

growing realization that pedagogical issues should constitute a part of digital library development, not an additional consideration after the fact.

Digital Libraries offers a useful glossary of terms, but it is not the ideal resource for those seeking detailed descriptions of specific topics. This is not surprising given Arms's goals and objectives. His text is an excellent primer for individuals who require an introductory survey or wish to examine digital libraries in a holistic manner. Even with this emphasis, and acknowledging the difficulties of combining breadth and depth, it might be useful for readers to have more references and a bibliography for further investigation of individual topics.

I was especially eager to review *Digital Libraries*, given my professional situation. My academic background includes engineering and economics, but I work in a research facility within an academic research library. My exposure to electronic publishing, scholarly communication, and intellectual property issues in the academic community arises from involvement with Project Muse since its inception. Even from the perspective of this diverse experience, I discovered new insights, facts, and understanding in this book. Arms inspires new perspectives on familiar ideas, whatever the reader's background.

He weaves an interesting story regarding digital libraries, with historical context, a view of the digital library landscape, and a blueprint for further research and implementation. Whether read for its narrative, architecture, or artistry, William Arms's *Digital Libraries* is noteworthy. Much like Michael Lesk's *Practical Digital Libraries: Books, Bytes, and Bucks* (1997), Arms's book should now be considered required reading for anyone interested in digital libraries.—G. Sayeed Choudhury (sayeed@jhu.edu) *Digital Knowledge Center, Milton S. Eisenhower Library, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.*

The Future of Classification. Ed. Rita Marcella and Arthur Maltby. Aldershot, England: Gower, 2000. 144p. £55; \$99.95 (ISBN 0-566-07992-5). LC99-46030.

With the intention of describing a vibrant future for classification, Rita Marcella and Arthur Maltby have gathered ten chapters whose authors include classification theorists of long standing such as Eric Hunter and A. C. Foskett, established academics such as Lois Mai Chan and M. P. Satija, editors of major classification schemes, and writers who bring other perspectives, especially from theory and computing. Some of the authors stress the strong points of classification, others discuss somewhat radical potential uses, and still others document concrete recent progress and its logical trajectory. The tone varies from cautious to enthusiastic, but none of it is unrealistic and most of it is frank. Most of the authors are or have been library school faculty, and most are from the United Kingdom. The chapters are organized starting from basic principles, many of which will be a review for professionals, continuing to theoretical views that offer fresh perspectives, particularly on the value of browsing, and moving logically to classification as an online tool. Three major classification schemes—the Library of Congress Classification (LCC), the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), and the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC)—merit a chapter each, and the concluding chapter documents the literature of classification and serves as a starting point for following up the ideas in the book.

In the United Kingdom, *The Future of Classification* is likely to be marketed as a textbook, but as an instructor in a Canadian context, I would not use it for this purpose. The book is interesting reading for North American professional librarians of all specializations—not just catalogers—because it reminds and challenges us

regarding a powerful library tool. Since Charles Cutter and others of his time introduced the dictionary catalog, we have spent less effort on classification. Still, we know that library users frequently use the catalog to find a likely call number and then go to the shelves to browse—an activity impossible without classification. We also know that Web search engines commonly include a quasi-hierarchical classification for assisting searchers in navigation. We may scoff at the nature of these classifications (finding “feral cat control” under “pets” under “hobbies”, for instance), but the fact that even poorly constructed classifications are popular should indicate the potential of well-constructed classifications.

Lest we forget the power of classification, *The Future of Classification* gives us the basics in readable form and then goes on to create a conceptual framework filled with suggestions of concrete approaches. The following sampler of ideas from this collection will entice readers into spending some time thinking about the merits and potential of classification:

- Classification is an exploratory device that allows creativity and serendipity as our subject heading searching does not.
- Classification in electronic form allows us to browse virtual shelves and make links across these shelves so that they are no longer only linear.
- Classification can be used as a switching device to link different languages, whether they are natural languages (English, French, Spanish, Mandarin) or controlled vocabularies (subject headings and thesauri).
- The two major North American classifications, LCC and DDC, are now both available in electronic form and are being used to classify electronic resources.
- Boolean searching on classification is possible in an electronic

environment, especially with faceted classifications like UDC (and, increasingly, DDC) with each aspect of the topic represented by a particular part of the number.

- UDC and DDC are moving closer together so that in the future a library might consider using UDC for specialized parts of its collection and DDC for the rest. This link is especially interesting for North American librarians unfamiliar with UDC.
- Classification is an international tool, especially as we use it increasingly in our catalogs and other sites on the Web.
- Automation makes updating classification numbers easier, especially when they are used for “virtual” rather than shelf browsing. Reclassification may be a cost-effective project, even for shelving, if it means significantly improved access.
- Shelving and browsing make different demands on classification, and we can use them differently for these two purposes.
- Advances in automatic classification are an aid to catalogers in terms of workload—an especially welcome capability for classifying large numbers of electronic resources.

Throughout the ten chapters, themes occur in different contexts, weaving elegant squares for a well-designed quilt. The connections are not always conspicuous, but one comes away from *The Future of Classification* with a far deeper and more cohesive understanding of classification and its potential than one might expect of ten varied chapters from ten quite different authors.

Editors Marcella and Maltby encourage us to take this book seriously. They suggest that librarians need to regard classifications as part of their total system for information retrieval.

The weaknesses of one aspect of the system can be balanced by the strengths of another part; however, this balance can only be achieved if librarians have a close understanding of each aspect. Classification is an area that we do not always stress in North America, yet it is a potent means of achieving our overall end: linking people and information.—*Hope A. Olson* (*hope.olson@ualberta.ca*), *School of Library & Information Studies, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada*

Gatekeepers of Knowledge: Journal Editors in the Sciences and the Social Sciences. By Stephen McGinty. Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey, 1999. 160p. \$55 (ISBN 0-89789-664-5). LC99-12703.

Journal publishing is receiving a great deal of attention, primarily because of the costs of journal subscriptions. Stephen McGinty addresses another element of the publishing process: editing. Specifically, he reports on the results of interviews with journal editors in the sciences and the social sciences. In part, his aim is to study the personal aspects of editing, such as how one becomes a journal editor, how the editors go about the business of editing, how the individual editors perceive their role in the scholarly community, and how they manage their workload. In addition to these personal details, he asks editors their perceptions about technology and journal publishing and the extent to which disciplinary cultures affect their work and their journals.

Despite the capabilities of technology, especially the Internet, to facilitate rapid transfer of information, many agree that there is still a need for some control over the dissemination of disciplinary information and that the role of the editor is likely to endure, regardless of the medium employed for publication. This topic is an important one, and this book is clear and

well written. These strengths, however, are not sufficient to overcome some serious deficiencies.

McGinty reports that he interviewed thirty-five editors. He does not, however, tell the reader why he chose this number, or more importantly, why he selected these thirty-five individuals. Was this simply a convenient number, or were these the individuals who agreed to speak with him? The editors come from disciplines in the sciences and social sciences, but McGinty does not reveal which particular disciplines are included, except that fifteen are from the sciences and twenty are from the social sciences. With quotations from individual editors, McGinty mentions the discipline in which the editors work, but there is no simple table or narrative that shows the specific disciplines represented. There is no way to tell, and McGinty rightly does not present these editors' experiences and thoughts as representative of editors in general. He does attempt to place the editors' experiences into some conceptual frameworks, notably the gatekeeper model suggested by Kurt Lewin several decades ago. The model is sometimes imposed, though, and its application is repeated unnecessarily. Even with the attempts at applying conceptual frameworks, there is a sparse review of the considerable literature on editing; the bibliography is scant and not very helpful.

There are other shortcomings in this work. In the chapter on the impact of scholarly culture on editors and editing, McGinty writes of differences between editors in the sciences and the social sciences. For example, editors in the sciences are likely to have larger full-time staffs and larger budgets. He implies that the differences may be due to the different cultures of the sciences and the social sciences. He does not, however, address some other important differences between these cultures that may affect editorial operations. He does not examine frequency