

Personal Experience with Mini-Studies

Fran Adams

In reviewing my Native American (Indian) exhibit over the period of its development, the list of suggested and actual changes is long and most of these subjects have been addressed by someone along the line in this journal. It has been simply a matter of finding my personal way of incorporating these suggestions for the most part.

One point however seems to have escaped detailed discussion – the use of mini-studies in respect to philatelic knowledge. In attempting to execute the philatelic knowledge requirement in competition, my exhibit now incorporates three short comparisons of material with the same design but different philatelic makeup.

First, the 14c American Indian (Chief Hollow Horn Bear) issue. Not only are there two printing varieties, but various perforation and overprint varieties as well. Ignoring the printing varieties - perforation and overprint variations were placed side-by-side to provide a comparison, demonstrating philatelic knowledge. A second provides a comparison of the differences in paper types and the third shows proof types.

This is a more direct vehicle than including all of these elements scattered singly throughout the exhibit and relying on the judges to catch each and then associate them all in a manner which produces the desired results. Since the initial three, a few others provide information on machine cancel dies, meter types, rates, colors, and etc. If kept to a minimal or reasonable number of items per example, this method should produce supplemental gains in points.

Just be careful to space them out and not overly populate the exhibit with mini-studies.