

776-787-Multiple-Links

Problem: Use of multiple 776s when the related items are essentially not equivalent. It clearly has caused the incorrect assignment of ISSN-L in some cases. Likewise 776 is being used in OCLC's FRBR processing and potentially drawing the same kinds of incorrect conclusions as was the case for ISSN-L.

Why do some records have multiple 776 fields?

- Multiple print records were created according to earlier title change rules and corresponding online records are created according to current title change rules, which consider the change minor. The multiple 776 fields on the record for the online version are showing both a vertical relationship (a title change under earlier rules) and a horizontal relationship between two formats
- Multiple 776 fields have been used on records where integrating entry has been used to link separate print records to one record for the online.
- There is a one to many relationship between resources, e.g. a CD-ROM that contains digital content from several resources.

One proposed solution: Make use of 787 fields instead of 776 fields in these situations