# CONSER Standard Record RDA Core Elements Task Group

## Preliminary report, 01 December 2011

The CONSER Standard Record RDA Core Elements Task Group was charged with making recommendations for Program decisions on issues on CONSER-related issues identified by the PCC RDA Decisions Needed Task Group. These included four high-priority issues—the first three to be considered together—where CONSER Standard Record Guidelines conflicted with RDA instructions in identifying which elements were “core”:

* Recording the authorized access point for a translation (1XX/240 vs. 7XX)
* Making additions to access points to distinguish works whose titles will otherwise be identical (130/240)
* Recording dates of publication (260 $c)
* Recording statements of responsibility relating to the title proper (245 $c)

Our recommendations, based on a review of current practice (CSR/AACR2), application of the methodology set out in our charge, and discussion among members of the Task Group, are given below. The recommendations represent the consensus of the Task Group.

## General

There was a general concern over making recommendations that have not yet been tested against the real world. Consequently, these recommendations are made with the understanding that they will be revisited by CONSER prior to the full implementation of RDA by the national libraries.

Recognizing that the requirements of the ISSN Network differ somewhat from those of RDA, there was also a general concern that these recommendations not unnecessarily impede the US ISSN Center in carrying out its responsibilities.

*As directed in its charge, the Task Group considered issues C-2, C-3, and C-7 as a group. These issues are addressed first in this report.*

## C-2. Authorized access point for translations and language editions[[1]](#footnote-2)

### Current practice (CSR/AACR2)

AACR2 chapter 25 (Uniform Titles) gives considerable leeway to cataloging agencies (25.1A): “Although the rules in this chapter are stated as instructions, apply them according to the policy of the cataloguing agency.”

In this context, CONSER Standard Record practice is not to assign uniform titles to translations.

An added entry (using MARC 21 fields 700-730) is made for the translation as it would have been entered using the appropriate rules from AACR2 chapter 25. In rare cases—when the title of the translation changes at a different point than the title of the original—this can result in more than one such added entry.

### Evaluation of current practice based on RDA (methodology from Task Group charge)

* Does current CSR practice reflect RDA CORE practice? *No*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA user needs? (RDA 0.4.2.1) *No: The mechanism used does not support finding all resources that embody a particular work (RDA 0.4.2.1)*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA implementation scenario 1? *No: The mechanism used does not enforce the primary relationship between the expression and the work realized in the expression (RDA 17)*
* Would there be outside support for recommending a revision of RDA? *Possibly. Support for constructing authorized access points for translations based on the title of the translation rather than the title of the original goes back at least as far as the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles (1961)*

### Discussion

* Although catalogers know the added entry in the 7XX represents the resource described in the record, it would not be obvious to others. The 7XX fields have two second indicator values: analytical entry and "no information provided". It is not possible for a machine to determine whether a 7XX coded as "no information provided" refers to the resource described in the record or to a related resource. Consequently, we cannot bring together all the expressions of a work via a 7XX field. The best we can do is to bring together "all the expressions of a work and other stuff intermixed".
* For the CONSER Standard Record, we have been identifying language expressions in a 7XX field rather than in the 1XX/240 fields, primarily due to complications occurring with a small percentage of serial titles:

1. When the title of the original work changes, but title of the language expression does not
2. When the title of the language expression changes, but the original title does not
3. When the title of both the original and the language expression changes, but at different times (a situation which occurred with many “Soviet journal of …” to “Russian journal of …” titles)

* One member felt that in cases where it was not possible to identify the original language, the RDA instruction to select the language of the version cataloged first seemed arbitrary, but others considered this to be the simplest solution and one that avoids “cataloging wars”.
* From an ISSN standpoint, entering a translation under an authorized access point based on the original has a serious impact on the alignment of ISSN and RDA records because new ISSN can only be assigned if the key title (based on the title proper) changes. Following RDA will result in a lack of one-to-one correspondence between records and ISSN, a result that seriously impedes ISSN use in linking. Consideration should be given to a CONSER MARBI proposal to define a 7XX second indicator value for “resource described in the record.” This solution might limit alignment problems to those cases where both the original and translation titles changed but at different times.
* The user can be negatively impacted by entry under the original title. One of the reasons the CSR opted to make an added entry rather than use uniform title main entry is that users (and some library staff) are often confused by a new record for the translation when they could not discern any change in the publication.

### Recommendation:

* Apply RDA instructions during the interim period
* Prepare a revision proposal for RDA to treat translations as related works rather than as expressions of a work. Seek support from other cataloging communities, including those in other countries

## C-3. Additions to distinguish otherwise identical authorized access points for resources

### Current practice (CSR/AACR2)

AACR2 chapter 25 (Uniform Titles) gives considerable leeway to cataloging agencies (25.1A): “Although the rules in this chapter are stated as instructions, apply them according to the policy of the cataloguing agency.”

In this context, the CONSER Standard Record requires uniform titles to distinguish otherwise identical authorized access points for resources only for (1) monographic series and (2) resources identified only by a “generic” title such as “Journal”.

### Evaluation of current practice based on RDA (methodology from Task Group charge)

* Does current CSR practice reflect RDA CORE practice? *No*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA user needs? (RDA 0.4.2.1) *No: The mechanism used does not support finding all resources that embody a particular work (RDA 0.4.2.1)*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA implementation scenario 1? *No: The mechanism used does not identify works (RDA 6)*
* Would there be outside support for recommending a revision of RDA? *Unknown*

### Discussion

*Note: The Library of Congress Policy Statement for RDA 6.27.1.9 provides guidelines for the form of any addition to distinguish works with otherwise identical authorized access points.*

Reasons to follow RDA and LCPS 6.27.1.9:

* To distinguish one work with a given title (and its expressions and manifestations) from other works with the same title (and their expressions and manifestations)
* To distinguish members of one monographic series from members of another, and to enable each series to be displayed in the form of a discrete ordered list of its members
* To enable users to discover the desired work more quickly. For example, catalog result sets consisting only of titles are not particularly helpful to users trying to identify a particular resource
* To facilitate the international exchange of metadata with other countries employing RDA

Reasons to retain current CONSER Standard Record practice:

* To simplify cataloging practice
* To save time the time of the cataloger, who does not need to search the database to determine whether an identical title proper has already been used by a different resource
* To avoid obscuring the publication in lists and indexes because a place qualifier (the most commonly used qualifier) does not represent the current place (or even country) of publication. Users may not recognize the correct record because it is identified by what they perceive to be the “wrong” place.

Possible alternatives to additions listed in LCPS 6.27.1.9:

* Assign an addition that would be most meaningful to the user rather than following a rigid hierarchy
* Assign a more general addition to limit the creation of new records when an issuing body—particularly a government agency—changes. For example:
  + LCPS as currently written:
    - Economic update (Nevada. Employment Security Dept.)
    - Economic update (Nevada. Employment Security Division)
    - Economic update (Nevada. Research & Analysis Bureau)
  + LCPS with greater latitude:
    - Economic update (Nevada)
* If an issuing body has been used as an addition to a non-generic title and the issuing body changes, replace it with a more stable addition
* Assign whatever addition seems most appropriate in the circumstances, even an unconventional addition.
* Possible candidate qualifiers (Note: These qualifiers are less likely to be meaningful to the typical catalog user than existing qualifiers, and they are more likely to identify manifestations than works and expressions):
  + ISSN
  + CODEN

### Recommendation:

* Apply RDA instructions during the interim period
* Recommend that LCPS 6.27.1.9 be revised to give greater latitude to the cataloger in selecting an appropriate term for the addition

## C-7. Recording dates of publication

### Current practice (CSR/AACR2)

Under AACR2 rule 1.0D, date of publication is a required element for all levels of bibliographic description. Rule 1.4F8 instructs that date of publication be recorded whenever the first and/or last issue is available, and optionally even when these issues are not available.

CONSER Standard Record practice is that this element is optional. Hence CSR practice for this element does not conform to AACR2.

### Evaluation of current practice based on RDA (methodology from Task Group charge)

* Does current CSR practice reflect RDA CORE practice? *No*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA user needs? (RDA 0.4.2.1) *Not* w*hen the dates of publication differ from the years in the chronological designations or in cases of reprints*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA implementation scenario 1? *Yes*
* Would there be outside support for recommending a revision of RDA? *Unknown. CSR practice is also in violation of ISBD stipulations*

### Discussion

Reasons to follow RDA:

* Data in 260 $c is parsed by some ILS’s for use as additional data in title lists.
* The date of publication may be different from the chronological designation. In cases where this is true, providing that information assists patrons and staff (those issuing claims in particular). For example, a report covering fiscal year 2009 may not be published until 2011. On the other hand, the *World Almanac* for 2012 has already been published. Even in cases where the dates are the same, this information can be helpful.
* For reprints, it is critical to include the date of publication of the reprint.
* In short lists such as catalog result sets that may provide only the title and a publication date, the publication date aids the user by providing context for/identification of the corresponding title.
* As a result of the latitude allowed by the CSR, there is currently no consistent practice among CONSER catalogers on entering/omitting this information, either in the 260 field or as part of an unformatted note in the 362 field. Some CONSER catalogers still record it more or less routinely when they have the first and/or last issue in hand, while others may see this as a violation of the CSR and remove the information.

Reasons to retain current CONSER Standard Record practice:

* Potential patron confusion between the date of publication and the chronological designation .
* Time needed to find a publication date on many serials, especially online serials, where many pages may have to be viewed.

### Recommendation:

* Apply RDA instructions during the interim period

## C-6. Recording statements of responsibility relating to the title proper

### Current practice (CSR/AACR2)

Under AACR2 rule 1.0D, the first statement of responsibility is a required element for all levels of bibliographic description; subsequent statements of responsibility are required elements for the second and third levels of description. The glossary defines a *statement of responsibility* as “A statement, transcribed from the item being described, relating to persons responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the item, corporate bodies from which the content emanates, or to persons or corporate bodies responsible for the performance of the content of the item.”

CONSER Standard Record practice is that this element is optional. Hence CSR practice for this element does not conform to AACR2, at least in relation to the *first* statement of responsibility.

### Evaluation of current practice based on RDA (methodology from Task Group charge)

* Does current CSR practice reflect RDA CORE practice? *No*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA user needs? (RDA 0.4.2.1) *No. It can impede a user finding a desired resource*
* Does current CSR practice support RDA implementation scenario 1? *Yes*
* Would there be outside support for recommending a revision of RDA? *Unknown. CSR practice is also in violation of ISBD stipulations*

### Discussion

Related proposal:

* Following the CONSER webinar in August, a discussion relating to statement of responsibility took place on the CONSER list. At that time, Les Hawkins proposed making the statement of responsibility a required if applicable element within the CONSER Standard Record, but with CONSER guidelines and examples that:
  + Allow the cataloger to determine whether a clear statement of responsibility actually appears on an issue;
  + Focus on the sources most likely to be seen by users rather than tracking down all the possible sources that could contain one; and
  + Emphasize not spending time deciding whether or not a statement of responsibility appears: decide to record or not, then move on.

Reasons to follow RDA:

* Modern Google-like catalog interfaces are probability-based. When search terms are entered in a search, records are given a higher score (and returned near the top of the search result) when they occur in the same field because there is a higher probability that these records are what the user is seeking. If users search using title words combined with terms that appear in the statement of responsibility in the record, the record will receive a higher score.
* The presence of a statement of responsibility on an existing bibliographic record (or access to the issue on which the bibliographic description is based) may assist verification that the related access point is the correct one to represent the responsible body. Without it the cataloger may be left with the choice of authenticating a record where there are strong doubts about the access point or deleting the access point and so reducing access.
* When a user searches a catalog using keywords that include the name of a responsible body, the record will be retrieved in cases in which the form of name searched corresponds to the form transcribed in the statement of responsibility but differs from the form on which the authorized access point is based.  For example, “University of Tokyo, Department of Physics” vs. “Tōkyō Daigaku. Butsurigaku Kyōshitsu”, “Volkswagen” or “VW” vs. “Volkswagenwerk”,  or “NASA” vs. “United States. National Aeronautics and Space Administration.” In these cases the absence of the statement of responsibility reduces recall.
* When a user searches a catalog using a citation from a book or journal article, and the citation uses a form of name corresponding to the one used in the statement of responsibility in the record, the presence of the statement of responsibility in these instances assists recall.

Reasons to retain current CONSER Standard Record practice:

* Because the descriptions of serials are based on the earliest available issue, data transcribed in a statement of responsibility often becomes out of date over time and may mislead a user when the statement is included in a catalog display.
* Not recording statements of responsibility saves time the time of the cataloger, especially when the publisher and the body in the statement of responsibility are the same.
* Catalogers are free to add statements of responsibility when they determine doing so would be useful in a particular case.
* Statements of responsibility are still required for minimal-level CONSER records and for records created by non-CONSER libraries when no name authority record exists for the named body.

### Recommendation:

* Retain current CONSER Standard Record practice
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1. "Language editions" as used in C-2 refers to the simultaneous publication of the same work in different languages and under different titles, none of which is known to be the original language or title (AACR2 25.3C2-3). Language editions that represent different works are covered by C-3. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)