

To: RDA Steering Committee
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Discussion paper: RDA and WGA treatment of aggregates

Thanks to the Aggregates Working Group for continuing to work on the complex issues surrounding aggregates. We appreciate that design outlined provides catalogers the flexibility that is necessary to separate the “theoretical” and the “practical” approaches. We are particularly thankful for the many examples found in the appendices, they were most helpful.

Questions from the Working Group:

1. Does the RSC agree: that it is important to retain the distinction between a whole-part work and an aggregation work?

LC response: In general, we agree with the Working Group that there is a distinction between certain “aggregation works” and “whole/part” works.

2. Does the RSC agree: that it would be useful to provide simple direct wording to enable a cataloguer to differentiate between a whole-part work vs. an aggregation work? The AWG thinks it might be useful if such wording could start with:

- If a manifestation embodies multiple distinct expressions, and:
 - ..., then the manifestation embodies an Aggregation Work and Distinct Works
 - ..., then the manifestation embodies a whole-part Work and its parts.

LC response: We agree with the Working Group that unambiguously distinguishing between the two types of aggregations of works is critical, and it must be fairly simple for a cataloger to apply the appropriate instructions. We think, perhaps, the distinction between the two types is based on the intent of the creator(s) of the original works: was the “work” conceived by the creator(s) as a whole but broken into parts, or is it a compilation of “independent” works that are subsequently combined (by the original creator(s) or someone else). The AACR2 definition of “Collection” (and the instructions at AACR2 21.7) addressed this latter concept:

Collection 1. Three or more independent works or parts of works by one author published together. 2. Two or more independent works or parts of works by more

than one author published together and not written for the same occasion or for the publication in hand.

This approach may not be without its complications (e.g., how does a cataloger discover “intent,” are modern divisions of whole works the same as the original creator intended, how do you address selections from compiled collections?), but any approach will have some complexity because aggregate works themselves can be complex. The concept of “not written for the same occasion” may be the most difficult to discern, and perhaps should not be addressed directly.

RDA currently provides different instructions for single works, parts of single works, compilations of independent works by the same creator, and compilations of independent works by different creators; we think any new approach will need to address all types in the future.

3. Does the RSC agree: that an “incorporated in / Incorporates” relationship is useful for describing aggregates and a relationship element for it should be added, at some later date, to RDA?

LC response: Yes, as long as the relationships that would be appropriate to the different types of aggregate works could be made clear and distinct (see question 4 for choice of term).

4. Can the RSC offer guidance on:

- an appropriate label for this relationship element?

LC response: We generally preferred “Aggregated in / Aggregation of” to the other proposed terms. “Incorporates / Is incorporated in” leave us with connotations related to “the physical” and use terminology related to corporate bodies, so we would like to avoid those.

- where this relationship element would fit in the hierarchy of Expression relationships at RDA J.3?

LC response: Adding a relationship category following Whole/Part would be likely, but changes would be necessary for existing Whole/Part relationships (e.g., J.2.4, J.3.4) to clearly distinguish the two types of aggregations.

5. Does the RSC agree: that a “Creator of Content / Creator of Content of” relationship is useful for adding short-cut access to an expression of an Aggregated Work when it does not seem necessary to describe distinct works and expressions separately, and that a relationship element for it should be added, at some later date, to RDA?

LC response: Yes. We assume that more specific terms might also be proposed (e.g., composer of content). We would also encourage the Working Group to determine if some other terms from Appendix I.2 should address whole/part vs. aggregation works (e.g., is “compiler” only applicable to the latter?).

6. Does the RSC agree:

- that the addition, deletion, or revision of an included expression in an aggregation Expression requires a new aggregation Expression, but not a new

Aggregation Work, unless the entire concept of the Aggregation work has changed?

- that an instruction should be added to RDA somewhere to say this?

LC response: Yes, like all things, it is likely a matter of “degree” of change, and the cataloger would still need the options currently at 6.27.1.5 to allow for both “new expression” and “new aggregation work.” We also agree that new instructions will need to be added for this, and other issues concerning aggregates.

Impact on Cataloguers

LC response: We’re not sure we understand the impact of the second bullet at this point, but note that there are changes proposed for 6.27.1.6 in RSC/LC/1.

Miscellaneous Questions:

1. Figures 1, 2, and 4 show an “Expression” box pointing to “Aggregation Work”; shouldn’t this box really be labelled “Aggregation Expression” or “Aggregation Work Expression”? Note the use of “AWE” in Appendix B examples.
2. With the Working Group’s concept of “compiler” of an Aggregation Work, would the compiler be used in the authorized access point of the aggregation work?
3. In the Appendix B examples with shaded AW/AWE, is it the opinion of the Working Group that the aggregation as a whole would not be needed for other relationships (e.g., as a subject relationship)? Or is that just the ‘cost’ of choosing that option?
4. Example #5, Option 3 (page 9 of Appendices): the Working Group indicates that because the title of the AW is the same as the title of the predominant content, it will need to be qualified to distinguish it. Is that really the case, since one of the works is identified through a creator and the other isn’t?