

One of the first steps in this study was to create a list of keywords (in English and in French) representing work-to-work bibliographic relationships. Keyword searching was used based on a simple assumption that there are key terms representing bibliographic relationships in bibliographic records that may be helpful in identifying and understanding relationships between different bibliographic entities. These terms are generally scattered all over the bibliographic records, especially in titles, statements of responsibility, and notes.

Data was collected in AMICUS (the Canadian national catalog<sup>24</sup>). The decision to use this source was primarily based upon the fact that AMICUS is the national catalog of Canada maintained by Library and Archives Canada/Bibliothèque et Archives Canada (LAC/BAC), containing over 30 million records,<sup>25</sup> which is large enough to obtain representative data for Canadian publications in all classes of DDC. Collecting data through an online tool meant, however, that the researchers did not have physical access to the material that was retrieved.

As mentioned, an exhaustive list of English and French keywords<sup>26</sup> was constructed to represent every bibliographic relationship listed in Table 5.1 (Work-to-Work Relationships) of the *FRBR Final Report*. In an attempt to find as many records exhibiting a work-to-work relationship as possible we used the “advanced search” function with the “any keywords” key (i.e., all keywords in the record) with a publication date filter set to “2009” and place of publication set to “Canada.” Only LAC/BAC contributed monographic records were considered. Searches were carried out during a four-month period between September 1, 2010 and December 22, 2010.

The retrieved bibliographic records were used as the data for the analysis of bibliographic relationships. Each bibliographic record was manually analyzed to determine the type of relationship expressed and to detect false hits. To determine whether the bibliographic records provided sufficient data on the bibliographic relationships, we carefully read bibliographic information in each record, especially the notes. The type of relationship was often clearly indicated in the record: “Suite de: Hush! Hush!” (sequel); “Supplement to: Doelle, Meinhard, 1964- Environmental law” (supplement); “Illustrations taken from the Max & Ruby animated television series and adapted by Muse Publishing and Communications” (adaptation); “Motion picture based on the novel by Herman Brusselmans” (transformation). In some cases, searching in other bibliographic tools (WorldCat, Amazon, Google Books) was required to determine whether two or more works were related or not. If there were two or more records for the same work (in print, electronic, sound recording, video recording, etc.), only one of them was counted. Records that turned up in more than one search were of course also only counted once.

The frequency of each type of bibliographic relationship was empirically assessed. Analysis was carried out by constructing frequency and cross tables in a spreadsheet. The types of bibliographic relationships were classified and