

Sociology Terminology

Especially as Represented in L.C. Subject Headings
and in the Yale Catalog¹

Miss Meyer, formerly senior cataloger at Yale, is now in the Descriptive Cataloging Division, Library of Congress.

THE PROBLEM of adequate representation of sociological concepts through the subject headings adopted for use in the Public Catalogue has stimulated continuing interest and study on the part of Yale University Library catalogers working in this field. The present investigation, however, will attempt only general exploration of some fundamental points and detailed appraisal of a few important concepts.

The difficulty for the cataloger is greatly augmented by the loose use of terminology still commonly found among sociologists and in the social sciences as a whole. Theorists in these disciplines have long recognized the need for uniformity and exactness. They have realized that most of the subject matter of sociology is close to common everyday life, and that most of its ideas are capable of being expressed with reasonable clarity in ordinary language. They have pointed out the alternatives of drawing words from popular speech and trying to restrict their meanings or of inventing new words to designate particular concepts precisely. Through the years concern for accuracy has grown, and classified lists of terms, detailed glossaries and recently an extensive sociological

dictionary² have been produced. Such results present a hopeful prospect; only as sociologists begin to agree among themselves is it possible for librarians and others to standardize and integrate their handling of sociological terminology.

Subject Heading Theory

It is a generally accepted principle that the scholar who is thoroughly acquainted with the literature of his field usually consults the catalog to find a specific title which he knows contains the material he wants. His needs are thus adequately met by the author card with a call number to supply location in the stacks. But this direct approach is not possible for the student at the elementary and intermediate level of bibliographical knowledge of a discipline; for the lay public; or for the expert, either, when he must stray slightly from his own bailiwick. For these categories of patrons the library must provide subject entries. The cataloger is then immediately confronted with the problem of determining how the catalog user will translate his sometimes carefully delimited, more often vague ideas into words. What verbal concept will come most naturally and often to the largest number of potential readers, and what clues must be supplied to lead the atypical thinker to it?

If the library specializes in a restricted

¹ This paper was prepared in May 1949, for a Yale University Graduate School course, Introduction to Cultural Sociology. It was brought up to date in March 1950, abridged and revised for publication.

² Fairchild, Henry P., ed. *Dictionary of Sociology*. New York, Philosophical Library, 1944.

field of interest where the experts are in reasonable agreement as to terminology, the development of adequate subject headings is relatively simple. It is a question of assimilating and organizing concepts from the literature of a single discipline into a balanced and inclusive list; and adding to it such general terms as may be needed for peripheral areas, expressed in language comprehensible to the selected, homogeneous group. But as the collection seeks to become all things to all men, the difficulties increase in geometric progression. The users now approach the catalog with every sort of point of view and with subject familiarity ranging anywhere from ignorance to wisdom in all areas of knowledge. Furthermore, appropriate words and phrases from one field, after they have been determined, must be integrated with those of every other, and differences in scope and meaning reconciled, so that one guide may attempt to lead all searchers on their diverse quests. While the university library may assume a fairly high level of general education on the part of all of its patrons who have any real claim on its services, rather than having to cope with the completely heterogeneous clientele that besieges the public library, there are few subject fields which it dares or cares to ignore, and requirements of the beginning student as well as the fully qualified specialist ranging in unknown territory must always be considered.

To meet these needs, catalogers long ago³ laid down the rule of specific entry: prescribing selection of the subject heading which most closely fits the contents of the book, rather than grouping under broad topics. Recent studies in the use of the catalog, however, give indication that this principle is not known or is not understood

³ Cutter, Charles A. *Rules for a Dictionary Catalogue*. 3d ed. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1891. (U.S. Bureau of Education. Special Report on Public Libraries, Part II.) p.46-47.

by a large proportion of both undergraduates⁴ and graduate students⁵ who search for topics there. Nor is the system of *see also* references, which aims to tie all special aspects to the more general term, more skillfully utilized for the most part.⁶ These references are reciprocal only horizontally between related headings of relatively equal complexity. In a vertical plane they constitute a one-way road, leading always from inclusive heading to its parts but supposedly never vice versa. Thus they tacitly recognize the public's unwillingness to particularize and suggest the extent to which it may be appropriate. Employed in this fashion they may even penalize the experienced catalog user who does turn first to the most specific wording. If the library has no material on that aspect alone, he will find no clue there. He is not only required to realize the possibility that there may be useful material under a larger subject, but must also be capable of assigning his small topic to the correct comprehensive category one or more steps up in the hierarchy and know how to select helpful titles there. Moreover, the question of exactly how specific headings can be without scattering material more than the size of the collection and catalog⁷ and the needs of patrons⁸ war-rant must be faced by every library.

Another difficulty is introduced when the topic in the catalog user's mind, though a valid and definite concept, has no precise name. Under such circumstances it is not possible to group such material as a unit in the catalog.⁹ This is paradoxically both akin to and the reverse of the situation

⁴ Knapp, Patricia B. "The Subject Catalog in the College Library. An Investigation of Terminology." *Library Quarterly*, 14:223, 225, July 1944.

⁵ Brown, Margaret C. "The Graduate Student's Use of the Subject Catalog." *College and Research Libraries*, 8:207, July 1947.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p.205, 207-08.

⁷ Gull, C. D. "Some Remarks on Subject Headings." *Special Libraries*, 40:83, March 1949.

⁸ Pettee, Julia. *Subject Headings; the History and Theory of the Alphabetical Subject Approach to Books*. New York, Wilson, 1946. p.80-81.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p.60-61.

when the cataloger has a book in hand with vague or assorted contents that defy pigeonholing under any meaningful subject. The name is not only a fundamental prerequisite for entry, but it may serve as a focal point where aspects, uses and connotations from various fields meet, as they cannot in a logical classification.¹⁰

The cataloger must also cope with the problem of keeping subject headings up to date. New ideas and objects come into being constantly and receive sometimes a variety of names, one of which must be selected for catalog use and linked with its closest relatives through references. Old terms, moreover, acquire altered meanings or become obsolete, and the subject list must follow along as best it can. If a new heading is adopted too rapidly, choice may fall on a form which does not gain general acceptance. If caution delays decisions too long, a just complaint of antiquated terminology is raised. It has been claimed, however, that leaving older material under the popular catchword of that moment is a comparatively innocuous practice that may even "serve to collect books on a particular phase of public opinion."¹¹ Some necessity for change may be averted, too, "by avoiding popular terminology in favor of an exact if slightly broader meaning."¹²

Because library staffs usually do not have the resources of money, time and personnel sufficiently qualified in all fields that the establishing and constant refurbishing of their own files of subject headings would require, adoption of the standard Library of Congress list has been general practice. Ordinarily there are at least a few variations to suit the local scene, but administrative economy prescribes that these be kept to a minimum.¹³ Yet in some areas this list,

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.57-60.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p.81.

¹² Knapp, Patricia B. "The Subject Catalog in the College Library. The Background of Subject Cataloging." *Library Quarterly*, 14:111, April 1944.

¹³ Pettee, *op.cit.*, p.82.

as its latest introduction admits,¹⁴ has just evolved without rational planning to meet each need as encountered and without much concern for integration and consistency. There has always been criticism, now of this feature, now of that; the investigation of college student use of subject headings mentioned above makes several recommendations for revolutionary changes in certain basic principles, for which its findings indicate some need.¹⁵ Another recent critic¹⁶ condemns inconsistency in the handling of compound adjective-and-noun headings, where the approved entry in some cases is under the adjective, and in others under noun with modifier appended. She proposes a major upset of tradition by which such subjects would be treated as personal names (always inverted) with consistent entry under the noun, very much as titles are handled in German trade bibliography. The catalog user would then be drilled not merely to seek a specific concept, but, more definitely, a specific *noun*, and then a specific aspect as a subdivision under it. For subject headings in the fields of science and technology, however, a Library of Congress expert has just last year expressed a preference for the direct adjective-noun approach.¹⁷ All such suggestions show at least a healthy concern with a vital problem area.

Current Interpretations of Certain Sociological Concepts.

At this point it is proposed to examine a few significant terms and ideas from the field of sociology to see how certain authorities have defined them and to consider how

¹⁴ U.S. Library of Congress. Subject Cataloging Division. *Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress*. 5th ed. Washington, 1948. p.iii.

¹⁵ Knapp, Patricia B. "The Subject Catalog in the College Library: An Investigation of Terminology." *Library Quarterly*, 14:225-27, July 1944.

¹⁶ Prevost, Marie Louise. "An Approach to Theory and Method in General Subject Heading." *Library Quarterly*, 16:140-51, April 1946.

¹⁷ Gull, *op.cit.*, p.83-87.

they are treated in the catalog. As a beginning the word *sociology* itself seems appropriate. E. E. Eubank, perhaps the leading semanticist of the discipline, rejects "the scientific study of society" as entirely too broad, analyzes the pronouncements of a dozen experts and summarizes in a vein of discouragement:

Thus, according to the several viewpoints obtaining in these definitions, from standard sources, Sociology is variously conceived of as having as its basic idea *association*, or *process*, or *processes*, or *contact*, or *interests*, or *relation*, or *forces*, or *group*, or *achievement*, or *structure*, or *control*. Of course these definitions are not necessarily contradictory; but certainly one who is not sufficiently familiar with sociological theory to reconcile the various approaches has ample ground for feeling that he is confronting a hopeless confusion!¹⁸

Yet at the end of his volume he has reached this conclusion:

Sociology may be defined as the science of the associated life of men, considered with explicit or implicit reference to these seven major categories [*i.e.*, The Single Human Being, The Human Plural, Societary Energy, Societary Control, Societary Action, Societary Relationship, and Culture]¹⁹

The glossary in C. M. Panunzio's textbook supplies etymology followed by the explanation:

The science or discipline which deals with the collective, unspecialized aspects of human behavior; particularly with the phenomena of the origins, structures, changes, functions, adjustments, maladjustments, and similar phases of human society.²⁰

Included are statements from Edwin R. A. Seligman and Russell Gordon Smith, as

¹⁸ Eubank, Earle E. *The Concepts of Sociology; a Treatise Presenting a Suggested Organization of Sociological Theory in Terms of its Major Concepts*. Boston, Heath, 1932. p. 47.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 386.

²⁰ Panunzio, Constantine M. *Major Social Institutions; an Introduction*. New York, Macmillan, 1939. p.563.

well as cross references to and from the entry for the "science of society," where an almost identical definition is given.²¹ E. B. Reuter proposes:

The discipline that undertakes to isolate and define the processes of social interaction that result in human personality and social organization. It seeks to formulate natural laws and generalizations in regard to human nature and society that are of universal validity.²²

Fairchild's *Dictionary of Sociology*, finally, recognizes various schools of thought and attempts reconciliation in "The scientific study of the phenomena arising out of the group relations of human beings. The study of man and his human environment in their relations to each other."²³ Like Panunzio, he lists *science of society* as well, delimiting it thus: "The body of knowledge derived from the systematic observation and conceptualization of those social relationships and social processes which exist as a result of human association."²⁴ For material covering these general concepts both Library of Congress and Yale University Library catalogs use only the heading SOCIOLOGY.

Social change is a valid and independent concept in sociological thinking. Eubank distinguishes between the connotation given in Ogburn's work,²⁵ where it is confined to the development of human culture, and his own use of the term as a "generic designation for all societary modification," including "any alteration that occurs in (1) the position or (2) the condition of anything from a state previously existent," both as action and as a series of relationships.²⁶ Panunzio supplies a reference to *change*

²¹ *Ibid.*, p.557.

²² Reuter, Edward B. *Handbook of Sociology*. New York, Dryden Press, 1941. (Dryden Press Handbooks) p.157.

²³ Fairchild, *op.cit.*, p.302.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p.268.

²⁵ Ogburn, William F. *Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature*. New York, Huebsch, 1922.

²⁶ Eubank, *op.cit.*, p.261, 264.

from *cultural change* but not from *social change*, and defines the first as

the process by which a pre-existing culture trait or complex undergoes alteration as a result of its coming into contact with another culture or as a result of discovery, invention, or other cause.²⁷

Ogburn's remarks on *cultural change*, in the same work Eubank mentions, are cited as an example. Reuter lumps definitions of both aspects under *change*: "Any alteration of a pre-existing element or complex. Culture change is any alteration of a culture trait or complex; social change refers to an alteration in social relations."²⁸ References are supplied from both *cultural change* and *social change*. Fairchild defines *change* in general, plus nine special varieties, including a very comprehensive *social change*—"variations or modifications in any aspect of social process, pattern, or form"²⁹—and *cultural change*—"modifications in the civilization of a people, *i.e.*, in the man-made environment, occurring either automatically or by design."³⁰ In spite of the specific entry principle, the subject heading authorized by both Library of Congress and Yale is again SOCIOLOGY, with a second entry under CIVILIZATION, or CIVILIZATION—HIST., in certain cases.

Social control is another aspect of sociology which neither Yale nor Library of Congress has conceded an independent existence in the catalog. Again one must search through the SOCIOLOGY file for apt titles, most of which have additional entry under SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. The *Public Affairs Information Service* index also tosses *social control* in with *sociology* without reference. Eubank finds that the majority of "existing definitions of this concept are incomplete or ambiguous."³¹ Again he construes

broadly, including in what he calls *societary control*, "whatever way any person or group exercises influence or constraint which modifies the behavior, thought, or feeling of any other person or group."³² Panunzio has a double-barreled definition of *control*, referred to from *social control*:

(1) The process by which society guides or forces its members to conform to established modes of group behavior and by which it punishes departures from the regulations it establishes; (2) the attempt to subject the social processes to more conscious guidance.³³

Reuter gives a lengthy explanation under *control, social*, which incorporates quotations from four other sociological writers (none of whom were cited in Eubank's survey) and careful distinguishing of *social control* from *control* in general and other special types of control.³⁴ Fairchild's volume again is most specific, with explanations for *control* per se and for 14 varieties of it, including *control, culture; social control; societal control; control, subsocial; control, super-social; and social constraint*—all separately described.³⁵ *Social control*, moreover, shades off into the concept of *leadership*, separately treated in all four of the works just mentioned and also accorded independent entry in the library catalog. Off on further tangents are *authority* and *dictators*, also utilized as subject headings. According to Eubank:

Conflict has for its immediate objective the elimination of one's opponent from the contest, either by getting rid of him entirely, or by reducing him to a status of subordination where he must acknowledge his conqueror's supremacy in the particular issue in which they are engaged.³⁶

This same explanation is quoted as the second part of the definition in Panunzio's

²⁷ Panunzio, *op.cit.*, p.527.

²⁸ Reuter, *op.cit.*, p.90.

²⁹ Fairchild, *op.cit.*, p.277.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p.80.

³¹ Eubank, *op.cit.*, p.216.

³² *Ibid.*, p.219.

³³ Panunzio, *op.cit.*, p.532.

³⁴ Reuter, *op.cit.*, p.102-03.

³⁵ Fairchild, *op.cit.*, p.66-67, 279, 299.

³⁶ Eubank, *op.cit.*, p.293.

glossary.³⁷ Reuter, however, grants separate consideration to *conflict*; *groups*, *conflict*; *conflict*, *mental*; *conflict mind-set*; and *conflict of values*.³⁸ Here again Fairchild's dictionary discusses the general term and also various phases, one of them being *social conflict*.³⁹ In spite of such common acceptance of the concept as an entity by sociologists, it is almost impossible to track down this material in the catalog. One follows a devious trail leading through EVIL, NON-RESISTANCE TO; EVIL, PROBLEM OF; ANTIPATHIES AND PREJUDICES; BATTLES; COMBAT; WAR; FIGHTING (PSYCHOLOGY); FIGHTING, HAND-TO-HAND; AGGRESSION (INTERNATIONAL LAW). But it is all a wild goose chase as far as locating any substantial amount of literature with sociological implications. Even when one tries individual books dealing with the topic, they turn up classified as psychology, political science or sociology, and entered in the catalog under such vague labels as SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY; PSYCHOLOGY, PATHOLOGICAL; or just plain SOCIOLOGY.

Other perfectly legitimate sociological concepts which cause difficulty because the catalog does not recognize them specifically might be briefly mentioned. One is *Industrial Sociology*, for which, in addition to consulting the few cards under the new heading PSYCHOLOGY, INDUSTRIAL, combing lengthy files under SOCIOLOGY; LABOR AND LABORING CLASSES; and INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS seems to be the only resort. It should be noted here that the *Public Affairs Information Service* index, usually more ready to adopt new terminology than the Library of Congress, also clings to *sociology* for *industrial sociology*, without benefit of reference either.

³⁷ Panunzio, *op.cit.*, p. 531.

³⁸ Reuter, *op.cit.*, p. 98-99, 122.

³⁹ Fairchild, *op.cit.*, p. 58-59, 278.

Communication in the sociological sense may seem elusive too, since it has been scattered through the heterogeneous file under the double heading COMMUNICATION AND TRAFFIC. There is also *sociology of knowledge*, for which one may try IDEOLOGY, SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, and the 800 cards under KNOWLEDGE, THEORY OF, most of which represent philosophical treatises; or somewhat more efficiently, consult the shelf list under SOCIOLOGY: PHILOSOPHY, THEORY, METHOD, where this topic is mixed in with statistical methods of social investigation. For those seeking what has sometimes been known as "social anthropology" ETHNOLOGY AND SOCIETY, PRIMITIVE, appear to be the "Open, Sesame," although no reference reveals it. Finally, material on social theory and groups as such (unless definitely from the social work point of view) is also to be dug out from the comprehensive SOCIOLOGY catchall, although the group concept usually is brought out under SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY as well.

Specific Sociological Subject Headings

It now seems profitable to reverse the procedure just followed and to consider what the sociologist may expect to find when he seeks under certain subject headings in the catalog. Again SOCIOLOGY is the starting point. If one may assume for these purposes that the title accurately indicates the scope of the book (admitting, of course, that it in many instances may not), the cards filed under this word in the Yale University Library Public Catalogue represent all treatises on the whole field of sociology and the science of society (if there is any real difference); such aspects as social control, social theory, industrial sociology, groups, general applied sociology; odd titles on leadership, ecology, historical sociology; and some material quite outside the field where the approach is strongly sociological,

or the relation to sociology is stressed. Such subdivisions as ADDRESSES, ESSAYS, LECTURES; BIBLIOGRAPHY; BIO-BIBLIOGRAPHY; CLASSIFICATION; DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPEDIAS; HISTORY; INDEXES; METHODOLOGY; OUTLINES, SYLLABI, ETC.; SOCIETIES; STUDY AND TEACHING; TERMINOLOGY; TEXT-BOOKS; and YEAR-BOOKS are also used. Inverted headings SOCIOLOGY, CHRISTIAN; SOCIOLOGY, JEWISH; SOCIOLOGY, RURAL; and SOCIOLOGY, URBAN follow after. The last is a Yale innovation, which substitutes for Library of Congress's CITY AND TOWN LIFE; it was preferred because analogous to SOCIOLOGY, RURAL, which both libraries use. *See also* references, filed before the SOCIOLOGY subject cards, lead to a multitude of related and subordinate topics; those employed at Yale, however, differ rather widely from the ones suggested in the Library of Congress current list.

Both Yale and Library of Congress omit either entry or reference under the word SOCIETY standing alone, but each uses SOCIETIES for material on voluntary organized groups. Distinctions are established, furthermore, between SOCIETIES and ASSOCIATION AND ASSOCIATIONS, as well as between SOCIETIES (in general) and various special types, such as LEARNED SOCIETIES, SECRET SOCIETIES, COOPERATIVE SOCIETIES, etc. In this section of the catalog, however, one encounters the inverted, anthropological subject SOCIETY, PRIMITIVE. The Yale catalog has some 200 entries here, for those titles which cover many facets of life in a number of primitive groups, and for some which are studies of individual tribes. Treatises on particular aspects such as the family, education, political institutions, dancing, philosophy, and even use of alcohol commonly have additional entry here, supplementing that under the special topic. SOCIETY, PRIMITIVE is the specific entry

authorized for general works on the economic life of prehistoric man and of other primitive groups, although much of this material is duplicated under INDUSTRIES, PRIMITIVE. Yale directs the reader to seek further under CLANS AND CLAN SYSTEM; GIPSIES; INDIANS—SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOMS; MAN, PREHISTORIC; NOMADS; RELIGION, PRIMITIVE; TRIBES AND TRIBAL SYSTEM; and VILLAGE COMMUNITIES. The Library of Congress lists AGRICULTURE, PRIMITIVE; ART, PRIMITIVE; CANNIBALISM; INDUSTRIES, PRIMITIVE; LAW, PRIMITIVE; MUSIC, PRIMITIVE; TABOO; and TOTEMISM besides.

There is an interesting history behind COMMUNICATION AND TRAFFIC, a double heading of the type condemned by some of the experts,⁴⁰ where several areas of knowledge come together and overlap a little. About two years ago the Library of Congress finally plucked out titles on TRAFFIC ENGINEERING and TRAFFIC SURVEYS, and set up these last as independent headings. Yale did likewise, and inserted the following explanation at the beginning of the file, still following Library of Congress:

Here are entered works on communication in its widest sense, including the written and spoken word. Works on a particular medium of communication are entered under its name, e.g. Shipping, Telecommunication, Radio broadcasting, etc. Communication in the sense of transportation of persons or goods is entered under the heading Transportation.

However, late in 1949, the Library of Congress yielded to the inevitable and finally produced a completely separate heading COMMUNICATION, thus delimited:

Here are entered works on human communication, including both the primary techniques of language, pictures, etc., and the secondary techniques which facilitate the process, such as the press and radio. Works dealing with individual means of communication are entered

⁴⁰ For one denunciation see Prevost, *op.cit.*, p.145.

under the headings Language and languages, Printing, Telecommunication, etc. Works dealing collectively with the industries concerned are entered under the heading Communication and traffic.

A *see* reference is provided from MASS COMMUNICATION, and a *see also* from SOCIOLOGY, as well as references in both directions for LANGUAGE AND LANGUAGES. A reference is also indicated to the old form COMMUNICATION AND TRAFFIC, where a new explanation now appears:

Here are entered works dealing collectively with the communication industries. Works dealing with individual means of communication are entered under the headings Radio broadcasting, Shipping, Telecommunication, etc.

Yale approves this most recent distinction and will follow along in its catalog with a project for the immediate future of combing entries under COMMUNICATION AND TRAFFIC for desirable transfers to the new heading. The latter will then have sociological and language significance, while the former will become primarily an economic topic. Meanwhile much technical material still remains there, as well as treatises, discussions, collections on both halves of the heading from psychological, legal, business, historical, geographical and political points of view.

There is much gold for sociologists under SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, too, but it must be extracted from a file of some 400 cards for general works, plus 50 more under the subdivision TEXT-BOOKS. The range of this subject is very close to and overlaps a little with those of both PERSONALITY and PSYCHOLOGY, APPLIED; it includes material on social control and on conflict as well. From SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY a web of references reach out to other topics on the sociology-psychology borderline: ACCULTURATION; ATTITUDE (PSYCHOLOGY); CLASS DISTINC-

TION; CROWDS; ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY; GROUPS; INTERVIEWING; LEADERSHIP; MORALE; NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS; PRISON PSYCHOLOGY; PROPAGANDA; PSYCHOANALYSIS; PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE; PSYCHOLOGY, APPLIED; PSYCHOLOGY, FORENSIC; PUBLIC OPINION; REVOLUTION; SOCIOMETRY; STEREOTYPE (PSYCHOLOGY). The Library of Congress, however, differs slightly from Yale in the relationships it recognizes here; its list omits ACCULTURATION; CLASS DISTINCTION; PROPAGANDA; PSYCHOANALYSIS; and REVOLUTION, but suggests the alternatives ANOMY and PRESTIGE.

An appraisal of some of these related subjects may have interest and value. LEADERSHIP, besides constituting one of the approaches to works on social control, collects material concerned with such diverse topics as principles of command in the Army and Navy, the conduct of meetings and discussion groups, theories of the functions of the nobility and the philosophy of national socialism. It represents one aspect of certain titles in the areas of national and international politics, labor relations, employment management and religious education, as well as in pure psychology. Yale offers no clues to further searching here, though the Library of Congress list provides for a reference to DISCUSSION. One is led on to LYNCH LAW; MOBS and RIOTS, however, from the heading CROWDS. The cards here deal with politics, strikes and revolutions, and there is usually another entry under SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY.

No material is entered in the catalog under CLASS or CLASSES, but Yale has elected to interpret CLASS DISTINCTION broadly and to attract there MARXIST CLASS STRUGGLE, to which the Library of Congress has granted an independent existence. CLASS DISTINCTION at Yale also covers titles dealing with various forms of antagonism and

of social cleavage, in both primitive and advanced societies, including even works where the legal aspect is stressed. The catalog user is sent elsewhere, however, for specific information on ARISTOCRACY; CASTE; EQUALITY; LEISURE CLASS; MIDDLE CLASSES; NOBILITY; PRECEDENCE; SERFDOM; and SLAVERY. The Library of Congress is less generous with suggested alternatives, but, interestingly enough, prescribes a reference from, rather than to, EQUALITY.

Under MAN—INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENT Yale has again deliberately cast adrift from Library of Congress policy. According to the latter, ethnological, psychological and sociological works are all attracted here, but references lead on to ACCLIMATIZATION; ATTITUDE, INFLUENCE OF; ANTHROPO-GEOGRAPHY; COLOR OF MAN; EUTHENICS; REGIONALISM; and WEATHER—MENTAL AND PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS. These appear to lay somewhat heavy stress on physical aspects. Yale, however, has adopted the following definition: Here are entered works on the influence of environment, particularly social environment, on man. For works dealing specifically with the influence of geographical environment, see Anthro-geo-graphy.

The subject as thus constituted includes most of the writings on the heredity-versus-environment controversy, although these also have entry under HEREDITY or HEREDITY, HUMAN, to cover the opposite side. In addition, through a heterogeneous accumulation of cards here, one may wander off into a consideration of the main topic in special relation to children, twins, inventions, racial differences, factories, public opinion, intelligence, psychology of learning, vocational choice, juvenile delinquency, health, psychoses, the divergent effects of urban and rural life or who gets into *Who's Who* or the Hall of Fame!

Deviation from Library of Congress prac-

tice, even with such an explicit explanation as is supplied for MAN—INFLUENCE OF ENVIRONMENT, is fraught with potential danger. The careless or unwitting cataloger who does not realize the significance of Yale's departure here is all too prone to follow Library of Congress suggestions without question when new material is being handled in the future. In addition to SOCIOLOGY, URBAN, already mentioned, Yale has also adopted an independent course in the regions where religion and sociology meet. In place of Library of Congress' CHURCH AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS, which covers the concrete and practical aspects of the church's treatment of social problems, the Yale catalog user is directed to CHURCH AND LABOR; CHURCH AND POLITICS; CHURCH CHARITIES; MISSIONS, HOME; SOCIALISM, CHRISTIAN; SOCIOLOGY, CHRISTIAN; and WAR AND RELIGION. The heading RELIGION AND SOCIOLOGY is used by both institutions, but the Library of Congress emphasizes that it is not restricted to Christianity, whereas Yale delimits its area as "works on the contribution of social factors to the origin of religious ideas and on the interdependence of the social needs of man and transcendent spiritual forces." Both have entered material under SOCIOLOGY, CHRISTIAN, also, which the Library of Congress considers to be abstract social theory from a Christian point of view, and which Yale maintains should be "works on the obligation implicit in Christianity to society for the promotion of social welfare and all works discussing the application of Christian principles to general economic, social, or political conditions." Yale divides its file of cards here, first into three date groups, then by denomination and by country. Although Yale's procedures here have been formulated and initiated by experts who could legitimately set up particular interpretations for its catalog, it is

significant that newer materials flowing into these subjects seem to bring them closer and closer to their Library of Congress connotations.

Time and space do not permit further detailed consideration of individual subjects, although CULTURE; ETHNOPSYCHOLOGY; SOCIAL CONDITIONS; SOCIAL ETHICS; and SOCIAL PROBLEMS suggest themselves as profitable points for investigation. A logical and thoroughgoing coordination and subordination of the subject headings that have been treated, a complete analysis of *see* and *see also* references, and a systematic indication of the connections between particular subject headings and particular niches in the classification would also have been desirable but could not feasibly be included here.

In Conclusion

It should now be possible to point out a few implications of the preceding discussion for the cataloger who wishes to meet more adequately the requirements of the sociological public. (1) More and better definitions of subject headings should be provided, as noted in an appraisal of subject headings eight years ago.⁴¹ The most useful explanatory card not only clarifies the scope of the topic in question, but also draws sharp lines between it and the related headings which also appear in the catalog and sends the reader to the one of them which more exactly represents what he is seeking. (2) Continued and continuous scanning of current writings in the sociological field to glean new ideas and new and changed terminology should aid in keeping headings up to date and in supplying truly adequate references, of both the *see* and *see also* varieties. (3) Deviate from Library of Congress usage at one's peril, however, and

only with extraordinary justification! Even though today the cataloger might be able to produce independently a more logical organization of headings in some particular area, will successors five, 10, or 20 years later understand and consistently apply the distinctions set up? (4) In the solution of the whole subject heading problem, finally, more studies of the use of the catalog, especially like the one centering on graduate students of the social sciences mentioned above⁴² and more attention to and adoption of changes specifically or implicitly advocated should return large dividends. Indeed, several of the more fruitful ideas developed in this paper originated in the questions and comments of sociology students somewhat baffled by the catalog's subject ramifications.

For this latter group some practical suggestions can be offered, too. (1) Remember the rule of specific entry. But if first search there reveals nothing, material broader in scope under a more inclusive term, to which no reference will ordinarily lead, may yield chapters on the desired topic. In any event, read through definitions and *see also* references carefully before leaping into the file of subject cards. Also consider the possibility that a subdivision, which follows the group of general works and for which a guide card may or may not be supplied, may better serve the particular need of the moment.⁴³ (2) When one suitable work has been located, note subject headings traced for it and follow appropriate leads. (3) When search under subjects in the catalog seems hopeless, consult sociological bibliographies for specific titles and look for them under their authors in the catalog. The subject headings which the catalog

(Continued on page 157)

⁴¹ Tauber, Maurice F. "Subject Cataloging and Classification Approaching the Crossroads." *College and Research Libraries*, 3:150, March 1942.

⁴² Brown, *op.cit.*, p.203-08, 217.
⁴³ Knapp, Patricia B. "The Subject Catalog in the College Library. An Investigation of Terminology." *Library Quarterly*, 14:221, 223, 225, 227, July 1944.

education, business, commerce and other magazines. *Life* was read by 35 per cent of the students, *Time* by 29 per cent, *Saturday Evening Post* by 21 per cent, *Reader's Digest* by 14 per cent, *Newsweek* by 12 per cent, *Collier's* by 8 per cent, and *Look* by 6 per cent. None of these magazines have a Flesch score above "standard" and four are below. Six magazines were selected at random from the long list of those mentioned only once (viz., *Better Homes and Gardens*, *Successful Farming*, *Glamour*, *Mademoiselle*, *Christian Century*, *Farm and Home Science*). When the Flesch score was calculated for these magazines all but one was found to have a reading level above "standard" and the sixth was at "standard."

In summary, the typical student spends four hours each week on his recreational reading. This includes books, magazines and newspapers but excludes reading assigned in classes. He spends relatively the same amount of time on his reading as his female classmates. He reads neither more nor less than married students. If he is a

veteran, chances are that he spends more time on his reading than does the non-veteran. Whether he is a freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior determines to a great degree the amount of reading he does. As he progresses from freshman to senior year, he reads more. Likewise the busy student engaged in outside activities and work reads more than the one who is not so occupied. Chances are two to three that he reads one book or less a month. These same odds hold in that he will read two or more magazines a week, and two or more newspapers daily. Of the books he reads, 61 per cent will be fiction. The leading contenders for his nonfiction reading are history, biography and travel. Most of the books read will have a readability level classified by Flesch as standard—that is, readable by the average American citizen. He reads generously among the general, pictorial and news magazines. Chances are one to three that he will read *Life* magazine every week. No matter what magazine is read, in all probability it will be of a standard or below standard level of difficulty.

Sociology Terminology

(Continued from page 154)

uses for such material can be determined from the tracings, and other works may then be sought there. Moreover, investigation in the field of literature has shown that there at least the catalog, even when supplemented by the classification, can never hope to rival subject bibliographies in completeness and effectiveness for use.⁴⁴ (4) Get acquainted with the Library of Congress printed list, shelved very close to the catalog. It contains some references not in the card catalog; it shows all entries and references under *Social*, for example, much

faster than one can determine them by checking through the catalog trays; and it saves time and foot-mileage tramping from alcove to alcove. (5) Remember that often no books have yet been written on very new topics, and the periodical indexes are the logical tools to consult first. (6) The catalog in general can exercise no discrimination as to the value of material included, and the user must separate as best he can the good from the mediocre and irrelevant by observing dates of publication, publisher, series or sponsoring body (if any), as well as author, title and contents (if enumerated).

⁴⁴Swank, Raynard C. "The Organization of Library Materials for Research in English Literature." *Library Quarterly*, 15:49-74, January 1945.