

To: Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
From: Dave Reser, LC Representative
Subject: Revision and Expansion of RDA Appendix K: Relationship Designators:
Relationships Between Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies

Our response is structured in two parts, Part 1 responds to the “Issues to be resolved” section of ALA's proposal and Part 2 responds to the proposed replacement for Appendix K.

Part 1

Proposed reorganization of Appendix K

General

The question of whether the changed organization structure to separate relationships generally applicable to all agents from those specific to one type of agent is an issue we defer to the JSC Relationship Designators Working Group and the Technical Working Group. The Relationship Designators WG has as one of their tasks to clarify the requirements of same-entity and cross-entity designators (6JSC/Chair/20/2015). The Technical WG has the related task of investigating labels used in the RDA Element Set and relationship designators (task #3 in 6JSC/Chair/11/2015). We do believe that the structure in this proposal is preferable to the structure shown in the 2013 proposal 6JSC/ALA/25. Our comments on the remainder of the proposal are based on the assumption that the revised structure is valid.

Retention of sections without specific relationship designators

Agree to retention of sections without designators but with references to K.2.1.

However, in the generalizing of these designators, we think some hierarchies have been lost. For example, in the current K.2.2, the more general designator is **family member**, and the more specific term is *progenitor*. When ALA generalized family member and member (see K.2.3) to become **member** and changed *progenitor* to *ancestor*, the hierarchy was removed. Thus, it is harder for a cataloger to apply the instruction in K.1 about recording a more general relationship designator if there is no indication that such a relationship is more general. We also note that the relationship designator **member**, which currently relates a person to a corporate body, has no hierarchy but probably should. We think that **ancestor**, **employee**, and **descendant** are more specific designators for **member** in ALA's new K.2.1

Another hierarchy issue ALA did not address is when the more specific relationship designator is in a different section of Appendix K. For example, an **officer** (see K.3.3 of proposal) is clearly a **member** of a corporate body, but because the two terms are located in different areas, this is not clear without reading through all the designators in Appendix K and comparing their definitions. This presents a challenge to the task of assigning relationship designators. Is there a way to show this hierarchy for relationship designators in different areas of Appendix K in ALA's proposed structure?

References to K.2.1 in sections that have specific relationship designators

We think the reference should be placed before the list of designators, not after. This should warn the user up front that terms they expect may not be there.

Addition of reciprocal relationships

We think this is helpful.

Person to person family relationships

We would prefer not to add these relationships. We concur with ALA that “we are building a bibliographic, not a genealogical database.” The use cases presented did not seem compelling to us: the bibliographically relevant relationship for the Miller/Lee example is that of collaboration; the bibliographically relevant relationship for the McCaffrey example is that of work-to-work sequel (Appendix J); other relationship information can be provided at either 30.2 (Explanation of Relationship), or 9.17 (Biographical Information).

The relationship designators “family” and “corporate body”

Agree with ALA's conclusion.

Relationships of families to corporate bodies

The argument made that corporate bodies could found a family does not seem compelling to us. If ALA has specific examples of this situation, we could be convinced otherwise. We note that the approach here is not in synch with that in 6JSC/BL/27 (we prefer the approach in this proposal).

Relationships within entity descriptions (authorized access point to/from variant access point)

We believe it is premature to make this radical shift to type the relationship between nomens. The discussions on how to introduce the FRBR-LRM nomen entity,

and the work of the JSC Relationship Designators Working Group may provide a similar path in the future, but such a path needs to be comprehensive, and not just applicable to Appendix K. As noted in the “Deferred Issues” section, there have been no corresponding changes proposed in the instructions for Section 9 of RDA (Chapters 29-32), and we do not believe that these relationships should be added until the overall path is clear.

The attributive relationship

We do not agree with the approach as proposed, which justifies the relationship designator **appropriator of identity**. The overall concept of “attribution” is more complex than presented. For example, the discussion implies that the attributions were done to appropriate the identity of another person by impersonation. While this is true for some cases, it is also true that the attributions were merely mistaken conclusions by scholars, and not acts of impersonation by the creator. It is also true that in rhetorical practice of *declamatio*, the speaker might adopt the persona of a famous figure, but this was done without intention to actually impersonate—it was merely an intellectual exercise. Finally, we think that there is overlap between this concept and that of fictitious characters/real non-human entities. Is this an appropriate way to relate Barbara Bush and the dog Millie because Barbara presented *Millie's book* as being the work of the dog? We would encourage ALA to examine 6JSC/BL/8 and the LC response to it and provide a more generalized solution.

Part 2

K.2.1 Relationship Designators to Relate Persons, Families or Corporate Bodies to Other Persons, Families or Corporate Bodies

associated with : remove

This relationship designator is too broad. Its definition is equivalent to the relationship element and does not provide more specific information about the nature of the relationship (see first 2 paragraphs of K.1). If the relationship were to be retained, all others must be moved under it as it would form the top of the hierarchy.

collaborator : remove

This relationship designator is too broad. Its definition is equivalent to the relationship element and does not provide more specific information about the nature of the relationship (see first 2 paragraphs of K.1).

distinguished from : remove

This relationship designator relates entities that are not related (a negative relationship). The information should be recorded in a Cataloguer's Note (29.7).

influenced by : revise definition or move to Appendix J

As we said when this designator was proposed with this definition in 6JSC/ALA/25, this definition is "overly broad as persons typically may influence or be influenced by many entities daily. We also wonder if these terms are better as Appendix J relationship designators as it is the work of some creator that serves as an intellectual or artistic influence on the work of another?"

possibly identified with : remove

This relationship designator relates entities that are not confirmed to be related. The information should be recorded in a Cataloguer's Note (29.7). See our related comments on negative relationships in 6JSC/ALA/45/LC response.

publisher : remove

In addition to being an element name (Publisher (21.3)), it is also describing a particular type of "**client**" relationship, which is already in the list.

ward : revise

This definition should be more closely matched to its reciprocal guardian. The current definition would imply a patient at a hospital under the care of a medical professional. It should say "A person whose affairs are managed by a related person or corporate body because the person is unable to conduct their affairs independently"

K.3.1.1 General Person to Person Relationships**apprentice** : move or change

As defined, this relationship designator should be subordinate to **co-worker**. We also note that this relationship as defined is subordinate to **student**, but we are unsure of how the relationship designator could be subordinate to two different terms that are not hierarchically related. We also found the master/apprentice terms to be closely tied to a historical time period—we do not think an apprentice carpenter today would refer the experience carpenter training him or her as "my master", and the negative connotations of that word through its association with

slavery make it even less likely. We suggest two terms which include this concept, but are broader, and therefore perhaps more useful. Our proposed terms also do not have the hierarchy problems of apprentice/master:

mentee A person who is trained and/or advised by the related mentor. *Reciprocal relationship*: mentor

mentor A person who trains and/or advises the related mentee. *Reciprocal relationship*: mentee

appropriated identity/appropriator of identity: remove

See comments in **Part 1, The attributive relationship**, in our response.

assistant/assistant to: remove or move

As defined, this seems to be subordinate to other terms (co-worker, colleague). This would need resolution.

business associate: remove or move

As defined, this seems to be subordinate to several other terms (**co-worker, colleague, partner**). This would need resolution.

co-worker : move

As defined, this seems to be subordinate to **colleague**.

partner : move

As noted above, the hierarchical relationships between partner, business associate, co-worker, and colleague need to be resolved.

K.3.1.2 Person to Person Relationships Within a Family

As noted in our comments in Part 1, we do not believe that these relationships are bibliographically significant.

K.3.3 Relationship Designators to Relate Persons to Corporate Bodies

delegate/representative : combine

As defined, we do not understand the distinction.

graduate : revise

As defined, this excludes graduates of vocational institutions that do not award "academic degrees" such as massage therapy schools and culinary schools, and it also excludes more short-term, non-degree schools/programs in specialized areas such as driving schools, rare book schools, and first aid training programs. We suggest it say: "A person who has completed a course of study or training from the related institution."

K.3.4 Relationship Designators to Relate Different Names of a Person

As noted in our comments in Part 1, we do not believe that these relationships between nomens should be added at this time.

K.5.1 Relationship Designators to Relate Corporate Bodies to Persons

delegate to/representative of: combine

As defined, we do not understand the distinction.