language, beginning with a brief summary of the basics of U. S. copyright law and its implications for the profession. This is the most technical section of the book; however, it does an excellent job of describing the substance and nuances of these confusing sections of U.S. code, as well as the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, and a range of legal issues relating to technology, access, and potential legal changes with emerging technologies.

In the section entitled “Working with Patrons,” the two chapters address the importance of protecting the privacy of patrons and the implications of the Americans with Disabilities Act on library and electronic resources access. Library security expert Bruce Shuman discusses levels of security and ways to ensure that those who work in and use public buildings enjoy a secure environment.

Although legal issues of immediate significance dominate this work, an important section deals with the somewhat more immutable subject of ethics and ethical behavior in the life of the information professional. One chapter limits its focus to ethics in the virtual realm of e-commerce, whereas a second places classical ethical norms of truth, justice, and freedom within the context of professional decision making on issues such as privacy, intellectual property, information quality, and information access. The third chapter in this thoughtful section deals specifically with putting professional ethics into practice.

This book is written as a handbook to help information professionals understand legal issues. It concludes with a section on drafting and implementing policies as well as a list of resources. It is important to note that no work can serve as a definitive guide to the shifting landscape of laws regulating museums, archives, and libraries, and none can substitute for an attorney’s legal advice. The most one can hope for in a book like Libraries, Museums, and Archives is that it will offer a detailed overview of current playing field. This fine volume does that admirably.—Gene Hyde, Lyon College.


This reviewer, who finds it difficult to dislike any book, was disappointed by this one. Based on the author’s doctoral dissertation (University of North Carolina, 1999), the work reports on a study made to identify and examine the cognitive processes involved in the assignment of subject headings through a case study of catalogers. The thought processes that go into subject cataloging have received sparse attention, and the topic is deserving of scholarly exploration. This study makes a definite contribution to the quite limited body of literature. Sauperl’s failure to explain certain aspects of her research methodology frequently cause the reader to become puzzled, however, if not frustrated. The printed text itself could have been improved by careful editing and some rewriting.

The work is organized into seven chapters. An introduction discusses the purpose of the study and very briefly describes the research strategy. The second chapter reviews the treatment of subject determination as presented in cataloging and indexing textbooks and discusses the previous research concerned with subject analysis and indexing. The inclusion of indexing research strengthens the study and is to be applauded. The third chapter describes the research methodology. Chapter four, “Twelve Personal Approaches to Subject Cataloging,” presents the case studies. Being ninety-five pages in length, it forms the core of the book. Chapter five summarizes what was learned from the case studies. Chapter six presents a model for subject analysis. Chapter seven discusses the author’s findings in relation to earlier studies and the implication of those findings for cataloging education and cataloging in libraries. The section concerned with previous research has a fair amount of redundancy with chapter three. Although repetition of this
nature is not uncommon in dissertations, less detail in one chapter or the other would have been preferable in the book. A bibliography and an index conclude the volume.

Sauperl’s case study participants were twelve experienced original catalogers from three academic libraries in the Southeastern U.S. Each institution had “more than a million volumes ... several branch libraries and large central cataloging departments with several catalogers performing original cataloging. All the libraries used OCLC.” Each participant performed original cataloging for three books of his or her own selection. Except for the first case study, however, participants only “describe cataloging of one of the three items.” The reason for imposing this limitation in a study, that by its very nature is already quite limited, is not stated.

Six catalogers were observed by Sauperl, who used the “think-aloud method ... to capture the cognitive process of the catalogers during their work.” The other six were interviewed. The respective methodologies are discussed, but the rationale for their dual employment is nowhere stated. Sauperl does comment that the different methods had a substantial impact on the reports of the case studies. “While the observed catalogers actually cataloged books during the observation session, the interviewed catalogers only talked about their cataloging approach. This means the stories of the observed catalogers are much more detailed and based on evidence from the observation, whereas the stories of the interviewed catalogers are quite brief and skeletal.”

Interviewed participants were asked to describe some recent work they had cataloged, given the opportunity to explain their philosophy of cataloging, and so on. The interviews were structured inasmuch as individuals were asked to respond to and discuss, as they deemed appropriate, the relation of a number of factors to subject cataloging.

Each participant was presented with several factors that “were selected from the observation session of one or two catalogers in another library in the study.” Participants were therefore not responding to a uniform set of factors, a circumstance that Sauperl leaves unexplained. The responses given to the variables were interesting and informative. This reviewer believes the study would have been stronger had a comprehensive set of variables been developed and each participant in the three groups presented with the same identical factors to prompt discussion.

There are several problems with the handling of the variables. Given their importance to the interviews, Sauperl’s failure to discuss them in a separately labeled section of the text must be faulted. She also must be faulted for explicitly stating the complete set of variables for just one interviewee group. No comparable sets are provided for interviewees in the other two groups. One learns the factors used to prompt discussion with these interviewees only in the text. Variables or concepts presented to the first group included such expected elements as authority file, local catalog, title page, record for a previous edition, tentative heading and subject heading, as well as such factors as time and cost. Participants in this group were not asked to comment on the importance of the author’s intention, skimming the work, and thinking of the library user as a part of the process when choosing subject headings, variables included as prompts to another group of interviewees. Cooperation with colleagues and “saturation point ... that feeling when you had to stop” working with a given book, were among the other variables.

Despite its shortcomings, this is not an unimportant work. Scholars of subject cataloging will obviously be its primary audience. The study provides a base for future research and, given its moderate price, should be owned by any library and information science collection that supports serious scholarship. The book is worth consideration as supplementary reading for cataloging courses. Catalogers should at least skim the work, especially those at entry level and mid-career.
By way of conclusion, it seemed only appropriate to check WorldCat to look at the subject headings assigned to this work. A title search (done on August 9, 2002) retrieved five records, two for the book and three for the preceding dissertation. The record for the book in hand (OCLC: 48588266) had two subjects: “Subject cataloging” and “Subject cataloging—United States—Case studies.” A second record (OCLC: 50100464), which had an identical bibliographic description except for pagination being noted 192 (versus 173 for the copy in hand), gave the single subject: “Subject cataloging.” The record for the printed version of the dissertation (OCLC: 42810541) had three subjects: “Subject cataloging,” “Subject headings,” and “Catalogers—United States—Attitudes.” The final records were for microform versions of the dissertation. The records for both the microfilm (OCLC:44492710) and the microfiche (OCLC: 44161585) gave the two identical headings: “Subject cataloging” and “Subject headings.” The subjects given all seem appropriate, even if they are not entirely consistent. This reviewer would suggest adding another subject heading to bring out the cognitive aspects of the study. But that’s just a thought.—James W. Williams, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign.


How did humans make their way from an oral tradition in Homeric or pre-Homeric times to the language of computer programs today? That is exactly the question that Julian Warner addresses in his 2001 book, Information, Knowledge, Text. On the faculty of the School of Management and Economics, The Queen’s University of Belfast, Warner may seem an unlikely candidate to find his way to a topic steeped in the academic study of information but, in fact, he has written extensively in this area. Library Literature and Information Science lists forty-two citations for his work, including many book reviews of related studies. His approach is thorough, academic, credible, and quite interesting. The bibliography at the back of the book is extensive and wide-ranging. The chapters have, as Warner states in the preface, all “previously undergone editorial and … full peer review as either journal articles or conference presentations.” Warner made appropriate revisions to the original articles to “avoid repetition and increase coherence.” He has looked well after his new readers, as the chapters do provide a coherent collection. Regarding repetition, however, this reader could have done with fewer references to Bacon’s famous statement, “Writing [maketh] an exact man.” The book finishes with republished reviews written by Warner of books that allow him to continue his exploration of the symbology and significance of writing. There is no index included at the back of this book, an omission this reviewer found unfortunate.

Taken individually, the chapters stand on their own. In the first chapter, “Studying Writing,” a careful analysis of Roy Harris’s The Origin of Writing (1986) and Signs of Writing (1995), Warner begins to persuade the reader that the route from spoken to written communication was sure and inexorable. The chapters that follow build on exactly this argument. The semiotic approach to language and its relationship to signs throughout human history is persuasive, if not always easy. By the third chapter, “Not the Exact Words…: Writing, Computing, and Exactness,” Warner has