"Mind the [Trans-Atlantic] Gap, Please": Awareness and Training Needs of UK Cataloguers

ANNE WELSH

Department of Information Studies, University College London, London, UK[1]

CELINE CARTY

Cambridge University Library, Cambridge University, Cambridge, UK

HELEN WILLIAMS

LSE Library Services, The London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK

Methodology: Action research. Analysis of emails sent to an e-forum on RDA in the UK in April 2011. Emails were assigned tags based on contents. Email addresses were analyzed for sector. The resource list co-created by participants was analyzed for format and country of creator(s). Findings: More than 200 people subscribed and received 195 emails sent by 38 individuals about current actions; training; training needs; the hybrid catalog and cataloguer judgment; implementation; productivity; the RDA Toolkit; MARC and FRBR. Topical concerns were found to be the same as for U.S. RDA testers, although accompanied by "vague concerns" about whether they were acting quickly enough.

KEYWORDS   bibliographic control, cataloguing standards, RDA, training

INTRODUCTION

This article considers the UK cataloguing community's awareness of the new international cataloguing code, Resource Description and Access (RDA) (Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA, 2010a) and the training needs concerning it expressed in an online discussion forum held in April 2011 (CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group, 2011c). It provides a discussion of RDA's importance within the future of bibliographic control, an overview of the current state of training and awareness of RDA, and a list of key topics identified in the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals (CILIP) Cataloguing and Indexing Group (CIG) E-Forum on RDA, held on April 18 and 19, 2011.

RDA AND THE FUTURE OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

As the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control pointed out in its report *On the Record* (2008), the library catalogue is now only one route that users take to access data. The standards for library cataloguing, currently the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed. (AACR2) (Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR2, 2005), and soon to be RDA, coexist alongside a range of other metadata standards:

> Today's metadata environment comprehends AACR2/RDA, MARC 21, MARC XML, the
> Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS), Dublin Core, and the Online Information

---

[1] Address correspondence to Anne Welsh, Department of Information Studies, University College London, Gower Street, London, WCIE 6BT, UK. E-mail: uczcawe@ucl.ac.uk

Exchange format (ONIX), amongst others, while the retrieval protocol environment encompasses Z39.50, the Search and Retrieve services (SRW/U), the Metasearch XML Gateway (MXG), and the need to work with OpenSearch and other protocols. (Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, 2008, p. 26).

AACR2 draws on a tradition of bibliographic control with roots in the work of Panizzi at the British Museum (1841), Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue* (1876) and trans-Atlantic initiatives from the dawn of the 20th century, beginning with *Rules: Author and Title Entries* (Library Association and American Library Association, 1908; American Library Association and Library Association, 1908). It is often claimed to be "the most widely-used standard for descriptive cataloguing in the Englishspeaking [sic] world" (Kior- gaard & Kartus, 2009), although recent surveys focus on the use of MARC, the exchange format most commonly associated with AACR2, not on AACR2 itself, and so a level of inference is involved in these claims.

Ma's survey of Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) conducted in 2007 and reported in 2009 found that of the 68 libraries (55%) that responded, 61 (91%) were using MARC, followed by 56 (84%) using Encoded Archival Description (EAD). Other popular schema included Dublin Core (52 respondents, or 78%) and Qualified Dublin Core (45 respondents, or 67%), with other schema in use by less than 50% of the respondents including TEI, MODS, and VRA Core Categories (Ma, 2009, p. 5). In the United Kingdom, a survey conducted by CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group (CIG) in 2010 found that 54 (90%) of the 60 respondents to the same question were using MARC21, with a further 9 respondents (15%) using UKMARC and 1 respondent (1.7%) using UNIMARC. Dublin Core was used by 6 respondents (10%) with all other schema used by less than 10% (Danskin, 2010).

The usage reported in these surveys indicates that MARC cannot be ignored in a discussion of the future of bibliographic control, and since MARC21 as a communication format draws heavily on AACR2 for its content designation (Library of Congress Network Development and MARC Standards Office, 2006), we might infer that AACR2's successor, RDA, will be a major preoccupation for bibliographic control within the Anglophone library community.

The response to trainings offered by CILIP and CIG in 2010 and 2011 certainly indicates a high level of interest within the UK cataloguing community and strategic managers.

RDA IN THE UK: TRAINING AND AWARENESS

The latest survey by CILIP CIG (Danskin, 2010) received responses from 78 members of the UK cataloguing community. In the same year, there were 1,378 members of CIG (CILIP CIG, 2011b). The survey was open to members and nonmembers, and we do not know how many nonmembers were among the 78 respondents. Nor do we know how large a proportion of the entire UK cataloguing community is represented in the 1,378 members. Any calculation of the representativeness of the survey can only be generally indicative, but with caution we can state that the 78 respondents equates to (but does not equal) just over 5% of CIG members (CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group, 2011b).

Many of the questions in the CIG survey were optional and so not all questions were answered by all respondents. Of the 66 who answered on their awareness of RDA, 39 (59%) had heard of it, but only 15 (23%) felt they understood it, and 9 (15%) said they would be confident to explain it. At the opposite end of the spectrum, 3 (less than 1%) respondents checked the box for "What is it?" in the survey. Perhaps this last figure is less surprising than it first seems when we consider that of approximately 150 presentations about RDA listed on the web pages of the Joint Steering Committee, only 13 have occurred in the United Kingdom (Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA, 2010b, last checked 21 December 2011).

It is important to acknowledge that the availability of online courses and documentation make it increasingly possible for UK cataloguers to follow developments in the United States. A series of webinars on RDA offered by the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) were specifically recommended by two e-forum participants. The CIG e-forum itself was modeled on the ALCTS e-forum format.

It is equally important to remember that the links between UK cataloguers and colleagues in the United States are largely informal. At the last survey of international members of the American Library Association available on the ALA web site, it was found that

> International members constitute nearly 3.5% of ALA membership. There are ALA members in 80 countries, though close to half of the non-U.S. members are in Canada (American Library Association, 2006).

Similarly, although the U.S. RDA Test Committee accepted test data from "informal testers" no matter their country of origin, application to become a formal test institution was not open to UK cataloguing institutions. This is natural—the tests were convened by the U.S. National Libraries and aimed to provide information about the impact of RDA in the United States. There was not a similar national initiative in the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom's own library association, CILIP, has so far reached the largest audience through its Executive Briefings on RDA. When the first of these was announced in 2010, it sold out in under a week—before it was even advertised in Library + Information Gazette, at that time the main published publicity organ for CILIP members (Welsh, 2010). In publicizing the 2011 briefing (RDA11), CILIP Events stated "Last year's two RDA briefings sold out with almost 180 attendees and were rated 93% Good to Excellent" (CILIP Events, 2011). The speed with which the events sold out could be said to reflect the eagerness of senior library staff to understand the potential impact of the new cataloguing code on their institutions.

The 2010 briefing introduced attendees to RDA and addressed both tran-sitional and future issues, as well as providing a live demonstration of the RDA Toolkit for the first time in the United Kingdom. Presentations included perspectives from the British Library; a library supplier; an experienced bibliographic services manager (based on the last comparably-sized transition, from UKMARC to MARC21); and three iSchool academics, Shawne Miksa, Anne Welsh and Keith Trickey (Taylor & Williams, 2010).

In 2011 Beacher Wiggins (Library of Congress and RDA Committee of Principals) travelled to the United Kingdom twice in the space of a month to address the UK cataloguing community on the progress of the U.S. National tests on RDA at CILIP's executive briefing. The agenda also included an overview of the British Library's preparation for RDA, two UK case studies of university libraries preparing for implementation and a supplier perspective on the transition to RDA (CILIP Events, 2011). CILIP has not publicly announced attendance figures for the two events, but they were high enough for another Executive Briefing on RDA to be planned for 2012 (Russell, 2011, December 14).

In addition to the Executive Briefings, CILIP organized two training courses, "Moving on in MARC21: Potential impact of RDA" (CILIP Training & Development, 2010) and "Getting started with RDA" (CILIP Training & Development, 2011). Both were facilitated by well-known academic and trainer Keith Trickey and included practical cataloguing work using the RDA Toolkit.

Courses such as these are an excellent resource, but are necessarily limited to those who have an employer willing to invest in RDA training or who can afford to attend themselves. As a benchmark on cost, the 2011 course was priced at £200 + VAT for CILIP members and £275 + VAT for nonmembers. In comparison, the last Cataloguing and Indexing Group event for which there were charges was priced at £75 for members and £85 for nonmembers (CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group, 2011d).

The Cataloguing and Indexing Group has always been active in educating members of the profession and keeping them up-to-date with developments in standards. Members of the CIG Committee sit on committees for standards bodies including the CILIP/BL Committee on RDA, and as well as organizing specific training sessions on topics of current interest, each year CIG holds its Standards Forum, which fulfills one of its stated objectives, "to disseminate information on current innovations, standards and practice within the Group's fields of interest." (CILIP Cataloguing and Index- ing Group, 2011a).

Following the style of Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ACLTS) forums in the United States, CIG held an e-forum on RDA specifically focused on the UK perspective. The current article provides an analysis of the discussion that took place during the forum's two days of email conversation between participants.

ANALYSIS OF EMAILS FROM THE CIG E-FORUM ON RDA 2011

Methodology

A spreadsheet was created and the 195 emails from the CIG E-Forum were entered into it. Basic analysis of the number of participants who contributed to the forum and the sectors in which they work was carried out. The emails' contents were analyzed and tagged using informal headings suggested by the body of each email (Table 1). Up to five topics were observed in each, with most emails displaying three or fewer topics. Most emails (53, or 27%) were concerned with training, although 20 emails (10%) shared current practice, and several participants took the opportunity to ask questions about RDA and its implementation (16 emails, or 8%), sometimes apologizing for their lack of knowledge about the new standard (3 emails, or 2%).

Overview

More than 200 people subscribed to the e-forum (Carty & Williams, 2011). Of these, 38 contributed at least one email to the forum. If we took the number of subscribers to be exactly 200, 38 would be 19% total subscribers.

TABLE 1 Email topic categories

Topic Categories							
Training	Resources	Hybrid catalog	RDA Toolkit	Current actions and sharing	US RDA Tests		
RDA11 Implementation	MARC	FRBR	Rule changes	Print	RDA Productivity	Cataloguer judgment	Authority records RDA10
# Emails (n = 195)							
53 (27%)	24 (12%)	21 (11%)	21 (11%)	20 (10%)	17 (9%)	14 (7%)	9 (5%)
8 (4%)	8 (4%)	7 (4%)	7 (4%)	6 (3%)	5 (3%)	4 (2%)	1 (under 1%)

This represents a higher proportion than the general 1% rule of partic- ipation inequality, which states that 1% of participants in online discussions contribute the majority of the content, with a further 9% contributing inter- mittently and 90% reading or observing but without contributing (Nielsen, 2006). As Wu has pointed out, figures in support of the 1% rule are averaged out over a large number of statistics from a wide range of online communities (Wu, 2010).

In analyzing the opinions of this self-selecting group, we must remember that the majority of subscribers to the forum remained silent and did not choose to share opinions or ask questions. However, the emails sent by active participants can be seen to be representative of the UK cataloguing community. A total of 38 people is also just under half the number that Danskin reported had answered one or more of the questions in the 2010 RDA in the UK survey, although we have no way of ascertaining whether all 38 active participants in the forum also took part in that survey.

However, if we consider that there were 1,378 members of CIG at the last count (CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group, 2011b) we can see that 38 equates to just under 3% of this figure and if we take there to be 200 people subscribed to the forum and receiving emails from it, that figure would equate to just over 14%. Observations made based on the emails in the e-forum are, therefore, no more than indicative of the opinions of the UK cataloguing community as a whole. On the other hand, we may assume that since the e-forum was free and not exclusive to CIG members, the self-selecting group who took part represents those members of the UK cataloguing community who were actively interested in RDA in April 2011.

As shown in Table 2, an overwhelming majority of active participants work in the academic sector: 27 participants (69%) had ".ac.uk" email

A. Welsh et al.

TABLE 2 Active participants

Participants							
Academic library	Public library	iSchool (academics)	National library	Vendor (LMS)	Vendor (Records)	Third sector	Independent
# (%)							
27 (69%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	2 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)

addresses but were not library academics. Academics in fact formed the second largest cohort—three

participants (8%), jointly with three (8%) pub- lic library staff. Two participants (5%) worked in national libraries, while one participant (2%) belonged to each of the following sectors: vendor of cataloguing records; vendor of library management systems; the third sector (charities and voluntary organizations); and independent scholar.

Again, as seen in Table 3, the academic sector accounted for the majority of individual emails—133 emails (69%) were sent by academic librarians. Library academics sent 17 emails (9%), closely followed by 15 emails (8%) sent by public librarians. National library staff sent 7 emails (4%), while the participant from the vendor of cataloguing records sent 6 emails (3%). The LMS vendor sent 3 emails (2%) while the third sector employee sent only 1 email (rounded down to 0%). Meanwhile, the independent scholar contributed 11 emails, which was statistically high at 6%—only six emails fewer than the combined total of emails sent by library academics employed by iSchools.

In terms of individual contributions, it is unsurprising that the forum moderators, Carty and Williams, sent more emails than anyone else: 33 (17%) and 31 (16%), respectively. These emails incorporated "administra- tive" emails (introducing the forum, summarizing each day's activities and moving general discussion from one topic to another) and more substantive messages, describing the state of play in their home institutions—both large

TABLE 3 Participant emails

Participants							
Academic librarians	iSchool (academics)	Public librarian	Independent	National library staff	Vendor (Records)	Vendor (LMS)	Third sector
# (%) Emails							
133 (69%)	17 (9%)	15 (8%)	11 (6%)	7 (4%)	6 (3%)	3 (2%)	1 (0%)

academic libraries with strong research reputations. It is worth noting that at the time of the forum, Carty's institution was the only academic library in the United Kingdom known to have a full subscription to the RDA Toolkit, and as a result her emails provided answers to questions from forum participants.

There were 129 emails, excluding the moderators' postings. The average number of emails per participant was 3.5, but this average figure belies the long tail: 23 participants sent three or fewer emails, including 14 people who sent 1 email each. Only three people sent 10 or more emails: an iSchool academic (10), an independent scholar (11), and an academic librarian (13).

Topics

In reading the emails, there were several topics that emerged from the texts. The forum took place a week after CILIP's Executive Briefing on RDA (RDA11), and as this paid event was priced, as its title suggests, for executives to attend, the moderators summarized its contents and answered questions about it. In total, there were 14 emails (7%) about RDA11 and 1 (under 1%) about RDA10. There was also interest in the U.S. RDA Tests (17 emails, or 9%). Another topic that was quite specific in nature was the RDA Toolkit (21 emails, or 11%) and, related to that, the availability of a print version of RDA (7 emails, or 4%). Otherwise, topics were general and open:

• Current actions (20 emails, or 10%) and sharing knowledge (8 emails, or 4%)
• Training (53 emails, or 27%) and Resources (24 emails, or 12%) • Implementation (9 emails, or 5%) and Productivity (6 emails, or 3%) • MARC (8 emails, or 4%) and FRBR (8 emails, or 4%) • The hybrid catalog (21 emails, 11%) and cataloguer judgment (5 emails, or 3%) • Authority records (4 emails, or 2%)

Seven emails (4%) also discussed specific rule changes from AACR2 to RDA. The rest of this article analyses the forum emails on these topics, and contextualizes them within the wider United Kingdom and Anglo-American cataloguing scene.

Current Actions and Sharing

The 20 emails on current actions were sent by 12 cataloguers and one iSchool academic. Later emails in the forum discussed specific training actions and are discussed below in the section on training.

The cataloguers who shared the current actions being taken by their insti- tutions came from eight academic libraries and two public libraries. They all

expressed a "wait and see" attitude, which was reinforced by an observation from the cataloguer working in library supply.

The iSchool academic stated,

One thing that really struck me last year and this year was how hard it was to fill the slot [in CILIP's RDA Executive Briefings] in which practitioners share their experience ... Similarly on RDA-L and AUTOCAT there are few UK practitioners sharing their current experience. I wonder why this is? (Welsh, 2011a)

Four cataloguers responded to this query in 7 emails, giving reasons includ- ing wariness of discussing plans that are "still at a very changeable level" (Williams, 2011d); practical reasons such as lack of access to online tools like wikis, lack of copyright permissions to mount items such as title pages on the public web and the paper-based nature of many training materials (Jardine, 2011; O'Reilly, 2011); and cultural differences between the United States and United Kingdom (Carty, 2011b). Lack of access to the RDA Toolkit and the subsequent difficulty in referencing specific rules was also given as a reason for reluctance in sharing knowledge on general email lists (Williams, 2011d).

One of the outcomes of the e-forum was the production of a list of resources shared by participants (Williams, 2011a). This was the result of 24 emails (12% of the total number of emails) from 14 people (37% of the total number of participants). The contributors to the resource list were nine academic librarians (65% resource list contributors), three iSchool academics (21%), one public librarian (7%), and one independent scholar (7%). This list comprises 25 resources, supplemented by a separate document comprising 14 RDA references from the draft bibliography of a forthcoming book on cataloguing (Welsh and Batley, 2012).

It is interesting to note that of the 38 unique citations on the resource lists, 9 (24%) were produced in the United Kingdom; 18 (47%) in the United States; 1 (3%) in Canada; and 10 (26%) by international organizations includ- ing the JSC and the European RDA Interest Group [EURIG]). A total of 24 (62%) resources were web sites (including blogs) and 11 (29%) were pre- sentations (or web pages listing presentations). Only 1 (3%) book (Oliver, 2010), 1 (3%) book chapter (Tillett, 2007), and 1 (3%) article (Knight, 2011) were included in the lists. The preference for online resources may reflect a desire, at this stage in the introduction of RDA, for materials that are updated regularly. Certainly, Oliver's book was the only monograph on RDA avail- able in the United Kingdom in April 2011, although other book chapters and articles have been published since RDA was first mooted in the mid-2000s.

All 12 cataloguers who shared their current actions stated that they were following events in the United States led by the Library of Congress and were keeping up with reading on RDA. Although each of these practitioners demonstrated themselves to have current knowledge and to be following

best practice, there were expressions of "vague concerns" about the timing of making policy decisions and offering training (cf. Perry, 2011; Francis, 2011).

The impossibility of ignoring RDA even in the short-term was also raised, with cataloguers reporting RDA records in consortia downloads (cf. Perry, 2011; Taylor, 2011).

The Hybrid Catalog

The notion of the "hybrid environment" began to appear with some regularity toward the end of the U.S. RDA Test period. It featured in many of the RDA- related events at the ALA Midwinter meeting in San Diego, January 7–10, 2011, (LeBlanc, 2011) and was also an important part of the presentation given at the CILIP Executive Briefing on RDA by Beacher Wiggins in April 2011 (Carty, 2011a). In the context of discussions about the findings of the RDA Test, the term hybrid primarily concerns combining records created following AACR2 and those created using RDA within one database.

The Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloguing (PCC) of- fers a useful working definition in its Frequently Asked Questions:

There are multiple meanings for this term: hybrid database, hybrid bibli- ographic records, and hybrid headings.

At the database level, there is a hybrid environment when a database adds a new category of records that use a new/different set of rules. Usually over time, the number of records in that database that reflect earlier sets of rules gradually diminishes.

At the bibliographic record level, a hybrid record might have headings reflecting one set of rules and bibliographic description a different set of rules.

In authority records, a hybrid heading could be something like a cor- porate heading where part of the name is established under one set of rules, and another part uses a different set of rules; understandably, we want to avoid this situation.

A hybrid environment could also be applied to the new types of dis- covery environments offered to our users today, where names from ar- ticle metadata and digital library projects mix with formally controlled name headings. All of these meanings of "hybrid environment" apply as we think about RDA implementation. (Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloguing, 2011)

Just a few days before the e-forum took place, the Program for Cooper- ative Cataloguing Policy Committee (PoCo) released a discussion paper on implementation alternatives looking primarily at implications of a hybrid environment where PCC members were creating records using both RDA

and AACR2. Overall, the PCC concluded that "in any scenario, PCC must adapt to a hybrid environment" (Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloguing Policy Committee, 2011, p. 1). Specifically, the committee found:

The cataloguing environment is already hybrid. OCLC WorldCat includes records created under AACR1, AACR2, RDA and a variety of other in- ternational rules. As OCLC continues to pursue global participation, par- ticularly from national libraries, the environment will grow increasingly more diverse. (p. 2)

It also observed:

It is likely that the JSC will continue to focus its attention on the de- velopment of RDA and that ALA will no longer revise AACR2. RDA will continue to evolve over time and will become increasingly divergent from AACR2. Perpetuating the hybrid environment long term will have a nega- tive (and costly) impact on our catalogs and on all areas of bibliographic control. (p. 2)

Further, it offered this definition of the hybrid environment:

One in which PCC libraries could chose to participate following either RDA or AACR2, and encoding in MODS, MARC or other schema. It is understood that while a library may choose to follow AACR2 or RDA, understanding of both cataloguing codes will be required to interpret records correctly, to do record upgrades, and to perform appropriate bib- liographic and authority file maintenance. All existing BIBCO, CONSER and NACO documentation will need to be reviewed. (p. 2)

Given the prominence given to the notion of a "hybrid environment" during the period prior to the e-forum, it is perhaps not surprising that this seemed to be a specific source of anxiety identified during the e-forum discussions. A total of 21 emails out of the total number sent to the forum by 13 participants (34%) from 12 different institutions pertained to this topic. All those involved in this discussion were practitioners coming from nine different academic libraries, one national library, one library management system provider, and one supplier of bibliographic records. It is notable that the topic was first raised at 11:12 on April 18 and ran throughout the two days, with the last email on the hybrid catalog timefranked 19 Apr 2011 15:58:24 +0000.

Overall, the hybrid catalog was a topic raised in response to eight dif- ferent discussion threads within the forum:

1. AACR2 or RDA? 2. RDA in MARC 3. Incoming RDA records

4. AACR2 or RDA? What about the headings? 5. RDA workflows and productivity 6. Developing training for RDA/FRBR etc. 7. Welcome to CIG e-forum Day 2

8. National Libraries implementation

Participants highlighted their discovery of RDA records in consortia down- loads (cf. Perry, 2011; Taylor, 2011); the lack of human intervention in the downloading of records (cf. Arens, 2011; Ryder, 2011); and the potential im- pact of RDA records on a non-RDA catalog managed by a non-RDA-trained cataloguing team (cf. Ransom, 2011; Williams, 2011c).

Of course, the mixing of records within catalogs is nothing new, and this was pointed out by practitioners from institutions old enough to have been cataloguing before the introduction of AACR.

It is always pleasing, when teaching MA LIS students about the hybrid catalog, to be able to point to one of Panizzi's own books as an example of a "hybrid record"—created under an earlier cataloguing system and then amended in places to enable it to coexist with records created under newer systems. The British Library's record for Hosking's Some Observations Upon the Recent Addition of a Reading Room to the British Museum, with Panizzi's manuscript notes, is a case in point (British Library, n.d.). In it we can see that the pre-1968 format, pagination and publication details have been massaged through various data upgrades into the modern MARC catalog as

260 |a pp. 34. Pl. A-E. Edward Stanford: London, 1858. 300 |a fol.

We can see the drawbacks inherent in this record were it to be shared with another database using machine-readable cataloguing with no human intervention (a caveat for the Semantic Web), but we can also see that for the human catalog user, there is no difficulty in understanding this hybrid record in our modern environment (AACR2 in MARC). This record is not only typical of many legacy records found in the British Library system but also those contained within comparable large libraries all over the world. UK cataloguers continue to look to the British Library for guidance on proceeding with the new

cataloguing standard. In the e-forum, Alan Danskin shared information based on the British Library's work so far with RDA:

From a BL perspective we do expect to work in a hybrid environment. We have happily mixed RDA and AACR2 records in a development database on Aleph. We have linked bibliographic and authority data and haven't experienced any significant problems. We anticipate that there will be a long tail of AACR2 users and in the event that we adopt RDA we will continue to accept AACR2 records where these satisfy our quality criteria. We have had to make some changes to our "batch upgrade" routines.

254

These routines are designed to automatically update records for which an LC CIP [Library of Congress Cataloguing in Process record] is available and are quite complex (as the database record may not be the LC CIP, it is just flagged to indicate that a CIP exists). In order to avoid produc- ing hybrid records when a full AACR2 record overwrites a preliminary RDA record, or vice versa we have revised the matching instructions; the merge profiles have been updated to take account of changes in RDA and some post processing fixes have been added to tidy up the final record. We would certainly like to see functionality in Aleph which would pro- vide contextual links from the cataloguer's worksheet to RDA which are similar to those currently enabled for MARC. (Danskin, 2011a)

The e-forum contributor from the LMS company was also reassuring:

As a developer for a LMS, we're not expecting to see significant problems with a hybrid database of AACR2 and RDA records. Having worked for and with several system suppliers over many years, in the design of a catalog, one is much more concerned with the (logical) form of the data . . . I think there are a few areas which may need some care—not least, the issue of possible changes to the form of, for example, personal names . . . but this has been noted by others already. Another example is the handling of parallel titles, I think, where in RDA, parallel titles are included in full in 245, as well as, possibly, in tag 246 . . . There are other changes which, I think, limit some of the functionality which we can currently provide (but fairly minor, I think) . . . I see that several people have expressed some concern about the mixing and matching of RDA and earlier forms. I would be most interested to know if there are some objective problems which we're not aware of, or whether this is more a vague disquiet about the ability of vendors and LMS' to be able to support the situation. (Watson, 2011)

In fact, throughout the two days of the forum there were only 6 emails (3% total emails) discussing OPAC display, which is a surprisingly low fig- ure considering the potential impact afforded by RDA's development using the FRBR model. Existing iterations of "FRBRized" catalogs include Varia- tions/FRBR (Indiana University, 2010) and the RDA Sandbox (VTLS, n.d.), and both demonstrate alternatives to MARC-based catalog systems. Indeed, FRBR itself was the subject of only 8 emails (4%), and 3 of those were sent by iSchool academics.

RDA in MARC

Even MARC was the subject of only 8 emails (4%) out of the total emails sent. The forum took place a month before the Manchester Executive Briefing on RDA (RDA 11 Manchester), at which Beacher Wiggins circulated the press

release for "Transforming our Bibliographic Framework" (Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, 2011). This statement acknowledged that

Spontaneous comments from participants in the US RDA Test show that a broad cross-section of the community feels budgetary pressures but nev- ertheless considers it necessary to replace MARC 21 in order to reap the full benefit of new and emerging content standards. (Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, 2011)

The first of the stated objectives of the working group is to "determine which aspects of current metadata encoding standards should be retained and evolved into a format for the future. We will consider MARC 21, in which billions of records are presently encoded, as well as other initiatives" (Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, 2011).

On 18–19 April, we did not know in the United Kingdom that this statement was being prepared on the other side of the Atlantic. The majority of the participants in the e-forum were silent about encoding format, and it is easy to see the common sense in Rosemary Stenson's view:

Whilst I appreciate that there has to be a wider discussion on RDA beyond MARC, for those of us with busy cataloguing departments to run, our initial concern will be in training cataloguers in RDA encoded in MARC (Stenson, 2011a).

RDA in the United Kingdom: Access to the Toolkit

As well as being unaware that the MARC format might cease to be the main format for bibliographic records, participants in the e-forum had limited experience of the RDA Toolkit. A total of 21 emails (11%)

discussed the Toolkit and 7 emails (4%) were concerned about the availability of a print version.

In the Report and Recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee (2011) it emerged that U.S. cataloguers had reported dissatisfaction with the RDA Toolkit during the U.S. test period. Difficulties in navigation (p. 85) and the lack of an index (p. 85) were both areas that had been criticized by those using the online product. By the time the RDA e-forum was held in the United Kingdom in April 2011, both of these issues had been addressed by the publishers and implemented into the Toolkit (Linker, 2011).

Although nonsubscribers could see these two new sections, which are freely available to everyone, at the time of the e-forum, participants discussed their difficulties in seeing the full content of the RDA Toolkit after the free access period in Summer 2010. At this stage the Toolkit was incomplete, so

it is apparent that parts of the product had not been viewed at all by these members of the UK cataloguing community. All but 2 emails regarding the Toolkit were concerned with lack of access. Two options for a free access period of 30 days have been released since the e-forum occurred.

Three emails stated the difficulties faced by small libraries in affording the RDA Toolkit, and while the print version was welcomed, its cost was seen as prohibitive, and small libraries were instead looking to their LMS providers for guidance, without obtaining access to RDA directly.

The fact that RDA is a closed standard was raised at RDA11, and has also been discussed on RDA-L and AUTOCAT and on UK cata- loging blogs (cf. "Orangeaurochs," 2011). Part of the benefit of the Toolkit comes from the value of workflows contributed by users such as LC (http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/ full report, p. 84), but while the product remains closed, these will be lost to those who cannot afford to pay for access. Two participants reported owning a print copy of RDA, but generally it seemed to be accepted that the online version was easier to use, offered better value for money, was more straightforward to update, and had added value from workflows, mappings, and cross-referencing.

As so few have been able to investigate the complete Toolkit in detail, discussion was mostly limited to cost and access concerns. Only one partic- ipant was confident enough in the Toolkit to anticipate that the costs of it could be recovered by gains in productivity.

Productivity

Mid-afternoon on the first day of the e-forum, participants were asked how much thought they had given to productivity and workflows when introduc- ing RDA. Discussion on this was quite limited (6 emails, or 3%) as it sparked a discussion on the hybrid catalog, but the productivity issues mentioned are nevertheless significant and worthy of brief discussion here.

Four participants (11%) highlighted a concern that productivity would be reduced while cataloguers assimilated new rules, two of them mentioning that, particularly during a time of economic constraint, this would not be acceptable to senior management teams. The replies on this topic came from those at academic libraries, and at two of these institutions, cataloguers also had responsibilities in both acquisitions and repository metadata, and consequently could not afford a slow-down or backlog in cataloguing work, which would have a "knock-on" negative effect on other areas of their work. One respondent was reassured that RDA would be implemented in a MARC environment and that this familiarity would minimize some of the complexity of introducing a new standard, but overall the dominant feeling appeared to be one of concern.

Alan Danskin reported at CILIP's RDA April 2011 Executive Briefing that when considering "factors influencing the decision to implement RDA,"

discussions had concluded that "productivity must be sustained," and "key performance indictors must be satisfied," to the extent that there should be "no net increase in the amount of material routed to professional cataloguers." (Danskin, 2011a, p. 8). At this stage it looked as if one possible way to achieve this would be to take RDA copy records where they were available, but to continue to accept AACR2 records where no RDA record was available and where the AACR2 record was considered fit for purpose (p. 15). This would allow material unlikely to have RDA copy records (such as theses, special collections, older donations, and gray literature), to be dealt with quickly using imported AACR2 records, which may help to offset the inevitable drop in productivity while RDA training and implementation is bedded in. A decision to produce such a policy, however, will lead to an environment in which the hybrid catalog increasingly becomes the norm.

RDA in the United Kingdom: Training

With 53 emails (27%) from 27 participants (71%), training was the topic discussed most often in the e-forum. It was raised for the first time at 11: 24 on April 18th, and topics discussed over the two-day period of the e-forum included whether it was too early to consider training (cf. Francis, 2011); the cost implications (cf. Ryder, 2011); and the timing of training (cf. Stenson, 2011b). Most cataloguers were keen to see training developed by CILIP, CIG, and the consortia, and for training sessions to be equally available to people throughout the country.

By the evening of April 18th it had been suggested that the e-forum format might be adapted to offer a low-cost training option for those wanting to try some RDA cataloguing (Welsh, 2011b). On April 19th expressions of interest were sought by the moderators and received from 17 participants (45%). Of the 14 people who contributed only one email to the forum, 6 (16%) commented to show interest in this idea. The demise of CILIP Training and Development courses in July 2011 after a major review of all CILIP activities increasingly places CIG as the lead contributor to the RDA training scene in the United Kingdom. Overall, the e-forum generated many helpful suggestions for possible training. In response, CIG is preparing to run a practical e-forum in 2012, which will allow librarians and cataloguers to share RDA records, air questions, examine problem areas, and discuss RDA options (Williams, 2011b).

One month in advance of the forum, 10 title pages will be circulated to participants along with a simple cataloguing form for record creation and submission. Co-moderators will collate all the submitted records to present the most common issues or questions raised by each title (Welsh, 2011b). Participants will be able to ask any questions or bring up points of discussion for each record in turn. Subscribers can take part without submitting records personally, but the previous e-forum suggests that many people will be keen

to take advantage of the opportunity to work with RDA. The more records received, the more the exercise will be able to teach about RDA and the current situation across the United Kingdom. CIG hope to make use of the collated data for further analysis or training.

From the analysis of the emails that form the e-forum discussion we can see that this self-selecting group of cataloguers is interested in further training in RDA. Three specific rule changes were flagged as needing further work:

• the Rule of Three—currently an option to retain this rule in RDA • the media, content, and carrier information now covered by recently in-

troduced MARC fields 336–338 • the edition statement in RDA, particularly some confusion as to when an edition is a manifestation and when (if at all) it might be an expression

At a more general level, as discussed above, there was interest in training in FRBR concepts and how these are worked out in RDA.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear from the emails within the e-forum discussion that in April 2011 this self-selecting group of cataloguers in the United Kingdom were concerned about many of the same issues that were raised in the report of the U.S. RDA Tests two months later (U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee, 2011), especially:

• the hybrid catalog and its management • training of staff • the representation of RDA within MARC • access to the RDA Toolkit and the cost of the print version • productivity gains and losses

• timing of implementation • rule changes

It was also evident that participants were looking to the Library of Congress as well as the British Library for guidance on all these issues.

As discussed in this article, participants in the e-forum expressed "vague concerns" about their current actions lest they should be doing more and had already fallen behind. They also gave clear reasons why it is unusual in the United Kingdom for cataloguing training documentation to be published and made freely available on the open Web.

As discussed at the beginning of this article, an awareness of the cur- rent understanding of the main cataloguing standards (AACR2 and RDA) is important when considering the future of bibliographic control. Success in

change management depends to a certain extent on addressing the concerns of current practitioners.

In short, analysis of the emails that constitute the CIG e-forum on RDA in April 2011 reveals that the issues we identify are the same on both sides of the Atlantic, but without the culture of the annual ALA

conference and the structured training provided by the U.S. RDA Test (which can now be cascaded from test institutions to other cataloguing agencies), UK cataloguers in these emails express themselves less confidently about their actions and observations so far. In developing future training, the UK cataloguing com- munity looks to the Library of Congress and other participants in the U.S. RDA Tests for materials and shared practice. We might conclude that the trans-Atlantic gap is not topical but emotional, but no less real for that.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

REFERENCES

American Library Association. ([2006]). International member survey. Sum- mary. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/missionhistory/plan/ international.cfm#;

American Library Association and the Library Association. (1908). Catalog rules: Au- thor and title entries (American ed.) Chicago, IL: American Library Association. Arens, E. (2011). Re: RDA in MARC Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=30010 British Library. (n.d.). Item details [for BL UIN BLL01001740501]. Retrieved from http://primocat.bl.uk/F?func=direct&local_base=PRIMO&doc_number=00174-0501&format=001&con_lng=prm Carty, C. (2011a). Exec briefing on RDA summary [Email to CIG e-Forum, timefranked

18 Apr 2011 09:12:39 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=1265 Carty, C. (2011b). Re: Exec Briefing on RDA summary: Sharing practitioner experi- ence [Email to CIG e-Forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 12:46:51 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=47176 Carty, C., & Williams, H. (2011, June). RDA in the UK: Reflections after the CIG E-Forum on RDA. Catalogue & Index 163, 2–4.

260   A. Welsh et al.

CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group. (2011a). About us. Retrieved from http:// www.CILIP.org.uk/get-involved/special-interest-groups/cataloguing-indexing/ about-us/pages/default.aspx

CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group. (2011b). Annual report 2010: Prepared for the Annual General Meeting of CIG, September 2011. Retrieved from http:// www.CILIP.org.uk/get-involved/special-interest-groups/cataloguing-indexing/ Documents/Annual%20Report%20(for%20CIG%202011%20AGM).pdf

CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group. (2011c). CIG E-Forum archives. April 2011. JISCMAIL. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A1= ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM

CILIP Cataloguing and Indexing Group. (2011d, August 8). Reclassification Event. Catalogue & Index Blog. Retrieved from http://communities.CILIP.org.uk/ blogs/catalogueandindex/archive/2011/08/08/cig-reclassification-event.aspx

CILIP Events. (2011, April 12). RDA: Resource Description and Access execu- tive briefings, London/Wednesday 25 May 2011, Manchester. Retrieved from http://www.cilip.org.uk/rda2011/pages/default.aspx

CILIP Training & Development. (2010). Training directory 2010. Autumn update. Re- trieved from http://www.cilip.org.uk/filedownloadslibrary/training/td_update- web.pdf

CILIP Training & Development. (2011). Training directory 2011. Retrieved from http://www.cilip.org.uk/SiteCollectionDocuments/pdfs/training/Training_ Directory_2011.pdf

Cutter, C. A. (1876). Rules for a printed dictionary catalogue. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Danskin, A. (2010). RDA in the UK: Summary of results. CILIP Cataloguing & Index- ing Group Conference, 2010. Retrieved from www.cilip.org.uk/get-involved/ special-interest-groups/cataloguing-indexing/Documents/CIG%20Conference% 202010/2010DanskinA.ppt

Danskin, A. (2011a). RDA in the British Library, UK and Europe: CILIP Executive Brief- ing, April 12th 2011. Retrieved from http://www.cilip.org.uk/rda2011/Docu ments/Alan%20Danskin.pdf

Danskin, A. (2011b). Re: Welcome to CIG e-forum Day 2 [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 19 Apr 2011 10:16:25 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www. jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P= 90003

Francis, E. (2011). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 11:24:26 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi- bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=24127

Indiana University. (2010). Variations/FRBR: Variations as a testbed for the FRBR conceptual model. Retrieved from http://www.dlib.indiana.edu/projects/ vfrbr/

Jardine, H. (2011). Re: Sharing practitioner experience and materials [Email to CIG e- forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 13:55:56 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www. jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-

FORUM&F=&S=&P= 60215

Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA. (2010a). RDA: resource de- scription and access, RDA Toolkit. Chicago, IL: American Library Association,

Canadian Library Association and CILIP (Chartered Institute of Library and In- formation Professionals). Retrieved from www.rdatoolkit.org/ Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA. (2010b). Presentations on

RDA. Retrieved from http://www.rda-jsc.org/rdapresentations.html Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. (2005). Anglo-American Catalogu- ing Rules (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: American Library Association, Canadian Li- brary Association and CILIP (Chartered Institute of Library and Information

Professionals). Kiorgaard, D.& Kartus, E. (2009). A rose by any other name?: From AACR2 to Re- source Description and Access. Canberra, Australia: National Library of Aus- tralia. Retrieved from http://www.nla.gov.au/openpublish/index.php/nlasp/ article/viewFile/1169/1437

Knight, F. T. (2011). Resource Description and Access: from AACR2 to RDA. Cana- dian Law Library Review, 36(1), 8–12.

LeBlanc, J. (2011, January 22). Notes from the ALA Midwinter Conference. Cornell University Library Conference Wiki. Retrieved from https://confluence.cornell. edu/display/CULCONF/ALA+Midwinter,+2011+%28Jim+LeBlanc%29

Library Association and the American Library Association. (1908). Cataloguing rules: Author and title entries (English ed.). London, United Kingdom: Library Associ- ation.

Library of Congress Network Development and MARC Standards Office. (2006). MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data. Introduction. Washington, DC: Li- brary of Congress. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/ bdintro.html

Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloguing. (2011). Frequently Asked Questions: Program for Cooperative Cataloguing and RDA. Retrieved from http:// www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC-RDA-FAQ.html#PCCandRDA5

Library of Congress Program for Cooperative Cataloguing Policy Committee. (2011). PoCo discussion paper on RDA implementation alternatives (Origi- nal release 4/05/2011; revised 4/15/2011. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/ catdir/pcc/PoCo-RDA-Discussion-Paper040511.pdf

Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. (2008). On the record: Report, January 9, 2008. Washington, DC: Library of Congress. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/lcwg-ontherecord-jan08-final.pdf

Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Con- trol. (2011, May 13). Transforming our bibliographic framework: A state- ment from the Library of Congress. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/marc/ transition/news/framework-051311.html

Linker, T. (2011, March 31). New content and functionality added to the RDA Toolkit. RDA Toolkit Blog. Retrieved from http://www.rdatoolkit.org/blog/119

Ma, J. (2009). Metadata in ARL Libraries: A survey of metadata practices. Journal of Library Metadata, 9(1–2), 1–14.

Nielsen, J. (2006, October 9). Participation inequality: Encouraging more users to contribute. Jacob Nielsen' Alertbox. Retrieved from http://www.useit.com/ alertbox/participation_inequality.html

Oliver, C. (2010). Introducing RDA: A guide to the basics. London, United Kingdom: Facet.

"Orangeaurochs." (2011, March 23). RDA as a closed standard. Aurlog. Retrieved from http://www.aurochs.org/aurlog/2011/03/23/rda-as-a-closed-standard/ O'Reilly, B. (2011). Re: Sharing practitioner experience and materials [Email to CIG e- forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 13:47:23 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www. jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P= 59421

Panizzi, A. (1841). Catalogue of printed books in the British Museum. London, United Kingdom: British Museum.

Perry, J.-C. (2011). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 11:00:37 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin? A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=17556

Ransom, N. (2011). Re: Developing training for RDA/FRBR etc. [Email to CIG e- forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 14:57:17 +0000]. Retrieved from https://www. jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P= 81000

Russell, J. (2011, December 14). RDA in February 2012 [unpublished email from event organizer to Anne Welsh, event chair].

Ryder, J. (2011). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 11:20:41 +0000]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin? A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=39729

Stenson, R. (2011a). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 11:10:36 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/ webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=19576

Stenson, R. (2011b). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CiG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 13:26:14 +0100].

Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/ webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=53959

Taylor, H. (2011). Re: RDA in MARC [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 11:18:14 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin? A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=21375

Taylor, W., & Williams, H. (2010). At the event: RDA (Resource Description and Access). Ariadne 63. Retrieved from http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue63/rda- briefing-rpt/

Tillett, B. B. (2007). FRBR and RDA: Resource Description and Access. In A. G. Taylor (Ed.), Understanding FRBR: What it is and how it will affect our retrieval tools. (pp. 87–95). London, United Kingdom: Libraries Unlimited.

US RDA Test Coordinating Committee. (2011). Report and recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee, May 9, 2011, revised for pub- lic release June 20, 2011. Retrieved from http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic- future/rda/source/rdatesting-finalreport-20june2011.pdf

VTLS. (n.d.) RDA Sandbox. Retrieved from http://www.vtls.com/services/ rdasandbox

Watson, F. (2011). Re: Welcome to CIG e-forum day 2 [Email to CIG e-forum, time- franked 19 Apr 2011 11:21:01 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac. uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=96007

Welsh, A. (2010, February 11). RDA Briefing rerun on March 30. Library Margina- lia. Retrieved from http://annewelsh.wordpress.com/2010/02/11/rda-briefing- rerun/

Welsh, A. (2011a). Exec Briefing on RDA summary: Sharing practitioner ex- perience. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2= ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=41129

Welsh, A. (2011b). Re: Developing training for RDA/FRBR etc. Retrieved from https:// www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=& S=&P=85553

Welsh, A., & Batley, S. (2012). Practical cataloguing: AACR2, RDA and MARC21. London, United Kingdom: Facet.

Williams, H. (2011a). CIG e-forum resources list [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 19 Apr 2011 17:20:02 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi- bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=21375

Williams, H. (2011b, December 14). RDA practical e-forum [Unpublished email to e-forum moderators].

Williams, H. (2011c). RDA workflows & productivity [Email to CIG e-forum, time- franked 18 Apr 2011 14:50:02 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail. ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=64536

Williams, H. (2011d). Re: Exec Briefing on RDA summary: Sharing practi- tioner experience. [Email to CIG e-forum, timefranked 18 Apr 2011 12:33:58 +0100]. Retrieved from https://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind 1104&L=CIG-E-FORUM&F=&S=&P=43567

Wu, M. (2010, March 18). The 90–1-1 rule in reality. Lithium lithosphere. Retrieved from http://lithosphere.lithium.com/t5/Building-Community-the-Platform/The- 90–9-1-Rule-in-Reality/ba-p/5463