



Using relator codes in connection with accesspoints instead of quoting statements of responsibility – the Danish implementation

Hanne Hørl Hansen
Bibliographic consultant
DBC
Ballerup, Denmark

Meeting: 93. Cataloguing

WORLD LIBRARY AND INFORMATION CONGRESS: 76TH IFLA GENERAL CONFERENCE AND ASSEMBLY
10-15 August 2010, Gothenburg, Sweden
<http://www.ifla.org/en/ifla76>

Abstract:

This paper shows how relatorcodes in connection with accesspoints instead of quoting statements of responsibility was implemented in the Danish national bibliography. The paper examines the pros and cons and gives an overview of the practical considerations in doing this.

Multilingual Bibliographic Access is not only about translation and transcription but also about how to communicate from the catalogue to the user. When *Promoting Universal Access* to bibliographic data we have to take into account the changes in the way, that bibliographic data are accessed:

Earlier on, bibliographic data were read and understood with a professional as an intermediary or at least by trained non-professionals. Today, the internet makes it possible for end users without any understanding of the bibliographic universe and its standards to have access to library catalogues. This fact challenges our way of expressing bibliographic information and the way we display our bibliographic information.

Using relator codes makes it easier to display bibliographic data in a way understood by end users.

Further more using relator codes makes it easier to translate statements of responsibility – it is much easier to translate a code instead of randomly used words in the text (for instance, the code *trl* - in English *translator* – is much easier translated than a range of phrases such as *in Danish by* or *translation by*)

Also the need for connecting data is becoming more obvious – on short term we want to help users more differentiated in seeking information in our catalogue. By *differentiated* is meant through more specified indexes such as an index of directors of movies in connection with a catalogue on movies or an index of translators from a given language etc.. In the long run we want bibliographic data to become part of the semantic web. Relator codes can be seen as qualifiers to the accesspoints, which can be used in linked data.

What have we done in Denmark? – a simple example.

Before – quoting statements of responsibility according to ISBD and most cataloguing codes:

```
100 00 *a Lindgren *h Astrid
...
245 00 *a Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården *c billedbog *e [tekst]
      ved Astrid Lindgren *e og [illustrationer ved] Ingrid Nyman *f
      på dansk ved Erik Stig Andersen
...
700 00 *a Nyman *h Ingrid Vang
```

Shown as:

Lindgren, Astrid: Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården : billedbog / [tekst]
ved Astrid Lindgren ; og [illustrationer ved] Ingrid Nyman ;
på dansk ved Erik Stig Andersen ...

*Today – using relator codes **instead of** quoting statements of responsibility:*

```
100 00 *a Lindgren *h Astrid *4 aut
...
245 00 *a Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården *c billedbog
...
700 00 *a Nyman *h Ingrid Vang *4 ill
720 00 *o Erik Stig Andersen *4 trl
```

- where the fields 100/ 700 is used for persons with primary responsibility (controlled forms) and the field 720 is used for persons or corporations with a secondary responsibility (uncontrolled forms)

Shown as:

Lindgren, Astrid : Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården : billedbog / forfatter:
Astrid Lindgren ; illustrator: Ingrid Nyman ; oversætter: Erik Stig
Andersen ...

or:

Lindgren, Astrid : Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården : billedbog / author:
Astrid Lindgren ; illustrator: Ingrid Nyman ; translator: Erik Stig
Andersen ...

or:

Pippi Langstrømpe i Humlegården : billedbog

Author: Astrid Lindgren

Illustrator: Ingrid Nyman

Translator: Erik Stig Andersen

... or any other combination you might prefer.

The point is that we have seized quoting and the transformation from relator codes to text now lies in the tools used for displaying.

Background

In Denmark we have a special Danish cataloguing code as well as a special format.

The cataloguing code is based on AACR2 but was revised back in 1998 where a lot of changes based on daily needs in the Danish libraries were made.

The format is danMARC2. We preferred to maintain a special Danish format instead of moving to MARC21 because we in some ways find the Danish format has better functionality than MARC21 – as an example the ISBD-punctuation is not a part of the Danish format.

Punctuation is created from subfield codes when data is displayed. This fact makes it possible to be flexible in displaying data.

In Denmark we also have library.dk. An OPAC to the national union catalogue including the Danish national bibliography. From library.dk you can request - 24/7 - all items available for loan from any Danish library and pick it up at your preferred local library. Records of online material are included in library.dk - at present approx. 800.000 records.

Library.dk started in 2000, has 12 mill. records (april 2010) and approx. 3.7 millions visits in 2009.

The success of *Library.dk* and also of local catalogues used by end users has highlighted the needs of the non-professional end users.

At DBC, who is responsible for the main part of the Danish national bibliography and at the same time hosts *library.dk*, we are running some projects focusing on what we need to change in our way of cataloguing to fulfill the needs of end users – you could call this a kind of a check-up on the services we provide.

The end users often express having problems selecting the right material from a larger amount of records. We therefore find it important to move from an observing role to a more communicating role when describing the material.

At the same time - as in other countries - we have to be focused on the cost of cataloguing. Also we have had the experience that projects on collaborating with players outside the library environment sometimes are difficult because of our rigid demands for quotation. Using relator codes instead of quoting statements of responsibility is one specific result of these projects and considerations.

Our inspiration

We have to admit that we didn't get the idea ourselves.
In the first draft of RDA the following was proposed:

2.4.0.3. Recording statements of responsibility

Record statements of responsibility that relate to persons, families, or corporate bodies playing a major role in the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of the resource.

Optionally, in lieu of recording a statement of responsibility as a descriptive element, provide a controlled access point for the responsible person, family, or corporate body (see chapters 11–16).

The option was later on removed from RDA.

Our situation was: we liked the idea of using relator codes but at the same time we couldn't afford both doing this and still be quoting the statements of responsibility. Therefore we started analyzing the pros and cons of giving up quotation.

ISBD

We have the deepest respect for ISBD as a model for the content and the structuring of the description and also the parts of ISBD, which recommend quotation – but only when this is needed.

Lets go back to the basic question: Why do we quote?

The demand for quotation derives from a time where a description should serve as a surrogate for the material described and at the same time enable the user to identify the material – did I get the right material?

Today we are moving in a direction where those needs are met in another way:

- Identifiers such as ISBN has become common
- If a cover image is presented with the description of the material as we see in many catalogues today or an online material is only a click away - then why quote instead on focusing on normalisation?

Of course: In an ideal world we could both quote and normalize but we have to be aware of the costs of cataloguing.

The model

We started making plans for an implementation in the national bibliography for books, audiobooks, e-books and audiobooks online.

At first we were willing to adopt all the MARC21 relator codes, but after analyzing the codes we thought some of the codes were overlapping, some codes were missing and some codes were not relevant in a Danish context.

We decided that all MARC21 relator codes should be allowed, but we would recommend a carefully chosen subset of the MARC21-codes for materials described by Danish libraries. In connection with these codes we made suggestions how to display the codes (ex. *aut*: suggestion for display: *forfatter*)

We also recommended a few special Danish codes. The Danish codes consist of 5 letters always beginning with the letters *dk* – so they can never be mixed up with a new MARC21-

code. In exchanging data in MARC21 these special codes are exchanged as *oth* (unspecified) and in case a corresponding MARC21-code should appear the Danish code can be identified and converted.

Examples of Danish codes are *dkops* (recipes in a cookbook) and *dkfig* (figures – for example in childrens books).

As we move along using relator codes for responsibility on other materials some more danish codes must be expected. We have found that the MARC21-codes seem to focus on books – some codes are missing for other materials.

As we still can't afford to mention more than three persons or corporations responsible for the same function (even though the Danish code has allowed this since 1998) we also had to develop a method for expressing *et al.* This was done by a code in a special subfield.

700 00 *a Paludan Andersen *h Signe-Marie *4 aut *g 1

means:

author: Signe Marie Paludan Andersen ... [et al.]

The project group made a selection of examples dealing with all kinds of different problems such as:

- *What do we do when a person appears both with a primary and a secondary function?*

We decided as a principle not to repeat names but just apply the relevant relator code to the name in the controlled form:

100 00 *a Jørgensen *h Marianne *c f. 1966 *4 aut *4 pht

to be presented as:

.../ forfatter: Marianne Jørgensen ; fotograf: Marianne Jørgensen

- *What do we do when a person appears as a single author (primary function) and together with others as protographers (secondary function)?*

We followed the principle not to repeat but just apply the relevant code to the name:

100 00 *a Tøjner *h Vibeke *4 art *4 edt

245 00 *a Stedløs

...

720 00 *o Ove Mogensen *4 edt

to be presented as:

Stedløs / kunstner: Vibeke Tøjner ; redaktører: Vibeke Tøjner, Ove Mogensen

- *What do we do when a single person appears alone as in a primary function and together with more than two others in a secondary function?*

In such case we dispense from the rule on repeating

245 00 *a Pædagogisk brug af test *c et systematisk review

...

700 00 *a Nordenbo *hSvend Erik *4 aut *g1

720 00 *o Sven Erik Nordenbo *4 edt

to be presented as:

- *What about statements of responsibility in the edition area?*

We decided that this was a distinction we could do without.

Several other issues were treated and we also made some recommendation for how the logic in displaying the data should work.

Practical consequences by not quoting:

- We can't control the order of the statements of responsibility
- We can't distinguish whether a term for a function appears on the material or is decided by the cataloguing personnel
- We might have problems with recognisability when the name on the material differs from the form translated according to bibliographic standards
- At the moment we display all our statements of responsibility in Danish even though it is a book in English, German etc. We could refine the displaying by having several tables for languages and letting the code for language in the record regulate which table to use. On the other hand some Libraries actually stated that the language presentation was an advantage.

We didn't find any of these consequences crucial compared to the expected benefits from the new model:

- Flexibility in displaying data for different kind of users
- Possibility of more advanced indexes (example an index of directors of movies, an index of people translating from a special language etc.)
- In Libray.dk the pesentation are made on the FRBR-level work instead of manifestation. This is done on the fly. Relatorcodes make the match for identifying manifestations representing the same work easier.
- The potential of relator codes for semantic web
- Possibility for cooperation outside the library community
- More rationel to produce than producing both description and accesspoints

We tried the model on one week's production to find out if this was working or if we had overlooked some problems. We found that the model could work without crucial consequences.

The new model exists peacefully along with the traditional model in old records and in records reused from abroad.

Decision and implementation

DBC decided to recommend a change of the Danish cataloguing code parallel to the proposed text in the RDA-draft. This was approved by the Danish Bibliographic Council and announced November 2008 in order to give the system vendors and libraries time to make the necessary changes.

At DBC we carefully informed libraries and system vendors and gave presentations on the new model - all to secure a succesfull implementation.

Since June 2009 we have been using the model in the Danish national bibliography and in several Danish public libraries.

The practical implementation in the national bibliography was also a kind of a mental process for the cataloguing staff. We were so trained in quoting that sometimes stopping doing it felt like selling out! Lesser trained staff did on the other hand find the new model much easier to work with.

Is it cheaper to use relator codes rather than quoting? After a proper time of implementation and adjustments I would claim it is. Of course we still have to adjust some things along the way.

It is also interesting that we haven't heard any complaints on the new model and the displaying from libraries, publishers, authors, end users etc. even though we have now been doing things in this way for nearly a year.

We are now working on implementing the same model on movies.

References:

Larsen, Kirsten .“Bibliotek.dk: opening the Danish union catalogue to the public”.
Interlending & Document Supply, 2007, 35 (4), pp. 205-210

bibliotek.dk – library.dk. <<http://www.danbib.dk/index.php?doc=english#bibliotek.dk>>