

## 2020-05 VAOH Session

### Presentation summary

Robin Six and Jay Wietz presented on the mysterious 3xx fields. Robin provided a breakdown of the fields along with examples showing how the fields are used in bibliographic records and Jay covered the vocabularies used within these fields along with the current best practices associated with these fields.

### URLs mentioned during the presentation:

Music Toolkit by Gary Strawn - <https://files.library.northwestern.edu/public/Music382/documentation/>

Bibliographic Formats and Standards (BFAS), 3xx Fields - <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/3xx.html>

MARC 21 Authority Format, Headings General Information - <http://www.loc.gov/marc/authority/ad1xx3xx.html>

MARC 21 Source Codes for Vocabularies, Rules, and Schemes - <http://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/>

MLA Supplements to Best Practices for Music Cataloging - <http://cmc.blog.musiclibraryassoc.org/mla-best-practices/>

OLAC best practices documents - <https://olacinc.org/training-publications>

RDA registry - <https://www.rdaregistry.info/>

RDA value vocabularies - <https://www.rdaregistry.info/termList/>

Reopening Archives, Libraries, and Museums (REALM) Information Hub: A COVID-19 Research Project - [https://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/COVID-19-research-project.html?\\_ga=2.181988199.1987174497.1589487680-1793029776.1585837435](https://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/COVID-19-research-project.html?_ga=2.181988199.1987174497.1589487680-1793029776.1585837435)

Searching WorldCat Indexes, Fields and subfields, 33x fields - [https://help.oclc.org/Librarian\\_Toolbox/Searching\\_WorldCat\\_Indexes/Fields\\_and\\_subfields/3xx\\_fields](https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Searching_WorldCat_Indexes/Fields_and_subfields/3xx_fields)

Valdosta State University libraries - <https://www.valdosta.edu/academics/library/>

WC3 WebSchemas/Accessibility - <https://www.w3.org/wiki/WebSchemas/Accessibility>

### Member questions (2020-05-07)

#### Is there a list of the terms used in 34x fields available outside the RDA Toolkit?

Answer: BFAS 3xx fields page (<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/3xx.html>) point to the appropriate vocabulary to use. You can also find the list of terms for these fields by going to the RDA registry's RDA value vocabularies (<https://www.rdaregistry.info/termList/>).

#### Which fields are valid for both bibliographic and authority records?

Answer: Fields that are work and expression based would be valid for both. These would include: 046, 336, 348, 370, 377, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, and 388.

A full list of 3xx fields for authority records can be found in the MARC 21 Authority Format, Headings General Information page (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/authority/ad1xx3xx.html>). For a list of all of the fields that can be used in bibliographic records, please see BFAS, 3xx Fields (<https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/3xx.html>).

**Are there any examples of the 386 field being used in the public catalog interface. Anyone doing this? How did you choose to set up indexing, display, etc.?**

Answer: Many of these fields and subfields were not intended for public display on their own. The intent of many of these fields is to enable a local system to facet things in ways not done before, such as identifying specific format. Currently, the OCLC Discovery interface does not display these fields. However, Valdosta State University libraries (<https://www.valdosta.edu/academics/library/>) use fields 385 and 386 in their public display. If you go to their catalog, you can see how they are used in display and faceting.

**If I am cataloging a collection of letters and papers belonging to a single person would I include a 381 field with the persons last name or is that necessary?**

Answer: In this case, you would have a subject access point for the person's name instead of using field 381. However, use of field 381 is geared more toward differentiating one work or expression from another work or expression. For example, two different motion pictures released in the same year with the same title but with different directors.

Harlow (Motion picture : 1965 : Douglas)

Harlow (Motion picture : 1965 : Segal)

**Can you expand why OCLC decided to use separate fields for each unique term even if the terms come from the same vocabulary?**

Answer: While it is not required that you use different fields when the terms are from the same vocabulary, the thought was that it might be easier to facilitate things like faceting when searching if separate fields were used. Both OLAC and MLA best practices allow you to use a single field with separate subfields when the terms are taken from the same vocabulary or from no vocabulary at all. While current best practices allow terms from the same vocabulary to be added to the same field with separate subfields, this may not be the best solution when using subfields \$0 and \$1, which would be used in transforming data from MARC to BIBFRAME or a linked data environment.

**Are the 3xx fields indexed in WorldCat?**

Answer: Yes, 3xx fields are indexed in WorldCat. Indexing varies from field to field and many of them fall under the "entities" index, or "en:". You can find a complete list of the 3xx fields that are indexed in the OCLC Help site under Searching WorldCat Indexes, Fields and subfields, 3xx fields ([https://help.oclc.org/Librarian\\_Toolbox/Searching\\_WorldCat\\_Indexes/Fields\\_and\\_subfields/3xx\\_fields](https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Searching_WorldCat_Indexes/Fields_and_subfields/3xx_fields)).

**Does OCLC plan to have validation when subfield \$2 codes are present in the 3xx fields?**

Answer: Yes, the subfield \$2 codes are already validated.

**Is it recommended to fully code both 007 and 3XX fields despite their great overlap in content?**

Answer: OCLC recommends that, for the time being, libraries continue coding field 007 while adding any appropriate 3xx fields. OCLC continues to participate in the current discussion about using 007 and 3xx fields. A lot of existing local systems were built to use the 007 field for faceting and differentiating one resource from another and not all of them have adjusted to using the newer 3xx fields. In WorldCat, OCLC uses both field 007 and 3xx fields to determine material type, while the Library of Congress has moved to using 3xx fields instead of field 007 and various fixed fields when converting BIBFRAME to MARC.

**More of a discussion prompt than a question... I recently finished a collection-level record for a 163-linear foot collection of many material types. When I looked at the finished record in WorldCat, it picked out the 346 values for display, making it look like video formats were the only material types included even though 15/16 series are not video. I guess that what's we want??? Our archivist thought that was so misleading that I went back and deleted the field at her request. For those viewing chat text, details are...**

**Displayed material types: Videorecording (vid); U-matic (umc); Videocassette (vca); VHS tape (vhs)**

**346 †3 Series 9 moving image material: †a 8 mm †a Betacam †a Hi-8 mm †a U-matic †a VHS †2 rdavf**

**300 (101 boxes, 15 oversize folders, 2 binders, 102 books, 5 items, 2 oversize containers, 1 drawer of notated music, 20 audio discs, 150 audiotape reels, 772 audiocassettes, 74 film reels, 231 video cassettes, 254 video cartridges)**

Answer: There is a lot that goes into displaying the icons in WorldCat. When your library sees a specific display that is misleading, please send the OCLC number to [askqc@oclc.org](mailto:askqc@oclc.org) and we will look into it. The generation of Material Types from the data in a bibliographic record goes back a long time, significantly predating the definition of many of the MARC 3XX fields, including 346 (defined in 2011) as well as the creation of the RDA Registry that tries to codify many of the controlled vocabularies we now rely upon. Many of those newer 3XX fields are certainly taken into account in the formulation of Material Types; a few of those of more recent vintage are slated to be taken into account the next time we are able to make changes to WorldCat indexing.

For better or worse, not every possible kind of video or audio format generates its own specific Material Type, although all of the most common ones do (in video, for example, VHS, DVD, U-matic, Beta, and Blu-ray are among those that generate their own MT). The more obscure video recording formats (many of which are documented in MARC Video 007/04, <https://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd007v.html>, or in BFAS Video 007 subfield \$e, <https://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en/0xx/007video.html>), such as Type C, EIAJ, Betacam, M-II, 8 mm, and Hi-8 mm, instead generate a more general MT as appropriate. There were simply not enough WorldCat records representing some of these formats to justify their own Material Type. This explains why the record in question registered only VHS and U-matic as specific MTs; the other video formats listed in the 346 essentially roll up to the more general "Videorecording."

In a vast archival collection such as #1149392345, which includes numerous different kinds of print and nonprint media, there could have been literally dozens of Material Types represented, had all of them

been accounted for in the bibliographic record. Coded Material Types may derive from various fixed field elements, 007s, 300s, 33Xs, 34Xs, 856s, and elsewhere.

**On slide 23, you show the key of music as D minor. To musicians, a lower-case letter shows a minor key: d minor; upper case is for major key: D Major. Does MLA have anything to say about this?**

Answer: The field in question does not have a controlled vocabulary and traditionally, the key was always capitalized (i.e. D) and the mode (i.e. Major or Minor) was spelled out. The best practice is to capitalize the key and spell out the mode. This partially has to do with indexing and other software like that. Rebecca Belford in chat mentioned that Capitalizing key in 384 also matches the AAP format for \$r, making copy-paste or theoretical machine generation easier.

**We have a recording that includes a CD, a 12 inch 33 1/3 rpm disc and 7-inch 45 rpm disc. When recording the 3xx fields, is it best to create separate 300 fields first and then how do you organize all of the 33x and 34x fields? There would seem to be a lengthy amount of fields and some might overlap. Any suggestions?**

Answer: RDA allows catalogers to use separate 300 fields or string them together in a single 300 field. A suggestion would be to organize the 3xx fields in the same order in which they appear in the 300 field(s) and use subfield \$3 to identify which piece that particular 3xx field refers to.

**Should we be using tag 385 instead of a 521 note for intended audience?**

Answer: For now, OCLC encourages the use of both fields during this transitional time. While field 521 is intended for display, field 385 is not intended for displayed.

**If many fields are not intended for display, why then do we use textual controlled vocabulary, which is prone to typos?**

Answer: The answer is that it is more practical. Both textual controlled vocabulary and codes are prone to typos. While RDA sometimes gives one preferred vocabulary to use, for many fields, there are a number of vocabularies which would require the creation of a corresponding set of codes for every single vocabulary.

**How granular should we be? For a recording with both stereo and mono tracks, or for a SACD (usually coded both stereo and surround), is it desirable to enter these terms in the same 344 field or in separate ones?**

Answer: The extent of the granularity and how much information you want to facet is up to you. In field 344, it would not be uncommon for more than one term from the same vocabulary to apply to the same resource. As mentioned in the presentation, the MLA and OLAC best practices both allow catalogers to use multiple subfields in the same field when using the same vocabulary or no vocabulary at all. While OCLC prefers the use of separate fields for each term, cataloger may choose what works best for them.

**Does OCLC have any plans to partner with anyone to retroactively add some of these fields to legacy records? I know that MLA is working on a toolkit that will add some of these fields to legacy records but not all. Are there other projects underway from other communities?**

Answer: Gary Strawn from Northwestern University has created a toolkit (<https://files.library.northwestern.edu/public/Music382/documentation/>) that will create certain 3xx

fields based on information elsewhere in the bibliographic record. OCLC has looked at applying Gary Strawn's software to WorldCat to apply some of these 3xx fields. Although no decision has been made one way or another, we are interested in any ideas about how to retrospectively add 3xx fields.

**Was the GMD deprecated because it was redundant with the 3XX fields?**

Answer: No. The GMD was always problematic because it was one dimensional and trying to do many things with one piece of information. The International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) tried to facet out what GMDs were trying to say in the sense of content, medium, and carrier. This was the origin of the 33x fields. The 33x fields were designed to replace the GMD during the transition from AACR2 to RDA.

**Is it possible to use subfield \$8 in addition to or in place of subfield \$3 to connect multiple kinds of 3XX fields?**

Answer: If your system is set up to deal with subfield \$8, then you are welcome to use it. There are not many systems that use this subfield. While you may use it, OCLC does not suggest that you replace using subfield \$3 with subfield \$8 as subfield \$3 is displayable and human readable and the subfield \$8 is not.

**I notice on some slides that this presentation includes the RDA instruction number. Will future presentations make use of the citation numbering used in the RDA Beta Toolkit? I am trying to learn the Beta Toolkit and use of the citation numbering.**

Answer: Currently, the RDA Beta Toolkit is not in its completed form, as the Beta site itself notes: "... the functions and content of the site are still under development. The RDA Steering Committee has not yet authorized the beta site for use in cataloging work. The beta site will become the authorized RDA Toolkit on December 15, 2020." Even at that time in late 2020, both the current version of the RDA Toolkit and the Beta version will be available. A year-long Countdown Clock will begin sometime in 2021, at a time yet to be determined by the full agreement of the RDA Board, RDA Steering Committee, and the publishers of the RDA Toolkit. We will have to see how things develop, but we would imagine that OCLC presentations created during the period when both RDA versions are available will reference both the original RDA instruction numbers and the new numbers and that we will switch over entirely when the original RDA is decommissioned. Until December 15, 2020, we will continue to use only the original RDA instruction numbering.

[Member Questions \(2020-05-14\)](#)

**Is OCLC's recommendation to put subfield \$3 at the end rather than the beginning of a field (as in the example for the audio recording that also had a guidebook, and some repeated 33x)?**

Answer: MARC 21 illustrates, with some examples, subfield \$3 at the end of the 33x fields, so when OCLC implemented these fields a few years back there was a conversation about what the recommended practice for placement of subfield \$3 should be. Catalogers are used to placing subfield \$3 up front with other fields for display purposes. When looking at the 33x fields, though, the thought was that since they were primarily there for retrieval and indexing purposes and not for display, then subfield \$3 is nothing more than a control subfield and so should be listed after subfield \$2 at the end of the field. If your library decides to display these fields, you may move the subfield \$3 to the front of the field for use in your local system.

**What is the relationship between field 380 (Form of Work) and 655 (Genre/Form)? What are the best practices for using one field vs. another to express the form of a resource?**

Answer: Adam Schiff answered that typically, field 380 would be used to record a generic genre/form term, usually the one that would be used in a qualifier in the access point if it were needed. Field 655 would have the specific genre/form terms. For example:

380 Motion pictures \$2 lcgft

but

655 Comedy films. \$2 lcgft

380 Fiction \$2 lcgft

but

655 Novels. \$2 lcgft

655 Detective and mystery fiction. \$2 lcgft

Jay Weitz commented that OCLC doesn't offer specific guidance about these two fields but, generally speaking, these two fields have different purposes, and, in WorldCat, they appear in different indexes.

**I would love to see a controlled vocabulary for the Accessibility field, and echo Bob's question about where they're indexed so I could see examples of how they're being used 'in the wild'.**

Answer: Honor Moody mentioned that there is not a universal accessibility field, but that the W3C has an accessibility schema that can be considered a controlled vocabulary (<https://www.w3.org/wiki/WebSchemas/Accessibility>).

**What would you use for the 380 for Made-for-TV movies. †2lcgft and Fiction television programs. †2lcgft in the 655 fields for 24. Redemption?**

Answer: Adam Schiff said that OLAC best practice says to give "Television programs" in field 380 and the specific terms in field 655.

**Would you include 380 for nonfiction too or let 655 handle it? For example, Personal narratives, Guidebooks?**

Answer: Adam Schiff said that his library typically doesn't bother to give a 380 field at all, since the 655 field can be used for all the appropriate genre/form terms. Their system indexes both field 380 and field 655 as genre/form terms. It really depends on the system your library is using and how it's configured.

**On slide 34, "polychrome" is synonymous with "color" so are we saying that we can just put in a different word if we don't really like the RDA term?**

Answer: Adam Schiff mentioned that different terms from different sources for the same concept can always be recorded in most of these fields. Kelley McGrath added that there is a history behind the

polychrome problem and the way RSC wanted to define color vs. the way it applies to tinted and toned film, which is why there's an alternative to use a substitute vocabulary.

**What is everyone using in field 347 for an electronic book?**

Answer: If it is a text file, you would use the phrase "text file in field 347. For example:

347 text file \$2 rdaft

**Does OCLC have a stance on privacy concerns related to recording demographic characteristics (especially gender) of creators/contributors in 386?**

Answer: This is a very sensitive topic, and while OCLC doesn't have a stance on this, the general consensus is that just because you have the data doesn't mean that you should record the data, especially with sensitive information. So, the cataloger should be very deliberate when making the decision to include sensitive information or not.

**Is there a list of official abbreviations to be used in the \$2? I know they're based on the titles of various RDA sections, but the longer the section title, the harder it is to guess what the abbreviation should be.**

Answer: The codes in subfield \$2 are not abbreviations but rather codes. All of the codes used in subfield \$2 can be found in the appropriate MARC code list on the MARC website (<http://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/>).

**Can you please expand on using the 300 fields for born digital materials that come in via cloud transfer, with no container?**

Answer: They would be treated as any other online resource.

**Depending on the format of the ebook, is it really a "text" file? like MOBI or EPUB?**

Answer: Adam Schiff stated that he assumed that text file means something you can read with your eyes. Bryan Baldus added that the RDA registry says that a text file is a file type for storing electronically recorded textual content.

**Encoding the 3xx fields can take a lot of time, is OCLC planning to provide some help to streamline the creation of these fields?**

Answer: Yes, there are some tools out there that may help you. Gary Strawn from Northwestern University has created a toolkit (<https://files.library.northwestern.edu/public/Music382/documentation/>) that will create certain 3xx fields based on information elsewhere in the bibliographic record. There may also be other macros out there to assist you in creating 3xx fields. Robert Bremer and Jay Weitz have talked about going back through WorldCat to try to retrospectively create various 3xx fields, however, this has not been done yet.

**Is there any thought for OCLC to creating separate indexes to better search for specific characteristics? For example, limiting a search to just 385 or 386 instead of all other 3XX fields?**

Answer: The entity attributes index was created a while ago, during the early development of many of these fields and before some of the fields existed. At that time OCLC had very little idea how they would be used, if they would be used, and what kind of vocabularies would be used in some of these fields. Because of this, the decision was made to utilize the entities attributes in the short term, with the intention to possibly creating more specific indexes for individual fields as needed.

**Is it still best practice to code 336 still image for books that contain a lot of images?**

Answer: Yes.

**Is OCLC retrospectively separating 34X fields with multiple subfields into separate 34X fields for each subfield?**

Answer: OCLC, currently, does not have any automated process doing this but it makes sense that we ought to do it. Terms that have been supplied in some of these fields that match up to pre-RDA controlled vocabulary could have subfield \$2 added with the appropriate codes to clean up the records.

**I heard a partner of OCLC has some of the virus, to see how it reacts with various library materials. How is that going?**

Answer: OCLC has partnered with Battelle to discover how the COVID-19 virus works on various library materials. Metadata Quality staff are not involved with this project so we cannot answer specifics about it. For details about the project, please see Reopening Archives, Libraries, and Museums (REALM) Information Hub ([https://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/COVID-19-research-project.html?\\_ga=2.181988199.1987174497.1589487680-1793029776.1585837435](https://www.webjunction.org/explore-topics/COVID-19-research-project.html?_ga=2.181988199.1987174497.1589487680-1793029776.1585837435)).

**Jumping back to the earlier 347 ebook question regarding text files, what happens for a children's book where the text is minimal but it's heavily illustrated?**

Answer: For an electronic book version of a children's book, if you choose to use field 347, you would use "text file" and "image file" to bring out both the text and illustrations.

**I also am wondering about controlling headings in these fields. Will there be that functionality at some point like there is in 6XX and other access point fields?**

Answer: While we think this is a great idea and would be extremely useful, OCLC has not yet looked into this and what would be needed to make this happen.

Adam Schiff said that regarding Temporal Terms Code List, the ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies is considering creating a controlled vocabulary for chronological headings that could be used in the 388 field. Stay tuned. He also mentioned that the SAC Subcommittee of Faceted Vocabularies will be issuing best practices for recording 046, 370, 385, 386 and 388. The one for 046/388 is nearly complete and hopefully will be published by SAC later this spring or summer.

**For adding 3xx fields that are standard for print or DVDs or audiobooks when doing original cataloging we put these in word documents and copy and paste them into OCLC when creating the record.**

Answer: Yes, this is a great work around for adding the same information to the records you are creating. Another option would be to use constant data.



**Do you recommend putting all subfields in separate 3XX fields even if the \$2 would be the same, such as 340 \$a, \$c, and \$e that all use the rdamat vocabulary?**

Answer: Yes, this is OCLC's recommendation. This is partially due to the possibility of including subfield \$0 and subfield \$1 to these fields, in the future. The subfield \$0 and subfield \$1 would be associated with an individual term or phrase in a subfield and would be used in transforming data from MARC to BIBFRAME or a linked data environment. So, putting each subfield in a separate field would facilitate this.

**Wouldn't creator characteristics be better in authority records and not entered in individual bib records? Or do we enter in bibs because systems can't handle it from authority records?**

Yes, putting these personal attributes for a creator are appropriate in the authority record. It is your choice whether you put them in both places or not, and may have to do with your local system capabilities. As we look forward to a world of linked data, new best practices may emerge about the optimal place to record such information. This is likely to be an ongoing conversation within the cataloging community.