

CONTENTS

MEMBERS OF THE IFLA WORKING GROUP ON THE FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBJECT AUTHORITY RECORDS (FRSAR)	4
1. BACKGROUND.....	6
2. PURPOSE AND SCOPE.....	8
2.1 PURPOSE	8
2.2 SCOPE	9
2.3 ABOUTNESS AND OFNESS.....	10
2.4 METHOD	12
2.5 COMPONENTS OF THE STUDY	12
3. ENTITIES.....	14
3.1 DIAGRAMMING CONVENTIONS.....	14
3.2 GENERAL FRAMEWORK.....	14
3.3 CHOICE OF TERMS FOR FRSAD ENTITIES	16
3.4 THEMA.....	16
3.5 NOMEN	18
4. ATTRIBUTES	19
4.1 ATTRIBUTES OF A THEMA.....	19
4.2 ATTRIBUTES OF A NOMEN	21
5. RELATIONSHIPS.....	25
5.1 WORK-TO-THEMA RELATIONSHIP	25
5.2 THEMA-TO-NOMEN RELATIONSHIP	25
5.3 THEMA-TO-THEMA RELATIONSHIPS.....	26
5.4 NOMEN-TO-NOMEN RELATIONSHIPS	31
6. USER TASKS	33
6.1 USERS AND USE	33
6.2 USER TASKS	34
6.3 ASSESSING VALUES RELATIVE TO USER TASKS	35
6.4 MAPPING OF ATTRIBUTES, RELATIONSHIPS, AND USER TASKS.....	37
7. CONCLUSION.....	38
APPENDIX A. MODELING ABOUTNESS.....	39
A.1 SUBJECT RELATIONSHIP AND GROUP 3 ENTITIES INTRODUCED IN FRBR	39
A.2 POSSIBLE APPROACHES TO THE MODEL OF ABOUTNESS	40
APPENDIX B. RELATIONSHIP OF FRSAD WITH FRBR AND FRAD	45
B.1 RELATIONSHIP OF FRSAD WITH FRBR.....	45
B.2 RELATIONSHIP OF FRSAD WITH FRAD	46
APPENDIX C. FRSAD MODEL AND OTHER MODELS.....	48
C.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE THEMA-NOMEN MODEL	48
C.2 MAPPING THE FRSAD MODEL TO OTHER MODELS.....	49
C.3 CONCLUSION	50
APPENDIX D. EXAMPLES FROM SUBJECT AUTHORITY SYSTEMS.....	51
D.1 EXISTING MODELS OF THEMA TYPES.....	51
D.2 THEMA-THEMA RELATIONSHIPS PRESENTED IN SUBJECT AUTHORITY DATA.....	55

D.3	SAME THEMA REPRESENTED BY NOMENS FROM DIFFERENT SCHEMES.....	68
D.4	EXAMPLES OF DISPLAY RECORDS FROM CONTROLLED VOCABULARIES OR SUBJECT AUTHORITY FILES	68
REFERENCES	73