

# SCTS Cataloging Standing Group

## Report on Faceted Terms in Bibliographic Records

Final  
October 31, 2018

Cataloging Standing Group members:

Linnea Marshall, University of Idaho (Chair)

Peggy Firman, University of Puget Sound

Casey Mullin, Western Washington University

Suzanne Sager, Portland State University

### Faceted MARC Fields and Term Lists

In recent years certain non-topical concepts that traditionally have been integrated into *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (LCSH) have been separated out into their own distinct MARC fields and authorized term lists. These concepts include the form and genre of an item, medium of performance for musical works, audience characteristics, and creator/contributor characteristics. Formerly, embedded in LCSH, these concepts can now be encoded in separate MARC fields making them more readily actionable by computers and therefore usable as facets to refine search results in library catalogs. During early adoption, these fields may seem duplicative to the cataloger, particularly in combination with existing LCSH practices. With time and increased participation, and with retrospective projects to enhance legacy records, these data will become powerful search options for our users.

### Genre/Form Terms (MARC Fields 655 and 380)

[MARC field 655](#) and 6XX \$v to separate genre and form terms--what a work *is*--from subject headings--what a work is *about*--were established in the early 1990s. By separating genre and form from subject, it became possible to search for works by their genre or form. However, libraries faced a legacy of bibliographic records created before the advent of these MARC fields and library search systems that could not, at the time, take advantage of the coding.

There is a growing list of [sources for terms](#), some discipline-specific, that can be used as genre and form terms. In 2007 the Library of Congress began development of a new list of terms, the [Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials](#) (LCGFT). This list was started with genre and form terms for [moving image materials](#) (films and television programs). Since then, it has expanded to include terms in several additional areas: [radio programs](#), [cartographic materials](#),

[law materials](#), [“general” materials](#) (e.g., dictionaries, encyclopedias), [literary works](#), [music](#), [religious materials](#), and [artistic and visual works](#). In addition to establishing a [list of terms](#), LC also developed a draft [manual on genre/form terms](#) to be used with LCGFT. The manual provides instructions on assigning of LCGFT terms from the list as well as policies on the establishment of new terms. A document on [frequently asked questions about LCGFT](#) is also available on the Library of Congress Web site.

The [380 field Form of Work](#) was added to MARC in 2010. Similar to the 655 field, it can use vocabulary from the same sources. Unlike the 655 field, it is also defined in the MARC Authority format. In authority records, the 380 field is used to store genre/form terms describing works and expressions, including but not limited to those terms that can be used as qualifiers in authorized access points to differentiate entities with the same title.

### **Medium of Performance (MARC Field 382)**

For musical works, many subject headings assigned from LCSH are a combination of musical form and medium of performance, for example **Sonatas (Trombone and organ)**. These distinct concepts can now be separated, with musical form going into a 655 genre/form field and medium of performance being recorded in the [382 field](#), which was established in 2010. The Library of Congress began work on its [medium performance terms](#) in 2009 and an [initial term list was approved in 2014](#). LC has since developed a draft [manual](#) for the Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus for Music (LCMPT) that currently includes primarily information on proposing new terms or revising established terms in the list. The Music Library Association has prepared a [manual of best practices for using LCMPT](#), which includes robust instructions on term assignment and 382 encoding.

### **Audience and Creator/Contributor Characteristics (MARC Fields 385 and 386)**

Many terms in *Library of Congress Subject Headings* incorporate characteristics of the creators or of the intended audience. For example, the LCSH heading **American poetry--African American authors** combines the form *poetry* with the creator demographic of *African Americans*. The subject heading **English language--Textbooks for foreign speakers--Czech** combines the form *textbooks* with the audience demographic of people who speak Czech. The Library of Congress began development of a list of terms for [demographic groups](#) in 2013; by 2015 an [initial list was approved](#). The Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT) can be recorded in MARC fields [385 Audience Characteristics](#) and [386 Creator/Contributor Characteristics](#); both fields were new in 2013.

### **Time Period (MARC Fields 045, 046, and 388)**

A resource may be associated with any number of dates or time periods. There is the date a work was created, the date a particular expression was created, a date of publication for the original manifestation, and, possibly, a date of publication for a subsequent manifestation. A

video recording will have the date of the publication of the DVD and for feature films there is also the earlier date that the film was originally released as a motion picture. A nonfiction video recording or a sound recording may capture a performance from a particular date. All of these dates place a resource in a temporal context and may help to identify it. The date of the creation of a work is sometimes embedded in a LCSH heading. Music might be assigned a LCSH heading such as: **Popular music--1951-1960**, or **Piano music--19th century**. A collection of works of literature by multiple authors might have a subject heading: **Literature, Modern--18th century**. Individual works of literature and collections by a single author are generally not assigned genre/form headings (SHM: H 1790) and, consequently, do not have subdivisions for the time period of creation.

While time subdivisions in LCSH may function to indicate when a work or expression was created, they are probably more often used to show the historical coverage of the content. For example, subject headings such as **United States--Politics and government--1953-1961** and **Education--Great Britain--History--19th century** are for works that discuss their respective topics within a certain historical time period. For the purposes of limiting a search for the music or literature of a particular time versus limiting a search for historical treatment of a topic to a particular time, there is no distinction in LCSH headings. However, when a date or time period is coded in MARC fields [045 Time Period of Content](#), [046 Special Coded dates](#), or [388 Time Period of Creation](#) a discovery interface can make that distinction. Inclusion of these fields is not dependant on the presence of dates in a LCSH heading string and they can be more specific than the date ranges provided in LCSH.

### **Geographical Location (MARC Fields 370 and 257)**

As with time periods, works and expressions may be produced in a geographic place or may be about a geographic place. Subject headings such as **Popular music--United States--1951-1960** and **English fiction--18th century** bring together items that are products of a place. Headings like **France--History, Medical care--United States** and **Authors, English--18th century** bring together items that are about a place or topics within that place. When place is embedded within the subject heading, as it is with **English fiction** it becomes even more difficult to be used for limiting a search. [MARC field 370 Associated Place](#) can provide a link between a work or expression and its place of origin. For moving image resources, [OLAC best practices](#) recommends including [MARC field 257 Country of Producing Entity](#) to record the name of the country of the original production.

### **Alliance Genre/Form Task Group's Report of 2014**

Several years ago an Alliance Primo Genre/Form Task Group was formed and given the charge to "Discuss moving the form/genre field to its own Primo display and index, as opposed to the current situation of form/genre being written to the subject display and index buckets in Primo. Discuss indexing of a separate form/genre field in both simple and advanced search in Primo.

Describe Primo experience for both novice and expert user groups.” The Task Group submitted their report to the SILS Catalog Working Group in December 2014. Pertaining to their charge they recommended that genre terms (MARC fields 655, 694, 380, and \$v of 600, 610, 611, 630, 650 and 651) be indexed separately from subject terms, and to also display separately from subject terms. They recommended that a defined list of genre vocabularies, as coded in \$2, be used (e.g. aat, gsafd, lcgft) to narrow the indexing and display to “reduce clutter and help highlight the vocabularies that are relevant to our users.”

Because the greatest value of these facets lies in accurate and robust data, the Alliance Primo Genre/Form Task Group also recommended providing training and documentation. Furthermore, these facets in Primo will not achieve optimal value for discovery until there is more comprehensive coverage across the bibliographic records in Alma. Therefore, the task group also suggested that cleanup work on the master records in OCLC WorldCat that correspond to the bibliographic records in our Alma Network Zone would be beneficial.

### **ALCTS/CaMMS Subject Access Committee White Paper of 2017**

In 2017 the Working Group on Full Implementation of Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies, Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation, ALCTS/CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee submitted their white paper: [A Brave New \(Faceted World\): Toward Full implementation of Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies](#). This paper anticipates “a new era in resource discovery” as non-topical attributes of works and resources are moved from less flexible positions embedded in LCSH or MARC control data fields to new fields developed specifically for use with faceted terms. Like the Alliance’s Primo Genre/Form Task Group, this group also acknowledged that “until a critical mass of bibliographic metadata includes these faceted attributes, the vision of optimal user discovery experience that these attributes enable remains out of reach.” This working group envisioned a combination of current implementation (through training catalogers to consistently add these terms) and retrospective implementation (through use of computer algorithms) to reach that critical mass. They presented five components as they advocate for full implementation; the first of which is “Comprehensive faceted vocabulary training for catalogers working in shared environments.”

### **SCTS Cataloging Standing Group**

The Shared Collections and Technical Services [Cataloging Standing Group](#) (CSG) began work in January 2018. Its charge was to “Review and recommend cataloging policy for the Alliance. Create training outlines and documentation for best practices.” One of the suggested projects for the group to take on was “implementing Primo genre/form recommendations.” The Cataloging Standing Group decided to build on the work of the previous Alliance Primo Genre/Form Task Group by developing training materials and documentation for Alliance members on genre/form terms as well as other faceted terms.

As a first step, the group wanted to assess the current state of usage of faceted terms. This was twofold: an examination of the prevalence of MARC bibliographic records that contain faceted terms and a survey on current cataloging practices to include faceted terms among Alliance libraries.

### Faceted Field Usage Analysis

In February 2018, CSG member Casey Mullin performed an analysis of the occurrence of faceted data fields in Western Washington University's Institution Zone, utilizing Alma's "filter set by indication rule" functionality. The goal of this analysis was twofold: to ascertain how far one Alliance library is from "full implementation" of faceted terms across its IZ, and to establish a routine set of analytic parameters with which to create a longitudinal view of faceted field usage over time. The categories under observation are as follows.

MARC field	Categories of bibliographic records
655 with \$2 lcgft <sup>1</sup>	All records Musical scores Sound recordings Children's materials <sup>2</sup> Cartographic materials Videos
370	All records Musical scores and sound recordings (as a combined set)
382	Musical scores Sound recordings
385	All records Children's materials
386	All records

Casey has run the same analysis each month for the past six months. The data are encouraging: with rare exceptions, the percentage of records in each category has increased consistently from month to month. This is due to efforts across not only Alliance libraries, but

<sup>1</sup> The indication rule for 655 includes a test for \$2 lcgft. This is primarily because 655 fields with FAST terms occur in a preponderance of records in WorldCat (and thereby the NZ and IZ). We wish to know which records have LCGFT terms specifically. The other fields in this table are newer to cataloging practice, and do not have significant established usages that predate the LC faceted vocabularies.

<sup>2</sup> Defined by library and location (i.e., WWU Libraries' Children's Literature Interdisciplinary collection).

from other libraries who catalog in OCLC WorldCat, since their enhancements to master records flow automatically to the NZ and Alliance members' IZs.

The CSG also requested that the NZ Manager Lesley Lowery run the same analyses on the NZ (a task none of the CSG members can do). However, since the NZ is an order of magnitude larger than WWU's IZ, and therefore the filtering jobs take proportionally longer to complete (multiple days in some cases), we determined that a monthly cycle would be resource-prohibitive. Instead, Lesley has agreed to proceed on a quarterly schedule (beginning with August 2018), so we may benefit from the same longitudinal view at the NZ level. The data at this level (with two analyses completed thus far, in February and August 2018) are just as encouraging.

The WWU IZ and NZ usage data are viewable [here](#), and will continue to be updated over time.

The longitudinal usage data are interesting by their own merit. However, the CSG presents them in this report to demonstrate that full-scale implementation of faceted terms in the Alliance NZ is a plausible goal. As computer-assisted tools for retrospective implementation continue to develop over time, Alliance members can use the usage data to identify potential areas of focused effort, whether through manual enhancement projects or programmatic enhancement of WorldCat records (through MARCEdit's OCLC [integration tools](#), for example). Additionally, the usage analysis performed by the CSG and Lesley thus far can be adapted for use by other Alliance libraries, who may wish to filter on yet different fields, and/or examine different categories of bibliographic records.

### **CSG Survey on Application of Faceted MARC Fields by Alliance Institutions**

The Cataloging Standing Group began work in February 2018 on creating a [survey](#) about the current level of assigning faceted terms within the cataloging units of Alliance member libraries. The results of the survey were to be used to help direct the CSG in their efforts to develop training materials and other documentation on the vocabularies and application of faceted terms in bibliographic records. The survey was sent to the Alliance TS Reps via the TS Reps discussion group email on June 4, 2018, with a closing date of June 22. Each TS Rep was asked to compile a single response to represent their entire institution. Of course, for some of the Alliance members with large library systems that have cataloging responsibilities distributed among several diverse units, this was a big undertaking for their TS Reps. They had to contact the various units and generalized their responses. Out of 39 Alliance member institutions, the CSG received responses from 27 libraries. The responding libraries are a mix of both large and small institutions and seem to be fairly representational of the Alliance as a whole.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Participating Alliance members were: Central Washington University, Clark College, Concordia University, Eastern Washington University, George Fox University, Lane Community College, Lewis & Clark College, Linfield College, Mt. Hood Community College, Oregon Health & Science University, Oregon Institute of Technology, Oregon State University, Pacific University, Portland Community College,

## Enabled Facets in Primo

In their 2014 report the Alliance Primo Genre/Form Task Group recommended that genre/form terms have their own Primo index, separate from subject headings. This has been accomplished and any Alliance library can now choose to include facets for genre, creator demographic group, audience, music medium of performance, and others. This faceting is achieved through normalization rules which convert MARC data into PNX format that can be used by Primo for faceting and display. However, there are complexities to this normalization process as Kelley McGrath and Lesley Lowery describe in their article published in *Code{4}Lib Journal*.<sup>4</sup>

Since these MARC fields and term lists are relatively new, a large proportion of Alliance bibliographic records do not contain them. Therefore, enabling the facets for use in Primo could lead to search results that exclude many relevant resources. Until there is a sufficient critical mass of bibliographic records that include these MARC fields, libraries will be disinclined to add these facets to their Primo. However, because these terms are not being used for faceting in their institution's catalog, cataloging departments may not be motivated to add these terms to the bibliographic records they use or create in the cataloging workflow. This "chicken and egg" problem presents a major barrier to progress in the realm of faceted access.

Question two of the survey asked the respondents which of certain facets had been enabled in their institution's instance of Primo. Of the 27 responding libraries, 16 reported that they had enabled at least one of the Primo facets. Eleven libraries had enabled the facet for *Genre* and 11 had enabled the facet for *Creation Date*. The *Audience* facet has been activated by three libraries and *Music: Number of Performers* by two. Each of the remaining facets--*Instrumentation Includes*, *Instrumentation Statement*, *Creator Demographic Group*, *Original Date*, *Country of Production*, and *Associated Place*--have been activated at a single institution. Perhaps it is not so surprising that the *Genre* facet has been activated by the most libraries. The concept of genre—what a resource *is* as opposed to what a resource is *about*—is not new and the 655 genre/form field has been established long enough to have become familiar to most catalogers. (See Table 1)

---

Portland State University, Reed College, Saint Martin's University, Seattle Pacific University, Seattle University, University of Idaho, University of Oregon, University of Portland, University of Puget Sound, University of Washington, Washington State University, Western Washington University, and Whitworth University.

<sup>4</sup> Kelley McGrath, Lesley Lowery, "Getting More out of MARC with Primo: Strategies for Display, Search and Faceting," *Code{4}Lib Journal*, issue 41 (2018-08-09) <https://journal.code4lib.org/articles/13600>

## Which Faceted Terms are Being Added to Bibliographic Records

For each of the MARC fields 655, 380, 382, 385, and 386 the survey asked if the cataloging departments were adding or editing/correcting the faceted MARC fields within their current cataloging process or workflow, questions 3, 10, 17, 23, and 30 of the survey asked for each of these MARC fields if that field was being added “Frequently to always”; “Sometimes”; or “Never to rarely” to a list of different formats of library materials. It also asked which of these library materials were “Rarely or never cataloged” because a cataloging department may not be adding these fields to a particular format for the simple reason that they are not cataloging materials in that format.

The counts of libraries that add the various faceted data fields to bibliographic records for various formats is interesting in itself, but since some formats are not cataloged at all libraries, another way to look at the results is the ratio of the number of libraries that add a faceted data field either “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” for a format to the total number of libraries that actually catalog materials in that format (this excludes the count of the libraries who “Rarely or never catalog this format”). For example, of the 27 responding libraries, nine indicated that they rarely or never catalog Artists’ books, therefore, there are only 18 libraries that do. Of those 18 libraries, six assign 655 Genre/form fields either frequently (five libraries) or sometimes (one library) for a ratio of 6/18 which can be expressed as 33%. Books of literature or fiction are cataloged at all 27 of the responding libraries. Nine libraries assign 655 Genre/form fields either frequently (one library) or sometimes (eight libraries) for a ratio of 9/27 or 33%--the same ratio as Artists’ books. (See Table 2)

Questions 8, 15, 22, 28, and 35 of the survey asked whether the responding library had carried out, or was considering carrying out, projects to retrospectively add these MARC fields to their records for specific formats of materials.

### Genre/Form (655)

Nineteen of the 27 responding institutions indicated that they assign genre/form terms either “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” to one or more formats. None of the 20 formats presented in the survey was excluded from receiving a 655 field at least “Sometimes.” Perhaps not surprisingly, given the greater familiarity with the field, the 655 genre field received more “Frequently to always” responses than MARC fields 380, 382, 385, and 386 combined. Ten of the 27 respondents selected this response 51 times across all formats with one library adding textbooks in the free text box for additional formats. Eighteen respondents selected “Sometimes” 78 times across all formats.

Over half of the libraries that catalog theses and dissertations (55%) assign 655 fields to those records. Of the 22 libraries that catalog this format, six assign 655 fields “Frequently to always” and six assign the field “Sometimes” (12/22). Theses and dissertations also have the highest count (three) of libraries with projects for retrospectively adding 655 fields. Whether these



libraries are only adding the genre term **Academic theses** or also evaluating whether other genre terms may be appropriate is unknown. At some institutions, theses may be in the form of musical or literary works, which would qualify them for additional genre/form terms.

Archives and manuscript materials have the second highest percent (53%) for including the 655 Genre/form field. Of the 19 libraries that catalog this format, seven add a 655 frequently and three add the field sometimes (10/19). One respondent indicated that their library was considering a project for retrospectively adding genre/form terms to records for these materials. Nine of the 20 libraries (45%) that catalog Rare Books/Special Collections and six of the 18 libraries (33%) that catalog Artists' books add 655 fields to their records.

Music materials were significant among the formats receiving genre/form terms. Music sound recordings have a ratio of 11/23 (48%) and scores have a ratio of 8/20 (40%). One respondent indicated their library was considering a retrospective project for both music sound recordings and scores, another respondent indicated such a project for music sound recordings only.

Video recordings in DVD, Blu-ray, or VHS formats are cataloged at all 27 responding libraries. Eleven (41%) add 655 fields either frequently (five) or sometimes (six) to their bibliographic records. Streaming video recordings are cataloged at 20 libraries and five of them (25%) add 655 fields to their records either frequently or sometimes.

Materials in book format, both nonfiction books and books of literature and fiction are cataloged at all 27 responding libraries. In each case, about one third of the libraries add 655 fields "Sometimes." One respondent indicated that their library assigned a 655 to literature and fiction "Frequently to always."

### **Form of Work (380)**

Similar to the 655 field, the 380 Form of Work field is used to record the form of a resource. Six of the responding libraries apply the 380 field either "Frequently to always" or "Sometimes" to 15 types of materials. The 380 field is used most often with moving image materials, which may be attributable to OLAC's recommendation in its [Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21](#). Of the libraries that catalog video recordings, 20% (5/25) add a 380 field either "Frequently to always" (three libraries) or "Sometimes" (two libraries) to records for video recordings on disc or tape. Ten percent of the libraries that catalog streaming videos (2/20) add a 380 field either frequently or sometimes.

Three of the 21 libraries (14%) that catalog music sound recordings add a 380 field in their records either frequently (one library) or sometimes (two libraries). Other formats that receive a 380 field either frequently or sometimes are artists' books (2/16), non-musical sound recordings (2/18), Archives and manuscript materials (2/19), CD-ROMs and DVD ROMs (2/19), scores (2/20), and juvenile materials (2/22).

### **Medium of Performance (382)**

The 382 medium of performance is only appropriate for scores, musical recordings, and video recordings of musical performances. Many of the 27 responding libraries catalog materials in these formats. Twenty-five libraries catalog video recordings, 21 catalog music sound recordings, and 20 catalog scores. Nine (45%) of the libraries that catalog scores include the 382 field either frequently (seven) or sometimes (two). Of the libraries that catalog music sound recordings, eight (38%) include the 382 either frequently or sometimes, and for video recordings, five (20%) add the field frequently or sometimes.

### **Audience Characteristics (385)**

While the 521 Target Audience field can be used to record information about the reading grade level, the interest age level, interest grade level, or provide a free text description of the intended audience for a resource, the 385 Audience Characteristics field provides a place to record a term for a specific demographic group from a controlled vocabulary. Five of the 27 respondents indicated that their institution applies the 385 field either “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” to 14 types of materials. Twenty-two respondents indicated that their libraries catalog juvenile materials, and of that number, four (18%) will add a 385 field either frequently or sometimes. Two libraries indicated retrospective projects for juvenile materials. Three libraries out of 19 (16%) will add a 385 “Sometimes” to scores and to streaming video recordings. Three libraries out of 25 (12%) may include an audience characteristics field for DVDs, Blu-ray and VHS video recordings.

### **Creator/Contributor Characteristics (386)**

The 386 field is similar to the 385 field and can draw from the same controlled term lists, but it is used to record characteristics of the creator or a contributor of a work or expression. Four of the 27 respondents indicated that their institution applies the 386 field either “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” to 12 of the types of materials listed in the survey.

Three of the four libraries that assign this field use it for archival types of materials. Those three libraries apply this field “Frequently to always” to Archival and manuscript materials. Two apply it “Frequently to always” for Artists’ books as well as to Rare books/special collections. Music is another area where these three libraries use the 386 field. They will apply the 386 either “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” to scores as well as to music sound recordings.

Other formats that may be assigned a creator/contributor characteristics field are: juvenile materials, books (both literary and nonfiction), non-music sound recordings, ebooks, graphic materials, and CD-ROMs and DVD ROMs.

## Reasons for Not Adding Faceted Terms to Bibliographic Records

Survey participants were asked to select the reasons for not adding the faceted data fields to bibliographic records (questions 5, 12, 19, 25, and 32 of the survey). They were able to select multiple reasons for each facet (655, 380, 382, 385 and 386) from among 11 suggested reasons (12 for the 655 field) and could write in a reason not provided on the list. Nine of the 11 suggested reasons were selected over 20 times across the five faceted data fields.

“Lack of familiarity with assigning these terms to bibliographic records” is the top reason for not adding a faceted field. It was selected 91 times by respondents across all of the facets. Twenty-one respondents (the greatest number) selected this reason for 380 Form of Work field and 14 respondents (the fewest) selected this reason for 655 form/genre field.

The second most selected reason was “Lack of enough time to add these.” It was marked 69 times by respondents uniformly across the five faceted data fields. It was selected by 14 respondents for each facet except the 382 medium of performance, which was selected by 13 respondents.

The six other most frequently selected reasons are (in descending order) “Item is handled only by lower level staff who lack sufficient expertise”; “Bibliographic record meets floor level”; “Lack of knowledge of what terms to use” ; “Most materials cataloged don’t seem to need these” ; “Fast-tracked cataloging for the item” ; “Records are batch-loaded vendor records” ; and “Terms seem redundant to other data in the record.” (See Table 3)

## Faceted Vocabulary Lists Used

Respondents were asked which faceted vocabulary lists were “Preferred” for use with MARC fields 655, 380, 382, 385, and 386 (questions 7, 14, 21, 27 and 34). They were allowed to select more than one “Preferred” list for each field as well as more than one “Alternative” list. (See Table 4)

The 655 Genre/Form and 380 Form of Work fields can use terms from the same vocabularies. *Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials* (LCGFT) and *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (LCSH) are the two vocabularies that were selected most often as a preferred source for terms (23 and 16 times respectively for the 655 and 380 fields combined). LCSH was also selected the most often as an “Alternative” list (11 times for the 655 and 380 combined) while LCGFT was selected as an alternate term list five times. *Art & Architecture Thesaurus* (AAT) and *Guidelines on Subject Access to Individual works of fiction, drama, etc.* (GSAFD) were also selected as “Preferred” and “Alternative” term lists for the 655 and 380 fields. For rare book cataloging, the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section controlled vocabularies are relied on. This was selected as the “Preferred” choice five times and as an “Alternative” choice two times. Locally-controlled genre/form term lists were indicated as both

“Preferred” or “Alternative” for the 655 field by six respondents. The *Thesaurus for Graphic Materials* (LCTGM) and *MARC Genre Term List* (MARCGT) are considered as alternate lists by a few respondents.

There is less choice of vocabulary lists for medium of performance so *Library of Congress Medium of Performance Terms* (LCMPT) was the natural top choice for the “Preferred” list.

For both the 385 Audience and 386 Creator/Contributor fields, the most preferred vocabulary list is *Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms* (LCDGT). LCSH was also selected as a “Preferred” list, but more often as an “Alternative” list. One library selected AAT as a preferred list for both of these fields. One library considers both the *Occupational Information Network* (ONET) and the *Index Terms for Occupations in Archival and Manuscript Collections* (itoamc) as alternative lists and one other library also considers ONET as a alternative list.

### **Other Facets (046, 388, 257, 370)**

The survey also asked respondents if their institutions added fields 046 Specially Coded Dates, 388 Time Period of Creation, 257 Country of Producing Entity, and 370 Associated Place; and if so, for what formats of materials (questions 37, 38, 39, and 40). Six libraries replied that they use some or all of these fields, if only occasionally, for scores, musical sound recordings, video recordings, and rare materials. (See Table 5)

Three respondents indicated that field 046 Specially Coded Dates was added “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” for scores and musical sound recordings. Another library commented they assign this coded date “always” for video recordings and films but “rarely for anything else.” The 388 Time Period of Creation field is assigned by fewer Alliance libraries than the 046 field. One respondent commented that their library was applying it on an experimental basis to literature and music that have subject headings with chronological subdivisions.

Inclusion of the 257 Country of Producing Entity field is recommended by OLAC in its [Best Practices for Cataloging DVD-Video and Blu-ray Discs Using RDA and MARC21](#) so it is not surprising that the two respondents who indicated that their libraries assign the 257 field “Frequently to always” do so for film and video recordings. The 370 field for associated place is assigned by one Alliance library “Frequently to always” for scores and musical sound recordings. Another respondent commented that this field was rarely added and then “usually for music or literature.”

There was one library that responded to the survey question on each of these four fields by indicating that while they “Never to rarely” add these fields generally, they do assign them “Frequently to always revise/correct for Rare materials.”

## Training

Questions 42 through 47 asked the respondents about training on faceted terms. When asked “If there existed Alliance-level training materials or best practices for inputting faceted data, would that impact your local policies and practices in this area?” 21 of the respondents (78%) answered yes. However, even among those who answered yes, many expressed some hesitation and reservations. But the availability of Alliance training materials was seen as possible help in overcoming the barriers to applying faceted terms in their cataloging workflows, and there was a general willingness to follow Alliance-level best practices. (See Table 6)

When asked which of the faceted MARC fields they recommended the Alliance create training materials on, the 655 Genre/form field was selected by 22 of the 27 respondents. The 382 Medium of Performance field and the 385 Audience Characteristics field each were selected by 12 respondents. The 386 Creator/contributor Characteristics and the 046 Specially Coded Dates fields each were chosen by 11 respondents. Nine recommended 370 Associated Place, and eight recommended 388 Time Period of Creation. (See Table 7)

Considering that many felt that they had insufficient time to incorporate adding faceted terms in their cataloging workflows, it is not surprising that only six responding libraries have done any in-house training for their cataloging personnel. The 655 and 386 fields were each covered at five of those libraries, and the 385 field at four. (See Table 7)

It is apparent that for some of the libraries simple copy cataloging that is performed by staff with less cataloging training is a separate workflow from original cataloging and complex copy cataloging, which goes to higher level catalogers. We must acknowledge that for the former, there may be neither the time nor the expertise to evaluate and edit each bibliographic record for adding the MARC fields for faceted terms. For catalogers who do have the expertise, but nevertheless are short on time, access to concise guidelines on applying faceted terms could help habituate them to these MARC fields and diminish the time-consuming hurdle of working with the unfamiliar. As well, confidence with adding faceted terms to bibliographic records could encourage catalogers to advocate within their libraries for enabling these search facets in their institutions’ instances of Primo.

## Conclusions

The SCTS Cataloging Standing Group believes the effort to incorporate new MARC fields designed for faceted data into bibliographic records is one that will benefit our users. The number of bibliographic records including these terms is growing rapidly and may drive future system design. Currently, LCSH continues to incorporate some of the terminology that is separated out in the faceted data fields, and both LCSH and faceted data fields should be used in tandem. However, already we see places where the terms can be applied in singular ways, providing more granular and specific information for the savvy searcher. Terms in LCSH

heading strings may be too ambiguous to be fully actionable by a computer. Using faceted vocabulary in precisely defined MARC fields and subfields allows for more specific computer searching. While faceted terms seem redundant to LCSH now, it is important to recognize that with time, we expect the Library of Congress will modify its LCSH instructions on the application of subject headings, and even cancel certain subject authority records, based on parallel instructions and overlapping practices around LC faceted vocabularies. Also, LCSH has limitations on the uniform and universal application of subject headings. For example, LCSH instructions state that single works of literature are not to be assigned literary genre headings. The faceted data fields, however, do not have these limitations on application.

Ideally, since most faceted terms are attributes of the creator/contributor or of the work or expression, the faceted terms would be added only once to the authority records for those entities and not duplicated in each related bibliographic record. However, many of the current library discovery interfaces cannot make use of the corresponding attribute fields in authority records for faceting. As well, most of the vast legacy of authority records that predate RDA do not have these attribute fields yet, and there are a great number of creators/contributors and works/expressions that do not have an authority record and likely will not for quite some time. To to provide our patrons with enhanced search features now, catalogers will need to add these faceted data fields to the bibliographic records.

For these reasons, we believe the Alliance members should introduce these terms into their cataloging practices, and we suggest the following steps toward this goal.

- In the survey results, lack of familiarity with assigning faceted terms to bibliographic records was the most often selected reason for not adding faceted terms. The survey also documents strong support for having instructional materials on faceted terms. Of the 27 libraries that responded to the survey, 78% indicated that if there existed Alliance-level training materials or best practices, it would impact their local policies and practices. Faceted terms are not just of local interest, it is an area of increasing attention in the broader cataloging community as evidenced by the ALCTS/CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee 2017 white paper: [A Brave New \(Faceted World\): Toward Full implementation of Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies](#) and the formation of the [IFLA Genre/Form Working Group](#) in 2014. Therefore, provision of instructional materials at the Alliance level is a project that is valid to the evolving cataloging practices and of use to all member libraries.
- Genre/form (655) terms are integral to the use of faceted terms for all formats of library materials. This is reflected in the survey, which counts more of the responding libraries as adding 655 terms across all formats than any of the other faceted data fields. Of the 27 responding libraries, 10 add 655 terms “Frequently to always” to one or more of the formats, 18 add 655 terms “Sometimes” to one or more of the formats. Four respondents indicated an interest in retrospectively adding 655 fields to their records for at least one of the categories of materials. Eleven libraries reported that the “Genre” facet was

enabled in their instance of Primo, a much higher number than the other Primo facets (except for creation date). Twenty-two libraries recommended the development of training materials for the 655 field, much more than any of the other faceted data fields, and five have already done some in-house training on this field. Since the 655 is a core faceted field and there is already strong interest in it among Alliance libraries, general instruction on this field should be among the initial Alliance instructional materials on faceted terms.

- The faceted data fields, in many instances, work in tandem to supplant LCSH headings. For example, in music both genre/form terms (655) and medium of performance terms (382) are required to replace LC subjects such as **Concertos (Flute and piano)**. Literary works may need a genre/form term (655), a Creator/Contributor attributes term (386), and an Associated Place (370) for subject headings such as **American poetry--African American authors**. So that the concepts embedded in LCSH headings are fully expressed by faceted terms, instructional materials should cover faceted data fields in the context of their complementary combinations to supplant LCSH. As well, for certain formats there is an expected set of faceted terms related to the nature of those materials. For example, moving image materials will typically need one or more genre/form terms (655), also, commonly, a form of work term (380), country of producing entity term (257), and audience characteristics term (385). Archival materials will usually require date of creation (046), genre/form terms (655), creator characteristics terms (386), and associated place (370). Music materials will need a medium of performance statement (382) and, additionally, genre/form terms (655), date of creation (046), and associated place (370). For the convenience of time-pressed catalogers, instructional materials should be tailored to specific formats to include the appropriate suite of faceted terms.
- There are certain types of materials which people are more likely to be looking for based on their attributes more than on their topics. The time a work was created, its place of creation, characteristics of the creator, form of the work, or genre of the work are often of particular interest for people looking for literary works, musical works, moving image materials, and archival materials. These attributes are what LCSH tends to obscure or leave out and what the faceted data fields are good at precisely recording. To some extent, the survey results demonstrate that there is already greater interest in the faceted data fields among catalogers who work with these materials. Instructional materials should focus on those types of materials where faceted data fields will have greater use and benefit. These include music materials, archival materials, and video recordings.
- The Alma Analytics reports on the presence of faceted terms in bib records for Western Washington University and for the Network Zone as a whole show a marked increase in the presence of the 382 Medium of Performance field. This reflects not just Alliance enhancements, but the degree of involvement by the wider music cataloging community. The survey indicates that nine of the responding Alliance libraries are already adding the

382 field “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” for scores, and eight libraries for sound recordings. Two libraries indicated their interest in retrospectively adding this field to their records. Twelve of the responding libraries recommended that the Alliance address training efforts on the 382 field. This year, the [Music Toolkit](#), which can be used with OCLC Connexion Client, was released. This program facilitates the process of adding of the 382, 655 and other faceted data fields to bibliographic records for music. Since there already is a strong interest in faceted terms for musical materials both at the national level and at the Alliance level, this format should be included in the initial efforts at providing instructional materials.

- The survey shows that more of responding libraries (seven) add genre/form terms to archives and manuscript materials “Frequently to always” than to any other format. Archives and manuscript materials also had the greatest number of responding libraries (three) for adding creator characteristics terms (386). As well, one library has carried out or is considering carrying out a project to add 655, 385, and 386 fields to their records for archival materials. Bibliographic records for archival materials are usually unique to the holding library, therefore no other WorldCat member library will be enhancing these records; it is incumbent for the owning Alliance library to add faceted terms to the bibliographic records for their own archival materials. Since there is evidence of current use of faceted terms for archival materials and because libraries cannot rely on the distributed efforts of the wider cataloging community to enhance these records, this format should also be a focus for initial Alliance instructional materials.
- Video recordings, both on disc or tape and streaming, are being assigned faceted terms “Frequently to always” or “Sometimes” by several libraries. This includes the the 655 field (11 respondents for discs or tapes, five for streaming), 380 field (five for discs or tapes, two for streaming), 382 field (five for discs or tapes), and the 385 field (three for discs or tapes, three for steaming). Along with books, video recordings are the most common format cataloged by Alliance libraries. Because this is a commonly cataloged format, and since there appears to be already a strong level of applying faceted terms, instructional materials on faceted terms for video recordings would likely be of high interest among members.

### **Summary of Comments from SCTS Day**

The Cataloging Standing Group presented an overview of the survey results and conclusions at the Shared Collections and Technical Services Day in Portland, Oregon, on October 11, 2018. Thirty-seven people attended this session and they were encouraged to comment on the CSG’s draft report, faceted data fields, and the kind of training and documentation that would work best. Comments from the audience reminded the CSG to be mindful of the copy cataloging workflows at many of the member libraries and develop resources that can be used by lower-level cataloging staff either to add faceted data fields themselves or to flag a bibliographic



record for the attention of a higher level cataloger. This would be especially appropriate for the more obvious genre/form terms, as with literary works. Tools that would work well within the workflow of cataloging support staff include constant data records, macros, and checklists. Alliance technical services open calls could be a good venue for training. Web-based demonstrations accompanied by good documentation is another approach. The [Alliance Technical Services Documentation page](#) was suggested as an appropriate place to consolidate links to training materials and documentation created by this group.

The CSG could work with the Primo Normalization Rules Standing Group to look for more ways to map other data in the MARC bibliographic records to the Primo facets. Although not all of the MARC coding is comprehensive to all of the MARC formats, and this cannot completely make up for a lack of the rich data provided by the faceted data fields, it could help increase the number of records that are included in the Primo facets, especially when a majority of records lack the faceted data fields. The consequent low recall rate from using the Primo facets discourages many libraries from enabling most of these facets in their instances of Primo.

The Alliance could look for ways to be advocates within the broader cataloging community for the inclusion of faceted data fields. For example, the Alliance library members could speak as one strong voice to encourage OCLC to perform advanced enhancement of bibliographic records in the WorldCat database. Based on information present within the records, OCLC may be able to add faceted data fields through an automated process. Another path to explore would be for some Alliance members to volunteer to work with Gary Strawn in the development of additional toolkits similar to the [Music Toolkit](#) but for other specific formats. The CSG could have a role in instigating or coordinating these efforts.

### **Action Plan**

Based on the results of the survey and the comments offered during SCTC Day, the CSG has outlined the following action plan.

Develop checklists, based on national standards and best practices, of faceted data MARC fields for literature, music, video recordings, and archival materials. These will be posted on the Alliance web page for Technical Services Documentation <https://www.orbiscascade.org/technical-services-documentation/>. The value of the checklists and documentation would be to help copy catalogers and original catalogers to gain facility with incorporating faceted data fields into their normal workflow and to develop confidence in applying these fields.

Set up an Alliance clearinghouse on faceted data. This clearinghouse could identify documents on national standards and best practices, share internal training materials created by member libraries, and provide a registry of members' projects to retrospectively add faceted data. The

value of this clearinghouse would be to share ideas and expertise and to encourage action toward wider embracement of faceted data.

Propose retrospective projects for adding faceted data fields to existing bibliographic records. These projects may be quasi-automated, as exemplified by the Music Toolkit, or manual. The value of these projects would be to increase the number of legacy bibliographic records in the Network Zone with faceted data fields thus increasing the effectiveness of Primo faceting.

### **Appendices**

Survey questions (PDF document)

Tables (Excel document)

Selected Primo facet and display fields as of September 2018 (Excel document)