

Demonyms for Local Places in LC Demographic Group Terms Analysis of the Issues

A Thought Experiment by the Library of Congress' Policy and Standards Division

November 3, 2015

Executive Summary

Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT) will be used to describe the creators of, and contributors to, resources, and also the intended audiences of resources. It is being developed in stages by the Policy and Standards Division (PSD) of the Library of Congress, which approved almost 400 terms as the first phase of the pilot vocabulary in June 2015. Phase 2 will include hundreds of additional terms that will be approved by the end of 2015.

The intent of the pilot is to test the principles guiding the development of LCDGT, to provide consistent patterns for future development, and to generate discussion within the library community. One of the most significant outstanding issues relates to demonyms, which are the words that the residents or inhabitants of a place use to refer to themselves (e.g., people from the United States are Americans). Phase 1 of the pilot included terms that describe people from continents, supra-national regions, countries, first-order administrative subdivisions of countries (henceforth ADM1s), and sub-national regions that encompass multiple ADM1s.

PSD has decided in principle that demonyms for the residents of places within ADM1s may be included in LCDGT, but the appropriate level of disambiguation among demonyms that are, or that may be, used to refer to people from unrelated places must be determined, as must the form of qualifier.

This paper first summarizes the discussions of PSD policy specialists and others as they attempted to decide on the appropriate level of disambiguation and the form of qualifier to create unique strings. Some of the solutions seemed to be cumbersome and could therefore negatively impact the long-term sustainability of LCDGT, so three "outside the box" options are also presented:

- Limit conflict to LCDGT, instead of anticipating conflict when multiple places share the same name, and, presumably, a demonym. This option has some merit, but does not obviate the need for qualifiers and would create more authority and bibliographic maintenance than anticipating conflict would.
- Post-coordinate demonyms for local places and their superior jurisdictions instead of creating unique strings. This approach would not resolve all of the conflicts, and could cause confusion when a local place and an ADM1 have the same demonym.
- Include demonyms for local places only as UF references to those for ADM1s. Again, this would not obviate the need for disambiguation since ADM1s and local places may share demonyms.

PSD is requesting feedback and suggestions, which may be sent to Janis L. Young at jayo@loc.gov by January 30, 2016.

Demonyms for Local Places in LC Demographic Group Terms Analysis of the Issues

A Thought Experiment by the Library of Congress' Policy and Standards Division

November 3, 2015

Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT) is a new vocabulary that will be used to describe the creators of, and contributors to, resources, and also the intended audiences of resources. It is being developed in stages by the Policy and Standards Division (PSD) of the Library of Congress, which approved almost 400 terms as the first phase of the pilot vocabulary in June 2015. Hundreds more terms will be approved by the end of 2015 and will constitute phase 2 of the pilot.

The intent of the pilot is to test the principles guiding the development of LCDGT, to provide consistent patterns for future development, and to generate discussion within the library community. One of the most significant outstanding issues relates to demonyms, which are the words that the residents or inhabitants of a place use to refer to themselves (e.g., people from the United States are Americans).

The first phase of the pilot included terms that describe people from continents (e.g., Europeans), supra-national regions (Central Europeans), countries (Germans), first-order administrative subdivisions of countries (Bavarians), and sub-national regions that encompass multiple first-order administrative subdivisions (New Englanders). It did not include demonyms for the people from cities (e.g., Pittsburghers) and other lower-level jurisdictions, or for regions within a single first-order administrative subdivision (Upstate New Yorkers) because discussions on whether to include them were ongoing.

PSD has decided in principle that demonyms referring to the residents of jurisdictions and regions within first-order administrative subdivisions may be included in LCDGT. Before they can be included, though, some practical problems must be resolved. The appropriate level of disambiguation among demonyms that are, or that may be, used to refer to people from unrelated places must be determined. That decision will influence the form of the authorized term, and especially the form of qualifier. The solutions to the problems must be consistent and simple enough to allow for the long-term sustainability of the vocabulary.

The following is a thought experiment that describes those problems and the options that PSD has considered for resolving them, in the order in which they were considered. PSD is soliciting feedback on the discussion presented below, and is also open to other suggestions. A summary and questions to consider follow the discussion. Feedback and suggestions may be sent to Janis L. Young at jayo@loc.gov through January 30, 2016.

BACKGROUND

The following facts and suppositions led PSD to agree in principle that demonyms for lower-level jurisdictions and regions should be included in LCDGT.

- Literary collections are often geographically focused; editors often compile fiction, poetry, etc., by people from a region, country, or city.

- Authors of individual literary works often self-identify as being from local places (e.g., San Francisco, New York City, Paris).
- LCSH permits geographic subdivision of certain literary form headings in order to bring out the geographic focus of collections, but LCSH form headings will eventually cease to be assigned to literary works. When that happens, the information contained in the geographic subdivision will be lost unless other provision is made for it.
- Scholars often focus on literature from a particular geographic area, sometimes even to the level of city section (e.g., literature by people from Brooklyn, a section of New York City).
- LCDGT already provides a significant level of collocation due to its inclusion of demonyms to the level of the first administrative subdivisions of countries. That may not be specific enough for some users. Specifically, researchers whose work has a tight geographic focus would probably find demonyms for lower-level regions and jurisdictions useful. Collection development and reference librarians would also find more granularity useful as they strive to identify, collect, and provide access to works by “local authors” – authors who live within their libraries’ service areas.

DISCUSSION

Note: Some demonyms used in this paper are well-known, such as Californians for residents from the State of California. Others, such as Californians as the demonym for people from California, Pennsylvania, may be actual demonyms, or they may have been constructed by PSD for the purposes of this discussion. In cases where the demonym was constructed, the intent is not to coin one, but is solely to depict and elucidate situations that are reasonable and likely to arise as demonyms are added to LCDGT.

Disambiguation

After deciding that demonyms for regions and jurisdictions below the first-level administrative subdivisions of countries (henceforth ADM1s) may be included in LCDGT, we (PSD policy specialists and others) discussed whether distinctions should be made between and among people from unrelated places that may share a demonym. For example, people from Paris, France, are called Parisians, and people from Paris, Texas, may also be called Parisians. People from the State of California are called Californians, and people from California, Pennsylvania may also be called Californians. People from Brandenburg State in Germany are called Brandenburgers, and so are people from the city of Brandenburg, which is located within Brandenburg State. Potential conflicts are rife, both within and across countries.

We thought that it would be important to distinguish among demonyms, because someone interested in resources by people from Paris, France, would not be satisfied with also retrieving resources by people from Paris, Texas. Too, someone looking for resources by people from Paris, Texas, would likely become frustrated if resources by people from both places were lumped together, because those of interest would likely be lost among the numerous resources by people from Paris, France.

It may be less important to maintain the distinction in situations such as Brandenburgers, where the demonym for the larger jurisdiction is the same as that for a jurisdiction within it. Those people can be said to be geographically related, and in some cases the resources themselves may not be clear about whether the authors are from the smaller or larger jurisdiction. It would be much more sustainable,

though, to have a single policy that is applied across all demonyms, rather than exceptions for particular situations.

Our first thought was to qualify all demonyms for jurisdictions smaller than ADM1s. Demonyms for ADM1s would remain unqualified unless there was a conflict at the ADM1 level or above. Our rationale was that when people think of Californians, they almost universally think of residents of the State of California. We would borrow the “commonly accepted meaning” principle from LCSH, which states that a qualifier should not be added to a term used in its commonly accepted meaning even though it may have other obscure meanings.¹

Californians
Californians (California, Pa.)

Parisians (Paris, France)
Parisians (Paris, Texas)

Frankfurters (Frankfurt am Main, Germany)
Frankfurters (Frankfurt an der Oder, Germany)

Georgians (State of Georgia)
Georgians (Republic of Georgia)
[Conflict between the demonyms for an ADM1 and a country]

This plan worked well for the demonyms of ADM1s in the United States and Canada, but further analysis showed that it did not necessarily have global application. Americans who think of Durango probably think of the city in Mexico, not the state, and likewise for the city and state of Brandenburg in Germany. We do not know what the commonly accepted meaning would be if one were a Mexican or German, respectively. It can be reasonably supposed, however, that the commonly accepted meaning is relative to one’s geographic location and/or worldview. Demonyms for continents, supra-national countries, and countries, though, are probably exceptions to this general rule, and would not need to be disambiguated as a matter of course.

There seemed to be two options for disambiguating among demonyms when the demonyms for an ADM1 and a local place conflict. The first option would be to qualify all demonyms below the country level with the exception of demonyms for the states, provinces, and territories of the United States and Canada.

Brandenburgers (Brandenburg, Germany) [the state]
Brandenburgers (Brandenburg, Brandenburg, Germany) [the city]

Veracruz residents (Veracruz-Llave, Mexico) [the state]
Veracruz residents (Veracruz, Veracruz-Llave, Mexico) [the city]

but

Californians [the state]
Californians (California, Ky.)
Californians (California, Pa.)

¹ *Subject Headings Manual* instruction sheet H 357, sec. 1.d (revised June 2013).

The second option would be to qualify all of the demonyms for the ADM1s and below, including those in the United States and Canada.

Californians (California, Ky.)
Californians (California, Pa.)
Californians (State of California)

We noted that the vast majority of the names of U.S. states are also names of populated places (e.g., New Mexico in Maryland; Pennsylvania in Alabama; but South Carolina is not also the name of a populated place), and we believe that to be the case in other countries, too. The demonyms for the local places may logically be the same as those for the ADM1s, so qualifying all demonyms at the ADM1 level or below would be practical. It would negate the need to search each place name in both GNIS and GeoNet in order to determine whether there is a possible conflict somewhere in the world.

It seemed both reasonable and useful to treat the demonyms for all jurisdictions of all countries in the same way. One of the criticisms of LCSH over the years has been that it is too American-centric. Unlike when the principles of LCSH were first developed, the principles of LCDGT are being developed in a global information environment, and we thought it would be a good idea to make policy accordingly.

We further thought that it would be best if all demonyms for ADM1s and lower-level jurisdictions and regions were qualified at the time they are first proposed (we would revise the demonyms for ADM1s that were approved in phases 1 and 2 of the pilot). Taking this approach would follow a general practice of LCSH, which is to anticipate conflict for entities with proper names. For example, in LC subject headings for named buildings are always qualified by location and those for geographic features are also routinely qualified, with only a few exceptions. Even names of languages are searched against reference sources to determine whether conflict can be anticipated, and the headings and UFs are qualified if a potential conflict does exist. Experience has taught us that it is less work to anticipate a conflict and disambiguate at the first instance than it is to revise headings and/or cross-references later.

Form of Qualifier

The next question was the form of the qualifier. We briefly considered using the demonym for the next-higher-level jurisdiction as the qualifier.

Californians (Americans)
Californians (Pennsylvanians)

Parisians (French)
Parisians (Texans)

Brandenburgers (Germans)
Brandenburgers (Brandenburgers)

We quickly rejected that idea because the qualifiers would not always make the demonyms mutually exclusive. Californians from California, Pennsylvania, and Californians from the State of California all reside in the United States, so *Californians (Americans)* could actually refer to residents of California, Pennsylvania. The same situation also occurs with *Brandenburgers* – but with a twist, since the city of Brandenburg is within Brandenburg State. The qualifier for *Brandenburgers (Brandenburgers)* would have to be qualified in some way.

Once we rejected the idea of qualifying demonyms by other demonyms, qualifying by place name as authorized in the LC/NACO Name Authority File (NAF) seemed to be the obvious solution. We could again borrow from LCSH practice and modify the form of heading by changing the punctuation and removing additional information that is part of the established heading.

Form of heading for city: Chicago (Ill.)
Form when used as qualifier: (Chicago, Ill.)

Form of heading for city: Black Creek (Wis. : Village)
Form when used as qualifier: (Black Creek, Wis.)

Form of heading for city: Veracruz (Veracruz-Llave, Mexico)
Form when used as qualifier: (Veracruz, Veracruz-Llave, Mexico)²

The place name modified as above, however, does not appear to provide enough differentiation for ADM1s. Examples:

Form of heading for ADM1: California
Form when used as qualifier: (California)
[Users may not know which California is intended: the state, the city in Kentucky, or the city in Pennsylvania]

Form of heading for ADM1: Durango (Mexico : State)
Form when used as qualifier: (Durango, Mexico)
[Users may not know which Durango is intended: the state or the city in Mexico]

It therefore seemed reasonable to expand upon the decision that we made for the Republic of Georgia and the State of Georgia during phase 1 of the pilot, and include the type of jurisdiction for the demonyms of ADM1s and above:

Georgians (Republic of Georgia)
Georgians (State of Georgia)

Doing so yields these terms:

Californians (State of California)
Californians (California, Ky.)
Californians (California, Pa.)

Pennsylvanians (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)
Pennsylvanians (Pennsylvania, Ala.)

Durangos (Durango State, Mexico)
Durangos (Durango, Durango, Mexico)

² *Subject Headings Manual* instruction sheet H 810, sec. 1.c (revised June 2014).

These qualifiers raised the issue of transparency. Would a user seeing Durangos (Durango, Durango, Mexico) understand that that the term is the demonym for people from the city of Durango? Or is it an opaque cataloger construct? Perhaps one of the following would be more transparent.

Durangos (Durango State, Mexico)
Durangos (Durango, Durango State, Mexico)

or

Durangos (Durango State, Mexico)
Durangos (City of Durango, Durango State, Mexico)

or

Durangos (Durango State, Mexico)
Durangos (City of Durango, Mexico)

Some of these options lead to very long terms, and may not enhance transparency for the users. In addition, the more we tinker with the authorized form of the place name, the more time-consuming and labor-intensive, and therefore the less sustainable, the practice becomes.

An additional consideration is the form of qualifier for those places that do not have demonyms, which are established in the form **[place] residents** (e.g., **Connecticut residents**). We again perceived two options for construction of those terms, one employing a parenthetical qualifier and one using an internal qualifier. Examples:

Parenthetical qualifiers based on the authorized place name:

Veracruz residents (Veracruz, Veracruz-Llave, Mexico)
Veracruz residents (Veracruz-Llave, Mexico)

Sinnemahoning residents (Sinnemahoning, Pa.)

Fairfax County residents (Fairfax County, Va.)

Connecticut residents (State of Connecticut)

Internal qualifiers, based on the authorized place name:

[Note: Spelling out all places has the benefit of transparency for everyone. We thought that abbreviations would not need to be used for internal qualifiers because the authorized term would be a running phrase with no explicit relationship to the NAF-authorized form of the place name.]

Veracruz, Veracruz-Llave, Mexico, residents
Veracruz-Llave, Mexico, residents

Sinnemahoning, Pennsylvania, residents

Fairfax County, Virginia, residents

Connecticut residents

The parenthetical qualifiers on terms constructed as **[place] residents** seemed to lead to significant redundancy. We also know from experience that catalogers making proposals often try to remove apparent redundancies, which could lead to ambiguous proposals such as *Durango residents (Durango, Mexico)*. Sorting out the ambiguity through an examination of the resource being cataloged, discussions with the cataloger, and/or marking the proposal “resubmit” and returning it to the cataloger for revision, would increase the labor required to maintain the vocabulary and thus would negatively impact its sustainability.

Use of internal qualifiers would lead to shorter strings, and put the disambiguating information closer to the front of the term. We therefore thought that internal qualifiers would be desirable. But what about the cases in which it is not possible to include an internal qualifier, as with **Connecticut residents**?

There are no other places named Connecticut so there is not a conflict, but we cannot know how many other situations like this we may encounter; in some cases there may indeed be a conflict.

We started to make some draft proposals according to the following principles:

- Demonyms for continents, supra-national regions, and countries would not be qualified unless there appears to be a conflict within those levels, or with an ADM1 (e.g., Republic of Georgia)
- Demonyms for sub-national regions that encompass multiple ADM1s would not be qualified except in cases of known conflict (e.g., New Englanders; Southerners (United States))
- Demonyms for all ADM1s and below would be qualified. Places with demonyms would have a parenthetical qualifier based (loosely at times) on the authorized form of the place name. Places without demonyms would be internally qualified, again based loosely on the authorized form of the place name.

The results looked like this:

Americans
Aucklanders (Auckland, New Zealand)
Baltimoreans (Baltimore, Md.)
Beijingers (Beijing, China)
Brandenburgers (Brandenburg, Brandenburg, Germany)
Brandenburgers (State of Brandenburg, Germany)
Brazilians
Canadians
Cariocas (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)
Catalans (Catalonia, Spain)
Chicagoans (Chicago, Ill.)
Chinese
Fairfax County, Virginia, residents
Florentines (Florence, Italy)
Frankfurters (Frankfurt am Main, Germany)
Frankfurters (Frankfurt an der Oder, Germany)
Germans
Hessians (State of Hesse, Germany)
Illinoisans (State of Illinois)
Italians
Lagos, Lagos State, Nigeria, residents
Lagos State, Nigeria, residents

Marylanders (State of Maryland)
Mexico City, Mexico, residents
Michiganders (State of Michigan)
New Yorkers (New York, N.Y.)
New Yorkers (New York State)
New Zealanders
Nigerians
Ontarians (Province of Ontario)
Pennsylvanians (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)
Philadelphians (Philadelphia, Pa.)
Rio de Janeiro State, Brazil, residents
Sinnemahoning, Pennsylvania, residents
Spaniards
Torontonians (Toronto, Ont.)
Tuscans (Tuscany, Italy)
Yoopers (Upper Peninsula, Mich.)

It seemed to us that most of the terms would be lengthy and appear to include redundancies, and we were concerned that even the short alphabetical list above might be visually off-putting to some users.

A review of the alphabetical list also led to the realization that using the NAF-authorized form of place name creates an inherent bias in the LCDGT qualifiers: ADM1s for the United States, Canada, and Australia are not qualified by their respective countries, while ADM1s from other places are. Additionally, local place names are qualified by the name of the country except for those in the three exceptional countries, whose local places are qualified by the ADM1 instead. If a principle of LCDGT is to treat all demonyms equally, should the qualifiers on demonyms for American, Canadian, and Australian places include the name of the country, as in the following examples?

Americans
Baltimoreans (Baltimore, Md., United States)
Canadians
Connecticut residents
Fairfax County, Virginia, United States, residents
Illinoisans (State of Illinois, United States)
Marylanders (State of Maryland, United States)
Michiganders (State of Michigan, United States)
New Yorkers (New York, N.Y., United States)
New Yorkers (New York State, United States)
Ontarians (Province of Ontario, Canada)
Pennsylvanians (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, United States)
Philadelphians (Philadelphia, Pa., United States)
Sinnemahoning, Pennsylvania, United States, residents
Torontonians (Toronto, Ont., Canada)
Yoopers (Upper Peninsula, Mich., United States)

The terms were becoming longer and more complex. Our fundamental assumption was that a consistent policy would be sustainable because it could be applied across the board; based on our experience, exceptions can be difficult and time-consuming to maintain and explain. Our attempt to formulate consistent policies, however, seemed to be erring on the side of consistency-as-sustainability, instead of simplicity-as-sustainability. Were we overthinking it? Should we step back? We decided to start thinking outside the box.

Outside-the-Box Option: Limit Conflict to LCDGT

Is it necessary to anticipate conflict? We know that very few place names are unique, even within a country; when the universe of conflict is broadened to the world, the proportion of unique names is probably quite small. Without literary warrant and research, though, we do not know if places with the same name actually do share a demonym (e.g., do people from the populated places named California in Kentucky and Pennsylvania actually call themselves Californians?).

Working on the supposition that some proportion of demonyms is in fact shared, it is still impossible to know whether those shared demonyms will ever be needed in cataloging. LC subject headings indicate through geographic subdivision the geographic provenance of literary collections (e.g., **American fiction—New York (State)—New York** is a collection of fiction written by authors from New York City). No such subject headings exist for nonfiction resources or for individual literary works (e.g., Patricia Cornwell resided in Richmond, Virginia, when she wrote many of the Kay Scarpetta novels, but that information is not brought out in the records for her works and expressions). Terms from LCDGT may be assigned to individual works, but we do not know how common that practice will become, or which demonyms will be needed.

What if we limited conflict to LCDGT itself? Qualification would be necessary only when the conflicting demonyms were actually being proposed for LCDGT. Authorized terms such as the following would result.

Americans
Aucklanders
Baltimoreans
Beijingers
Brandenburgers
Brazilians
Canadians
Cariocas
Catalans
Chicagoans
Chinese
Fairfax County residents
Florentines
Frankfurters
Germans
Hessians
Illinoisans
Italians
Lagos residents
Marylanders
Mexico City residents
Michiganders
New Yorkers (New York State)
[conflict was anticipated in the case of New York; the term would not be revised]
New Zealanders
Nigerians
Ontarians
Pennsylvanians
Philadelphians
Rio de Janeiro residents
Sinnemahoning residents
Spaniards

Torontonians
Tuscans
Yoopers

We can see two potential problems with this approach.

First, the context of lesser-known places is lost. Where is Sinnemahoning? Does it matter to the user, who is unlikely to search for `Sinnemahoning residents` unless he/she knows about Sinnemahoning? Not yet discussed in this paper, but important to note here, is that the demonyms will have broader terms (BTs). The BT for an ADM1 will be the demonym for the country, while the BT for all of the local places within an ADM1 will be the demonym for the ADM1. *Example:*

Alexandrians
BT Virginians
[Alexandria is an unincorporated locale in Fairfax County, Virginia]

Chantilly residents
BT Virginians
[Chantilly is an independent city geographically within Fairfax County, but is not subordinate to the county]

Fairfax County residents
BT Virginians
[Fairfax County is part of the region of Virginia known as Northern Virginia]

Northern Virginians
BT Virginians

Virginians
BT Americans

Are the hierarchical relationships enough to provide context for the users, in the absence of a qualifier?

The second problem relates to well-known place names. Would catalogers and users know to which place a demonym relates? Would `Lagos residents` and `Brandenburgers` refer to residents of the cities or of the states? Would `Frankfurters` refer to residents of Frankfurt am Main or of Frankfurt an der Oder? The answer to the question is important not just for catalogers who assign terms and users who search them. It is also important for maintenance and development. If catalogers do not know that `Lagos residents` pertains to residents of the state of Lagos, how will they know to propose a term for the city when necessary? And would catalogers making proposals provide the pertinent information consistently enough for us, the policy specialists, to know what we are being asked to approve? If not, then the maintenance costs would rise and the sustainability of LCDGT would be in question.

One option would be to include a scope note for very demonym below the country level, as in the following examples.

Virginians
SN Residents of the Commonwealth of Virginia.
BT Americans

Lagos residents
SN Residents of the State of Lagos.
BT Nigerians

Frankfurters
SN Residents of Frankfurt am Main.
BT Hessians

Northern Virginians
SN Residents of Northern Virginia.
BT Virginians

When a conflicting demonym is proposed, both it and the existing term would need to be qualified, as would any records using the existing term.

Frankfurters CHANGE HEADING
Frankfurters (Frankfurt am Main, Germany)
SN Residents of Frankfurt am Main.
BT Hessians

Frankfurters (Frankfurt an der Oder, Germany)
SN Residents of Frankfurt an der Oder.
BT Brandenburgers

Say that the term Brandenburgers were being proposed for the city of Brandenburg, and a term already existed for residents of the state of Brandenburg. The following proposals would have to be made:

Brandenburgers CHANGE HEADING
Brandenburgers (State of Brandenburg, Germany)
SN Residents of the State of Brandenburg.
BT Germans

Brandenburgers (Brandenburg, Brandenburg, Germany)
SN Residents of the city of Brandenburg.
BT Brandenburgers (State of Brandenburg, Germany)

Frankfurters (Frankfurt an der Oder, Germany)
SN Residents of Frankfurt an der Oder
BT Brandenburgers DELETE REFERENCE
BT Brandenburgers (Brandenburg State, Germany) ADD REFERENCE

Not anticipating conflict – that is, limiting conflict to LCDGT – limits the number of terms that will need to be disambiguated, at least in the beginning. It does not remove the need for qualifiers altogether. And this of course leads us right back to the questions about the appropriate form of qualifier, discussed above.

Another important aspect of this outside-the-box option is the maintenance that would be needed for bibliographic records and authority records for works and expressions. If we were to anticipate conflict and qualify as a matter of course, we could be reasonably certain that the authorized terms would be highly stable; except for clear errors or (potentially) changes in policy, it is unlikely that terms would be revised. By revising existing terms as conflicts are added to the vocabulary, the volume of ongoing maintenance of records for works and expressions will definitely be larger. How much larger would

depend on how many conflicts are added to LCDGT, and we cannot begin to answer that question based on existing data.

Outside-the-Box Option: Post-Coordination

We questioned whether it is necessary to make unique strings. Could post-coordination within bibliographic records and authority records for works and expressions resolve some of the perceived issues with the strings? Would it lead to simpler terms and a more sustainable vocabulary? In this paradigm, catalogers would assign an unqualified demonym for a local place, and also a demonym for the ADM1, if pertinent, or for the country. It seems to work for conflicts below the ADM1 level.

Work by authors from Paris, France
386 ## \$a Parisians \$a French

Work by authors from Paris, Texas
386 ## \$a Parisians \$a Texans

In this case, Parisians would be established as:

Parisians
UF Paris residents

This does not always work well even below the ADM1 level, though. In the following example, either there is no disambiguation between authors from Frankfurt am Main and Frankfurt an der Oder, or the user is assumed to know the ADM1 for each place. Neither outcome seems to be desirable.

Resource by authors from Frankfurt am Main
386 ## \$a Frankfurters \$a Hessians
[or 386 ## \$a Frankfurters \$a Germans]

Resource by authors from Frankfurt an der Oder
386 ## \$a Frankfurters \$a Brandenburgers
[or 386 ## \$a Frankfurters \$a Germans]

Nor does this approach resolve conflicts between demonyms for ADM1s and lower-level regions and jurisdictions.

Resource by authors from California, Pennsylvania
386 ## \$a Californians \$a Pennsylvanians

Resource by authors from the State of California
386 ## \$a Californians

Resource by authors from the city of Brandenburg, Germany
386 ## \$a Brandenburgers \$a Brandenburgers
[or 386 ## \$a Brandenburgers \$a Germany]

The ADM1s would still have to be qualified to provide clear information to catalogers and users.

Resource by authors from the State of California
386 ## \$a Californians (State of California)

Work by authors from the city of Brandenburg, Germany
386 ## \$a Brandenburgers \$a Brandenburgers (State of Brandenburg)
[or 386 ## \$a Brandenburgers \$a Germany]

The demonyms for the cities of Brandenburg and California could not be qualified because they would be assigned to a resource by, or intended for, residents of any city, village, town, hamlet, etc., named Brandenburg or California. Not qualifying them, though, means that they could be misconstrued as referring to residents of the states of the same name.

Outside-the-Box Option: Upward UFs for Demonyms of Local Places

We also questioned whether we were correct in our supposition that researchers and collection development librarians need individual authorized demonyms for local places. Would lead-in terminology, in the form of upward UFs for the demonyms of individual regions and places, be enough?
Example:

Virginians
UF Arlingtonians

Texans
UF Arlingtonians

Result:

Arlingtonians
USE Texans
Virginians

This approach seems to simplify the authorized terms because it would eliminate most of the conflict situations – demonyms for local place names would not have to be disambiguated. Another example shows that some conflicts would still exist, and could cause just as many ADM1s to be qualified as before.

Californians
USE Kentuckians
Pennsylvanians

Californians (State of California)

In this scenario, collocation would be at the ADM1 level, except for demonyms for cities that are independent of an ADM1 (e.g., Beijing and Shanghai, China). The demonyms for cities that are not subordinate to an ADM1 would be authorized terms, with a BT for the demonym of the country.

Beijingers
BT Chinese

Fuzhou Shi residents	<i>[Fuzhou Shi is an ADM1 in China]</i>
UF Ganzhou Diqu residents	<i>[Ganzhou Diqu is a locality in Fuzhou Shi]</i>
UF Jiangxi Sheng residents	<i>[Jiangxi Sheng is a locality in Fuzhou Shi]</i>
BT Chinese	

Shanghai residents
BT Chinese

The legal status of cities would therefore determine whether the demonym were an approved term or a UF reference. The reason for making the demonym for one city an authorized term, and another, a reference to an ADM1, would not be transparent. There would likely be a significant number of queries about this sent to the Policy and Standards Division on an ongoing basis. Catalogers making proposals would also be likely to propose a term when a reference is needed, and vice versa. Both situations would increase the workload associated with LCDGT and could threaten its sustainability.

SUMMARY AND QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

The Policy and Standards Division has determined that it would be useful to include demonyms below the ADM1 level in LCDGT. Policy questions must be decided before they can be included, though. PSD poses the following specific questions for feedback and suggestions from the library community.

1. Is it necessary that all demonyms, at any level of jurisdiction, be eligible for inclusion as authorized terms? Or would upward references be sufficient? Or do you disagree with the basic premise that demonyms for lower-level jurisdictions need to be included?
2. If you consider it necessary to allow all demonyms to be authorized terms, is it necessary to disambiguate among them (e.g., separate terms for Parisians from Paris, France, and Paris, Texas)?
3. Would post-coordination in bibliographic records and authority records for works and expressions be a workable solution? That is, local place names would not be disambiguated, and would be assigned in conjunction with a demonym for the ADM1-level jurisdiction or country, as appropriate.
4. How closely should parenthetical qualifiers for demonyms adhere to the authorized NAF form of place name? Are any of the ideas for parenthetical qualifiers presented in the body of the paper acceptable?
5. If you think that the [place] residents terms for local places should be disambiguated, do you prefer a parenthetical qualifier (e.g., Fairfax County residents (Fairfax County, Virginia)), or an internal qualifier (Fairfax County, Virginia, residents)?
5. Should qualifiers for places in the United States, Canada, and Australia include the name of the country?
6. Should conflict be anticipated (i.e., demonyms for all places at the ADM1 level and below would be qualified when first proposed), or should conflict be limited to LCDGT (existing terms

would be qualified only as necessary when proposals for new terms create conflict situations in LCDGT)?

7. If you think conflict should be limited to LCDGT, what are your thoughts on provision of context for the term? That is, how would we make it clear that Brandenburgers refers to residents of the state and not the city, or vice versa?