**Handling of Supplemental Material on Main Record**

**Background:**

There are instances where a book can be best used with another item, even though the two are not issued together. This other material could be a sound recording containing examples of the music discussed in the book, a videorecording dramatizing scenarios described in the book, or a web site whose content supplements a book.

The decision one library makes on how to treat these supplementary materials can affect the public displays in the catalogs of other libraries when the libraries operate their public catalogs in a consortial environment that shares information, as is the case with the State University Libraries in Florida. The University of North Florida describes a situation it encountered recently:

UNF added an 007 field to a book record for an accompanying sound cassette that was not issued together with the book by the publisher as a single item. The book and audiocassette were meant to be used together, but the publisher issued them as stand-alone items priced separately. UNF added the audiocassette to the book record because, although not issued together, the text of the book referred several times to the sound recording and it appeared they were meant to be issued and/or used together. However, UNF is the only SUL that owns both items. In addition, a search of OCLC showed that there were separate OCLC records for the book and the audiocassette. According to OCLC holdings, 217 institutions owned the book but only 45 had holdings on the audiocassette record. The University of Florida is one of those institutions that owned the book but not the audiocassette.

When UNF added the 007 for the audiocassette for its record, the UF record in the Mango public catalog displayed “Audiocassette” as one of the formats listed at the bottom of the record and as one of the facets on the left-hand side of the record. Although UF did not own the audiocassette, the merging of information on records in Mango made it look as if it did, which caused confusion for UF librarians and patrons.

UNF brought this issue to the Metadata Subcommittee in hopes of formulating some guidelines for SULs on how to proceed in these matters. The Subcommittee examined the issue and has drawn up this proposal.

**Recommendation:**

Supplemental material that is issued separately by the publisher should have a separate catalog record made for the item. An 007 field containing coding for the supplemental material should not be added to the record for the main item.

If an institution wishes to note in the bibliographic record that supplemental material is available, the 590 field (not 500) should be used, and a delimiter 5 with the institution’s symbol should be added after the text of the field. This will make the note institution-specific, and the note will not be brought into a merged record in Mango.

Since some users do not read the entire contents of the bibliographic display, it is recommended that the institution also place a note in the holdings record regarding availability of supplemental material. Place the note in subfield z of the 852 field in the holdings record. Information placed in subfield z will display in Mango, in the holdings information at the bottom of the screen, under Location. In the brief display of the list of records retrieved, the first five or six words of the note will display.

**Other possibilities discussed:**

The MARC format does define several 7xx fields as linking fields in which information about related items can be recorded. Field 770 would contain bibliographic information about a supplement to the item being described in the catalog record, while field 772 would have information on the parent entry when the record is describing the supplemental material. Field 787 (defined as “other relationship entry” could also be used. Use of these fields would be a viable option for SULs to inform the public if the fields would display in Mango and the user could click on them to retrieve the catalog record for the item listed in these fields. However, of the linking entry 7xx fields, only fields 780 and 785, used for preceding and succeeding entries in serials cataloging, currently display in Mango. It is good cataloging practice to use these linking fields in the bibliographic record. For them to be useful in public SUL catalogs, however, they would have to display and be clickable so the related title’s record could be retrieved. This would require action by FCLA, after the idea is approved by the OPAC Subcommittee.

Use of the Aleph-specific LKR field was discussed by the Metadata Subcommittee as a possibility. Not all SULs have implemented the LKR field in their cataloging, however. There is also concern that, as an Aleph-specific field, the information may not carry over into a new system. Thus, the Subcommittee chose not to make this a recommended practice for all SULs.
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