

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative
Subject: Major and minor title changes for serials in languages which do not divide text into words: proposal for new wordings and instructions

ALA thanks the ISSN International Centre and the ISSN Review Group for the opportunity to comment on the upcoming changes to the ISSN Manual. We are unclear if these proposed changes will be incorporated into the ISSN Manual's fall 2014 release. We assume that a future paper will propose changes to harmonize the ISSN Manual with their equivalent RDA instructions.

We are also concerned about the harmonization of RDA, ISBD, and ISSN. Although the proposal states that harmonization with the Consolidated edition of ISBD shall be maintained, no explanation is provided about how this will be achieved.

To ensure continued harmonization between ISBD and RDA, ALA recommends that the JSC consult with the ISBD Review Group before making final decision on changes to the text of RDA.

For the proposed ISSN Manual changes, ALA recommends:

- Including a clear definition of the term “component” (used in 2.3.1.2 and 2.4.1); we are unclear if this equates to “character”.
- Providing a definition of what constitutes “languages and scripts that do not divide text into words”.
- Adding CJT examples for all of the affected rules to assist with understanding and application.
- Incorporating the RDA language into 2.3.1.1.a “unless the change belongs to one or more of the categories listed as minor changes”. ALA reviewers found the current wording “except as indicated below” confusing.
- Including the equivalent of 2.3.1.1.c, for corporate body name changes, in the new 2.3.1.2.
- Creating sub-instructions in 2.4.1 for languages and scripts that divide text into words and those that do not, to follow the pattern proposed in 2.3.1.

ALA observes that the proposed 2.4.1.k, which treats a change of term that indicates the type of continuing resource as a minor change, would be a change in practice for those following the LC-PCC PS for 2.3.2.13.2, category i).

The Council of East Asian Libraries (CEAL) prepared a detailed response to this paper, which ALA endorses. It is included as an appendix below.

Appendix

CEAL response to 6JSC/ISSN/4 (September 12, 2014)

Members of the Committee on Technical Processing (CTP) and the subcommittee on RDA of CTP of the Council on East Asian Libraries (CEAL) discussed the ISSN's major and minor title changes for serials in languages which do not divide text into words: proposal for new wordings and instructions. And the whole CEAL membership was invited for feedback/comments.

I. Assessment

CEAL generally supports the ISSN's discussion paper with some concerns. We want to point out a few problem areas with some suggestions. The Paper accommodated CEAL's request to remove any reference to counting and examine changes anywhere in the title proper. Examining the original script also eliminates the problem created from the transliteration process. Creating the new subsection to fit the rule for Chinese and Japanese, which do not divide text into words, is helpful to apply. However, we think there is a room to refine the new rule (see II.1). And there are some concerns that Korean is not specifically mentioned with Chinese and Japanese to follow the new rule (see III.1).

II. Areas to be improved

1. 2.3.1.2 For languages and scripts that do not divide text into words

This new section with one bullet needs to be more elaborate in terms of the definition of the word 'component' and how to apply the part "changes the meaning of the title". It will be helpful for easy understanding if there is clear definition and examples. It leaves so much room for individual cataloger's interpretation, part of it due to the nature of cataloging work. If we just judge whether the meaning of the whole title proper has changed or not (liberal approach), it may reduce the necessity of creating new records. But if the examination for title change is the word level, then it may end up producing about the same number of new records as when we apply the current practice. But it may create less room for discrepancy from the different interpretation.

For example, a Japanese title changed the word '文化財' to '歴史遺産' as in '京都橘大学文化財調査報告' and '京都橘大学歴史遺産調査報告.'

With the new ISSN proposal, there is a room for discrepancy between major and minor title change by different catalogers. If one takes a liberal approach-- which looks at whether the overall meaning of the title proper has changed or not-- these are just different words for the same thing, so it's a minor change. However, with the conservative/strict approach, which examines each word, these can be a major title change.

The second example is adding the word '調査' as in '区政モニターアンケート調査報告書.' With or without the word, the meaning of the whole title proper does not change much by the liberal approach. But with conservative/strict approach, by examining each word, it may be a major title change.

The National Diet Library, the officially-designated ISSN national centre for Japan, decided in May 2014 that these two title changes were major title changes.

```

001      025427529
003      JTNDL
005      20140523120346.0
008      140512c20149999ja ar p          |      |0jpn
040      |a JTNDL |b jpn |c JTNDL |e ncr/1987
245 00 |6 880-01 |a 京都橘大学歴史遺産調査報告 = |b Kyoto Tachibana
University historical heritage research report.
780 00 |w 000009435078 |t 京都橘大学文化財調査報告 =
880 00 |6 245-01/(B |a Kyoto tachibana daigaku rekishi isan
chosa hokoku = |b Kyoto Tachibana University historical
heritage research report.

001      025433831
003      JTNDL
005      20140527174111.0
008      140515c20149999ja uu p          |      |0jpn
040      |a JTNDL |b jpn |c JTNDL |e ncr/1987
005      20140527174111.0
245 00 |6 880-01 |a 区政モニターアンケート調査報告書.
780 00 |w 000000085646 |t 区政モニターアンケート報告書.
880 00 |6 245-01/(B |a Kusei monita anketo chosa hokokusho.

```

The Chinese examples below show records from National Library of China (NLC) which is the official ISSN China Center. They were created based on the decision of the major title change, even though the subject matter did not change at all (650 fields remain same)

- i. 测绘信息与工程 (1007-3817) -> 测绘地理信息 (2095-6045)
- ii. 中国科技史料 (1000-0798) -> 中国科技史杂志 (1673-1441)

These examples demonstrate that the rule is not easy to follow due to the possibility of different interpretation.

If the new rule is meant to align with the current practice of NDL, NLC or other ISSN centers in East Asian countries, the rule needs to be refined to achieve less confusion and more consistency.

Suggestions

The following instruction may be easier to follow in the practical sense if the part “... **that changes the meaning of the title or indicates a different subject matter**” is removed.

Then the 2.3.1.2 would be changed from:

The following are to be considered major changes (exceptions are listed in 2.4.1)

- An addition, deletion, change or reordering of any component of the title proper that changes the meaning of the title or indicates a different subject matter.

to:

The following are to be considered major changes (exceptions are listed in 2.4.1)

- An addition, deletion, change or reordering of any component (that has significant lexical meaning, but not function elements) of the title proper occurs.

Omitting the phrase "that changes the meaning of the title or indicates a different subject matter" will remove unnecessary judgment calls and avoid discrepancy engendered from different interpretations. Then we will create new records if any addition, deletion, change or reordering occurs to any component (provided it is not fall under the minor category).

If this suggestion is accommodated, 2.4.1 d) also should be changed like “ ... , provided that there is no addition, deletion, or change of any component of title proper (that has significant lexical meaning).”

2. Typos and problem with examples in 2.4.1 K) under minor changes

i. 1. Background, 1st sentence: RDA 2.3.2.13.1.i should be RDA 2.3.2.13.1

ii. 2.4.1.k example

The changes in the first component " 研究" (research) and "研修" (training) would be considered a major change. Therefore, if this example is replaced by 研修實施概況報告 -> 研修實施概況報告集 or other distinctive example, it would be more helpful.

III. Requests

1. Korean language issue

Korean language belongs to the languages and scripts that divide text into words in 2.3.1.1.

However, the CEAL community would like to request that the new rule be applied to Korean language materials as well. The reasons are as follows: 1. The current practice of the ISSN Korea Center is to examine the whole title proper, rather than applying the first five-word rule, 2. Grammatical concepts are different from Indo-European languages (e.g., no articles), 3. Applying the word "function elements" in 2.4.1, 'd' is more appropriate for Korean language, 4. The examples in 2.4.1 'a' and 'b' also apply to Korean language.

With the reasons above and reflecting the ISSN Korea Center's current practice, it would be more beneficial if the new rule also applies to Korean language.

2. Harmonization issue

The CEAL response to 6JSC/ISSN/2 in 2012 included the harmonization of source and choice of title proper as one of the additional comments. CEAL members strongly feel that harmonization should be accomplished before changes to ISSN rules are implemented.