

## Julie Su's Presentation Slides

### Questions and Answers for CONSER Standard Records Workshop at CEAL 2009 Pre-Conference

#### Slide 55

Q: Should we use square brackets around *years* in 246 field?

A: *If you don't know the first or the last issue when the title variation occurred, angle brackets < > are used; use no brackets if the exact date or issue of variation is in hand.*

#### Slide 62

Q: Would you include 300 field information for a ceased title?

A: *When editing existing records, do not delete \$a v. in MARC 300 field. When closing existing records fill the total # of volumes in MARC field 300, subfield \$a if you have the information, and are using formatted 362 fields.*

#### Slide 65

Q: Spaces around numbers?

A: *Please follow the current spacing practice in CJK language bibliographic records. No spaces around numbers in C & J script fields, but spaces are given for nonroman fields that consist solely of Korean hangul, or hangul and ideographs; Spaces around numbers are given in roman parallel fields for all CJK records. Refer to AACR2 Chapter 12 CJK examples.*

#### Slide 66

Q: Should we use a semicolon (;) or a colon (:) in "Description based on" and "Latest issue consulted" notes?

A: *Always end the phrase of "Description based on" and "Latest issue consulted" with a colon (:), followed by the number / chronology of the source with the initial alpha letter capitalized. Use a semi-colon to separate the numbering/chronology data and the title source information.*

Example: Description based on: 1976; title from t.p.  
Latest issue consulted: V. 23, no. 1 (Mar. 2007).

CJK example:

Latest issue consulted: 第 10-輯  
Latest issue consulted: Dai 10-shu.

*Not*

Latest issue consulted: 第 10-輯

Latest issue consulted: **dai 10-shu**.

**Discontinued** practice (Nov. 2008)  
Description based on *first issue*  
Latest issue consulted: *last issue*

Additional comments consulted:

*You are certainly right that notes are not prescriptive. But consistent coding improves the behavior of OCLC macros; so we've generally been adding a colon after BOTH the "DBO" and "LIC" phrases in notes. If a word follows the colon, we are capitalizing it (e.g., Description based on: Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 2008)....) That way, we can use Robert (Bremer, OCLC)'s name authority macro without fiddling.*

--> Description based on: 1 (1977); title from ...

--> Latest issue consulted: Dai 10-shu.

**Slide 70**

Q: Began "with" or "in" in 362?

A: *We have seen both usages; however, **Began with** is used more often when enumeration is given with or without chronology. – Julie*

Additional comments consulted:

*I don't know whether anyone else reads "Began in" and "Began with" as having different meanings. But to me, they do mean different things. E.g., "Began with v. 1, no. 1 (winter 1994)": I would read this as **a precise statement naming the beginning issue**. E.g., "Began with 1989/1990": same thing here. BUT: "Began in 1994." This gives the year that the publication began, not the numbering. (This may be taken from the ISSN Portal, for example, or some other source outside of the issue.) And it could turn out that the actual designation on the piece was "1993/1994"*

CONSER: *Most examples in the CEG show 362 1 without the colon as well, I don't think it matters. (But I agree with the distinction made between "began with" and "began in" that matters a great deal more) -- LEH*

**Slide 77**

Q: "Issues for ... also called" or "Issues for ... called also"? Perhaps "also called" is more natural.

A: *5XX fields are not prescriptive. However, several examples in CEG use "also called", and the same is also found in the SCCTP CSR workshop slide, "called also" is found in all the examples collected in Notes for serials cataloging 2nd ed (Geer & Caraway, 1998). Under section 515, Double numbering ( page 33).*

Additional comments consulted

*“Called also” or “also called”: I remember a while ago this came up on the CONSER discussion list. Some said that “also called” was less grammatically correct than “called also.” But since I have also seen the note both ways, my conclusion is that some catalogers are not troubled by the difference in word order. Another grammatical concern is notes that begin with conjunctions (e.g., the grammatically incorrect “Also called ... ” versus the grammatically correct “Called also ...” - the first being a conjunction, the second being an adverb).*

[**Note** from Julie: Wording in slide# 77 has now been changed as the result of the above comments; however, from the following CONSER comment, you will see that is subject to cataloger’s judgment. ]

*CONSER: think the person quoted from the CONSER email list discussion was really objecting to beginning sentences with "Also called" but not so with the words appearing that way in the middle of a sentence as in these examples. CONSER has had the discussion many times over the years on, [and] have made changes back and forth and I am not sure it needs to be revisit it right now. -- LEH*

### **Slide 79 Closing Option 2**

Q: No “Began with”?

A: Because it’s updating on the existing record.

### **Slide 81**

Q: No “ceased with” in 362?

A: This is the case of changing numbering system with a new series, not the cease of publication.

### **Slide 87**

Q: Sequence of multiple 321?

A: Oldest one first not in reversed order. *Input them in chronological order (earliest to latest) following field 310. -- CEG 310/321*

### **Slide 98**

Q: Should we use “In” for language notes in MARC field 546? Past LC practice was to begin the note with “In” when giving a note for three or more languages; “In” is not necessary for two languages. Is this still the current LC practice or not?

A: We have seen 546 notes with and without the word “in”. However, *the confirmation from CONSER and examples in CONSER Cataloging Manual (2004) support the practice.*

*CONSER: I think there is no change in practice; these notes still appear either way in LC records. -- LEH*

### **13.6.2. Form of the note**

When including more than one language in the note, give first the predominant language of the text. If there is no predominant language, give the languages in alphabetic order. Separate the languages by the word "and" in all cases (LCRI 1.7B2).

245 00 \$a [Title in French only]

546 ## \$a English and French.

546 ## \$a In French, German, Italian, and Spanish.

**Q: What is the note order when both 5xx and 546 are present?**

A: Doesn't the reformat function in Connexion rearrange note in numbering order?

**Participants:** No. Field 546 should come after field 500 Latest issue consulted note.

*Re: CONSER Cataloging Manual (2004)*

**13.2.5. Order of notes**

While AACR2 prescribes an order in which notes are to be given in the record, CONSER policy is to input notes in 5XX tag order.

An exception is made for field 533 (Reproduction note) which is given as the last 5XX field in a record for a reproduction. 5XX tag order If there are multiple notes with the same tag, specifically those tagged 500, follow the order prescribed by AACR2. Input the "Description based on" note and/or the "Latest issue consulted" note as the last 500 note, even when the DBO is combined with the Source of title note (which is one of the first notes prescribed by AACR2).

Workshop discussion: What do you like and dislike about CSR?

Like

- Simplification of 246 indicator usage
- Change of 006/007 subfields requirements
- Elimination of redundant 5xx notes by using the 7XX Linking fields to generate notes and perform linking functions.

Dislike

- Redundancy of note fields (e.g. DBO and LIC required in addition to 362)
- Possible confusion on series tracing;
- With the changed new definition of first indicator, libraries that have no authorization to create a series authority record in the national file are left with no other options but use 490 0 which means "series not traced".
- What if a library wants to trace a series but finds no authority record available in the national file?

Post-Workshop discussions:

**Q 1:** Regarding CSR new guidelines that allow the transcription of vernacular number instead of converting it to Arabic number:

According to the old rule, vernacular numbering should be changed to Arabic numbers. So we will indicate like 제 1 집 in nonroman and Che 1-chip in roman field if the item shows 제 일집. So the record shows both field using Arabian numbers. Since CSR gives option not to convert it to Arabic numeral, we can indicate like 제 일집 in nonroman and the roman would be Che ilchip which is spelled out form. The same rule applies to field 362 and MARC 500 DBO and LIC notes.

If we transcribe [vernacular numbers] following new [CSR] optional choice, it would be hard to recognize the numbering quickly for catalogers and users. Arabic numbers are easy and quick to recognize.

Is it then up to the individual catalogers either to translate the numbers to Arabic or not? Or we get a consensus among CJK community and make an exceptional rule as special materials?

A: Yes, I totally agree with you. Unlike the CSR for Western language numbering, the CSR new guideline which allow for recording vernacular numbers as found DOES NOT benefit the CJK records nor simplify the cataloging process. On the contrary, it adds the burden of transliteration of vernacular numbers in the roman parallel field; and it potentially hinders the users' ability to quickly recognize or identify the item.

It is my opinion that CJK materials are best treated and recording of numbers is the easiest if we continue following the traditional AACR2 rules that call for converting numbers to Arabic numerals.

CSR documentation recognizes (see Principle page), that CSR may not apply well for legal materials, rare serial and other special types of resource.

The CEG Appendix O Introduction paragraph #2: CJK serials and the CONSER standard record (CSR)section specifically says that "Catalogers of special types of serials such as nonroman script serials, rare serials, legal materials and newspapers, have made it clear that elements beyond the basic requirements of the CSR are often needed for these resources"

Moreover, guidelines for 362 1# in the CONSER Standard Record Materials Application Profile (MAP) says: "Numbers may be transcribed as found or they may be recorded as Arabic numerals, **whichever is easier**". It is my personal opinion that using Arabic numerals in both roman and nonroman fields is easier than transcribing vernacular CJK numbers in the nonroman parallel field and romanizing it in the roman parallel field. I trust that CJK catalogers will exercise their best cataloging judgment in recording numbers in field 362 1#.

**Q#2:**

What is the best practice for catalogers who follows CSR guidelines for all the descriptive fields but wants to use AACR2 convention for numbering? Which option is better? a) Using 362 0 and

formatted data in an otherwise CSR record, OR, b) using unformatted field 362 1, DBO, LIC, but using numbering data following the AACR2 convention in a CSR record?

CONSER: my preference is for the unformatted 362 fields, DBO, LIC. But I think that some catalogers feel very strongly about using the formatted 362 0 and we have not "outlawed" it. So there are some newly created CONSER records that contain it. – LEH

**Q#3:**

If a serials has a chronological designation that is different from the publication date, and the CSR record omits the publication date in 260 \$c, would the publication date be transcribed in 362 1 and DBO notes as follows?

362 1 Began with 2004, published in 2005.  
500 Description based on: 2004, published in 2005; title from cover.  
500 Latest issue consulted: 2005, published in 2006.

CONSER: Your examples make sense to me – LEH

[Note: Answers by Julie Su with additional unofficial comments from another CONSER CSR/ SCCTP trainer, and/or official CONSER responses from LC (followed by --LEH). ]