Judul subjek tidak dibobot atau diurutkan berdasarkan relevansi dengan permintaan yang diprediksi sebelumnya. Judul subjek biasanya tidak mencerminkan sudut pandang penulis atau reaksi kritis terhadap karya. Judul subjek tidak menunjukkan apakah suatu karya dianggap otoritatif dalam bidang subjeknya. Ini termasuk daftar isi, daftar pustaka, indeks, anotasi, ringkasan dan abstrak, perkenalan, judul bagian koleksi, uraian dari jaket buku, informasi evaluasi, dan daftar judul pos. Saat ini kita seperti penulis misteri yang detektif fiksinya membaca sebuah telegram dan berteriak «Aha!» - tetapi tanpa menyampaikan petunjuk dalam telegram kepada para pembaca. Kritik-kritik ini menunjukkan sekali lagi bahwa judul subjek pada dasarnya adalah ringkasan dari apa dokumen tentang, menggunakan frasa atau string kata-kata untuk mewakili topik yang diidentifikasi. Dalam buku, ini termasuk judul dan subtitle, uraian buku penerbit, daftar isi, kata pengantar dan / atau pengantar, ringkasan abstrak atau bab, bibliografi, dan, mungkin, indeks dan klaim pendukung. (231)

Subject headings are not weighted or sorted by relevance to pre- dicted queries. Subject headings do not usually reflect the author's point of view or the critical reaction to the work. Subject headings do not indicate whether a work is considered au- thoritative within its subject field. These include the table of contents, bibliographies, indexes, annotations, summaries and abstracts, introductions, titles of parts of collections, blurbs from book jackets, evaluation information, and classified lists of headings .

At present we are like the mystery author whose fictional detective reads a telegram and cries «Aha!»-but without conveying the clues in the telegram to the readers. These criticisms point up once again that subject headings are essentially summaries of what documents are about, using phrases or strings of words to represent the topics identified. In books, these include the title and subtitle , the publisher's blurb, table of contents, preface and/or introduction, abstract or chapter summaries, bibliography, and, perhaps, index and support- ing claims. 231

On the basis of these, one «pigeonholes» the book by determining the overall theme and where it fits into the structure of the subject field. We like to think that the text conveys a message, but that is only partly true. Readers project their own perceptions, experiences, and level of comprehension onto the text. 3 There is always a degree of tension between the new information and what the reader already knows or believes [27, p.  
  
These processes include analogy, rele- vance, selectivity, research, expert advice or exchange of information, background knowledge and experience, memory, and the reputation of the authors cited [28]. An effective expert system must build a knowl- edge base that can analyze verbal clues in context and compare them with similar materials for consistent treatment. The limits of artificial intelligence indicate the power of the human mind and how little we know about it. A knowledge base contains hundreds of rules, which are as difficult to maintain and apply consis- tently as they are to develop and construct [29], but most machines can handle only one task at a time, and they have as much difficulty inconstructing multi-term headings as human indexers do [30].  
  
and pragmatic implications of human communication present problems that cannot be solved by the semantic and conceptual rules built into machine systems. Clearly, a knowledge base cannot equal the range of human experience, so heuristics tries to identify the most potentially useful information and examples. But the human mind can handle ambiguity, use more than one approach to a problem, bring in informa- tion from the fringe of consciousness, and draw on a large number of examples in perceiving analogies [31]. Many of the analyses of mental processes assume that a cataloger first breaks down the work into key terms or concepts and then synthesizes them into a single summary statement.  
  
«We have not yet discovered the linguistic algorithm in the human brain for summarizing of content or indexing» [32, p. We know that both searchers and catalogers succeed in bridging the gap regularly, but, since we cannot explain it, we cannot codify or evaluate it. In practice this occurs only if the cataloger recognizes the similarity between works and understands the definition of the subject heading so that it is used consistently. A study by Ann Painter in the early 1960s found that consistent applica- tion of subject headings by both human and machine indexers was only 62 percent to 72 percent [34].  
  
In general, the effectiveness of the subject catalog can be measured by its ability to lead users to the information they need. The effectiveness is usually based on the extent to which all relevant materials are identified by a query but no irrelevant materials are identified [35, pp. There are some serious drawbacks to this basis for evaluation. Second, the measurement depends on the concept of relevance.  
  
This is an undefined term unless it is based on factors that works must possess in common or on some external criteria to which they must be related. But even if we could identify intrinsic factors or external standards, there is no assurance that the works that meet this definition of relevance will be pertinent to an unforeseen future information query [36]. «There need be no relationship known to logic between a text and a problem it helps someone solve» [28, p. Third, relevance measures the effectiveness of the subject catalog according to user needs although the subject headings are based on the works being cataloged and not on their potential uses.  
  
Of course, the purpose of the subject catalog is to lead users to the materials they need at any particular time, but guessing at what those needs will be is no basis on which to construct a code or even an individual subject heading. The premise of this discussion is that a code must be based on theory and not consist merely of rationalized procedures or a string of arbitrary rules. We can continue to modify the terminology in the LCSH list to language that is current and unbiased. We can also add new headings in a timely fashion.  
  
We can encourage the Library of Congress to stream- line the present time-consuming and complicated procedures for sug- gesting new headings so that more non-Library of Congress catalogers can participate in this endeavor. Libraries can also suggest cross- references based on unsuccessful search queries or perceived needs in their local libraries. We can improve the cross-reference structure by evaluating the present references and eliminating inappropriate ones. We can then use the cross-references to determine the structure of each discipline in the subject catalog.  
  
Perhaps we can alter the structure to agree with the perceptions of practitioners in each field. In addition, we must be able to revise and update headings easily using global editing. The online authority file must include subdivision con- trol. We can emphasize subject catalog searching techniques in biblio- graphic instruction programs.  
  
Thanks to the initiative of the Library of Congress, experiments in several other libraries, and the creative use of online catalogs, many of these developments are already underway. If, as seems likely, the measures listed above result in more systematic procedures, more consis- tency in subject headings assigned to similar materials, more predictable subject heading forms, and increased searching success, they are worth pursuing. (1)

3 There is always a degree of tension between the new information and what the reader already knows or believes [27, p. These processes include analogy, rele- vance, selectivity, research, expert advice or exchange of information, background knowledge and experience, memory, and the reputation of the authors cited [28]. An effective expert system must build a knowl- edge base that can analyze verbal clues in context and compare them with similar materials for consistent treatment. The limits of artificial intelligence indicate the power of the human mind and how little we know about it.  
  
A knowledge base contains hundreds of rules, which are as difficult to maintain and apply consis- tently as they are to develop and construct [29], but most machines can handle only one task at a time, and they have as much difficulty inconstructing multi-term headings as human indexers do [30]. And pragmatic implications of human communication present problems that cannot be solved by the semantic and conceptual rules built into machine systems. Clearly, a knowledge base cannot equal the range of human experience, so heuristics tries to identify the most potentially useful information and examples. But the human mind can handle ambiguity, use more than one approach to a problem, bring in informa- tion from the fringe of consciousness, and draw on a large number of examples in perceiving analogies [31].  
  
«We have not yet discovered the linguistic algorithm in the human brain for summarizing of content or indexing» [32, p. A study by Ann Painter in the early 1960s found that consistent applica- tion of subject headings by both human and machine indexers was only 62 percent to 72 percent [34]. In general, the effectiveness of the subject catalog can be measured by its ability to lead users to the information they need. The effectiveness is usually based on the extent to which all relevant materials are identified by a query but no irrelevant materials are identified [35, pp.  
  
Third, relevance measures the effectiveness of the subject catalog according to user needs although the subject headings are based on the works being cataloged and not on their potential uses. Of course, the purpose of the subject catalog is to lead users to the materials they need at any particular time, but guessing at what those needs will be is no basis on which to construct a code or even an individual subject heading. The premise of this discussion is that a code must be based on theory and not consist merely of rationalized procedures or a string of arbitrary rules. We can encourage the Library of Congress to stream- line the present time-consuming and complicated procedures for sug- gesting new headings so that more non-Library of Congress catalogers can participate in this endeavor.  
  
In addition, we must be able to revise and update headings easily using global editing. If, as seems likely, the measures listed above result in more systematic procedures, more consis- tency in subject headings assigned to similar materials, more predictable subject heading forms, and increased searching success, they are worth pursuing (2)