

Teaching Reference and Bibliography: Articulation and Experimentation

参考・書誌科目の教育： その位置づけと試み

Frances Neel Cheney

フランシス・ニール・チェニー

要 旨

近年、参考・書誌教育の方法について多くの研究成果が発表されるようになったが、とくにレファレンス・プロセスが強調されている。この論文の前半で参考・書誌の初級科目は他の初級科目と密接不可分な関係にあることを明らかにし、後半で社会科学資料科目において試みた教授法を紹介している。

資料の形態的記述の研究をする記述的書誌学への導入は目録関係の科目において行なうのが最も適当である。また、資料の知的内容に関する体系的書誌学を教え、分類法、件名付与の問題を理解させなければならない。さらに、簡潔明瞭な記述的注解を書くことは資料選択の科目において教えるのがよい。つまり、参考・書誌、目録法、資料選択論の各担当者が緊密に協力することによって、学生に書誌、目録、索引などをよく理解させることができる。

参考・書誌の科目では、まずレファレンス・プロセスの性格を簡単に紹介したのち、書誌類の解説からはじめた方がよい。この順序をふむことによって、学生にまず主題文献案内を理解させることができる。図書館・情報学の主題を選ぶならば、書誌、索引などをはじめとし、統計、法規関係資料から専門雑誌までをとりあげ、注解付書誌にして学生に配布する。これはすべての初級科目で使用される必携書となるばかりでなく、主題文献案内のパターンを学生に理解させるのにも役立つ。

書誌類の単元に次いで、人名関係資料に進んだ方がよい。これらは目録法において著者名を確認したり、資料選択論において著者の情報を求めるときに役立つからである。

以上のように、各科目の間の密接な関連を考慮するならば、相互に情報交換ができるし、学生の間に生じがちなフラストレーションを緩和することができるので、教員としても努力のしがいがある。

次に、社会科学資料の教育における最近の試みを紹介する。これを“Each One Take One”とよぶ。この方法は学期の最初に各履修学生に社会科学関係の研究をしている大学院生を一人ずつ探させ、その要求に応じてどのような援助ができるかを検討させることから着手する。このプロジェクトは共同研究ではなく、一連の事例研究である。

各学生がどのような院生を選ぶかは自由であるが、それぞれ面接して、① 学歴、② これまで図書館利用教育を受けた程度、③ 図書館利用の困難さ、④ 必要とする資料を求める手段、⑤ 関心をもつ主題領域について尋ねさせる。その結果を基礎にしてクラスで報告し、必要なサービスの種類をチェックリ

Frances Neel Cheney, Associate Director and Professor, George Peabody College for Teachers, School of Library Science, Nashville, Tenn., U.S.A.; 1951-52 Visiting Professor, Japan Library School, Keio University
フランシス・ニール・チェニー： ビーボデー大学大学院図書館学研究科副主任教授；1951 年度図書館学科訪問教授

ストにまとめる。このうちには、閲覧目録の利用指導、分類体系や件名標目の説明、視聴覚機材の利用指導、コレクションの所在案内などを含むオリエンテーション関係の援助、特定の資料の利用指導、主題文献リストの作成などを含む書誌的援助などからなる。これらの各サービス項目について、どの程度援助できたかを記録するために、4段階の評点を与えさせたが、最も多く行なわれた援助は索引や抄録の利用指導であった。

学期の終り頃、学生は自己評価にもとづいて討議し、① 院生との接触を保つ場合に生ずる困難性、② 提供できるサービスの種類、③ そのサービスに対する反応、④ このプロジェクトから学んだこと、⑤ 誤りをした事柄の五つの点にわたってレポートを書くことになる。

こうしたプロジェクトによって一つの結論が導かれるわけではないが、この試みを実施することによって、どのような問題が生じたかを明らかにすることができる。(M. N.)

We teachers of reference and bibliography have grown increasingly articulate in recent years about what we do and how we do it. I am reminded of a sharp comment of my husband some years ago, "Fannie, since you started teaching, you've grown so garrulous."

Garrulity leads to repetition, either in saying the same things over and over, or in repeating what others have said, perhaps with the conviction that "Repetition is the mother of learning." At any rate, we have a good many more testimonies on methods and materials of teaching reference and bibliography than we had 25 years ago. In the United States, at least, this may be due to a number of reasons, among them: 1) a growing self-consciousness and more self-examination, which appear to be characteristic of the times we live in; 2) conviction on the part of writers of articles that they have at least a partial solution to the problems; 3) increasing opportunities to deliver papers at professional meetings devoted to library education; 4) new journals whose editors solicit articles to fill their pages, such as *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, and *RQ*; and 5) emphasis on innovation in viewing the changing curriculum in library schools.

Out of the mass of articles produced during the last decade, many of them included in Masao Nagasawa's admirable summary, *Trends in Teaching Reference*,¹⁾ one finds a continuing emphasis on the reference process as described by Alan M. Rees; "The reference process,

therefore, comprises a complex interaction among the questioner, reference librarian, and information sources, involving not only the identification and manipulation of available bibliographical apparatus, but also the operation of psychological, sociological and environmental variables which are imperfectly understood at the present time." Dr. Rees differentiates between reference process, reference work, reference sources, and reference services, noting that "The reference process incorporates the sum total of variables involved in the performance of reference work by an intermediary designated as reference librarian. It includes both the psychology of the questioner and the environmental context within which the need for information is generated, together with the psychology of the reference librarian and the reference sources employed. Reference service is the formalized provision of information in diverse forms by a reference librarian, who is interposed between the questioner and available information sources. Reference work is the function performed by reference librarians in providing reference service. The perception on the part of the librarian of the need of the questioner is an important part of the reference process. The formalized representation of this need is the question, which may or may not be an adequate expression of the underlying information requirement."²⁾

How do we prepare prospective librarians to engage fruitfully in the reference process? According to a study of the curriculum pat

terns among 37 accredited schools in the United States, made by Kathryn Oller,³⁾ these schools offer an introductory course which includes kinds of reference service provided, relationship to total library service, characteristics of the reference librarian, reference techniques, with emphasis on the reference interview and analysis of questions; evaluation of reference books and principles of their selection, and study of various types of sources, such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, bibliographies, etc., with wide variation in individual titles taught, and some variation in the sequence. For example, some instructors have a firm conviction that bibliographies and indexes should be considered first, while others believe that the dictionary should be considered first.

Miss Oller also found that these 37 schools offered a course in each of the major subject areas (social science, humanities, and science); courses for special subject areas such as law, medicine, music, business, and theology; courses in types of publications such as bibliography, with a significant part of the curriculum dealing with reference. Related courses in government publications, library resources, indexing and abstracting, literature searching and search strategy are also offered in some schools.

It is not the purpose here to review course contents, or to comment on the wide variations in titles found in the syllabi of various schools, this being already well-known. The following is intended to present only two facets of the subject, the first being the growing recognition that the introductory course in reference and bibliography does not exist in a vacuum. The other will describe one method of teaching one of the subject bibliography courses.

Articulation

In these days of fragmentation, it is essential that the introductory courses generally offered in graduate library schools be interrelated in a fashion that will be apparent to the begin-

ning student who is often enrolled in courses in reference and bibliography, cataloging and classification, book selection, and foundations of librarianship, all during the same semester. What skills are demanded of him almost immediately, and in what courses should they be taught?

Simply stated, he must learn how to describe the format of a book, article, document, film and recording. This elementary form of descriptive bibliography is best taught in introductory cataloging courses, where the student is introduced to general rules for establishing the main entry, for recording the title, place of publication, publisher, date of publication, size, number of pages, and illustrations and series note, when applicable. He must understand that this is a simple form of descriptive bibliography, upon which more elaborate forms of descriptive bibliography are based.

The student must also be introduced to the elements of systematic bibliography, those concerned with the intellectual content of a book, its subject matter. He must learn to designate the book's place in some system of classification, and to assign its appropriate subject headings in terms of some established system. And he must be aware that in so doing, he is engaging in a simple act of systematic bibliography. This skill is usually taught in courses in cataloging and classification.

The student must also learn to write clear descriptive annotations, annotations which accurately describe the contents of a book in the fewest words possible. Practice in this skill can be gained in all courses, but the primary responsibility for instruction in this skill rests with the teacher of book selection.

Working closely with instructors in cataloging and book selection, the instructor in reference and bibliography can acquaint the students with examples of bibliographies, especially national library catalogs, such as those of the British Museum, Library of Congress, and Bibliothèque Nationale; with trade bibliographies of various countries, with indexes which provide a more analytical approach to

the contents of a printed entity than book catalogs, and which often employ more specific subject headings.

Thus the course in reference and bibliography, after a brief introduction to the nature of the reference process, should begin with bibliography. This view is shared by Ray E. Held, who believes that bibliography should constitute half of the course. He says, "Start with library catalogs and trade bibliographies and proceed through indexes, directories of periodicals, and other bibliographic tools. Assign the other reference materials to the last half of the course. Although this violates the principle of beginning with the most familiar (encyclopedias or dictionaries) and proceeding to the less well known and more difficult, it has definite advantages. It is the most stimulating opening possible. It introduces the new students immediately to the work that are actually most fundamental to the interests of all library school students and all librarians. It also provides for greater review of the most difficult materials, since there is obviously less opportunity to review the works that enter the course late in the term."⁴⁾ The strongest defence for this order is that it gears in with other introductory courses and reinforces Kent's description of the reference process.

This order also affords the instructor the opportunity to acquaint the beginning student with that very important type of bibliography, the guide to the literature of a field. By selecting library and information science as the illustrative example, the instructor is able to introduce the student to the bibliographies and indexes (*Library and Information Science Abstracts*, *Library Literature*, etc.) encyclopedias and yearbooks (*Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, etc.); dictionaries of terms (glossaries and polyglot dictionaries); biographical sources; directories of library associations; statistical sources; sources of library laws and standards; and important library periodicals. An annotated list of appropriate titles, grouped under the above categories, can be given to the beginning student

very early in the course, and frequently referred to by the instructor. It provides a handy *vade mecum* for use in all beginning courses as well as impressing on the student the pattern of guides to the literature of other subject fields.

Continuing to bear in mind the relationship of the course to cataloging and book selection, the unit on bibliography might well be followed by one on biographical sources, some of which would be useful in verifying an author's full name in cataloging, others useful in the book selection course where bio-critical information about a writer is required.

Other fruitful meshing of courses can be achieved by instructors working closely together and keeping one another fully informed. It certainly helps to allay the student's frustration, so frequently experienced in the early weeks in a library school program. This, in itself, is sufficient justification for the added effort required of the faculty.

Each One Take One

And now to turn to a recent experiment in teaching the Bibliography of the Social Sciences.

Methods used by individual faculty should certainly vary from instructor to instructor, depending not only on his fondness for such equipment as the overhead projector, on his patience in preparing flow charts, filmstrips and other audio-visual materials, on his faith in the case study method, or his experiments in programmed instruction.

I have experimented with another method which I have not seen described in any of the literature on teaching methods, but which other instructors may already be using. This can be called in simple terms, Each One Take One, though I would avoid the acronym EOTO.

Recognizing that experiences with one group of 35 students enrolled in the Bibliography of the Social Sciences during the Spring of 1970 are not sufficient evidence to draw any firm conclusions, I would still like to describe what

occurred. Early in the semester, I asked the members of the class if each would like to discover a graduate student in one of the social sciences at Peabody or one of the neighboring colleges, find out his library needs, and try to help him meet those needs. There was some opposition from those who felt the time might be better spent by learning more about the literature of the social sciences. They had a point. But there was a vocal minority among the more confident and "outgoing" members of the class who were enthusiastic about the project. Perhaps these were the ones who already possessed the personal characteristics necessary for a good reference librarian, but this is only conjecture, since no elaborate psychological tests were administered to the students.

We agreed, after discussion, that this project was not to be viewed as a group research activity, but rather as a series of cases. This led to an examination of the case method extensively used in the social sciences and a discussion of some of the techniques involved.

Students were allowed complete freedom in the selection of their graduate students. Some of the young women living in dormitories took an easy way out and selected their roommates, since it was easy to "relate" to them. One approached a psychology professor who allowed him to talk to his graduate seminar. Though he aroused only mild interest from the seminar group as a whole, he was able to work directly with several of the graduate students in psychology during the semester. Some chose foreign students, motivated by a feeling that these students might need more help than native students. Some took graduate students who were just beginning their graduate work, while others rashly selected men who were near the completion of their dissertations. All in all, it was quite a mix and obviously one which could not be reduced to statistical tables. This was also discussed in class.

The next step was to develop through class discussion, an outline for a "reader profile" which library school student might use in his

"reference interview." This outline, supplied to each member of the class, listed the following points: 1) the graduate student's formal education, including colleges attended and major subject fields; 2) the extent of previous instruction in the use of libraries; 3) previous difficulties in using libraries; 4) means of access to needed materials; and 5) special subject interests.

From these interviews the library school students learned that in most cases, the graduate students knew very little about the organization of the Joint University Libraries serving neighboring colleges. Nor did they know how to use the pertinent indexing and abstracting services in their fields, or what interlibrary loan services were available. These findings cannot be reported in tabular form since some of the library school students were more adept and more meticulous in reporting their findings than others.

For purposes of clarity, library school students will be referred to as LS and graduate students in the social sciences will be referred to as GS in the following text.

Progress reports in class served to stimulate LS students to offer additional assistance to their particular GS students which they had not thought of until mentioned by another student. These oral reports also served as a basis for a checklist of the kinds of service rendered. As developed by the LS students, the checklist of activities included: 1) orientation, further subdivided by such activities as instruction in the use of the card catalog, explanation of classification systems and subject headings, instruction in use of audio-visual equipment, physical location of collections, explanation of services such as interlibrary loan, reprography, circulation rules, the union catalog, and introduction of students to members of the library reference staff; and 2) bibliographic assistance, including instruction in the use of pertinent sources, and actual preparation of lists of suggested references on specific topics. Also recorded here were instances when the LS student lent personal copies of certain titles or delivered

needed material directly to a GS student.

Each item in the checklist was graded by a scale of 1 to 4 indicating major, minor, not applicable, or omitted, to record the extent to which a particular service was given. As expected, the activity most frequently engaged in by the LS students was suggesting pertinent indexes and abstracts, and by giving instruction in their use.

Near the end of the semester, the LS students discussed the matter of self-evaluation, and all of them prepared a written report which answered five questions:

1. What difficulties did you encounter in establishing contact with your case?
2. How would you describe the assistance you were able to give your case?
3. How would you describe the reactions of your case to your services?
4. What have you learned from this experiment?
5. What mistake did you make in this experiment?

In summarizing the answers to these questions, we bore in mind that all students were not equally thorough in their answers, that some students lacked sufficient enthusiasm for the project to spend the necessary time in sustained self-examination, and that other may have expressed a false enthusiasm in an effort to impress the instructor.

But for what it is worth, in answer to "What difficulties did you encounter in establishing contact with your case?" it appears that:

Thirteen of the 35 LS students reported no difficulties, or only minor ones, easily overcome. These were students who were previously acquainted with their GS student, or had been introduced through personal friends, or through a supervising social science professor, or who were close neighbors to the GS student.

In other words, familiarity with and proximity to the GS student determined the ease with which contact could be established.

Summarizing the replies to the second question, which simply asked the LS student to

put into words what he had previously reported on the graded checklist of activities, we find students making frequent use of the adjectives "general" and "specific," with approximately half of the reports falling into each category. Those who described their assistance as general felt that they had "helped to fill in a few gaps" in the GS students' knowledge and appreciation of the library by introducing them to bibliographic tools, abstracting services, indexes and other reference sources of which their subjects had little previous knowledge. Some reported that they had helped GS students to overcome certain barriers to library use, such as their ignorance of the resources of specialized libraries within the Joint University Libraries system, their misconception that the Peabody Library could be of no help in the subject's research area, and the general frustration resulting from not being able to locate materials in earlier library experiences, especially back issues of periodicals, which in some instances were unfortunately at the bindery.

A common problem encountered by several of the LS students was discovery that the GS students "wanted to do the work themselves but did not know how to begin the search." A typical report reads: "I would like to have given more assistance, but my case did not want or require more." Another reported, "My subjects were rather professional in their pride of accomplishment and sufficiency. I missed, therefore, the opportunity to be a real buddy... It wasn't so much assistance given as it was getting into a fellowship of mutual concern and appreciation of one another's problems."

Many of the LS students who were able to penetrate their GS students' self-sufficiency were especially successful in giving specific bibliographic help. In some cases this came out of an awareness of the GS student's degree of sophistication, which made only very specific help necessary or useful. One GS student eagerly accepted the LS student's help, knew exactly what kinds of help he needed, and worked out a specific schedule which was

efficiently carried out. Another GS student, having an "unusually good background in library use," enlisted the LS student's aid in preparing the bibliographic form for his research papers. Specific aids took varying forms: annotated lists of suggested references prepared by the LS students; discussions of the organization and best uses of particular tools; literature searches; explaining ERIC documents; identifying appropriate subject headings in periodical indexes; and guided tours through the Joint University Libraries Central Division.

Proving once again, however, that the best efforts sometimes are in vain, one LS student sadly described extensive personal labors in her case's chosen subject area, adding that the GS student had "in the meantime changed her subject." She observed, "There was a great deal that Sally *might* have learned..."

Though we have already given some indication of the reaction of the GS students to the assistance they received, the answers to the fourth question reveal that most of the LS students found the GS students to be appreciative and most grateful for all the varying kinds of bibliographic help given. Some even described their GS students as astounded. One GS student was skeptical at first of the LS student's proposed aid, but "when a few pieces of material of real interest and value turned up, her attitude changed completely and her enthusiasm was gratifying." Two LS students reported that their cases preferred to let them do the searching rather than to learn the sources and methods themselves. Others discovered, however, that their cases greatly appreciated general help but preferred to do their own specific searching. And while some GS students were reserved in manner, either not wanting to impose on the LS student or doubtful of the amount of help a master's student could give to a doctoral student, others were enthusiastic and complimentary. They felt free to ask for help, and in one case, the LS student was asked to "be available for later consultation" after the project was over.

Finally, in contrast to the one or two GS students who were reported as not really satisfied, there were notable successes like the following: "She (the graduate student) has received favorable comments from her professor on her sources of information. Also she is a lot more confident, when talking with reference librarians and has learned where to go for materials in the Joint University Libraries, and now she is doing her own 'cross-referencing' mentally within the libraries, so she can often locate related materials without other aid."

The fourth question on what LS students felt they had learned from the experiment is perhaps one of the most important, though it is difficult to generalize from the individual answers. Most of them felt that, in one way or another, they had learned to understand their patrons and the problems of communicating with them. As one student expressed it, "There is a vast difference between using and explaining the use of a reference source."

Some of them discovered that learning "what *not to do* was as important as what *to do* in reference service." Among the difficulties encountered were the inability to give significant aid to the graduate student whose investigation had not yet taken a definite direction; the inadvisability of giving reference service where "exact information requirements" were not clear; the graduate student's desire for "easily accessible sources" in the "quickest, most convenient forms"; and the means of finding out what the patron's real need were.

Having resolved these difficulties, the LS students learned the necessity of having greater confidence in themselves as reference librarians. They found great satisfaction in specific research, and they were pleased with the GS students' reactions to their success. One student found it especially "interesting to see how excited my case got over learning about some of the standard sources that librarians use every day."

In general, the problems of relating one's own knowledge to the patron seem to have given

the students a real insight into unfamiliar subject areas in addition to a taste of the actual reference experience. Some found it "relatively simple," a matter of "appropriate guidance." One, in fact, found the giving of sympathy and moral support to be among her basic tools, concluding "She was appreciative, and that is what matters...whether you can help in any way."

In assessing their mistakes, the LS students indicated that many had made the same errors and had discovered similar inadequacies in their reference techniques. For examples, several who had omitted an early orientation tour of the Joint University Libraries later found that their cases would have benefited from such a tour. Similarly, many reported that they had not accurately appraised their cases' previous knowledge and understanding of the library and its resources, having taken the GS students' self-assurance at face value. Still others felt that a lack of communication with their cases made their specific needs unclear and resulted in getting their project off to a late start, either by spending too much time on general sources or by failure on the part of the GS student to define his research topic during the semester.

A number of LS students felt that they had lacked initiative in handling their cases, either by allowing their cases to take the lead, or by failing to approach them with valuable materials which they hadn't asked for, and hesitating to introduce them to sources which they didn't seem to want. Many felt that they had, for one reason or another, omitted possible sources, through oversight, unfamiliarity with the subject area, or failure to re-evaluate the needs of the GS throughout the semester. At the other extreme, one LS student confessed to "spoonfeeding" her case, failing to let the GS student find the materials on the shelves for herself.

Finally, one student made this interesting observation: "If I were counselling someone else I would say, 'Get with it as soon as you can. Find someone not too occupied with the final stages of his work. Find a brother in

great need. But don't do his work for him.'"

Every instructor is aware that it is not possible to please all of the students all of the time, that some students apparently enjoy what others detest. Thus while one might deplore the somewhat vague and roughly defined approach to this experiment, another said, "This type of assignment has been most valuable to me for it has forced me to be creative and do my own searching. A structured assignment is limiting to the individual and a bore to work on, for nothing original is accomplished." Another who found the actual reference experience "very beneficial," suggested that if the experiment were repeated, the heads of various departments in the social sciences should be consulted in advance so that only GS students eager for help of this kind will get it. Such a procedure, she felt, would "make for a better relationship between the library school student and his case." One student, with somewhat more enthusiasm for the experiment than many of the other students, wrote, "This is a great thing, I think. It relates the library to the serious students. It could make the library a friend, one coming to you to help, and with concern, rather than being something you tussle with and try to figure what your odds might be in dealing with it."

Whatever its shortcomings, and there are many, (serious being the reduced time available for an orderly approach to the literature of the various fields of the social sciences, the methods of the social scientists, the characteristics of various types of reference sources, all of which had to be acquired on the run) does this person-to-person approach have any real worth in preparing a student to perform intelligently as a reference librarian? Well, to use a word currently in vogue, it depends on the variables. These are too obvious to mention.

Certainly it would drive an instructor wild who wants an orderly approach, to have run in all directions after library school students who are darting to and fro, or prod the more phlegmatic students who can't seem to get on

with the job. But if the class is not too large, much can be learned about the individual students—their capabilities and temperaments. And a lot can be learned about how to transcend the difficulties which arise in using libraries, due to practices not always designed to make searches simpler for the user, or due to changing classification systems, or to depriving users of needed materials by sending them to the bindery at the wrong time.

Thus I think I will try the experiment again. Then I may be able to commend it to those who want to live dangerously and where the action is.

This loosely constructed testimony is just another example of the kind of article that addresses itself to the importance of relating the teaching of reference and bibliography to other courses in the library school curriculum, and which describes an isolated experiment in bringing students face to face with library users. The appended list of references, many of them included in Masao Nagasawa's recent article in *Library and Information Science*, as already noted, are a sampling of English language sources which, if read, will reveal that there is more than one way to skin a cat.

References

- 1) Nagasawa, Masao. Trends in Teaching Reference. *Library and Information Science*, No. 7, 1969.
- 2) Rees, Alan M. Broadening the Spectrum. in Winifred Linderman, ed. *The Present Status and Future Prospects of Reference/Information Service*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1967, pp. 57–65.
- 3) Oller, Kathryn. Curriculum—Reference. *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 3: 65–71, January 1967.
- 4) Held, Ray E. Teaching Reference and Bibliography. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5: 228–233, Spring 1965.

Other References

(not cited in text)

- 5) Bonk, Wallace J. The Core Reference Course, *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 4: 196–

208, Spring 1964.

- 6) Bunge, Charles A. Library Education and Reference Performance. *Library Journal*, 92: 1578–1581, April 15, 1967.
- 7) Carroll, Leontine. Down with the Lists. *RQ*, 6: 29–31, Fall 1966.
- 8) Cheney, Frances Neel. The Teaching of Reference in American Library Schools. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 3: 188–198, Winter 1963.
- 9) Davinson, Donald. Experiment in Library Education: Teaching for Paper 4, Part I of the L.A. Final Examination at Leeds School of Librarianship. *Library World*, 67: 358–362, June 1966.
- 10) Freides, Thelma. Will the Real Reference Problem Please Stand Up? *Library Journal*, 91: 2008–2012, April 15, 1966.
- 11) Galvin, Thomas J. Teaching Reference Through the Case Method. *The Southeastern Librarian*, 16: 232–235, Winter 1966.
- 12) Galvin, Thomas J. Teaching Reference with Case Studies: An Interim Report. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5: 234–237, Spring 1965.
- 13) Katz, William A. In the Reference Arena. *Library Journal*, 90: 2532–2534, June 1, 1965.
- 14) Larsen, John C. Titles Currently Studied in Humanities Courses. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 10: 120–128, Fall 1969.
- 15) Monroe, Margaret E. The Core Courses at Wisconsin. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 9: 116–122, Fall 1968.
- 16) Pierson, Robert M. The Teaching of Reference Librarianship. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 9: 351–361, Spring 1969.
- 17) A Reference Encounter: In Which Two Library School Teachers Discuss with Lj Editors How Reference Work Should Be Taught... *Library Journal*, 90: 1818–1824, April 15, 1965.
- 18) Shores, Louis. We Who Teach Reference. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5: 238–247, Spring 1965.
- 19) Slavens, Thomas P. Computer-Assisted Instruction for Reference Librarians. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 10: 116–119, Fall 1969.
- 20) Slavens, Thomas P. Teaching Reference Work: Some Current Approaches. *Library Journal*, 93 1591–1593, April 15, 1968.
- 21) Stych, F. S. The Flow Chart Method. *RQ*, 5: 14–17, Summer 1966.

Teaching Reference and Bibliography: Articulation and Experimentation

- 22) Stych, F. S. The Flow Chart Method and Heraldic Enquiries. *RQ*, 6: 169-174, Summer 1967.
- 23) Teaching Bibliography and Reference—Four Divergent Views: *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 9: 18-44, Summer 1968. Contents: Bibliography and the Seminar by Raymund F. Wood; One Road Through the Wood by Laurel Grotzinger; Reality in Reference Teaching by Norma J. Shosid; An Introduction to Reference by Sylvia Ziskind.
- 24) Vavrek, Bernard F. The Emergence of New Reference? *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 10: 109-115, Fall 1969.
- 25) Views on Teaching Reference. *RQ*, 4: 1-3, 15, March 1965; 3-4, 8, July 1965. Contents: Medium Sized Public Library; by Joseph Corvo; University Library; Large Public Library; Part Two by Thomas Galvin, P. K. Mutchler, and John McCrossan.
- 26) Wilson, T. D. Teaching Subject Bibliography. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 9: 338-344, Spring 1969.