

To: ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Subject: Problem: Multiple sources for Statements of Responsibility (RDA 2.4)

Background:

RDA appears to leave room for interpretation about the following situation:

A manifestation has only the creator's last name on the preferred source of information but has fuller and/or additional statements of responsibility elsewhere in the resource.

When presented with this situation, catalogers need to interpret the following instructions for *Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper*:

2.4.2.1 Scope

A **statement of responsibility relating to title proper** is a statement associated with the title proper of a resource that relates to the identification and/or function of any persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible for the creation of, or contributing to the realization of, the intellectual or artistic content of the resource.

2.4.2.2 Sources of Information

Take statements of responsibility relating to title proper from the following sources (in order of preference):

- a) the same source as the title proper (see [2.3.2.2](#))
- b) another source within the resource itself (see [2.2.2](#))
- c) one of the other sources of information specified at [2.2.4](#).

Interpretation #1:

Transcribe everything in its fullest form, regardless of where it is found in the resource. Although RDA 2.4.2.2 gives a list of sources in preference order, it does not say “from one of the following sources”. This implies that more than one source can be used. Catalogers following this interpretation believe that users will be best served by the fullest information available in the resource, whether or not it appears on the title page.

This approach moves away from faithfully transcribing the information found on the title page. However, RDA already supports that. If no statement of responsibility appears on the title page

but one is present elsewhere in the resource, then that statement is recorded with no indication that it is *not* on the preferred source.

Interpretation #2:

Transcribe what's on the title page, and transcribe any additional statements of responsibility from anywhere within the resource exactly as they appear. Do not use square brackets for information not taken from the preferred source.

This is a variation of interpretation #1. It would not allow for using a fuller form of a name if a shorter form appears on the preferred source.

Interpretation #3:

Transcribe what's on the title page, and supply additional statements of responsibility from elsewhere in the resource in square brackets. This is effectively what AACR2 instructed.

This approach is a variation of interpretation #2; the main difference is the use of square brackets.

Depending on the information added, this could essentially mimic the outcome from applying RDA 2.4.1.7, *Clarification of Role*. That instruction makes it clear that the information supplied comes from outside the resource; however, that would not be the case in this situation.

2.4.1.7 Clarification of Role

Add a word or short phrase if necessary to clarify the role of a person, family, or corporate body named in a statement of responsibility.

Indicate that the information was taken from a source outside the resource itself (see [2.2.4](#)).

Interpretation #4:

Transcribe what's on the title page and provide any additional information about statements of responsibility in a note, if desired.

This interpretation only uses a single source from 2.4.2.2.

Questions for discussion:

1. Which interpretation should be followed?

2. Should RDA be clarified to support that interpretation? If so, how?
3. What does it mean to have a statement of responsibility “associated with the title proper” (2.4.2.1) or “relating to the title proper” (2.4.2.2) if it can come from a different location in the resource?
4. Are there other RDA elements related to the manifestation that have similar interpretive problems?