

Name Authority Records: AACR2/RDA Compatibility Issues
 BIBCO/CONSER Operations Committee Meetings
 May 5-6, 2011
 Library of Congress
 James Madison Memorial Building

ABSTRACT

Presented here are statements found in the *Cataloging Service Bulletin* regarding the use of “AACR2 Compatible” headings. I present them simply to provide some historical context for using this approach when AACR2 was implemented and hope that the 26-year history of dealing (or not dealing, really) with these headings will illuminate our thinking as members of the BIBCO/CONSER Operations Committees as well as PCC’s Policy Committee as we discuss the issues related to compatibility of AACR2/RDA headings and the options that will work best for working during this transitional period.

Categories of personal name headings that were coded “AACR2 compatible” were identified in the *Cataloging Service Bulletin* (Fall 1982, no. 18). They included:

1. **Hyphens.** The existing heading lacked a hyphen between forenames or compound surnames that would be present in the AACR2 form.
2. **“Pseud.”** The existing heading contained the term “pseud.”
3. **Extraneous forename/initial.** The existing heading contained a forename or forename initial that would not be present in the AACR2 form (“forename” includes any name element that is transcribed in the forename position, e.g., a maiden name, a patronymic)
4. **Forename/initial lacking.** The existing heading lacked a forename or forename initial that would be present in the AACR2 form.
5. **Forename instead of initial.** The existing heading contained a forename that would be represented by an initial in the AACR2 form.
6. **Initial instead of forename.** The existing heading contained a forename initial that would be represented by a forename in the AACR2 form.
7. **Romanization.** The existing heading was established in its nonsystematically romanized form according to AACR1 rules for nonroman names rather than in the systematically romanized form.
8. **Unused title.** The existing heading contained an unused British title of honor (“Sir,” “Dame,” “Lord,” or “Lady”)
9. **“Bp.”/“Abp.”** The existing heading contained the abbreviation “Bp.” Or “Abp.” Rather than “Bishop” or “Archbishop.”
10. **“(ca.)”** The existing heading contained “(ca.)” after the date.
11. **“fl.”** The existing heading contained a twentieth century date in the form “fl. [date].”
12. **English term of address, etc.** The existing heading contained a term of address, etc., in English rather than in the vernacular form.

13. **Cataloger-supplied place of residence, etc.** The existing heading contained an indication of place of residence or field of interest that was supplied by the cataloger to resolve a conflict.

In the *Cataloging Services Bulletin* (Fall 1985, no. 30), it was established that

“all headings newly coded after August 1982 will be in accord with AACR2 and current policy and will be designated ‘AACR2’ (with two exceptions). A heading already coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’ will continue to be used in its existing form in post-August 1982 cataloging. The two situations in which a newly coded heading will be coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’ are a) the heading is for a body that is entered subordinately to another body whose heading has already been coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’; b) the heading is for a uniform title entered under a name heading that has already been coded ‘AACR 2 compatible.’ Before September 1982, headings were coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’ if they had been established before 1981 and fell into one or more of the categories listed below. Also coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’ were headings established after 1980 for bodies that were entered subordinately to bodies whose headings had already been coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’ and headings for uniform titles entered under name headings that had already been coded ‘AACR 2 compatible.’”

Following this explanatory statement, there followed a list of “Categories coded ‘AACR 2 compatible’” which appear to be categories of corporate name headings coded as AACR2 compatible. They include:

1. **Quotation marks.** The existing heading lacked quotation marks even though the body’s predominant usage showed quotation marks around one or more elements.
2. **Acronyms.** The existing heading contained an acronym in lower-cased letters after an initial capital letter even though the body’s predominant usage showed the acronym all in capital letters.
3. **Terms of incorporation.** A) The existing heading contained a term of incorporation that did not agree with AACR2 capitalization. B) The existing heading contained a term of incorporation that would not be retained under AACR2.

Of course there were some exceptions to these categories and they were explained in the corresponding CSBs as well.

This was the decision for these headings (which I’ve been told really only represented at the most 5% of the total authority records in the authority file) for the next quarter of a century. Throughout the development of NACO training, especially during the decades of major expansion in the 1990s and 2000s, new NACO participants were taught how to deal with these headings. In all reality, not much happened with those headings, but new headings were created that perpetuated the existence of these headings and their iterations.

This all came to a halt in 2007 when the CPSO issued in March and then adopted in August the following statement:

With the implementation of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR2) in 1981, the Library of Congress implemented a policy of “AACR2 compatible” headings to reduce somewhat the immense workload of adopting AACR2 and abandoning the policy of superimposition at the same time. The “AACR2 compatible” headings policy was to treating headings that differed only slightly from the “pure” AACR2 form such that they would still be easily found by the user. In the continuing effort to work toward the goal of simplifying or eliminating outdated cataloging policies, practices and documentation, the Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) has recommended and Acquisition and Bibliographic Access management has approved, the eventual elimination of the “AACR2 compatible” headings effective August 2007. Although it has always been LC policy when revising an existing heading for any reason to fully upgrade that heading, the recent policy change to add death dates to heading has resulted in some uncertainty among catalogers when doing so on “AACR2 compatible” headings. Many catalogers have used their good judgment when adding the death date or making other changes to “AACR2 compatible” headings and fully updated the headings while other catalogers have been uncertain about doing this. This has resulted in a variety of practices.

To stem the confusion, CPSO has created revised Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs) to replace the current policy with a new, more relaxed policy for dealing with “AACR2 compatible” headings. While the immediate impact of this change will be that some catalogers may spend more time cleaning up authority and bibliographic records, CPSO believes that this is part of the cost of doing business in a shared environment.

Benefits

1. While there will continue to be a variety of practices there will be documentation that clearly states what catalogers must do and what options catalogers may exercise.
2. The authority file eventually will be rid of these “AACR2 compatible” headings
3. Bibliographic records will be more uniform as the associated bibliographic file maintenance will lessen the mixture of AACR2 and “AACR2 compatible” headings in the same record.
4. The new guidelines have removed the information from the LCRIs that only those who lived through the transition to AACR2 remember, thus simplify the training of new catalogers (PCC and LC); the eliminated examples of “AACR2 compatible” headings will be posted on the Acquisition and Bibliographic Access Web site for historical and training purposes.
5. Documentation will be reduced.

Below is a list of LCRIs that have been revised. Please send comments to CPSO@loc.gov by April 23, 2007.

LCRIs with draft revisions

- 22.1.
- 22.1C
- 22.3A, p.2
- 22.15B
- 22.17, p.1-2
- 22.18A
- 24.1, p. 5-6
- 26.1, p. 2-4”

This was then followed by the actual drafts. Looking at the drafts made it rather obvious just the amount of time and care that went into just the documenting of the ramifications of the “AACR2 compatible” heading decision. Since August 2007, the elimination of the “AACR2 compatible” headings training section has resulted in a better NACO training as well.

Another thing to consider is the issue of superimposition as opposed to compatibility. Superimposition is mentioned in the 2007 statement above from CPSO related to AACR2 compatible headings. As I understand it, when AACR was first adopted, all existing headings were accepted as is and superimposed on the AACR file without being reevaluated according to the new code. This practice continued into the initial adoption of AACR2, but then was abandoned in favor of the AACR2 compatible approach to dealing with reevaluating and changing headings to match the new code. It appears that superimposition is being considered again with regards to implementing RDA. “Grandfathering” of all existing AACR2 headings without reevaluating them according to the new code directions would be superimposing these records. This was not a satisfactory approach before. It would likely NOT be a satisfactory approach today.

With the historical background and evolution of the process by which “AACR2 compatible” headings were created and eventually abandoned, we can now move on to discuss the issues involved in creating AACR2/RDA compatibility issues.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How do the benefits outlined in decision to abandon “AACR2 compatible” headings have value for our decision to allow AACR2 headings to be considered to be RDA-compatible headings?
2. What reasons would PCC give for creating RDA-compatible headings?
3. For the past two decades (almost) we have been promoting the concept of catalogers’ judgment. If we decide to implement RDA-compatible headings, what does this do to the idea of catalogers’ judgment?
4. In the recent PoCo Discussion Paper, the concept of “grandfathering” the AACR2 headings into RDA was presented. How is this different from the early LC policy of superimposition, discontinued in 1981?
5. If “grandfathering” means instituting policy of “RDA-Compatible” (not superimposition), what aspects of an AACR2 heading would be considered as RDA compatible?
 - a. Different forms of dates used in heading (abbreviated b., d., ca., fl.)?
 - b. Different form of qualifier used?
 - c. Missing titles (e.g. Jr., III) that would be present in the RDA access point?
 - d. Included titles (e.g. Sir, Dame) that would not be present in the RDA access point?
 - e. The abbreviation of “Dept.” in corporate body names?
6. Given the history of superimposition and AACR2 compatible, is it really wise to promote either superimposition or RDA compatible?
7. Should PCC make a statement about this issue? If so, what would it be? If not, why?

8. What is really meant by a hybrid environment in the authority file?
9. How would it be beneficial to allow all AACR2 headings to exist as is in the authority file and able to be reevaluated by any cataloger and changed to an RDA heading and RDA NAR?
10. Which RDA elements would be expected to be added?
11. During the US RDA Test, there was great consternation expressed over the options for adding qualifiers for fuller forms of personal names. Should we continue to use the RDA definition of fuller forms, which is more inclusive than AACR2's definition, as we continue to upgrade AACR2 NARs to RDA NARS, or should fuller forms only be added if they expand elements present in the form chosen as the preferred form of the name?
12. Should there be a revised LCPS regarding applying qualifiers such as fuller forms and/or dates to existing AACR2 NARs to upgrade to RDA NARs?
13. Would such a revision cause PCC to develop different application for options in RDA?
14. As we contemplate implementing RDA, what RDA elements will be core and optional for NACO participants?
15. Should there be any restrictive policies statements for each RDA element?
16. Will there be LCPSs created, clarifying use of 37x fields, i.e., names used in 373 field do not need to be established, but if the names have been established, please use this form.
17. Does PCC want to make policies about individual elements? Will they differ from LCPS? Example, should addresses of living individuals be provided in 371 fields? Are there privacy issues involved in this?
18. Will there still be a BFM requirement? If so, could BFM become a notification system that would benefit all, rather than just LC?
19. Does PCC want to let participants individually or cooperatively as institutions reevaluate existing AACR2 records and convert records to RDA?
20. Does PCC want to create projects for reevaluating headings, e.g., identify all undifferentiated name headings and determine if RDA will allow for creating differentiated name headings; identify all NARs with date discrepancies (per RDA) and systematically change these?