1. Introduction

Library catalog has a long history in Korea, but the General list of Gyujang(Gyujangchongmok), the first catalogue for an library collections in Korea was published in 1781.

In relation to cataloging rules, Cataloging Rules for Oriental Books in Korea(compiled by Bongsok Park) were released in 1948, these rules have prescribed to transcribe title first in the descriptions in bibliographic record. After these rules, Han-Un Catalog Rules(Catalog Rules for the Bank of Korea) published in 1954 were evaluated as the first rules to prescribe author main entry in Korea.

Korean Cataloging Rules, the first standard cataloging rules in Korea were published in 1964, revised edition(KCR2) in 1966, and third edition(hereinafter referred to as KCR3) in 1981 respectively. The KCR3 accepted the principles prescribed in the International Standard Bibliographic Description and adopted cataloging system which completes bibliographic record only with description. The KCR3 were considered very significant in the nation's bibliographic history in that they used, as their underlying description rule, the Korean traditional practice of under the title of a publication first, in line with the International Standard Bibliographic Description. However, the KCR3 were pointed out as having a couple of limitations: 1) The materials for description were limited mainly to printed media and 2) the advent of machine-readable catalogs required a new perspective toward the matter of the traditional selection and format of headings.

In order to resolve the limitations of KCR3, the fourth edition of Korean Cataloging Rules (KCR4) were released in 2003, which basically employed the description system of KCR3 with an addition of diversity in bibliographic features of multiform media including publications but without specific prescriptions for the selection and form of headings.
2. Key Features of KCR4

The main features of KCR4 are as follows:

First, KCR4 are the first set of rules to specify the functions of catalogs. While the existing KCRs failed to clearly state the intentions behind the rules, KCR4 expressively provided the functions of catalogs.

Second, KCR4 extended the objects of description for cataloging from current printed media including monographs, to various other types of media including multimedia resources.

Third, in an online environment, the way of description and arrangement of bibliographic data is different from that of traditional printed catalogs. Tracing, which has been used to designate the type and form of a heading, is a good example. The array of bibliographic records is differently processed in an online environment. In addition, the arrangement of bibliographic records in a file is decided irrespective of forms of headings. Therefore, a new term, ‘access points,’ came into use for ‘headings.’

Fourth, there is, in principle, no limitation to the number of authors in statements of responsibility. In case there are more than three authors for a resource with no indication of the principal author, the previous KCRs allowed only the first author to be described in the statement of responsibility while excluding the rest, which restricted the functioning of catalogs. In order to resolve the constraint, the new rules allow all the persons specified in the work to be described in the statement of responsibility.

Fifth, in principle, the concept of main entry headings has been excluded from cataloging because 1) it was difficult to define absolute criteria for determining a main entry heading, 2) there is no added entry in machine-readable cataloging which makes only one bibliographic record for a certain level of bibliographical material, and more importantly 3) the main entry heading does not by itself fulfill the objectives of the catalog. We can not find any differentiation between the functions of main entry headings and those of other access points including cross reference in the catalog. In other words, the main entry heading is only one of several approaches to a resource. For reasons such as these, the main entry heading needs to be understood as one of the access points in various types. As linking techniques can associate
the same access points of different forms together, the rules for selection of a main heading have been excluded from the cataloging rules.

3. Future's Tasks

1) Redefinition of Functions of Catalogs

FRBR has added a new function to cataloging: to find, identify, select, obtain and navigate bibliographic entities. In addition, FRBR applies an entity-relationship model to bibliographic records, focusing on works and expressions related to a certain person or corporate body. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce the FRBR-defined functions and relationship models in KCRs.

2) Subject Headings with a New Structure

Instead of pre-coordinated subject headings that are in current use, new subject headings that adopt a post-coordination method for determining relationships among terms needs to be developed. In addition, it is also necessary to develop a system capable of searching across different forms of subject headings in a simultaneous fashion. This should include the development of a language conversion system that synchronously searches for corresponding subject headings in foreign languages as well.

3) Development of an Authority System

The traditional control method has been to prescribe a particular form as the standard and consistently apply it throughout the catalog. However, this method ignores user-specific linguistic customs. For the following reasons, it is thus necessary to accept variations of headings in order to reflect the specific linguistic environment individual users are in and to satisfy their desire for knowledge.

(1) We identify any objects or entities we face in our daily lives in the names of their various forms. As a personal name described in a resource is one independent bibliographic identity, we have also to use the name of the same form in the bibliographic record. This simplifies the process of determining headings that are expressed in the user's language and scripts. 'Bibliographic identity' here refers to a name used by the creator in his/her works. For example,
below are the names that the author used in his works and yet they are two independent bibliographic identities.

Euclid and his modern rivals / Charles L. Dodgson
Alice's adventures in Wonderland / Lewis Carroll

Lewis Carroll as a novelist is a bibliographically different entity from Charles Lutwidge Dodgson as a mathematician. Therefore, these persons must be represented in independent forms in two different records. The authority control system will play the role of linking the two entities together.

(2) The way names are expressed varies, depending on which language or culture one is exposed to(e.g., ‘공자, 孔子, こうし, Confucius’). In this regard, one cannot just pick a single form as the standard. If one sets a particular system as the standard authority rule, people not only from different language zones with different cultures but also within the same languages and cultural boundaries will suffer limitations in their access. For example, among the three different names that refer to the same person, ‘Kim, So Wol,’(김소월) ‘Kim, Jung Sik’(김정식) and ‘So-wol,’(소월) which do you think should be the standard form for authority control? Moreover, as names change over time and different names are adopted depending on a period or styles of literatures, it is difficult to call one particular form the standard. Even within the same language area, securing consistency in form is extremely difficult due to spelling differences(e.g., labor vs. labour) and transliteration gaps. Given the above, the following new authority control method will be worth considering:

① Using the International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN) as an identifier, find a way to converge different names of the same person. Use of the ISADN will help identify names of a person or a corporate body regardless of languages or cataloging rules employed, allowing various representations of a name to be linked together across bibliographic files.

② UBC suggests the minimum key data elements to be included in authority records for resource sharing and recommends the method of simultaneous search of multiple national authority files by applying a standard form to certain entities and linking records for the same entities. Libraries of each nation can map relevant records on the internet through cross-referencing or by authority record number. In this way, access points of different forms will be linked together without a uniform standard. The individual users or libraries will be allowed to
choose their own form (or default form). It is a method of linking variant access points using the user-selected form or structure including scripts or languages.

3. It is necessary to expand the functions of access points by linking personal names, corporate name, geographic name or subject headings that work as access points with other relevant information sources such as dictionaries, glossaries, biographical dictionaries, etc. This will enormously improve the opportunity of users' access to information.

The ability of linking access points of different forms of same entities now allows us to share authority data at an international level. In other words, whatever forms the users choose from the catalog, they can find the right access point in the form they want, overcoming the limitations posed by languages or scripts. The sharing of authority information is expected to expand the function of catalogs to play the role of a general gateway to knowledge.

4. Combination of Bibliographic Descriptions and Resources

This is about recording basic metadata in addition to title, author and production date when producing electronic resources. This will enable the cataloger to extend records by adding subject headings and classification notations as necessary and to express the relationship between a person and a corporate body. On the users' side, they can obtain the book from an online bookstore system connected to the search system.
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