

Recording of the CAMCIG Webinar on Non-English and Parallel Records:

Part 1: Non-English Records (re-recorded on Mar. 6)

To view the recording, click the link below:

[View the Elluminate *Live!* recording](#)

Part 2: Remainder of the Webinar (original recording from Mar. 3)

To view the recording, click the link below:

[View the Elluminate *Live!* recording](#)

CAMCIG Webinar Chat: Questions asked (3/3/09) with answers (some answers expanded from those given during the Webinar)

Q: is a record from Canada or Australia considered a foreign language record or not?

A: Not necessarily. It would depend on the contents of the 040 \$b (if the 040 \$b has a value other than 'eng' then the item is, or should be, a non-English record).

Q: We notice the German language record has non-ISBD punctuation, which is or isn't a clue in itself?

A. Not necessarily. It would certainly be possible for an English record to omit the ISBD punctuation.

Q: Without causing too much of a digression, why does language of subject headings not bear on language of cataloging?

A: Subject headings are identified as to source (2nd indicator; subfield 2), and it has been OCLC policy to accept the addition of subject headings from any source to a record.

Q: If we find two English language records, one with 040 \$b eng, should we report one as a duplicate?

A: Yes.

Q: Records from some CJK cataloging agencies outside US didn't use \$b for language of cataloging, but we know they are parallel records. Do we still treat them as parallel or dup records?

A: If a record is consistently in a language other than English, but the 040 \$b is lacking, OCLC considers that to be a coding error. Add the

appropriate 040 \$b to the record and treat it as a parallel record (i.e., create or use an English-language record).

Q: Does the original record get a 936?

Q: If you create an English record, are you required to put the 936 field into all parallel records?

Q: We only add 936 in English record, right?

Q: Not required, but is it permissible to do reciprocal 936s?

A: Adding a 936 field to the original record (or any existing non-English record) is optional. OCLC considers that adding the appropriate 936 field to the record that you are using (or creating) is all that is necessary.

Q: How many OCLC #s may be used in the 936?

A: As many as there are records in languages other than English for the same bibliographic entity.

Q: What is the purpose of adding the parallel record number in the 936 field? Is this for machine manipulation? Can anyone add this?

A: OCLC has indicated that it will use the parallel record numbers for clustering the records in WorldCat. Anyone who is authorized to edit a record may add a 936 field to that record.

Q: If I remembered correctly, 936 field is also used by CONSER members to report dup records? If that is the case, 936 field has at least two functions?

A: Yes, the actual name of the 936 field is "OCLC/CONSER Miscellaneous Data". And that is probably why "PR" is used in the 936 field to introduce the numbers of the parallel records--to identify what these numbers are.

Q: Do you get an OCLC credit to add 040 \$b?

A: My assumption is that the credit would be the same as for any other editing of the record (any other editing that doesn't represent a change to encoding level), but I will check with OCLC (Sara).

Q: [Is] some [special] authorization required to modify non-English records?

A: The language of a record has no effect on the authorization required to edit it. For detailed information on editing WorldCat records, see section 5. "Quality Assurance" of Bibliographic Formats and Standards at: <http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality/default.shtm>

and, for information on the OCLC's Expert Community Experiment, which currently expands on the capabilities of OCLC authorizations, see the Expert Community Experiment main page at:
<http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/quality/expert/>

Q: Is it incumbent on us to remember when vendor records were treated differently, and determine when a vendor record was input?

A: No. In the case of the Puvill record I was indicating that at the time the record had been partially converted to English, the policy had been to convert vendor records to English, so the editing library had not acted "improperly" (although the editing library had not completely converted the record). But the fact that it was originally a vendor record has no bearing on the decision regarding what to do with it now. See next question for factors used to make the decision to edit this particular record to make it a consistently English-language record.

Q: Why they think the "A" choice is OK.. (we thought "B") in the case of the Puvill Libros record.

A: "B" would certainly be the safer ('when in doubt') choice. OCLC could always choose to merge the record you created with the hybrid record once you had reported it. The recommendation to edit this particular record was based on (1) When it was edited (2007) so OCLC will have no copy of what the record looked like before it was edited; (2) All holdings *libraries* associated with the record are in the U.S. and assumed to be English-language libraries (the vendor code is the only non-English holding associated with the record); and (3) Most of the record, aside from the coding in the 040 field, (i.e., everything except the 500 note) is consistent with being in English.

Q: When did the rules about vendor records change?

A: The 'vendor record exception' was eliminated in mid-2008 (approximately). The reason for the elimination is that there was widespread confusion regarding just what was a 'vendor record' and as a result many records that were not in fact vendor records were being improperly converted to English.

Q: The example of Puvill libros rec. if there is an English record, should we ignore the Puvill libros rec, thanks.

A: If there were an existing English record, then the recommended procedure would be to use that English record for your cataloging and report the hybrid to OCLC; OCLC could decide whether to revert the record to completely Spanish or merge it as a duplicate with the English-language record.

Q: If you have non-English records in your own local database, what are you going to do with them?

A. Good question. Whether to clean up those records or not would be a local campus decision. It is worth pointing out that in a reclamation or batchload project it might be possible to match them to English-language records if they exist. OCLC batchloading does permit limiting matches to English-language records.

Q: OCLC has been using the parallel record practice since Oct. 2003. Why we are emphasizing this policy at this moment? Thanks.

A: OCLC has changed the policy recently (2008) with respect to vendor records, and the information regarding this change has not been widely understood; also, with the recent (and continuing) batch loads of records from various large national and university libraries that use languages other than English for their cataloging, the increase in numbers of non-English records in WorldCat has increased enormously in the last few years. So catalogers are much more likely to encounter them now than they were a few years ago.

Q: What are the workflow implications for those getting brief vendor records that may be non-English?

A: Assuming that these are batch-loaded records that are intended to be used as-is, and not replaced with fuller records: the information in this training regarding CAMCIG policy for use (or non-use) of non-English record is intended for those cataloging individual items, not for those batchloading brief vendor records (for example, for a collection). However, if these brief vendor records are on-order records supplied directly by a vendor other than OCLC, and these records will subsequently be replaced by fully-cataloged records from WorldCat, there may be profile and/or workflow implications associated with assuring that, if there is an English-language WorldCat record, that the appropriate WorldCat record is eventually used for the titles.

Q: What's CAMCIG's policy for copy cataloging, add 936 if the field lacking?

A: CAMCIG doesn't currently have a policy. Should this be local policy decision based on available resources?

Q: Should we look for all the parallel records and add them to the 936?

A: It is desirable, but not required, to add the record numbers of all parallel records to the 936. Should this be a local policy decision, made based on available resources?

Q: You are cataloging a serial and find a vendor record in non-English language and in monograph format. You create a new serial record in English, deriving from the vendor record. Do you need to report the vendor record as a PR?

A: Yes. OCLC requests that you report the vendor record to OCLC for coding correction (from BibLvl 'm' to 's') and treat it as a parallel record, adding the appropriate 936 to your serial record.