Draft report of CCC Linking Fields TF
January 31, 2018

As part of our charge to "explore the various methods used by map catalogers to record information about and provide links to source documents of maps detached from identifiable larger works," we found that in recent years it appears that the two most common methods of doing so in MARC cataloging environments have involved one or the other of the following options:

- MARC field 773, "Host Item Entry," either used alone to record a vertical relationship, or in combination with a local 500 note if needed.
- MARC field 787, "Other Relationship Entry," often used in combination with field 580, "Linking Entry Complexity Note."

Our analysis of MARC and OCLC documentation has led us to the **conclusion that MARC field 787 is preferable to field 773** in cases where a map has been detached from a larger item (or other entity), and that field 500 is preferable to field 580 for recording the fact of detachment. That analysis follows:

Field 773 (LC documentation, OCLC documentation) is "provided in order to enable the user to locate the physical piece that contains the component part or subunit being described." Notwithstanding the documentation's use of the word "contains," we considered recommending use of 773 in cases where an institution holds both the component map and its (current or former) host item, regardless of whether the component map is still physically attached to the host item. In that case, we would have recommended that the master record's 773 would serve both in situations where the constituent unit is still within the host item, and in situations where it has been removed. Either a local note, or a locally modified subfield $i in the 773 would clarify the situation where the constituent unit has been removed from the host. BLvl would be coded "a" or "b" as appropriate, for the master record situation of either monographic or serial component part. (See also MARC Leader, position 07.)

On the other hand, there are several considerations which point us toward recommending instead the use of **Field 787** (LC documentation, OCLC documentation) to link to what were, or may have been, formerly host items of detached maps.

- If an institution does not own the item that a map was removed from, then 773's specification of a "host *item*" is not applicable. The 773 would be instead linking to the "host *manifestation*," a more theoretical former host, and one that is not clearly accounted for in the 773's documentation (with its emphasis on items and item-item relationships).

- Moreover, 773's specification of a "physical piece *that contains* the component part or subunit being described" (emphasis ours) suggests that this field is not intended for use in cases where a map has been detached from a physical piece in which it was *formerly contained*. Thus, while our intention was that the task force's recommendation would sufficiently adhere to the master record concept, the use of 773 would require copy catalogers to recognize 773 as appropriate for situations where the map being cataloged has been detached from the item described in 773.
- While either course (using 773 or 787) will provide a link to the related resource, the 787 affords more flexibility of interpretation to cover those (potentially many) ambiguous cases of maps that have appeared in a publication, but that are not demonstrably "from" a particular edition of that publication, or that may have been issued in another format (for example, issued separately). The link is recorded in a manner loosely-defined enough to accommodate a variety of item-specific situations, which libraries are free to record locally as needed, including by transferring the 787 information to a more specific linking field that suits a particular item.
- In terms of practical public service implications, we feel that local notes about maps being detached from former hosts are likely to get lost or be difficult to spot within detailed map descriptions, potentially leading to confusion about a map's location: Is it (physically) contained within a given resource, or not?

In cases of detached maps we consider it more useful to the researcher to have a master record for all instances where the carrier of the map in hand is (simply) *a sheet*, as opposed to attempting to create master records that bring together all instances that are, or were originally issued, within in a particular manifestation of a larger publication — a level of specificity that in many cases cannot be reached. We think field 787 is better-suited to this aim.

An example of this method can be seen in OCLC #1002859024, appearing in Michigan State University Library's catalog here. It makes use of the 500 field with subfield 5 to explain the 787.

Another example can be seen in OCLC #963845119, appearing in NYPL's online catalog here. No explanatory note was included in this record because of the explanation within the title. Note that the linking field is **not** displayed in the WorldCat records -- neither in its versions of the MSUL record, nor the NYPL record. (Issues of what the linking field actually links to, and the appropriate control number to use to effect that link, need to be determined locally, depending on local ILS systems.)

As to methods by which institutions can record local details about the detachment (or other circumstance) of the item being cataloged, we note that the MARC field that appears to be most specific to this purpose, field 580, "Linking Entry Complexity Note," (LC documentation, OCLC documentation) unfortunately lacks a subfield $5 or similar means of indicating that the details recorded there are institution-specific. Therefore, we recommend that such details be recorded in **Field 500 with an institution-specific subfield $5**, as in the MSUL example cited above. We additionally recommend that MAGIRT's Cataloging and Classification Committee consider

drafting a discussion paper for the MARC Advisory Committee on introducing the use of a $5 with the 580 field.

Finally, institutions may additionally find it useful to consider the use of added entry fields 700-730 in addition to linking fields. We note in particular the potential usefulness of subfield $i (relationship information) in these fields. In addition, the Linking Entry Fields--General Information (MARC) notes that "When an added entry is desired for a title used in a linking field, the added entry is recorded in the appropriate 700-730 field. *Linking fields are not intended to take the place of added entries* [emphasis added]. Likewise, an added entry in field 700-730 does not take the place of a linking field, as it cannot cause a note to be generated or carry a record link." The OCLC documentation also specifies that "Linking entry fields do not take the place of authorized access point fields."

Recommendations for consideration and possible future action by MAGIRT's Cataloging and Classification Committee:
- Examine this draft task force report and give us your feedback before we finalize our report;
- Consider drafting a discussion paper for the MARC Advisory Committee on introducing the use of a $5 with the 580 field;
- Consider relationship designators to recommend adding to RDA Appendix J.4.4.;
- Identify additional linking field issues that arise in cartographic cataloging situations that may need clarification.

Thank you for your time in reviewing this document.

MAGIRT Cataloging and Classification Committee, Linking Fields Task Force:

- Nancy Kandoian, New York Public Library *(chair)*
- Catherine Hodge, University of Iowa
- Tim Kiser, Michigan State University
- Maggie Long, Wesleyan University
- Iris Taylor, Library of Congress