Task Group on the Function of the Authority File

Final Report

Manon Théroux, Yale University (chair)
Linda Barnhart, University of California, San Diego (SCS liaison)
Rebecca Dean, OCLC
Stephen Hearn, University of Minnesota
Diane Humes, Library of Congress
Andrew MacEwan, British Library
Gary Strawn, Northwestern University
Bob Thomas, OCLC

Contents

V. Recommendations

1. Clarify Official Authority File Names

2. Communicate With JSC

3. Communicate With FRANAR

4. Formulate Policies for Recording Copy-Specific Authority Data

5. Promote Prohibition Against Authority Record Recycling More Aggressively

6. Record Former Undifferentiated Names in a Note Field

7. Prohibit Changing Undifferentiated Name Records to Unique Name Records

8. Record Cancelled Headings in a Note Field

9. Promote Use of Linking References for Pre-AACR2 Headings More Aggressively

10. Record Former AACR2 Headings That Are Not Valid References in a Note Field

11. Transfer "Missing" Wade-Giles References to Note Fields Rather Than Delete

12. Record Former LCSH Headings That Are Not Valid References in a Note Field

13. Record Former LCSH Headings Considered Offensive

I. BACKGROUND

I.A. Charge

The Task Group on the Function of the Authority File was appointed by the Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) in 2001. The group was given a two-part charge, as follows:

- Articulate the differences between shared authority data and data appropriate for local authority files. In doing this, consider the factors that form the basis of determining what data is appropriate to share and what data should remain local.

- Examine and make recommendations on issues related to the use of authority records to support maintenance of bibliographic records. More particularly, should references, originally designed to provide access to authority headings in support of the information function of the authority file, also be used to link old or user-friendly headings to new ones to support the maintenance of headings in bibliographic records? Should the information purpose of data be kept separate and distinct from some other use of it? If it is judged that one of the uses of authority records is to support maintenance of bibliographic records, what mechanisms other than references, if any, might achieve this purpose?

The group was instructed that its final report should be "pragmatic with recommendations for harmonizing local authority file requirements with national/international requirements."

This charge was based largely on the work of an earlier group, the Cross Reference Task Group. In its final report, delivered to the Standing Committee on Standards in 1999, the group identified these themes as two of several problematic areas that deserved to be explored in greater depth. The full report is available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/xreftgfinal.html. The SCS response to the report is available at: http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/xreftgscsresp.html.

I.B. Membership

The Task Group on the Function of the Authority File was composed of the following individuals:

Manon Théroux, Yale University (chair)
Linda Barnhart, University of California, San Diego (SCS liaison)

Rebecca Dean, OCLC
Stephen Hearn, University of Minnesota
Diane Humes, Library of Congress
Andrew MacEwan, British Library
Gary Strawn, Northwestern University
Bob Thomas, OCLC

Most task group members were appointed in the spring of 2001. Rebecca Dean joined the group later that same year. Linda Barnhart resigned from the group in the fall of 2002, concurrent with her resignation from the Standing Committee on Standards.

I.C. Process

The work of the task group was conducted primarily via e-mail. Members attending the 2001 Annual and 2002 Midwinter meetings of the American Library Association also participated in face-to-face discussions. In January 2002, the group submitted its interim report to the Standing Committee on Standards. That report is available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/tgauthrpt.html.

This document, submitted April 1, 2003, constitutes the task group's final report. In making the recommendations contained in this report, the group has generally attempted to reach consensus. However, it should be noted that not all recommendations necessarily reflect unanimity of opinion. Some proposals reflect majority opinion only.

1.D. Acknowledgements

The task group would like to thank the members of the Music Library Association's Authorities Subcommittee, chaired by Terry Simpkins of Middlebury College, for their thoughtful comments in response to our interim report. The group would also like to thank the members of the Standing Committee on Standards, chaired by Ann Caldwell of Brown University, for their numerous helpful comments and for granting an extension on the deadline for our final report.

II. INTRODUCTION

II.A. Organization of the Report

The Task Group on the Function of the Authority File's final report consists of a brief background section, followed by an introductory section containing general comments, followed by more specific comments in sections devoted to the two areas of our charge. These more specific comments summarize current Library of Congress and Program for Cooperative Cataloging practices and discuss various options for change. The report concludes with the task group's recommendations. For ease of reference, each recommendation is separately numbered and paginated.

II.B. Scope of the Report

Despite the broad implications of its name, the task group was charged to address only two topics: the differences between shared and local data and the appropriateness of data intended to serve a maintenance role. The group has not explicitly addressed any other functions of the Authority File in this report, nor has it attempted to articulate any comprehensive set of general principles that should govern the file.

It should also be noted that the group has interpreted the "Authority File," the rather vague term appearing in its name, to mean the entire database of machine-readable authority records jointly governed by the Library of Congress and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, including both name authority records and those subject authority records that serve as the basis for constructing Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). Consequently, some of the recommendations in this report apply to name authority records, some to subject authority records, and some to both categories of records.

Indeed, the task group has taken the topic of terminology a step further by issuing a proposal. Given the confusion surrounding the many names that are commonly used to refer to various aspects of the "Authority File," the group has recommended that LC and the PCC attempt to clarify their terminology and provide more consistent usage in their documentation (see Recommendation #1). Although this recommendation might be seen as marginal to the group's charge, the issue of terminology affected the group's ability to interpret its charge, engage in unambiguous discourse, and communicate its findings to others.

II.C. Evolution of the Authority File

The database of authority records commonly called the Authority File has evolved significantly over the past decades. Initially, the file was simply an online version of the local card-based authority file of the Library of Congress. However, the gradual implementation of cooperative authorities programs, such as NACO, brought new contributors to the file and allowed it to become a shared file. Although the file continues to function as the local authority file of the Library of Congress, it now also contains records created by catalogers throughout the world for headings that may never be needed in bibliographic records created by the Library of Congress.

As the scope of the Authority File has expanded, so has its utility. The original role of the file was relatively straightforward: it provided a means for catalogers to record authorized forms of headings and to generate cross references that would guide catalog users to these preferred headings. Although the file continues to fulfill this primary role as an internal reference tool for library staff and a public navigation aid for catalog users, it has increasingly been called upon to serve a database maintenance role as well. Library management systems commonly feature global change capabilities and reporting functions that rely directly on the data contained in authority records. In addition, authority control vendors routinely offer heading maintenance services based on authorities data. It seems likely that this heading maintenance functionality will only become more important with time, as the cumulative number of headings contributed to the Authority File grows (and the inevitable need for heading changes and heading cancellations increases) and as global change capabilities improve in automated systems.

II.D. Standards

The Authority File's evolution from a local to a shared database, its increased usefulness as a catalog management tool, and the ongoing need for heading maintenance in bibliographic files have had a significant impact on library technical services units, on vendor services, and on bibliographic utilities. Yet, our cataloging standards and guidelines have not always kept pace with these developments or addressed their many ramifications. Although current LC/PCC documentation does contain instructions relating to the appropriateness (or inappropriateness) of including certain kinds of local data in records contributed to the Authority File, as well as some instructions intended to facilitate the maintenance function of the file, these areas are not addressed comprehensively. Perhaps more importantly, no general principles currently exist to serve as a foundation for existing instructions and as a guide for their future revision.

The lack of a set of general principles governing the construction, maintenance, use, and future direction of the Authority File can partly be explained by certain weaknesses in the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (AACR). Although AACR contains instructions for the establishment of headings in bibliographic records and instructions for the provision of cross references, it does not explicitly address the

concept of an authority record, much less the concept of a collective authority file. In addition, AACR is primarily concerned with the creation of new bibliographic records; it does not address the concept of a catalog that exists over time and presents an almost constant need for maintenance. Finally, AACR does not address the electronic environment and its potential to support something as sophisticated and dynamic as a shared online authority file that can be used to support global change mechanisms. Because LC/PCC cataloging standards generally take AACR as their starting point, they tend to suffer from many of these same conceptual gaps.

Given that the function of the Authority File has not been clearly articulated in our shared standards, it is hardly surprising that efforts to revise these standards are often hampered by confusion and disagreement as to the appropriateness of suggested changes. The task group is heartened by the recent formation of the IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR) and by the decision of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) to include a section on authority records in a future edition of the code. We have proposed that both groups consider the maintenance role that can be played by authority records in the online catalog environment and provide an explicit acknowledgement of this role in the documents that they produce (see Recommendations #2 and #3).

II.E. Systems

Any effort to address the issues outlined in the task group's charge will necessarily be complicated by the lack of uniform functionality in library management systems. Some systems have linked authorities capabilities and some do not. Global change mechanisms, when present, can vary in method and efficacy. The ability to maintain local authorities data, and to protect it from overlay when replacement records are loaded into the system, is not consistent. The implementation of even long-accepted MARC codes is unpredictable (e.g. many systems display all 4XX references in the public catalog, even those coded "do not display" in subfield $w/3, thus frustrating discussions concerning the advisability of expanding the use of existing subfield $w codes or defining additional subfield $w codes). Inevitably, this uneven functionality across library systems raises pragmatic concerns that, in turn, can cause otherwise worthy ideas to be rejected.

Similarly, the bibliographic utilities that PCC participants use when doing authority work can differ dramatically. The "previous versions" feature of the current RLIN authority files, which can be extremely useful in resolving heading maintenance issues, constitutes one notable difference. This feature allows users of the RLIN authority files to view older versions of authority records and track changes made to those records over time. If such functionality were available within the OCLC authority file, and also within our local library systems, some of the proposals contained in this report might not be needed.

III. LOCAL vs. SHARED AUTHORITY DATA

III.A. Current Practice

III.A.1. Categories of Local and Shared Authority Data

Any attempt to articulate the differences between shared and local data in authority records must first recognize that the term "local" can be used in many different, and sometimes conflicting, senses. Taking a very broad view, quite a number of records in the Authority File could be considered "local" because they contain headings that are needed only by the institutions that contributed them. Many references added to Authority File records could be considered "local" for the same reason. This is especially true of manifestation-level references added to uniform title authority records for translations of works and collective titles. Users searching for a specific manifestation can be frustrated when a reference from the title of the desired manifestation leads them only to other manifestations not sought after. The presence of the manifestation-level reference in the catalog implicitly suggests that the library owns that particular manifestation. The task group debated the merits of recommending that NACO participants desist from adding manifestation-level references to uniform title authority records but, in the end, refrained from issuing such a proposal. The group noted that many catalog users appreciate being referred to other manifestations that might serve their purpose equally well and that catalogers assigning uniform title headings, both retrospectively and at the point of cataloging, find manifestation-level references quite useful. However, those exploring the application of FRBR concepts to the catalog might want to examine this idea more thoroughly.

Taking a slightly different perspective, the term "local" can be also used to refer to the perceived general utility of the information (e.g., a cataloger's initials can be considered local data because they serve no useful purpose outside of that cataloger's institution, while a reference from "Untied States" to "United States" might be considered universal data that should be shared because it has the potential to correct a common typographical error found in bibliographic headings in many library catalogs). The term "local" can also refer to any data that, according to current guidelines, must be entered in one's local system rather than contributed to the shared Authority File (e.g. a note containing a cataloger's initials and a reference from "Untied States" would both currently be considered local data in the sense that neither is permitted to be added to the shared Authority File). Finally, the term "local" can be used to refer to any data that can be contributed to the shared Authority File but must be identified as local data through the use of appropriate tags, indicators, and/or subfield $5 codes. In this final usage, the terms "local" and "shared" are not mutually exclusive.

Given the ambiguities of the term "local," it is important that authors of cataloging documentation and professional literature use the term with some caution. The intended meaning of the word should be stated explicitly or made clear from surrounding context. The task group has not identified any specific action to recommend on this issue; it simply offers a word of caution.

All contributors to the Authority File are expected to know whether or not particular kinds of authority data may be shared <u>and</u>, if they may be shared, whether or not that data must be identified as local through the use of appropriate tags, indicators, and/or subfield $5 codes. Various factors come into play when making these decisions, including:

- whether the data adheres to principles set forth in various cataloging standards
- whether the data relates to cataloging decisions that are permitted to vary among institutions (e.g. series analysis decisions)
- whether the data is institution-specific (e.g. an institution-specific classification scheme)
- whether the data is copy-specific (e.g. a form of name found on a bookplate)
- whether the data has potential relevance for other libraries
- whether the data belongs to the Library of Congress or a PCC institution

Current standards and guidelines address some of these factors more comprehensively than others. Instructions pertaining to copy-specific data, in particular, are sadly lacking. The task group recommends that appropriate policies for recording copy-specific data in Authority File records be decided and documented (see Recommendation #4). Catalogers of special collections materials are especially in need of such guidance.

III.A.2. Library of Congress Local Data

Local authorities data that the Library of Congress shares with other institutions include its call numbers (050 fields with second indicator value "0"), its classification numbers (053 fields with second indicator value "0"), and its series numbering and treatment decisions (642, 644, 645, and 646 fields with subfield $5 DLC).

Local authorities data that the Library of Congress does not share with other institutions is currently restricted to 9XX local note fields. These fields, as defined in the LC *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* Z1 section, include: 952 (cataloger's permanent note), 953 (local staff codes), 958 (confidential information), and 985 (record history). The 9XX fields are retained only in the LC local online system. During the ongoing record distribution process, the 9XX fields are stripped from outgoing versions of the records and merged with incoming updated versions of the records received from the utilities.

The Library of Congress does not currently add any local information to shared authority records that would be considered non-standard according to AACR2, LCSH, and LC/PCC documentation.

III.A.3. PCC Institutions' Local Data

PCC institutions are permitted to record only a limited amount of local data in shared Authority File records. LC call numbers for classed-together series (050 fields with second indicator value "4" and appropriate subfield $5 code) and unverified LC classification numbers for literary authors (053 fields with second indicator value "4" and appropriate subfield $5 code) may be recorded, but each of these fields may only carry the subfield $5 code of a single NACO participant. Similarly, series numbering and treatment decisions may be recorded in the appropriate 64X fields, but the subfield $5 code of only a single NACO institution may be represented. Usually the code corresponds to the NACO participant responsible for creating, or first updating, the record.

The prohibition against multiple PCC institutions placing their subfield $5 codes in authorities fields places an added burden on these libraries. It requires them to annotate the authority records directly in their own local systems and find some way of protecting their local annotations from overlay when later versions of the same authority records enter their systems.

PCC libraries that wish to record other types of data in authority records (e.g. local call numbers, local notes, and local references) must do so within their own local systems. Typically, such information is added in order to facilitate searching, processing, and catalog maintenance activities. The information is generally considered inappropriate for the shared Authority File because it has relevance only for a particular institution (e.g. call numbers constructed according to local classification schemes) or because it is not considered valid according to current cataloging standards (e.g. local references that the Library of Congress would consider "variants of variants"). Some of this data could prove useful to other libraries if it were allowed to be shared, especially information with the potential to serve a catalog maintenance role.

III.B. Options for Increased Sharing of Authority Data

III.B.1. More Comprehensive Shared Authority File

The task group discussed the ramifications of allowing all NACO participants to record their local series decisions and local call numbers in the shared Authority File, as the Library of Congress currently does. This would relieve these libraries of the burden of having to maintain this information in local systems and protect it from overlay. However, given the number of institutions currently participating in the NACO program, and the variations in practice commonly seen in different units within any single institution, this approach would result in authority records becoming exceedingly cluttered with local data and would make the records increasingly difficult to consult. Such an approach might be feasible if all local systems had the ability to automatically strip out unwanted information from incoming authority records, but authority records in the national utilities would still remain unbearably long and cluttered. Opening up the Authority File to this kind of local information would also result in a dramatic increase in the number of authority record updates, especially updates to series authority records. Libraries that subscribe to automated record update services would be see a big jump in the number of changed authority records received and would be forced to deal with the financial and systems implications. The task group discarded this idea.

The task group also discussed the ramifications of allowing PCC institutions to contribute to the shared Authority File information not valid according to current standards but potentially useful for catalog maintenance purposes in other libraries. This idea was seen as having potential merit. The task group has addressed this option more fully in later sections of our report and made numerous recommendations along these lines.

III.B.2. Separate LC Local and Shared Authority Files

The task group briefly discussed the possibility of the Library of Congress maintaining a local authority file separate from the shared Authority File. Such an arrangement would allow LC the option of importing only those authority records that correspond to bibliographic headings in its database. More importantly, in the context of this report, it would also allow LC to "filter out" any unwanted data present in incoming authority records. This filtering could be accomplished through the manual deletion of data or using an automated method to strip out particular fields or subfields. Such a model might allow the PCC more leeway in accepting and implementing recommendations that do not currently meet with LC approval.

However, a dual-database approach would force LC to maintain two databases simultaneously, the shared Authority File and its own local authority file. LC would also be saddled with the task, familiar to the rest of us, of trying to ensure that its local authority file stayed in sync with the shared file. The task group wondered whether some centralized body other than the Library of Congress might be made

responsible for maintaining this separate shared Authority File, but no group emerged as a likely candidate. The task group discarded this idea.

III.B.3. Implementation of Separate Maintenance Authority File

Finally, the task group briefly discussed the possibility of maintaining the current shared Authority File setup and instead creating a special separate database devoted solely to catalog maintenance information. This database would contain maintenance records that would be linked to Authority File records. Each record would contain notes relating to the history of a heading and fields that could be used for manual and automated maintenance purposes. However, the task group discarded the idea of a separate Maintenance Authority File. Not only did it seem technologically complicated, but also no organization emerged as a likely candidate for overseeing its implementation and maintenance.

IV. MAINTENANCE FUNCTION OF AUTHORITY DATA

IV.A. Current Practice

The need for ongoing heading maintenance in library catalogs, utilities, and other bibliographic databases should not be underestimated. Large numbers of bibliographic records with obsolete and unauthorized headings have entered our systems as a result of retrospective conversion projects. Many of these headings were formulated according to pre-AACR2 rules. Local online catalogs also frequently contain records that were loaded as part of batch-matching routines, purchased from vendors, or imported using copy cataloging workflows that bypass heading verification procedures. Libraries that perform heading maintenance work on these bibliographic records retrospectively tend to limit their corrections to their own local systems; they do not systematically upgrade the records they have contributed to the bibliographic utilities, perpetuating the likelihood that other libraries using those records as cataloging copy will encounter unauthorized forms of headings.

Somewhat paradoxically, even the success of the NACO program has contributed to an increased need for heading maintenance. As the number of records in the Authority File has grown, so has the need to resolve conflicts between new and previously established headings. The addition of qualifiers and other data to existing headings in order to differentiate them has generated a continual need for bibliographic file maintenance. Unresolvable conflicts have resulted in an increasing number of unique name records being turned into undifferentiated name records. The very fact that NACO participants create authority records simultaneously in different databases has led to an inevitable number of duplicate records, often with conflicting headings that must be reconciled.

Just as manual authority cards long provided the basis for heading corrections in the card catalog, machine-readable authority records now provide the basis for heading corrections in machine-readable bibliographic records. These corrections must often still be performed by a human operator, one record at a time, but increasingly they can be accomplished using machine matching and data manipulation. The desirability of an Authority File capable of supporting automated maintenance functions was noted a full decade ago by the Task Group on Authorities of the Cooperative Cataloging Council, a predecessor of the PCC. In its final report <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/tg3authfinal.html>, dated 1993, the group posited that:

> A national authority file must support multiple uses, including
>
> - use for unique identification and differentiation between headings
> - use for collocation functions

- use for syndetic structure
- **use for machine-validation and manipulation of records [emphasis ours]**
- reference use of information found in records
- use by cataloging units to easily identify the level of completeness of a record and the source, to determine the usefulness of that record for in-house files.

Unfortunately, current standards for creating and updating authority records in the shared Authority File generally make little mention of the file's potential as a maintenance tool for the manual and automated correction of headings in bibliographic records. However, they do contain <u>some</u> instructions intended to facilitate the maintenance function of authority records. These instructions are enumerated below and accompanied by references to specific recommendations intended to improve their effectiveness or introduce new functionality.

IV.A.1. Authority Record Recycling

When a record is no longer needed in the shared Authority File, current guidelines instruct that the record is to be deleted rather than edited and "recycled" to represent a different bibliographic identity. Situations that call for authority record deletion include: when a heading is created in error; when a heading is discovered to be a duplicate of another heading; when a subject heading is changed to a name heading (or vice versa); and when a subject heading is split into two or more new headings.

This prohibition against record recycling provides for stable LCCNs and prevents unintended heading flips in systems that rely on LCCNs for automated heading maintenance. Unfortunately, the prohibition is not well documented and is not always observed by Authority File contributors. The task group proposes the adoption of a more aggressive approach to documenting and promulgating this prohibition in order to promote LCCN stability in the shared Authority File (see Recommendation #5).

IV.A.2. Undifferentiated Name Records

When creating a new authority record for a bibliographic identity previously covered by an undifferentiated name authority record, current guidelines instruct that the LCCN of the undifferentiated name record is to be supplied in a 667 field (nonpublic general note). This note alerts catalog maintenance staff to the possibility that heading reconciliation may be needed in the catalog.

However, the old form of heading is not necessarily recorded in the new authority record. In order to identify bibliographic headings that might need correction, one has to search for the form of name in the undifferentiated name record using the LCCN supplied in the 667 or, alternatively, try the search using a shortened form of the new heading (i.e. dropping the $c, $d, or $q that has allowed the name to become

unique). The task group proposes that the undifferentiated name heading be recorded in the 667 field in addition to the LCCN (see Recommendation #6).

Concern for LCCN stability has also prompted the task group to propose the adoption of a new policy for modifying undifferentiated personal name authority records. The dynamic nature of undifferentiated name records results in extremely fluid relationships between LCCNs and bibliographic identities that wreak havoc in systems with linked authorities functionality. Bibliographic identities can be added to, and removed from, undifferentiated name records over time, causing these records to toggle back and forth between undifferentiated status and unique status. If a formerly undifferentiated record has become unique, the heading is liable to be changed to a different form, as is any heading that corresponds to a single bibliographic identity. Such a change will often result in inappropriate heading flips in local catalogs. Headings representing separate bibliographic identities that were once listed on the undifferentiated name record will all flip to the new heading for the unique identity. Many libraries have no way of knowing when identities are moved off an undifferentiated name record; their headings are still linked to the formerly undifferentiated record and are thus vulnerable to these incorrect flips.

The task group proposes that undifferentiated name records should never be changed to unique name records. If all of the identities but one have been removed from an undifferentiated name record, then a new unique record should be created for that remaining identity and the undifferentiated record should be cancelled (see Recommendation #7).

IV.A.3. Cancelled Records

When a record is deleted from the shared Authority File, current guidelines instruct that the LCCN of the cancelled record is to be entered in the 010 subfield $z of the authority record that is being kept. The presence of a cancelled LCCN alerts a human operator or an automated authorities system to the possibility that heading reconciliation may be needed in the catalog.

However, the form of the cancelled heading, when it differs, is not necessarily recorded in the authority record, making it difficult to identify the headings in the catalog that might need correction. The task group proposes that the cancelled heading be recorded in the authority record if it differs from the 1XX field (see Recommendation #8).

IV.A.4. Pre-AACR2 Forms of Headings

NACO participants are currently allowed the option of adding linking references to authority records for pre-AACR2 forms of headings found in Library of Congress MARC bibliographic records when they differ from AACR2 forms. These linking references are coded $wnna (if the pre-AACR2 form is compatible with AACR2

practice) or $wnnaa (if the pre-AACR2 form is incompatible with AACR2 practice). A linking reference may not be made if it would normalize to the same form as the heading or another reference on the same record or to the same form as a heading on another record or if there is no one-to-one correspondence between the old and new headings. An appropriate 667 field may be used to record the pre-AACR2 form of heading in such cases. Examples:

Linking reference for pre-AACR2 form compatible with AACR2 practice:

> 110 2# $a Delaware Racing Commission
> 410 2# $w nna $a Delaware. $b Racing Commission

Linking reference for pre-AACR2 form incompatible with AACR2 practice:

> 110 2# $a Pennsylvania Hall Association (Philadelphia, Pa.)
> 410 2# $w nnaa $a Pennsylvania Hall Association, Philadelphia

Note for pre-AACR2 form that normalizes to same form as AACR2 form:

> 100 0# $a Napoleon $b I, $c Emperor of the French, $d 1769-1821
> 667 ## $a Old catalog heading: Napoléon I, Emperor of the French, 1769-1821

Linking references can be invaluable in making manual and/or machine corrections to headings in bibliographic records. The task group recommends that the PCC encourage NACO participants to make more frequent use of these optional linking references for pre-AACR2 forms of headings found in LC MARC bibliographic records and that it provide better guidance in identifying these headings for those who choose to exercise the option (see Recommendation #9).

The task group rejected a proposal to make the linking references required, rather than optional. Such a requirement was seen as likely to discourage NACO participants from contributing records they might otherwise have been willing to contribute. The task group also rejected a proposal that pre-AACR2 linking references be allowed for pre-AACR2 forms of headings found on any library's MARC records. Most thought the resulting records would appear chaotic and the resulting index displays overly cluttered.

IV.A.5. Former AACR2 Headings

When changing the form of heading in an existing AACR2 or AACR2-compatible authority record, Authority File contributors are instructed to add a linking reference for the previously authorized heading, as long as that heading is compatible with current guidelines for making references. These linking references (coded $wnne) can be used to aid manual or machine corrections to headings in bibliographic records.

However, NACO participants are currently not allowed to make linking references (coded $wnnea) from former AACR2 headings that do not make valid references. The task group recommends that these headings be recorded in a note field to facilitate the task of finding headings in bibliographic records that may need to be corrected (see Recommendation #10).

IV.A.6. "Missing" Wade-Giles References

As part of the Pinyin Conversion Project, approximately 156,000 name authority records were converted from the Wade Giles to the Pinyin romanization scheme. References from the former Wade-Giles headings were added to 131,000 of these records and coded $wnne to identify them as previously established AACR2 headings.

However, the Library of Congress did not initially add Wade-Giles references to the remaining 25,000 records because the references did not qualify as valid AACR2 references. Most of these records featured name-title headings and headings for corporate bodies with subordinate units. According to current standards, the name portion of name-title references and the parent body portion of subordinate body references cannot be represented by cross reference forms. Instead, the reference for the name portion is contained only on the record for the name and the reference for the parent body portion is contained only on the record for the parent body. In addition, the combination of different romanizations in a single heading is not currently permitted. Thus, for example, a hybrid name-title reference containing a Pinyin name and a Wade-Giles title would also not be permitted.

In an exceptional move, LC agreed to add the references on a temporary basis (coded $wnnea) to assist libraries' efforts to accomplish bibliographic file maintenance. However, LC plans to remove the references from the authority records after two years. The text of the LC announcement is available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pinyin/wnnea2.html.

The task group recommends that the Wade-Giles references on these 25,000 authority records be retained in a note field rather than deleted entirely (see Recommendation #11).

IV.A.7. Former LCSH Headings

When the heading on an existing LCSH authority record is changed, a reference is generally made (coded $wnne) from the former heading. These references can be used to aid manual or machine corrections to headings in bibliographic records.

However, the LC *Subject Cataloging Manual* lists four circumstances in which references from former subject headings cannot be made. The task group recommends that such headings be recorded in a note field to facilitate the task of

finding headings in bibliographic records that may need to be corrected (see Recommendation #12). This method could also be used to record former subject headings considered offensive by contemporary standards. However, if there is no clear replacement heading for the offensive heading, then the task group proposes that the heading form the basis for a reference record (See Recommendation #13).

IV.B. Options for Expanding Maintenance Role of Authority Data

Expanding the maintenance function of the shared Authority File was generally seen as a laudable goal by members of the task group, given the potential benefits for users of library catalogs and the potential efficiencies for catalog management activities. The group identified two primary methods as possible options for expanding the maintenance role of the shared Authority File: an expanded use of note fields and an expanded use of cross references. The group also briefly discussed, and rejected, a proposal that all 4XX references should be unique and a proposal that authority records should be created for additional categories of headings.

IV.B.1 Expanded Use of Note Fields

There was general agreement among task group members that all of the changes that an authorized heading (1XX) has undergone ought to be recorded somewhere in the authority record. Therefore, the group has made various recommendations that call for Authority File contributors to make greater use of note fields to record formerly used headings that cannot currently be added to authority records as cross references.

The task of manually correcting obsolete headings in bibliographic records would be greatly facilitated by having all formerly valid headings clearly identified in the authority record. Catalog maintenance staff would know the history of a particular heading at a glance and could more easily find those headings in bibliographic records that need correction. There would be no requirement to add the notes retrospectively to existing authority records whose headings were changed in the past.

The task group identified three possible options for expanded note field use:

1) The existing 667 field (nonpublic general note) could be used for this purpose.
2) The existing 688 field (application history note) could be used for this purpose. The 688 field is currently not approved for use by the Library of Congress and PCC participants, but a proposal could be made that it be implemented. The description of the field seems to imply that it is reserved for recording former subject headings; if that is the case, a MARBI proposal could be made to redefine the field to apply to both name and subject headings.
3) An entirely new MARC tag, or range of tags, could be proposed.

The task group generally disliked the idea of using the generic 667 field to store information related to former headings. This field is currently used for a wide variety of purposes. The group thought that a field specifically designed to record former headings would serve much more efficiently for catalog maintenance purposes. Thus, the second and third options appealed to most members.

Ideally, the field used to store information relating to former headings would allow full content designation, including the ability to specify useful informational text (e.g. "Former heading") followed by the tag, indicators, and subfields associated with the former headings. Library management systems could then be programmed to make use of the information. The 688 field is not currently defined in this way, but a proposal to define a full range of subfields to be associated with the tag could be made. The same could be done if proposing an entirely new MARC tag. If an entire range of MARC tags were proposed, the tags and indicators could be mapped to the current range of authority 1XX tags.

In the examples that accompany our recommendations for expanding the use of note fields, we have generally opted to simply use the word "Note" rather than specifying a particular tag number to be used. If any of these recommendations are implemented, the word "Note" would, of course, be replaced by a MARC tag. In the two recommendations relating to undifferentiated name records, we have retained the 667 tag simply because it is already current policy to use a 667 tag in these situations (see Recommendations #6-7). However, if the other recommendations were to be adopted, it might make sense to use a different tag for "formerly on undifferentiated name record" notes. For simplicity's sake, we have not used any subfields other than the initial subfield $a in our examples of note fields. However, this convention should not be interpreted as an indication that we would prefer an approach that uses unencoded data. Finally, we propose that each former heading be recorded in a separate field rather than strung together in a single note using multiple subfields. The tags used for the note field(s) would thus need to be defined as repeatable in the MARC format.

IV.B.2. Implementation of "Maintenance References"

A second option for expanding the maintenance role of the shared Authority File would be an increased use of cross references. Many formerly authorized forms of headings and many variant headings encountered in reference sources, bibliographic utilities, and other shared databases cannot be added as references to Authority File records according to current LC/PCC standards. These variant forms can sometimes be recorded in 667 or 670 fields, and are thus useful for manual catalog maintenance approaches, but they cannot be included in 4XX fields as cross references and thus cannot be used to perform automated heading flips.

Variant headings that cannot already be added as references according to current standards could be added as "maintenance references" to authority records. This approach could be implemented by using the existing reference subfield $w/3 value "a" for "reference not displayed," by proposing a new value for reference subfield $w/3 to be defined as "reference is not displayed, used only for maintenance purposes" or by proposing a new MARC tag to be used exclusively for the purpose of constructing "maintenance references." Should the concept of "maintenance references" be adopted, the group agreed that adding them to authority records should be entirely optional and that they should not be displayed in public indexes.

The obvious benefit of adding "maintenance references" to authority records would be their potential for allowing machine validation and manipulation of headings in bibliographic records. Many variant headings currently found in large shared databases, such as bibliographic utilities, could serve as useful "maintenance references," including: headings with typos; headings with variant dates; headings with dates or qualifiers not present in the authorized form; headings considered "variants of variants"; and headings not constructed in accordance with AACR2.

However, some categories of variant headings might not make good candidates for "maintenance references" due to the risk of incorrect heading flips. For example, variants that conflict with currently authorized headings and variants that lack dates or qualifiers now present in authorized headings would probably not be good candidates:

> 100 1# McAllan, John
> [Maintenance reference from heading with typographical error "McAllen, John" used in RLIN bibliographic records conflicts with the authorized heading for another person]
>
> 100 1# Jordan, Mary, $d 1942-
> [Maintenance reference from former heading "Jordan, Mary" might cause headings representing another "Jordan, Mary" to be flipped incorrectly]

More useful would be the practice of adding "maintenance references" only in those cases in which it is unlikely that an incorrect heading flip would occur. For example, records in which both the variant and the established heading have dates:

> 100 1# Papp, Jonas, $d 1720-1781
> [Maintenance reference from variant "Papp, Jonas, $d 1721-1781" found in reference sources would not be likely to generate any incorrect heading flips]

An ideal solution would be if local systems could generate a trigger for manual review prior to making any potentially risky heading flips. However, it seems doubtful that such a feature could be universally implemented by automated library systems and, even if it could be, many libraries might not be able to afford the staff needed to perform these manual reviews. Should the "maintenance references" method be adopted, a better approach might be to draft guidelines identifying which categories of variant headings would, and would not, make appropriate references of this sort.

In the end, the task group was unable to reach consensus on whether to recommend the adoption of this method. Some members would like cross references to play a greater maintenance role than is currently permitted; others believe it is inadvisable to use the reference structure as a mechanism to manage bibliographic file maintenance, given the limitations of current authority control capabilities in automated systems and given concerns that the syndetic structure of the authority file

might be unduly compromised. Although "maintenance references" by definition should not display to the public, there is no guarantee that systems vendors would actually be willing to implement a new subfield $w/3 value or a new tag as envisioned. Many current systems already have problems suppressing references that are coded "reference not displayed" using the existing subfield $w/3 value "a". There was also concern that "maintenance references" might clutter staff-side heading indexes and that PCC participants, many of whom already find the subfield $w/3 values confusing, might not code the references correctly.

Given these many concerns, the task group opted not to make any recommendations relating to the idea of "maintenance references." However, we encourage any individuals or groups responding to this report to comment on the idea.

IV.B.3. Requirement That All 4XX References Be Unique

Current instructions permit a 4XX reference to normalize to the same form as a 4XX reference on another record. This can result in a nice index display when searching on the 4XX:

> AMA
> See: American Medical Association
> See: Australian Medical Association
> See: Automobile Manufacturers Association

However, it can be problematic for machine corrections of headings. When a heading in a bibliographic record matches multiple 4XX references, a bad system will change it to one of the authorized headings at random (e.g., the first one it encounters). A good system will provide notification that there are multiple matches and will refrain from making a correction (or will do a heading split for a X50 topical subject heading).

The task group briefly considered proposing that 4XX references need to be unique (except in the case of heading splits) but quickly decided that such a proposal lacked merit. First, it was noted that it would be difficult, and sometimes impossible, to differentiate many 4XX references. Second, even if a 4XX could be made unique through additions, qualifiers, etc., it would no longer match the form used in the bibliographic heading, so an automated heading correction would still not be made.

IV.B.4. Requirement That More Authority Records Be Created

Finally, the task group briefly considered the idea that authority records for certain categories of headings not currently established should be permitted in the Authority File. Headings for individual meetings of ongoing conferences were mentioned as one obvious possibility. Currently, LCRI 24.7B prohibits the addition of numbers, dates, or places to an authority record containing an ongoing conference heading. However, headings for individual meetings of the conference are permitted on bibliographic records and are qualified as appropriate.

Example:

Authority record:

        110 2# $a Fisheries Society of Nigeria. $b Conference

Bibliographic record:

        110 2# $a Fisheries Society of Nigeria. $b Conference $n (10th : $d 1992 : $c Abeokuta, Nigeria)

Although manual and machine corrections of conference headings in bibliographic records would be greatly facilitated by the creation of authority records for each meeting of an ongoing conference, the group refrained from making any recommendations, noting that such a proposal had been distributed by the Library of Congress a number of years ago and then withdrawn, based on comments received from NACO participants.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation #1 : Clarify Official Authority File Names

The files of machine-readable authority records for which the Library of Congress and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging share responsibility do not appear to have consistent naming conventions. These terms are commonly used to refer to the name records and subject records taken together as a single concept:

> Library of Congress Authority File
> Library of Congress Authorities
> Authority File

These terms are commonly used to refer to name records within the file (i.e. any record with an LCCN beginning with "n"):

> Name Authority File
> National Authority File
> NACO Authority File
> NAF
> Anglo-American Authority File
> AAAF
> Library of Congress Name Authority File
> LCNAF

These terms are commonly used to refer to subject records within the file (i.e. any record with an LCCN beginning with "s"):

> Library of Congress Subject Headings
> LCSH
> Subject Authority File
> SAF

The task group recommends that LC and PCC decide upon a suitable name for each of these three concepts (especially the first two, which seem to present the most confusion and are sometimes used interchangeably) and use these names as consistently as possible in their documentation. This standardization of terminology would facilitate professional discourse about the file. Ideally, the file's official names would reflect its status as a shared file with international contributors.

Recommendation #2 : Communicate With JSC

The current edition of the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (AACR) contains instructions for the establishment of headings in bibliographic records and instructions for the provision of cross references, but it does not explicitly address authority records, much less the concept of an authority file and its relationship to a bibliographic file.

Fortunately, the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) has agreed that AACR should contain an additional section devoted solely to authority records. The task group recommends that this section include general principles addressing the function of an authority file, including explicit acknowledgement of the catalog maintenance role played by an authority file in the electronic environment.

The group notes that Barbara Tillett, in a discussion paper presented to the JSC, has identified various principles, entities, and objectives that could be included in a revised introduction to AACR2. Drawing on the work of Patrick Le Bœuf, she suggests that the need to "manage" the catalog be acknowledged as one of a cataloger's many tasks and notes that early FRBR drafts used a similar term, "housekeeping." Supporting work by Rahmatollah Fattahi is also cited. (see: Tillett, Barbara B. "Principles of AACR," a draft document presented to the JSC on May 8, 2001, p. 6. Available online at: http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/prin2001.pdf)

Recommendation #3 : Communicate With FRANAR

The IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records (FRANAR) is currently working on defining functional requirements for authority records. The task group recommends that the working group consider the catalog management role that is played by authority records, especially in the online environment, and explicitly acknowledge that one of the many functions of an authority file is facilitating the maintenance of headings in bibliographic records.

Recommendation #4: Formulate Policies for Recording Copy-Specific Authority Data

NACO participants sometimes need to cite copy-specific data in records contributed to the shared Authority File. This happens most frequently when a special collections cataloger needs to establish a name relating to an item's provenance or unique physical characteristics. The task group recommends that guidance be provided for recording this kind of data in Authority File records.

The following examples illustrate two common situations and a possible solution:

> 670 ## Relaciones de don Ivan de Persia, 1604: $b bookplate in CtY-BR copy (Valerian Lada-Mocarski)

> 670 ## Hermanni Conringii De nummis Ebraeorum paradoxa, 1675 $b (name not given; binder of CtY-BR copy)

Alternatively, subfield $5 could be defined for use in the 670 field:

> 670 ## Relaciones de don Ivan de Persia, 1604: $b bookplate (Valerian Lada-Mocarski) $5 CtY-BR

> 670 ## Hermanni Conringii De nummis Ebraeorum paradoxa, 1675 $b (name not given; binder) $5 CtY-BR

Guidance could also be provided on whether references based solely on copy-specific usage are appropriate for inclusion in Authority File records. Although the data may not appear on other copies of the item being cited, it may very well appear on copies of other items (e.g. the bookplate of a well-known collector or the initials of a well-known binder may appear on thousands of items held by numerous libraries and constitute a form of name that a researcher would be liable to search in the catalog).

Some types of copy-specific information might <u>not</u> be appropriate for inclusion in Authority File records. For example, should titles appearing on unique bindings be cited in uniform title authority records and added as references? Probably not, as these can be added as 246 fields in the bibliographic record, if desired, and are not likely to be searched anyway.

Finally, catalogers of manuscripts and archival materials deal exclusively with unique materials and/or unique collections of materials. Constructing 670 fields in Authority File records for the "item being cataloged" can be problematic. Currently, what little guidance is offered these catalogers is found in the *NACO Participants' Manual*, which notes that a subfield $b location is not needed in the 670 field when citing archival collections:

670 ## Jervis, J.B. Papers, 1820-1884: $b (Horatio Allen; b. 1802; d. 1899) [no location given, since this is an archival collection]

However, more guidance on appropriate methods for citing manuscripts and archives materials would be helpful. One particularly problematic area is the need to differentiate between usage that appears in manuscript form (e.g. autographed letters) and usage that appears in printed form on publications contained within the archive being cataloged (e.g. annual reports). Sometimes both kinds of usage must be cited in a single 670 and making the distinction helps to justify the choice of form for the heading being established.

Recommendation #5: Promote Prohibition Against Authority Record Recycling More Aggressively

When a record is no longer needed in the shared Authority File, current guidelines instruct that the record is to be deleted rather than "recycled" to represent a different bibliographic identity. This policy provides for stable LCCNs and prevents unintended heading flips in systems that rely on LCCNs for automated heading maintenance. Unfortunately, the policy is not well documented and is sometimes not followed by NACO participants. The task group recommends that the prohibition against re-using LCCNs be better documented and more aggressively promoted. The current approach of issuing periodic reminders to NACO participants via the PCC electronic discussion list is not sufficient. The following steps should help raise catalogers' awareness of the potential for unwanted global heading changes:

1. Add the following question and answer to the PCC *Frequently Asked Questions* list on the web <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco/nacocatfaq.html>:

> **Question: What should I do if an authority record is no longer needed?**
>
> **Answer: If an authority record is no longer needed, you must ask your Library of Congress liaison to delete the record. This will happen most frequently when an authority record is discovered to be a duplicate of another authority record. Do not, under any circumstances, attempt to recycle the record by editing to make it represent another bibliographic entity, even if the authority record has only been in existence for a short time. Authority record recycling causes many library systems to perform inappropriate heading flips in bibliographic records and is strictly prohibited.**

2. Expand the existing "Cancellation of Name Authority Records" section in the *NACO Training Manual*, Day 1, as follows (suggested text given as boldface):

> The construction of the master file database utilized by the NAF does not allow for online cancellation of authority records by participants using the bibliographic utilities' software. Therefore, when candidates for deletion are identified (usually because of duplication) NACO participants are encouraged to forward requests for cancellation of NARs to their Coop Cat liaison. **NACO participants must not, under any circumstances, attempt to recycle an existing authority record by changing it into a record for another bibliographic entity, even if that authority record has only been in existence for a short time. Such recycling causes many library systems to perform inappropriate heading flips in bibliographic records and is strictly prohibited.**

3. Add an appropriate section to the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* (DCMZ1).

Recommendation #6: Record Former Undifferentiated Names in a Note Field

When creating a new authority record for a bibliographic identity previously covered by an undifferentiated name authority record, current guidelines instruct that the LCCN of the undifferentiated name record is to be supplied in a 667 field (nonpublic general note). This LCCN alerts catalog maintenance staff to the possibility that heading reconciliation may be needed in the catalog.

However, the old form of heading is not recorded in the new authority record. In order to identify bibliographic headings that might need correction, one has to search for the form of name in the undifferentiated name record using the LCCN supplied in the 667 or, alternatively, search using a shortened form of the new heading (i.e. dropping the $c, $d, or $q that has allowed the name to become unique).

The task group recommends that in addition to supplying the LCCN of the undifferentiated name record, the cataloger also supply the heading. This will facilitate the task of identifying the headings in the bibliographic file that might need correcting.

Example (current practice):

>   100 1# $a Smith, John, $d 1921-
>   400 1# $a Smith, J. $q (John), $d 1921-
>   667 ## $a Formerly on undifferentiated name record: [LCCN of undifferentiated name record]

Example (proposed practice):

>   100 1# $a Smith, John, $d 1921-
>   400 1# $a Smith, J. $q (John), $d 1921-
>   667 ## $a Formerly on undifferentiated name record: [LCCN of undifferentiated name record], Smith, J.

Recommendation #7: Prohibit Changing Undifferentiated Name Records to Unique Name Records

The dynamic nature of undifferentiated name authority records results in extremely fluid relationships between LCCNs and bibliographic identities, wreaking havoc in systems with linked authorities functionality. Bibliographic identities can be added to, and removed from, undifferentiated name records over time, causing these records to toggle back and forth between undifferentiated status and unique status. If a formerly undifferentiated record has become unique, the heading is liable to be changed to a different form, as is any heading that corresponds to a single bibliographic identity. Such a change will often result in inappropriate heading flips in local catalogs. Headings representing separate bibliographic identities that were once listed on the undifferentiated name record will all flip to the new heading for the unique identity. Many libraries have no way of knowing when identities are moved off an undifferentiated name record; their headings are still linked to the formerly undifferentiated record and are thus vulnerable to incorrect flips.

The task group recommends that undifferentiated name records should never be changed to unique name records. If all of the identities but one can be removed from an undifferentiated name record, then a new unique record should also be created for that remaining identity and the undifferentiated record should be cancelled. This policy will result in greater LCCN stability in the shared Authority File and fewer erroneous flips in local catalogs. The approach is similar to that used for subject heading splits. If a single subject heading splits into two or more new headings, the original authority record is deleted and new authority records are created for the new headings using new record control numbers.

Example:

Before (undifferentiated name record):

        010 ## $a [LCCN of undifferentiated name record]
        100 1# $a Maloney, Ethel
        670 ## $a [Author of A journey from Vermont to Ohio]
        670 ## $a A journey from Vermont to Ohio, 1932: $b t.p. (Ethel Maloney)
        670 ## $a [Author of The care of pigs]
        670 ## $a The care of pigs, 2002: $b t.p. (Ethel Maloney)

After (two new unique records):

        010 ## $a [Unique LCCN]
        100 1# $a Maloney, Ethel
        667 ## $a Formerly on undifferentiated name record: [LCCN of undifferentiated name record]
        670 ## $a A journey from Vermont to Ohio, 1932: $b t.p. (Ethel Maloney)

010 ## $a [Unique LCCN]
100 1# $a Maloney, Ethel, $d 1979-
667 ## $a Formerly on undifferentiated name record: [LCCN of undifferentiated name record]
670 ## $a The care of pigs, 2002: $b (Ethel Maloney)
670 ## $a WW in veterinary science $b (Maloney, Ethel; b. 1979)

One downside to this approach is the fact that NACO participants are not permitted to delete authority records. Record deletion requests must be forwarded to Library of Congress liaisons. The group has identified several possible scenarios:

1) Allow the NACO participant to contribute the two unique records and accept the fact that duplicate headings will reside in the file temporarily, generating error messages, until the undifferentiated record gets deleted by LC.

2) Require the NACO participant to leave the two new unique records in a save file, temporarily, until the undifferentiated record has been deleted by LC. The risk here is that the new records may never get contributed.

3) Require the NACO participant to send the LC liaison the information that uniquely identifies the next-to-last identity and let LC take care of all new record creation and deletion.

The task group prefers option 1, above.

Finally, there is the question of whether the LCCN of the cancelled record should be entered in the 010 subfield $z of one or all of the new records. The task group recommends against this practice, considering it appropriate in cases of one-to-one heading cancellations only. Because the old LCCN represented more than a single identity, no one-to-one relationship exists. Again, the group has looked to practices for subject heading splits as a model. The new unique name records would, however, retain the old LCCN in their 667 field notes.

Recommendation #8: Record Cancelled Headings in a Note Field

When an authority record is deleted from the shared authority file, current guidelines instruct that the LCCN of the cancelled record is to be entered in the 010 subfield $z of the related authority record that is being kept. The presence of a cancelled LCCN alerts a human operator or an automated authorities system to the possibility that heading reconciliation may be needed in the catalog. However, the form of the cancelled heading, when it differs, is not necessarily recorded in the authority record, making it difficult to identify the headings in the catalog that might need correction.

The task group recommends that the cancelled heading be recorded in a note field in the record that is being kept, if the cancelled heading differs from the kept heading. This will facilitate the task of identifying headings that might need correcting in the bibliographic file.

Examples:

> 010 ## $a [LCCN] $z [cancelled LCCN]
> 100 1# $a Philips, Gina, $d 1958-
> 400 1# $a Philips, G. E. $q (Gina Evelyn), $d 1958-
> Note: $a Record covers cancelled heading: Philips, Gina E.
>
> 010 ## $a [LCCN] $z [cancelled LCCN]
> 110 2# $a Auschwitz (Concentration camp)
> Note: $a Record covers cancelled subject heading: Auschwitz (Poland : Concentration camp)

Recommendation #9: Promote Use of Linking References for Pre-AACR2 Headings More Aggressively

NACO participants currently have the option to add linking references for pre-AACR2 forms of headings found in Library of Congress MARC bibliographic records when they differ from the AACR2 forms of the headings. However, this practice is not actively promoted and the value of these linking references is not emphasized in current NACO documentation.

The task group recommends that NACO participants be encouraged to make more frequent use of linking references and that PCC documentation be modified to highlight the potential use of these references as a maintenance tool in local online catalogs. The following steps would help raise catalogers' awareness:

1. Add the following question and answer to the PCC *Frequently Asked Questions* list on the web <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco/nacocatfaq.html>:

> **Question: Am I required to make linking references for pre-AACR2 headings found in LC MARC records?**
>
> **Answer: No, the practice is optional. However, these references are invaluable for catalog maintenance purposes and NACO participants are encouraged to provide them. For further instructions, see the "Linking References" section in LCRI 26 and relevant sections in the *NACO Training Manual*.**

2. Annotate the existing "$W Control Subfields in 4XX and 5XX Fields" chart in the *NACO Training Manual*, Day 1, to indicate that $wnnaa linking references are an option (currently the chart only lists $wnna linking references as an option).

3. Insert a new page in the *NACO Training Manual*, Day 1, that explains the value of linking references, encourages NACO participants to provide them when appropriate, and refers to the relevant section in LCRI 26. Include better guidance for identifying pre-AACR2 headings in LC MARC records for those who wish to exercise the option, including evaluating headings found in the bibliographic utilities and the LC online catalog.

Recommendation #10: Record Former AACR2 Headings That Are Not Valid References in a Note Field

NACO participants are currently not allowed to make linking references (coded $wnnea) for former AACR2 headings that do not make valid references. The task group recommends that these headings be recorded in a note field to facilitate the task of finding headings in bibliographic records that may need to be corrected.

Examples:

Former heading contained typographical error:

      100 1# $a Parra, Manuel
      Note: $a Former heading: Parra, Manual

Date added to former heading to resolve conflict:

      100 1# $a Haase, Felix, $d b. 1742
      Note: $a Former heading: Haase, Felix

Qualifier added to former heading to resolve conflict:

      110 2# $a Brown and Sons (London, England)
      Note: $a Former heading: Brown and Sons

Recommendation #11: Transfer "Missing" Wade-Giles References To Note Fields Rather Than Delete

As part of the Pinyin Conversion Project, approximately 156,000 name authority records were converted from the Wade Giles to the Pinyin romanization scheme. References from the former Wade-Giles headings were added to 131,000 of these records and coded $wnne to identify them as previously established AACR2 headings. However, LC did not initially want to add Wade-Giles references to the remaining 25,000 records because the references did not qualify as valid AACR2 references. These records were primarily name-title and subordinate body headings. AACR2 does not allow the name portion of name-title references or the parent body portion of subordinate body references to contain a cross reference form. Instead, the reference for the name is contained on the record for the name and the reference for the parent body is contained on the record for the parent body. To make matters more difficult, LCRI 26.1 prohibits the combination of different romanizations in a single heading so that, for example, a hybrid name-title reference containing a Pinyin name and a Wade-Giles title would not be permitted.

In an exceptional move, LC agreed to add the references on a temporary basis (coded $wnnea) to assist libraries' efforts to accomplish bibliographic file maintenance. However, LC plans to remove the references from the authority records after two years. The LC announcement is available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pinyin/wnnea2.html.

The task group recommends that the Wade-Giles references on these 25,000 authority records be retained in a note field rather than deleted entirely.

Example:

Wade-Giles reference slated for eventual deletion:

    100 0# $a Laozi. $t Dao de jing
    400 0# $w nnea $a Lao-tzu. $t Tao te ching

Former Wade-Giles heading recorded in note field:

    100 0# $a Laozi. $t Dao de jing
    Note: $a Former Wade-Giles heading: Lao-tzu. Tao te ching

Recommendation #12 : Record Former LCSH Headings That Are Not Valid References in a Note Field

According to the Library of Congress *Subject Cataloging Manual* (SCM), section H 193, former subject headings are added as $w nne references in subject authority records, except under the following circumstances:

- when the old form of heading "normalizes" to the same string of characters as the new form
- when the only change being made is the correction of a typographical error in the old form of heading;
- when the only change being made is the closing of what had been an open date in the heading or in a period subdivision under the heading;
- when a [heading]–[subdivision] record is being changed because the basic heading itself is also being changed, and the 4XX field containing the old form of the heading has been added to the authority record for the basic heading.

The task group recommends that the former heading be recorded in the record as a note in these cases. Example:

151 ## $a Venezuela $x Politics and government $y 1974-1999
Note: $a Former heading: Venezuela--Politics and government--1974-

The task group would like to note another category of changed subject headings not generally added as references in subject authority records: former subject headings considered offensive by contemporary standards. The task group has addressed these headings in a separate recommendation (Recommendation #13)

Recommendation #13 : Record Former LCSH Headings Considered Offensive

Former subject headings considered offensive by contemporary standards are often not retained as references in subject authority records when the headings are changed. The task group recommends that these former headings be retained as references whenever possible. However, if they are deemed inappropriate for public display, then the task force proposes that they be recorded in note fields or reference records, depending upon the nature of the heading. Indeed, given that these headings tend to be what we most want eliminated from our catalogs, it seems particularly important to provide some record of their previous existence so that catalog management staff know which headings to periodically search and correct. These subject authority records could also serve as a historical record of past prejudices in the catalog. Historians of libraries could benefit from our preservation of this data.

The task group proposes that offensive headings having a one-to-one correspondence with a replacement heading be treated as any other former subject heading not considered a valid reference (see Recommendation #10). The former heading should be recorded in a note field in the subject authority record. Example:

> 150 ## $a African American women domestics
> Note: $a Former heading: Mammies

Offensive headings not having a single designated replacement heading should be recorded in a reference record with the 008/09 fixed field coded "b" (kind of record = untraced reference). Some such records have already been created by the Library of Congress. Example:

> 150 ## $a Jewish question
> 260 ## $a Jews--[place], $i other subdivisions under the heading $a Jews, $i and related topics

However, many formerly valid headings have simply disappeared without a trace. The task group recommends that these former headings be created retrospectively as a special project.

To prevent catalogers not familiar with reference records and unaccustomed to interpreting fixed field 008/09 from assigning the headings to bibliographic records in error, the records could be clearly labelled using a note field. Finally, whenever possible, instructions could be provided to help the cataloger identify an appropriate replacement heading or set of headings. Example:

150 ## $a Yellow peril
Note: $a Not valid for use as a subject heading. Used prior to [...] for works on [...]