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Discovering new ways to unpack long ignored descriptions!
Year in Review for the Enslaved Description Group

1. Looking back – beginnings

2. Formulating name entries – based on slaveryCode

3. Conceptual Category Types – descriptions of CPF entities are being revised and expanded
   a. Occupation
      • Slavery Era Occupations
      • Domains - used as tool
   b. Slavery Era Demographic Group – new concept category type
   c. Ethnic Group – proposed concept category type

4. Editorial rules for controlled vocabularies
   – a draft for Standards and Editorial Policy Group review
... last year – I spoke about difficulties in conducting African American research:

• Basic Enslaved Person entries in databases are inconsistent

• Information taken from databases is often dispersed causing loss of relationships to associated facts

• Enslaved Person research & genealogy is more complex than Non-Enslaved Person research & genealogy

• Notes and clues (for further research) are difficult to organize

• Enslaved person research is often indirect ... through various owners, records, locations, occupations, happenstances, etc.

• Complexity makes it difficult to keep the information straight and in focus

• Enslaved person researchers may not know where to look until clue seen

• Enslaved person research does not fit the norms for non-enslaved person research

• **New TOOLS** are needed!!!!!!!!!!! ... could it be slaveryCode?
Remember last year?

We reviewed problems with enslaved person identity and description!

Hitting that “brick wall” may look like this for enslaved person researchers! . . . Very foggy!

How do you know which enslaved “Allen” is yours?

It is not easy to remove bricks!

Question:
What do non-enslaved persons have that most facilitates their research . . . a last name!!!!!
Quick review:

*Shorthand data that stays with a specific name entry from a specific record

Slavery Code Components

What do you know about Allen Battle from this?

Allen (overseer) enslaved Battle James S 1854 Battle Kemp P (Mrs.) Walnut Creek Plantation - Edgecombe Co NC Book

Allen Battle (wife “Sucky” Battle) freedman Battle Kemp P 1866 Edgecombe Co NC Cohabitation Certificate

Allen Battle b. 1808 (farm manager) freedman 1870 Walnut Creek Tshp Tarborough - Edgecombe Co NC 1870-US-Census
Enslaved Description Group
Getting Started Message in December 2020 from Daniel

Starting point and focus ----
- **formulating name entries (1)** for the enslaved that will facilitate research
- devise and relate this to **full description of the enslaved**, and to **description of entities (things) (2)** related to the enslaved.

**Describing** related entities will be essential because:
- know the enslaved largely through the records of those that enslaved them
- name entries will necessarily employ elements that are directly based on
  - names of the related entities
  - records that provide the evidence of an enslaved identity and life

**Currently** formulation of personal name entries in SNAC is based on
- library standard Resource Description and Access (**RDA**)
- components or parts of name entries are based on **UniMarc** (UniMarc explicitly recognizes surnames, whereas surnames are only syntactically implied in MARC21)

Neither **RDA nor UniMarc are sufficient** for formulating the names of the enslaved
- Necessary to focus on how to supplement both to accommodate enslaved name entries
Formulating name entries based on components of slaveryCode

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SlaveryCode Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person first name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formulating name entries based on slaveryCode:

“If the enslaved person . . . has a **sparse name**, that is, consists of a single name component (or perhaps two **when the found reference to the enslaved is an epithet**), then . . .

1. “The record in which the reference is found does not represent documentation of a transfer of custody (ownership, loan, lease . . .), then form the name entry using as many of the following as possible, and in the order presented:

1. Surname [SNAC]
2. Forename [SNAC]
3. **Name addition [SNAC] use for epithets**
4. Owner name entry [or name entry of controlling entity][new]
5. Location
6. Record type [that is, the type of archival record providing evidence] [new]
7. Record date [that is, the date of the archival record providing evidence] [new]

2. The record in which the reference is found represents documentation of a **transfer of custody**, then form the name entry using as many of the following as possible and in the order presented:

1. Surname [SNAC]
2. Forename [SNAC]
3. **Name addition [SNAC] use for epithets**
4. **Repeat** the following for each party in the transaction:
   - 5. Owner name entry [or name entry of controlling entity][new]
   - 6. Location
   - 7. Record type [that is, the type of archival record providing evidence] [new]
   - 8. Record date [that is, the date of the archival record providing evidence] [new]

Glossary: **epithet** (Merriam Webster): a characterizing [descriptive] word or phrase accompanying or occurring in place of the name of a person or thing

Daniel thinking out loud – August 2021: A future concept category “Event type” may be how slaveryCode concepts will be further addressed . . . food for thought!
Bernetiae: We need to recognize that sometimes the occupation, relationship (wife, husband, child, work partnership, etc.), physical characteristics, etc. can form the necessary distinguishing factor for an individual... then we may need to use these in the epithets.

Daniel's questions:
Would we relate a person to an occupation term and then also put the term in a name? And if so, why?

Bernetiae: Yes. Example: The distinguishing name addition uses an epithet “Blacksmith Lewis” or Lewis (“Blacksmith Lewis”).

Daniel's questions:
Why would we include the name of the wife, husband, child or work partner in the name when we can easily display the relations as we do now under Relationships?

Bernetiae's answer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has descendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has family association with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has sibling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has or had spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is or was owner of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has or had owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has or had work relation with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, name additions (epithets) are necessary.
Conceptual Category Types – selected focus:

**Occupations** (Daniel's request – February 2021)
- Slavery Era Occupations
- Domains

**Slavery Era Demographic Group**
- a new conceptual category type

**Ethnic Group**
- a proposed conceptual category type
“first is that there is SNAC as it is right now, and then there is SNAC in the future.”
Daniel Pitti 2021

Let’s look more closely at the record for Frederick Douglass

What is missing?!!!!!
Douglass, born into slavery in 1818 on Maryland’s Eastern Shore, wasn’t always owned by the Auld family. After living with an aunt and his grandmother, he was sent to serve at the Wye Plantation in Talbot County, Maryland. There, he saw the brutality of slavery on full display. His owner and overseer, Aaron Anthony, fed enslaved children from troughs and mercilessly whipped slaves who did not obey his orders quickly enough.

When Frederick was about 10, he was given to Anthony’s daughter, Lucretia Auld. She and her husband Thomas [Auld] sent Douglass to serve his brother, Hugh [Auld], in Baltimore, where he learned to read while working in his owner’s house. In 1833, after Thomas and Hugh got in a dispute, Thomas took back the enslaved workers. Douglass returned to Thomas’s estate the same year and resumed work as a field hand.

Illustrations depicting Frederick Douglass’s life from slavery to abolitionist. (Credit: Photo12/UIG via Getty Images)

With new conceptual category types – we need to revisit biographies and include enslavement description

Present, Future, and Proposed Conceptual Category Types in SNAC – not pleural / additions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biography</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Slavery Era</th>
<th>Demographic Group</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ownedBy (Enslaver) (Overseer)</td>
<td>Wye Plantation Tabot Co, MD</td>
<td>Enslavement Education</td>
<td>Slave atrocity</td>
<td>Domestic servants</td>
<td>Field hands</td>
<td>Domestic service Working in field</td>
<td>Enslaved Freedom seeker</td>
<td>Freedman</td>
<td>Transaction Escape</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupations for Slavery Era Entities

A decision was made to use more inclusive term “slavery era” and not “slave trade” --- applies to enslaved, free, freed, etc. + inclusive of colonial, antebellum, postbellum, etc.

Daniel’s request – February 2021:

Vocabulary management module is being developed in SNAC

- To manage conceptual category type – i.e., subject, occupation, and activity (function) terms

Vocabulary features:

- Preferred terms (Multilingual, for example, a preferred English term, preferred Spanish ....)
- Alternative terms (Synonyms)
- Related terms (Intellectually related; broader; narrower) (Multilingual)
- Scope note (Multilingual)

All the terms are maintained in one table, distinguished within by conceptual category type: subject, occupation, activity ....
### Occupation terms - sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forriers</td>
<td>Persons who shoe horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencers (laborers)</td>
<td>Persons who erect fences to ward off people or animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footmen</td>
<td>Men who, during the slavery era, accompanied carriages either on foot or by standing on exterior carriage boards to announce arrivals. Footmen also served food for meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse breakers</td>
<td>Persons who work to break in horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunters</td>
<td>Persons who hunt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock slaughterers</td>
<td>Persons who slaughter livestock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milkers</td>
<td>Persons who milk an animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muleteers</td>
<td>Persons who transports goods using mules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxen handlers</td>
<td>Persons who take care of or handles oxen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postillions, Postilions, Post boys</td>
<td>Persons who drive post chases or coaches from mounted positions on one of the attached horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranchers</td>
<td>Persons who own or work on ranches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range riders</td>
<td>Persons who ride on ranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropers</td>
<td>Persons who use lassos/ropes/lariats to catch animals, possibly in rodeos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustlers</td>
<td>Persons who steal cows, horses, and other livestock from owners on farms, ranchs, or the ranges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>Sheep herders.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Authority Record - example

**Nannies [preferred] ---- may change with review**
- **UF:** Mammies [non-preferred]
- **UF:** Duennas [non-preferred]
- **UF:** Nursemaids [non-preferred]
- **UF:** Nurses (SEE) [non-preferred]
- **UF:** Childminders [non-preferred]
- **BT:** Domestic servants
- **NT:** Dry nurses
- **NT:** Wet nurses
- **RT:** Sitters
- **RT:** Babysitters
- **RT:** Governesses
- **Domain:** Service work
- **Sub-Domain:** Caregiving work
- **Field of activity:** Caregiving service
- **Scope note:** Persons with charge over the care and protection of one or more children.
- **Historical Use Note:** [blank]
- **SRC:** Art & Architecture Thesaurus (AAT), viewed June 12, 2021 [nannies (domestics (servants), servants, ... URL: http://
- **SRC:** Wiktinary.org, viewed June 12, 2021 [nanny (plural nannies): A child's nurse.] URL: https://
- **SRC:** Wiktinary.org, viewed June 12, 2021 [nursemaid (plural nursemaids): A woman or girl employed to care for children.] URL: https://
Domains were used to organize these terms.

The role of domains is undetermined.

This is a sample from the list of over 400 occupations

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1-PHFP_w0t0x7eWmk-gxrA4m3XFvmmn3J/edit#gid=107158940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Level</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Scope / Short Descriptive Phrase (SEE) – Authority Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Domain</td>
<td>Cane cutters</td>
<td>Cane workers, Sugar cane workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persons who cut sugar cane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton pickers</td>
<td>Cotton-pickers, Cotton harvesters (persons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop Production Sub-Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton harvesters (persons) [preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UF: Cotton-pickers [non-preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UF: Reapers [non-preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BT: Harvesters (persons) [preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BT: Agricultural workers [preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BT: Farm workers [preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NT: Cane cutters (persons) [preferred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domain: Agricultural work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Field of activity: Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Glossary entry: Persons who harvest cotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton balers [SEE]</td>
<td>Persons who bale cotton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cotton ginners</td>
<td>Persons who work with cotton gins.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crop hands (laborers)</td>
<td>Laborers who work with crops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slavery Era Entities
Occupation Domains
(not being used in SNAC at this time)

Service
- Domestic
- Food, Drink, and Lodging
- Caregiving
- Mercantile
- Sex
- Other Service and Maintenance

Agricultural
- Crop Production
- Livestock and Animal Husbandry
- Forestry and Logging
- Insect and Worm

Education
- Noninstitutional Education
- Elementary Education
- Colleges and Universities Education

Financial
- Banking
- Bookkeeping
- Transactional

Transportation
- Overland Transportation
- Waterway Transportation
- Underground Railroad
- Exploration

Government
- Federal Government
- State Government
- Local Government
- Confederate Government
- Municipal Government
- Freedman Towns and Settlement Towns
- Legislative
- Judicial

Spiritual Custom and Practice
- Established Religion
- Spirituality
- Ritual Practitioner

Manufacturing
- Mill
- Textile and Industrial
- Mining
- Crafting, Skilled, and Workshop

Medical

Military

Managerial

Artistic, Creative, and Entertainment
Conceptual Category Types – main EDG focus:

**Occupations** (Daniel’s request – February 2021)
- Slavery Era Occupations
- Domains

**Slavery Era Demographic Group**
- a new conceptual category type

**Ethnic Group**
- a proposed conceptual category type
Slavery Era Entity Type or Enslaved Demographic Term vocabulary (now Slavery Era Demographic Group)

Daniel proposed - February 2021

- demographic term list for enslaved and related entities that can be displayed next to the name (or even, perhaps, strategically inserted into the name string for display)

- develop an Enslaved Demographic Term vocabulary,
  - using the system described above
  - maintain terms for both enslaved and enslavers.

  - want to use it in conjunction with Occupation terms
    Example:
    a Person is Enslaved and a Carpenter.

  - more than one Enslaved term can be associated with the same CPF qualified by a date range
    Example:
    a Person may be Enslaved [date range] and then Freed [date range], as the state of a person in relation to slavery can change over time.
### Slavery Era Demographic Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic group</th>
<th>Variant term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enslaved person</td>
<td>Slave, Captive, Enslaved, Chattel, Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipated (possibly use instead of &quot;Freed&quot;)</td>
<td>Freed, Freedman, Freedwoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free person</td>
<td>Free person of color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freed</td>
<td>Emancipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indentured servant</td>
<td>Bond servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond servant</td>
<td>Bondsman, Bondswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Given own time&quot; enslaved person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abolitionist</th>
<th>Anti-abolitionist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-slavery person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freedom seeker</th>
<th>Alternative to freedom facilitator for enslaved person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runaway, Escapee, Self-emanipated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Enslaved person freedom seeking associated corporate body | |
|----------------------------------------------------------| |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chain gang captive</th>
<th>Chain gangs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chained, shackled, and/or punitive iron wearing person</td>
<td>Chained person, Shackled person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaining, shackling, and punitive iron associated person</th>
<th>Coffle person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coffle person</td>
<td>Coffle slave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chained/Coffle person relate corporate body | |
|------------------------------------------| |
## Review of Conceptual Category Type scope

The list of category types will be extended as the ESPWG considers and approves additional types.

Any given concept may occur in more than one category type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Category Type Name</th>
<th>May be used in the description of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>corporate body, person, or family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>corporate body, person, or family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavery Era Demographic Group</td>
<td>corporate body, person, or family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress made by the Enslaved Description Group for slavery era descriptions

Some of SNAC’s Conceptual Category Types:
- Place
- Subject
- Occupation
- Activity
- Ethnic Group (proposed)

Slavery Era Demographic Group (new)

Daniel thinking out loud – another type in the future: Event (proposed) will help in the description of slaveryCode concepts!

Note: The Enslaved Description Group worked closely on the gold-colored categories.
Quick review again:

How does our work address slaveryCode concepts?

Name + Slavery Era Demographic Group + Relationship + Place + Event type

Conceptual Category Types in the current & future SNAC
Conceptual Category Types – selected focus:

**Occupations** (Daniel's request – February 2021)
- Slavery Era Occupations
- Domains

**Slavery Era Demographic Group**
- a new conceptual category type

**Ethnic Group**
- a proposed conceptual category type
Note: Many ethnonyms or ethnic terms may need **Historical Use Notes** to explain their sensitive inclusion.

*A tool for documenting sensitive and important descriptive data may be the **use of quotation marks for snippets** of written material from original sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Conceptual Category Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Bight of Biafra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>Bight of Biafra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous / Native American</td>
<td>Indian, Redskin, Native Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanga</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkomba</td>
<td>Bight of Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandinga</td>
<td>Upper Guinea, Senegambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metis</td>
<td>Mina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>Mina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatto</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatto gris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulatto rouge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulato</td>
<td>Brazil, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nago/Yoruba</td>
<td>Bight of Benin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nalu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negress</td>
<td>Female African American, Female Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>African American, Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octoroon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pernambuco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadroon</td>
<td>Quarteron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebalo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft of
Editorial Rules for
Controlled Vocabularies (Occupations)

(using ANSI/NISO Guidelines for the Construction, Format, and Management of Monolingual Thesauri)

Formation of a subgroup from the EDG to work on this:
Laura Hart, Stacey Lavender, and Bernetiae Reed

• Rules for Formulation of Terms
• Ethical Considerations in the Selection of Terms
Daniel – February 2021
“... there is SNAC in the future” in development

Instructed our sub-group to draft controlled vocabulary editorial rules for Occupation terms

“... the vocabulary management module in SNAC that will give us the opportunity to manage subject, occupation, and activity (function) terms.”
The NEED FOR VOCABULARY CONTROL arises from two basic features of natural language, namely:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two or more words or terms can be used to represent a single concept (re: Synonyms)</th>
<th>Two or more words can have the same spelling and represent different concepts (re: Qualifiers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Example: Water carriers/Water boys/Water bearers</td>
<td>• Example: Hands (laborers), Fencers (laborers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Three principal methods of control:

| Definition & Scope note – provide scope of use information and/or definitions | Relationship – preferred terms, non-preferred terms (UF, synonyms), BT, NT, RT | Qualifiers – used to distinguish among homographs |
May 20, 2021

Breakthrough on where to focus. (Sample later revised)

Jerry Simmons provided the following:

Sample Authority Record for occupations

Field hand [preferred]
UF: Field worker [non-preferred]
UF: Farm hand [non-preferred]
BT: Farm employee
Domain: Agricultural work
Field of activity: Agriculture [USMARC tag 373]
NT: Cotton field hand
NT: Trash field hand
SRC: Introduction to Jane’s Dictionary of old occupations, 1910: (field hand; also referred to as field worker or farm hand) URI: ...
SRC: Sears list of subject headings, c. 1966.
SRC: Department of Transportation thesaurus online, viewed May 6, 2021. URI: http:
Glossary entry:

Final focus in
EDITORIAL RULES
for controlled vocabularies:

Term Selection and Relationships:
Preferred term
UF = USED FOR or Variant term
(Non-preferred term, Alternate term)
BT = broader term
NT = narrower term
RT = related term

Scope Note (SN) – definition & clarification

Historical Use Note – historical context / specific explanations / sensitivities addressed

Source Citation

(Note: The role of “Domains” is still being considered.)
The initial editorial rules were intended for the Occupation conceptual category type – however, the application appeared often to be broader

- Use the **modern term** as preferred term when the occupation remains current, use the **older term** as the preferred term when the occupation is not current
- **Gender neutral** terms
- Use **humanize** terms as preferred terms. (e.g., “field workers,” not “field hands”)
- **Pleural** terms (because occupations are demographic groups)
- **Capitalized** first word of occupation term
- Use **qualifiers** for homographs in parenthesis – preferred use of “(persons),” not “(laborers)”
- **Preferred** terms (authority records) -- include **all UF non-preferred terms** related to the term
- A compound term **should be used**, instead of a single-word term with a parenthetical qualifier e.g., “harvest workers,” not “harvesters (persons)”
Ethical Considerations in the Selection of Terms  
(included in the editorial rules)

1. **Maximum Inclusion**  
   Examples:  
   “Kitchen workers,” not “Kitchen women”

2. **Gender-specific terms**  
   - Use gender-neutral term for preferred term, if term currently exists  
   - Use older gender-specific term, if term is currently used -- e.g., foreman, cowboy  
   - Use older gender-specific term, if an equivalent gender-neutral format does not exist  
   - Use older gender-specific term with a qualifier, if the term does not currently exist.

3. **Humanizing Terminology**  
   Examples:  
   “Field workers,” not “Field hands” as preferred term

4. **Worker Status (Conceptual Category Type: Occupation)**  
   - Occupation terms must consider the state of employment (paid work) vs non-paid work  
   Examples:  
   “Domestic workers,” not “Domestic employee”

5. **Modern vs. Historical Terminology**  
   - Exceptions to preferred modern term
Introduction to SNAC Controlled Vocabularies

Overview

Controlled Vocabularies are managed or controlled lists of terms that represent concepts, particular categories that are used in the descriptive representation of real world things. Controlling such terms serves discovery and, when discovered, the collocation or grouping of descriptions of things that share the characteristic represented by the term. Within the SNAC, controlled vocabularies are used in the description of CPF entities.

SNAC Vocabulary Management

The SNAC vocabulary management system is based on a basic implementation of SKOS (Simple Knowledge Representation System).

Within each concept category, the vocabulary management system supports the following for each concept within a category:

- **Preferred term.** For each concept, there must be one preferred term. However, a concept may have multiple preferred terms differentiated by language with the same or different language code. In practice, only one preferred term may be used for any one language.

- **Variant term.** For each concept there may be one or more variant terms for the concept. It is recommended that a non-preferred term, alternative term, or USE FOR (for use for) be used.

- **Associated term.** Associated terms are used to relate or associate one concept with another concept. The following types of related terms are supported, though related terms may be extended as necessary:
  - **Related term.** This is used to relate two concepts without specifying how the concepts are related. Most commonly this will relate two concepts that have an intellectual (conceptual) relation of some kind though are not conceptually hierarchical. The relationship indicator for this type of term is RT.

Draft of Controlled Vocabulary Editorial Rules

(Next steps: Review by the Standards and Editorial Policy Group)

Controlled Vocabularies Editorial Rules

A. Term hierarchy and relationships

(SRC: ANSI/NISO Z39.19-2005, 6 Term Choice, Scope, and Form)

Literary warrant provides guidance in the selection of terms and the vocabulary lists will continue to evolve with additions and use.

- **Preferred and Non-Preferred Terms**

  (SRC: ANSI/NISO Z39.19-2005, 6.6 Selecting the Preferred Form)

  - One term in natural language is always the *preferred term* and all other synonyms and sometimes near-synonyms are the *non-preferred terms*.
  - **Multilingual preferred terms (multilingual synonyms)** may be included with any term.
  - Preferred term selection should be determined after consulting with literary, user, and organizational warrants.
  - Abbreviations, initialisms, and acronyms should only be used if well established and if the full form is rarely used.
  - **Full forms of terms** are preferred and should be used unless another form is well established.
  - **Proper names** may be part or all of a preferred term.

B. Relationships of Terms

- **Synonym (Preferred, Used For, Alternative Term)**
- **Semantic Relationships (Non-Preferred Term, Broader Term [BT], Narrower Term [NT], Related Term [RT])**
Speaker: Ibrahima Kourouma
August 28, 2021 (Raleigh NC)

Response: Except for if this legacy is not documented, recorded, discoverable, taught, or respected!!!!!

This is our challenge!!!!!