**Authority Control Interest Group – September 27, 2022 Q&A**

Robert Maxwell – Representative Expression Elements

1. **Question**: Has there been PCC discussion of how or if these representative element choices will have to be justified in authority records?
**Answer**: Not that I know, but the equivalents in expression records do not need to explicitly justified (e.g. you don't have to explicitly justify "English" to record "eng" in an authority record for an English-language expression of a work. Since there is judgment involved in deciding what elements are "representative" for works, perhaps some justification might be useful, but so far nobody's requiring any. For the moment it will be "cataloger's judgment."
2. **Question**: So 387 $c duplicates 336?
**Answer**: 336 records the "content type" element, an element to be used in expression descriptions; 387 $c records the "content type of representative expression" element, an element to be used in work descriptions. The two elements are discrete and should not appear in the same record (387 should only appear in work records, 336 in expression records), although the value (data) recorded in the element may be the same.
3. **Question**: Is the representative expression the earliest expression of the work
**Answer**: Not necessarily. In many cases it will be the earliest expression, but if some other expression becomes "canonical" (that is, users think of it as representing the work) elements from that expression could be recorded, even though it isn't the first expression (e.g., I noted The Odyssey is an example where nobody thinks of it as "oral", which the original expression was).
4. **Question**: How would the representative expression record and /or the work record be used in a discovery system/catalog by a user? In other words, how will users encounter these records and in what situations would they encounter a work record vs. a representative expression record?
**Answer**:
5. **Question**: Maybe I misunderstood, but was Robert saying that we can apply these as attributes of expression (336, 377) AND as a canonical representation for the work (387)? Just want to be clear that we can continue to apply these 3xx RDA fields in bib records.
**Answer**: I was only speaking of authority records. We'll continue to record 3XX fields in bibliographic records just as we do now. What we would (or should) not do in authority records is record (e.g.) 336, 377 AND 387 in an authority record for a work. 336 and 337 should continue to be recorded in expression records (not work records); 387 will be used in work records (not expression records). As usual, we'll need to remember which data goes where, but this principle hasn't changed.

Jessie Daigle – RVM Thesauri

1. **Question**: What prompted the RVM's desire to create a directory of subject headings?
**Answer:** In 1946, French version of National Union Catalog (called Biblio at the time) no longer meets indexing needs, Laval University librarians took the initiative to translate Library of Congress Subject Headings for their own needs. Other universities were quickly interested in the product, as well as the libraries from other mediums.

Emily O’Neal – Deschutes Public Library DEI Initiatives

1. **Question:** Do your users regularly go into other databases or catalogs?  Do you have ways of alerting users that other databases and catalogs may not be as "friendly?"
**Answer:** We really don’t have a way of knowing if you customers use other library catalogs, so I’m not sure on that.  I do think that library users expect a different interface depending on the different library systems though, so I can imagine they are used to differing search abilities.  We do offer some databases, but being a public library, research needs are often met with the support of a librarian.
2. **Question**: Do you have a document that outlines all the LOC Subject Headings you added/replaced that could be shared, or, Is your “map”: public?
**Answer:** Yes, as I mentioned in the presentation, we made this openly available to all, available here: <https://www.olaweb.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=322> .  Our original intention was for all Oregon Libraries to contribute to this as a repository but after the initial wave of adding data, it has gone a bit dormant.  I myself have additional lines I haven’t yet gone back in to add just yet.
3. **Question:** When you talk about "thinking like a user" - how did you actually do that? did you look at your catalog's search logs, or what other processes did you use to determine what your patrons were searching for?
**Answer**: Yes and.  We did indeed look at the search logs to find any high occurrence terms we might want to add.  We also did a survey out to all staff who serve the public and asked them what words and terms are they often asked for that aren’t currently represented in the catalog.
4. **Question:** Have you considered using the discovery layer to display preferred terms instead of changing bibliographic/authority records?
**Answer:** We did look into the functionality of our discovery lawyers and found updating the data into our ILS was most beneficial for our set-ups.
5. **Question:** Did you consider community input when eliminating disfavored access points like "illegal alien"?
**Answer:** Yes, kind of.  We as an organization have made a commitment to equity, diversity and inclusion.  Based off of that, our teams all decided it was more important for us to use sensitive language to all users and help adjust search terminology for the customers using the dated terms, rather than to keep terms that would be hurtful to our users.
6. **Question:** Have Deschutes or Backstage made any proposals to change LCSH, based on the research you completed?
**Backstage Answer:** No, we are not SACO contributors and have essentially just made specific changes that our clients have requested. Often, each client will vary slightly so there has not “yet” been a consensus on all terms that we’re seeing. The broad sweeping change from “Indians of” to “Indigenous peoples of” or removing just the term “Indian” in favor of “people” in tribal names is a place holder until LC is able to begin making their changes through their newly formed project. We have not yet made significant changes to tribal names as there has not been input from the communities themselves, though we’re always looking for help with that task! The tribal name in the example was a change based on a library’s recommendation who has considerable exposure to the community and their proper name.
7. **Question:** As catalogers, we are trained to apply the idea of "specificity" in subject analysis, so I am wondering about the inclusion of broader headings rather than specifically equivalent headings.
**Answer:** We do still use the specific terms as they exist in our catalog.  The comment about using broader terms was in reference to the mapping itself.  If there is a term that meets that level of specificity, we can change it (for example: replacing poor with economically disadvantaged).  However, if the record only has a broader term (no narrower to base the specificity off of), for example “economic status”, we would not automatically add “economically disadvantaged”.  So really, the point was to be aware of specificity and broader/narrower when making the map replacements or additions of terms, based off what was available in the record.