

Use of Other Controlled Vocabularies in PCC Records (Open Discussion)

Nicole Smeltekop, facilitator

PCC Documentation regarding vocabularies in the [BPM](#)

- B3. BIBCO Record Contribution Requirements
 - Assign at least one or two subject headings and/or genre/form headings (at the appropriate level of specificity) from [an established thesaurus or subject heading system](#) recognized by the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data (e.g., AAT, MeSH, LCSH) ...
- E5.5. Subject Headings
 - BIBCO does not require its participants to use one particular subject thesaurus. BIBCO participants may use any subject heading scheme recognized by the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data. The format identifies the thesauri in two places:
 - 1. MARC Fields 600-651, 2nd indicator:
 - 0 - Library of Congress Subject Headings
 - 1 - LC subject headings for children's literature
 - 2 - Medical Subject Headings
 - 3 - National Agricultural Library subject authority file
 - 5 - Canadian Subject Headings
 - 6 - Répertoire de vedettes-matière
 - 7 - Source specified in subfield \$2
 - 2. MARC Fields 600-651, subfield \$2: Subject Heading and Term Source Codes
- E5.5.1. LCSH ...
- E5.5.2. MeSH ...
- E5.5.3 FAST ...

Focus of today's discussion is on the non-LC vocabularies

Commonly used examples

- [Getty's Art & Architecture Thesaurus](#)
- [FAST](#)
- [Homosaurus](#)
- [RBMS vocabularies](#)

[List of vocabularies recognized by the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data](#)

How many attendees use “other” vocabularies
in their PCC bibliographic records? (show of
hands please)

What are your reasons for using these
“other” vocabularies?

Do you use “other” vocabularies in addition to LC vocabularies or instead of them?

Do you use “other” vocabularies only in records for specific formats of material?

Are there particular “other” vocabularies that you don’t currently use but are interested in potentially implementing?

In copy cataloging, if you encounter a record that uses “other” vocabularies in addition to your preferred vocabularies, do you keep those “other” headings in your local version of the catalog record or do you delete them?

In copy cataloging, if you encounter a record that ONLY has headings from “other” vocabularies, do you add terms from your preferred vocabularies to the record or do you consider the existing headings sufficient?

Do you propose new terms or updates to existing terms to the editorial bodies that maintain “other” vocabularies? How does that experience differ from submitting proposals for LC vocabularies?

In OCLC, have you ever encountered problems with other catalogers deleting headings from “other” vocabularies that had previously been present in a Worldcat record?

New PCC members typically go through a process of having their records reviewed. Does the use of “other” vocabularies create any problematic issues for those serving as record reviewers or for the institutions being reviewed?

If you catalog graphic image materials, how do you decide whether to use LCSH/LCGFT vs. TGM vs. AAT vs. some other vocabulary?

Any other discussion points folks want to bring up?