TO: Cataloging Policy and Support Office, Library of Congress

FROM: Cheri Folkner, Chair, ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

SUBJECT: CC:DA comments on LCRI Changes on "AACR2 Compatible" Headings
Policies

The ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) supports the elimination of the concept "AACR2 compatible" headings and sees it as a positive change to the LCRIs. The introduction of "AACR2 compatible" headings was controversial when introduced, particularly to the non-U.S. cataloging community, much of which never accepted the concept. Now, thirty years later, it clearly seems time to lay the concept to rest.

A member of CC:DA commented that it seems ironic that this step should be taken at this point, that "a policy shift biased toward 'pure' AACR2 [should] emerge in the code's waning days." CC:DA encourages LC not to set up a similar policy with the advent of RDA, i.e., not to issue rule interpretations introducing a concept such as "RDA compatible" headings.

22.1 and **24.1**
CC:DA is concerned about the apparent discouragement against revising authority records unless changing the record for some other reason (e.g., to add a reference or citation). The wording "'AACR2 compatible' headings may continue to be used as is or they may be reformulated to conform to AACR2" is progressive, but CC:DA suggests finally breaking with the pre-AACR2 past by simply stating that these headings are no longer to be used, as done with the few pre-AACR2-coded headings encountered in the authority file. From recent discussion on the PCC list is understood that there are just under 47,000 records coded as 'd' (AACR2 compatible heading) in the authority file. Pehaps it would be possible to clean them out through a project of some sort in order to have the file clean of "AACR2 compatible" headings before beginning the potentially disruptive process of incorporating RDA headings into the file. If this is too big a project for LC to undertake alone, perhaps LC would be willing to spearhead a cooperative project that would undertake the task.

22.1 and **24.1** Existing heading being revised
We are confused by the reference to reporting bibliographic file maintenance under the third part of this section. One-to-one changes of 1XX fall under the category of non-reportable BFM (see Guidelines for reporting NACO BFM http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/naco/bfmguide.html). Perhaps this section is referring to an internal LC policy.

26.1 d) *Compatible headings*
The new language replaces "Normally, construct the reference to 'match' the AACR2 compatible element in the heading. Exception: Do not use 'pseud.' in references." The

removal of this language with a replacement simply stating that "AACR2 compatible" headings may continue to be used is confusing in this context. The cataloger might well wonder why this instruction is even here. 26.1 is the general rule for formulating references. If a cataloger is adding references to a heading that is coded "AACR2 compatible", under the new LCRIs 22.1 and 24.1 the record would be changed to AACR2 ("if changing an "AACR2 compatible" record for *any* reason [e.g., to add a reference …], reformulate the heading to conform to AACR2"). If the cataloger is adding references to a *new* NAR, the question of "AACR2 compatible" headings would not come up. Under the old practice, where one might add references to an existing "AACR2 compatible" record without changing the heading, the instruction to make the references "match" made sense. Under the new practice, mention of "AACR2 compatible" headings in this rule interpretation makes little sense. If anything, perhaps the LCRI could state something to the effect that when the cataloger revises an "AACR2 compatible" heading to make it AACR2, he or she should also revise all the references that have "matched" the former "AACR2 compatible" heading to make them match the revised heading.

Second, the new instruction is found in a section of 26.1 devoted to personal names. It replaces language specific to personal names. However, the new language is not specific to personal names, and it includes "see" references to 22.1 and 24.1. Since "AACR2 compatible" headings could be either personal or corporate names, if any mention of "AACR2 compatible" is retained in LCRI 26.1, perhaps it should be given its own section. But it might be just as well to drop mention of "AACR2 compatible" headings from 26.1 altogether. It was only there in the first place to give guidance for the no-longer-applicable "matching" practice.

Some mention of whether to add a new reference with ‡w coding for the former "AACR2 compatible" heading might be in order.