Adding E-books to Your Catalogue
Helen Greenwood

The Challenge

Allowing patrons to access full text e-books via the John Kinder Theological College catalogue (Anglicat)

Full text e-books from the NZ Electronic Text Centre (NZETC)
www.nzetc.org
Early New Zealand Books (ENZB)
www.enzb.org.nz
Attach to existing record for print version (if held)?

Create new record for electronic resource?

AUTOCAT

• Listserv discussing cataloguing issues

• To join, go to http://listserv.syr.edu/archives/autocat.html

• Has a searchable archive
While it can be confusing for patrons to view multiple hits for the same title in a browse screen, I have found that it is much more confusing from a collections management view point to have print and electronic formats represented on one record, as the search is for a single selector, but the print and microform are frequently available with the microform or print alone. While whole paper records, for example, may be the route for the microform, the practice is to create separate records for each format.

“Not sure what I would do if we already had a history of combining formats on one record, but I could never recommend starting the practice now.”

Chris

Chris Blackman
Catalog Librarian
Williams College Libraries
Posted on Autocat 11 December 2008

There aren’t any easy answers for this one. There is/was a general thought that multiple records for different formats present a source of confusion or frustration to users. Many libraries have opted for the “single record” approach in the past (including my own). This was particularly useful in the era of text-based OPACs, allowing users to see all the information in one place.

“Libraries of all sizes are discovering that the "separate record" approach adopted by large research libraries (for both pragmatic and principled reasons, and established as the "correct" approach), is the only manageable method of presenting multiple formats.”

John F. Myers, Catalog Librarian
Schaffer Library, Union College
Posted on Autocat 11 December 2008
Apart from fixed fields (which your OPAC may or may not apply), one record needs a gmd and one does not. That is sufficient reason for us to create two records. Unless you wish to introduce compound gmds, e.g., 245$[text & electronic resource], I would suggest two records.

That's what MARC21 would have you do.

While CO is electronic, I was told that e-journals are the most basic electronic format. We have found it useful to create a separate record for the URL and an item record against the URL.

Amy: In the long run I think it's best to have separate records as it facilitates batchloading e-resource MARC records from vendors and publishers, and it parallels what is done with services like Serials Solutions and ebrary.

E-journals tend to be with the entire full text in a single record. But there are exceptions, or files, or led by ebrary. Future Serials Solutions plans include realizing local cataloging problems with e-books. We are batchloading MARC records and our local cataloging is driven by MARC.

Posting the full text with the entire full text in a single record. But there are exceptions, or led by ebrary. Future Serials Solutions plans include realizing local cataloging problems with e-books. We are batchloading MARC records and our local cataloging is driven by MARC.

As much as possible, we're batch loading our materials, albeit from different vendors.

Sally Grucan, Head of Cataloging
Wesleyan University

Posted on Autocat 11 December 2008

Apart from fixed fields ... one record needs a gmd and one does not. That is sufficient reason for us to create two records.”

“In the long run I think it's best to have separate records as it facilitates batchloading e-resource MARC records from vendors and publishers”
In anticipation of an implementation date of August 1, 2009, the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide has been posted to the BIBCO Web site: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-MARC-Record-e-Neutral.pdf. Thanks to Provider Neutral Task Force members Becky Cullerton, Yael Friedman, and Anne Harty for preparing the guide. The document contains background information, a metadata application profile (MAP), and examples to guide BIBCO and other catalogers in creating provider neutral e-monograph records.

There is a link to the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide on the BIBCO Web site, listed under the BIBCO PCC Portal.

The Provider Neutral MARC Record Guide has been revised to incorporate PCC practices for online series. This is an update of the PCC Guidelines for online series, due to revisions and for online series.

Sincerely,
Les Hawkins
CONSER Coordinator
Library of Congress
lhaw@loc.gov
tel. 202 707-5185

Posted on Autocat, 1 August 2009
Definition

A provider-neutral e-monograph record is a single bibliographic record that covers all equivalent manifestations of an online monograph. Manifestations are considered equivalent if their format and their content are essentially the same, based on clues from the author, title, edition, publishing information, and physical description. Another separate record is needed only if the cataloguer determines that another online version, because of substantial differences (e.g., in content or subject), really represents a different manifestation. There will also be some cases where the resources are considered equivalent even though the titles that appear on each resource differ.

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf p. 10
What are the types of online monographs for which it is used?

The provider-neutral e-monograph record has been defined for monographs that have the same content available by one or more providers. The monographs may be issued as born-digital resources, current simultaneously-issued-with-print editions, or scanned reproductions of previous existing materials. A provider-neutral record should be created for online monographs even if no equivalent manifestations exist at the point of cataloguing.

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf p. 10

Why do we need it?

Current monographic cataloging practice in the Anglo-American world requires the creation of a new record each time a new publisher, aggregator, or distributor provides online access to the same electronic resource. As a result, many duplicative MARC records for online resources are created in shared cataloging systems such as OCLC. Catalog users often have difficulty understanding the rationale or the subtle differences between multiple records when searching through a cluster of very similar electronic resource records. The creation of one record that can be used for as many aggregations as possible will improve search and retrieval in online catalogs. Moving to the provider-neutral model puts the emphasis on the content of the resource, and not the provider.

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf p. 10
Sample records

• Available on OCLC WorldCat using the title search:
  Provider Neutral Task Force example records
008  Information codes

Code ‘s’ for form of item in position 23

820527s1982  gaus  s  00010  eng
0....+....1....+....2....+....3....+....4

010  LCCN

Print LCCN moved to 776 field

020  ISBN

Use $z for any ISBN other than the one specifically for the e-Book

050/082  Classification fields

Use of classification strongly encouraged but not required
245 Title

Use $h$[electronic resource]


250 Edition statement

Use edition statement from original print source
260  Publication, distribution, etc.

Use information from original print source

260 ## $a$Masterton, N.Z. :$b$Printed by Palamontain & Petherick,$c$1927.

300  Physical description

• Use $a$1 online resource
• Do not use $c$

300 ## $a$1 online resource (440 p.) :$b$ill.
Series fields

Used if on original resource

500 General note

500 ## $aDescription based on print version record.

Or

500 ## $aTitle from ...

“Prefer field 588 for this information once it has been implemented by OCLC” –
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf p. 6
588   Source of Description (R)
New field
1st indicator  b/ Undefined
2nd indicator  b/ Undefined
Subfields ‡a Source of description note (NR)
Note containing administrative information about the record, such as
source of description or latest issue consulted.
‡5 Institution to which field applies (NR)
MARC code of the institution
or organization that holds the copy to which the data in the field
applies. Data in the field may not apply to the universal description
of the item or may apply universally to the item but be of interest
only to the location cited. See Organization Code Sources
(http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ecbdorg.html).
‡6 Linkage (NR)
Indexing Field 588 is not indexed.

OCLC Technical bulletin 258, May 2010

510   Citations/reference note

Use information related to the original print source

510  4# SaBagnall,$cB1862
530 Additional form available note

Do not use, use 776 $1 instead

533 Reproduction note
534 Original version note
538 System details note
540 Terms governing use and reproduction note

Do not use
776  Additional physical form

Use to record information on the original resource


856  Electronic location and access

Indicator 2 is 0 – Resource

856 40 $u$http://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/metadata-tei-BarEarl.html $z$Book New Zealand Electronic Text Centre

Local decisions to aid searching:

655  Genre/Form heading

655  ## $aElectronic books
Or
655  ## $aElectronic journals

710  Corporate name heading

Name of corporate body supplying electronic text. NOT PROVIDER NEUTRAL!

710  2# New Zealand Electronic Text Centre

In the record for the original work

Add the following information

530  Additional form available note

530  ## $aAlso available via the World Wide Web.
Electronic location and access

Indicator 2 is 1 – Version of resource

856 41 $uhttp://www.nzetc.org/tm/scholarly/metadata-tei-BarEarl.html $zBook New Zealand Electronic Text Centre
