video, video, eVideo, electronic resources, online resources

- Seek information on searching, help with access (proxy) and additional links or guides.

- Note if streaming video and physical video materials (DVDs, VHS) are properly delineated or mentioned
Research Guides and Descriptions

- Look for specific information on individual streaming video packages

- Note how streaming video resources are described; are they databases? Electronic resources? Multimedia?

- Note the level of description of the overall streaming video resource; description of contents and coverage, any technical information, other links or guides to the resource (access, copyright)

- Note if streaming video resources get mentioned in subject or class guides. Note the level of description in these guides.

- Note if subject guides have separate guides to video resources, also if they have Streaming video guides.

- Note if guides mention outside (non-vendor or freely available) streaming resources.

- Note the format of subject guides, and particularly interesting and useful features that the guides have.

Catalog

- Search catalog for specific video titles (consult video example lists)

- Compare the level of cataloging between vendor and non-vendor titles (government)

- Note the level of detail provided (if they detail plot, images, aspect ratio, file sizes, authorship, vendor, etc).

- Note patterns observed if certain vendors tend to associate with a level of catalog detail

- Note unusual features and their usefulness in searching or recalling videos

Overall

- Search for information on Copyright and associated issues like fair use, DCMA, etc.

  - Note when guides provide copyright information specific to video or streaming video use

- Searches of the entire library website

  - Target terms such as: streaming video (or media, or eVideo), video, copyright, proxy

- Note other interesting phenomena on the websites that might not be a regular occurrence, but are interesting, odd, or helpful.
Appendix 3: Sample Videos Searched

These were the core titles that were used to search for individual title cataloging in the library catalogs. Other searches were used to find these videos as well, such as keyword searches for the format (usually 'streaming video', but variations such as 'streaming media', 'eVideo', and 'online video' were used to find titles) and searches for the name of the streaming resources also resulted in the listings of individual titles.

- America History In Video

Title: Amelia Earhart: Queen Of The Air
Author: Sanford Orkin; Jack Perkins 1933-, Laura M Verklen
Published: Greystone Communications; New Video Group. New York: A&E Television Networks: Distributed by New Video Group c2005

-Bates Visual Guide to Examination

Title: Head-to-Toe Assessment of the Child
Publisher: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins
Author: Bickley, Lynn S.

-Center for Disease Control

Title: Wes Studi. Don’t get, don’t spread
Published: Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, [2010]

-Counseling and Therapy in Video

Title: Mixed anxiety and depression: a cognitive behavioral approach
Author: a White Birch production; Newbridge Communications, Inc.; produced and directed by John Holland; with Donald Meichenbaum.
Published: San Francisco: Psychotherapy.net, c2006.

-Dance in Video

Title: Swansong
Author: composed by Philip Chambon; performed by Koen Onzia, Matz Skoog and Kevin Richmond; choreographed by Christopher Bruce; English National Ballet.
Published: ArtHaus Musik, 1989.

-Ethnographic Video Online

Title: Dodoth morning: a film

-**FMG: Film on Demand/Films for Humanities**

-Title: Reconciling History in Black and White

Other title: Bill Moyers Journal

Published: Hamilton, N.J. : Films Media Group, c2007

-Title: Fetal alcohol exposure changing the future / producer/writer/editor, Bill Johnson.

Other Author: Johnson, Bill, 1952-
Graybill, Christopher, actor.


-Title: 100% woman

Published: Princeton, N.J. : Films for the Humanities & Sciences, 2005

Author: director, Karen Duthie ; writers, Karen Duthie, Diana Wilson ; producer, Diana Wilson ; produced with the participation of the Canadian Television Fund ; produced in association with the Documentary Channel ; produced in association with Life

-**National Health Institute**

Title: Why I exercise [electronic resource].

Published: Bethesda, Md. : National Institutes of Health, [2001?]

Author: Lindberg, Donald A. B., 1933- -- Health -- Popular works.

-**National Transportation Safety Board**

Title: Marine accident report: fire aboard construction barge Athena 106, West Cote Blanche Bay, Louisiana, October 12, 2006.

Published: [Washington, D.C.] : National Transportation Safety Board, [2007]

-**OAlster**

Title: Man Haters Documentary

Publisher: 2007 Ball State University Libraries

*OAlster titles seem to be cataloged only when institution is using a Worldcat interface to search. Usually titles must be searched via the OAlster database.

-**Opera in Video**

La Cenerentola

Composer: Rossini, Gioachino (Antonio)
- **Theatre in Video**

  **Title:** To be young, gifted and Black

  **Author:** Hansberry, Lorraine, 1930-1965, directed by Frankel, Gene.

  **Published:** Kent, CT : Creative Arts Television [1969]

- **Other titles to look out for**

  - **Great Courses**
  - **Henry Stewart Talks**

  Sometimes occur in the FMG collection

- **Vanderbilt Television News Archive**

  Regularly cited in database listings, but not cataloged individually (searching happens on Vanderbilt's site)