

**To:** Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**From:** Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative  
**Subject:** Revision to 6.2.2.10 (Recording the Preferred Title for a Compilation of Works of One Person, Family, or Corporate Body) and 6.2.2.4 (Works created after 1500)

ALA thanks the National Library of New Zealand for this proposal to clarify Chapter 6 instructions relating to the use of conventional collective titles. During ALA discussion, it was not possible to reach a consensus about our position on the proposal; equal numbers were fully in support of and adamantly opposed to making these changes. This response contains both comments in favor and comments against the proposal, along with one suggested wording change for clarity.

***Comments in favor:***

1. Information seekers do not use conventional collective titles to fulfill the FRBR user tasks of find, identify, select and obtain. These titles primarily serve catalogers.
2. Decisions about the preferred title affect the construction of the authorized access point. When RDA requires distinguishing such access points, qualifiers may be chosen from attributes related to the manifestation, such as publisher, dates, or even the title proper. In these cases, it is certainly more efficient and effective to use the title proper as the preferred title.
3. Conventional collective titles are a poor way to do either work/expression identification or genre/form access. They have limited usefulness in our current environment, especially in relation to incomplete compilations, and they will become increasingly irrelevant as we move library metadata into a linked data context.
4. Perversely, with the move from AACR2 to RDA, conventional titles are now called for much more frequently, e.g., for art catalogs, collections of poetry or short stories.
5. If RDA did not call for the use of conventional collective titles, such titles could still be recorded as variant access points, if desired.

***Comments against:***

1. The scope of NZNL's proposed changes is significant, and it would have a substantial impact on legacy data.
2. ALA commentators disagreed with the characterization of the RDA principle of representation (0.4.3.4) as it applies to choosing preferred titles. That principle sets forward the following choices:
  - a. the title most frequently found in resources embodying the work in its original language
  - b. the title as found in reference sources

- c. the title most frequently found in resources embodying the work.

Similar phrasing occurs in the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*, 6.3.3, Choice of Authorized Access Point:

The name preferred as the authorized access point for an entity should be based on the name that identifies the entity in a consistent manner, either as most frequently found on manifestations or a well-accepted name suited to the users of the catalogue (e.g., ‘conventional name’) as found in reference sources.

By using the terms “frequently” and “resources”, both of these statements indicate that a collective title appearing on a single manifestation is not sufficient to establish a “well-known” title for a compilation.

Thus, any change in 6.2.2 about how to choose a preferred title would require a change to the Principle of Representation as stated in RDA 0.4.3.4 and restated in 5.2, *Functional Objectives and Principles*.

3. This proposal refocuses 6.2.2.10 so that the decision to use a conventional collective title is based on the presence/absence of a title on a single manifestation, instead of considering the completeness of the compilation. As written, the proposal would not allow the conventional collective title of “Works” in many cases where it would be useful.
4. The collocation function of conventional collective titles, especially for complete works and complete works in a single form, remains useful in our current environment.
5. 6.2.2.10 already allows for choosing a different title from a conventional collective title if the collection has become better known by that title.
6. In terms of providing access for particular titles, RDA already permits recording a distinctive title for a compilation as a variant title.

***Suggested rewording:***

ALA agrees with NZNL that the “known by” language in 6.2.2.4 and 6.2.2.10 could be clarified. However, we recommend a different approach, to use the phrase “commonly identified” instead. This is already used in relation to corporate bodies in 11.2.2.3, *Choosing the Preferred Name*.

We also believe that 6.2.2.10 should be modified, to clearly state that it applies to the works of one person, family, or corporate body.

We therefore recommend the following changes:

***Marked-up copy:***

**6.2.2.4 Works Created after 1500**

For works created after 1500, choose as the preferred title the title in the original language by which the work is commonly identified ~~has become known either through use~~ in resources embodying the work or in reference sources.

[remainder of instruction unchanged]

...

**6.2.2.10 Recording the Preferred Title for a Compilation of Works of One Person, Family, or Corporate Body**

If a compilation of works of one person, family, or corporate body is commonly identified ~~known~~ by a title that is used in resources embodying that compilation or in reference sources, apply the instructions at **6.2.2.4–6.2.2.5**.

[remainder of instruction unchanged]

***Clean copy:***

**6.2.2.4 Works Created after 1500**

For works created after 1500, choose as the preferred title the title in the original language by which the work is commonly identified in resources embodying the work or in reference sources.

[remainder of instruction unchanged]

...

**6.2.2.10 Recording the Preferred Title for a Compilation of Works of One Person, Family, or Corporate Body**

If a compilation of works of one person, family, or corporate body is commonly identified by a title that is used in resources embodying that compilation or in reference sources, apply the instructions at **6.2.2.4–6.2.2.5**.

[remainder of instruction unchanged]

***Note from the ALA Representative***

Although ALA could not agree on a unified response, I believe the JSC should also consider the following issues in relation to this proposal:

- The majority of the issues raised may be better addressed in new or revised policy statements, rather than with changes to RDA itself.

- Significant changes to the instructions for compilations may be inadvisable until after the FRBR Review Group completes its work on consolidating the FR models.
- Because a conventional collective title assigned per 6.2.2.10.2, *Recording the Preferred Title for a Compilation of Works of One Person, Family, or Corporate Body*, overlaps with 6.3, *Form of Work*, a possible alternative solution to this problem would be to further develop RDA to better accommodate genre/form attributes.
- Instead of revising all of 6.2.2.10, it may be better to reword 6.2.2.10.3, *Other Compilations of Two or More Works*, as instructions for incomplete compilations.

I will determine the final ALA position on this proposal after reviewing responses from other constituencies and participating in the JSC discussion in November.