

Proposal: Maintaining AACR1 Records in a Mixed Code Environment

10/13/2011; rev 10/19/2011; rev 11/27/2011

Question: During the interim period from November 2011 through implementation of RDA in January 2013 (or later), should CONSER test a hybrid-record approach for maintaining PCC AACR1 records?

Background:

During the Hybrid Records Task Group work (final recommendations:

<http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/Hybrid-Report-Sept-2011.pdf>), one question that needed to be

addressed was "What about pre-AACR2 records?" Two categories of possible concern were identified:

- (1) PCC Successive Entry AACR1 Records: Over 60,000 PCC pre-AACR2 successive-entry serial records are coded as "currently published." This set of records, while not huge when compared to the total size of the CONSER database (1,222,198 records), is too large to ignore. The current proposal focuses on a hybrid approach to maintaining these records.
- (2) PCC Latest Entry Records: About 780 pre-AACR2 PCC latest-entry serial records are coded as "currently published." Should currently-published latest-entry records be considered priority concern, the report suggests a separate task group. However, the current proposal excludes latest-entry records.

[Note: The statistics represent the CONSER database on Dec. 31, 2010.]

Current CONSER policy calls for observing the code used to create a bibliographic record when maintaining or enhancing a bibliographic record. The CONSER Cataloging Manual module 22 provides a wealth of useful information about pre-AACR2 cataloging principles and practices. Module 22 highlights aspects of pre-AACR2 rules (as mapped to MARC) that are most likely to confuse CONSER catalogers not trained to apply those earlier codes:

- Basis for description
- Choice of main entry
- Transcription of the title, including truncated and generic titles
- Imprint, including omission of the publisher and use of "etc."
- Special use of the 936 field by CONSER catalogers

Even with CCM Module 22 as an aid, the effort of trying to re-imagine the framework of an earlier code on an occasional basis has been a barrier for those unfamiliar with the 1967 Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. As experienced CONSER catalogers retire, the level of discomfort has led to evidence that some CONSER catalogers are already applying the CONSER Standard Record guidelines to these records, but inconsistently. (For example, one occasionally finds 500 notes recording later publishers along with a 588 latest issue consulted note.) With the shift towards a FRBR-based, data element-aware perspective, the next generation of catalogers will undoubtedly find maintenance of AACR1 records even more daunting.

CONSER has revisited the problem of maintenance of AACR1 records several times over the past decade. The most notable instance has been Lucy Barron's proposal during the 2004 CONSER Operations Committee Meeting (cf., [AACR2 Compatibility : making better use of non-AACR2 records](#)). The approach below builds on Lucy Barron's proposal but is more limited in scope.

Assumptions

1. The scope of this proposal is authenticated AACR1 records.
2. The focus of our energy should be on keeping our records accurate & current, rather than following past codes. The proposed approach assumes that the existing data in the record is an acceptable representation on which to build.
 - a. The approach outlined below is intended to serve when the cataloger does *not* intend to re-describe the resource.
 - b. Re-description may be a preferred alternative, depending on institutional policy, CONSER policy (e.g., in the case of reconciliation with series authority records), or cataloger judgment.
3. One difference between AACR1 and later codes is that the description is based on the latest issue. The proposed approach assumes that this difference can be neutralized by declaring the issue in the existing record used as the basis of description (i.e., the most recent issue cited). This information would be given in a standard “588 ## Description based on: “ note.
 - a. From then on, all subsequent changes would be recorded by adding to the record using the CSR guidelines.
 - b. The appearance of a 588 Description based on and 588 Latest issue consulted are assumed strong enough for subsequent catalogers to understand that the record is hybrid.
 - c. The hope is that this will impose a familiar framework for editing the record while accepting the data already in the record.
4. **The Hybrid Record Procedure provides an alternative to the two existing strategies for maintaining AACR1 records: (a) to maintain the bibliographic record in accord with Anglo-American cataloging code; or (b) to re-describe the serial according to the current cataloging code and current CONSER conventions. For more guidance on the latter, consult CONSER Editing Guide B4.3 and C9**

Hybrid Record Procedure

- Add a “588 Description based on:” note to identify the issue used to create the description.
 - If the record has a 936 field that records the issue used for description, use the last subfield \$a from the 936 field to create the “588 Description based on” note and delete the existing 936 field.
 - If the record lacks a 936 field and if the cataloger is editing the title proper (see 245 “truncated title” below), then use the issue used for description in the “588 Description based on:” note.
 - Otherwise, if the record lacks a 936 field, omit the “588 Description based on:” note.
 - Always add a 936 note: “\$a Original description based on AACR” if not already in the record.
- Add a “588 Latest issue consulted:” note citing the issue sent to cataloger.
- Generally accept the existing description. Use the current CSR guidelines to correct errors such as typos and to add to the record. To illustrate what one might expect as a result, here are some comments based on MARC fields:

110 field: Do not change choice of entry. Ignore the question of whether the body would be a main entry under AACR2 21.1B2 (or a creator under RDA 19.2.1.1.1). Assure that the form of heading is governed by an authority record.

245:

- Truncated title (e.g. “Report” rather than “Report of the [body]” per AACR1 162B) or generic title (e.g., “Annual report -- [body]”): If piece or surrogate is in hand, cataloger may replace a truncated or “generic” title with a title proper transcribed according to CSR guidelines. [Reminder: Also change 78X links in related records.]
- Actual minor changes to the title proper: add as 246 fields.
Comment: In some cases, either because the cataloger lacks evidence or because the

cataloger is unfamiliar with the former practices of truncation or generic titles, a cataloger may add a 246 with a fuller form of title rather than editing a 245 field.

260: Changes in place/publisher: add multiple 260 fields following the current CSR guidelines.

Comment: the first 260 field will represent the publisher matching the DBO rather than the actual first publisher, similar to a situation where a cataloger would currently use a DBO with an issue later than that recorded in the 362 field.

362: Use current style of notes.

Comment: If the record reflects the earlier practice of recording a library's holdings rather than the issues published, then that would probably be perceived as an error & corrected.

5XX: Use current style of notes.

936: Original description based on AACR

Example: Opera journal

https://ccle.ucla.edu/mod/resource/view.php?id=314372&subdir=/Opera_journal.AACR1

Folder includes four versions of the OCLC record. (Please note that the order of the files on the Web site does not match the order listed below.)

- As the record appeared in OCLC before August 7, 2011: "oc1761319.preA2.before.pdf"
- After maintenance, based on current practices: "oc1761319.preA2.after.current_rules.pdf"
- After maintenance, creating a hybrid record based on AACR2: "oc1761319.preA2.after_AACR2.pdf"
- After maintenance, creating a hybrid record based on RDA: "oc1761319.preA2.after_RDA.pdf"