SUMMARY

The cataloging treatment of reproductions at LC is being reconsidered as part of a full-scale reevaluation of cataloging policy decisions necessitated by the upcoming test of Resource Description and Access (RDA). Given that the basic approach to reproductions is the same in RDA as it is in AACR2, any new approach could be adopted even if RDA is not implemented at this time. The following discussion paper provides some background information on how LC’s policies came to differ from AACR2’s treatment of reproductions, possible approaches to implementing an AACR2/RDA-compatible treatment, and LC’s decisions on how its RDA testers will treat reproductions during the US RDA test.

The proposed policy is to base the record for a reproduction on the item in hand and to provide information about the original manifestation in a linking field. This policy will apply only when a decision to make a separate record for a reproduction has been made for LC’s catalog-- it has no impact on situations where a single record approach is used to represent LC’s analog content as well as a reproduction, as is often the case for LC’s digitization programs. The policy is also not intended to replace the “provider neutral” guidelines developed by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC). The provider neutral model is a practical solution developed to stem the confusion of having multiple records in the OCLC WorldCat database for reproductions that were essentially identical in content, but provided by different vendors or services.

The proposed policy to be tested at LC does apply to some situations beyond those covered under the existing LCRI for Chapter 11 (microform reproductions) and LCRI 1.11A (non-microform reproductions). Other equivalent manifestation relationships, e.g., monographic reprints/republications covered by LCRI 2.7B7, are to be considered under the broader definition of reproductions. The difference in the resulting records compared to current practice will be minimal for these republications: attributes of the original manifestation will be recorded in a different MARC field on the record for the reproduction (775/776 instead of 500/534).

LC will also assure that LC testers will catalog some typical reproductions to gain experience with the proposed approach and provide an opportunity to evaluate the proposal.

1 BACKGROUND

The cataloging treatment of reproductions was first described by Wesley Simonton in 1962 in an ARL study on bibliographic control of microforms. He identified two theories: the “facsimile theory” (primarily concerned with the intellectual content of the work) and the “edition theory” (primarily concerned with the physical object). Under the facsimile theory, the catalog record describes the original first (MARC 21 fields 245-4XX), with data relating to the reproduction being described in a note (field 533). The Simonton report recommended the “facsimile theory” be adopted. AACR1 incorporated this approach, calling for description of the original with information about the reproduction given in a note.

1The source of much of this background information is based on a paper by Crystal Graham, Microform Reproductions and Multiple Versions: U.S. Cataloging Policy and Proposed Changes in The Serials Librarian, v. 22, no. 1/2 (1992).
The second edition of AACR (AACR2) published in 1978 reversed this approach, calling for the resource at hand to be described in fields 245-4XX with information pertaining to the original given in a note. This approach created quite a stir within the U.S. Library community (e.g., “an obsession with principle to the exclusion of common sense.”). The Library of Congress considered the matter from both the processing and public service perspectives and announced in Cataloging Service, Bulletin 14, Fall 1981 that it would continue the practice followed under AACR1. The ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) sponsored extensive discussions of the matter and at its meeting on June 1981 in San Francisco voted to support LC’s approach. The JSC again discussed the matter on July 2, 1981 but decided not to take action with respect to rule revision, concluding that the matter had not been discussed as thoroughly in the other countries represented as in the United States. The LC Rule Interpretation “Chapter 11” (for microforms) was adopted by RLIN and OCLC and became a de facto national standard. A lengthy discussion on “multiple versions” also transpired, but no consensus was reached on an implementation scenario. In 1992, LC was asked by the University of Maryland to expand the reproduction concept to non-microform reproductions and LCRI 1.11A was created as a result. This LCRI was then expanded in 2000 at the request of OCLC, Inc. to reflect electronic reproductions.

Prior to 1981 most reproduction microforms in LC were added as copies to the record in the card shelflist for the original. In 1981 the decision was made to create separate records for microforms.

The successor standard to AACR2, Resource Description and Access (RDA) follows the same approach as AACR2. RDA 1.11.1 states: “When describing a facsimile or reproduction, record the data relating to the facsimile or reproduction in the appropriate element. Record any data relating to the original manifestation as an element pertaining to a related work or manifestation, as applicable.”

Terminology

The bibliographic universe contains many terms that may be understood differently in some contexts or when used by a given segment of the community. “Reproduction,” “republication,” “reprint,” “reissue,” and “facsimile,” just to name a few, are terms that some may consider synonyms but others may see as having meaningful distinctions. Although sometimes misconstrued, the LCRI for Chapter 11 was intended to be used only for reproductions of other physical resources, not for original microforms without a physical counterpart. The footnote for LCRI for 1.11A was even more restrictive as to what was considered a reproduction, specifically excluding republications and simultaneous publications in multiple formats. While it may be intellectually possible to distinguish preservation microforms made by a holding library, the transfer of a vinyl sound disc to a digital tape, or locally-digitized versions of analog content from commercially republished manifestations, it may not serve the user or the cataloger to adopt different cataloging treatments for these distinctions. Ideally, a single cataloging treatment may be found to relate the resulting manifestations, whether it is the type of reproduction described by the LCRIIs for 1.11A and Chapter 11 or for the republications covered by LCRI 2.7B7. The question of when the current reproduction policy should be applied was also addressed in the Guidelines for Bibliographic Description of Reproductions in section III (scope) and Appendix B.

Note that LC had already adopted an approach for its own digitization projects to reflect the details of digitization on the record for the original material rather than creating a separate record for the digital manifestation. LC does not plan to revisit that decision at this time.

Published by the American Library Association in 1995, Bruce Chr. Johnson, principal editor.
Consider the broadest definition of the word “reproduction” when used in subsequent sections of this document.

2 PROS/CONS

There are currently two approaches used in general cataloging at LC to describe reproductions, depending on the types of reproduction being considered. For reproductions covered by the LCRIs for 1.11A and Chapter 11, the record for the reproduction describes the original material, and a 533 note is used to describe the attributes of the reproduction. For the types of reproductions/republications described in LCRI 2.7B7, the record describes the item in hand and a general note (500) is used to record attributes of the original.

The main advantages for describing the original in a record for the reproduction:

• Representing the original most prominently in the record is useful for users focused on the characteristics of the original and may not be aware that a reproduction exists. It is to their advantage to have the data relating to the original presented in displays, including brief ones, derived from the record.

• “Cloning” the record for the original to create the basis for the reproduction records was seen as a necessary cataloging efficiency. At the time this approach was considered, there were substantial funds being spent on preservation activities and the concern about spending funds on “recataloging” instead of “preservation activity” itself may have influenced the decision.

The disadvantages of describing the original in a record for the reproduction:

• The item being cataloged is not being accurately described, the approach goes against the rules and therefore requires a separate guideline, and staff must take this variation into account. Users who know of the reproduction may fail to find the record if searching on the reproduction elements.

• At LC, because field 533 can be lengthy, a decision was made not to display it in the OPAC “brief display.” As a result, an observer may be mislead to believe that it is the original carrier that is held by the Library. This is mitigated, however, for some reproductions at LC by including the carrier as part of the call number (e.g., Microfilm 2008/10105) followed immediately by a “Request in:” statement that directs the user where to go to access the resource.

• The U.S. is the only major cataloging country following this approach.

The main advantages for the AACR2/RDA approach of describing the reproduction:

• One “catalogs what one sees,” following an important RDA objective and ICP principle of “representation.” No variant guideline is required; catalogers simply follow the rules.

• Users that know about the reproduction will be more successful in known item searching on the 4 IFLA’s International Cataloging Principles (ICP) available at http://www.ifla.org/files/cataloguing/icp/icp_2009-en.pdf
elements relevant to the reproduction.

- Displays can be adjusted to show details about the original and the reproduction.
- U.S. practice would follow the practice of other countries, increasing the likelihood that records from other countries could be used with little modification.

The disadvantage for the AACR2/RDA approach:

- The attributes of the original and reproduction, while recorded in both approaches, will be reflected in different MARC elements under the two approaches in catalogs with both legacy records and new records created under a revised approach if legacy records are not converted (see below for a discussion of legacy records).

### 3 METHODS OF EXPRESSING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN REPRODUCTIONS AND ORIGINALS

If the AACR2/RDA approach to describe the item in hand is followed, there are three possible techniques for recording relationships between the equivalent manifestations:

- Identifier for the related manifestation.
- Structured description of the related manifestation (i.e., a full or partial description of the related resource using the same order of elements that is used for the resource being described).
- Unstructured description of the related manifestation (i.e., a full or partial description of the related resource written as a sentence or paragraph).

Each of these three techniques may be accompanied by a “relationship designator” to indicate the nature of the relationship; a controlled vocabulary for relationship designators is found in RDA Appendix J. Even if RDA is not implemented, a list of relationship types could be adopted for use with MARC. RDA also allows, but does not require, the recording of reciprocal relationships when records for both the original and reproduction are made.

#### 3.1 MARC 21 Elements for Recording Relationships

*Note:* Appendix A identifies the specific subfields for the MARC fields mentioned in this section.

**Identifier for the related manifestation**

It is unlikely that an identifier alone (with or without a relationship designation) will satisfy all user tasks in the current environment unless records for both manifestations are present in the same catalog and the system supports navigation between records based on the identifier. The US RDA Test Coordinating Committee has decided that testers should not use the identifier alone for recording relationships during the test.

**Structured description of the related manifestation**

The attributes relevant to the related manifestations may be recorded using two different MARC 21 techniques: reciprocal note fields 533 (Reproduction note) and 534 (Original version note), or the linking entry fields 775 (Additional edition entry) and 776 (Additional physical form entry).
Field 533 could be used on a record for the original manifestation to indicate the facts about a known reproduction. Because field 533 has generally not been used in this manner\(^5\), it lacks subfields for recording attributes of the reproduction that may be different from the original manifestation (e.g., title, statement of responsibility, edition statement). The field may need to be repeated if the original has been reproduced more than once. There is no obvious subfield for recording the relationship designator (e.g., reproduced as), although the scope of $a could be revised or $i could be defined. On the record for the reproduction, field 534 may be used to produce a structured description of the original manifestation. Note that field 534 allows for a more robust description of the original than field 533 does for the reproduction.

The other technique in MARC to record a structured description would be the use of field 775/776. Like the identifier technique described above, 775/776 can be used to record the relationship designation ($i or $4), and an identifier for the related manifestation (e.g., $w, x, z, o), but several other subfields are defined to record other attributes of the related manifestation (e.g., main entry, edition, series statements, notes). The 775/776 field could be used reciprocally on both records, if desired, but presence of separate records is not a requirement for the use of linking entry fields in MARC. Note that when the LC reproduction policy was established in 1981, “format integration” was still many years away from implementation– the linking entry fields such as 775/776 were generally available only on records for serials.

Indexing some attributes of the equivalent manifestation may prove challenging given that a single subfield may contain multiple attributes (e.g., 775/776 $d contains place, publisher, and date of publication– the attributes are not parsed separately for easy machine manipulation).

**Unstructured description of the related manifestation**

In most cases, field 500 (General note) would be used to record an unstructured description of a related manifestation. The unstructured description could incorporate the relationship designator as well as attributes of the manifestation, although these attributes would not be parsed for machine manipulation, indexing, display, etc.

### 4 LC PSD RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The cataloging instructions should be applied as written for the RDA test– the record for a reproduction describes the item in hand.
2. A structured description should be used to record the attributes of the equivalent

\(^5\)Note that under the current LCRI practice, 533 fields are generally only found on records for reproductions. Under an AACR2/RDA scenario using the 533 as the structured description, the field would only be found on records for the original, if used at all.
manifestation/item relationship when the attributes of the original manifestation/item are known by the cataloger. Fields 775/776 are preferred over 533/534 to record the structured description because:

- 775/776 include subfields for recording the bibliographic elements as well as the identifiers for the different manifestations (field 533 lacks needed subfields).
- 775/776 are designed to generate a note, but also to provide machine linkage between the record for the target item and the record for the related item, if the related item is covered by a separate record. Many OPACs already provide functionality to display the relationships between records using the linking entry fields, as well as the ability for the user to navigate to associated records.
- Use of 775/776 will allow for a cleaner break with legacy practices and may prove to be less confusing than re-purposing the 533 field (under the current practice it records details about the reproduction on a record for the reproduction, under an AACR2/RDA approach it would contain details about the reproduction on a record for the original).
- The same field (775 or 776) can be used to record both sides of the reciprocal relationship, if both are made. PSD recommends only recording the relationship on the record for the reproduction (to the original), and not the reciprocal relationship on the record for the original (to the reproduction), with the exception of serials.

3. For reproductions, LC will generally use the relationship designators “reproduction of (manifestation)” and “reproduced as” rather than one of the more specific terms (e.g., facsimile, reprinted as) to simplify the process of choosing a relationship in an area where the meaning of terms is open to interpretation.

4. For the sake of simplicity, LC will consider the agency making the reproduction to be the publisher of the reproduction, lacking evidence to the contrary.

5. LC will investigate the use of a macro or software tool that will automatically build as much of the 775/776 data as possible based on the presence of a reciprocal record (when applicable), similar to the “Insert from Cited Record” feature in OCLC Connexion. Such a feature will ease the creation of the relationship fields and reduce keying errors.

6. LC will make a structured description of the original manifestation on the record for the reproduction; making a reciprocal structured description of the reproduction on the record for the original manifestation will be optional, but generally not made for monographs. Reciprocal structured descriptions will generally be made for serials.

7. LC will continue to follow current practice for determining the mode of issuance of a reproduction (e.g., a reproduction of a serial is generally cataloged as a serial).

8. LC will analyze legacy records to determine whether conversion to the new technique is possible and feasible.

9. LC will evaluate existing search indexes and displays to assure that attributes from both the original and reproduction are searchable and can be displayed. While some of the 775/776 subfields are already in composite indexes in LC’s system (e.g., 776$t is already part of the title keyword index), other subfields will need to be added to existing indexes where appropriate (e.g., 776$d to the publisher keyword index). This can be easily done.

10. LC will ask MARBI to consider whether additional development work may be necessary to adequately record attributes currently coded in 008 fields of the original record (such as a new fixed length control field for attributes of a related record, expanded definitions of existing fields (e.g., 044), or new subfields with controlled values (like $7 in field
533)). Scope notes may also need adjustment for 775 and 776.
APPENDIX A DETAILS ON MARC FIELDS 533, 534, 775 and 776

533 – Reproduction Note

Note: A “relationship identifier” (reproduced as) would likely need to be recorded in $a along with information about the type of reproduction.

$a - Type of reproduction (NR)
$b - Place of reproduction (R)
$c - Agency responsible for reproduction (R)
$d - Date of reproduction (NR)
$e - Physical description of reproduction (NR)
$f - Series statement of reproduction (R)
$m - Dates and/or sequential designation of issues reproduced (R)
$n - Note about reproduction (R)
$3 - Materials specified (NR)
$5 - Institution to which field applies (NR)
$7 - Fixed-length data elements of reproduction (NR)
   /0 - Type of date/Publication status
   /1-4 - Date 1
   /5-8 - Date 2
   /9-11 - Place of publication, production, or execution
   /12 - Frequency
   /13 - Regularity
   /14 - Form of item
$6 - Linkage (NR)
$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

534 – Original version note

Note: A “relationship identifier” (reproduction of (manifestation)) would likely need to be recorded in $p.

$a - Main entry of original (NR)
$b - Edition statement of original (NR)
$c - Publication, distribution, etc. of original (NR)
$e - Physical description, etc. of original (NR)
$f - Series statement of original (R)
$k - Key title of original (R)
$l - Location of original (NR)
$m - Material specific details (NR)
$n - Note about original (R)
$o - Other resource identifier (R)
$p - Introductory phrase (NR)
$t - Title statement of original (NR)
$x - International Standard Serial Number (R)
$z - International Standard Book Number (R)
$3 - Materials specified (NR)
$6 - Linkage (NR)
$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

775 – Other Edition Entry
First Indicator (Note controller)
0 - Display note
1 - Do not display note
Second Indicator (Display constant controller)
# - Available in another form
8 - No display constant generated

$a - Main entry heading (NR)
$b - Edition (NR)
$c - Qualifying information (NR)
$d - Place, publisher, and date of publication (NR)
$e - Language code (NR)
$g - Related parts (R)
$h - Physical description (NR)
$i - Relationship information (R)
$k - Series data for related item (R)
$m - Material-specific details (NR)
$n - Note (R)
$o - Other item identifier (R)
$r - Report number (R)
$s - Uniform title (NR)
$t - Title (NR)
$u - Standard Technical Report Number (NR)
$w - Record control number (R)
$x - International Standard Serial Number (NR)
$y - CODEN designation (NR)
$z - International Standard Book Number (R)
$4 - Relationship code (R)
$6 - Linkage (NR)
$7 - Control subfield (NR)
   /0 - Type of main entry heading
   /1 - Form of name
   /2 - Type of record
   /3 - Bibliographic level
$8 - Field link and sequence number (R)

776 – Additional Physical Form Entry
First Indicator (Note controller)
0 - Display note
1 - Do not display note
Second Indicator (Display constant controller)
# - Available in another form
8 - No display constant generated
APPENDIX B  COMPARISON OF CATALOGING APPROACHES

The following table compares the source of data elements in records for reproductions under the current practice and the proposed practice as described by AACR2 and RDA. For simplification purposes, the elements reflect a reproduction of a book; other elements may be required for other types of material. It is assumed that other name and subject access points would generally be the same under either approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data element (MARC 21)</th>
<th>Current practice</th>
<th>RDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007 Physical description fixed field</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 Type of date</td>
<td>Reproduction value used</td>
<td>Reproduction value used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 Dates</td>
<td>Reproduction (Date 1) and Original (Date 2)(^6)</td>
<td>Reproduction (Date 1) and Original (Date 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 Place of publication, etc.</td>
<td>Original (place of reproduction could be coded in 533 $7, but this subfield is not used at LC)</td>
<td>Reproduction (place of original could be coded in 044 if scope changes made in MARC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 Form of item</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
<td>Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008 All other positions</td>
<td>Would reflect both original and reproduction</td>
<td>Would reflect both original and reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 Title</td>
<td>Original, with addition of GMD in $h (Title, etc., of reproduction, if different could be recorded elsewhere in the description)</td>
<td>Reproduction; content type, media type and carrier type used instead of GMD (Title of original, if different, could be recorded in 775/776$b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250 Edition</td>
<td>Original (Edition of reproduction not recorded)</td>
<td>Reproduction (Edition of original in 775/776$s$b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) If multiple dates are available for the original publication, 008/11-14 (Date 2) on the record for the reproduction contains the earlier date from the original.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data element (MARC 21)</th>
<th>Current practice</th>
<th>RDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>260 Publication, etc.</td>
<td>Original (Publication, etc., information of reproduction in 533$bcd)</td>
<td>Reproduction (Publication, etc., information of original in 775/776$d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 Physical description</td>
<td>Original (Extent of reproduction in 533$e)</td>
<td>Reproduction (Extent of original in 775/776$h, and could be added as subunits in 300$a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 Series statement</td>
<td>Original (Series of reproduction in 533$f and 8XX (if used))</td>
<td>Reproduction (Series statement for original in 775/776$k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533 Reproduction note</td>
<td>Data pertinent to reproduction, including notes, etc.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>775 Other edition entry</td>
<td>LC monographs have used only $c Original and $w (LCCN of original), and not made a reciprocal link on the record for the original; practices for serials and integrating resources may vary</td>
<td>Use to record attributes of the original on a record for the reproduction, and vice versa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 1 illustrates reciprocal pairs of records (reproduction and original) using the 776 structured description technique for a reproduction in a different physical form, showing both a MARC view from the LC ILS cataloging module and LC’s OPAC display (four views):

Example 1, view 1:  Record for microfilm reproduction of book (catalog module view)
Example 1, view 2: Reciprocal record for book that has been reproduced (catalog module view); note that LC would not likely make this reciprocal relationship for monographs, provided here for illustration purposes.

Example 1, view 3: Record for microfilm reproduction of book (OPAC view)
Example 1, view 4: Reciprocal record for book that has been reproduced (OPAC view); note that LC will not likely make this reciprocal relationship for monographs, provided here for illustration.

Example 2 illustrates a regular print reproduction using the 775 structured description technique, showing both a MARC view from the LC ILS cataloging module and LC’s OPAC display (reciprocal records not illustrated):
Example 2 (view 1): Regular print reproduction (catalog module view)

Gold, gals, guns, guts: a history of Deadwood, Lead, and Spearfish,...

Type of Material: Book (Print, Microform, Electronic, etc.)
Related Names: Lee, Bob, 1930-
Lindstrom, Stan-
Lindstrom, Wynn-
Description: xvi, 259 pages : illustrations ; 26 cm.
ISBN: 0971517185 (pbk.)
Notes: Includes bibliographical references and index.
Subjects: Deadwood (S.D.)--History.
Lead (S.D.)--History.
Spearfish (S.D.)--History.
LC Classification: F659.02 S64 2004
Dewey Class No.: 970.3/91 22
Geographic Area Code: n-us-ed
Contact Type: text
Media Type: unmediated
Carrier Type: volume

Example 2 (view 2): Regular print reproduction (OPAC view)