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Terms of Reference

- to build a conceptual model of Group 3 entities within the FRBR framework as they relate to the aboutness of works,
- to provide a clearly defined, structured frame of reference for relating the data that are recorded in subject authority records to the needs of the users of those records, and
- to assist in an assessment of the potential for international sharing and use of subject authority data both within the library sector and beyond.

FRSAR Activities

- User surveys on the Use of Subject Authority Data
- Investigation of user tasks
- Entities

Use of subject authority data

a. Pilot with Non Library & Information Professionals
b. Library & Information Professionals
World-wide survey (June-September 2006, 798 participants)

Question 2: In what ways do you use controlled vocabulary information?

2a. In cataloging and metadata creation (87%)
2b. In subject authority work (77%)
2c. In searching or helping others search bibliographic information (81%)

User Tasks

FRBR (1998): Find entities of Group 1 that have entities from Group 1, 2, 3 as their subject
Identify Select Obtain

FRAD (2007): Find one entity or entities
Identify an entity
Contextualize, place in context, explore relationships
Justify the form of an access point

FRSAR (2006, 2007): Find one subject entity or entities
Identify Select Obtain

Additional information about the subject entity
Bibliographic records or resources about this subject entity
Explore

FRBR Group 3 entities....

This part of the model has been criticized, because it does not include time and does not cover well activities and processes (e.g., Heaney, 1997; Delsey, T. 2005.)
Study and Discussions

**Different scenarios discussed:**

- Keep FRBR Group 3 entities and only analyse attributes and relationships.
- Add time to the FRBR list.
- Take Ranganathan’s facets as basis.
- Take <indecs> as the basis.
- Make a pragmatic list of entities. One example is the one by Buizza and Guerrini.
- Propose something new.

Two small tests:

Four students and faculty members at Kent State Library school classified existing subject terms used by the NSDL (National Science Digital Library) contributors. These include 3 thousand terms assigned based on a variety of subject vocabularies and free keywords.

Professor Lois Chan classified the subject headings from LCSH she included in her books.

They classified terms into six categories: concrete stuff, abstract stuff, event, time, place, and others.

Test Results

- Blurred distinction between concrete and abstract.
- Confusion about named stuff.
- Lots of terms are put into ‘others’ category.

It will be difficult for any user (end users, librarians (cataloguers and other library professionals), and vocabulary developers) to conduct such a job when using subject authority data;

- Differentiating and categorizing do not seem helpful or necessary to the end users.

3.2 Models discussed

**Kent & Dublin meetings, 2006-12**

- Thema is all the things that could be “subject of” work, including Group 1, Group 2, and Group 3 (=Concepts).

**DC, Kent, & Dublin meetings, 2007-08**

- All the agents to which a library provides access.
- All the agents related to Group 1.
- Additional things that can be “subject of” work.
3.3 Proposal

(a) Choice of terms

- Different and overlapping meaning of ‘subject’, ‘topic’, ‘concept’
- Different views on granularity
- ‘Name’ was understood as ‘proper name’

Therefore:
- Terms from Latin that do not have to be translated and are not loaded with other meanings

(b) Thema

thema: anything that can be subject of a work

work HAS SUBJECT thema

Any thema may have components (parts) which are thema.

Types of thema

Depending on the implementation, thema can have types

Type is the only general attribute, other attributes of a thema are type-dependent

(c) Nomen

Any alpha numeric, sound, visual etc. symbol or combination of symbols by which a thema is known, referred to or addressed

Nomen may have components (parts). These components may (or may not) be nomen on their own. There may be rules governing the structure of nomen.

Nomen attributes and relationships with other entities (include but not limited to)
- Type of nomen (note: see next slide)
- Origin/source: system/vocabulary (LCSH, UDC, ...)
- Medium (alphabetic, sound, visual, ...)
- Language (English, Japanese, Slovenian, ...)
- Script (Cyrillic, Korean, Chinese-simplified, ...)
- Encoding (Latin-1, UTF-8, ...)
- Form (long, short, formula, ...)
- Time of validity
- Place of validity
- Community, for which this is the preferred form
- Status (provisional, accepted, official, ...)

Relationships:
- Rules (AACR2, RDA, PPIAK, BS 8723, ...)
- Resources using/referring to this nomen (relationship with work)

(note: examples of attribute values in parenthesis)
Types of nomen

- Identifier (= name, assigned to an entity, which is persistent and unique within a domain)
- Constructed name (= name constructed in authority control/vocabulary maintenance process, which usually serves as access point) (note: called Controlled access point in FRAD)
- Implementation-specific types, e.g.:
  - Defined by originating system
  - Defined by language
  - ...

(4) Relationships
General relationships between thema (applicable to all types)

- Hierarchical
  - Partitive
  - Generic
  - Instance
- Associative (=other)

Other thema-to-thema relationships are implementation-dependent

Nomen-to-nomen relationships (include but not limited to)
- Partitive
- Equivalence

Equivalence can be specified further, e.g.:
- Replaces/is replaced by
- Has variant form/is variant form
- Has derivation/is derived from
  - Has acronym/is acronym
  - Has abbreviation/is abbreviation
  - Has transliterated form/is transliteration