

**To:** ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access  
**From:** Task Force on FRBR Terminology  
**Re:** FRBR terminology in the draft of Part 1 of AACR3 (*5JSC/AACR3/I*)

## INTRODUCTION

The Task Force on FRBR Terminology (TF in this document) is responding to the initial draft of Part 1 of AACR3 (*5JSC/AACR3/I*). The TF has worked on FRBR terminology for several years. An historical report giving recommendations for glossary terms with respect to FRBR was numbered *JSC/LC/60* dated Dec. 23, 2003.

The TF began its work by reviewing previous committee work and looking at work done by the ISBD Review Group regarding FRBR terminology. The TF was very interested to determine that the ISBD Review Group has decided not to use FRBR Terminology. The Joint Steering Committee's decision to incorporate FRBR terminology and concepts into the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* therefore represents something of a break in the more or less parallel evolution of AACR and the ISBDs.

This document attempts to update some of the TF's earlier issues and glossary recommendations with respect to the initial draft of Part 1 of AACR3 and the interim Part 1 Glossary. While the comments and concerns raised in this report far exceed the current charge of this TF, members of the TF felt that as the CC:DA body formed to comment on the incorporation of FRBR concepts into the AACR cataloging code the short deadline under which CC:DA is presently operating warrants our broader response.

## TOPIC 1. FRBR TERMINOLOGY

**FRBR terms in general.** A major goal of the Strategic Plan for AACR is to incorporate terminology from Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) into the rules. The benefits of this have often been stated and include the need for a common more precise language, a framework for a more structured and rigorous way of looking at cataloging, the tools to design a better OPAC, etc. The TF reviewed the draft and believes that while progress has been made, the goal of employing FRBR terminology could be more fully realized. The TF recognizes that any assessment of the success or failure of this goal is difficult without seeing Part 1 in the context of the introduction, Parts 2 and 3, and a complete glossary. We recognize that our report will need revision as this AACR3 review process continues. Within these constraints, the TF discovered several areas of concern.

### I. SPECIFIC ISSUES INVOLVING THE TERM *RESOURCE*

Much of the TF's discussion centered on use of the word *resource* in the AACR3 draft. This is not one of the FRBR Group 1 entity terms. The TF notes that the draft uses the Group 1 entity terms in some places and in others uses *resource*. In addition, some instructions include both terms (see below). It is critical that users of AACR understand how *resource* is used within the FRBR context. Further, the TF notes that *resource* is defined in the AACR3 glossary, but not with respect to the FRBR Group 1 entities.

- A. Resource as item and publication per ISBD(G).** The ISBDs that have been revised to use *resource* as a replacement for the previously used *item* and *publication*, and this is explained in the introduction. It is unclear whether AACR3 will similarly use the introduction to define the relationship of non-FRBR terms to the corresponding entity attribute or relationship in the FRBR model. There may be resistance to the inclusion of such critical information in the introduction rather than in the glossary or in a section of its own. The IFLA ISBD Review Group and the IFLA FRBR Review Group arranged for preparation of a mapping from ISBD to FRBR. The TF finds undesirable an approach that requires users to consult another document for reference.
- B. Resource as FRBR-compatible term.** In addition, it is not entirely clear which of the FRBR Group 1 entities the term *resource* represents. In the AACR3 draft, the term *resource* denotes some context-specific relationship to the FRBR Group 1 entities. At times, the term appears to designate the cerebral concepts of works and expressions. At others, however, the term clearly seems to represent the tangible manifestation and item entities catalogers are accustomed to working with. For example, use of the term in the Glossary definition of *Colophon* as "a statement at the end of a resource" may strike users of the AACR3 as a real-world term more appropriate to physical embodiments and manifestations than to products of pure intellectual or artistic endeavor. The TF noted that the 2003 IFLA Cataloging Principles simply defines *bibliographic resource* as a "manifestation or item," perhaps further confusing the issue.

This was one of the topics the TF spent considerable time and discussion upon. During the discussion, TF member John Attig shared some thoughts based on statements made by the AACR3 editor, Tom Delsey.

"I believe that Tom agrees that, in **most** but not **all** cases, what we are cataloging is a manifestation. However, I'm not sure that he agrees that a component part can be considered a manifestation; it may be an expression of a work, but it is only part of a manifestation. More significantly, I don't think he considers an assembled collection of manifestations to be itself a manifestation. Thus whenever these two situations are within the scope of a rule, he might consider it inappropriate to use the term *manifestation*. Personally, I believe *manifestation* is a more flexible concept, but this does seem to be a large part of Tom's reluctance to consider replacing *resource* with *manifestation*.

"Personally I find the point made during the TF's discussion by Laurel Jizba to be more relevant. While a manifestation embodies a set of decisions made by the producer, publisher, [or] whomever, the resource as we are using the term embodies a completely different set of decisions made by the cataloger. Use of the term *manifestation* does not carry this set of cataloger decisions into the text of the rules. Only a different term can do that."

**Suggested solution.** The TF strongly recommends that the relationship between *resource* and the FRBR Group 1 entities be clarified and defined both in the introduction and in the glossary.

- C. Resource in AACR3 and item in AACR2.** The TF notes that some similar problems with the use of *resource* were present in AACR2 with the use of *item*. That is, a single term was used to refer to both the object of description as well as to differing conceptual levels (even pre-FRBR). The introduction of FRBR terminology and concepts into AACR further complicates these issues, and underscores the need for clarity within the text

and the glossary. Explication in the introduction and the glossary should even state that the FRBR Group I entity may be indeterminable without a specific context, and may therefore vary depending upon that specific context.

At least one TF member believes that the AACR3 term *resource* may be considered a replacement for the AACR2 term *item*. Indeed the TF has determined that this is how *resource* is used currently in the ISBDs. The ISBD Review Group made this decision in order to prevent confusion by using what has become commonly accepted as an FRBR Group I entity (i.e., *Item* differently in the ISBD documentation).

If the AACR3 term *resource* is a replacement for the AACR2 term *item*, however, then it appears that the current draft revision of AACR rather than resolving a problem previously identified by this TF, has simply transferred that problem to another term. As demonstrated herein, current use of the term *resource* in the AACR3 draft remains contextual, and does not appear consistent enough in intent to allow for a one-to-one synonymous relationship with any one of the FRBR Group I entities. The term has great potential to be used in multiple ways for multiple meanings. Which of course, was the problem with the usage of the term *item* in AACR2.

**Suggested solution.** Therefore, consider explaining the contextual usage of the term *resource* in the introduction and in the glossary. A suggested revision for the glossary definition follows.

**Resource.** An entity that is the basis of a bibliographic description, or a related entity that may be described bibliographically. A resource may be a single unit or part, two or more parts issued simultaneously or successively, a separately titled component, or an assembled collection. It may be tangible or intangible. With any given entity, the corresponding FRBR term that is being invoked may be difficult to determine without a specific context. Therefore, the term *resource* will often serve simply as a general reference point for the entity, without reference to a specific FRBR term. In some instances, a rule may of necessity make a general statement regarding a resource and also give instruction with respect to the specific manifestation. *See also* Aggregate resource.

With any given entity, the corresponding FRBR term that is being invoked may be difficult to determine without a specific context. Therefore, the term 'resource' will often serve simply as a general reference point for the entity, without reference to a specific FRBR term. In some instances, a rule may of necessity make a general statement regarding a resource and also give instruction with respect to the specific manifestation.

**D. Examples at 1.5A3 and A1.5A3.** The TF found instances of the term *resource* and a Group 1 entity term used in the same rule. A cataloger may, for example, be led to believe that the terms *resource* and *manifestation* are synonymous. As a general comment, the TF believes that catalogers who have worked to understand the FRBR model may spend a lot of time unnecessarily puzzling over which FRBR term they should mentally substitute for the word *resource*. An example of the two types of terminology in the same rule may be seen in the example below (emphasis added):

**1.5A3** If an **item** is available in different formats (e.g., as text and microfilm; as sound disc and sound tape reel), give the physical description of the format in hand. **[AACR2]**

**A1.5A3** If **manifestations** of a work are available in different formats (e.g., as printed text and microfilm; as sound disc and sound tape reel), record the technical description of the **resource** being described. **[AACR3]**

**Suggested solution for A1.5A3.** Per the above, change one of the terms to the other:

- Use *resource* for both terms if the general notion of object is meant,
- or use *manifestation* for both terms, if a manifestation is meant.
- Alternatively, if something more complex is meant, then the complexity would best be made clear to the cataloger through the introduction and glossary.

In the case of A1.5A3 as the instruction specifically addresses "Manifestations available in different formats," the correct solution for this particular rule is to use *manifestation* for both terms.

The draft contains numerous examples of this problem. Given time constraints, the TF has neither noted them rule-by-rule in this report nor discussed solutions which may vary depending upon each situation. The TF understands the need to make further amendments as editorial work continues.

## II. GLOSSARY DEFINITIONS THAT MAY STILL BE PROBLEMATIC

The TF checked to see if key recommendations in *4JSC/LC/60/ALA response* were incorporated into the current draft. We note them below as it is unclear whether changes/omissions are based on subsequent discussion or may need further review.

### A. Copy

The problem with *copy* has not been resolved. The TF previously recommended that the definition of *copy* be included in the Glossary or restored to the definition of *item*. The TF has noted that the terms *copy* or *copies* are not only used in the rules but also in the AACR3 Glossary in the definitions for *edition*, *impression* and *issue*. In turn, definitions that use *copy* become less understandable if the AACR3 glossary does not provide a definition of the term. *Copy* may serve as a synonym for *item*.

#### **Suggested solutions**

**Copy.** See *Item*.

**Item.** A single exemplar or an instance of a manifestation. Some items may be unique and original. Others may be mass-produced and therefore each may represent a single exemplar of the original manifestation, or a copy.

The TF had considerable discussion regarding the importance of providing a definition for *copy* in the AACR3 glossary. While TF members were agreed on the importance of this as the term is firmly entrenched in the standard definitions of many AACR Glossary terms, formulating an acceptable Glossary definition for *copy* met with far less consensus.

## B. *Edition* – FRBR Group I terms and *edition*

The present deliberations of the TF address the concept of *edition* within the context of Part 1 of the AACR3 draft. The TF recognizes that the "edition" concept is also inherent to Part 2, and that consequently further review of the concept will be necessary when the draft of Part 2 becomes available

The Group I entities in primary relationships found in the FRBR document are: Work, Expression, Manifestation and Item (see *FRBR* p.13).

It seems clear that the Editor and the JSC understand that the primary concept conflicting with the FRBR Group I entities in traditional descriptive cataloging is the concept of ***edition***. As noted in the October 2004 JSC minutes, there is an adverse effect when attempting to overlay the term *edition* with the FRBR Group I concepts to signify new content, and with the notion of an "edition statement" as a way to identify expressions (see JSC October notes, p. 15). The Editor noted that the "edition statement" was sometimes necessary to justify the creation and existence of a record, and that its use would best be restricted to the identification of new content. The problem confronting catalogers is that, without considerable research, they may not always know whether or not an expression contains new content, even when an edition statement is present. When a cataloger uses an edition statement in the edition area, the edition statement serves to indicate *possible new content* and increases the likelihood that a user will accomplish the FRBR user tasks of identifying and selecting. Without such an edition statement, the user's ability to accomplish these tasks is significantly impaired. The textual analysis necessary to determine the degree of altered or new content within the edition is left to the user rather than the cataloger.

Therefore, the TF agrees with the chosen solution at A1.2A1, Application, which expresses the need to use whatever "edition" information appears on the source of information.

As with the discussion above regarding this TF's history of recommendations concerning the terms *copy* and *item* in AACR, this group's work with the term *edition* are similarly long-lived. Following extensive discussions, there is consensus among TF members that the term continues to serve a significant function in the cataloging, publishing and library communities. This very fact may be what makes the current efforts to overlay the term with either the FRBR expression or manifestation entity that much more difficult. In short, the TF recognizes that within the current AACR3 draft the concept of "edition" is applied inconsistently. The result is that the concept in the present draft mixes attributes of FRBR expressions and manifestations leading to confusion and misinterpretation.

To quote one TF member, regarding the use of *edition* at A1.2B1: "the problem is that the AACR definition of edition includes not only change in content, but change in issuing body. As long as this is true, then the concept of edition will mingle aspects of both expression and manifestation. So one alternative would be to remove the language about issuing body from the definition of edition. The upside is that edition now matches expression; the downside is that edition in the rules diverges even further from the usage by publishers and scholars and probably library users in general. Frankly, there is no easy way out of this and I believe that the best course is to **minimize**, rather than **clarify**, the use of the concept of edition in the rules for edition statements. I don't really support an approach that further embeds the concept of edition in the

rules; on the other hand, we can't get rid of it, so I think that we should be trying not to make the situation worse."

**Suggested solutions.** One solution might be to include additional language in the introduction explaining the need for content change (to indicate a truly new edition), as well as the continuing value of using the edition statement. Edition statements help catalogers justify the creation and existence of a new record among shared records, even when they may be uncertain regarding the degree of newness of content.

The introduction should include general guidelines for catalogers regarding when to make a separate description. These general guidelines are an important context for a discussion of the concept of "edition". If a cataloger decides not to make a separate record for a printing, for example, (presumably because there is no difference in content/expression), then printing statements fall outside the scope of the Area 2 rules. It is precisely because separate records are not made for every manifestation that the concept of edition survives in the rules as a shorthand for grouping manifestations into an entity for which separate descriptions are made. This decision represents a critical application of the concept of 'edition' both for individual catalogers and within the larger universe of shared records.

Another solution complementary to the above, is to add, perhaps in the introduction, if not here at A1.2A1 as well, that in practice, while it would be valuable to identify new FRBR expressions at the point of cataloging, publishing practices at the manifestation level preclude doing so.

#### **Suggested revisions to the glossary:**

***Edition (Intangible resources).*** A remotely accessed resource that is distinctive with respect to scope of content, language, presentation, etc. See the Introduction for a discussion of the term Edition and its relation to FRBR terminology.

***Edition (Tangible resources).*** All copies produced from.... See also Facsimile reproduction, Impression, Issue, Reprint. See the Introduction for a discussion of the term Edition and its relation to FRBR terminology.

#### **C. *Multimedia resource (and Kit)***

The TF likes the new definition of *multimedia*. While we note that *kit* is still in use in most dictionaries used in the United States and that some publishers' editorial practices prefer to restrict multimedia to digital resources in their publishing guidelines to authors, we feel that in the AACR3 *multimedia* glossary definition, the simple statement given conveys the correct notions as to multiple parts and two or more media. The definition is broad enough to embrace all past, present and future usages.

However, we have some suggested revisions for the text in relation to multimedia. For example, at A1.5A5, Multimedia resources, a comprehensive statement that addresses technical description for multimedia resources in a general way is necessary. Simply referring the cataloguer back to A1.9 is inadequate.

**Preference.** Also, per discussion at CC:DA during ALA Midwinter, it was emphasized that in general, it is preferable to choose specific media over *mixed content* or

*multimedia* whenever possible, to minimize the use of the conglomerate term *mixed content* in considering the technical aspects relative to the GMD.

**Suggested revision to A1.5A5. Multimedia resources:**

In general, when considering multimedia, consider that there will be three methods of recording technical description, which are to be applied to emphasize specific media and/or specific displays of technical description. See A1.9. Related to the multimedia technical description, note that at A1.1C4 it is preferable to choose one or more specific media over *multimedia* or *mixed content* whenever possible.

This instruction provides for the use of *multimedia* or *mixed content* when necessary, but hopes to minimize their application.

**Suggested revision to A1.1C4:**

If a resource with a collective title contains component parts falling into two or more categories in the content list [**NB: refer to the place this is to be found!**], or two or more categories in the medium list [**Give reference here too!**], prefer to choose a predominant component part of the resource whenever possible. Record *mixed content* or *multimedia* only in cases when a predominant type of content or media component cannot be identified.

Early physical multimedia for use in schools still exists and for examples of that, such as "kits" or "multimedia" containing handouts for classroom students, slides and realia, it may be difficult — in a relatively smaller subset of cases — to choose a predominant specific content or media. Such cases therefore require the use of 'multimedia' or 'mixed content' (or both, if necessary). However, more recent digital multimedia often clearly have a predominant genre or type of content, such as text, film or sound. Nonetheless there may continue to be some cases where the medium *multimedia* is warranted and needed.

In diagramming the universe of content and media types with Venn diagrams, there will always be a place for *mixed content* and *multimedia* in AACR, so this needs to be available to the catalogers and their libraries to use. At the same time, the TF agrees with the AACR3 draft instructions that the use of other specific content and media should be encouraged over *mixed content* and *multimedia* whenever possible.

**D. *Manifestation***

The previous recommendation to clarify in the definition for *manifestation* that physical embodiment includes "intangible" resources has not yet happened. The TF reiterates its recommendation that it needs to. See also discussion regarding *edition* in this document.

**E. *Other title information***

The current AACR3 draft definition shares the manifestation/resource problem noted earlier. The TF continues to believe that *manifestation* is preferred within this definition.

## **F. Statement of responsibility**

It looks like the discussion over whether *statement of responsibility* relates to an expression or a manifestation has been poorly resolved by using *resource*. This solution presents its own set of difficulties as mentioned previously.

For one, the TF is not at all certain that it is possible to transcribe a statement of responsibility from a FRBR expression.

## **III. OTHER TERMINOLOGY ISSUES**

The Friday Omnibus meeting at ALA questioned the use of "focus for the description" as *focus* is not a word used in other standards or in FRBR and called for consideration of another term. The TF previously (in CC:DA/TF/FRBR Terminology/8) suggested "object of a bibliographic description" or an "entity that forms the basis for a bibliographic description."

**Suggested solution.** The TF strongly suggests substituting the word *basis* for *focus* (e.g., Basis for the description).

## **TOPIC 2. INCORPORATING FRBR OBJECTIVES INTO AACR (E.G., RELATIONSHIPS AND USER NEEDS)**

The TF recognizes and wishes to re-emphasize the importance of these two objectives within FRBR and consequently the revised AACR3. With respect to displaying relationships between and among bibliographic resources, this emphasis seems especially significant in light of CC:DA's recent decision to withdraw the final report from the Rule 21.0D Task Force.

Without access to the revised Part 2 of AACR3 or the new introduction, it is difficult for this TF to contribute substantive or significant comments at present. The TF looks forward to the draft of Part 2 and will need to examine it closely in conjunction with Part 1 as well as Part 3 and the new introduction.

## **TOPIC 3. THE MULTIPLE VERSIONS (MULVER) ISSUE**

[It should be noted that not all TF members agreed that the MulVer issue was one the FRBR Terminology TF should respond to specifically. Others indeed saw relevance though, so while the comments below appear in this report, it should be remembered that not all TF members believe they belong.]

At the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Mass., CC:DA held an all-day "omnibus" meeting to bring together members of several current CC:DA Task Forces to comment on the AACR3 draft of Part I. During this omnibus meeting one of the participants referred to the Multiple Versions issue (MulVer) as the 800-pound gorilla sitting in the room, or more appropriately, sitting on the AACR3 draft. That is, at a practical level the managers and directors within the majority of libraries utilizing AACR have grappled with, or continue to grapple with, the Multiple Versions problem and the single-record approach for at least some of their library's resources (e.g., serials, microforms, online resources, etc.). Nonetheless, the current draft

of Part I of AACR3 makes no mention of either the MulVer problem or the single-record approach to addressing it. In a world in which a significant percentage — perhaps even a majority — of libraries employ a single-record approach for at least some resources, a current revision of the cataloging code that fails to mention either the problem or any existing practical solutions appears remiss.

Obviously MulVer is a huge challenge that libraries in the automated environment have wrestled with for decades. No one expects either the editor or the JSC to resolve such an issue before the 2007 publication of AACR3. But at least to acknowledge that the issue exists would at this point seem like progress.

In the stated objectives and principles preceding the draft, the MulVer issue directly affects two of the objectives in Section B, Functional requirements. First, the responsiveness to user needs is one of the primary tenets within the FRBR document as well, and one of the reasons this TF felt a response to this concern with the AACR3 draft is appropriate. For example, user study after user study within the serials environment demonstrates a clear preference for displaying all serial holdings — regardless of format or carrier — from a single bibliographic description. When one considers how the majority of users approach serials and serial content (e.g., with a specific citation to specific content in hand), this appears intuitive. It therefore seems appropriate that by recognizing, or even attempting to solve the MulVer problem, AACR3 may accomplish its stated objective of achieving the four FRBR-defined user tasks (e.g., find, identify, select, obtain.)

The second AACR3 objective the MulVer issue affects is cost efficiency. From a managerial perspective there will be great interest in a cataloging code adaptable to today's environment of proliferating carriers and able to provide an optional treatment to manifestation-level cataloging for at least some library resources.

**Suggested solution.** As far as being able to record multiple formats, AACR3 would do well to reflect in the Introduction or even in a separate appendix, the examples and instructions found in the *Guidelines for Reproductions* and in the ISBD (ER) as an optional way for libraries to deal with multiple formats. That is, AACR3 can urge cataloging librarians to make sure that descriptive records contributed to shared databases clearly reflect accurate holdings. Such records are already in use in some major libraries in the United States, with holdings correctly displaying (or implied) in large shared databases. For example: see the record for *Atlantic Monthly* in Michigan State University Libraries' catalog.

**Digital.** Related to the multiple versions issue is the issue of digital entities — as (a) manifestations of other expressions of some works, as well as (b) manifestations of original works. As mentioned in the CC:DA meeting on Saturday at ALA Midwinter in Boston (2004), "digital" is an adjective that describes these two completely separate concepts.

On one hand, *digital* is used as a modifying term for the technical description of all types of other resources/manifestations of works or expressions.

**Suggested solution.** In these cases, the specific chapter for a given resource should address the use of digital as an indicator of the need for a computer to read the text, score or map, etc. Additionally, the use of digital and other specific physical description details should be described not only in table A1.5B2, but in a general instruction such as:

**A1.5A[4.5] Expressions of a digital nature.** In describing digital manifestations of a work, record the technical nature of the digital resource according to the appropriate chapter, and include the adjectival term *digital* when necessary. Make notes about other technical aspects of the manifestation if considered to be important.

On the other hand, there are a smaller percentage of cases in which the technical description is for the most part unknown or too cryptic to decipher. These resources primarily consist of data sets or numeric programs. It is this group of resources to which C7 should confine most of its technical descriptive instructions.

**Suggested solution.** The instruction at A1.5A[4.5] should continue as follows:

**A1.5[4.5] [continued from preceding wording suggestion]** However, in the case of digital manifestations consisting primarily of data or programs, or for which the content is largely unknown, or both, see C7.

#### **TOPIC 4. FRBR AND AACR3**

One of the concerns voiced at the CC:DA Omnibus meeting at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, and again in the so-called "Group of five" document concerns the arrangement and the organization of the AACR3 draft. Many reviewers have expressed disappointment that the JSC has not learned more from the precision and clarity present in the FRBR document. Alas, given the girth of the present draft of Part I, when Parts 2 and 3 and an introduction are added, AACR3 may easily approach 500 pages in length.

It is not only the length. Another prevalent concern expressed by many catalogers and reviewers is the style of the two documents. The FRBR document expresses a highly conceptual, abstract model in clear, simple terms. While that document may require more than one reading, it is more often because the subject itself exists at a greater remove than many catalogers are accustomed to in professional documentation. AACR on the other hand is a cataloging code, a practical instruction manual for describing and providing user access to those resources libraries and other repositories choose to collect. Easy-to-follow instructions and sentence structure are the norm for such writing. Practical instructions for everyday use need to be written crisply and with little room for error, confusion or variation. Unfortunately, the present draft is anything but clear and concise. Many practicing catalogers have expressed considerable concern on this point. And while CC:DA and the other constituent bodies of the JSC are reviewing the draft for clarity and precision, the short deadlines we are working with make it all but impossible that the proposed AACR3 publication date will produce a workable, finished cataloging code.

Finally, the TF believes that by further emulating the rigorous examination and observation process that produced the FRBR document, AACR3 will provide CC:DA as well as future catalogers and catalog designers with far greater flexibility.