

**Music Library Association (MLA)/
Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)
RDA Test Group
Discussion Summary Part 1: Major Issues with Access Points
5/20/11**

One of the most challenging areas for the MLA/OLAC RDA Test Group during our participation in the U.S. national libraries' official RDA test was the construction of access points, especially for expressions. This document summarizes the MLA/OLAC testers' informal discussions on access points. It does not constitute the formal position of either MLA or OLAC nor do all individual test participants necessarily agree with all the points made.

Contents

MLA/OLAC test participants	2
Test participants	2
Consultants	2
Testers from other sites who participated in the OLAC/MLA wiki and discussion list.....	2
Access points, especially for expressions	3
Selected rules related to work access points	3
From RDA 0.6.3:	3
Selected rules related to expression access points	4
From RDA 0.6.3 Recording Attributes of Work and Expression:	4
LCPS 0.6.3:.....	4
RDA 5.5 Authorized Access Points Representing Works and Expressions	5
RDA 6.27.3 Authorized Access Point Representing an Expression	5
Order of qualifiers (consistent, predictable, useful).....	9
Order listed in RDA 6.27.3	9
AACR2-compatible approaches	10
Extent of qualifications	11
Unique expressions.....	11
Classes of expressions.....	12
Work access points: a case for using only work access points.....	13
Anticipation of conflicts	14
Authority records for works and expressions.....	14
MARC subfield questions	14
\$s Version.....	14
\$f Date of work	14
\$h Medium.....	15
Original versions of works as expressions	15
Work vs. expression access points.....	16
Strings vs. long-term solutions	16
Moving images, languages and expression access points	17

Language information in expression access points	17
Using only work access points	19

MLA/OLAC test participants

Test participants

Marcia Barrett (OLAC), University of Alabama
 Nicholas Bennyhoff (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Vince Andrzejewski (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Edie Elliott (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Cheri Schuler-Faust (OLAC), Lewis & Clark Library System
 Linda Blair (MLA), Eastman School of Music
 Robert Bothmann (OLAC), Minnesota State University, Mankato.
 Sarah Cohen (MLA), Allen Music Library, Florida State University
 Keith Knop (MLA), Allen Music Library, Florida State University
 Grace Fitzgerald (MLA), University of Iowa
 Jean Harden (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
 Ralph Hartsock (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
 Mark McKnight (MLA), Univ. of North Texas Music Library
 Jeannette Ho (OLAC), Texas A&M University
 Mary Huisman (MLA), University of Minnesota
 Kristen Bergland (MLA), University of Minnesota
 Damian Iseminger (MLA), New England Conservatory of Music
 Darcy J. Nebergall (OLAC), King County Library System
 Anchalee (Joy) Panigabutra-Roberts (OLAC), University of Nebraska-Lincoln
 Karen Peters (MLA), UC Santa Barbara
 Alan Ringwood (MLA), University of Texas at Austin
 Marjie Lawrence (MLA), University of Texas at Austin
 Dana Tonkonow (OLAC), Central Connecticut State University
 Hermine Vermeij (MLA), UCLA
 Susan Wynne (OLAC), University of Wyoming

Consultants

Robert Freeborn (OLAC), Penn State University
 Kathy Glennan (MLA), University of Maryland
 Kelley McGrath (OLAC), University of Oregon (coordinator)
 Mark Scharff (MLA), Washington University in St. Louis

Testers from other sites who participated in the OLAC/MLA wiki and discussion list

Felecia Clifton (OLAC), University of North Dakota
 Greta de Groat (OLAC), Stanford University
 Nancy Lorimer (MLA), Stanford University
 Jennifer Eustis (OLAC), Northeastern University
 Karen Griggs (OLAC), Brigham Young University
 Marian Kelley (OLAC), Emory University

Access points, especially for expressions

We need more guidance on constructing access points, especially expression access points, more guidance on constructing title or name/title access points and guidance on when expression information *must* be in an access point, as opposed to recording it only elsewhere in the record. So far as we can tell, RDA does not prescribe any order for the elements of expression access points nor provide any guidance on what qualifiers should be chosen in what order to adequately identify an expression. If we are using string-based identifiers, it is important that they be consistently constructed and that the elements be ordered in a consistent, predictable and useful way. We are also uncertain whether expression access points should represent classes of expressions, as they did in AACR2, specific expressions or some combination of these two approaches, depending on circumstances. There may also be circumstances in which using only work access points would be more helpful to users. In order to apply RDA effectively in a shared cataloging environment, consensus and more guidance is needed on these issues.

Selected rules related to work access points

From RDA 0.6.3:

When recording data identifying a work, include as a minimum the elements listed below that are applicable and readily ascertainable.

Preferred title for the work
Identifier for the work

When the preferred title is recorded as part of the authorized access point representing the work, precede it, if appropriate, by the authorized access point representing the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work, as specified in the instructions given under 6.27.1.

If the preferred title for a work is the same as or similar to a title for a different work, or to a name for a person, family, or corporate body, record as many of the additional identifying elements listed below as necessary to differentiate them. Record the elements either as additions to the access point representing the work, as separate elements, or as both.

Form of work
Date of work
Place of origin of the work
Other distinguishing characteristic of the work

When identifying a *musical work with a title that is not distinctive*, record as many of the following elements as are applicable. For musical works with

distinctive titles, record as many of the following elements as necessary to differentiate the work from others with the same title. Record the elements either as additions to the access point representing the work, as separate elements, or as both.

- Medium of performance
- Numeric designation of a musical work
- Key

Selected rules related to expression access points

From RDA 0.6.3 Recording Attributes of Work and Expression:

When recording data identifying an expression, include as a minimum the elements listed below that are applicable to that expression.

- Identifier for the expression
- Content type
- Language of expression

Record as many of the additional identifying elements listed below as necessary to differentiate one expression of a work from another. Record the elements either as additions to the access point representing the expression, as separate elements, or as both.

- Date of expression
- Other distinguishing characteristic of the expression

LCPS 0.6.3:

LC practice: When ... recording an element to differentiate one work or expression from another work or expression or from a name for a person, family, or corporate body, always add the element to the access point.

RDA appears to say that elements that differentiate one expression from another have to be in the record somewhere, but not necessarily as part of an access point. The LCPS requires that date of expression when used as a distinguishing element, as well as any other distinguishing characteristic, be recorded as part of the access point. Does this imply that content type and language of expression do not need to be included in access points for expressions except when they are used as distinguishing characteristics?

RDA 5.5 Authorized Access Points Representing Works and Expressions

When constructing an authorized access point to represent a work or expression, use the preferred title for the work (see 6.2.2) as the basis for the access point. If applicable, construct the authorized access point representing the work by combining (*in this order*):

- a) the authorized access point for the person, family, or corporate body responsible for the work (see 6.27.1.2–6.27.1.8)
- b) the preferred title for the work (see 6.2.2).

If two or more works are represented by the same or similar access points, add to the access point representing the work an element or elements such as form of work, date, place of origin, or other distinguishing term. For specific instructions on additions to access points representing works, see 6.27.1.9.

When constructing an authorized access point to represent a part or parts of a work, apply the instructions given under 6.27.2.

When constructing an authorized access point to represent a particular expression of a work or of a part or parts of a work, add to the authorized access point representing the work or a part or parts of the work an element or elements identifying that expression (see 6.27.3).

Here RDA does spell out a general order of

person/family/corporate body + work title
(and seemingly) + additional work elements + expression elements.

RDA 9.19.1.1 (General Guidelines on Constructing Authorized Access Points to Represent Persons) lists potential additions for distinguishing names of persons that are to be added “in that order, as applicable.” However, RDA does not provide any explicit ordering within additional work and expression elements (RDA 6.27.1.9 and 6.27.3) and only says that they should be added “as applicable.” LC has construed this to mean that the question of how finely to distinguish among expressions is left to cataloger’s judgment. Although that may work, it is unlikely that leaving order of elements to cataloger’s judgment will result in a coherent and useful browse list.

RDA 6.27.3 Authorized Access Point Representing an Expression

Construct an access point representing a particular expression of a work or a part or parts of a work by adding to the authorized access point representing the work (see 6.27.1) or the part or parts (see 6.27.2), as applicable:

- a) a term indicating content type (see 6.9)
 - b) the date of the expression (see 6.10)
 - c) a term indicating the language of the expression (see 6.11)
- and/or
- d) a term indicating another distinguishing characteristic of the expression (see 6.12).

RDA 6.27.3 examples of expression access points

Goncourt, Edmond de, 1822–1896. Frères Zemganno. English
 Pushkin, Aleksandr Sergeevich, 1799–1837. Evgeniï Onegin. English (Beck)
 Kolloidnyi zhurnal. English
 Piave, Francesco Maria, 1810–1876. Ernani. Spanish
 Brunhoff, Jean de, 1899–1937. Babar en famille. English. Spoken word
 Wilde, Oscar, 1854–1900. Works. 2000
 Shakespeare, William, 1564–1616. Works. 2003. Yale University Press
 Langland, William, 1330?–1400? Piers Plowman (C-text)
 Nutcracker (Choreographic work : Baryshnikov)

The second example modifies the authorized access point for a translation by the translator. The Brunhoff example adds a term for content type rather than translator. All the rest of the examples have what look like "normal" uniform titles under AACR2. For instance, the first one is for a translation of a single work, so presumably the translator is known or can be found, but the authorized access point is not modified by translator. It *is* modified by language, though, so it's not simply an authorized access point for the work. Although the text of RDA provides some guidance on when expressions should be explicitly differentiated, it is silent on how much of that differentiation should take place in access points. It is also silent on the order of additions, which is important to creating a list that is usefully browsable. In a shared cataloging environment, if there is no general agreement on practice, we may end up with jumbled lists like the following.

Homer. Iliad. English. 2004
 Homer. Iliad. English. Fagles. Spoken word
 Homer. Iliad. English. Lattimore
 Homer. Iliad. English. Spoken word
 Homer. Iliad. English. Spoken word. 2006
 Homer. Iliad. English. Spoken word. Lattimore
 Homer. Iliad. English. Worsley

RDA 17.3 Core Elements [for primary relationships, i.e., “relationships between a work, expression, manifestation, and item that are inherent in the FRBR definitions of those entities”]

When recording primary relationships, include as a minimum the work manifested. If there is more than one expression of the work, record the expression manifested.

Interpretation: Always record the work using one of the methods given in chapter 17. If there is more than one expression of that particular work out there (How do we know this? In what universe? Do we go back and fix early records that later acquire new expressions?), record the expression relationship.

If more than one work is embodied in the manifestation, only the predominant or first-named work manifested is required.

Interpretation: For a collection of short films or a typical music CD, it's only necessary to record a relationship for the first or top-billed work.

If more than one expression is embodied in the manifestation, only the predominant or first-named expression manifested is required.

Interpretation: If multiple soundtracks options on a DVD are considered to be independent expressions, catalogers are only required to make a relationship for the first or predominant one.

Chapter 17 isn't about access points specifically, but about recording relationships among the FRBR group 1 bibliographic entities. RDA says this can be done in three ways" (1) identifiers; (2) access points; or (3) composite descriptions.

17.4.2.1 **Identifier** for the Work, Expression, Manifestation, or Item
Provide an identifier for the work, expression, manifestation, or item, formulated according to the instructions given under 6.8 (identifiers for works) ... as applicable.

LC has ruled out this option for the test and it isn't clear how this would work with MARC.

17.4.2.2 **Authorized Access Point** Representing the Work or Expression
Provide one or other of the following:

- a) an authorized access point representing the work, constructed according to the instructions given under 6.27.1–6.27.2.
- b) an authorized access point representing the expression, constructed according to instructions given under 6.27.3.

LCPS 17.4.2.2

LC practice: Record an authorized access point representing the expression.

We had initially interpreted the LCPS for 17.4.2.2 to say that the expression manifested relationship is ALWAYS recorded as an access point. An alternative reading says that IF the access point convention is used for relationship recording, use an expression access point. So the work or expression manifested could be just as easily described in a composite manner. This would seem to imply a bibliographic record with no work or expression access points, but these are not uncommon in current cataloging.

17.4.2.3 *Composite Description*

Prepare a composite description that combines one or more elements identifying the work and/or expression with the description of the manifestation.

EXAMPLE

Beethoven, Ludwig van, 1770–1827. Sonatas, violin, piano, no. 2, op. 12, no. 2, A major. Allegro piacevole; arranged
Divertimento, op. 12, no. 2 / L. van Beethoven ; transcribed for woodwind by George J. Trinkaus. — New York : M. Witmark & Sons, ©1933. — *Arranged for flute, oboe, clarinet, horn, and bassoon*
(Medium of performance of musical content—an attribute of the expression—combined with the description of the manifestation)

A composite description is essentially a bibliographic record. In this approach some or all of the elements identifying the work or expression are put in the body of the bibliographic record rather than in the access point. In the examples given, the elements added to the body of the description are often in a free text form and not easily made into machine-actionable data. This approach grandfathers in many of the things we do with existing AACR2 records.

RDA 17.4.1 mentions that

The relationship between a work and a manifestation that embodies that work may also be recorded without identifying the expression through which the work is realized (see 17.7 (manifestation of work) and 17.8 (work manifested)).

Does this mean that it is not necessary to identify the expression at all, although other language in RDA suggests that the expression relationship is core if more than one expression exists?

RDA 17.8 (work manifested) is a core element. The examples do not appear significantly different from work expressed.

LCPS 17.8 says that

For resources other than compilations, this core element [work manifested] is covered by the authorized access point for the work when present in a MARC bibliographic record (not possible to give this core element separately in a MARC record). For compilations of works, give an analytical authorized access point for

the predominant or first work in the compilation when it represents a substantial part of the resource. Disregard contributions such as a preface or introductory chapter. Generally, do not apply this core element to anthologies of poetry, conference proceedings, journals, collections of interviews or letters, and similar resources.

Order of qualifiers (consistent, predictable, useful)

Although in the future we may not be dependent on alphabetical lists of strings for navigation and browsing, current catalog data does not support any viable alternatives. However, it is not clear to us that RDA provides sufficient guidance on constructing authorized access points for use in a shared cataloging environment. Either RDA needs more specific instructions or external guidelines need to be developed.

A consistent, predictable order of elements is essential for string-based access points to work in a left-anchored browse list. Under AACR2, two music catalogers working independently on the same piece would reliably produce the same expression access point. RDA does not appear to provide sufficient guidance to do the same.

In addition, the order of elements needs to be arranged in a way that optimizes the usefulness of the resulting array for patrons. In a one-dimensional string it is impossible to meet all users' needs, but an order should be chosen that is anticipated to meet as many typical anticipated uses as possible.

RDA 6.27.3 gives several types of information that may be added to expression access points:

1. content type
2. date of expression
3. language of the expression
4. other distinguishing characteristic of the expression

RDA does not prescribe an order for adding these elements to expression access points. In addition, neither MARC, ISBD, nor Appendix E (Record Syntaxes for Access Point Control) give any guidance on this issue. We explored two main methods for ordering distinguishing elements in access points.

Order listed in RDA 6.27.3

This method seems mostly like to produce a replicable string. That is, two catalogers working independently are likely to agree in their interpretation. However, it does not seem to lead to an optimal arrangement for user browsing and would not interfile helpfully with existing access points.

Német táncok. \$h Notated music. \$f 1995. \$l German.
Német táncok. \$h Notated music. \$f 1995. \$l German, \$o arranged.
Német táncok. \$h Notated music. \$f 1995. \$l English.

Német táncok. \$h Notated music. \$f 2005. \$l German.
Német táncok. \$h Performed music. \$f 1995. \$l German.

Single work or non-distinctive part of a work (non-music):

\$a/t Title (Form : Date of work : Place : Other distinguishing characteristic of work). \$n/p Part designation. \$h Content type. \$f Date of expression. \$l Language. \$s Other distinguishing characteristic of expression

Single work or part of a work, non-distinctive title (Music)

\$a/t Title, \$m medium, \$n number, \$r key (Date of work/expression : Place : Other distinguishing characteristic : Sketches [if the U.T. was for the part, Sketches would follow the part title in curved brackets]). \$n/p Part title; \$h Content type. \$f Date of expression. \$l Language., \$o arranged \$s Vocal/chorus score/other. \$s Other distinguishing characteristic of expression

Single work or part of a work, distinctive title (Music)

\$a/t Title (Other distinguishing characteristic), \$m medium, \$n number, \$r key (Date : Place : Other : Sketches [if the U.T. was for the part, Sketches would follow the part title in curved brackets]). \$n/p Part title; \$h Content type. \$f Date of expression. \$l Language, \$o arranged. \$s Vocal/chorus score/other. \$s Other distinguishing characteristic of expression

Conventional collective title (Works or Works. Selections)

\$a/t Title. \$h Content type. \$f Date of expression. \$l Language. \$s Version.

AACR2-compatible approaches

Some sort of approach based on AACR2 with RDA-specific elements added at the end of the string. However, it doesn't seem quite right to rely on AACR2 for something like this and there would be no guarantee that everyone using RDA would make this choice.

Német táncok. \$l English. \$f 1995. \$h Notated music.
Német táncok. \$l German. \$f 1995, \$o arranged. \$h Notated music.
Német táncok. \$l German. \$f 1995. \$h Notated music.
Német táncok. \$l German. \$f 1995. \$h Performed music.
Német táncok. \$l German. \$f 2005. \$h Notated music.

Single work or non-distinctive part of a work (non-music)

\$a/t Title (Form : Date of work/expression : Place : Other distinguishing characteristic of work/expression). \$n/p Part designation. \$l Language. \$h Content type

Single work or part of a work, non-distinctive title (Music)

\$a/t Title, \$m medium, \$n number, \$r key (Date of work/expression : Place : Other distinguishing characteristic : Sketches [if the U.T. was for the part, Sketches would follow the part title in curved brackets]). \$n/p Part title; \$o arranged. \$s Vocal/chorus score/other. \$l Language. \$h Content type.

Single work or part of a work, distinctive title (Music)

\$a/t Title (Other distinguishing characteristic), \$m medium, \$n number, \$r key (Date : Place : Other : Sketches [if the U.T. was for the part, Sketches would follow the part title in curved brackets]). \$n/p Part title; \$o arranged. \$s Vocal/chorus score/other. \$l Language. \$h Content type.

Conventional collective title (Works or Works. Selections)

\$a/t Title. \$l Language. \$f Date of expression. \$s Version. \$h Content type.

If the term Selections is used to represent two or more parts of a work, it should be added as the next to last element before the content type. For music, if the designation “arranged” is used, the formulation \$k Selections; \$o arranged should appear before the content type, but after all other elements.

One person suggested that for music it might be useful to privilege \$o (arranged statement for music), \$s (version), and \$l (language of a work) so that catalogers would add those first and then include additional information at the end of the string when necessary to distinguish.

Extent of qualifications

How many and what kind of qualifying elements should be added to a work access point to describe an expression?

There are three general means of approaching this question. Access points could be given for

1. Unique expressions
2. Classes of expressions
3. Works only

Unique expressions

If we are using expression access points rather than work access points, is it necessary or useful to create access points that contain enough information to differentiate between each and every unique expression of a work (e.g., an access point for each unique publication and performance of Beethoven’s 9th) as RDA seems to suggest? To what extent can unique

expressions be differentiated in practice? What are the implications of this approach, especially for music? Will there be an authorized access point for each unique recorded performance of a work?

Higdon, Jennifer, 1962- Zaka. Performed music (Eighth Blackbird (Musical group))

Or score that has been edited?

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756-1791. Concertos, bassoon, orchestra, K. 191, B ♭ major (Herttrch); arranged (Petrenz))

Will users be helped by lengthy lists separating out all the variations under musical works that have been performed many times? How easy will such lists be to navigate?

Classes of expressions

Should we include some expression information only in the body of the description (i.e., use a composite description) and consider that sufficient? Is it preferable to continue to differentiate only between classes of expressions in access points as we have done under AACR2? In just some cases?

If not every piece of distinguishing information belongs in an access point, what sorts of things are usefully distinguished in access points? For example, how useful is the distinction between notated music and performed music in access points? They clearly do represent different expressions so perhaps they just seem odd because we haven't done this in the past? Is what is appropriate or helpful to add in one collection different from what is needed in another collection? What are the implications of this for shared cataloging? How will we cope with local variation in needs or desires for expression differentiation? For instance, perhaps it will be useful to add content type to headings in a catalog where the public display doesn't show icons or some other indication of the content type. Since content type is unlikely to be useful to many libraries in access points, should it only be added locally by those who wish to use it?

Is it useful to append things like arranged, etc. on to headings because they collocate important groupings of expressions together in a browse list? Users may prefer not to have the arrangements mixed up with the originals.

Perhaps the ability of an expression element to provide meaningful collocation in a browse list could be the key criteria for determining whether or not an expression element is included in an access point. For music, this could mean including "arranged", "vocal score" or "chorus score" or other \$s information, plus language whenever it is applicable. The other expression information would be added only rarely when it is needed in a particular case.

A similar approach would be to use as a determining factor how many Core elements need to be recorded in order to differentiate between titles within a file that are the same or similar. Additionally, with the exception of motion pictures and television programs, the guiding

principle for conflict resolution in AACR2 is to not provide distinguishing information that would be the same across all titles within a file. That principle could be carried over from the construction of AACR2 headings.

Work access points: a case for using only work access points

Uniform titles in AACR2 serve three purposes: collocation, identification, and differentiation of works (in the AACR2 sense). For works in the RDA/FRBR sense, work access points work just fine. They can do the things that AACR2 described. But expression access points, at least as RDA views them, really only serve to differentiate, because expressions, especially for music, tend to be unique. Appending arr., Vocal score, etc. was a handy device to collocate bibliographic records together. We never thought of it in terms of expressions. We were thinking in terms of a browsable file and thought it was helpful in this type of environment to collocate the arrangements, etc. together.

In RDA, collocation really isn't one of the purposes of recording work and expression data. According to RDA 5.2, besides the FRBR objectives of find, identify, and select, the other goals are differentiation and representation. Authorized access points are collocation mechanisms for works and this is made explicit in 6.0 in the lists of purposes for an authorized access point. It is not to collocate different manifestations of the same expression together. If the purpose of recording work and expression data is differentiation (which can be recorded anywhere), but the main purpose of access points is to collocate works together, then why do we need, in the form of an authorized access point, this extremely long text string?

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 1756-1791. Concertos, bassoon, orchestra, K. 191, B ♭ major (Herttrch); arranged (Petrenz)

What does this tell the user that isn't already recorded in the rest of the bibliographic record?

Why would we want to clutter a browsable file like this? The logical endpoint of this approach is screen after screen after screen of headings for just sound recordings of Beethoven's 9th. This one's by Berlin with Karajan, this one with Berlin by Abbado and so on. For music at least, a more effective approach in current catalogs for formulating the relationships required by chapter 17 is to provide an access point representing the work for the Work Manifested relationship and to use a composite description for the Expression Manifested relationship. This would mean (and this is a departure from current practice) that things such as "arranged," "Vocal score" or language would no longer be recorded in the access point. There are other fields within the MARC formats that can accommodate this important information. We need to get away from the old thinking that we have to load up headings with all the possible relevant information that a patron needs to know. In the computer age, a work heading does not need to do all the heavy lifting. Let other parts of the record do their job. Let authorized access point do what they are good at, which is collocation of works.

Anticipation of conflicts

There was some feeling within the group that only including expression information when it's necessary to differentiate within a given file will create an unhelpful file where the first expression would have the work access point and additional expressions would have distinguishing qualifiers added. However, it was pointed out that this is more tied to shared community norms such as NACO where current practice would be to add something to both access points if there is a conflict between expressions. On the other hand, some expressed the opinion that proactively adding differentiating information when it is in hand and easy to do so often saves work in the long run.

Should catalogers add only enough information to distinguish the expression in the file they are working on at the top of cataloging or are there circumstances where proactively including additional information in authorized access should be permitted or even encouraged? Should this additional information only be added in other authority record fields in anticipation of software that will be able to automatically update expressions to distinguish them should that become necessary.

Authority records for works and expressions

What work and expression records do we make authority records for and how? Currently not all authorized access points for works and expressions require authority records. Would it be useful to increase the proportion of authority records made to prepare for an environment where the different FRBR group 1 entities might have their own records?

MARC subfield questions

\$s Version

RDA 17.10.1.3 gives the example:

Blade runner (Motion picture : Final cut)

If final cut is version information about a particular expression, would this not be better as:

Blade runner (Motion picture). \$s Final cut

Is what goes in the parentheses without separate subfielding always work information while what goes in \$s is expression information?

\$f Date of work

MARC defines \$f in the uniform title fields as follows

\$f - Date of a work

Date of publication used in a uniform title field.

730 0# \$a Bible. \$l Latin. \$s Vulgate. \$f 1454?

130 0# \$a Tosefta. \$l English. \$f 1977.

Despite being called date of work, it seems to actually be used as either a date or expression or date of manifestation, which is reflected in the examples.

A date added parenthetically to distinguish between identical uniform titles (works?) is not separately subfield coded.

RDA 6.1, 6.4

130 0# \$aKing Kong (1933)

130 0# \$aKing Kong (1976)

This is confusing and the lack of subfielding in parentheses is not optimal for computer processing.

One example in our practice record set used \$n to specify date of expression. Is this correct? Some of our group suggested that \$n with parentheses is AACR2 practice and that possibly RDA should have \$f without parentheses.

700 12 Scarlatti, Alessandro, †d 1660-1725. †t Venere, Adone, et Amore †n (1696). †l Italian.

700 12 Scarlatti, Alessandro, †d 1660-1725. †t Venere, Adone, et Amore. †n (1706). †l Italian.

Should this be

700 12 Scarlatti, Alessandro, †d 1660-1725. †t Venere, Adone, et Amore †f 1696. †l Italian.

700 12 Scarlatti, Alessandro, †d 1660-1725. †t Venere, Adone, et Amore. †f 1706. †l Italian.

\$h Medium

Content type maps to \$h.

Star wars (Motion picture). \$h Two-dimensional moving image

Német táncok. \$h Notated music

Original versions of works as expressions

In AACR2 uniform titles such as Homer. Iliad do double duty as access points for the work and as access points for expressions in the original Greek. Since FRBR considers language to be only an expression-level characteristic, RDA makes no distinction between original and translation languages and tells catalogers to add language to all expressions when it is needed for differentiation. RDA 6.11 currently says

Language of expression is a core element when needed to differentiate an expression of a work from another expression of the same work.

There may be advantages to describing the expression characteristics of the original version in access points in ways that we didn't under AACR2. One participant thought that adding original language to title access points for works such as operas in the original language would be beneficial for patrons. Patrons find it difficult to realize and remember that an opera in the original language may show in the catalog either with no language at the end of the uniform title, with more than one language at the end of the uniform title, with the original named last in a series of languages at the end of the uniform title, or even with Polyglot at the end of the uniform title and the languages named in a note. Although it would require catalogers to do more typing, it would be vastly simpler for patrons if all versions of Don Giovanni with Italian text (whether other languages are present or not) would show in the catalog as Don Giovanni. Italian.

However, LC has proposed that RDA be modified so that language would only be core for translations of various types (http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/6JSC_Sec_1_LC_response_LC_addendum.pdf). LC's proposed RDA 6.11:

Language of expression is a core element when needed to differentiate a translation or a simultaneous language version of a work from the original expression of the same work.

Work vs. expression access points

RDA 17.4.2.2 says to provide either an access point for the work or one for the expression. The related LCPS says LC practice is to record an authorized access point representing the expression.

When do we want to have access points representing works and when we do want to have access points representing expressions? Would there be value to having two access points in each record—one for the work and one for the expression?

Are there situations in which work access points would be preferable? Some members of the test group think this approach would be preferable for most moving images (see discussion on moving images below).

Strings vs. long-term solutions

Current cataloging relies primarily on string-based access points to provide any sort of machine-actionable data describing and distinguishing works and expressions. Does it really make sense for us to try to expand the sorts of information that we put in strings? Should we rather focus on finding ways to put structured data about works and expression in bibliographic and authority records and then populating those fields so we have suitable data when our data formats and tools catch up with RDA?

Moving images, languages and expression access points

Language information in expression access points

We would like an option where we don't need to create language expression access points for moving images. There are a number of difficulties associated with recording language of expression in access points for these materials and the benefits are unclear.

We are not sure how RDA intends to treat the different types of language access found on moving images. Are only spoken or sung languages intended to be included in access points or are subtitle languages also to be included? If both types of languages are intended to be included, is there a method for distinguishing them? Should plain English subtitles be distinguished from captions and subtitles for the deaf and hard of hearing (SDH)?

It is also unclear how RDA interprets individual expressions in terms of the variety of language options available on many DVDs.

The instructions under RDA 6.11 (language of expression) are not informative. Catalogers are instructed

If the expression involves more than one language, follow the additional instructions given under 6.11.1.4

For guidelines on recording details relating to the language of expression, see the instructions on language of the content given under 7.12

RDA 6.11.1.4 states that

If a single expression of a work involves more than one language, record each of the languages.

7.12 (language of the content) appears to be the equivalent of a language note that could be put in 546 and is not related to structured access.

LCPS 6.27.1.9 appendix 1 gives this example of a bibliographic record for a motion picture with the original language and two dubbed versions

130 0# \$a To live and die in L.A. \$l English, French & Spanish.
245 10 \$a To live and die in L.A. ...

Original in English, dubbed in French and Spanish

Here are several approaches to constructing expression access points for a typical DVD with English and French soundtracks and optional English and Spanish subtitles.

Only give soundtrack languages; consider each language option to be a separate expression

Dracula. \$I English

Dracula. \$I French

Only give soundtrack languages; consider the DVD as a whole to be a separate expression

Dracula. \$I English & French

Give both soundtrack and subtitle languages without distinction; consider each language option to be a separate expression

Dracula. \$I English

Dracula. \$I French

Dracula. \$I Spanish

Give both soundtrack and subtitle languages with some sort of distinction (not explicit in RDA, but perhaps could be considered other distinguishing information); consider each language option to be a separate expression

Dracula. \$I English (soundtrack)

Dracula. \$I English (subtitles)

Dracula. \$I French (soundtrack)

Dracula. \$I Spanish (subtitles)

Give both soundtrack and subtitle options languages without distinction; consider the DVD as a whole to be a separate expression. Note that this is indistinguishable from a film, such as Babel, that was made with a mixed language soundtrack.

Dracula. \$I English, French & Spanish

Give both soundtrack and subtitle options languages with some sort of distinction; consider each combination of soundtrack and subtitle options to be a separate expression. This approach would lead to a large number of expression access points on many DVDs.

Dracula. \$I English (soundtrack)

Dracula. \$I English (soundtrack) & English (subtitles)

Dracula. \$I English (soundtrack) & Spanish (subtitles)

Dracula. \$I French (soundtrack)

Dracula. \$I French (soundtrack) & English (subtitles)

Dracula. \$I French (soundtrack) & Spanish (subtitles)

DVDs tend to offer many language options. The outliers may contain as many as ten or fifteen soundtracks. Is it helpful to users to add authorized access points for all of these to feature film

records that are already very long? RDA 17.3 does provide an option to identify only the predominant or first-named expression (which in the case of DVDs would be largely arbitrary), but this would seem to undermine the usefulness of these expression access points in that they would no longer be predictable for users. Users would have no way to know why some language options warrant expression access points qualified by language and others don't. This would limit the usefulness of this approach as a search tool.

The larger question is, are these expression access points qualified by language useful to patrons? Is this an effective mechanism for providing access to language expressions for moving images or would it be better to rely on system limiters based on information in MARC 041 and eye-readable information in the language note as we do now?

Using only work access points

For moving images, recording only work access points might be a preferable approach. It is not clear how to make language and widescreen/full screen qualifiers useful in a browse list and it is unclear that most users of moving images are likely to perform left-anchored browse searches in an attempt to identify these variations. Using \$s to bring out things like theatrical release, director's cut and unrated version might possibly be useful, although these are usually given in the edition statement. One approach would be to

- Make only Work-level access points for moving image works.
- Use composite descriptions (i.e., information in the body of record) to distinguish expressions.

In order to prepare for future record structures we recommend recording as much additional data about the work in the bibliographic record in machine-actionable form as possible. This would include

- 041\$h for original language
- 046\$k for original date
- 130 uniform title even when there's no conflict
- 257 country of production
- \$e/\$4 for 1xx/7xx names