2020-11 VAOH Session

Presentation summary

OMG, there are so many 5xx fields, what do I do?
Hayley Moreno and Cynthia Whitacre presented on MARC 5xx fields. The fields covered in this presentation were those that are "Required if applicable" for full level records that include fields 500, 501, 502, 504, 508, 511, 513, 515, 518, 525, 526, 532, 533, 534, 538, 545, 546, 547, 550, 555, 580, and 588. Information was also shared on what fields will transfer as a result of a merge transaction.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

Bibliographic Formats and Standards:
https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en.html

WorldCat Discovery Community Center:
https://www.oclc.org/community/discovery.en.html

Connexion Help, Export specifications:
https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/OCLC_MARC_records/Reference/Export_specifications

Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA version:
http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PN-RDA-Combined.docx

Resource Description and Access (RDA) Toolkit:
https://www.rdatoolkit.org/

BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) RDA Metadata Application Profile:
https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf

How item bibliographic data is displayed:
https://help.oclc.org/Discovery_and_Reference/WorldCat_Discovery/Search_results/How_item_bibliographic_data_is_displayed

Member questions

Nov. 5, 2020 session notes:

Should 501 be used for 'reversed print' books, containing 2 distinct titles? And if the reversed part is just a translation of the same work?

Under AACR2 and the LC rule interpretations plus OCLC's policy with regard to cataloging resources as issued, if you had more than one title issued under one cover, you would create one record to represent the whole thing. So if you had a back to back situation, which is typically a translation, you would create one record for that, transcribe both titles in the 245 field, and make an additional title in 246. Field 501 is mainly reserved for rare books. Under earlier rules, i.e. AACR1, field 501 had also been used for sound recordings when you had one work by more than one composer. You would create a record for each work

and link them with the 501 field. That's still allowed under AACR2 and RDA, but is not the standard practice. Under current practices you would generally create a single record with the multiple titles in field 245 with subsequent works in 7xx fields.

Does field 502 transfer when merging?

Field 502 does not transfer.

For the discography examples in the 504 field, shouldn't the pages be enclosed in parentheses like a bibliographical note?

The typical bibliography note should normally follow the formula "Includes bibliographical references" followed by parens with the page numbering. If it's some other kind of note, you are using the word "Discography" as a caption, so you would not include parentheses in that case.

Does field 504 transfer?

Yes, field 504 does transfer when merging.

Does QC have any advice on alternatives when note fields don't display in Discovery, for example language notes in field 546? We're a WorldShare library, and we're concerned that not all public notes are displaying for users. Our current approach is to continue as per BFAS and work on enhancement requests for Discovery. But are there different fields or different approaches we could look at? We've already considered LBD but these are fields that are already valid in the WorldCat record and LBD only displays in our local instance.

Our colleagues that work in Discovery are in the process of re-evaluating what fields should display and how libraries might be able to customize that. Jay and I are consulting with them on that and those conversations have just started. Submitting enhancement requests to the WorldCat Discovery Community Center is definitely recommended.

Does 'No Transfer' mean only when it is on the non-preferred record but remains if it is on the preferred record?

If we are merging two records together, and this applies to both the automated and manual process, we have the preferred record and the record that is merged into it. If one of these fields is already on the preferred record, that is the field that will be kept. However if the preferred record does not have the field, for example field 504, and the record being merged into it does, then field 504 will transfer to the record being retained.

Will BF&S be updated to include the transfer information when records are merged?

We will be discussing including field transfer information into BFAS in the future.

Does the closed-captioning note now go in field 532?

Yes, it now goes into field 532. We will update the example in 546, which was the previous practice. There were two accessibility fields that were added to MARC 21 fairly recently, field 532 which is the accessibility note and field 341 which is the accessibility content. So far there isn't very much official

guidance on using field 341. There are no standardized vocabularies that have been established yet for the 341 field. The 532 field is more free text and although has no standardized vocabulary to use there, you don't really need that. Most notes that have to do with accessibility, i.e. closed captioning or signing notes, could be included in 532 notes.

Is it recommended to use 538 in addition to 34X fields?

Yes, the 34x fields may not have comparable displays in local systems. Field 538 puts it into a form where people can read the note if that notes displays in your discovery system.

How do you describe multiple alphabets in field 546?

If you have multiple scripts, you can enter the scripts in separate subfields b, which is repeatable so you can enter multiple scripts in the note. On the slides there is an example with Mongolian in $a and Cyrillic alphabet in $b.

I see more and more books records using field 588. Is that correct?

You are probably seeing that more on electronic book records. This is required to tell you where the description came from for the e-book, for example the print book was used as the basis of the description for the e-book record.

Can you talk about the order the fields should be entered in?

There is not a prescribed order for notes in RDA as there is for AACR2 and for CONSER records that are in tag order. Catalogers tend to generally continue to use the prescribed order from AACR2.

Do you also use 588 field for 'Title from cover' note?

No, field 588 is about the whole description of the record. The source of the title would be entered in field 500. However for continuing resources, field 588 will specify the volume that the description of the record is based on and will also include the source of the title.

What is the rationale for not transferring the various fields? It may be duplicative? For example, I found a GPO record that had been merged that lost the 500 field with the shipping list information.

The major rationale for not transferring certain fields in certain situations is that you may end of up with duplicative information. Since field 500 is for general notes, there is no telling what information may be in it, so there is no way of telling what may be important to retain. For manual merges, we are able to determine what would be important to transfer manually to the retained record. If you have found that information has been lost, you can add that back yourself, or if you are unable to you, can send us a request to add that information back in. Send an email to bibchange@oclc.org, or use the error reporting function in Connexion and Record Manager.

Is it necessary to keep romanization parallel field, which is seldomly searched? Can catalogers just use the original language in item and ignore "Contents in vernacular field only" in 500, 520, 588, even in 505?

If a library has entered both non-Latin script fields and Romanized parallel fields for notes, please leave them in the WorldCat record. If you wish to delete one or the other for your local catalog, assuming you do not use WMS, that is a local policy decision.

We have some old archival collection records that have 545 fields for biographical information of collection, organization, or person. Is this correct?

What you have sounds fine. Use of this field to provide more information for archival records is great. It is a field that would not be used routinely with modern published works.

For content notes input in volume number order in 505 fields, why is the order changed in reverse in OCLC (see OCLC# 231619396) ?

While fields with non-Latin script are sorted ahead of fields with the same tag containing Latin script only, the issue here concerns the relative order of three 505 fields all of which contain non-Latin script. Reformatting, validating, and replacing has no impact on the order of these fields as input by the cataloger. In the cited record we have moved the fields into their proper sequence and replaced the record in the Connexion client with no issues.

Is there a limit to the number of characters in the 505 specifically in Connexion?

Connexion Help says that record size in bibliographic records must meet size limits defined in MARC21 standards. The number of characters in a field cannot exceed 9,999. The number of characters in a record cannot exceed 99,999. These limits apply to records you catalog using Connexion and to those provided by the OCLC MARC Subscription service. For other offline services that output records and for catalog card production, record size is restricted to 50 variable fields and 4096 characters. Records may be truncated for the output records only. Connexion retains the full-length record. For record export, maximum record size is 6,144 characters, according to the online OCLC-MARC Records (https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/OCLC_MARC_records/Reference/Export_specifications).

Is it ok to add the institution code in field 500 subfield $5 for non-rare materials?

No. If you are cataloging rare and special collection materials, you can use field 500, subfield $5 for copy- or institution-specific notes having scholarly or artistic value beyond the local institution. Please reference BFAS chapter 3.4.1 for more information.

For Chinese rare books, 500 fields are input in order by its cataloging rule, but after saving in OCLC, the order changes. How do you decide the 500 order?

You may be observing changes in the sort order based on fields containing non-Latin script always sorting ahead of those with Latin script only when they have the same tag.

Weren't rules changed so that both seen and unseen narrators are put in this field and not unseen narrators only in 508?

You are correct. It was formally rescinded with some simplification in RDA in the April 2015 Update. The instructions regarding Statements of Responsibility were greatly simplified, with much more being left to cataloger's judgment. This is mostly thanks to a joint CC:DA task group of OLAC and MLA that tried to rationalize some complex instructions in RDA 2.4 (Statement of Responsibility), RDA 7.23

(Performer, Narrator, and/or Presenter), and RDA 7.24 (Artistic and/or Technical Credit). The instructions in RDA 7.23 and 7.24 were essentially deprecated in favor of references back to RDA 2.4 and 2.17.3 for Statements of Responsibility and forward to RDA Chapters 19 and 20 for "recording relationships to agents associated with a work or expression."

I often think that a lot of 5xx fields require doubling in text what I would already be coding or describing in 3xx or 7xx fields. Do others recognize this? Is there a solution to not having to double the information?

For better or worse, MARC has always had built-in redundancies. The 007 fields code many elements that have been spelled out elsewhere, for example. That's become even worse with the proliferation of 34x and other fields under RDA. In this transitional period at least, some local systems are not equipped to do anything useful with 34xs, for instance, so such fields as 538 remain useful in that sense.

Notes do not necessarily have to be included just to express information. Notes are no longer needed to justify access points in 7xx when they are not mentioned elsewhere in the description. But, inclusion of these kinds of notes is not necessarily incorrect. Perspectives on this issue vary and are likely driven by what local systems display.

When inputting multiple 505 fields, should subfield $8 be used to indicate proper sequence? This seems logical but I don't think I've ever seen it.

Subfield 8 should not be used for these purposes.

Where is the best place to add a translation note, field 546 or field 500?

A note may not be needed if information about the translation or translator is transcribed in the 245 $c. If a note is needed, usually a 500 note is used. If there is complex information that involves both the language and the translation, a 546 field could be used. Examples:

> 500 $a Translated into English by Melissa Stone.

> 546 $a Original text in English with translations by Melissa Stone into French, Spanish, and Italian included.

Concerning field 546 vs. field 532--what if ASL is more of a main language than an accessibility feature? Recording of an interview carried out in ASL, for example.

When signing is the chief (or only) means of communication in a resource rather than an alternative accessibility feature, it would make sense to me to indicate this in field 546. It's my hope that once we get some official guidance on the two recent accessibility fields 341 and 532, we'll also have a better sense of how they are intended to relate with field 546.

In an email I received from Jay Weitz in January, he responded to the 588 note stating that it may be used for all kinds of resources. The newly revised PCC BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) RDA Metadata Application Profile (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/bibco/documents/PCC-RDA-BSR.pdf), for instance, specifies on page 11 (corresponding to RDA 2.17.2) that the "Note on title" is a PCC Core element, when applicable. When the cataloger supplies the title, regardless of the type of resource, use of field 588 would be appropriate. Both the Objects Best Practices (page 30) and the

BSR acknowledge that some institutions will continue to use field 500 for such notes because their local systems may not deal fully with field 588. But use of field 588 should now be the standard.

Although we most commonly associate field 588 with continuing resources, the field may be used for any appropriate type of resource. In addition to the BIBCO Standard Record Document cited, the current version of the *Provider-Neutral E-Resource MARC Record Guide: P-N/RDA version* (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/scs/documents/PN-RDA-Combined.docx) cites two RDA elements that may use field 588: 2.17.13, Note on issue, part, or iteration used as the basis for identification of the resource; and 2.17.2.3, Title source. The latter instruction makes clear that it refers to a wide range of title sources, from print title pages to title frames of moving images and has several examples backing that up. (In my reading of all of this, field 588 for a "Title from cover" note is fine.) As with many newer fields, some local systems may not be equipped to fully utilize field 588, so continuing to use field 500 is permissible but field 588 would now be preferred. Depending upon the circumstances and the significance of the title, a field 246 with an appropriate Second Indicator or subfield $i with display text may be useful to identify the source of a title.

Can vernacular scripts be added in 500 field and not paired with parallel Romanized fields?

Yes, though that is not standard practice currently within the U.S. If your language of cataloging is English, presumably your notes would be in English using Latin script. However, if you are quoting from the item that is in a non-Latin script, it is perfectly acceptable to include the non-Latin script in the quoted note. If your language of cataloging is Arabic, or another language using non-Latin script, then presumably your notes would be in that language and script.

You mentioned putting the source of title in a 500 field for a mono instead of 588. Is it incorrect to state in a 588 something like "Online resource; title from pdf title screen (Idaho Geological Survey, viewed November 5, 2020)"? Would it be better to include the title info in a 500?

Similarly, as I read all of this including RDA 2.17.2.3 and 2.17.13.4, some wording such as "Title from PDF cover page … based on version consulted: Nov. 5, 2020" is also perfectly acceptable in 588 or in 500 (as noted above).

Nov. 12, 2020 session notes:

What does it mean when a field is described as Required if applicable/Optional?

What we have in BFAS the standard for full followed by a slash, then the standard for minimal level. So Required if applicable/Optional means that it's required for full level and it's optional for minimal level.

What is meant by "these fields don't transfer when records are merged?"

In the merging process, whether it's by DDR which is the automated process that runs through Worldcat or when we manually merge records, there are fields that will transfer if the retained record does not have that field, for example field 504. There are other fields that do not transfer, for example field 502, so we would have to manually transfer it when merging.

For the 504 field should we use webliography now instead of Includes bibliographical references?

If it presents itself as a webliography in the resource or a discography, then it's okay to use that in field 504. Generally if any kind of bibliographical chapter or appendix to a resource has a specific title, it's okay to use the 504 note and to transcribe that title followed by a colon and the paging of the bibliography. If it's just a standard bibliography, you want to follow the standard "Includes bibliographical references" followed by the parenthetical paging.

Concerning "does not transfer when records are merged"--is the field deleted from all the records, or if one record is considered the "main" record, the field would be retained, but not added from the other records?

In the process of merging, if the field is already on the retained record, that field will be kept. If the note is not on the retained record, it will transfer from the record being merged into the retained. If there are multiple records with the note, it will transfer from the first record that gets merged.

If these are required fields, then shouldn't they be retained?

When we are merging manually and know a note is not going to transfer, we will manually transfer the note. We have more control over what gets transferred. In DDR, that's an automated process with a complex set of algorithms around the transfer of data. We try not to lose important information but also at the same time trying not to add redundant information. For example, we do not transfer the 500 field because it's a general note and we don't know what kind of information may be in the note.

In the 518 example, shouldn't $a be $3?

Yes, you are correct! We will correct the typo before we post the slides.

I would be interested in standards regarding note order.

RDA does not specify a note order but AACR2 did, so it depends on what standards you are using for cataloging. The general practice is that you order the notes in order of importance. CONSER records are in tag order with the exception of fields 533 and 539 which are listed last.

Is it incorrect to put "Includes index" in the 505 $a?

A note that simply says "Includes index" should be entered in field 500. If it's combined with a bibliographical references note, that could be part of the 504 note, i.e. Includes bibliographical references and index.

Someone said something regarding brackets around pagination in 504, I believe. Could you repeat that? Brackets used to be used for pages that didn't have a number printed on the page. But that seems to have gone away.

In RDA you wouldn't use brackets.

Why are 500 notes indicating a video recording is in widescreen format being added to DVD/Blu-ray records when that information is already in the 538 field?

Field 538 does transfer, and if there is a record with this information is already in field 500, you end up with duplicate information.

The Marc Advisory Committee is in the process of defining a new subfield in an existing field for aspect ratio which would include things like widescreen and full screen, so that information in the future will have its own place in a MARC record, which it doesn't have presently. That is why you often see aspect ratio information in field 500 because there was not a specific field for this kind of information. It's also possible that a statement of aspect ratio may be properly included as an edition statement. That's why you may see that kind of redundancy.

In the 502 field, do we omit "Thesis"? I did not see the 502 $a presented.

If you are using subfield $a to include all of the information about the thesis, then yes you would typically include "Thesis". The example on the slide was a 502 with multiple subfields, so in that case you do not include the word Thesis.

Should the 538 note "Mode of access world wide web" not be added for e-resources since this would be obvious?

Yes, you do not need to add that note.

Regarding numbering, when is unnumbered used?

In field 300 when you are describing page sequences, you would say "X unnumbered pages". If you need to specify which sequence you are talking about for the location of bibliographic references, you could give that in the parenthetical note. There is also the instance of where footnotes are scattered throughout the book at the bottom of the page, those may be bibliographical references you handle the same way.

Do OCLC staff have a sense of the extent to which information that should go in a specific 5XX field is input in a 500 field?

We don't have any solid data on that, except gut reactions. We also have to remember that practices have changed and the MARC format has changed so that nowadays there are many more specific 5xx fields for which information that previously had been relegated to a 500 field would now be put in a specific 5xx field. One example, the aspect ratio that I mentioned earlier, once that new subfield is defined.

Do you put "Dissertation" in the 502?

See answer above about "Thesis".

Is a formatted 502 now required? The lack of punctuation in it would create an unpleasant display in a non-MARC environment.

No it is not required. It depends on your system, so if your system does not take advantage of the subfields, then you may want to leave it all in $a. We have however been making a concerted effort to convert the 502 fields to the sub-fielded version. The reason for that is the information is much more granular and searchable.

So how is DDR (automated process) normally performed?

DDR is running constantly. Records that have been added as new records or records that have been changed all get fed every day into the DDR process with a delay of 7 days.

Is there a place where information is given on whether any given note field displays? We are a WMS/Discovery library and I noticed that 546 fields are not displaying. Other 5xx fields also don't seem to display.

https://help.oclc.org/Discovery_and_Reference/WorldCat_Discovery/Search_results/How_item_bibliographic_data_is_displayed

If institutions are looking for ways to voice their opinion on what fields they want to see added to Discovery, then they can add something to the community center. When we're ready to add additional fields to be displayed we always like to consult which ones are the most requested by the community.

Is it okay to use punctuation in 502 field for example if your ILS does not automatically insert them?

Yes.