

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
From: John Attig, ALA Representative  
Subject: Compilations in RDA chapter 6, Discussion paper

ALA thanks ACOC for raising the issue of compilations of works in RDA Chapter 6. ALA does not agree with the conclusion that there are missing instructions in RDA. However, we would support a future proposal to clarify which instructions do in fact apply to recording the preferred title and to constructing the authorized access point for compilations of works.

The critical issue here is whether a compilation of works is itself a work and whether the instructions relating to works in fact cover such compilations. FRBR and RDA are both quite clear about this. FRBR 3.3 (page 29) states: “The structure of the model, however, permits us to represent aggregate and component entities in the same way as we would represent entities that are viewed as integral units. That is to say that from a logical perspective the entity *work*, for example, may represent an aggregate of individual *works* brought together by an editor or compiler in the form of an anthology, a set of individual monographs brought together by a publisher to form a series, or a collection of private papers organized by an archive as a single *fond*.” RDA 5.1.2 states: “The terms *work* and *expression* should be read, where applicable, to include not only an individual entity, but also aggregates and components of such entities (i.e., the term *work* should be read to include aggregate works and components of works as well as individual works, etc.).”

Therefore, any RDA instruction that applies to “works” applies to compilations of works. Specifically, while recording the preferred title of compilations of works of one person, family, or corporate body are covered explicitly at 6.2.2.10, recording the preferred title of compilations of works by more than one person, family or corporate bodies is covered by the general guidelines on choosing the preferred title (6.2.2.3, etc.). Likewise, while there are specific instructions on constructing authorized access points representing a compilation of works by more than one person, family, or corporate body at 6.27.1.4, constructing an authorized access point representing a compilation of works by one person, family, or corporate body is covered by the general instructions at 6.27.1.2.

This is a fundamental aspect of the FRBR model. It should not need to be stated explicitly wherever the term *work* is used that this includes compilations of works. This is something that needs to be handled through training. That said, where there are specific instructions that apply to some compilations, it would be a good idea to include references to the instructions that cover other compilations. And the scope of those references should be clear; we therefore support the revision suggested by the British Library at 6.2.2.8.

We also note the point made by the Library of Congress that a distinction needs to be made between the instructions for *choosing* the preferred title and the instructions for

*recording* the preferred title. Both need to be covered. ALA accepts LC's point that "there is nothing in the instructions about *choosing* a preferred title in 6.2.2.3–6.2.2.7 that allows for a conventional collective title to be chosen over the title proper of the original edition per the default instruction at 6.2.2.4." We agree that this is something that ought to be addressed.

The above considerations relating to the general instructions also seem to apply to the instructions for musical works. The following statement was provided by the representative of the Music Library Association:

MLA commenters feel that RDA actually does cover everything, if you read it very, very closely. For music cataloging, you would start at 6.28.1.1 (general guidelines on constructing authorized access points representing musical works) and be directed to 6.27.1, which includes 6.27.1.4, which itself contains the helpful Best of Broadway example. Once again, 6.27.1.4 directs you to 6.2.2 "if the work is a compilation of works by different persons, [etc.]", and you would follow 6.2.2.4 or 6.2.2.5.

An entire separate section on choosing the preferred title as opposed to constructing the access point isn't truly necessary, since with compilations by different persons etc., choosing the preferred title and constructing the access point are essentially the same activity: you use the title proper of the resource in most cases.

However, we agree that there is a problem: sometimes the instructions are explicit about compilations by one person etc., and sometimes they are explicit about compilations by more than one person etc., but they infrequently explicitly address both in the same section(s) of Chapter 6. So, the problem isn't really an absence of applicable instructions, but rather a lack of clarity in the wording of the captions and instructions. The FRBR document (FRBR 3.3, page 29) allows for the "work" entity to represent an "aggregate of individual works," i.e. compilation, but the burden should not be on the cataloger to be highly conversant with that sense of the word "work," nor to keep it at the forefront of her mind when browsing titles of instructions in the navigation pane, looking for the appropriate instruction that addresses the type of compilation in hand. We therefore urge that it be made explicit in crucial RDA instructions that the term "work" includes compilations.

Therefore, we would welcome more explicit language in the captions and/or instructions at 6.2.2/6.2.2.4/6.2.2.5 that makes it clear that you really can and should use these instructions if you have a compilation in hand. We would also welcome more explicit language in the caption and/or instruction at 6.27.1.2. Perhaps the caption could be: *Works or Compilations of Works Created by One Person, Family, or Corporate Body*.

In thinking through this from a music cataloging perspective, we identified a music-specific instruction that would benefit from more explicit language as well. The ACOC document recognizes that 6.27.1.4 covers constructing the authorized access point for music, but does not mention 6.28.1.1, which is the instruction that leads the

music cataloger to 6.27.1.4 in the first place. The language there is unhelpful in getting the cataloger to make the connection to 6.27.1: “For other types of musical works, construct the authorized access point applying the instructions given under 6.27.1.” We suggest: “For other types of musical works *and compilations of musical works*, construct the authorized access point applying the instructions given under 6.27.1,” if the JSC does not wish to add a separate instruction for compilations in 6.28.

If, by chance, a music cataloger began at 6.27.1.1 rather than 6.28.1.1, it would also be helpful to have more precise language at 6.27.1.1 that prepares the music cataloger for the fact that 6.28.1 does not actually cover all categories of musical works and expressions, to guard against the music cataloger overlooking 6.27.1.4 for compilations. We suggest: “For instructions on constructing access points representing *certain categories of special types of works...*,” if the JSC does not wish to add a separate instruction for compilations in 6.28. Not being certain of the implications for legal and religious works and official communications, we might alternatively suggest: “For instructions on constructing access points representing special types of works, see 6.29.1 (legal works), 6.30.1 (religious works), and 6.31.1 (official communications). For instructions on constructing access points representing special types of musical works, see 6.28.1 (musical works).”