

bibliographer should ever be held to total perfection.

This publication, along with Henriette Mertz, "Copyright Bibliography for Checking Purposes" (Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1950, 213p.) should be in every library. With them, adequate access to the literature of copyright and literary property will be assured.

Finally, it must be noted that although this work carries a 1971 copyright date, its cut-off date is 1968. It is to be hoped that the author is planning a supplement.—*J. Myron Jacobstein, Law Librarian and Professor of Law, Stanford University, Palo Alto, California.*

Harris, Jessica Lee. **Subject Analysis: Computer Implications of Rigorous Definition.** Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1970. 279p. \$7.50.

In order to comprehend and assess this volume as a unit, its subtitle must be taken seriously. Many who have read other works in the field of "subject analysis" will find Harris' book to be quite different from what they have come to expect. The work is not philosophical or expository in the tradition of Cutter, Mann, Pettee, Haykin, or Metcalfe. On a superficial level it could be "put down" (both literally and figuratively) as being stylistically a technical report rather than a treatise. Despite the paraphernalia of statistical analysis, however, and the formal hypothetical research terminology, Harris' work cannot be dismissed as just another library science dissertation.

Jessica Harris has already established something of a reputation in librarianship on the basis of her work with Theodore Hines, resulting in their 1966 publication, *Computer Filing of Index, Bibliographic, and Catalog Entries*, and as teacher at Columbia University's School of Library Service. Thus the appearance of her dissertation occasions perhaps more notice than would be accorded an unknown writer. Further, Americans have not in recent years written many entire books on subject analysis; thus, greater attention must be paid to the few that do emerge.

"Subject analysis" in Harris' work refers primarily to subject *headings*, and in particular, to those found in the *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the*

Library of Congress, 7th edition. After reviewing some of the history of the development of subject headings in the United States under the aegis of Charles Cutter, Harris delineates four analyses of Library of Congress headings: (1) use of aspect subdivisions, (2) use of adjective-noun phrases, (3) relative scope of headings for use in different types of collections, and (4) use of form headings. For each of these, she designed a specific process of investigation, generally making use of sampling techniques and logical analysis to test a number of hypotheses. On the basis of her findings, she has projected certain adjustments in the form of Library of Congress subject headings which will enable them to be arranged by computer in a filing sequence acceptable for library use. Certain of the modifications are sufficiently formal in nature to be accomplished in a strictly mechanical fashion; others are more subtle, requiring complex judgments which must be implemented manually.

Harris could be charged with rewriting the Library of Congress headings in many cases. She believes, however, on the basis of her four studies, that the recommended adjustments are legitimate and express more accurately and consistently the intent of the headings. It might be noted that John C. Rather, in his "provisional version" (March 1971) of *Filing Arrangement in the Library of Congress Catalogs*, advocates making no such modifications, arguing, "It is illogical to construct a heading one way and then to file it as if it were constructed another way" (p.v).

Whether or not Harris' thesis is convincing, her reworking of the headings could produce a list which—especially in machine-readable form—would lend itself to a more intelligent analysis of the meaning and value of the various types of headings. For example, when inverted headings are changed to nouns with the adjective as a subdivision preceded by a dash, the resultant interfiling of "comma" and "dash" headings raises pertinent questions about the need for both punctuation patterns. From the standpoint of stimulating further research, Harris' suggestions have considerable merit, even though both theoreticians and practitioners may wish to quarrel with her about a number of points.

In sum, Harris' book, while not felicitous in style, embodies suggestions for developing a subject heading list, in machine-manipulable form, which could stimulate considerable investigation into the theory underlying the construction of the headings. Any book with such potential, in these lean years for treatises on the subject, deserves to be taken seriously, even if only to prod the library world toward further research in the field.—*Doralyn J. Hickey, Associate Professor of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

Current Problems in Reference Service.

Thomas J. Galvin. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1971. 162p. \$9.95.

The new Bowker Series in "Problem-Centered Approaches to Librarianship" is designed "to make case studies available for instructional use in all major areas of the library school curriculum, as well as to demonstrate the value of the case study as a vehicle for presentation and analysis of professional problems." This inaugural volume of the series includes thirty-five new case studies in general reference and may be used in conjunction with the thirty case studies published in Mr. Galvin's earlier collection, *Problems in Reference Service: Case Studies in Method and Policy*, also published by Bowker. Those unfamiliar with case study methods and objectives are referred to the "Introduction" to this earlier collection, or to any of several other works listed in a "Selected Bibliography" appended to the present volume.

This new collection should be attractive to anyone engaged in the training of library personnel. The cases are drawn from actual library situations and have been specially selected to represent issues of current concern. One case, for example, poses a problem in performance budgeting. Another deals with the borrower's right to privacy. Several cases involve services to the handicapped or to minority groups. Many older problems are of perennial concern, and thus four cases contain variations on the theme of censorship. The situations presented sometimes go well beyond the usual concept of general reference. One of them requires the design of an acquisitions program for the reference collection of a new, two-year school of engineering technology,

starting with an initial purchase of \$35,000.

As raw material, the cases vary in quality. Some are much richer than others in the possibilities offered for investigation, interpretation, evaluation, and resolution. These possibilities seem greatest when the fundamental issue or problem facing the student is one of administrative decision-making. These cases have many conflicting elements to consider and no "right" answers. It is in the presentation of these kinds of problems that the case study method was developed and has demonstrated its value.

Less successful are those cases primarily concerned with the identification of reference sources and the location of specific information. Such problems are more narrowly limited in scope and lacking in the kinds of conflicting alternatives so favorable for case presentation. One questions the relative effectiveness of the case method with "reference problems" since they appear to gain less by such presentation than do the administrative issues. It is doubtful that any substantial benefit is obtained by dressing up a reference question with dialog which often sounds contrived and with characterization which tends to become caricature. The author suggests evaluating the reference interview in these cases, but this device wears thin after two or three uses.

Despite this criticism, each of the cases has some value as a tool, and the use of a tool has much to do with its effectiveness. Presumably, the successful use of these cases in the classroom has justified their publication here. Another instructor may use them or not, in any way that is profitable and convenient for his purposes. That seems to be just what Galvin intended.—*Larry N. Yarbrough, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.*

The Chinese in California: A Brief Bibliographic History. Gladys C. Hansen, Annot. by William F. Heintz. Portland, Ore.: Richard Abel & Company, 1970. 140p.

Was California discovered by a Buddhist monk in 458 A.D., or by the blown-off-course Chinese sailor-navigator Hee-Lai in 217 B.C.? Did the first Chinese laborers arrive in California in 1815, or in 1848, or at some date in between? Mr. Heintz' annotations, based primarily on Mrs. Hansen's