

Q & A from NACO CJK Corporate Names Reference webinar (February 23, 2012):

1. *On p. 9 of the slides, why the corporate body entered directly if it is known that the Forest Environment Research Institute is under Kyongsang-bukto's jurisdiction. Wish more examples were given on entering government bodies directly or subordinately. Like the example.*

“Kyōngsang-bukto Sallim Hwan'gyōng Yōn'guwōn” which is the name appeared on the source, does not fit any of the subordinate entry rules under 24.18 for government bodies, so it is entered directly. *See AACR2 24.18.*

The webinar is on corporate references thus there was very limited time covering corporate entry rule which forms 110 of the heading.

2. *Again on p. 9 of the slides, can you explain why “Korea” is used in the qualifier, but not “Korea (South)”?*

According to the rule, we do not include the type of jurisdiction in the qualifier used for the government body. Another example is, Buffalo (N.Y.), not Buffalo (N.Y. (State)). *See LCRI 23.4B.*

3. *Does the type of special rule for Hong Kong government body names apply also to Macau Special Admin Region, Chinese vs. Portuguese official languages?*

Yes. Follow the similar guideline and establish Macau government body names in Portuguese if both Portuguese and Chinese are available, code the heading provisional. This instruction does not apply to non-government bodies.

4. *We've noticed that several of your examples show qualifiers that are not in catalog-entry form, and are not even transliterations of the catalog-entry form. Are you applying any kind of rule in the construction of these qualifiers?*

According to **LCRI 24.4C5**, “when adding the name of a higher or related corporate body to a corporate name, give the name of the body in the form and language on which the heading for the body is based (not necessarily the catalog-entry form for the institution).”

5. *On slide 41, why not A & C?*

When a corporate body is entered subordinately under 24.13 Type 5, a direct reference needs to be provided which is entered under the subordinate body. Choices A and C would be cataloger's judgment. *See LCRI 24.13 Type 5.*

6. *Is there a special policy or convention on handling qualifiers in non-Latin script references?*

Under the current guideline on non-Latin script references, qualifier in the 4XX non-Latin reference field remains Romanized form. Due to OCLC's automated pre-population project, there are many authority records which contain non-Latin references with non-Latin script qualifiers derived from the bibliographic records.

7. *On slide 45: why were 3rd 410 (\$a is not in established form) and 5th 410 (the university with qualifier) provided?*

The screen shot on the slide was from a real record in Connexion. Both references (3rd and 5th) are incorrect and should not be provided for the record.

8. *On slide 29, about inverted forms, does the rule apply to English terms? If not, should "Guojia di zhenju" have another form "Di zhenju, guojia"?*

Inverted form rule applies not only to English names. It is a good point that "China. Di zhen ju, guo jia" should be provided as an inverted reference.

9. *When should I consider establishing the corporate name used in the qualifier (if not established yet), e.g., cataloging an English work published by a Chinese institute (everything in English)?*

LCRI does not require the cataloger entry form. Use cataloger's judgment to decide if the catalog entry form would be helpful in searching the heading.

10. *On slide 36, two references in non-Roman form were provided. Is 2nd non-Roman reference valid since it's a reference from reference?*

As a result of OCLC automated pre-population project, many non-Latin script references that were added from the bibliographic records do not necessarily conform the Guideline on Non-Latin Script References nor were they evaluated.

11. *On slide 28, x-ref for Korean example, don't we need to provide \$wnne for the old romanized form starting with Kyongsang-bukto? How do you do for Chinese heading by Wade-Giles system?*

Romanized form following former Romanization scheme is considered previously valid AACR2 heading and should be coded using \$wnne, including forms made prior to the latest Korean Romanization guideline.

12. Many corporations have their Asian names and English names (not romanized names). Do we list their English names, and in which fields?

1XX field contains romanized form of the name in the official language of the body established. All other forms including different language forms are considered as variants or references, and should be provided in the 4XX fields (410, 411).

See AACR2 24.3.

13. How do I treat the quotes used as part of Chinese corporate body names?

If the form of name selected as the heading includes quotation marks, retain them. *See LCRI 24.1A.*

14. Can a 1XX in a Pinyin field match a 4XX in another record's Pinyin field? What about vernacular-Chinese 1XX-4XX matches? So is this different from English language records?

Regardless of language, a 1XX in one record cannot match a 4XX from another record.