

Executive Summary and Questions for Discussion

The following report lays out the background and several opinions for how to handle remote electronic serials that change titles but do not retain the earlier titles on the issues to which they applied. This situation may occur with born digital serials and with serials that have print counterparts, particularly those in aggregations. The revised chapter 12 originally had a statement of how to accommodate this situation, but it was removed late in the revision process and is basically not addressed in AACR2. Thus, the question is whether it needs to be addressed specifically in an LCRI (that might lead to a rule revision proposal) and what instructions should be included in the RI.

There are two basic categories. 1) The first is where the serial has changed its title, removed all trace of the earlier title and there are no records for it; or a serial is digitized with all issues bearing the later title. In both cases, there is no existing record for the earlier title(s). 2) In the second category, the earlier title has been cataloged and there is a record in OCLC. Subsequently, the title changes, serial is reformatted, and the earlier title is removed.

All authors of this report agree that in either of the situations in category 1, only one record should be created. If the earlier title is known, it should be noted (in field 247 or some other appropriate place).

The disagreement comes with the second category and the question is basically what should happen to the record for the first title: 1) should it be updated in a latest entry fashion? (Hawkins/Hirons); or 2) should it be closed out and a new record created? (Reynolds).

We apologize in advance for the length of the report that follows!

Questions for discussion

1. Should we distinguish between serials that are born digital and those that have print counterparts? Is there a good reason to keep the records for print and electronic in sync and are there likely to be multiple versions of the electronic version, some that retain earlier titles, some that don't?
2. If keeping the print and electronic in sync is important, should we construct a record for the earlier title even in the cases in category 1? Would this better enable a future FRBR solution?
3. What do we need locally versus what do we need in OCLC and can we have both? How easy is it to delete one record and replace with another? Is it easier to replace with an updated latest entry record?
4. If we opt for the successive entry approach, do we want to call it something a little different to identify the fact that it isn't strict successive entry (e.g., modified successive)
5. How does this proposal fit in with the other issues related to electronic serials that will be discussed at this meeting?

HANDLING E-SERIALS WHICH ARE RE-FORMATTED UNDER NEW TITLES: A DISCUSSION PAPER

LES HAWKINS, JEAN HIRONS, REGINA REYNOLDS
WITH COMMENTS FROM DAVE RESER AND JUDY KUHAGEN

April 2002

Introduction

The purpose of this discussion paper is to examine the situation presented by remote access serials that change their titles and re-format all issues under the new title or which include in the online version under a current title content previously issued under earlier titles. Options for giving cataloging guidance in these situations are presented. This paper was prepared for discussion at the May 2002 CONSER meeting and the results of the discussion will be a decision for LC/CONSER practice. The experience and expertise gained from applying that decision will inform a future rule proposal.

- I. Background
- II. The problem
- III. Categories of disappearing titles
- IV. Assumptions
- V. The options
 - A. Viewpoint 1: Use latest entry
 - a. Discussion
 - b. Pros and Cons
 - c. Examples
 - B. Viewpoint 2: Adapt successive entry
 - a. Pros and cons
 - b. Discussion
 - c. Examples
- VI. LC/CONSER practice

I. Background

During the work of the CONSER groups assisting with the revision of Chapter 12, there was much discussion with the serials cataloging community about how to handle title changes for electronic serials. The fluid nature of e-serials seemed to some to call for use of latest entry cataloging. However, others felt that the cumbersome nature of latest entry records over time, the use of successive entry for ISSN assignments, and the desire to use the same rules for those resources published in both print and online versions were arguments in favor of using successive entry for all e-serials.

An early example of one challenge presented by an e-serial was the case of BMMR, which began in August 1993. When the title was changed in May 1997 to The Medieval Review all issues were re-formatted under the new title. Since this was a real situation and could not wait for revised Chapter 12 to be issued, a practical solution was devised: a new record was created for The Medieval Review, which was cataloged with a start date of August 1993 and a note stating, "all issues previously published under the former title BMMR [Bryn Mawr medieval review] have been reformatted with the new title: The medieval review and are now available on the World Wide Web site for the new title." The record for the former title, BMMR, was closed with the May 1997 date and a 785 link and this note was added: "The publication changed title with May 1997 issue to Medieval Review and reformatted all old issues to build a complete archive under the new title..."

This BMMR solution prompted Sara Shatford Layne to write a discussion paper in May 1998 proposing that title changes for all electronic serials be handled using this model that she called "incorporating entry." Although this seeming middle ground between latest and successive entry sparked much interest, it was finally decided that the incorporating entry approach was somewhat complex, especially when numerous title changes were involved, and was dependent on MARC tagging to describe it, making it difficult to convey in the code.

It was finally decided that serials should continue to be cataloged using successive entry but that integrating resources should be cataloged using latest entry. In order to accommodate the various ways e-serials are issued, the definition of "serial" deliberately used the phrase "issued in successive parts" so as to include e-serials which were not divided into issues but issued articles one at a time. This decision was made so that print serials and their online counterparts could be cataloged in the same way and continue to make use of the ISSN. The one remaining difficult area was the case of serials that change their titles and are re-formatted under the new title as in the BMMR example above. This was made an exception to the rule and latest entry was proposed for this situation as can be seen in the first and revised proposals noted below.

The rule revision proposal that finally went forward to the JSC in April 2001 read:

21.2C1. a) *Serials.* If a major change occurs in the title proper of a serial, make a new entry. If a major change occurs in the title proper of an *electronic serial*, make a new entry unless the earlier title is no longer formally presented on any source. In that case, treat the electronic serial like an integrating resource (see 21.2C1b).

However, while the Australian Committee on Cataloging (ACOC) was considering a change of wording and placement of the above rule they became concerned about making an exception to the successive entry rule for this situation. They recommended removing the exception and cataloging all serials using successive entry. Their specific comments were:

1. This rule revision will lead to anomalies when the electronic serial has a print

equivalent. The print version of the serial would be given successive entry, whereas the electronic version would have latest title entry.

2. It is in the nature of serials to make repeated changes of title. This rule revision will make it unclear how such a title should be treated in relation to any future title changes that may not also be accompanied by reformatting of previous issues.
3. Catalogue users who are searching for the serial as originally cited may not be served as well by this approach.
4. It is uncertain how ISSNs will be allocated to such serials, and how this would affect the creation of new catalogue records.

ACOC also stated that the circumstance was rare and felt that it was better excluded at this point until more experience could be gained.

Reynolds and Hirons were asked to comment on the ACOC comments in August and there was little time to consult with others. Both agreed that the rule could be omitted from the code at this point, Hirons more reluctantly! Both felt at the time that this might be a simplification. Thus, the current version of AACR2 Chapter 12 that will be published in summer 2002 is silent about how to handle this situation. According to a written comment on this paper by Judy Kuhagen, CPSO, the JSC action to remove the rule “was not an endorsement per se of successive entry” for this particular problem; the JSC decided not to address the issue at that time.

II. The Problem

According to 12.0B1 and 12.1B8, resources that are issued successively are cataloged using successive entry and resources that are issued in an integrating manner are cataloged using latest entry. Online serials meet the definition of a serial because they generally have separate numbered parts (sometimes issues, sometimes articles). However, unlike their print counterparts, where each issue is separately distributed, the issues or parts in an e-journal do not necessarily require that the title be given with them. The title may only exist on a home page or other general pages. However, there is nothing in the definition of serial that says that each issue or part must bear the title. Thus, even when an online serial changes its title and is re-formatted with all issues under the new title, it still meets the definition of serial. Should a new record be created, as was done in the case of BMMR, following the principle that a new record is created each time the title of a serial is changed, or should the existing record be turned into a latest entry record, following the practice mandated in revised Chapter 12 for integrating resources? There are good arguments for and against both possibilities. They will be presented with the options below.

An additional aspect of the problem that has surfaced subsequent to the Chapter 12 revision discussions is how to handle cases where an electronic journal exists in print version that has undergone one or more title changes and is digitized with no evidence of its former titles.

A closer look at some of the types of problems is presented below.

III. Categories of “disappearing titles”

Category 1) Title is reformatted before it is cataloged or Earlier title never existed; no record already created

There are two possibilities: 1) The first is that a born digital serial changes its title before it could be cataloged and leaves no trace of the earlier title. The earlier title has thus “disappeared” although there might be evidence of its earlier existence. Hints might include the fact that the URL in an existing record leads to a resource that shows a different title or the publisher may explain the history of the publication on an “about” page. 2) The second situation is where an aggregator digitizes a serial that is also issued in print and in doing so removes all evidence of earlier titles that appeared on the print. In both of these situations there is no record for the earlier title.

Category 2) The title existed online at one time and there is a record for it

In this case, which is the case of BMMR, the serial appeared online under a certain title and was cataloged under that title. Later, the publisher or aggregator reformats the serial to remove evidence of the earlier title. In this situation there is a record.

One common feature shared by the two situations is that identification of earlier titles by which issues or articles might be appropriately cited is lacking on the Web page serving as the chief source for the current title. An additional problem is that in some cases, it isn't really clear whether or not a title has been “retained” by a producer of a digitized version. Occasionally there are vestiges of earlier titles that appear in scanned images from the print version or other references to earlier titles (see examples). The cataloger needs to be able to distinguish when it is possible to create a record for an earlier title contained in an aggregator package. For example, an aggregator may present the current title only on its Web pages but also present scanned images of the articles as they appeared in print with the earlier title at the bottom of the page with SICI or copyright information. Would the title appearing on the scanned image be enough to create a record for the earlier title? Can CONSER provide a rule of thumb on how to decide when to use successive entry and when to use latest entry for these situations?

IV. Assumptions

There are several assumptions that all authors agree to:

- If there is no record for the earlier title none can nor should be created (category 1)
- However, if CONSER agrees to follow a successive entry approach, the record created for the category 1 situation would be coded as successive entry and any

further changes would be handled by a new record

- The result of this is that a record could be coded as successive entry (because further changes will be handled in this manner) while also containing a 247 field (because the earlier title did not exist at the time of cataloging)
- If in cases where there is an existing record (category 2), CONSER agrees to use a successive entry approach, adaptations to the convention will have to be made because both records would have the same beginning numbering in field 362.

V. The Options

When there is an existing record for a serial that has not retained its earlier title(s):

- use latest entry, i.e. to update an existing record when the title changes and place the new title into the title proper position, or
- create a new successive entry record to represent the new title and re-formatted resource.

A. Latest Entry: a viewpoint from Jean Hirons and Les Hawkins

Latest Entry: Pros and Cons

Latest entry cataloging conventions could be used to handle both categories of disappearing titles described in section III. If a title changes on an electronic serial, and the earlier title is not retained on issues to which it applied, the title proper of the same record would be changed to show the most recent title. The former title would be given in field 247.

Pros:

- Some catalog users (including catalogers and reference librarians) feel that it is undesirable that there be a record for something that no longer exists.
- The 247 field is a valid field to provide title added entries for former titles. The earlier title (or titles), ISSN, and dates that the resource bore the earlier titles, when known, can be given in 247 former title fields.
- MARC 21 coding has been developed in conjunction with the AACR2 rule revisions of 2002 to distinguish the application of the latest entry approach for integrating resources from pre-AACR latest entry rule conventions for serials. The “Entry convention” code contains code 2 for “Integrated entry” to identify the new use of latest entry conventions for integrating resources and electronic serials that do not retain their earlier titles. E-serials cataloged

according to latest entry conventions would be coded as bibliographic level code “s” for serial and code 2 to show the form of cataloging convention being applied. The code “s” would distinguish these resources from integrating resources.

- Many CONSER libraries have expressed the desire to have one record for these titles in their OPAC to facilitate public services and acquisitions.
- Aggregators are arranging serials under later titles so that it is impossible to create successive entry records for online serial content when there is no source of information for earlier titles given in an aggregator database.
- The use of a single record may be more in keeping with the philosophy of the revised chapter 12 as it mirrors the resource, i.e., new successive records for titles that change and earlier titles still exist, and redescription on records for resources that don’t retain earlier titles.
- The resulting latest entry record benefits from cooperative maintenance via the national database (as opposed to the latest entry records existing only in local catalogs)
- A record with 247s for earlier titles can associate all titles very efficiently for retrieving citations to articles published under the earlier titles

Cons:

- Serials would not all be cataloged according to the same, entry conventions (although there is a difference in the cataloging of a resource issued as a serial in print and as an integrating resource online.)
- The description would need to be revised to reflect the current issue.
- While it is currently possible to use the 247 to show earlier titles, the entry convention code 2 isn’t yet available on the utilities and it is uncertain when it will be. If the 247 is used before code 2 is implemented, records having a 247 may be difficult to interpret.
- It is possible that tracking of citations for the earlier title may be confusing for some users when it is in the 247 field. Comment from Dave Reser, CPSO: “but [citations to earlier titles] may be easier for users to summarize using 247s in a single record than expecting them to reach the same conclusions by consulting several different successive records.”
- Currently the ISSN Network uses a successive entry approach for assigning ISSN for serial title changes. Separate records are therefore used in the ISSN database and on the utilities for US and Canadian ISSN assignments to show authenticated records for title changes. Though

the ISSN can be added to subfield x of the 247 field for earlier titles, it is unclear when the ISSN network will be able to parse this information to maintain separate ISSN records for them.

A special note on ISSN

One concern with latest entry is the ISSN, but in this case, there may not be a problem. ISSN will be assigned to integrating resources, as well as serials, and the library community will be cataloging them according to latest entry, while ISSN catalogs them according to successive entry. Thus, the problem already exists and is primarily a problem for the ISSN network, not the entire library community. The library community will have a single record for integrating resources and may also want a single record in cases where serials do not retain their earlier titles. It would seem that the same solutions the ISSN network applies to integrating resources can be applied to these serial titles as well.

Examples of latest entry treatment:

1 . Title on all issues is reformatted with a new title

Asian age

Record as first encountered

- Cataloger finds the following record and notices that all issues have been reformatted with the new title in the online archive.

Bibli= s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource= p

245 00 Asian age \$h [electronic resource].

260 New Delhi, India : \$b Asian Age

500 Description based on: 6 Mar. 2001; title from caption (viewed Mar. 5, 2001).

856 40 \$u <http://www.asianage.com/>

Record as updated by cataloger

- The 245 is changed to the current title,
- the earlier title and what is known about the dates it carried is put into field 247.
- Also, the new publisher is recorded in the 260 and a note about the previous publisher is added.

Bibli= s

Entry convention = 2

Type of continuing resource= p

245 00 Asian age online \$h [electronic resource].

247 10 Asian age \$f <6 Mar. 2001>-

260 Uttar Pradesh, India : \$b HCL InfiNet

500 All issues originally published with the title: Asian age have been reformatted with the new title: Asian age online.

500 Description based on 29 Jan. 2002; title from caption (viewed Mar. 26, 2002).

500 Published: New Delhi : Asian Age, <6 Mar. 2001>-

856 40 \$u <http://www.asianageonline.com/>

Newsline on the Web

Record as first encountered

- Cataloger finds this record describing the earlier title.
- This is an online only publication.
- No print version exists.

Biblv1= s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource= p

245 00 Newsline on the web \$h [electronic resource].

246 30 Newsline

260 Prague : \$b RFE/RL, Inc., \$c 1997-

362 0 1 Apr. 1997-

310 Daily

500 Title from caption.

538 Mode of access: World Wide Web.

856 40 <http://www.rferl.org>

936 Vol. 1, no. 129 (1 Oct. 1997) LIC

937

Record as updated

- The title on all issues including 1 Apr. 1997, the first cited in the above record, has been changed to RFE/RL Newsline.

Biblv1= s

Entry convention = 2

Type of continuing resource= p

245 00 RFE/RL Newsline \$h [electronic resource].

246 30 Newslines
 247 10 Newslines on the web \$f 1 Apr. 1997-<1 Oct. 1997>
 260 Prague : \$b RFE/RL, Inc., \$c 1997-
 310 Daily
 362 0 1 Apr. 1997-
 500 All issues originally published with the title: Newslines on the Web have been reformatted with the new title: RFE/RL Newslines.
 500 Description based on: Vol. 6, no. 57 (26 Mar. 2002); title from caption (viewed Mar. 26, 2002).
 538 Mode of access: World Wide Web.
 856 40 <http://www.rferl.org>

2. Aggregator gives access to earlier issues only under the current title.

Forest pathology

Record created based on resource

- Content of the earlier title is being published under the current title online
- No record for the earlier online title exists.
- The current title has been assigned an ISSN by the German ISSN Center (no ISSN has been assigned to the earlier title).
- 776 links are given to print format records of the current and earlier titles.
- The following record is created:

Bibliography = s
 Entry convention = 2
 Type of continuing resource = p

022 1439-0329
 210 For. pathology & Internet
 222 Forest pathology & Internet
 130 0 Forest pathology (Online)
 245 00 Forest pathology \$h [electronic resource]
 247 10 European journal of forest pathology \$f <Feb. 1999>-Dec. 1999
 260 [Berlin, Germany] : \$b Blackwell Wissenschafts-Verlag
 362 1 Electronic coverage as of Mar. 26, 2002: Vol. 29, issue 1 (Feb. 1999)-
 500 Description based on: Vol. 32, issue 1 (Feb. 2002); title from table of contents page (viewed Mar. 26, 2002).
 500 Available through: Synergy.
 710 2 Synergy (Online service)
 776 1 \$t Forest pathology \$x 1437-4781 \$w (DLC) 00220241 \$w (OCoLC)43766903

776 1 \$t European journal of forest pathology \$x 0300-1237 \$w (DLC)sn
82022053 \$w (OCOLC)1643880
856 40 \$u [http://www.blackwell-
synergy.com/member/institutions/issuelist.asp?journal=efp](http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/member/institutions/issuelist.asp?journal=efp) \$z Available
through: Synergy

B. Successive Entry : a viewpoint by Regina Reynolds

The debate about the use of latest and successive entry has been going on for at least 30 years. When latest entry prevailed, persuasive arguments were made for successive entry. As memories of latest entry have faded--at least in some minds--arguments in favor of latest entry are again being heard. In truth, neither approach is completely satisfactory and until systems are developed that eliminate the need to choose one approach over the other, those working on cataloging rules and practices must choose the approach which has the most advantages and the fewest disadvantages at a particular point in time. In discussions about how many records to create for format variations, the phrase "lumping and splitting" has been used. Lumping would be equivalent to latest entry where all titles are on one record; splitting would be comparable to successive entry where each title has its own record. In most discussions of lumping vs. splitting I have listened to or held with persons skilled in systems analysis and design, the usual comment is that it is generally preferable to "split" to the lowest practical level of granularity because it is always possible to "lump" as necessary for display or other uses. The reverse--in this case, creating separate successive records from a latest entry record--is not usually possible. Thus, from a systems perspective, successive entry has an advantage.

It is also important to examine how often and under what circumstances problems of journals being re-formatted or re-published without earlier titles occur. If these problems do not occur with great frequency, creating a potentially confusing exception to the general rule does not seem justified, as noted by ACOC in their comments to the rule proposal. The problems can occur with born-digital serials and with titles in aggregations but seem to be more common with titles in aggregations. However, the overall volume of the problem when compared to the number of serials to be cataloged would still seem to be relatively small. And whether the current situation of competing and confusing handling of serials by aggregators will continue to prevail is an open question. It is important to recognize that online publishing is still in its infancy. Publishers are uncertain about how best to present serials online and are engaging in creative experimentation as well as trial and error due to inexperience. Print serials have long presented challenges because of their ability to change from issue to issue. The fluid nature of online publishing allows a publisher to re-design and re-format already published issues as well as future issues, creating a whole new magnitude of problems for the cataloger. So, titles that "disappear" can re-appear just as easily and the cataloging solution needs to be able to accommodate both kinds of change. Successive entry is more versatile in this regard because all changes are handled in the same way: by creation of a new record.

My observations of journals received in NSDP for ISSN assignment is showing a shift towards primary publishers taking back content from aggregation services now that the primary publisher has become more comfortable in the electronic world. This shift might well lead to fewer aggregators and fewer of these kinds of problems. Additionally, the sheer number of aggregators currently competing for a limited amount of business leads me to believe there will be an inevitable “shake-out” in this highly competitive world. One can hope that those who survive the shake-out will have evolved towards a certain degree of standardization and adherence to “good practices” with regard to libraries, especially with some guidance from the library community. For this reason, I believe we should take a conservative approach to solving this problem, choosing an approach closest to the rules as written—at least at first—since this might turn out to be a diminishing problem. NSDP and CONSER are also planning how to educate aggregators to the importance of preserving former titles that appeared in the print version.

When considering what approach to recommend, it is also important to take the multi-national scope of AACR2 into account. The rules in revised Chapter 12 are the result of extensive international discussion, including considerable efforts to harmonize rules among AACR2, ISBD(CR) and the ISSN Manual. It has to be recognized that LCRI is not followed by the entire AACR2 community. Thus, an LCRI solution which is in opposition to the rule in revised Chapter 12 risks disrupting the carefully crafted harmonization achieved in revised Chapter 12 and diminishes the possibilities for record sharing and one-to-one correspondence between records and ISSN. Even though ISSN records in the future might be out of synch with AACR2 records for integrating resources (and the final decision has not been made regarding this) it would be even more confusing and disruptive for there to be a disparity in treatment within the universe of serials themselves.

Adapting Successive Entry

Standard successive entry is neither possible nor desirable in most of the cases in question. If there is no record for the previous title and it has disappeared from the Web site, no reasonable record can be created for it after the fact. If the online version never appeared online under the previous title, a record under that title is not appropriate. The cataloger can only catalog what he or she can see. Likewise, it would be very contrived to use as the beginning coverage date on the later successive record the date when the online serial was re-titled to the new title. The coverage date of the online serial needs to reflect the coverage of the serial at the time it is cataloged. For these reasons, some adjustments to traditional successive entry need to be made to accommodate the reality of these resources. However, the most basic concept of successive entry cataloging—namely, that each title is described on its own record—can be retained and retention of this principle will allow compatibility with the way other serials are cataloged and will be compatible with Revised Chapter 12 as written.

Applying successive entry cataloging to electronic serials that do not retain their titles after re-formatting, or which are published online under the current title of the serial even though the articles were first published in print under an earlier title requires that the cataloger simply catalog

what he or she is presented with at the time of cataloging. When a journal is re-formatted to include issues published under the former title, the coverage date of the new record has to be the same as the coverage date of the preceding record because the coverage of the new title includes the coverage of the former title. A note can be added to indicate that material previously published in the print version under different titles is included. Access points and corresponding ISSN can be added to provide access under the former titles and ISSN. The former record will be closed and linked to the new record but the new record need not have a backward link to the old record since the new material is described on the new record as well. This will allow a library to retain only the current record, since it describes the complete online publication. These practices will allow a new record for each title change and thus preserve successive entry for these resources which are undeniably serials will be in keeping with the provisions of the revised Chapter 12. International harmonization will be best served by first trying to implement the rules as published—by writing an RI that gives guidance on how to create successive entry records in this particular situation.

Successive Entry: Pros and Cons

Pros

- Follows revised Chapter 12's rule to use successive entry for serials, thus keeping all AACR2 countries synchronized in their practices [Comment from Dave Reser: since the JSC decided to be silent on the issue, we don't really know what the other AACR2 countries are going to do about this phenomena, with the possible exception of ACOC?]
- Avoids creating an exception to the basic rule for serials and eliminates the need for catalogers to determine when to apply the exception, a determination which may often be difficult, since there is little standardization or predictability in the way many electronic journals are presented online.
- Avoids the problems caused by subsequent re-formatting which might restore the missing titles, or subsequent title changes without re-formatting, all of which will cause the record to become out of step with the way the serial is published
- Results in a “best of both worlds” solution: one record for the local catalog, multiple archival records for the national database, and harmonization with the ISSN database
- Easier training of catalogers
- Accommodates archiving and A&I services citations under titles associated with the article at the time of publication
- Accommodates institutions which only have access to one of the titles (this was a problem with latest entry in a cooperative environment)

- Allows retention of records for earlier titles in the national database
- Allows matching against the ISSN database and easier use of ISSN records
- Works better in a cooperative environment because latest entry records cannot be updated by all database users but all users can input new successive records as needed
- Avoids the inevitable duplicate records which will be common under latest entry because a cataloging agency does not recognize that what appears to be a new title is really a change from an old title. Using successive entry, a new record is always created if the information is discovered and appropriate notes can be added as the information about the earlier title or titles becomes known.
- The decision to use successive entry is more easily reversed. Since we are in something of an experimental mode, this is important. If it is later decided to use latest entry, such records can be created from multiple successive entry records. The reverse—creating successive entry records from a latest entry record—is not usually possible, since certain data (especially date information) is missing and it cannot be determined to which records the data pertain.

Cons

- In the likely case that a library does not want a record under the former title, the library has to remove the record from the local database and consolidate holdings under the current title. A single record in the local catalog doesn't benefit from cooperative maintenance. Creation and maintenance of duplicate records (one for the local and others for the national file) may be a problem with regard to limited cataloging resources at some institutions.
- The national database will have records with overlapping start dates, which will require notes to explain them and might be confusing until this practice becomes more common

Additional cons added by Dave Reser:

- Successive entry may result in records for intervening titles that are not linked to earlier or later titles if information about title changes and their sequence was not made explicit by the publisher/aggregator.
- Catalog users following an 856 link on a record for an earlier title may think they have reached the wrong resource when they discover a resource with a different title at the resolved URI.
- Use of successive entry would require a change to the definition of Serial 008/34 code 2 “integrating entry” in MARC 21 that currently reads: “Code 2 indicates that a record is

cataloged under its latest (most recent) title or issuing body ... It is used for integrating resources and electronic serials that do not retain their earlier titles.”

- The presumed advantage of successive entry from a systems perspective would not be realized until systems are redesigned to perform “splitting” and “lumping”; not a short-term solution needed by catalogers today

Examples

1. Title on all issues is reformatted with a new title

Asian age

Record as first encountered:

- Cataloger finds the following record and notices that all issues have been reformatted with the new title in the online archive.

Biblvl = s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource = p

245 00 Asian age \$h [electronic resource].

260 New Delhi, India : \$b Asian Age

500 Description based on: 6 Mar. 2001; title from caption (viewed Mar. 5, 2001).

856 40 \$u <http://www.asianage.com/>

Record as closed by cataloger

- A 500 note has been added to explain the re-formatting
- The 856 has been removed
- A 785 has been added to lead a user to the new record

Biblvl = s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource = p

245 00 Asian age \$h [electronic resource].

260 New Delhi, India : \$b Asian Age

500 Description based on: 6 Mar. 2001; title from caption (viewed Mar. 5, 2001).

500 All issues reformatted as of March 26, 2001 under new title: Asian age online.

785 00 \$t Asian age online

Record for new title

- A note is added to explain that all formerly titled issues have been re-formatted under this new title
- The 856 (URL) is placed on this, the current title
- No 780 is added because the old issues are now covered by this record
- An access point is made for the former title. 247 was chosen so as to accommodate the ISSN but 730 could also be used, especially if the MARC format were to add a subfield x for the ISSN

Biblvl = s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource = p

245 00 Asian age online \$h [electronic resource].

247 10 Asian age \$f <6 March 2001-> \$x XXXX-XXXX

260 Uttar Pradesh, India : \$b HCL InfiNet

500 All issues originally published in New Delhi by Asian Age under the title: Asian age have been reformatted with the new title: Asian age online.

500 Description based on 29 Jan. 2002; title from caption (viewed Mar. 26, 2002).

856 40 \$u <http://www.asianageonline.com/>

2. Aggregator gives access to earlier issues only under the current title

Forest pathology

Record created

- Cataloger finds that the content of the earlier title is being published under the current title online and creates the following record. No record for the earlier online version exists.
- One record is created to describe the content as first published
- The record is coded as successive entry (0) because any subsequent changes will be

handled by a separate record. **{Note: this is the only difference between this record and the record given in the latest entry section above}**

- A note is added to indicate that the current publication includes content first published under an earlier title
- Access is given to the earlier title (and ISSN if available) through field 247 or alternatively through a 730 field which might be modified to add a subfield x for ISSN
- If this title were to change again, a new record would be created, as illustrated in the first example

Biblvl = s

Entry convention = 0

Type of continuing resource = p

022 1439-0329

210 For. pathol.&b Internet

222 Forest pathology &b Internet

130 0 Forest pathology (Online)

245 00 Forest pathology \$h [electronic resource]

247 10 European journal of forest pathology \$f <Feb. 1999>-Dec. 1999

260 [Berlin, Germany] : \$b Blackwell Wissenschafts-Verlag

362 1 Electronic coverage as of Mar. 26, 2002: Vol. 29, issue 1 (Feb. 1999)-

500 Description based on: Vol. 32, issue 1 (Feb. 2002); title from table of contents page (viewed Mar. 26, 2002).

500 Includes content originally published in print under the title: European journal of forest pathology, <Feb. 1999>-Dec. 1999.

500 Available through: Synergy.

776 1 \$t Forest pathology \$x 1437-4781 \$w (DLC) 00220241 \$w (OCoLC)43766903

856 40 \$u <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/member/institutions/issuelist.asp?journal=efp>

V. LC/CONSER practice

It is hoped that a decision on LC/CONSER practice can be made at the CONSER operations meeting in May 2002. Guidelines for applying the approach chosen will be documented in the

CONSER cataloging manual Module 31. Experience and practice gained from applying the decision will inform a future rule proposal. CONSER members are also asked by CPSO to consider the possibility of making successive vs. single records be an "allowable duplicate" within CONSER (this "option" would allow a library to pick the approach that better serves its needs or the approach "mandated" by its local system constraints). (For example, LC would have serious purchase order and record replacements problems with successive records.)

Appendix A: Sample of CONSER records from CDS

Les Hawkins

In early April 2002, I examined a non-random sample provided by CDS. CDS extracted every 13th record that met the criteria for an e-serial from a 1999 segment of their “CONSER retro file” to provide the 101 record sample.

Title changes

I was able to connect with 79% (80/101) of the resources in the sample. 25% (20/80) of these represented a title change, that is: the title currently on the resource differed from the 245 or 130 in the current CONSER record, or the record in the sample represented an earlier title. 35% of the title changes (7/20) did not appear to retain the earlier title.

Discussion of resources that did not retain earlier title

Of the 7 items not retaining title, three were email publications with related Web sites which did not provide a direct way to examine back issues online. “Articles” issued in the past were archived by two of these but it was unclear whether the articles were issued as email issues showing the earlier title or if they were articles originally appearing only on the Web site.

One of the resources that did not retain its title was a state government agricultural document that now shows the title: Kansas hay directory, as opposed to Hay directory on the record. Kansas hay directory was given as a variant title on the CONSER record. Another title was a scholarly journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, an online only publication that said it was “formerly the Journal of Consumer and Market Research.” The record for the current title has a note that says: “Articles with the former title... have been reformatted to show the current title.” The back issue link did not seem to be working when I viewed the document, so it was difficult to confirm this completely.

The other two resources not retaining the earlier title represented more ambiguous changes, the titles in the catalog records are clearly not mentioned on the sites and a new/different title appears on pages to which the CONSER record URLs connects. It appears that they have become integrating resources rather than serials and may be only minimally related to the earlier titles referred to in the records; that is they appear to be different resources altogether rather than a continuation of the former title.

Sample makeup

The sample included records for the following publishers or aggregators: JSTOR= 5, Muse=4, Blackwell Synergy= 1, First Search=1. A title search on OCLC for these revealed that 8 had records for multiple providers (e.g., JSTOR/First Search, OCLC/Synergy).

There were 7 online only scholarly serials sponsored by a research organization (e.g. ACM, American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists, etc.).

67 of the records were authenticated by NSDP, NAL authenticated 13 of the records (most of these state and federal agriculture documents), other authenticating libraries included University of Michigan, GPO, and University of Washington.

Comment on the approach

I would have preferred to have selected a random sample from the entire subset of CONSER records representing e-serials, rather than just from the single year 1999. I think more records authenticated by other institutions would have appeared as well as more titles that are part of aggregator databases.

Comparison

A study done in 1998 as a part of the AACR2 revision process (<http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/aacr2breport.html>) showed a rate of title changes for e-serials to be about 12%. About a quarter of these situations were cases where the earlier title was not retained. This was a random sample of CONSER records and citations from the ARL directory of serials. A total of 138 resources from both the CONSER database and the ARL directory were used for the 1998 study.