To: ALA/ALCTS/CC:DA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From: Nathan Putnam, Chair, Task Force on Instructions for Recording Relationships

Subject: Instructions for Recording Relationships: Final Report (May 2013)

Introduction and Charge

The Task Force charge is to:

Investigate the instructions for recording relationships in RDA;

Consider the structure of elements for relationships and the instructions for recording relationships; and,

Draft instructions for recording structured descriptions of relationships, such as contents notes and accompanying material statements, taking into account the issues raised in the JSC Representative's discussion paper on this topic (CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/5).

The task force should submit an interim report at Midwinter 2013 and a final report at Annual 2013.

Summary and Recommendations

Task Force Recommendations:

- Review themes highlighted from the straw man proposal, which included the addition of instructions and more general guidelines; Some overarching changes to the chapters include:
    - Use appropriate RDA relationship designators from Appendix J in all examples
    - Incorporate additional examples
- Discuss the use of including non-ISBD punctuation examples
- Discuss the appropriate number of elements to include for a relationship description and the appropriateness/feasibility of including Manifestation-level elements when recording relationships at the Work or Expression level

The Task Force's Work

After Midwinter, the Task Force:

- Issued a straw man proposal to garner feedback;
- Incorporated feedback into the Task Force's working document;
- Revised the straw man proposal, concentrating on the examples first; and,
- Created a new set of questions for further discussion.

Based on a favorable response during the ALA Midwinter Meeting, the Task Force converted the straw man proposal to a wiki format and asked for comments and suggestions. Based on this feedback, the Task Force felt that the change in the overall structure of these instructions would benefit the cataloging community and provide better guidance for recording relationships between resources. The changes to the instructions expanded the general instructions on recording relationships and added instructions on recording structure descriptions. The comments and straw man poll can be found here:
http://wikis.ala.org/ccda/index.php/Task_Force_on_Instructions_for_Recording_Relationships

The first of two overarching minor changes to review is the inclusion of terms from Appendix J in all examples. All of the examples lacked the WEMI level qualifier and the Task Force recommends including only the full phrase from Appendix J or using an appropriate term in the same form when applicable. For example:

> *Continues:* Arctic & Antarctic regions = ISSN 1043-7479

… becomes …

> *Continues (work):* Arctic & Antarctic regions = ISSN 1043-7479

The second minor change is to include additional examples, especially to benefit those in the non-book cataloging environment. In the Task Force's working version of the straw man poll, the Task Force included many of the examples suggested in the wiki poll and included some additional music related examples. This heavily edited document will be available upon request but is left out of this report so as not to rehash six months worth of work and will be provided in its heavily edited form.

Having agreed on the process thus far, the Task Force then began to look at incorporating the new examples and additional instructions. This resulted in two large issues: the prolific use of ISBD punctuation in the examples, and which elements and how many to record for the related resource.

Issues for Discussion

Use of ISBD Punctuation in the Examples

The examples found in chapters 25-28 highlight a variety of issues, an important one being that every structured description assumes the use of the ISBD punctuation. It would be desirable to have examples that highlight other ways of conveying the same information, since RDA is meant to be output-neutral toward any type of encoding format.

Related to this problem is that the proposal instructs us to record the elements according to the relevant chapter's presentation of those elements, which is in direct contradiction to the order of ISBD elements and punctuation. This is a further argument for moving away from ISBD punctuation, but it would also leaves us without a standard to use in recording information given the current MARC format structure.

Example from 25.1.1.3 (current), 25.1.1.3.3 (straw man proposal)

> *Described in:* Virginia Woolf : a list of manuscripts. — London : Spencer, 1986

Possible revision:

> *Described in*: Virginia Woolf, a list of manuscripts; 1986; London, England; Spencer

(Note: other title information was used because it states the form of work.)

The Task Force recommends that members of CC:DA consider incorporating non-ISBD punctuation into the examples for these chapters.

Manifestation Elements for Work or Expression Relationships

Another pertinent issue is the inclusion of elements other than those specified. For example, in the structured description for Related Works, what is the minimum number of elements necessary for identification of the work? Instead of adhering to a minimum, should the cataloger also provide some information that identifies a manifestation that embodies the work? The purpose of the structure description is to indicate a relationship, but beyond having described that relationship, is more necessary, desirable, or helpful? How does it serve the user? If it is beneficial for the user, how can the cataloger judge which and how many elements to include?

The questions can also be approached from the opposite direction. If the cataloger needs a structured description of a related Work, should she be allowed to add Manifestation details? Probably the relationship designator should limit the details included. Due to the inherent relationships of the WEMI structure, if the cataloger needs the structured description of a related Manifestation, she must include the identifying details of the Work, as the Manifestation depends upon and implies the existence of the Work. But the opposite is not true. The cataloger could be dealing with the Work in the abstract, and not with any particular Manifestation. If that is true, then is it helpful to include any Manifestation details, even if a particular Manifestation is the trigger for the relationship?

Having discussed these important structured description issues at length over the course of the past year, the Task Force recommends a discussion of the issues above. The Task Force also recommends that a group be formed to examine the WEMI levels as they relate to structured descriptions. This Task Force can further investigate the complications that arise when crossing levels and and incorporate these finds with the new structure provided by the straw man proposal.

Submitted by Nathan Putnam (Chair) on behalf of the Task Force:
John Attig, Lori Dekydtspotter, Melanie Polutta, and Tracey Snyder.