

2021-01 VAOH session

Topic	More on 5xx fields
Date	Tuesday, 12 January - 9:00 AM Eastern Thursday, 21 January - 4:00 PM Eastern
Host	Robin
Emcee	Shanna
Presenter	Hayley, Jay
Panelist(s)	Charlene, Cynthia
Attendee/note taker	Megan
Number of participants	12 January: 155 21 January: 202
Recording link	12 January: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/lsr.php?RCID=5ab0b2abb1cf47eba3480b272576a218 21 January: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/lsr.php?RCID=66f7fc9b3b31428890a69c75540c677b
Registration link	12 January <ul style="list-style-type: none">Attendee: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e1a6a22c16cd4482af51ab0c360564599Panelist: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e855c326cf7574e1a819dfbabb7e3708c 21 January <ul style="list-style-type: none">Attendee: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=e96b23bd66d2b56efc1e303e01d2971e6Panelist: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=edf420f5893d99c5f5df726eebe10169a

File list

File 	Modified
Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet 2021-01-12 VAOH Attendee list.xlsx	Jan 21, 2021 by Six,Robin
Text File 2021-01-12 VAOH chat.txt	Jan 12, 2021 by Six,Robin
Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet 2021-01-21 VAOH Attendee list.xlsx	Jan 22, 2021 by Six,Robin
Text File 2021-01-21 VAOH chat.txt	Jan 22, 2021 by Six,Robin
PDF File 2021-01 VAOH 5XX fields_Part 2.pdf	Jan 12, 2021 by Six,Robin

 [Download All](#)

Presentation summary

2021-01 VAOH session

Topic presentation

Oh My, there are so many 5XX fields, what do I do?

Jay Weitz and Hayley Moreno presented on MARC 5xx fields. The fields covered in this presentation were the "optional" for full level records that include fields 505, 506, 507, 510, 514, 516, 520, 521, 522, 524, 530, 535, 536, 539, 540, 541, 542, 544, 552, 556, 561, 562, 563, 565, 567, 581, 583, 584, 585, 586. It was noted that although 545 was recently changed to be an optional note, it was already covered in the November session and as such would not be covered again.

URLs mentioned during the presentation:

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#editpccrecords>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging.html#characters>

<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/input.html>

<https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/guidelines-terminal-periods.pdf>

Member questions

Jan. 12, 2021, session notes:

Some bibliographic records have large two or three 505 fields. What are the split or repeated 505 fields based on? Are the 505 field contents evenly split if you have, e.g., two split 505 fields?

It really depends on kind of the vintage of the particular record or the vintage of the 505 field, if it was added. In, a long time ago there were limits to the number of, there were practical limits to the number of characters that could be in a particular field. Those limits really kind of don't exist anymore or they're high enough that they're almost never reached. So if the record is old enough, it's very possible that if you would try to input the record manually, with a huge 505 field, the system would hiccup and you'd have to manually split the 505 field into multiple fields so that each of the individual fields would be under the limits. Again, that's not really the case anymore. Nowadays, it's really more common that a cataloger will split a 505 for more logical or bibliographical reasons: the contents of different volumes, of different parts of a multi-part resource, and that kind of thing. So it really depends on the context of the record and the resource that you're cataloging as to whether you want to split a 505 field or if it's necessary. Sometimes it's easier to make the 505 field legible or understandable or readable if you split it up, but it's not something nowadays that usually gets done automatically.

Re: 505 field. Isn't there a limit on number of characters in a field?

Not really any longer, as I mentioned before. There used to be limits to the length of the, of individual fields. The limits on both fields and records themselves are now so high that they are for most practical purposes nonexistent. So I don't think there's an actual limit on the number of characters in a 505 field or any other field.

Since the subfields in an enhanced 505 aren't intended to be indexed as phrases, what's the logic behind putting every single title in a 505 that consists only of titles in its own separate subfield \$t? Wouldn't using a single subfield \$t for all those titles suffice?

I guess logically that would be the case, but MARC21 calls for individual titles in a 505 to be separately subfielded in subfield \$t if you are going to use the enhanced 505 practice. But that's just what MARC21 says and we carry that over into Bibliographic Formats and Standards.

Is there a recommended way to indicate a sequence of 505 fields?

If there is a logical bibliographical way to indicate the sequence, such as volume numbers or something like that, that would be the way to go if you're going to have multiple 505s. If there's a bibliographically logical way to identify each of the 505 fields, such as volume number or volume title, something like that, that would be the practice.

Are the indexed 5XX fields in a field-specific index or in indexes which merge content from multiple fields?

Most of the 5xx fields that we've mentioned today that are indexed are in both the notes index, which is "nt:", and in the keyword index, "kw:". There are some of the fields that we've mentioned today that may also be in other indexes as well, and in many cases with other fields that aren't 5xxs or from other ranges in the MARC format. We didn't go into, obviously, we didn't go into much detail, in fact hardly any detail at all, about what specific indexes the fields are in because the presentation was already more than half an hour long and we try to keep it to a controllable length. It would have been even longer if we had gone into that kind of detail. But those details are in Searching WorldCat Indexes.

Does the presence of any of these 5XX fields block the dedup process?

Not per se. The deduplication process is, as we have had many times talked about, really complicated. And there are some 5xx field elements that are brought into consideration in certain comparisons within the deduplication process. So it's quite possible that a 5xx field or the information in a 5xx field can block a deduplication or, I guess, prove to the DDR process that the records in question are not duplicates or are questionable enough not to merge. I guess you could say that yes, the presence of certain information in some 5xx fields can prevent a DDR transaction.

Do 5XX fields that 'do not transfer as part of the deduplication process' transfer if they are stored in an LBD?

So the LBDs themselves are transferring. The information in the LBD does not transfer into the bibliographic record, but the LBDs that are associated with the record when records are transferred remain associated with the retained record.

Because the 521 Target audience note has a repeatable subfield \$a do you recommend when cataloging videos (though not print materials) that additional statements be added in the repeatable subfield \$a and not in a separate 521 field? For example: 521 _8 MPAA rating: R; for strong violence, some drug use, and language. a Canadian Home Video rating: 14A; brutal violence, coarse language.

This question's really a matter of cataloger's judgment in many cases. If you would be creating different 521 fields with, for instance, different first indicators for, let's say, reading grade level, interest, age level, interest, grade level, and so on; obviously with different first indicators you would want to create separate 521 fields, if the information in the 521 field is of a similar type and would be the same first indicator, even if it has a blank or an 8. Generally, I would use separate 521s in a case where there are different rating systems. So MPAA rating in one 521, the Canadian home video rating system in a separate 521 field. But it's really up to you as the cataloger.

What is the order of these notes in a bib record?

Well, in the days of AACR2, the order of notes was supposed to be the order of the instructions in AACR2, more or less, although there was a provision that a cataloger could choose to make a particular note the first note if it deserved some kind of prominence. In the era of RDA, however, there is really no prescribed order of notes. So it's really up to you. A lot of catalogers, especially those of us of a certain age, will have continued to use the AACR2-ish order of notes, but strictly speaking, there is no order. And some, especially some local systems, it's my understanding, actually rearrange the notes into some kind of order, especially some kind of numerical order, but there is no longer any prescribed order for notes under RDA.

Can the reformat option put the 5xx notes in the expected order?

Reformat does not do that, especially considering that there is no longer an "expected order" for notes.

Records that are added in WorldCat tend to keep all the 5xx fields, even 561. But when other records are matched to existing records lose their own 5xx (those that do not transfer). Is there a way for such 5xx fields to be preserved in the LBDs please?

From the response to a previous question, it sounds like LBD information is not being lost with merged transaction, it's just that information, if it was in the bibliographic record, and based on whatever circumstances occur with the deduplication process, it may transfer or it may not.

It sounds like what you're asking about is whether, when your record is incoming and matching to an existing record, and there are 5xx fields that do not transfer during that matching process, that you want those 5xx fields preserved in an LBD even though they weren't there originally. And I don't think any of us on this call have the expertise to answer that.

Re: 585 Exhibitions Note: are there 'impact' criteria regarding the Exhibition? does it need to have been (inter)national, generated a publication, etc. For instance, would an inhouse-exhibition justify such a note in the materials that had been used in that exhibition?

I tend to think with WorldCat records, you tend to have notes that will be of interest to other catalogers that have that resource. I'm thinking if it's local, to have it in a local note, like a 590 or so, but I would think impacting international or national makes more sense of having that 585 field in a WorldCat record because it will be of interest outside just of your local institution.

Just remember that you're cataloging a bibliographic resource and if the resource itself indicates that materials in the resource have been used as part of an exhibition or are somehow related to an exhibition, and that was mentioned in the resource, that would be enough justification, regardless of the "impact" of that, whether it's national, international, or local, that would be the justification for the note, the 585 note.

Are there any differences in the distribution of use of specific 5XX fields across OCLC's different language-of-cataloging communities?

That would take some research. It would not surprise me if there are differences among different language of cataloging communities. There are certainly fields that get more heavy use under certain, not just language of cataloging communities but also different descriptive cataloging standards communities. But that would take extensive research to answer, really definitively I think.

I would like to see 510 be indexed particularly for rare materials, as in some cases this is the only way to know how many items a library holds from the ESTC database, by just looking for "ESTC" if this is entered in the 510.

The 510 field is, if not at the very top, it is one of the fields that we have put on our list of things to be indexed, so that is definitely under consideration in the future.

The slide 63, the slide said it is indexed, but we were told it is not.

My apologies if I misspoke. It is indexed and my notes indicated that.

Jan. 21, 2021, session notes:

Is there a character limit to the 505 field? Does it generate a continuation 505 field if the character limit is exceeded? Also the 520 field?

There's no practical limit to the number of characters that may be in any field, 505, 520--any field. There used to be, but those have more or less been eliminated. Previous OCLC systems would sometimes break up a 505 field that was too long or a 520 field that was too long into multiple fields, but as far as I'm aware, the current implementations of WorldCat do not do that.

One of our colleagues mentioned for the character limit, 9999 to be able to comply with MARC (and export the record).

Recently we discovered over 80 OCLC records in our database for audiobooks that had a 506 for access restricted to disabled patrons, this field was not applicable to any of these records. Could they have come from deduplication? The current OCLC records no longer have these fields.

It's possible that the 506s could have transferred. If you have examples, OCLC number examples, we could take a look at Journal History to see when the 506s were added and possibly where they may have come from.

How is field 520 indexed?

520, if I remember correctly, is in the notes index and the keyword index. So note is nt: and keyword is kw:. It's just general, word-by-word, phrases, however you want to go. There are details on, for most pages in BFAS, there's a link back to the Searching WorldCat Indexes for that field, so if you click on that, you will get to Searching WorldCat Indexes and it will give you the details of how that field is indexed and in what indexes it appears.

For most of these, they are in those two indexes, for nt: for note and kw: for keyword.

Is it okay to add two 520 fields one for English and one for the non-English language for works that are not in English?

Strictly speaking, if a resource is being cataloged in English--that is, the 040 \$b says "eng," the descriptive information--the notes that you add to the record are supposed to be in English. That's how things are supposed to work.

If a book is bilingual, could we add a 520 field or appropriate notes in both languages?

If the book is in parallel text, could you add 520 notes in both languages?

If the resource is being cataloged in English, that is, the 040 \$b is coded as English, the notes and things related to the notes would best be in English. That's the general rule.

You may have a local policy where you want to include notes or summaries in a different language or the language of the item, if you want to do that. It's not standard practice to do that. Another thing I have seen sometimes is if the summary note is a quoted note and someone is quoting from the source where it's not in English, you may have it not in English in quotes, within an English language of cataloging record. So that's something that's possible.

We want it discoverable in both languages. We are trying to make resources available to patrons who do not speak English.

All of the notes should follow the language of cataloging. Even though you might not be able to do that to the WorldCat record, you can definitely do that in your local practices in your catalog to serve your patrons.

Would it be possible to get the info on if fields can be added/edited in PCC records in BFAS? Or maybe it's already in there and I'm just not seeing it?

It is already there, it's in chapter 5. <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/quality.html#editpccrecords>

How does OCLC decide some 5xx is indexed or *not* indexed; for instance 563, 'Binding information,' and it is indexed?

That is a really great question and unfortunately I do not know how these fields get decided if it's indexed or not. I know there are some fields that members wish would be indexed but they're not.

A lot of indexing decisions were made a long time ago in consultation with, there used to be a group of users who would consult with people at OCLC about indexing and display issues. We still get recommendations nowadays from groups such as the Online Audiovisual Catalogers, OLAC, from the Music OCLC Users Group, MOUG, about indexing and things related to that. When new fields are added or new subfields are added, as part of the OCLC MARC update, we make decisions about indexing based on what we know about the field and how we expect it to be used, or the subfield, how it fits into the rest of the field and how useful it would be to have it indexed or if it's something that isn't worth indexing. If you have requests for things that aren't indexed that you would like to see indexed, you can send them to us and we will add them to a list of things, sort of a wishlist that we have of things that could be indexed in the future.

What email address should we send indexing requests to?

They can just send those to askqc@oclc.org email address.

Do we need to cite where we get the summary for 520 fields? For example, "summary is from Amazon," do I need to put a subfield c?

I think current practice is to, if you're quoting from a source other than the resource itself, and possibly even depending on where it comes from in the resource itself, current practice would be to cite that source. It is subfield c. So yes, if you do cite the source, put it into subfield c.

Are there characters that should not be put into a 505 or 520? Sometimes we want to copy and paste...

When you copy and paste into a bibliographic record, sometimes that can cause problems. There are ways around that, because not all sources from which you would copy conform to the display rules for bibliographic records.

The characters not to include are mentioned in Chapter 2 of Bibliographic Formats and Standards, like vertical bar and smart characters. <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/onlinecataloging.html#characters>. I'm also thinking off the top of my head, there's certain resources like math books that have a lot of symbols, like pi and that, that can also cause a lot of issues when it's copy and pasted to the record. And there's also the option to paste things in records using plain text rather than doing a ctrl+c and +v to copy and paste, so that sometimes can help as well.

When you validate a record, doesn't that tell you if there are characters that shouldn't be there?

Yes, usually when you validate, it will say something like "bad character" or "invalid character," if there is something there that is not valid. That happens a lot less often now that we validated Unicode within WorldCat than it used to, but it does occasionally happen and it is those characters that are documented as not being usable.

Sometimes those validation error messages are kind of cryptic though, so sometimes they aren't as useful as they could be.

Sometimes validation doesn't report everything that it should, that can happen a lot with authority records and illegal character issues, so just keep that in mind as well.

I was taught that the 505 should not include things like "Introduction", "Bibliography" or "Index". Is that still correct? Also not to put in "Chapter 1" before the title of Chapter 1.

Those are generally still good practices not to include things like that, in many cases. There will occasionally be cases where you will want to ignore those, but generally those are good practices.

We still see a lot of records in WorldCat that have those words in them, like "Introduction" or "Index" or "Bibliography" that you probably wouldn't normally include if you were putting in your own contents note. Those are often there in eBook records that are machine-generated, so an automated process is generating those contents notes rather than a human being and that's often why you see them.

I sometimes see page numbers included in the 505 field. Should we delete those?

I don't necessarily know. I don't recall seeing page numbers. I suppose there could be circumstances where it would be appropriate to include those, but I can't think of any offhand. You can probably, if you're able to edit that 505, and you're so inclined, you can probably take those out.

Is the rule about not putting in index and bibliography different for children's books?

No, it's not different. It's just that bibliography and index notes go into a 504 field, where it says "includes bibliographical references and index," or, if it's just an index, that would usually go in a 500 field, so that's the main reason, I think, because they are distinguished that they are not put into a contents note in the 505 field.

There used to be a Library of Congress project which added 505s or 520s (machine addition) to bibliographic records for monographs. Is that still being done?

I suspect we're all being silent because we don't know the answer. I don't know the answer.

So, if a paperback issued at a later time with a unique ISBN (i.e. 2020) but it is actually a reproduction of one 2018 DLC record, should or could we add 020 to that DLC and not necessarily to create a new book for paperback (in 2020)?

The answer is "it depends." If indeed this is just another printing of the 2018 book and it just happens to be in paperback and it's the same size, it has the same pagination, et cetera, you're welcome to add that ISBN to the existing record and use that record. If, however, there is a difference with the paperback issuance, meaning that it has a different size or a different pagination or perhaps a different edition statement, maybe even some new foreword or something, then you would want to create a new record.

You can also find out more information in Bibliographic Formats and Standards, the chapter on when to input new records. That will give you an idea of the situation that you have and if a new record is warranted or not. <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/input.html>

We have noticed some records with many sets of ISBNs, now are they all valid for that one record? Does someone verify them?

I would say depends as well. With this case, they could have been transferred through some merges in the past, if everything matched and there was a difference in ISBN, then those would transfer over. Sometimes there are cases where the ISBNs are really for another version of the resource, like a large print or maybe the electronic, and they're not coded correctly, indicating they're valid for that particular description in the record, so it just depends and it will end up having to look at the record and really verify, someone could have put those ISBNs in there and they do their verification and it does have a few ISBNs. Sometimes, not necessarily, it could have just been a transfer transaction, and those are not necessarily always done by a person, so yeah, it would depend.

Should we be suppressing invalid ones even if the record is DLC?

I would say if you can confirm, you can put them in a subfield z, if you can confirm that ISBN is really for the large print and not for the hardback, then it would be appropriate to indicate it's an invalid ISBN. I don't necessarily think, there's nothing wrong with having ISBNs from other formats if it's the same title, so for the large print and the electronic, if you want to have those ISBNs there, they're okay to be there as long as you indicate they're invalid because they represent another version of the record.

Under both AACR2 and RDA, you're allowed to include in a bibliographic record all of the ISBNs or standard, other kinds of standard numbers that are in that resource, whether they apply to that resource or not. Those that apply to the resource that's being cataloged would properly be in subfield z rather than in subfield a. Only those that apply to the actual resource being cataloged, only those belong in subfield a, in an 020, for instance.

Why is there no punctuation at the end of the 586 field?

It's not just the 586 now. It's all of them. With punctuation now also being optional--and there was a whole Virtual AskQC Office Hour on this--so a lot of these notes will not be ending in any punctuation. The PCC, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, has issued guidelines about punctuation and you now have a choice of including ISBD punctuation or not including ISBD punctuation. You'd have to go to the PCC website to find those instructions about what the options are, but generally speaking, most of the 5xx fields, unless they end in an abbreviation or some other term that would naturally have a period after it, the final punctuation is generally now left off of many, many 5xx fields. <https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/guidelines-terminal-periods.pdf>