port, which should prove invaluable to
future surveyors—in fact already has pro-
voked the basic pattern for two other univer-
sity library surveys.—G. Flint Purdy,
Wayne University, Detroit.

Reading in General Education; an Ex-
ploratory Study. William S. Gray,
ed. American Council on Education,
Washington, 1940. xii + 464 pp.
$2.50.

That reading cannot be regarded as a
tool or facility which is acquired in
elementary school and to which no further
attention need be given has been empha-
sized by numerous studies in recent years.
It now seems clear that the development
of the art of reading must occupy the
attention of elementary, high-school, and
college teachers, and likewise of public,
school, and college librarians.

Many specific phases of the problem of
reading are still under investigation. The
present collection of eleven thorough and
well-documented studies by both teachers
and librarians is intended to be “an
intensive, critical study of the present
status, recent trends, and current issues in
reading, with special reference to high
schools and junior colleges, and to identify
problems that are in urgent need of
further investigation.” It constitutes the
report of the Subcommittee on Reading in
General Education of the Committee on
Measurement and Guidance of the Ameri-
can Council on Education. Funds were
supplied by the General Education Board.

The individual studies are quite spe-
cialized and reflect, of course, the par-
ticular interests of the specialists who have
prepared them. For this reason some of
them will be of greater interest to
librarians than others, even though it
might be difficult to select any as in-
trinsically more important or more val-
ueable than others.

After a rather general statement by
Neal M. Cross concerning the responsi-
bility of teachers in developing satis-
factory reading programs, entitled “Social
Change, General Education, and Read-
ing,” William S. Gray analyzes the
various interpretations of the term “read-
ing” and the factors that influence the
reading act. This second study, “Reading
and Factors Influencing Reading Effi-
ciency,” stresses the importance of con-
tinuing the search for needed facts and
using these facts in developing greater
reading efficiency.

In the third study, “Relation of Read-
ing to Other Forms of Learning,” Edgar
Dale considers reading in its relation to
the various other methods of communicat-
ing experience (pictures, radio, etc.) that
may be used in general education. Louis
C. Zahner, in “Approach to Reading
through Analysis of Meanings,” suggests
the creation of a central institute like the
Orthological Institute in London to carry
on and coordinate research in the teaching
of reading, while Bernice E. Leary and
William S. Gray, in “Reading Problems
in Content Fields,” indicate certain prac-
tices and procedures that teachers may
follow in guiding the improvement of
reading in any field.

The sixth study, “American Culture
and the Teaching of Literature,” by Lou
L. LaBrant, will be of general interest,
but librarians will be particularly inter-
ested in the following study, “Reading
Interests and Tastes,” by Harold A. An-
derson, since it touches on the problem
not only of stimulating interest in reading
but of developing tastes for good reading.

Studies eight, nine, and ten, “Diffi-
culties in Reading Material,” by Bernice
E. Leary, “Diagnosis and Remediation,” by Ruth Strang, and “Techniques of Appraisal,” by J. Wayne Wrightstone, again concern themselves with the mechanics of reading. Finally, the eleventh study, entitled “The Library,” by Edward A. Wight and Leon Carnovsky, “is concerned primarily with considerations of facilitating the union between the book and the reader.” Here are discussed such familiar topics as “Functions of the Library,” “Physical Plant and Equipment,” “Library Content,” “Instruction in the Use of the Library,” “Stimulating Use of the Library,” “Measuring Use,” “Personnel,” and “Technical Work,” with reference, of course, to high-school and junior-college libraries.

As a treatment of reading per se the total effect of this series of studies is highly impressive. It is well, however, to go back to Mr. Anderson’s study and let ourselves be reminded again that the art of reading is not an end in itself. In the final analysis how well or how much people, and particularly students, read, must always be subordinate to what they read and what they enjoy reading. Perhaps even an exploratory study might have given more attention to the latter question.—John J. Lund, Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Notes Used on Catalog Cards, a List of Examples. Olive Swain. American Library Association, 1940. viii, 11, 102p. $1.25 (Planographed)

To most catalogers, this carefully selected list of notes to be used on catalog cards will be a welcome addition to the small body of literature in their field, very little of which has been written concerning notes. One is reminded of the earlier lists, compiled by Robinson Spencer and by the Twin City Regional Group of Catalogers, which have been so much in demand through the years. One can assume that this one will be even more generally used than the others.

The title indicates a broader scope than is actually covered by the list, which is a tool for the general cataloger and not for the specialist, and which excludes notes which would be used only in serial cataloging. The usefulness of the list would be increased considerably if notes for serials were included. The arrangement is an alphabetical one, by headings under which one might look to find notes describing features of a book; as, Cover-title; Dedications; Dissertations, Academic; Editions, etc. Under headings, a further alphabetic order is followed in listing the notes. The same note may be given under two or more headings, as “Part of thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Chicago, 1938,” which appears under the headings “Dissertations, Academic,” and “Source.” Explanatory material, especially regarding the limitations of the use of some notes (as “For a device that cannot be identified,” “For a diary,” “For an oratorio”) is given below the note itself, but sometimes it is omitted when it might well be there (as in the case of the note “Authority for author’s name: Catalogue of the Library of the Harvard law school,” which may need, for the beginning cataloger and student of cataloging, some explanation of the limitation of its use).

The compiler’s explanation of the choice of terms, and of the use of some terms, as given in the preface and following some of the notes, will be invaluable to the beginners. In any future revision, an expansion of this feature will increase many fold the usefulness of the work.

In the list itself, the examples are good