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The Employment Time Bomb

Clark Kerr, chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, recently warned that higher education was "sitting on a very real time bomb." In order to achieve the parity in faculty appointments by 1980 which the federal government currently demands, America's 2,800 campuses will have to impose an immediate moratorium on the employment of the majority group. Dr. Kerr noted that "that's a very real time bomb." He further asked: "What happens to all of those who are now working on their PhD's and all of those below them who had planned to do so?"

Library schools are manufacturing a mini-version of the same employment time bomb. Last year over 5,000 library school graduates entered a labor market which is already approaching a supersaturated state.

How do we stem the flow of new graduates? One frequently-heard solution is to reduce the number of accredited library schools. But that is not practical unless there are schools willing to close their doors voluntarily. Accreditation is based solely on whether a school meets the published professional educational standards. In truth, there is no existing mechanism to control the number of graduating librarians. As a matter of fact, a recently-adopted ALA standard will make it very difficult for a school to monitor the quality of new library school students, without exposing itself to a charge of discrimination in one form or another.

Library administrators unintentionally have further reduced the job opportunities for new professionals. In an effort to stretch funds, or under the pressure of an increasingly perceptive and militant nonprofessional employment force, they are reassigning work to train nonprofessionals for work formerly performed by professionals.

What responsibilities does a professional school bear for the employment of its graduates? Should students be admitted to graduate school when the prospects for their employment are bleak? Surely some professional soul-searching is in order.

Many still argue that if libraries provided the full range of services recommended in the professional standards, we would be confronted with a shortage instead of a surplus of librarians. But the hard truth is that college and university libraries are now operating during a time when the prospects for significant budgetary growth do not appear bright; student enrollments have stabilized, and in some institutions have actually declined; the job market for many PhD's is grim;
at some institutions some departments are scrambling to justify the
very existence of their programs. In short there is a wide chasm be-
tween professional aspirations and current budgetary reality.

American librarianship is indeed perched upon an employment time
bomb. It can be defused only if our professional association and/or
the library schools succeed in stemming the flow of new graduates.
I can offer no instant solution, but I would strongly urge the sup-
pliers (library schools) to communicate with their market (libraries)
in order the better to assess the realities of the job situation. In the
meantime, as competition for the available jobs intensifies, the man-
power surplus will all too soon become a depressant upon salaries.

R. M. Dougherty
Performance Appraisal of Librarians—A Survey

Performance appraisal touches on one of the most emotionally charged activities in business life—the assessment of a person’s contribution and ability. This is true whether the business is that of running a university library or operating a commercial organization.

In the spring of 1971, a study was undertaken by the author to compile information on performance appraisals of librarians in college and university libraries. The objectives of the study were to:

1. determine approaches used in appraising librarians, together with the apparent success, or lack of success, of these approaches;
2. compare the results with performance appraisal concepts expressed in recent literature;
3. draw conclusions which could be helpful to those responsible for appraisal of professional personnel in libraries.

All university libraries in the United States and Canada having more than fifteen librarians on the staff were surveyed. Out of this total of 185 libraries, responses were received from 138. The majority, almost 95 percent, indicated that some form of appraisal was used. The methods ranged from a casual observation of staff members by the director with no written record made, to lengthy interviews with staff members discussing their performance based on the results of a form. The frequency of appraisal varied from several times during the first year, to annually until tenure was achieved. The type of form used showed the most divergence: of the seventy-four sample forms received, only one form was duplicated. The forms ranged from mediocre to excellent in each of the three categories into which they were separated—rating-sheet types, forms identical to those used to evaluate teaching faculty performance, and forms designed to evaluate the special competencies of librarians. There were samples of thirty-five rating-sheet types, seventeen of the kind used to evaluate teaching faculty performance, and twenty-two forms especially designed to evaluate librarians. Not all libraries stating that they conducted appraisals and used a form included one with their questionnaire, and some libraries used two or three forms of various types.

A consensus of experts in the field suggests that no organization has a choice of whether it should appraise its personnel and their performance. Every time a promotion is made or a salary increase is given, an appraisal of some kind takes place. The question is not then whether there should be an appraisal, but rather it is a question of method.

The fact that performance appraisal is increasingly used is borne out in the literature by many writers. Thompson and Dalton point out that the signals a person receives about the assessment his
supervisor is making about his contribution and ability has a strong impact on his self-esteem and on his subsequent performance.¹ Sloan and Johnson stress that the scope of performance appraisal is growing.² Its traditional focus has been enlarged to include not only the individual's on-the-job behavior but also his functioning as an integral part of the organizational system. Applying the systems approach to personnel appraisal, the individual stands as an integral part of a unit or department and his performance should also be evaluated by the degree to which he accomplishes specific results that contribute to departmental and organizational achievement.³ Performance is evaluated by the degree to which a person achieves explicit objectives in terms of measurable performance or results.

Kellogg points out that the appraisal system has also become a basis for counseling and coaching subordinates, if used properly.⁴ Wallace lists the three functions of performance appraisal as an individual growth tool, to distribute rewards among a group, and to file as a personnel reference history.⁵ He concludes that these are distinct, different needs, and no one appraisal system designed for one need should be used for another.

Performance appraisal in libraries has, in the past, been closely tied to periodic library planning activities; it has been used primarily as a written justification for salary action. The personnel director of a large university library in Pennsylvania stated that, in the past, librarians were immune from appraisals of any kind; however, with severe budget cutbacks, she felt that some kind of appraisal system would have to be initiated. Others who were using rating scale appraisals, indicated that they were trying a new technique. The new method was often a form similar to that used to evaluate teaching faculty, particularly if the librarians had just recently achieved faculty status. Other library directors, possibly more comfortable about the security of their librarians' status, were designing forms which specifically measured the competencies of librarians, or were experimenting with management-by-objects, or mutual goal-setting techniques. Of the respondents indicating that they used appraisals, 43 stated that they were considering changing their present technique; an additional 22 respondents indicated that their appraisal method was either in its first or second year of use.

**Frequency of Appraisal**

The majority of those libraries surveyed which conduct appraisals performed these evaluations periodically, 80 percent on an annual basis. Continuous evaluation of performance is an essential part of supervision states Harold Mayfield, and many others advocate a relationship between supervisor and subordinate where performance is discussed as a part of day-to-day operations.⁶ Black suggests that the appraisal interview is primarily a teaching device.⁷ The objective is to help the employee help himself by persuading him to recognize and correct his deficiencies. The follow-up of the appraisal interview is the training program. Talking to a subordinate about how he does his job is a vital part of his training, and successful managers recognized for their talent to develop people use every opportunity to give their employees individual coaching. This includes regular critiques of their performance, not just a once-a-year, get-it-over-with-for-another-year approach. Daily, on-the-job contact with subordinates is a natural time to point out the specifics of job performance. Praise or criticism in such circumstances does not take on exaggerated importance. The employee more clearly understands the deficiency when it is pointed out to him immediately than if it is discussed six months later in a formal
interview. If he has done something well and receives instant recognition, he is far more pleased than if his merits are recited at the annual review.

Practitioners as well as theorists seem to agree that the greatest disadvantage of the single periodic appraisal is in expecting it to accomplish too many objectives. The salary action issue so dominates the annual comprehensive performance appraisal interview that neither party is in the right frame of mind to discuss plans for improved performance. Some supervisors indicate that set, periodic appraisals tend to cause them to save up material in order to have enough to discuss.

Although the majority of libraries surveyed conducted appraisals on an annual basis, several specified modifications, such as more frequent appraisals where past deficiencies were recorded or elimination of appraisals after tenure was achieved. The inference underlying this response seemed to be that some directors felt that appraisals were to be avoided. The confident reply of one director fairly well sums up this attitude: "It has been our experience that, by judicious selection of applicants and by careful screening during the probationary period, we have a staff of such quality that appraisals are not needed for those who attain tenure." It is easy to find administrators who feel that they know their people so well that appraisals are unnecessary; however, it is much more difficult to find staff members who would not welcome a chance for a better understanding of the over-all goals of the library and a reassessment of the contributions they are making. The attitude of some administrators seems to be that appraisals are intended only to point out shortcomings and that when you have a tenured staff, appraisals are no longer necessary. This interpretation completely eliminates the functions of counseling, praise for jobs well done, a measure of how to distribute rewards, an individual growth tool, or an opportunity to talk with individual staff members to compare their self-goals with the over-all objectives of the library.

For the majority of libraries conducting appraisals annually, fall, winter, and spring were specified with equal frequency. Significantly, the appraisal time was almost always selected to tie in with the annual salary review, budget preparation, or determination of retention, tenure, or rank for the coming year. Thompson and Dalton, as noted earlier, strongly advocate resisting the temptation to devise one grand performance appraisal system to serve all management needs. Culbreth points out that the appropriate time for evaluating an employee—in terms of his individual development—rarely, if ever, coincides with a rigid timetable; he recommends holding an appraisal whenever one is needed to maintain a good relationship between the supervisor and subordinate or to advance employee development.

Use of Forms for Appraisals

Of those university libraries which do have appraisals, 78 out of 130 used some kind of form or set of guidelines to perform the appraisal. Those not using forms stated that they held informal discussions, or prepared written summary reviews (with no apparent criteria followed).

The use of a well-designed appraisal form is no guarantee of an effective appraisal method. An administrator who possesses the proper skills could conduct satisfactory appraisals with or without a form. The information gathered suggests, however, that the use of a written guide assured a greater degree of success, even in the hands of unskilled evaluators, than would an evaluation system with no guidelines.

Pros and Cons of Various Appraisal Techniques

Cangemi suggests that when using a form based on a rating scale, the evalu-
ator should be careful to avoid four common errors: personal bias, central tendency, halo effect, and logical error. Personal bias errors result when an evaluator rates all individuals consistently too high or too low. The error of central tendency signifies that the evaluator seldom ever gives ratings at the extremes of the scale. The halo effect is usually found in those operating under the presence of strong personal biases. In this situation, the rater judges a person to be the same or nearly the same in all characteristics. Logical error results from a misunderstanding of the characteristic to be measured, and happens more often when no definitions of the characteristics are given.

Another reason for dissatisfaction with forms is the difficulty of fitting an individual's performance into pet phrases such as "Knowledge of Bibliographic Resources—Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor (check one)." A measure such as this may be irrelevant to the work performed, yet an evaluation must be given; therefore, a decision is made on probable performance. Once the evaluation of that characteristic has been transformed into a rating such as "Good," it is considered equal to other ratings with more reliable bases of measurement. Even the phrase "Quantity of Work" can be difficult to evaluate fairly. Books cataloged can be counted, but there is extreme variation in effort required. Certain kinds of reference work defy quantification, yet many reference librarians are regularly evaluated on the quantity of work produced.

A frequently stated advantage of the checklist is that it promotes consistency between managers; but different interpretations of the levels of rating, and different opinions of what proportions of the employees should be given above-average ratings often negates this apparent advantage.

In some of the traditional methods of appraisal, the subordinate sometimes reacts adversely to criticism. To accept criticism—even if it is deserved—from a comparative stranger is a bitter pill. One can imagine the rated person thinking "Let he who is without fault cast the first criticism." In order to avoid the role of "judge," other more objective techniques have been designed. One is the management-by-objectives approach popularized by Peter Drucker. This method centers on the assessment of performance by contrasting it with goals set mutually by the supervisor and the subordinate. The individual participates in the goal setting, makes a commitment, and then evaluates his own achievements. McGregor suggests that this type of management encourages the professional to bring his talent, training, and creativity to his job. If a manager uses this approach, he listens, advises, guides, and encourages the subordinate to develop his own potential.

One important advantage of the self-evaluation or participatory approach is that it can often provide the supervisor with useful insights to the person being appraised. Macoy advocates appraisal interviews as an opportunity to take significant steps forward in understanding subordinates, and also as an opportunity for meaningful self-examination by the employee. Employee development is, in the last analysis, self-development.

With rating scales, there is an implied requirement that all qualities must be evaluated. In many cases, this forces judgments on characteristics which have no relationship to job performance. The most frequently used qualities on rating scales are: initiative, leadership, quantity of work, dependability, attitude toward others, cooperativeness, accuracy, judgment, loyalty, organization of work, and quality of work. Several of these traits might be easy to measure and evaluate in a cataloger but impossible to consider fairly in a reference librarian. The quality of leadership could be assessed in a person with super-
visor responsibilities but not in a person who had never had an opportunity to lead others.

The various grades, or levels, of each item on the rating sheet present another opportunity for inconsistency. If five levels are allowed, such as 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, with 5 being the top of the scale, how meaningful is it to give someone a 4 in accuracy? How many errors would one need to make in order to be rated at a 4 instead of a 5? Unless ridiculously specific guidelines are set up, the entire process becomes little more than an exercise. The raters themselves differ in the way they evaluate people. A very conservative person may rarely give a 5 to anyone, while another supervisor may rate everyone at the top. About the only real value of the rating scale kind of appraisal is that it is done periodically and provides an opportunity to think about an employee’s progress and discuss with him more than merely why he was given a 3 in loyalty this time.

One strange requirement on many appraisal forms is that of the employee’s signature. As Maier points out, this requirement is inconsistent with the goals of an appraisal except where a warning is given.15 In this case, the purpose of the signature is to preclude the employee saying at a later time that he was never told his work was unsatisfactory. It is somewhat incongruous to come to the close of an otherwise pleasant evaluation interview and be reminded, “Now we must have your signature on the form.” One other possible explanation for the signature requirement is that it proves to the administration that the supervisor actually held an evaluation interview with the employee.

Culbreth states that there is no better way to ensure a department’s maximum efficiency than to give its personnel proper, continuing evaluation.16 With this thought comes the question of personnel vs. organization appraisal. It has been suggested that a person is respon-

sible for and can control only certain aspects of his performance.17 Perhaps we should be evaluating performance problems rather than people. Does a supervisor, as he appraises each employee, ask himself the question, “Did I, as the supervisor, in any way contribute to a performance problem of the subordinate?” Haynes suggests that an employee’s effectiveness depends on four things: the employee, the job, the supervisor, and the work environment.18 Therefore, a performance discussion aimed at increased effectiveness should not be limited to just the employee.

**Librarian Appraisal in the Academic Environment**

“How many professionals in the library have academic rank? Is your appraisal method for librarians the same as for teaching faculty?”

An analysis of the questionnaires showed that many librarians possess a status somewhat equivalent to faculty, whether or not they had academic rank. An analysis of those responses in which an appraisal form of some kind was used showed that 38 out of 78 used a form identical to that used for teaching faculty, or one similar which had been designed to evaluate the special competencies of librarians. Performance rating, or rating scale forms, were used in 35 libraries. A few libraries relied mainly on summary-type or self-evaluations. Several used more than one technique.

Eldred Smith has discussed the merits of, and prospects for, academic status for librarians.19 Most librarians desire academic status but a conflict can occur when the librarian is rated on the regular faculty appraisal form in which the criteria are related more to teaching or research faculty activities. A librarian who catalogs eight hours a day may suffer when measured against such criteria. The logical conclusion is that the appraisal must be for performance in a specific position, while still allowing
credit for scholarly achievement beyond the call of duty. The differences and similarities of faculty and librarian responsibilities must be considered specifically for each person and position.

**Who Appraises?**

In almost all cases where appraisals were conducted, the person responsible for the appraisal gathered opinions from others or reviewed the results with others. If the immediate supervisor was not responsible for the appraisal he was usually consulted. The findings are summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>The director or administrator either prepares or participates in preparing the appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>One or more committees, councils, or peer groups are involved in the appraisal process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Personnel officer is involved in the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Only the director is involved in the appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Only the immediate supervisor is involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Only a committee, council, or peer group is involved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some libraries used more than one method, resulting in a total of more than 100.

When appraisal is performed by someone other than the immediate supervisor, and the results are not disclosed to the employee, the main advantages of the process are lost. It is essential for people to know if their work is satisfactory and if not, how and why it fails to meet the mark. Even an outstanding employee should be informed of specific instances both of superior performance and of areas where he might improve.

Grandy cites an example of an outstanding employee completing her first year in an organization. At her appraisal interview her supervisor mentioned no particular areas of excellence but merely told her how pleased he was with her work. Following the evaluation, her work became quite erratic. Unless the supervisor is able to point out exactly what the employee is doing well, the employee will devise his own tests to discover which behavior pattern will gain approval and which will not.

Although only a few university libraries in this survey assigned primary responsibility for appraisal to a peer group or committee, many respondents indicated participation by such a group. The apparent objective in the use of a peer group is to attempt to increase the reliability of the appraisal by drawing upon several opinions. French states that when the ratings are made by a group or committee, actual knowledge of the person’s performance by each member is vital. Without objective data, a committee may be simply pooling their collective ignorance. In a large library, all members of a committee usually do not have firsthand knowledge of everyone’s work. French further indicates that a major problem in the use of peer, or subordinate, ratings is the potential danger that the ratings may be unintentionally made on criteria which are useful to the rater but not necessarily to the enterprise. For example, a reference librarian participating in the peer group might give excessive weight to incidents involving reference room activities. French concludes, however, that ratings by peers do show promise of being useful in promotional decisions. Hollander found peer ratings to be high in reliability in a study of officer candidates where leadership potential was an important factor.

**Typical Ratings**

“On the basis of your experience, what percentage of your personnel get ratings that are in the following categories—Above Average, Average, Below Average?”
The majority of respondents indicated that they gave above-average ratings to 70 percent of their staff. Two gave this rating to 95 percent of their staff. Below-average ratings were given to only about 5 percent of the personnel.

The report of the Conference on Performance Appraisal and Review held in 1957 at Michigan, sponsored by the Foundation for Research and Human Behavior, pointed out that appraisal ratings are usually bunched at the good end of the scale, and that rater differences are sometimes more marked than differences between those rated. One reason is that the supervisor has to justify his evaluation to the subordinate, and few supervisors possess the desired insight and tact to tell a subordinate how to improve. The easiest way out is to limit the evaluation discussion to the employee's good points. Often the administrator rationalizes his all-above-average ratings by stating that the library does not hire or retain average or below-average people.

Kirchner and Reisberg conclude that better supervisors tend to show more spread and variation in their ratings, and also tend to give more regard for independent action and creative thinking on the part of their subordinates. More effective supervisors also tend to check a greater number of least strengths, whereas the less effective supervisors tend to rate subordinates much more alike. Thompson and Dalton found one manager who expressed the belief that low performers should be given extremely low scores—possibly even lower than they deserved—to encourage them to leave. It was found, however, that this approach was more likely to influence them to stay to try to gain security. The supervisor should not deliberately adjust his ratings to try to achieve a particular purpose but should be able to defend his evaluation with specific instances of good and poor performance.

Effectiveness of Appraisals—Survey Findings

The questionnaire asked several questions about the effectiveness of the appraisal technique in the opinion of the director (or person responding to the survey questionnaire). The questions included: How effective do you think your appraisal method is in...

- pointing out employee shortcomings?
- giving employees encouragement to improve performance?
- helping make reliable judgments upon which to base salary increases?
- giving the person an opportunity to discuss problems?
- helping eliminate bias and favoritism in ratings?

Regardless of the appraisal system used, the replies indicated that 26 percent felt that their method was "very effective," 64 percent thought their technique of appraisal was "somewhat effective," 8 percent considered it "ineffective," and 2 percent rated theirs as "completely ineffective."

Bias cannot be eliminated by the choice of a particular type of appraisal system according to a majority of writers. Rather the rater must become aware of bias tendencies so that he can attempt to avoid them in his ratings. There is more likely to be bias in an appraisal system where the supervisor does not have to confront the person appraised, since the discussion and questioning by the person appraised tends to bring out any bias in the ratings.

Failure of appraisal programs is due to inept techniques, ineffectual communication between rater and ratee, and the role conflict experienced by the rater. The type of form used has much less influence on the final results.

Conclusion

Whether formal or casual, appraisals are conducted in every organization. There is seldom any difficulty in identi-
fying extreme patterns of behavior—
the very good or the very poor—and not
much time or money needs to be spent
on the exercise. Appraisal systems are
more essential for those who fall be­
tween these extremes.

Appraisal forms are useful at least
for assuring a periodic review and as­
essment of the employee's contribu­
tions. Rating scale forms have many
shortcomings, and it is difficult to judge
a librarian's work performance by ap­
plying the same criteria used to evaluate
teaching faculty. The best yardstick for
measuring librarians is a form
specifi­
cally designed to consider the special
competencies of librarians. Ideally, two
forms should be used: one to be com­
pleted by the individual, permitting him
to list activity in research or publica­
tion, professional or personal develop­
ment, and participation in professional,
academic, or community affairs; the sec­
ond form, to be completed by the li­
brarian's supervisor, requiring essay-like
summaries of the person's on-the-job
performance, personal traits, and atti­
tudes.

The supervisor has to accept the re­
sponsibility to judge the performance
of other people. Often this responsibil­
ity is hesitantly taken because he feels
uncomfortable in his role as a judge.
It is this psychological barrier which un­
derlies the failure of most evaluation
systems. When a specific system fails, a
common solution is to adopt a different
evaluation instrument, but the underly­
ing fault is with the people making the
evaluations.
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Approval Plans: Vendor Responsibility and Library Research

A Literature Survey and Discussion

The widely accepted approval-plan concept has moved from a lengthy period of discussion of selection responsibility to a few recent studies of the plans' cost, efficiency, and impact on research collections. An annotated list of articles from 1958 to 1972 traces this transformation and identifies the research studies. Responsibilities of vendors in advertising and promotion and in continuing service to libraries are discussed. Areas for further research and cooperative programs to apply research findings are proposed.

Librarians writing about approval plans are nearly unanimous in their support of the concept. It seemed, however, from discontinuous reading, that much of the discussion was offered by administrators who were concerned with theory, not with technique; that much of the widely expressed satisfaction was unsupported by critical study or research; and that the continuing influence of the originator and promoter, the vendor, was largely overlooked.

Therefore this literature survey. The discussion following the bibliography is restricted to plans for United States publications, although some articles in the survey treat both domestic and foreign plans as a single concept. United States plans, because they produce more books, seem to provoke more of the complexities. The discussion considers two problems—the performance of vendors offering the plans and the difficulties of acquiring unvolunteered books—and will suggest areas for further study.

Literature Survey

Libraries with approval plans of their own will not find much in this list that is outside their experience. Almost every author has been cited by another; there is much in-breeding, a situation suggesting the need for more research.

Articles are in roughly chronological order, but those that relate to each other are grouped; literature was searched through mid-December 1971. Quotations pointing out technical problems and proposing research were deliberately chosen for that reason and are not to be construed as necessarily representing the author's principal thesis. Research surveys and in-house studies are indicated by an asterisk.

Early blanket orders involved selection, but in general return privileges were not a part of the agreement, giving rise to later charges of librarians' abdicating their selection responsibilities.

1. Jacob, Emerson and Salisbury, Begel, "Automatic Purchase of University
Describes procedures used at Michigan State University library to acquire all books of university presses, receiving books directly from the presses, but using a jobber to place the standing orders and to consolidate billing to the library.

A news story describing in some detail the review-copy plan devised by Emerson Greenaway, first with Lippincott and later with other publishers. All books received were paid for, but librarians selected from books received those they wanted to catalog and to order in quantity for branches.

An editorial questioning blanket orders on the grounds that the selection process is abandoned and costs of cataloging more books offset cheaper acquisitions costs. Information is based on the 1957–58 report of the Ohio State University director of libraries.

Response to entry no. 3, again arguing selection vs. completeness; “... surely there must be some reason why so many of their [i.e., university presses'] books get remaindered.”

Continues the discussion of the foregoing by noting responses from the library in defense of its plan. The library was ordering more than 90 percent of the total output of forty-seven university presses before the blanket plan; most of the remaining 10 percent were canceled by profile exclusions.

The first major article on blanket orders vs. selection, it is also a plea to critics to distinguish between receiving books earlier than usual and their subsequent review and selection. It is a symposium on the Greenaway plan, with Emerson Greenaway as a participant. Others were spokesmen for Lippincott and public, county, college, and university libraries. All but one (Oboler) felt that the advantages outweighed the disadvantages.

An editorial addressed to blanket-order critics. “There is always the danger that something holy can easily become a sacred cow. Those who wage indiscriminate war on behalf of the sanctity of book selection are in danger of precipitating this process.”

Response to entry no. 4, principally Oboler’s comments in 3a and 4; compares blanket orders for large research collections with a smaller library’s continuation orders for monographic series.

From the first articles in 1958 to early 1961, the discussion of blanket orders centered on the charge that publishers were supplanting librarians as book selectors. After an apparent five-year hiatus, the subject again appears, but now discussion turns to the absolute necessity for rigid selection, and the topic begins to turn from “blanket orders” (all books kept, if not cataloged) to “approval plans” (books not selected can be returned). In addition to the emphasis on selection, criticism of vendors’ services and complaints of internal problems for libraries begin to appear. Some of the problems are now being re-searched.

A selection from the 1964/65 report of the University of California library, Los Angeles. It is the first to point to problems in the mechanics of the system: publishing, late receipt of books, and coverage.

Unfortunately the blanket order system is least effective for U.S. books because of the complexity of the American publishing
business and the inexpertness of the American book distribution channels. Some test runs this year revealed shocking and apparently increasing delays in our receipt of currently published U.S. books. We had gone on the assumption that our own internal procedures, prior to ordering and after receipt, were the guilty elements, because libraries as nonprofit institutions are always easily accused of inefficiency. However, the oppressive delays appear to be in the market place and beyond our control. Moreover, the blanket-order system appears to be least effective for scientific and technical books, although the reason for this is not immediately clear.


Material originally presented at a College Division workshop during a Pacific Northwest Library Association conference at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, August 23, 1967, minutes of which appear in "College Division Workshop," PNLA Quarterly, Oct. 1967, p. 29-30. The principal author reviews the kinds of blanket orders and the reasons for using them. He cautions against heavy dependence on approval plans and states the need for further study of their immediate and long-term effects. His conclusion is that approval plans are basically beneficial but can produce automatic superficial selection methods that must not be allowed to supersede traditional librarian-faculty cooperation.


Concedes the value of approval plans, but questions the dealer's preselection: he works "from his definition of the word 'scholarly'" and the books he considers not scholarly and does not send can be lost to the library completely because they may never be brought to the library's attention. His "contention is that the quality of the collections produced, not the promised increase in efficiency of ordering procedures is the true issue" (p. 140).


Browne is opposed to blanket orders on the basis that "particularly in the small college library . . . the one really professional library activity which we, as librarians, perform is that of book selection" (p. 142). He emphasizes the negative selection role a blanket order leaves to the librarian; i.e., the librarian rejects what he does not want after the initial selection by the jobber.


Presents guidelines for determining whether a library can afford an approval plan, depending principally on a college's teaching commitment to the subject, the amount of publishing in that area, and whether a library's single-book ordering normally approaches the amount for total publishing.


News report of a speech delivered by W. Carl Jackson, director of the Pennsylvania State University library, to eastern college librarians. One point not made generally is the advantage a blanket order provides of the library's gaining control of book funds previously held by departments. Problems cited include "delays in Library of Congress cataloging; the need to communicate to the faculty just what kinds of materials come automatically—and the need to explain to faculty members why a given book either was or was not accepted by the library."


First to address in detail the problem of internal mechanical procedures in dealing with unverified bibliographical data, interim controls, storage, and selector traffic in the acquisitions area. He concludes that "it may be more costly to process unordered books than ordered ones" (p. 342).


Offers suggestions for revising internal procedures, e.g., filing records and LC proofs by title to bypass the problem of unverified entries; Xeroxing rather than typing multiple 3x5 records. (See entry no. 22, Anderson and Rebuldela.)
Problems still are the acquisition unit's having to type its own purchase-recommendation forms for unordered books, normally library, e.g., reference, browsing room. "How Good Is Your All Book Plan?" Norman, University of Oklahoma Libraries, n.d. (Mimeographed.) An internal research study run in the second quarter 1968/69 to determine whether the library's approval-plan vendor was producing, as promised, as much as 80 percent of the books within the week of publication or before the title's first appearance in trade bibliographies. Results were that the company was supplying 70 percent. The study found that university presses give the best service, followed, in order, by trade-scholarly publishers, publishers issuing fewer than five titles a year, and trade publishers. The study is described in detail by Axford.19


Discusses selection vs. collection in the context of the distinction between blanket orders and approval and approval plans and addresses the argument that it is easier to keep a book than to return it. "I believe it is a slur on librarians to say they would not return unwanted volumes" (p. 6). The article concludes with a survey of academic libraries to determine how many use the plans and what their experience has been. Questions and tallies of responses are included (p. 318-3). Dudley notes this fundamental aspect of approval plans: "A blanket order is a powerful tool; like any powerful tool it can be dangerous if not handled properly" (p. 326).


Originally a paper read at the second seminar on approval and gathering plans, this is a widely discussed article that counters completely the general acceptance of approval plans.21 Rouse's thesis is that his librarians, with an average of 14.7 years on the staff at the time of his article, are much more knowledgeable about users' requirements than his vendor. He describes the library's unfortunate experiences with the internal technical problems created by the plan. Among these is the vendor-related problem of not knowing whether a book would be sent and of having to resort to the previously-used selection procedures to monitor the program.

Rouse also brings up a problem not previously discussed in the literature, that of over-statement of a company's capabilities by its representatives. The plan was in op-
eration only four months, but he says, "... I shall admit to the possibility of unfairness in an experience of only four months but also point out the fact that this was one month longer than the agent said was needed ..." (p. 148). Because of the short time the plan was in operation and because of other specific statements, the article prompted numerous lengthy responses.


The letters, Rouse's responses to the writers, and the original article must be read as a unit. Together they demonstrate that an approval plan is not a panacea and not for every library and that if an approval plan is undertaken the library must be prepared to give it constant attention; it is not automatic.


Assesses approval plans as basic tools that will automatically supply the obvious, self-selecting kind of book, freeing bibliographers' time for collecting the more esoteric material. Then addresses the matter of how much they cost: "... it is difficult to assess how much more is spent on the system than is saved by professional staff no longer being expensively used as efficient clerks" (p. 402). Urges research into costs and the long-term effects on collection-building in libraries, both individually and nationally, with many specific questions to be answered. A significant article.


Distinguishes acquisitions policies for college libraries from those of research libraries, which have more diverse interests and larger budgets. Also introduces a factor that must be taken into account when approval programs are instituted: faculty attitudes toward departmental funds (see also entry no. 7 and Atkinson20, 21). "The library which promotes any approval plan must face the important task of winning over the faculty members who can be notoriously conservative about 'their' libraries. Any program which appears to take money out of their hands and place it in a common pool for purchase of current materials is seen as a threat to the faculty's traditional control. It does not help, either, when a faculty member in a fairly conservative field sees some of the 'frivolous' titles other departments are spending money to purchase" (p. 398-9).


A study of four academic libraries compares the circulation of books selected by librarians, those selected by faculty, and those produced by blanket orders. Results were that "librarians selected more titles that were used than did faculty members or book jobbers, and faculty members selected more titles that were used than did book jobbers" (p. 301). Although the study was not intended to inquire into the reasons for the results, the figures did point to the differences in procedures of reviewing the books received: one person at one library, two at another, and teams of bibliographers at the other two. He concludes that rigid selection is essential and that selection must be done by persons for whom it is a primary responsibility, not added to other duties. Areas for additional research are noted on p. 307-8. The article is based primarily on the author's Ph.D. dissertation, "The Influence of Book Selection Agents Upon Book Collection Usage in Academic Libraries." Graduate School of Library Science, University of Illinois, 1969. The abstract appears in Dissertation Abstracts International 30:3032A (Jan. 1970).


A descriptive article on both foreign and domestic plans intending "to place the positive benefits of a properly handled system on the record ..." (p. 286). He emphasizes the need for critical control on the part of the library selection staff: "The plans, although they are in a sense automatic, do not operate by themselves" (p. 289).

17. Steele, Colin. "Blanket Orders and the

Continues the point suggested by the Evans study, that subject specialists must be involved in helping to organize the approval-plan profile in the first place and in selection from the book shipments to maintain essential critical control of the program.15


Subject bibliographers and approval plans are discussed in the interview with Robert G. Vosper (p. 175-6); other aspects of an approval plan—screening shipments, funding, coverage—are discussed with William P. Kellam (p. 74-5).


"With respect to approval plans, what is needed at the present moment is a solid body of research which will calm some of the controversy by moving us from opinion and prejudice into documented facts" (p. 368). "Much of the published and unpublished research [views] approval plans largely in isolation from the total acquisitions and processing effort" (p. 369).

Axford studied processing costs and the use of staff time, specifically by each function in each technical service department, at five state universities in Florida, comparing the costs of books acquired by approval plan with those acquired by other means. The data "clearly support the contention that a blanket approval plan is an efficient method" and that "a well-managed approval plan can save at the minimum one full-time position, with significantly higher savings possible depending on variances in internal procedures" (p. 371).

The project also included a vendor-performance study for university-press titles similar to Maher’s, which he describes in detail.9 Results indicate faster and more complete coverage in the libraries with approval plans. The study was also presented at the third seminar on gathering and approval plans.22


*Three symposia have been convened to discuss approval plans exclusively, both foreign and domestic. Proceedings of the first two have been published; the third is due shortly. These three books provide a comprehensive survey of many aspects of the entire subject, including discussion by dealers’ panels. The first two have appended material describing the programs and services of jobbers offering foreign and domestic plans, and the first has examples of profiles.*


*Atkinson, Hugh C. “Faculty Reaction to an Approval Plan at the Ohio State University.” p. 30-40.


21. Sypers-Duran, Peter, and Gore, Daniel, eds. *Advances in Understanding Approval and Gathering Plans in Aca-
Contents:


Harris, Thomas C. "Book Purchasing or Book Selection; a Study of Values." p. 53-56.


Rouse, Roscoe. "Automation Stops Here." p. 35-48. (See also entry no. 12.)

A description of approval plans written from the view of a publisher and bookseller, information for which was gathered at the second seminar. Some of his comments concerning vendors:

He may ... sense a new mandate regarding speed of delivery (p. 112).

Needless to say, the test of a gathering plan is not whether it provides the best discount, but whether it provides the books (p. 111).

The greatest gain ... seems to lie in the way the suppliers have risen to their new responsibilities. Formerly they could feel that they'd done their part when they had sent what they could and reported on the balance (p. 112).

Any wholesaler who accepts a blanket order contract ... accepts a new (and defined) type of responsibility. Like the library book-selection staff itself, he may have for the first time a really precise definition of what the library wants from him —and means to get. And he will be up against a staff with time to spend making sure they get it (p. 112).


Papers, unavailable at this writing, will include:

Anderson, Le Moyne, and Rebuldela, Harriet, a review of technical procedures to take advantage of the economics that approval plans offer. (See also entry no. 8a.)

*Axford, H. William, a study demonstrating the economies effected by blanket and approval plans. (See also entry no. 19.)

Gore, Daniel, plans for libraries with small budgets.

Gormley, Mark, the possibility of failure if the plans are not properly administered and monitored.

Lane, David O., the effects of approval plans on academic libraries.

Blanket order and approval plans have come to occupy a separate section in the reviews of acquisitions published annually by Library Resources & Technical Services. Ranging from brief mention to reviews of the year's major articles, they are:


There are packets of brochures, thesauri, lists of publishers, and customers' manuals describing approval plans and related services available from vendors, and, in addition, their services are described in appendices in the seminars on approval and gathering plans.²⁰,²¹ The following five offer plans for U.S. publishers:


31. The Baker & Taylor Company, 50 Kirby Avenue, Somerville, NY 08876 (21, p. 120-2, 157-8).

32. Edco-Vis Associates, Box 95, Verona, WI 53593.

33. Midwest Library Service, 11400 Dorssett Road, Maryland Heights, MO 63042 (21, p. 203-5).

34. Stacey's, Division of Bro-Dart, Inc., 15255 East Don Julian Road, City of Industry, CA 91747 (Bro-Dart's Books-Coming-Into-Print program described in the seminar proceedings has been superseded by a science-technology plan at the Stacey division).

DISCUSSION: VENDORS

Technical problems, aside from the selection process, are usually generalized and only briefly mentioned in the literature. They have been presented in detail in only two articles, Thom⁸ and Rouse.¹²,²¹ A paper yet to be published, that of Anderson and Rebuldeла, also discusses processing technicalities.²² Some of the vendor-related difficulties that complicate technical procedures are discussed here.

On the theoretical level an approval plan is an arrangement among three cooperating groups: publishers, vendors, and libraries. In practice, these are three centripetal forces.

The problems with publishers are well known: advertisements far in advance of publication, with title changes in the interim, postponed publication or unannounced cancellations; the proliferation of small publishers; the difficulty of reaching university departments and professional associations; the same book published here and abroad.

Libraries can be inefficient. They sometimes fail to adjust technical processing to accommodate the demands of an approval plan or make use of the conveniences the vendors offer; they are frequently slow in paying bills, placing heavy demands on the financial structure of the vendor; they fail to understand the limitations of an approval plan, producing subsequent misunderstanding by faculty and librarians alike; they sometimes fail their selection responsibilities; they force vendors to meet individual processing requirements, causing increased vendor overhead and subsequent higher costs for all libraries.

Vendors, by placing themselves between these two problem-prone groups are patently asking for their troubles. But they themselves are causing others. Beginning with advertising and promotion, they overstate their capabilities. Consider:

Books from all major publishers. . . .
Each month [the company's] new publication . . . keeps university, college, and special libraries abreast of virtually all new books of interest to them.
You'll be dealing with one source for new books from more than 4,000 pub-
lishers. This program applies to all books in the humanities or the sciences, continuations, and monographs by commercial and non-commercial publishers.

[The company] now supplies the books of more than 3,000 publishers. In fact [the company] will supply any U.S. book in print distributed through normal wholesale channels, including trade, University Press, text, reference and technical titles.

The tendency, even in this day of supposedly sophisticated consumers, is to look upon book jobbers as specialists in the matter of liberating books from publishers. Vendors' public statements lead one to expect that the situation is well in hand, especially when company representatives in person verbally support the advertising. One company, new to the approval-plan business, but which has obviously learned from its elders, says this: "We feel that it is unrealistic for any jobber to state that he obtains or warehouses, in fact that he even has contacts with all the United States Publishers, let alone Foreign Houses."

Approval plans for U.S. publications do not, because they cannot, supply "all" or "virtually all" of the academically pertinent output of "4,000 publishers" or even "3,000 publishers," major or otherwise. Vendors restrict their publisher coverage, as is verified by their lists of approval-plan publishers. Some specialty publishers will not work through dealers; but others that would are conspicuously missing from approval publisher lists. Wilden-Hart proposes persuading jobbers, using the Encyclopedium of Associations as a base, to handle the more difficult task of acquiring the publications of institutes and professional associations as an alternative to the costly gift-and-exchange systems libraries now depend upon (p. 404-5).18 "Jobbers are so conditioned to the commercial publishers who offer large discounts... that they have not had the perspicacity to see that the libraries are not in business to make a profit but to get those things they want" (p. 405).

Because approval plans/blanket orders do not blanket, prevailing opinion now is that approval plans must be monitored in the library by checking book receipts against Library of Congress proofs and other bibliographic tools. To insure complete coverage, even from the vendors' own publisher lists, this has to be done by the libraries, but it is not consistent with the companies' advertised and promotional claims. Furthermore, claiming a missed book will not always produce the book, in spite of the statement that "it is a simple matter to Xerox a copy of the request and to claim it against the plan... Such a move would insure the receipt of the desired item" (p. 345).12a

There are four points to consider in regard to claiming:

1. A claim represents a book outside the vendor's routine. It is apparently extremely difficult to break into the normal processing to make a place for a stray book, especially in a computer system and even with a manual system. One vendor's representative said in a private meeting, "On any claim or back order we don't make a penny. The most expensive thing to do is send an [unscheduled] book."

2. Claiming is enormously expensive for a library. If a library receives a request for a book or discovers in monitoring that a book expected on an approval plan has not been received, the library logically will not order the book but will request the vendor to send it. It then probably files the request against the day the book arrives, and it must periodically check the file to see what has been outstanding too long. Over the months, because vendors do not supply all books and because claims do not produce all the known missed books, the file continuously enlarges. The library, ever hopeful, continues claiming.

Melcher estimates from an internal
cost study that it takes ten cents to file a single form and another ten cents to pull the form from the file (p. 12, 21) —twenty cents for the filing operation for one claim. Add the number of claims and the number of times each is claimed, multiply by twenty cents, add the cost of Xeroxing and mailing, and add the unquantifiable costs of doing without the book in the meantime. In addition, the price of a book when announced can and does increase during the time it is repeatedly claimed and eventually produced or is ordered elsewhere.

3. The burden of seeing to it that all pertinent books arrive is on the library, not the vendor, who is advertising totality and selling the service. This is a fundamental point: the library staff, if it monitors its plan and tries to claim missed books, is in the unpaid employ of the vendor.

4. One of the charges against an approval plan, based on experience and the literature, is the uncertainty of knowing when, or even whether, a specific book will arrive “particularly when it had been specially requested” (Dudley, p. 322). An approval plan will produce most of the books, an accurate statement of the generality. But, how can a library know which specific title will be in the group that is volunteered and which title will be among those that are missed so that the library can take immediate action? Assuming that the responsibility for monitoring coverage is the library’s and not the vendor’s, Wilden-Hart proposes a cooperative plan: “... if one library is assiduous in checking what it does not receive through approval plans, is then all the work involved for the benefit of one library and for one copy? ... By notifying the jobber that individual requests from libraries on approval plans may be significant items for other libraries, methods could be established to see that others benefit from the checking done. This could even be extended to sharing the bibliographical work in highly specialized fields ...” (p. 404). One library at least has repeatedly made the point to a vendor that a claim could represent multiple sales to other libraries, but we are now back to point no. 1 in this section: if the book does not enter the system routinely, it may never be entered.

Another aspect of the question of vendor responsibility is whether his representative should sell approval plans indiscriminately. Or, because through extensive travel he becomes knowledgeable about many kinds of libraries, can he be expected to act as a professional counselor? Should libraries be required to pass with high marks an approval-plan aptitude test? The agent knows his approval plan. Can he be expected to study the library’s internal procedures and judge whether they are compatible? The library knows its own internal structure, its own individuality, but it must rely heavily on the agent’s description of the approval plan to make a decision. Sheer increase in the number of customers cannot only overrun a vendor’s staff so that it cannot support a representative’s assurances, but the resulting problems caused by the mismatch can create complications and subsequent increased costs for the vendor and all his customers.

Errors in invoicing, duplicates, late receipt of books, failure to follow the profile, and casual bibliographic data are other grievances lodged against the vendor. They are a minor part of the process numerically, but they take a disproportionate amount of time to correct, and they drive costs up.

Vendors do not always follow their own advice. The president of one of the major vendors, in a speech before publishers in New York in 1962, was cited in Publishers Weekly as follows:

[He] made the point that library budgets are for the most part static,
and any way in which the expenses of library clerical work can be decreased means more money from the budget available for the purchase of books.

[He] mentioned that more than a few libraries have simply stopped ordering books from publishers who, through delays in shipping, incomplete orders, and unintelligible invoices, cause a mountain of paper work.

Whether books are supplied on approval or by order, by the publisher or through a vendor, the problems are the same, and the comments underscore the gap between the vendor's intent and his execution of bibliographic and accounting records. This is not always just a matter of inability to anticipate a Library of Congress entry; rather it is often a matter of an invoice that does not match its book or an invoice for a nonexistent book, requiring correspondence and special controls over the books and invoices until the matter can be resolved.

**DISCUSSION: RESEARCH**

Most of the literature is descriptive; that is, the articles generalize about the theory and philosophy of an ideal approval plan or discuss procedures within a library. Those that have attempted statistical analysis include an in-house study at the University of California, 5 Maher, 9 Lane, 10 Dudley, 11 Evans, 15 Axford, 19, 22 and Atkinson. 20

The need for further research has been stated by Wilden-Hart, 13 Evans, 15 and Axford, 19, 22 with specific suggestions for study given by Wilden-Hart and Evans.

Approval plans can be a tremendously helpful adjunct to a total acquisitions program. Another advantageous aspect, if it is followed up, is that they have an astonishing ability to throw into relief organizational weaknesses of the library and to amplify the need to consider collection-building throughout university-wide planning. But it is possible that an imaginatively conceived and vital selection tool will be lost to libraries if the complications, suspected or demonstrated, that they create in acquisitions processes and the subsequent increased costs should begin to be demonstrated in future research studies. Administrators who have accepted, and have stated publicly their acceptance of, the theory and philosophy of approval plans will not be able to accept the costs.

The following represent some aspects of approval plans that have received little attention in the literature; many studies have investigated the subject as generalities, but not all have been considered in specific relation to an approval plan.

—The relation of the approval plan to the on-going acquisitions program. How much does the money spent now on current acquisitions really reduce over the years the amount needed for retrospective purchases, considering incomplete coverage, delays in receipt of books, and the need for and futility of claiming?

—In-library costs of technical processing, especially for books not received: the costs of monitoring the program. Axford's study indicates the economy of an approval plan (for books received) but, because libraries themselves are a variable, his findings may not be applicable generally. 19, 22

—Prices of books; the total cost of an approval program and the cost by subject as an aid to budgeting, both library and departmental. Wilden-Hart said: "Research has yet to be done on the allocation of budgets by libraries using approval plans" (p. 403). 18 Statistics based on the amount of publishing are not reliable for this purpose because for one reason or another not all books published are received; vendors' curtailed publisher lists will exclude many of them. The University of Nebraska and Florida Atlantic have been maintaining unpublished, therefore not

—Computers. Does, and how does, a computer system reduce the complicated technical detail an approval plan thrusts upon an acquisitions unit? How can unverified bibliographic data be handled to avoid complicating computer controls of the records? Boss says: “We have not found a way to use the computer to handle blanket orders” (p. 20). Also, is it possible for vendors to reduce scholarly publishing, which is bibliographically complex, to computer programming, which is inherently rigid and literal? One company has transferred its costly and unreliable computer-selection program to a previously organized manual system.

—Cataloging in publication. If an approval plan does produce books more rapidly than title-by-title ordering, some of them still wait in the library until the Library of Congress produces the cataloging and the cards. Presumably, cataloging in publication will speed library cataloging, but weaknesses are difficult to foresee. To take advantage of the cataloging printed in the book, one must have the book; to have the book, the publisher must send it to the vendor, and the vendor must send it to the library. Some vendors use as a way of announcing books a Library of Congress cataloging information service that is received several weeks in advance of proof-slip distribution; it would suffer from the same disadvantage of LC’s late cataloging of some materials. The preproof-slip service suggests another area to explore: a comparison of the efficiency of vendors’ announcement media.

—Selection. The subject has been thoroughly discussed in the literature, and Evans has expressed the need for further research, including “the need to examine the entire matter of acquisitions procedures in an objective and detailed manner. Too many of the decisions in acquisitions work are based on feelings and opinions rather than on evidence and fact” (p. 307).

One extralibrary consideration can be expanded. Vendors have standing orders with publishers. Whether a vendor is working with all books of scholarly interest, or specializing in selected areas, he will have to describe to each publisher just what he has in mind—his own profile; the profile is then subject to interpretation by each publisher. The genesis of selection, obviously, is the editorial staff of the publishing houses, which must necessarily place economics before a library’s esoteric needs. Approval-plan books thus move through three screenings before they ever appear in a shipment to a library.

Related to selection is the quality of publishing. A query frequently posed by faculty is whether approval plans with their supposed automatic library market promote excessive publishing of inconsequential books. One answer is probably no more than the publish-or-perish dictum under which most faculties try to survive. In academic publishing the faculty itself supplies most of the manuscripts that later return as approval-plan submissions. The whole question of the publishing-selection process could be explored, in addition to the reverse effect of approval plans on publishing.

—Subject bibliographers. Some opinion holds that when bibliographers are used for difficult and esoteric areas, like Slavic studies, they can work to the disadvantage of general areas, like history, and therefore produce the same imbalance of the collection that an approval plan is supposed to correct. Is then one unit of a library’s acquisitions organization canceling the efforts of another? Another aspect of the subject is suggested by Wilden-Hart, who proposes a study of how approval plans “are slowly
changing the work of a subject bibliographer" (p. 405).18

The long-term value of the books the approval plan produces, with its concomitant problems of shelving and subsequent weeding, which in turn are part of the costs. Studies using circulation during a fixed period as the base may not reliably measure this precise point because the focus of interest, especially in sociology and political science and possibly to an even greater extent in scientific and technological research, is constantly shifting. In addition, there is elapsed time before the appearance of bibliographies and indexes that stimulate continuing use. A book not used during the survey could be in demand later, although Evans says that some authors have found that future use is closely correlated with past use (p. 307).15

On the other hand, the whole point could be canceled by the philosophy that a new book is news, and that a library user should have any book available so that he is then able to decide for himself whether it is suitable for his purpose, now or in the future. If he decides not, the book’s “use” will not be reflected in circulation figures, but it will certainly have been “used,” and for a purpose. It suggests a survey of library policies and procedures for selection from approval-plan shipments.

Research will answer the questions, but then ways to apply the information must be found. Some writers are beginning to suggest cooperative ventures as possibilities. Vendors and libraries would surely gain by trying to implement such programs. Libraries need the vendors’ expert assistance in dealing with publishers. Vendors could profit by the specialized bibliographic knowledge of the librarians and also by a greater understanding of the philosophical thinking their approval plans promote in libraries in contrast to the demanding logistical problems that must engage much of the vendors’ efforts. An approval plan is a continuum; it is not a mutually exclusive two-step geographical process of shipping cartons of books from one spot and receiving them at another.

Wilden-Hart has outlined an interlibrary monitoring program and a plan to bring under control the publications of associations.13 A F. Schnaitter has proposed liaison-librarians to work with vendors at their locations (p. 348).12a

There are others:

The literature survey turned up two in-house studies: the University of California study of some of the mechanics and the University of Oklahoma study of vendor reliability.9 In addition to the University of Nebraska and Florida Atlantic statistical studies, there are undoubtedly others. A clearinghouse of such otherwise unavailable information could be established and lists published regularly for comparison among libraries and for points of departure for more generalized surveys.

Another aspect of mutual library-vendor understanding is described by the same company president quoted earlier; he “attributed many of the problems to a lack of communication between the publisher and the library purchaser, each of whom has his administrative requirements to fulfill, but seldom realizes the needs of the other.”

As a way of implementing the need for better library-vendor communication, perhaps vendors would consider newsletters to their customers detailing the realities of publisher-vendor relations and of book-publishing economics and logistics. Descriptions of their own organization and procedures, with directories of personnel, would be helpful.

Librarians, in their relations with library users, deal with facts and with ideas of substance, not in unsubstantiated promotional claims. Because of their stock in trade and because of the unanimity of support for the approval-
plan concept, librarians are psychologically in a position to turn a vendor's special knowledge, if he will share it candidly, into an informed effort to make approval plans functionally acceptable.

And as librarians learn more of their own internal specifics, they will in turn have practical information to share with vendors.
BEVERLY LYNCH

Participative Management in Relation to Library Effectiveness

This paper reviews a recent study on the influence of participative management on library performance. Because most of the recent theoretical and empirical research being done in this area is ignored and an invalid measure of participation in decision making is used, the study provides no basis for the generalization that an increase in the library staff's participation in decision making will increase the library's effectiveness.

If research in librarianship is to progress toward its objective of "extending the existing body of factual knowledge concerning the values and procedures of libraries in their many aspects," researchers must make every appropriate use of insights, concepts, and methods of other disciplines. One advantage of the affiliation of library schools with universities is that it facilitates the use of theories developed in other fields. The library researcher who borrows a theory, however, must fully understand its assumptions and limitations and must be thoroughly familiar with the empirical evidence which tends to support or to limit the application of the theory to the problems of librarianship. Naïve or uninformed use of approaches found useful in other disciplines can be damaging, particularly if library administrators act on the basis of the invalid generalization. It is therefore important that studies that borrow from other fields be monitored critically so that only well-founded research will be accepted.

This paper examines a study by Maurice P. Marchant, entitled, "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," which is based upon his dissertation, "The Effects of the Decision Making Process and Related Organizational Factors on Alternative Measures of Performance in University Libraries." Marchant's investigation was designed to measure the influence of the professional librarian's participation in decision making upon the library's effectiveness. Although Marchant found no statistically significant relationships between these variables, he reports significant relationships between participation in decision making and staff satisfaction.

Marchant borrows theory from behavioral science and deals with a subject which is of current interest to librarianship. His study is likely to be cited in library literature as evidence for the desirability of change in managerial style. Marchant's work is better than many recent studies on library organization and management in its structure, reporting, and use of statistical methods, but it reflects an insufficient knowledge of the theoretical and empirical work which has been done in
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participative management. There are also several faults in method and data analysis.

**THE THEORY**

The major theoretical basis for Marchant's work stems from Rensis Likert's theory of participative management, which was presented in Likert's *New Patterns of Management* and then elaborated in his *The Human Organization*. According to Likert a work group that accepts the "principle of supportive relationships" will achieve a higher rate of productivity than one that does not. Likert relies heavily for support of this theory on the experiment conducted by Morse and Reimer in four clerical divisions of a large company over a period of a year. Morse and Reimer report significant increases in productivity for both "participative" and "hierarchical" units, with a slightly higher increase in the hierarchically controlled division. Despite these contrary results the researchers felt that over a longer period of time the adverse effects on morale, which they observed in the hierarchical groups, would reduce their productivity. They assumed, however, that no self-corrective measures would be introduced into the hierarchical groups as production fell.

According to two recent comprehensive reviews research results relating participative management to productivity have been inconclusive. Day and Hamblin report democratic supervision to be more effective, while Shaw reports authoritarian treatment to be more effective. Studies by McCurdy and Eber, Sales, and Spector and Suttell, indicate no relationship between leadership styles and productivity. Current research in a government organization fails to support a positive relationship of participative management to productivity. Furthermore, Carey, Korman, and Vroom have suggested that studies which consider the causal effect of managerial style on subordinate performance can be interpreted as measuring the reverse effect, that is, the impact of performance on managerial style. More recently, another experiment provides strong evidence to support this hypothesis. It confirms an earlier study which reported that organizational behaviors are sensitive to prior organizational effectiveness.

Vroom and Mann, French et al., Foa, Gibb, Patchen, and Pelz suggest that the effects of participative management on productivity may depend upon what exactly is being measured in the study, participative supervision, considerate supervision, or closeness of supervision, and upon the needs and expectations of subordinates. These studies suggest that a participative, considerate, or supportive leadership style may be most effective when the decisions are nonroutine in nature, when the information required for effective decision making cannot be centralized nor standardized, or when, because rapid decision making is not required, there is time for subordinates to be involved in the process. Whether subordinates feel a need for independence, regard their participation in decision making as legitimate, consider themselves capable of contributing to the decision making, or are confident enough to work without close supervision also may influence the effectiveness of a participative leadership style. Unfortunately, none of this literature is presented by Marchant, nor does the design or methodology of his study reflect it.

Previous research has not demonstrated that participative management causes high productivity. Most of the research treats small groups with only incidental references to the organization as a whole. Most of the hypotheses regarding the relationships of participative decision making to other organizational variables have been too gross to be proved or disproved.

Marchant defines his purpose as an at-
tempt "to test the application of Likert's participative management theory within academic libraries." Presumably he intends not to reevaluate Likert's theory, but rather to apply it to a library setting. Despite objections in the management literature to the grossness of previous hypotheses, Marchant has not refined his own. He states his principal hypothesis as "the greater the extent to which the professional personnel on the staff are involved in the library's decision making processes, the more effective will be the library's performance." Marchant does not define participation in decision making. Whether he means actual decision making, perceived decision making, actual or perceived influence in decision making, increased communication, supportive relationships, or something else remains unclear.

Furthermore, while purporting to apply Likert's theory, Marchant changes Likert's independent variables, adds dependent variables, and entirely omits the intervening variables of the Likert model, inserting his own control variables, some of which are treated as intervening variables in his analysis. (See Figures 1, 2.) Although Marchant introduces the important variable of job satisfaction, he neglects to cite any literature on the subject, although more than four thousand articles have been published since the 1930s. Despite the large amount of research, experts still do not agree on the causes of job satisfaction, nor has the question whether job satisfaction influences productivity or vice-versa been answered. Marchant ignores the controversy.

The omission reflects only one example of the theoretical and empirical research that Marchant might usefully have brought into the library literature. For instance, he might have described the characteristics of the decision making process, defined such concepts as participation, satisfaction, or productivity, or given us a comprehensive review of the literature in one or more areas. Since he fails to do so, his contribution is restricted to the merits of his particular investigation, and even that is seriously flawed for lack of evidence of awareness of previous work.

**Measurement**

In his search for ways of measuring independent variables Marchant adopts Likert's "Profile of Organizational Characteristics," which has been validated as a measure of managerial style. A researcher who borrows another's instrument must either use it in the context of the same theory or establish its validity in the context of his own or different theory; Marchant does neither. Moreover, he simply extracts three of Likert's eighteen questionnaire items and designates them as his "Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Variables</th>
<th>Intervening Variables</th>
<th>End-result Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive relationship</td>
<td>Favorable attitudes toward superior</td>
<td>Low absence and turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group decision making</td>
<td>High confidence and trust</td>
<td>High productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High reciprocal influence</td>
<td>Low scrap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent communication; up, down and lateral</td>
<td>Low costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performance goals</td>
<td>High peer-group loyalty</td>
<td>High earnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High peer performance goals at all levels re: productivity, quality, scrap</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Likert, *The Human Organization*, p. 137

Figure 1
### Participative Management

#### Marchant’s Research Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Performance Measurements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decision making</td>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Organizational profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-range planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uniformity of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control Variables</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Doctoral degrees granted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Prerequisites available to librarians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Library expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decentralization of collection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Library autonomy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Beginning librarian salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Staff size and composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collection size and growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Staff breadth of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Service time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Marchant, “Participative Management . . . ,” p. 51

---

**Making Index.** Marchant then uses all eighteen Likert items to form what he calls “Profile Index.” Marchant’s use of a portion of the Likert questionnaire to measure one variable and then his use of the whole questionnaire, including the extracted portion, to measure another variable seems extraordinarily naive, particularly since Marchant reports the entirely anticipated correlation, .9696. This strong relationship merely demonstrates that the “Decision Making Index” and the “Profile Index” are different measures of the same characteristic, managerial style.

Although the validity of the “Decision Making Index” cannot be determined from the single correlation matrix Marchant provides, some assessment of its validity can be made. First, the average intercorrelations computed for these items in the “Decision Making Index” were computed and compared with the average correlations computed for these same items with the items in the “Profile Index.” The within-cluster average (.6966) is higher than the between-cluster average (.5898) as it should be if different constructs are being measured. As a comparison, two other three-item clusters were extracted from the “Profile Index.” The items grouped under the heading, “Leadership process,” have an average correlation of .69; they have an average correlation with items in the “Profile Index” of .5588. Three items listed as a “communication process” group have a within-cluster correlation of .64; the average correlation of these items with items in the “Profile Index” is .5735. Although the within-cluster averages are higher than the between-cluster averages for each of these groups, the difference between the correlations is dubious evidence to support the conclusion that more than one construct is being measured. A simple examination of the correlation matrix indicates that the items of the “Decision Making Index” correlate about equally well with each other and with the items in the “Profile Index.” It is unlikely that the Likert instrument, as used by Marchant, is measuring more than one construct.

Even if the validity of Marchant’s “Decision Making Index” were unsalable, questions would arise as to its reliability. Marchant makes no effort to
support this characteristic. The demonstration would have been difficult. A three-item scale is rarely reliable, for it requires that all three items measure a single concept. What is considered to be a unidimensional construct, as is assumed by Marchant in the "Decision Making Index," may be two-dimensional or more. Three questions form the index: whether problems are discussed at various levels in the organization, whether decision makers are aware of the problems at the lower levels in the organization, and whether subordinates are able to make their own work decisions. Marchant maintains that each question taps a discrete dimension of the decision making; it is more likely that each question is measuring one aspect of managerial style.

Before the relationships between specific variables can be tested there must be some confidence in the measurement. Since Marchant's "Decision Making Index" inspires little confidence, his conclusions based upon it are correspondingly shaky. Likert validated the "Profile Index" to some extent, making it a more acceptable measure. But it is a measure of the general concept of managerial style, not a measure of participative decision making.

The evidence Marchant uses to assess his dependent variables consists of circulation statistics and responses to a variety of questionnaires. The use of circulation statistics as a measure of library effectiveness has well-known limitations, but the measure has been accepted in the literature as being the best one so far developed. In the case of the questionnaire measures of satisfaction, faculty evaluation of effectiveness, long-range planning, and uniformity of evaluation, however, Marchant neglects to establish their validity or reliability.

**Data Analysis**

Marchant aggregates the data from the individual questionnaires to determine a library's score. The library scores (N = 22) are used in a step-wise regression procedure in order to calculate the proportionate variance in the dependent variables accounted for by the independent and control variables. Variables accounting for the largest proportion of the variance, in most cases, are entered then into a regression equation. The coefficient of determination, R², is often used as a convenient measure of the success of the regression equation in explaining variations in data, and Marchant adopts it as a measure in his study. However, an increase in R² can be the result, not of a real significance of the variable added to the model, but of the fact that the number of parameters in the model is getting close to the number of observations. Since there are seventeen variables in the Marchant model and twenty-two observations, his reported coefficients of determination must be viewed with caution. Furthermore, in deleting each variable with the highest partial correlation from the subsequent regression equations, Marchant violates the assumption required in regression analysis that the error terms are randomly distributed. A result of this violation can be that variables are retained erroneously in the model and their significance overestimated.

Unfortunately, the table reporting partial correlations between managerial style variables and performance measures in Marchant's article is misleading. It implies that the measures of the relationships between the performance measures and the "Decision Making Index" and "Profile Index," as reported in the table of partial correlations, are independent of the effects of all of the control variables. That is not the case. The partial correlation reported between the "Profile Index" and staff satisfaction was calculated by controlling for ratio of librarians to staff, while the partial correlation between the "Profile Index" and faculty evaluation was cal-
culated by controlling only for the effect of number of librarians per full-time student. Furthermore, book expenditure per student explained the highest proportion of the variance in overall satisfaction when all the control variables and the "Profile Index" were accounted for, but it was omitted when the partial correlation was computed.

While book expenditures per student was identified as the most important variable affecting staff satisfaction, it would be improper to assume that redistributing available funds so as to increase the book budget would result in higher staff satisfaction. The book budget variable stands for the entire wealth factor set of variables, and to divide the budget in some ratio not typical of the libraries studied would insert a condition beyond the predictive capability of the equations.

Further evaluation of the data . . . indicated two other important facts. First, variables representing several diverse sources of influence contributed to the cumulative proportionate variance. Second, variables from three different organizational areas were the primary contributors. The first [book expenditure per student] represents the university's financial support. The second [Profile Index] represents managerial style, which is largely determined by library top management. The third [breadth of education] characterizes the staff composition. It is apparent that no one ingredient determines staff satisfaction.

A more serious flaw in Marchant's analysis stems from his use of partial correlations to determine the causal priority of the variables. Partial correlations do not demonstrate causal priority; they assume knowledge of it. Robert Gordon, in his discussion of the partialling fallacy in multiple regression, comments on this directly:

A somewhat more subtle version of the partialling fallacy is likely to be committed in multivariate studies that present all of the possible highest-order partials between each one of a large set of independent variables and the same dependent variable. Apparently, this practice also draws inspiration from Kendall and Lazarsfeld, although the procedures they advocated are actually quite different in logic. Kendall and Lazarsfeld's procedures assume knowledge concerning the presumed causal priority of the variables—they are not intended to provide that knowledge. Roughly, they address the question, "Is variable A causally prior to B, or is it irrelevant?" and not the question, "Is variable A causally prior to B, or is B causally prior to A?" Yet it appears to be the latter question that is being posed when researchers calculate all possible highest-order partials to see which variable will emerge with the largest partial . . .

There is no statistical rule for attributing controlled covariation to the influence of one rather than another of the independent variables, regardless of the disparity in the size between their partial correlations. The question (of whether variable A is prior to B or B is prior to A) is simply not answerable by these means.

The Simon-Blalock method for inferring causal relationships from correlation data, which Marchant adopts, involves use of partial correlations in the circumstances where certain combinations of correlations are expected to disappear. Thus the Simon-Blalock method can be used in some cases to determine which variables might be deleted from a theory. Essential to the appropriate use of the Simon-Blalock method is the existence of a theory. That is, if it is theorized that no relationship exists, between managerial style and size, the correlation between these variables, holding all other variables constant, would be expected to be zero. If the correlation is not zero, the model is adjusted accordingly, and a test of the adjusted model then is made.
Marchant’s Preliminary Model of Causality Explaining Faculty Evaluation (see Figure 3) shows faculty evaluation being directly influenced by staff satisfaction and collection size. Variables of managerial style, wealth, and breadth of education (measured by “counting up the number of different disciplines in which a given staff reported having a degree and giving each discipline a weighted value depending upon the highest level of degree reported”) explain faculty evaluation indirectly, through their effect upon collection size and staff satisfaction. 27

Marchant’s Preliminary Model

\[ X_1 = \text{Managerial style} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{Wealth} \]
\[ X_3 = \text{Breadth of education} \]
\[ X_4 = \text{Collection size} \]
\[ X_5 = \text{Staff satisfaction} \]
\[ X_6 = \text{Faculty evaluation} \]

Figure 3

In this model Marchant assumes that no relationships exist between collection size and staff satisfaction (\( X_4 \) and \( X_5 \)), nor between size and breadth of education or managerial style (\( X_4 \) and \( X_3 \) or \( X_1 \)). However, the simple correlations reported between the “Profile Index” and some measures of size suggest that some relationships between these variables may exist: the correlation between the “Profile Index” and collection size is -.1706, although it is not significant; the correlation between number of librarians (another measure of size) and the “Profile Index” is -.4285 (significant at the .05 level). 28 These correlations are interesting in light of Marchant’s attempt to control for size by studying Association of Research Libraries’ members with collections under three million volumes. However, the size variables are deleted from the data analysis along with several other control variables because of their potentially confounding nature.

Variables related to size and growth of collection and staff are heavily represented [in the group of potentially confounding variables]. It is possible that the managerial style of the larger and older libraries tended to develop when classical theory of administration was current and that smaller libraries tended to be more influenced by later, more participative theories. If this is true, these variables may simply reflect the managerial style which accompanies them. 29

Aside from the intriguing assumption that managerial style is a static variable, this passage suggests that age and size of library might be causally prior variables, but Marchant dismisses them as mere reflections of managerial style. There is no convincing theoretical argument supporting his exclusion of these variables from his model predicting academic library effectiveness. If several initial assumptions about the ordering of the variables are equally plausible, the statistical techniques used by Marchant provide no basis for deciding among them.

SUMMARY

Marchant, in his study of the effects of the decision making process on library performance, ignores most of the recent theoretical and empirical research being done on these variables. He attempts to test hypotheses others were testing in the 1940s and 1950s. His results, like theirs, are inconclusive.

Marchant fails to establish the validity and reliability of his decision making index. Because the only independent variable being measured in his study is the general concept of managerial style, he is unable to test his hypothesis—“the greater the extent to which the professional personnel on the staff are involved in the library’s decision making
processes the more effective will be the library's performance.”

Inconclusive though Marchant’s study is, he does suggest some variables that might be determinants of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in academic libraries. He provides no convincing theoretical reasons, however, to explain the inclusion of these variables rather than any others. He bases his choice solely on the largest proportion of the explained variance. Unfortunately, the step-wise regression procedure warrants no such conclusions.

Had Marchant presented the assumptions and limitations of Likert's theory and offered empirical evidence that supported or limited the application of this theory to problems of librarianship, library science might have profited. Had Marchant used measures developed by Likert in the context of the same theory or developed valid and reliable measures of his own, his research would have added to the knowledge of the relationships of participation in decision making and library effectiveness. Given the inadequacies of the theoretical development and the invalid measure of decision making, however, the study provides no basis for the generalization that an increase in the library staff’s participation in decision making will increase library effectiveness.

References


20. Ibid., p. 298.


24. Ibid., p. 158.


28. Ibid., p. 134.

29. Ibid., p. 136.
WHEN I STARTED DEVELOPING PLANS to study the library as an open system, I found no awareness of the concept in library literature, and my discussion of it with other librarians indicated a general skepticism regarding certain key aspects. But library administration generally was (and is) so obviously in need of revamping that I decided to commit myself to its study and improvement and to use the open system theory for direction. But, of course, one must start such a study by cutting out a manageable area for research. I chose participative management because I recognized in Likert’s writings, and the generalized theory drawn from it by Katz and Kahn, answers to behavior under stress which I had observed and experienced in my own library staff prior to beginning my doctoral study.¹

But even participative management was too broad a study for a dissertation, so I limited it more specifically to the area of decision making and determined to be satisfied with manifestations of such generalized effect as a horizontal study might indicate within the parameters between input into the library and its outputs. This meant that no in-depth, step-by-step causal ladder would be likely to emerge. But it appeared proper to establish the general relationships initially before filling in the specifics. I established other constraints, such as type and size of library, to try to control some external variables. Yet, despite this, many variables remained which might confound the relationships to be studied.

In ideal experiments, variables are either brought under control, which calls for satisfactorily accurate measurement, or are randomized. In nonexperimental surveys and investigations, uncontrolled variables are only assumed to be randomized.

I attempted to identify such variables as appeared to me likely to affect library outputs. In doing so, I paid particular attention to the standard statistics that are compiled, since their general acceptance insinuates belief that they are important and since action has been taken to attempt to standardize their collection and definitions. Other variables were also identified and added as appeared appropriate and as means of measuring them, presumably accurately, were found or devised. However, concern for the accuracy of measurement of many variables often nags at one, especially as one finds cases in which the data collection has been incomplete or not conforming to a standard definition. In such cases, there are only a few practical alternatives. One might reject the variable from the study, assigning it to the group of uncontrolled variables which might act to confound the study. One can attempt to improve the measurement, although this option is sometimes not open. Or one can use the values available if the inaccuracy is sufficiently minor.

Nonexperimental research generally requires sampling a total population rather than drawing data from every population member, and this leads to concern over the extent to which the sample typifies the entire population. I made choices by which I tried to assure
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representation of various characteristics, but only future application of the research results to other libraries can determine their application beyond the sample studied.

In my research, the number of libraries studied was twenty-two, which was smaller than might be hoped for. It meant that a fairly high measurement of relationship had to exist in the sample in order to be significant for the total population at any magnitude.

The basic statistical procedure which I used to test the relationships being studied was linear multiple regression analysis, a process which also provides multiple and partial correlation coefficients. It allows for predicting a dependent variable by the joint variance of two or more independent variables. It does not demonstrate causality, however, which must rely on a theoretical or logical basis. But, given such a basis, it can test the theorized relationship and confirm its likelihood and magnitude within stated statistically significant levels. However, care needs to be taken against misuse of this procedure to assure the quality of the results.

Ms. Lynch’s complaints concern several matters, a few of which are major. Some, especially minor ones, are not well expressed and lead to the impression of generalized errors whereas, in my attempt to identify their referral points, I have found them to deal with single and minor matters.

One of Ms. Lynch’s major complaints was really directed at Rensis Likert’s theory of participative management. She went to considerable pains to point toward publications which disagreed with Likert. This is all very admirable. I chose to emphasize McGregor, Argyris, Maslow, Bowers, Seashore, D. Katz, R. L. Kahn, Herzberg, Blake, and Mouton instead. I mentioned a small number of demurrals to bring attention to their existence; but, since I was testing the Likert theory, it seemed proper to me to discuss the theories and research which generally support Likert. We also shared some discussion, since we both mentioned Pelz’ work. And the relationship between participative management and variable work was also emphasized by Likert. I find it difficult, considering the magnitude of literature related to the subject, to understand why her choice of readings should be considered preferable to those included in my study. Mine are certainly as up-to-date as hers. Except to rebut the insinuation that I am ignorant of the field, I feel that this part of the discussion is irrelevant. However, I appreciate her references and will review those with which I am unfamiliar for future interest.

Ms. Lynch also accused me of having neglected the entire corpus of literature regarding job satisfaction. Ms. Lynch is simply wrong, and I refer her to the dissertation regarding this matter. Mentioned there are the writings and research of Herzberg, Argyris, Maslow, Ash, McGregor, Likert, Mayo, Myers, Paul, Roche, Pfiffner, and Etzioni. Some of these describe specific research projects and results dealing with motivation and satisfaction, and the last two include short surveys of the literature. This subject certainly could have been expanded; but with thousands of papers to draw upon, there must be a point of diminishing returns. Dissertations are notorious for their lack of readability and I am sure mine is no exception. I chose to sample important sources rather than exhaust them (and the reader in the process) because the statistical data and analyses made the text as formidable as most librarians are likely to be able to stand anyway.

More central to the issue was her criticism of my definition of participative decision making. Actually, I felt I had described it quite well. In the Library Trends article, I stated that it “was an index of the extent to which the profes-
sional library staff perceives of itself as involved in the "decision making process" and referred to Likert's questionnaire for specifics. The dissertation described the three factors involved and included the precise wording of the questions. Because Ms. Lynch doesn't like the definition is hardly to say it is vague. Her statement that I am unclear regarding whether I mean "actual decision making, perceived decision making," and so forth seems to me due to her imprecise reading. I knew what I meant and said so.

I added a second independent variable, which I called the Profile. This was not, as Ms. Lynch suggested, intended to be a measure of decision making. It was intended to be a measure of managerial style, and I said so in both documents. I accurately described Likert's concept of managerial style as composed of seven interrelated factors, one of which is decision making. The high correlation between the two independent variables and among pairs of the eighteen items making up the questionnaire are not indications that they are measuring managerial style. The correlations simply demonstrate that they vary together. Since decision making is part of managerial style, one should expect a significant correlation, although theirs is surprisingly high. That they are not the same measurement is demonstrated both by the questions asked and by comparison of their means, which differ at the .05 level of significance.

Ms. Lynch acknowledged that the Likert instrument has been validated "to some extent." But why did she insert the phrase "to some extent"? All validations can be so described. I think she intended the phrase to suggest a low magnitude of validation. And even if she didn't, that is likely to be the impression projected to most readers. Yet I suspect Ms. Lynch knows little more about that instrument than she acquired from examining it. Those who have used it extensively can describe its shortcomings, but are also strong in praising it. After my use of it, I sent Dr. Likert an appraisal and suggested an area in which it might be improved. His response was that he intended to revise it soon and would try to rectify the weakness. It has been revised several times and even has variant forms for use with particular groups. At least one form has more than one hundred items. This growth and diversity are the result of highly competent study based on many research projects. The eighteen items in the short form I used were carefully chosen from larger instruments to represent the important dimensions of managerial style and of each of the seven processes of which it is composed. Ms. Lynch's complaint of the low reliability possible with three-item scales is not applicable here because they were carefully chosen from among a larger group to include those most important in describing and measuring the decision making process. In fact, use of this instrument was determined in part by the reliance that could be placed upon it and the extent to which it has been validated by use.

Beyond that was another consideration. I had initially intended to develop my own instrument for measuring decision making and was, in fact, in process of doing so. Learning of my study, Dr. Likert suggested that I use his. I decided to do so because of its high quality and because it would allow expansion of the study into the other six organizational processes. The dissertation, utilizing only two somewhat generalized indexes, has become phase one of my study. Further work has included consideration of each of the eighteen items separately and more in-depth consideration of other variables. The total pattern has been to confirm the dissertation findings generally and to define the interrelationships more specifically.

There seems little purpose in expending great energy validating an instru-
ment already known to be satisfactory for the purpose to which it is to be put. I proposed to test Likert's theory on libraries. What could be more satisfactory than to use his measuring device?

Ms. Lynch complained that I changed Likert's independent, intervening, and dependent variables and added my own control variables and she reproduces part of page 137 of his *The Human Organization* to indicate what she thought I should have tested. Except as regards the independent variables already discussed, I acknowledge her statement. But then I never aspired to test that specific model. It is appropriate to profit-making organizations but not to such nonprofit organizations as academic libraries. She is correct in assuming that my intention was to apply Likert’s theory to the library setting rather than to reevaluate the theory. So why should she complain when I do what I propose? Considering the difficulty of measuring library performances, I felt my limited endeavor was quite sufficient for one dissertation.

I fail to understand the complaint regarding my use of control variables. Their use in multiple regression analysis is well understood, and they offer data by which the true relationships between the independent variables and the performance measurements might be better approached. The simple correlations as manifestations of those relationships are certainly less acceptable. To the extent that such influences are considered and, when appropriate, partialled out, the values of the primary relationships are improved.

However, Ms. Lynch manifested a lack of understanding regarding the proper discipline to be placed on multiple regression analysis, its interpretation, and my use of it. She also misstated the total number of variables involved in the research.

Listed in my research model are ten groups of control variables which finally accounted for twenty variables which were used in the dissertation phase of the research. This was more than could enter the regression analysis along with the independent variables because of the limitation placed by the number of libraries in the study, so three variables which were found to be largely repetitious were deleted.

It would be most surprising to find more than three or four variables enter significantly into a multiple regression analysis with such a small sample. Moreover, in order to enter, a variable must explain a fairly large percent of the variance remaining at that point in the dependent variable. The partial correlations I reported between the independent and dependent variables partialled out only the variance attributable to control variables which had entered at the .05 level of significance. And the levels of significance which I reported are as accurate as possible considering the limits placed by the small sample size.

Ms. Lynch’s complaint that I have padded the proportionate variance (coefficient of determination was her term) by including all the control variables is without substance. While I presented tables including as many as seventeen control variables and showing the cumulative proportionate variance, I also showed the significance levels related at each step as well as the significance level of each variable at entrance into the analyses. This was a preliminary step. Then I reanalyzed the problem allowing entrance only to those control variables which could enter significantly at the .05 level plus the independent variables separately. I even went to the trouble of correcting cumulative proportionate variance for bias to assure as much as possible against overstating it. My procedures were particularly conservative and my evaluation cautious. I suspect some significant relationships were missed thereby, and it is important
not to assume that relationships do not exist simply because they are not demonstrated.

The fact that more than one variable entered a regression analysis significantly indicated that they independently explained significant amounts of variance in the dependent variable. This does not mean that they are independent of each other and I did not so state nor imply. It is even possible that some of the control variables cause libraries to move toward participative management or toward that part dealing with decision making. But that was not what I was studying. I assume such causal variables exist and might be identifiable, and I think it would be worth studying. But it wasn't part of my study.

It is also possible that the independent variables cause some of the control variables or that both result from some unidentified variable. In either of the last two cases or if spurious correlation coefficients result from sampling bias, inclusion of a control variable can mask the true relationship being searched. The proper way to deal with such an eventuality is to delete the confounding variable. I have done so, but only when there was real evidence in the specific case of likely confounding. When doing so, one ought to be aware of the possibility that the deleted variable rather than the independent variable might belong in the analysis. However, the primary purpose of introducing control variables into the study was to partial out their effect on the dependent variables in order to determine more accurately the true relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The independent variable measurements were assumed to be accurate, and partialling out of variance in the independent variables tended to confound rather than clarify the relationships sought. It would be best if such a problem did not arise. It did so only once; and in that case, the resulting partial correlation was of questionable significance (.10) even with its use and was so identified. In other words, while a strategy for handling such cases was developed, within the study it was little used. Ms. Lynch has assumed erroneously that it was used routinely. Had she checked the analyses she would have known better.

Ms. Lynch complained of my procedure for studying the relations between the independent variables and the control variables wherein I inserted the control variables as predictors of the independent variables and then deleted several of them in sequence to determine the decrease in cumulative proportionate variance that resulted. This was simply a practical procedure for studying interrelationships and for providing insight into their potential confounding effect. It was not part and had no direct bearing on the regression analyses which were intended to clarify the relationships between the independent and performance variables at all, as the reading of her paper suggests. When dealing with as many variables and as few libraries as are involved in this study, one needs as much insight as possible regarding their interrelationships. Ms. Lynch's statement that in doing so I violated the assumption that error terms are randomly distributed is absurd. She might be reminded that random distribution does not mean equal distribution.

Ms. Lynch accused me of implying a lack of relationship when variables are not controlled in computing partial correlation coefficients. I did no such thing. The partial correlations are meant to clarify relationships to the extent possible considering the complications involved and limitations imposed by such realities as size of the sample. Libraries contain complex interactions, and anyone who believes they can be sorted out so as to describe accurately all their true and independent causal relationships is deluding himself. Ms.
Lynch's accusation that I implied non-relationship suggests that she needs more experience with multiple regression analysis.

Another example of her statistical inexpertness was demonstrated by her labeling as a flaw in regression analyses the long quotation from my dissertation regarding the meaning of the individual variables as predictors of staff satisfaction. Regression analyses predict best around the mean values of the variables involved and become less successful as the values move toward the limits of those sampled. Predicting beyond the limits or outside the boundaries of the relationships existing within the libraries involved in the study is speculative. Ms. Lynch needs to discipline herself to this reality.

Regarding her accusation that I confused partial correlations with causality, I refer her to page eighty-one of the dissertation, part of which reads, "Statistical relationships are inadequate for the purpose of proving causality but are useful in verifying causal relationships empirically which have been otherwise inferred by logical or theoretical procedures." I laid out the logical and theoretical undergirdings. Ms. Lynch's complaint appears to emanate from her disagreement with the theory, as previously discussed. But that is her problem. The results tended to support my position, especially from managerial style to staff satisfaction to faculty evaluation.

Again, regarding my preliminary model of causality, Ms. Lynch accused me of assuming that no relationships exist that are not stated. There is a great difference between stating that a relationship does not exist and that it has not been demonstrated. I presented some interrelationships that appeared to have been demonstrated within reasonable bounds of logic and statistical significance. I was even careful to state that it is incomplete and has weaknesses. That Ms. Lynch continued to assume that a lack of demonstrated statistical significance carried the intention of no significance indicates a gross misunderstanding of the meaning of correlation coefficients.

As a matter of fact, considerable attention has been given since completion of the dissertation to filling out and improving the model. A few errors have been identified, corrected, and used in reevaluations. I hope by this time next year the improved model will be available (ALA is the publisher). I have no illusions, however, regarding its completeness even then.

I did not assume and do not believe that managerial style is a static variable. I speculated on, but did not study, the possible effect of historical factors on the current state of a library's managerial style. Inertia is generally thought to influence behavior, but change occurs despite it.

I am fascinated by Ms. Lynch's conflicting tendency to complain that my research is too broad and not adequately refined on the one hand and, on the other, that I have failed to study various related problems.

While I was still analyzing some of my data, I appeared on a discussion panel regarding participative management at which Dr. Stanley E. Seashore, then associate director under Dr. Likert at the Institute for Social Research, was the main speaker. Afterwards, while we traveled together to Ann Arbor, he asked me to describe my research. I did so, emphasizing some of the problems that bothered me. I was particularly concerned because of the small sample size, and I asked him for his evaluation. He agreed that more libraries would have been better, but he also said it was the largest study of its kind that he knew of. He suggested it was an important study and made no reference to the possibility that it was outdated by recent research. And he brought to my attention my responsibility to distribute the
results once they were complete. Given the comparison between Dr. Seashore's and Ms. Lynch's evaluation of the importance and timeliness of my research, I have little difficulty choosing.

I expect criticism, especially from those who feel threatened by suggestions of administrative change. I even solicit criticism from knowledgeable people who can offer suggestions for improvement. But I wonder about the value of a paper which starts by saying the research is "better than many recent studies," claims to review the study, finds thereafter not one good thing to report, and then deals with it ineptly.

It might be that future research will better explain the relationships I have studied. I hope so. Man is not likely to do better than approach truth, particularly in the study of human behavior, so there is always room for improvement. The study of libraries as dynamic operations has been largely ignored, and mine is only a pioneering study. Ms. Lynch has demonstrated that she is acquiring the competency to aid in that endeavor despite some present inadequacies. I will look forward to reviewing her contributions as she completes her dissertation.
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Interlibrary loan traffic in academic libraries has doubled in the past five years, with an ever-growing percent of the lending being done by the nation's few largest libraries. Concurrently labor costs have risen substantially so that some large libraries now claim that they are putting $50,000 to $100,000 per year more into interlibrary lending than they are getting out through borrowing. This growing inequity is forcing discussion of programs—local, regional, and national—for charging fees for interlibrary loan service. This paper raises some of the considerations that should figure into any such discussions.

The centuries-old practice of one library lending its books to another is based upon the premise that although books may physically be the chattel of the institution that bought and paid for them, they belong intellectually to the general cultural heritage of mankind and ought somehow to be made available to all men. Interlibrary loan has satisfied this latter characteristic of books while in the former sense the lending library's equity in its books was presumably protected by the reciprocal nature of the practice itself. After all, as many books were borrowed as were lent.

Reciprocity, however, functions effectively as a balancing factor only in the broad middle range of libraries that borrow and lend at roughly the same rates. At one end of the scale there are many small libraries that can be only borrowers, while at the opposite end there are a number of libraries, perhaps a hundred, that lend very many more books than they borrow. Thus the resources of the latter institutions go to subsidize the system for the benefit of the former.

David Kaser is director of libraries, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

Until relatively recently this imbalance caused limited concern among large libraries, because it required of them only a modest supernumerary expenditure above their own operating costs. Their major investment was in the books themselves, and if the normal use expectancy of a book was fifty readings, an occasional interlibrary use of that volume represented a loss to the holding institution of only one-fiftieth of its cost. Labor was cheap, so the staff time required for the internal handling of interlibrary loans was rationalized as a small contribution to the general good.

Libraries, however, have recently become very substantially labor intensive enterprises. By far the largest portion of a library's expenditure today goes into direct payroll; expenditures for the books themselves represent only half as much investment in terms of operating costs as do labor costs. The reversal of this ratio is now forcing recognition and appraisal of the impact of the practice of interlibrary loan on the large primarily lending libraries.

Concurrent with this relocation of library costs from books to labor came another phenomenon that aggravated the long quiescent problem of the large
library’s expenditures on interlibrary lending. This was society’s inability any longer to fulfill all of its advanced study and research needs, in that relatively few university centers which were already prepared to furnish out of their own resources the requisite library materials. Suddenly research and advanced study with very large library requirements were going on seemingly everywhere, whether the necessary book resources were available there or not. Traffic in interlibrary loan requests against the few large libraries virtually skyrocketed, while their own needs to borrow from the system rose less rapidly when indeed they rose at all. The historic inequity thus became greater even than it had been before, although recognition of its debilitating effect upon the lending libraries remained slow in coming. 

Reasons for the slowness of the library community to recognize this change have doubtless been varied. One reason is that, just as doctors will let no one die despite his inability to pay, so librarians feel constrained to let no one’s need for a book go unmet. Secondly, some large publicly supported institutions have assumed their extra-campus landings to be a mandated service accompanying their tax support, although this argument becomes uncomfortably vague when loans are made outside of the geographical area constituting the tax base. Interlibrary loan furthermore is one service for which librarians have received only praise from the lay public, and no one ever likes to relinquish a practice that others think he performs well. In the final analysis, however, the main reason is probably that the full magnitude of the costs of interlibrary lending have seldom really been recognized by librarians themselves.

This is perhaps because few libraries have developed sufficiently sophisticated cost accounting systems to enable them to state with certainty just how much they do invest annually in their interlibrary loan operations. Occasional ad hoc studies however, mostly of the “time and motion” type, have revealed discomfittingly high costs of even the simple operations of identifying and retrieving an item requested for interlibrary loan; of recording, wrapping, and shipping it; and finally of discharging and replacing it on the shelf when it is returned. Indirect costs such as internal and external administrative overhead, personnel development costs, and physical maintenance have seldom been considered. In any final analysis, moreover, still other factors ought also to be calculated into any accurate determination of total cost, such as the value of the expertise that went into the original selection of the title, an appropriate share of the original purchase and processing costs of the volume, and a portion of the cost of preserving it over its lifetime.

Some have estimated the total cost of a single interlibrary loan to be as high as $8 within the lending institution alone. If this figure is assumed to be approximately accurate, it may be seen that a library that lends 5,000 more titles annually than it borrows is spending $40,000 a year in service not to patrons from within its own supporting constituency but to other institutions entirely. Indeed some large libraries have estimated that they are spending in excess of $100,000 per year on interlibrary lending more than they are benefiting from it. The best-willed institution on earth cannot long afford to carry such a burden. Indeed there is a troubling moral question here as to whether an administrator of a large library, especially a private library, may not be violating his responsibilities as the steward of his institution’s bibliothecal assets when he allows this kind of dissipation to occur at all.

A glimmering recognition of this dilemma is now beginning to emerge on
a few fronts. Two of the fifty states have recently implemented programs wherein the libraries within them that are primarily lenders are paid from state funds for lending to other libraries within the state. There is also talk of developing such a system on a national level. A national program would be infinitely better than local or regional programs because reader needs are not respecters of geographical or political boundaries. There is no logic, for example, to the present situation wherein Columbia University is reimbursed $4.50 by the state of New York for a loan to the library at Skidmore College when it renders the same service in the same day to the library at Swarthmore completely free because the latter is located in Pennsylvania. Concurrent with discussion of a national plan, there are also discussions taking place among a number of large private libraries about the possibility of establishing a standard charge for all interlibrary loans, whether to be reimbursed by a state program, a national program, a borrowing library, or the ultimate recipient of the service—the patron who finally receives the book in the borrowing library.

Clearly this ferment of activity is leading somewhere, but no one is as yet prepared to predict just where. There are troublesome questions involved in any pay-as-you-go interlibrary loan program that need first to be resolved. One such question is “Who should pay?” Certain trends on the national scene seem to be toward letting such charges fall where the benefit is derived—namely in this case on the individual scholar for whom the book is borrowed. Not only does such an arrangement seem to satisfy neatly the current management quest for accountability, but it also relieves fear in some quarters of a user taking advantage of the system—for example, of someone promiscuously requesting twenty loans where one might do since the state or the library rather than the user is paying the cost. Experience with state-reimbursed loans, however, in New Jersey and New York seem thus far to indicate little need for fear on this score. This view seems also to have been fortified a decade ago when most libraries discontinued passing on to their users the postage charges incurred on their behalf in interlibrary borrowings.

Another question that would need to be resolved in any paid interlibrary loan system is whether or not the present Interlibrary Loan Code would continue to be adequate or would have to be revised. Would borrowings become permissible for undergraduates, a practice currently discouraged by the Code but allowed under New York State’s NYSILL plan at state cost? Does the ability of a college library to borrow books for its undergraduates hinder its own natural growth rate? Perhaps. On the other hand, the line separating undergraduate instruction and research from work on the graduate level becomes less distinct daily. Maybe it has become meaningless.

Another troublesome moral problem is determining the proprietary rights of a paid borrower in the material he seeks. As long as interlibrary loan remains free there is no question but that service will be made available to him after all local needs for the same material have been fulfilled. Will a paying borrower actually purchase a share of access to the material he borrows equal to that of the local patron, or does he continue to gain only extraordinary access after local needs are met? If the latter, he presumably should be charged somewhat less than the cost to the local institution of “first-class” access.

How should an appropriate lending fee be determined? The most rational answer would probably be based on a cost accounting effort—namely the total cost of performing the transaction. Another approach might be for a lending
institution to recalculate its rates annually simply by dividing the total library operating expenditure by the total number of circulations with the quotient serving as the unit charge for each interlibrary loan during the subsequent twelve months. Some librarians feel (and this concept is incorporated into New York State's program) that an equitably paid interlibrary loan system should involve two fees: one for receiving and attempting to fill an interlibrary loan request, and another for actual success in delivering the needed volume. Certainly there is some sound logic in having two fees.

These concepts are based upon the idea that each lending library would cost out its own operations and settle upon its own schedule of charges. There is some logic behind this scheme in that every library's costs are unique unto itself and should be fully reimbursed under any truly equitable program. Yet variant price schedules would create what would in effect be a chaotic market wherein borrowers would be inclined to "shop around" for the best price. Strong arguments seem therefore to militate in favor of one standard national price for interlibrary loan, perhaps based upon average costs in a sample of lending libraries, periodically reviewed.

Another complication lies in the way of implementing anything other than a nationally-funded program of interlibrary loan: the enormous overhead cost to the lending institution of maintaining separate accounts for each of its borrowing institutions, of rendering periodic invoices, conducting correspondence, collecting and depositing, writing off bad debts, and other commercial paraphernalia. Present state programs permit one central billing, made periodically to the appropriate state agency, and the receipt and crediting of one periodic check, thereby vastly facilitating the paper work involved in a paid interlibrary loan program.

Another possible method of mitigating the above difficulty might be the use of a nationally recognized interlibrary loan scrip of the kind proposed several years ago for purchasing photocopies. Such coupons could be purchased by libraries from a national agency and one sent accompanying each interlibrary loan request. Whenever a library that lends more than it borrows accumulates a superabundance of coupons, it could return them to the national agency in exchange for face value reimbursement. Local accounting requirements, of course, might in some institutions hamper efforts to get these reimbursements credited where they can be best used by the library.

A very substantial problem in the way of any priced interlibrary loan program is its relation to photocopy pricing schedules. Of the many factors enumerated above as making up the real costs of interlibrary loan service, all are exactly the same for meeting a photocopy request, in addition of course to the actual costs of making the copy. Thus if, for the sake of discussion, the hypothetical $8 handling cost for interlibrary loan is held to be valid, then a similar handling charge would seem to be warranted in processing photocopy. An amount in that range is considerably greater than is presently being charged by any library in the country. If all charges were the same, of course, most large libraries would probably prefer to furnish photocopy in lieu of loan because their materials normally would not need to be off the shelf as long. Some small libraries also would for the same price probably prefer photocopy because they can retain the purchased piece to augment their collections against possible future need. Presumably photocopy charges to off-the-street patrons in large libraries would also be
substantially influenced upward by any such revamping of the interlibrary-loan/photocopy structure.

At any rate, it is clear that any program of paid interlibrary loan, whether nationally or locally funded, will bring with it a host of complications. The number of interlibrary loans would doubtless be vastly reduced because of the resulting relocation of their actual cost from the supplier to the user. Coming at a time when there is growing desire to free up rather than restrict the flow of the materials of scholarship, any such discussion is sure to elicit a spate of bad publicity for the large libraries that seem to favor it. Unless it is widely and clearly understood, it would likely be a very unpopular cause. Yet it might lead to salutary widespread recognition of the very high costs of library services in support of advanced studies—a recognition that is certainly long overdue. Careful groundwork appears to be called for before such a program can be initiated.
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The Graduate Business Student and the Library

Research on the graduate business student's knowledge, attitudes toward, and use of the library is rare. When one considers the alleged importance of the library as a source of business information and the increasing emphasis on research skills in business, the lack of research on the role of the library in the education of the graduate business student is surprising.1

There is general agreement with A. M. Carter's assertion that, "The library is the heart of the University; no other single nonhuman factor is as closely related to the quality of graduate education."2 While there seems to be a philosophical consensus that this premise is a necessary and desirable goal, in fact, casual observation tends to make this statement seem a mere platitude. Certainly, any assumption concerning the actual role of the library in the education of graduate business students is subject to much closer examination.

The basic objective of this research was to examine the aforementioned situation. It was as an exploration into an area where research was long overdue. The research had three purposes: (1) to examine the graduate business student's knowledge of the library, (2) to explore the graduate business student's attitude toward the library, and (3) to secure some indication of his use of the library.

Methodology and Subjects

The data for this study were obtained by administering a twenty-two item questionnaire to three graduate business classes at a large accredited southeastern business school.* Seventy-nine graduate business students returned the two part questionnaire which took approximately twenty minutes to complete.

The convenience sample consisted of fifty management majors, fourteen marketing majors, eight finance majors, six accounting majors, and one quantitative methods major. Three respondents were DBA candidates.

Eight of the questions utilized a "Likert-type" format consisting of five responses (strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree; or very poor, poor, average, good, excellent). Of the remaining questions, three required a simple "yes" or "no" response while eight required the naming of specific library sources that the student would consult to obtain specified information. Three questions were open-ended in nature seeking attitudes and opinions.

* A copy of the questionnaire will be provided by the authors on request.
STUDENT KNOWLEDGE OF THE BUSINESS LIBRARY—A SELF APPRAISAL

The first part of the questionnaire required the graduate business student to appraise his knowledge of the library along with the knowledge of his fellow graduate students and college students in general. Additionally, two questions were included to ascertain where and how the respondent acquired his knowledge of the library.

Sixty-five percent of the respondents felt that college students do not know how to use the library effectively. Of the remainder, 21 percent were undecided while 13 percent thought that students knew how to use library resources effectively.

When the respondents were asked to assess the ability of graduate business students to utilize the library, 48 percent held the view that graduate business students could not utilize the library well. The same 13 percent who thought college students in general could effectively utilize the library were the same respondents who felt graduate business students knew how to use the library; the remainder were unsure.

Students were then given an opportunity to rate their own knowledge of the library prior to actually being tested for competency. Nine percent rated their knowledge as very poor, 22 percent rated their knowledge poor, and 43 percent of the graduate students rated their knowledge as average. Only 25 percent of the respondents rated their knowledge good or excellent. While these ratings do not seem extraordinarily high, test results proved these ratings to be grossly overestimated.

Finally, inquiries pertaining to where or how the student acquired his knowledge of the library revealed that none of the students had ever received any formal classroom instruction on use of the library. A significant 82 percent of the respondents reported that they had done no independent reading to improve their knowledge of how to use the library.

TESTED KNOWLEDGE OF THE BUSINESS LIBRARY

After the student had completed the first part of the questionnaire covering library usage, knowledge ratings, and attitudes, he was given a fill-in questionnaire (which consisted of six specific questions) requesting him to identify specific sources (indices, abstracts, or publications) which he would consult to obtain certain information. Topics for which the student was requested to list library sources were: the top 100 industrial firms in the United States in 1970; a review of Toffler's Future Shock; disposable personal income; and so forth. One question asked for a listing of the indices and/or abstracts in the library that the student felt competent to use. Another important question required the student to outline the exact research strategy he would develop to compile an annotated bibliography on the subject of management development.

On the first set of questions, 25 percent of the students were unable to indicate a single suitable source for obtaining information on any of the six subjects given. Only 37 percent of the respondents were able to answer correctly more than one question; 48 percent of the graduate students could not list one index or abstract that they knew how to use. Only 11 percent of the respondents were able to list more than two sources that they knew how to use.

In scoring the answers to the question requiring the student to outline the exact strategy for the annotated bibliography, grades on a scale of 0 to 5 were subjectively assigned depending upon the adequacy of the student's research procedure. The results showed that 47 percent of the graduate students scored 0; another 47 percent scored 1; and the remaining 6 percent scored 2. No one re-
received a score higher than 2. The dismal performance of the respondents on this part of the test was at first attributed to unrealistic expectations on the part of the graders. A subsequent review of the results, however, did not alter the original ratings. Without exception, these graduate business students did not know how to compile an adequate bibliography on such a mundane topic as management development.

Self Rating of Knowledge—A Reappraisal

Immediately after the first testing of the respondent’s knowledge of the library, the students were asked to rate their knowledge of the library a second time. The purpose of this rerating was to determine what effects, if any, the test for competency had had upon the student’s analysis of his proficiency in using the library. Significantly, 55 percent of the students now rated their knowledge as poor or very poor (an increase from 31 percent for the same question asked prior to the actual testing for knowledge), 30 percent rated their knowledge average (a decrease from 43 percent), and only 15 percent maintained a self-appraisal of good or excellent (a decrease from 25 percent).

When one considers that 42 percent of the students had actually lowered their self-appraisal by either one or more levels of proficiency, it is not difficult to ascertain the effect that the student’s own performance on the first test had on his view of his own skills. Moreover, not one respondent raised his self-appraisal after completing both parts of the questionnaire. Obviously the students had not impressed themselves with their display of knowledge.

However, even in light of the more realistic reappraisal, the students’ view of their library skills remained considerably greater than could be justified when test results were analyzed. This may in part be due to the fact that the test results were not disclosed prior to the rerating. Their poor performance on test questions which required a display of library knowledge, plus their tendency to lower their own ratings after attempting to answer relatively simple questions, is ample testimony to both their lack of proficiency and, in some cases, their unawareness of the extent of their deficiencies.

Library Usage and Confidence

Students were asked to estimate the number of times they made use of the library in an average month. Approximately 67 percent of the students reported that they used the library six or more times a month, while 18 percent indicated that they used the library between one and five times a month. A surprising 15 percent of the students noted that they did not use the library at all.

A reexamination of the open-ended questions revealed that the library was used in part as a place to study or to socialize between classes. The purposes of library use were not obtained by the instrument, but follow-up interviews with eight of the students who had indicated they used the library six or more times a month found that they made extensive use of the library to study, not to do research. The interviews with the students seemed to support Lyle’s observation that students still regard libraries as places for studying their own texts, for meeting friends, or for lounging. It was particularly significant to note that 53 percent of the students surveyed had never used the library for research other than class assignments. When one considers the current emphasis on independent study and individualized instruction, the absence of library utilization, except when required, raises serious questions about the capacity of the graduate business student to engage in independent study. Conversely, questions must be raised about the extent to
which the library is integrated into the business curriculum.

Student opinions of their library knowledge were correlated with their usage. The ratings presented a consistent pattern, in that high usage was correlated with high self-ratings of library knowledge and low library knowledge ratings with low usage.

Another area studied was perceived library knowledge and its relationship to the students' completion of a graduate business research course. This course requires a considerable amount of library research. Correlations were done between two groups of students: those who had previously taken the research methods course and those who had not. The results showed that among those who had taken the research course, 67 percent rated their knowledge as good to excellent while 33 percent rated their knowledge as poor to very poor. Among those who had not taken the research course, only 34 percent rated their knowledge as good to excellent, while 66 percent rated their knowledge as poor to very poor.

All of the students, irrespective of their length in the program, who had not taken the research course, rated their knowledge of the library, poor or very poor. This analysis suggested that a high degree of confidence in use of the business library was instilled in students who had completed the research methods course. It also presumed that length of time in the program, by itself, was not an important variable. Unfortunately, additional analysis of the questionnaire results revealed that the confidence instilled by the research methods course was not justified. In other words the test results indicated that students having completed the research course were not more knowledgeable than the students who had not taken the course. Thus, confidence in one's ability to use the library is not necessarily an indication of one's real ability.

**Student Attitudes Toward the Library**

Student attitudes toward the business library were ascertained through three questions. The first question was open-ended requiring the respondents to name the first thing that came to mind when he thought of the business library.

Comments to this open-ended question were varied. The responses fell into these categories: physical conditions, utilization of facilities, and general statements concerning the library. Approximately one-third of the responses to this question were negative in that they focused upon facility problems or the difficulties that students experienced in using the library.

Student opinions were solicited on the role the business library presently plays in the education of graduate business students. Seventy-five percent of the students strongly agreed or agreed with the statement that the library plays an important role while 9 percent were undecided as to the role of the library. The business library was felt to be capable of playing an important role in the education of graduate business students by 90 percent of the students. An analysis of the strongly agree responses for both questions found a substantial change of approximately 25 percent. It would seem reasonable to conclude that the graduate business student recognizes not only the importance of the library to his program of study, but the potentially greater role that it could and should play.

**Conclusions**

A recent study of undergraduate business students found their knowledge of the library to be quite deficient. It can be seen from the results of this study that the same conclusion is warranted for the graduate students. The graduate business student is, by his own admission, ill-prepared to use the library effectively in his course of study. Test re-
sults were consistent in that the scores confirmed the students' perceived lack of knowledge. In fact, test results indicated that a majority of students rated their knowledge higher than warranted. While the graduate business student may be better prepared to use the library than the undergraduate business student, his level of knowledge is still inadequate. This is particularly disturbing since an executive's knowledge of the literature of his field and his skill in its use are important factors determining his professional advancement and competence.

There exists a clear need to review the role of the library in the formal education of graduate business students. It is ironic that such a gap exists between the potential role of the library and its present role. The present "sink-or-swim" approach to developing library skills is a proven unsatisfactory method. Students do not acquire library knowledge by "osmosis" nor by guided tours. It is also somewhat disheartening to note that an overwhelming majority of the graduate students do not take the time to build their library skills through independent study.

The negative attitude evidenced by one-third of the students is not an inconsistent finding, considering the difficulties they face in utilizing the resources of the library. It is quite possible that this negative attitude would not exist if proper instruction in the use of library resources could be provided early in the graduate business program. However, it may also be possible that, at present, most members of business faculties are themselves too deficient in library skills to answer the challenge.
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To the Editor:

In the January 1972 CRL Brigitte Kenney of Drexel University volunteers to send me a list of “money-saving automated library operations.” This implies that she has studied and approved detailed cost analyses of these operations. Let her present just one such analysis in these pages so we can see exactly what she takes to be valid cost analyses. Frankly, I think she is talking through her professorial hat.

Ellsworth Mason
Director of Libraries
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

To the Editor:

Three cheers for Roger Horn’s “Think Big: The Evolution of Bureaucracy” (CRL, Jan. 1972). It is a devastatingly accurate exposure of the “numbers game” as it is currently played in the research libraries and their would-be imitators. There will unquestionably be howls of protest from the establishment. The truth hurts.

Paul DuBois
Assistant Director
Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio

To the Editor:

I suspect CRL’s January editorial, “Libraries for Decision-Makers”—with which I agree wholeheartedly—was prompted in part by Herbert M. E. Pastan’s depressing letter published in the same issue. The point is that usually the library has not demonstrated that it is essential to the operation of a business organization or an educational institution.

As a librarian, I don’t like to admit it, but it seems that, in general, libraries and librarians are not as important as we’d like them to be. When money is tight, library budgets—which typically amount to less than 5 percent of total institutional expenditures—are often among the first to be cut. Currently, the principal mode of teaching/learning, i.e., the lecture-textbook method, makes minimal use of academic libraries. If space is needed for additional classrooms, library reading areas are frequently appropriated by the decision makers. And when library buildings are being planned, campus librarians are not always consulted.

Perusing L. Carroll DeWeese’s article on status and professionalism in the same issue of CRL has caused me to reexamine my ideas. While I have been an ardent supporter of faculty status for librarians—and continue to be—I now feel that we have generally been “placing the cart before the horse.” It is unrealistic for most librarians to expect higher standing for themselves while the library is not of greater importance on campus. Only when library service is commonly considered the equal of teaching will academic librarians throughout the country achieve the status they are seeking.

To be judged a high-priority concern, the library must prove that it is vital to the existence of the institution—that an organization will fail without one. Campus leaders must be shown that academic libraries can supply them with the information they require—even before the need for information is fully perceived—at a reasonable cost. Through such current-awareness services as selective dissemination of information, librarians can bring new material to the attention of decision-makers before the desire for the specific items arises.

We must be more successful as a profession in reaching the campus leaders. As
Pastan puts it, "We certainly won't sell the case for librarianship talking to each other at ALA meetings."

Leonard Grundt
Director
Nassau Community College Library
Garden City, New York

To the Editor:

It was with some consternation that I read your little editorial in the March 1972 issue.

I suppose at this stage in life I should not be surprised at the continued examples of administrative and budgetary theft that are so often at hand. I do not know how else to describe the failure to use fees for their implied purpose. You ask for reader response. I would be most unhappy if CRL was to cease or be curtailed. While I would like CRL News to continue, I would not miss it to the same degree.

I would think that in this day and age when we are faced with so many separate and separated library organizations to which we feel we should belong, but from whose number most of us must choose a few, that the central authorities of ALA will not increase the temptation to not renew membership in ALA by removing from our hands CRL. I think the issue is that specific, and should be brought to the attention of the ALA authorities in as vigorous a manner as is possible.

R. G. Bracewell
Emmanuel College
Librarian and Library Coordinator
Toronto School of Theology
Toronto, Canada

Ed. note: Mr. Bracewell's letter appears to refer to the editorial in the March 1971 issue of CRL, rather than the issue indicated.

To the Editor:

I enjoyed reading Mr. McInnis' article (May 1972, p. 190–198) describing his use of regression techniques to investigate determinants of library size; it seems that library science can only profit from the introduction of tools that have proven themselves so valuable for the other social sciences. Because of this, however, it is important that these techniques be presented as clearly and accurately as possible. Without commenting on substantive issues, such as the propriety of using a predictive equation based on the nation's finest research libraries as a norm for college libraries in general, I do wish to clarify one technical point that recurs in Mr. McInnis' article and that may be confusing to readers.

Mr. McInnis, referring to an earlier treatment of this problem by Reichard and Orsagh, states that their conclusions are effectively invalidated since the "size variables are patently not (statistically) independent of each other." This statement, and others about the problem of multicollinearity, can be misleading. Linear regression equations of the form $y=a + bx + cx^2$, for example, often appear in the literature, although the "size variables" $x$ and $x^2$ are "patently not independent of each other." It is true that if the variables on the right side are statistically uncorrelated, the analyses may be simpler, but there is nothing in the theory that prevents one from using correlated variables. If two of these variables are perfectly correlated in the sense that one completely determines the other, an investigator will not get incorrect results, but will rather find he gets no solution at all; that is, he won't be able to solve the equations. If the variables are strongly, but not perfectly, correlated he will get a solution, but will find that the confidence intervals (or better, confidence ellipsoids) for the coefficients are larger than he might otherwise have expected. These statements are not the same, however, as saying that the conclusions reached are invalid.

Mr. McInnis introduced the discussion of correlated size variables in an attempt to explain the negative coefficients of the Reichard and Orsagh paper. One can obtain an alternative explanation of these negative regression coefficients by carefully considering what a regression coefficient is. A regression coefficient indicates how much the dependent variable will increase if a particular dependent variable increases while the other dependent variables remain
constant. For the case at hand, if faculty size is fixed, an increase in the size of the student body probably represents a reduction in the quality of the college; the "worse" a school, the fewer books its library will own, and hence the negative coefficient. Thus student body may, in this instance, be more a measure of quality than size. This effect is eliminated in Mr. McInnis' treatment since his sample includes only excellent schools.

I would finally like to note that the equation given is a linear approximation, in an extreme region, of what is most likely a nonlinear equation. This should be considered if one wishes to apply this equation to schools of small or medium size. The negative constant term may be explained by this observation.

Abraham Bookstein
Professor
Graduate Library School
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois
BOOK REVIEWS


One might well question the propriety of reviewing Terence Crowley and Thomas Childers' book, Information Services in Public Libraries: Two Studies, in a journal devoted to academic libraries. However, what professors Crowley and Childers have done in exploring devices and methods applicable to the measurement of information services has serious and important consequences for college and research libraries. One of the most difficult of a library's functions to measure and quantify for performance evaluation is the information services provided to its client groups. While this work addresses the need to know how effective and correct the information disseminated by reference departments and personnel is, a farther reaching effect is the model or style of measurement developed by these two researchers that has application in academic libraries as well as public libraries. Hence, their objective formulation, problem solving methodologies, and controlled data gathering and testing devices should be carefully considered by any academic librarian interested in reference service.

The two studies in this work are sequential in nature and explore the feasibility of developing and applying quantitative methods and statistical methodology in the assessment of information services. While the superficial nature of the studies might well lead one to conclude that the principal thrust was on the correctness or effectiveness of the information response mechanisms and the role of telephone reference, the substantive aspects of these studies lie in the intellectually conceived approach to the problem, the conceptual development of an investigatory scheme that would not change what was being measured (generally conceived as the Hawthorne effect) and the logical framework of the research undertaken.

Numerous conditions and factors were reviewed and considered by professors Crowley and Childers in the deliberation of what methodology for measurement would be needed. Factors such as per capita dollar amounts available to the various target libraries for books and professional staff, nonprofessional staff, and other expenditures in related areas were included in an interwelding of support conditions that a library might marshal to provide reference services. It was the provision of information services based upon the relationship between a high degree of support and the actual ability of the library to deliver factual and correct information that Crowley and Childers researched with a high degree of success. The control of variables to correspond to the researchers' original contentions and hypotheses coupled with the tactics and instruments devised for these studies should have general applicability in academic libraries.

Obviously certain techniques used by other researchers were employed, such as the use of standardized questions with a scale of difficulty, the use of anonymous callers and questioners, and a control target group of equal or near equal libraries. As such, Crowley and Childers' study borders very near to what Lowell Martin did in his study of the public service sections of the Chicago Public Library. What is of some interest is the similarity of results that Crowley and Childers received when compared to that of Lowell Martin's. Just in the area of accuracy of information services provided, only thirty-six percent of Crowley's questions were correctly answered. Childers did somewhat better as fifty-four percent of his questions were correctly answered. To add insult to in-
jury, Crowley's poor showing was explained by the fact that he included current event questions that required up-to-date sources for answers and some form of current awareness service to up-date the information resources of librarians and library support staff.

While the results of the two studies are depressing, a very positive approach to the study of qualitative measurement makes this book highly worthwhile. All academic librarians interested in the effectiveness and performance of their information service units would do well to study these research methods and begin to ask, "are we failing in one of our principal library tasks in not providing correct or valid information?" I recommend this book highly.—Robert P. Haro, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.


Why does the editor choose not to mention the connection of this publication with its predecessor, Directory of Special Libraries and Information Centers (2d ed., 1968)? In many ways it is very similar. The content of the descriptions for each organization listed is similar (seventeen categories of information in the Directory, eighteen in the Encyclopedia). The format is different: in the former, the listings run several to a page with abbreviations and codes to conserve space; in the latter, each organization has a full page, with each category of information labeled. Some 13,000 organizations are listed in the former; 833 in the latter. The arrangement is slightly different: in 1968, U.S. organizations are separated from Canadian; some effort has been made in 1971 to include innovative services and exclude commercial services or traditional special libraries.

The substantive differences between the two publications exist in the indexes. In the Encyclopedia the different types of services or systems (e.g., abstracting and indexing services, Selective Dissemination of Information (SDI) Services, serials publications, micrographic applications and services, etc.) are indexed separately. Both editions have personal name and subject indexes. The Encyclopedia contains an "Acronyms and Initialisms Dictionary."

Is a directory an encyclopedia or a dictionary? Can the permuted indexes created from directory information legitimately qualify a directory to be called an encyclopedia? I think not, but the indexes to this new edition of a directory of innovative, experimental, computerized information centers, networks, and data banks could have been useful indicators of the applications of new technologies in the field of information services if they were better done. Pity that the indexes are so poor. The subject index is especially poor, with many incongruous stylistic aberrations and a totally inadequate syndetic structure. Not only will these flaws frustrate and confuse the user of this book as a directory, but it will limit its usefulness as an analytic tool to study the availability of information systems for given subject areas. There are too many instances to cite, but perhaps these examples will suffice: (1) In Subject Index, Handicapped Children has no "see also" references; Gifted Children has "see also Exceptional Children"; Exceptional Children does not send the reader to Handicapped Children, Gifted Children, Blind, Brain-Diseases, and so on; (2) Two entries appear for the same ERIC Clearinghouse on Exceptional Children (pages 125 and 739 of the directory). Both appear in the Subject Index under Exceptional Children, but only one of each appears under Gifted Children or Handicapped Children.

The eight separate indexes for specialized features or services are merely an alphabetic listing of the organizations who have responded affirmatively to certain questions on the survey instrument. There is no attempt to analyze, for instance, what kind of computer application or service is provided, or for that matter if the abstracting and indexing services are complete for the collection held, published or available on request. There is no classified index by computer system or micrographic equipment used.

As a directory, this is a useful update of the 1968 edition of the Directory. As an encyclopedia, it is a poor first try. Recommended for libraries in need of information
about other information services (names, addresses, phone numbers, etc.) for referral purposes, but not recommended to anyone in need of an encyclopedia of information systems and services.—Pauline Ather-ton, Syracuse University.


This slender volume is interesting despite its formidable title which might better have been stated as "The Concept of Behavioral-Based Personnel Systems and the Theory of Their Library Applications." Assistant professor of librarianship at the School of Librarianship at the University of Oregon, Mr. Kemper's purpose is to improve library personnel practice. He hopes this theory "will be useful to librarians who do research on personnel systems, to those who design them, to those who use them, and to students." The book does not present methods for personnel administration but rather "a perspective on personnel systems and human organizations."

Once the reader has adjusted to the behavioral language, the volume is clear and well organized. One can obtain a reasonable comprehension of the entire text by reading the first half of the preface, Chapter 2 (three pages of text), Chapter 3 (five pages of text), and Chapter 6 (four pages of text). The volume includes some "thought questions" which may help the volume be used in a classroom situation. A very lengthy set of case studies constitutes Chapter 5.

There are some very good statements and thoughts. For example, "An organization as a social system . . . involves recognition of such elements as formal and informal organization within a total integrated system." On page twenty-three a paragraph on "emergent behavior" is well stated and stimulating. And later: "Information on emergent behavior is meaningful only if it can be regarded as making an incremental contribution to some explicitly stated long-range desired goal."

Then again there are some debatable statements. "The library organization reflects the motives and aspirations of library personnel as modified extensively by sociocultural factors." In describing the BBPS position, the author states as one of his positions that "Men require majority opinions as men carry clubs—for security." Among environmental constraints determining behavior is the fact that "the image of the library is determined to a large extent by facility and resource planning." Or finally, "although the BBPS model has limited value for strategic long-range planning, cause-and-effect analysis based on this model can be applied fruitfully in a library to several kinds of operational planning decisions. For instance . . . administrators could measure the effects of requiring professional librarians to type sets of catalog cards as a result of the institution's decision to decrease money allocated for clerical typists."

The statement of the theory seems to overlook the fact that organizational goals are in constant flux, personnel aspirations keep shifting, procedural factors are altered continuously, and thus the apparently idealistic nature of BBPS seems naive as here presented. Nevertheless the "perspective" is a useful challenge to anyone in personnel administration.

The volume is interesting and easy to read despite such curious statements noted above; it can be useful for those who are going into a review of personnel management in a serious way. The author is to be applauded for his conclusion that "justice, decency, managerial behavior, and effective conflict resolution cannot be written in . . . personnel manuals. They must be written in the mind and the heart of the library administrator or supervisor." To this one might add that other essentials are judgment, a sound ethical basis for action, sympathy, tolerance, and flexibility—partly inborn and partly based on experience. This volume may help to that end.—David C. Weber, Stanford University.

The editor is honest in his introduction
when he explains the make-up of the book and his reason for its publication:

The ISR reports covering the SMART system are not generally available in the open market; moreover, the information contained in the reports is difficult to assimilate, being dispersed over a large number of volumes including many thousands of pages. For this reason it has seemed advisable to collect in an organized manner, as a single book, the most important contributions contained in the earlier reports.

The present volume thus consists of updated versions of twenty-seven studies taken from the material contained in the ten most recent scientific reports (ISR-8 to ISR-17). Among the material covered are theoretical developments, including the derivation of system evaluation measures, language analysis techniques, document grouping techniques, and adaptive space transformation methods, as well as experimental studies relating to document analysis methods, interactive user feedback procedures, partial document searches based on clustered file organizations, and comparisons between the SMART system and more conventional operational information systems.

The material and research done in these reports was accomplished between 1964 and 1969. The research which this volume reports has been reviewed generally in those years. Some of the experimentation is rigorous and the ideas are fresh (or were fresh). However, since commentary on the experimentation is already available, it is more important to delve into the utility of this publication. The gathering together and reorganization of the materials and experiments on automatic document processing, rearranged to put thesaurus construction, experimental evaluation, etc. in context is valuable. For people generally not looking for reports in this area, this is a good state-of-the-art review for SMART experiments. For someone who is interested in experiments in automatic indexing, query negotiation automatically, and so on, this is not a bad book to own. If however, you are working in this field, you should already have read the reports reproduced herein.

Some of the chapters have also appeared in periodical literature and in proceedings of meetings, and as parts of a book. The publication of the reports as they are causes redundancy in some of the reports.—Henry Voos, Rutgers University.

**Library Service to the Disadvantaged.**


A more descriptive title for this book might be “Public Library Service to the Disadvantaged,” for there is little or no discussion of programs of other types of libraries for serving this special group. The emphasis on public library programs is not a limitation—the quantity and range of the literature, which consists in large measure of reports of individual library successes and failures, necessitated a comprehensive overview. In this book, the author reviews many relevant programs and synthesizes the various experiences and viewpoints into general and specific guidelines for action.

Eight groups which are disadvantaged by economic, social, mental, or other handicaps are identified: the aged; neglected youth; physically handicapped persons; the mentally handicapped; persons deprived economically; persons confined in institutions; those with language barriers; and persons who are discriminated against because of race. The particular needs and service-related problems of each group are presented with numerous examples of actual programs. In the chapter on the physically handicapped, for example, topics include requirements for special reading aids and the need for adapting facilities for persons with impaired mobility. Psychological approaches and techniques, steps to take in initiating programs, and the use of nonbook materials are other useful features of the chapters on the eight groups. The suggested reading lists for the disadvantaged (for example, “Best Books for Disadvantaged Blacks”) perhaps should not be accepted without some reservation; it is difficult for any individual to determine what is best for a large group.

Some general problems emerge from a study of programs for these groups. Lack of funding and adequate staffing, attitudes among the disadvantaged that the library is not relevant to their needs, low educational levels, and passive attitudes on the part of library boards and librarians are
among the several problems cited. Ways of coping with these obstacles, such as participation of the disadvantaged in program planning and increasing the tax base through the establishment of regional systems, are realistic, if predictable.

Librarians are more aware of the need for continuing evaluation of programs and services. It is to the author's credit that this function is discussed and the need for it stressed. If evaluative techniques had been employed consistently as the public library evolved, the current crisis in meeting the needs of a changing clientele might have been averted.

The trend toward diversified services addressed to the particular needs of a group has its critics. As libraries take on activities such as sex and hygiene classes and consumer education groups, a reasonable question can be raised as to whether nonbook oriented activities are within the domain of library functions. These new activities, as illustrated in many of the program examples, demand an expertise beyond the training of the librarian. The author deals with this question at some length, suggesting the need for cooperation between libraries and other agencies and the use of personnel from other professions. Some discussion of the possibility of integrating certain library services into agencies such as settlement houses would have been provocative.

This reviewer detected some unsupported and somewhat biased statements ("The flight of industry and white, middle-class families to the suburbs has also robbed the inner cities of leadership." p. 76). It is probably a subjective judgment as to whether these statements mar the effectiveness of the book; the reviewer simply found them annoying.

Library Service to the Disadvantaged should be of value as a source book for public librarians. The extensive references to ongoing or experimental programs and the suggested approaches for implementing new programs are particularly useful features. Academic librarians, who in many instances are becoming increasingly sensitive to the needs of disadvantaged students among their clientele, will find some of the guidelines relevant to their planning.—Saundra Rice Murray, Howard University.


It is always interesting to look at the solutions of a building program through someone else's eyes. In this case the building program belongs to the University of Guelph library. Mr. Langmead, the project architect, and Ms. Beckman, Deputy Librarian, have done an excellent job of describing their philosophies and approaches to library building planning and development. It is their thesis that successful library buildings must be functionally and aesthetically satisfying.

The question one must raise is, "To what extent did the authors satisfy this ambitious undertaking?" Let us take a close look at the two parts of this book.

The first sixty-nine pages are dedicated to the task of identifying such complex problems of new library building development as site selection, selection of planning team, functional considerations for library operations, architectural considerations, furniture selection and layout, moving, and operating the new library. The second half of the book includes approximately forty pages of the University of Guelph Library Building Program and its floor plans.

After reading his work, the reviewer was left with the strong suspicion that the building program for Guelph was written before the guidelines for planning were developed in the first part of the book. The guidelines suggested reflect much of the local scene at Guelph which may or may not have any bearing for other campuses. One can only surmise that the authors' technique is justified by assuming that what is good for Guelph must be good for others as well. A good example of this takes place in Chapter 3, where the role of the planning team is covered: the discussion reflects strictly local attitudes and circumstances.

Very few, if any, of the many items discussed in this book are explored in any depth. Major considerations are treated briefly and in almost abstract style, offering little help and few solutions to problems. The issues of centralized vs. decentralized
library, of a separate undergraduate facility and of open vs. closed stacks are discharged in less than two pages.

The complete omission of the following important considerations should also be noted:

(1) There is no discussion on the desirability of certain types of floor coverings. There is no relief to such questions as where in the building should one use carpeting or tile floor covering. What quality of carpeting should one look for? Does carpeting hold up on stairways?

(2) A number of libraries have been built during the past twenty years with automatic smoke detection systems to prevent small fires from becoming major disasters. Smoke detection systems can be installed to show the exact location of trouble. Not one word on this important safety device.

(3) The security problem in a library building can be improved by connecting alarm-activated fire exits to a central panel, thus alerting staff when a door is opened without authorization and the location of the opened door. Apparently this type of detail was not considered by the authors.

(4) The authors fail to discuss in any depth the vertical transportation problem of students and faculty. Remaining unanswered are such questions as how many elevators are needed per thousand students in various high buildings? When does one consider an escalator instead of an elevator?

(5) It is common knowledge that libraries have some doors even when completely flexible modular, open-access buildings are designed. A few strategically located doors that are a few inches too low and narrow have defeated the easy, free-access concept in many libraries. Questions on these problems are seldom raised before construction, and the subject is not brought out by the authors either.

(6) The work gives no advice on the desirability of a public address system in a large building. Should a public building of a certain size have such a system to announce closing hours? To help evacuate the building if an emergency develops? To provide the flexibility of piping programmed music in limited and select areas?

(7) The importance of the shipping-receiving area cannot be overemphasized in library buildings. Many building consultants claim that if the shipping-receiving room is undersized or poorly designed, the rest of the building will have undesirable features. The New Library Design does not discuss the receiving area at all. The lack of appreciation for a functional receiving area is reflected in the Guelph Library Basement Floor Plan, which shows a marginal receiving area (p. 86).

(8) Anybody who has planned a university library of some size will agree that faculty studies can be a touchy issue. Most libraries plan either too few or too many. Much help is needed to establish local needs. If you were looking for an answer relating to faculty studies, such as number needed, size, and location in the building, here is the quote of the entire section dealing with the subject matter:

Small private studies, available for library related research by faculty members are found in both college and university libraries. The numbers which will be necessary will vary depending on the size and character of the institution and other facilities provided on campus.

Other topics are treated with equal depth and breadth. How useful is such a statement to prospective library planners and architects? This work can not serve as a checklist of new buildings when one considers the omissions. It is equally difficult to consider this book as a guide to library planning, since it offers little or no guidance at all.

Considering the positive points, the reviewer recommends reading the work if you are interested in "how we did it at Guelph." In fact, if you buy the book, don't miss reading about the problems identified at the Guelph Library (p. 84-85). It is most educational. It is entirely possible that their problem list is only two pages long because they have used their own checklist.

The reviewer cannot recommend this work for the use of the practitioner who needs advice for an overall good building. At best it can serve as a companion to other works that are listed in the bibliography.

—Peter Spyers-Duran, Florida Atlantic University.

This mistitled volume, widely anticipated in the public library world, is a distinct disappointment—mainly because it says very little about systems, and what it does say consists of reassuring generalizations and platitudes designed to prove to local libraries that they need have no fear of cooperative systems and that there are naught but benefits to be derived from membership.

Whole chapters belong in a basic book of public library administration. And often where the role of the system could be useful, it is overlooked or minimized. For example, in the chapter on capital improvements the system consulting staff and system knowledge are entirely overlooked. System staff can assist in selecting the right architect, help to select the best site, and so on. Nothing of the sort is mentioned. The authors and ALA are capitalizing on interest in a popular subject without really writing about it. The section on supportive system services should have occupied half the book instead of the mere nineteen pages devoted to it.

Comments like “It [the cooperative library system] presents absolutely no threat to the library’s local prestige . . .” represent ideas not shared by a large number of member libraries throughout the nation. In light of New York State’s massive direct-access problems, such as those which prompted the recent pullout of the Finkelstein Memorial Library (Spring Valley, New York) from the Ramapo-Catskill Library System, it is idiotic to use a 1963 comment by Jean L. Connor to prove that “an anticipation of serious drains on any member library . . . is not justified by experience records.” That’s just not true. And many libraries would disagree with the view that “the system is the voice of the member units in library and related planning and research councils.”

Essential cooperation with nearby large municipal libraries (Chicago, New York, etc.) is overlooked. While the importance of communication is stressed, no mention is made of the enormous problem of informing member library staffs, and not just the directors.

In the appendixes, the authors rely heavily on materials of the Suburban Library System. While this surely was quick and easy and may be fine for Stoffel’s ego, since he is director of that system, it unfairly overlooks the many superior documents developed by other systems. The model by-laws, for example, do not even suggest that the director should serve as secretary to the board, a common and desirable practice.

The authors are working on a new manuscript which will consider the problems of cooperative library systems. Maybe that will result in the book we’ve all been waiting for.—Guenter A. Jansen, Director, Suffolk Cooperative Library System.


This volume is a compilation of previously-published materials concentrating upon selected aspects of American library history. The fifth volume in a growing series, it includes writings by such authors as David Mearns, Kenneth Brough, and Howard Clayton on the historic development of American libraries and librarianship. Three of the selections are admirably suited as study-pieces in American intellectual history courses: “Democratic Strivings” by Sidney Ditzion; “Causal Factors . . .” by Jesse H. Shera; and “. . . Rise of Research and Research Libraries, 1850–1900” by Samuel Rothstein. Harris’s credentials for this undertaking include his *Guide to Research in American Library History* (Scarecrow, 1968) and numerous bibliographic contributions to *The Journal of Library History.*

The book excerpts and journal articles number twenty-four, and each selection is prefaced with a brief explanatory statement. The text is printed on “raggy” paper (National Cash Register Company maintains its own paper mill) with double-column paging for the body of each selection. The selections are arranged into six topic headings ranging from colonial library history through Melvil Dewey and ALA to twentieth century specialization (library
service to children, growth of the library catalog, etc.). Introduced by a short introduction, these topic headings all end with a bibliography of suggested “Additional Readings.”

Due to the potential student audience for such a work, such frivolous study-imperfections as text-illustrations or an index have been omitted. One may criticize the lithograph cover illustration depicting an interior scene of an English library, drawn by either David Loggan (1635-1700?) or one of his contemporaries. This cover is standard for all titles in this series. A seventeenth century English library interior may be an appropriate cover for a Reader in Library Administration or Reader in the Academic Library, etc.; but as the single illustration for a book dealing with American library history, it is of questionable value. Other criticisms include misspelled words within the text, such as “Pennsylvaina” (p. 204), “farily” (p. 175) and “made” in the phrase “could made an exchange” (p. 66). An identical Justin Winsor quotation appears in two neighboring selections (p. 206 and p. 212).

Unlike the earlier American Library History Reader (ed. by John David Marshall), no separate biographical essays on American librarians are included. Marshall’s book was compiled from papers delivered before the American Library History Roundtable; whereas Harris depends upon bibliographical selection from among a multitude of widely scattered subject-related materials. On the whole, this is an excellent, thoughtfully-constructed reader that can be heartily recommended for background study in American intellectual history or library science-oriented reserve collections.—Paul A. Snowman, III, formerly at Sullivan County Community College, South Fallsburg, New York.


These are the proceedings of what must be the most elaborate, expensive, and well-organized library conference yet held. A planning group, representing some seventeen professional organizations, worked for over a year to plan the conference and to commission thirty-one studies that were distributed in advance to the 125 invited participants who were selected to represent all interested professional communities, all types of libraries and information centers, all geographic areas, and “new blood.” The participants were then convened for five days to “identify and discuss the propositions fundamental to the establishment and operation of a national network of libraries and information centers.” They were given three tutorial sessions—one on telecommunications, one on librarianship and interlibrary cooperation, and one on computer concepts and the relationship of the computer to library automation—in order to provide a common basis for the terminology and concepts of the interdisciplinary groups represented; heard a keynote speech on “Federal Telecommunications Policy and Library Information Networks”; and then organized into five working groups—network needs and development, network services, network technology, network organization, and network planning—which examined in detail the commissioned papers, discussed the issues, and prepared written summary reports of discussions and recommendations. These recommendations, unfortunately, consisted mainly of statements of sentiments that all can endorse but few can enforce. (“Personal privacy and other human considerations should be protected in the interface with technology, and freedom of access to information without the constraints of censorship should be guaranteed.”)

The conference passed two major resolutions. The first asked “That, as a matter of priority, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science devise a comprehensive plan to facilitate the coordinated development of the nation’s libraries, information centers, and other knowledge resources.” The second asked the Federal Communications Commission to allocate specific frequencies for space and terrestrial noncommercial public and educational ser-
vices, including library and information services.

In his introduction to this volume the editor and conference director summarizes his personal observations of the conference as follows: (1) the papers represent the most comprehensive collection of material on networks available; (2) a national network of libraries and information centers appears to be a viable concept; (3) the individual is the one to be served by a national network; (4) the development of the network concept is an interdisciplinary task; (5) libraries and information centers will need to be "proactive" rather than reactive; and (6) new patterns of organization that will permit networks to operate effectively must be developed, and meaningful network development cannot be imposed from the top down but must grow from grassroots motivation and support. It is, incidentally, difficult to reconcile this observation with the conference resolution asking the National Commission to devise a comprehensive plan.

This publication presents the thirty-one commissioned papers, the five working group summary reports, a bibliography, and, as an epilogue, a poetic parody Hiawatha's Network. While the papers are uneven, contain much duplication (*Gone With the Wind* is constantly being transmitted by telefacsimile in two minutes but Ralph Shaw's slow messenger is nowhere to be seen), and too often consist of speculation about networks they do, in general, bear out Becker's conclusion that this is the most comprehensive source of information on networks available. In particular the papers by Casey, Hacker, Hayes, Kenney, Miller and Weber, and Lynden represent good summaries of the historical development of networks. On the other hand it is hard to believe that the network concepts of the future as described by Licklider and Samuelson will be attained by 1980, as Licklider suggests. The papers of most significance are those by Bunge ("Reference Service in the Information Network"), Chapin ("Limits of Local Self Sufficiency"), and Dennis ("The Relation of Social Science Data Archives to Libraries and Wider Information Networks") which represent analyses of and commentaries upon present-day practices and problems.

The major value of the conference was probably the preparation and publication of this information. It is difficult to see how the conference otherwise advanced the cause of networks. There are now, and were at the time this conference was planned, many elements of a network in existence. A major conference of those actively involved in those elements which discussed ways of developing standards and practical bases of cooperation and intercommunication would certainly have been a more productive use of the grant funds than the discussions represented here.

The most distressing element of this conference, however, is how little attention was paid to the major question of what it is libraries have to communicate and what the real purpose of a national network is. Only Chapin's paper seems to have directly addressed this problem and there is little evidence in the working group summaries that anyone at the conference paid much attention to it. His paper deserves further attention, especially the conclusion that "Elaborate schemes, at great expense, that do little more than make the last 3 or 4 percent of materials available are likely to be [and should be] rejected by librarians and the public."—Norman D. Stevens, University of Connecticut.

OTHER BOOKS OF INTEREST TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS


The following abstracts are based on those prepared by the Clearinghouse for Library and Information Sciences of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC/CLIS), American Society for Information Science, 1140 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 804, Washington, DC 20036.

Documents with an ED number may be ordered in either microfiche (MF) or hard copy (HC) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, LEASCO Information Products, Inc., P.O. Drawer O, Bethesda, MD 20014. Orders must include ED number and specification of format desired. A $0.50 handling charge will be added to all orders. Payment must accompany orders totaling less than $10.00. Orders from states with sales tax laws must include payment of the appropriate tax or include tax exemption certificates.

Documents available from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22151 have NTIS number and price following the citation.


The final report on the Council on Library Resources (CLR) Grant no. 443 for the New England Library Information Network (NELINET) is divided into three parts. Section one is a general commentary on the NELINET project, which was conceived to test the viability of creating a centralized, regional capability to use electronic data processing techniques for technical processes and other service requirements of a network of libraries. The philosophy of the total project and of the system design planned to achieve project objectives is discussed. The NELINET system design and its transferability is reviewed in section two. Section three is a technical report on the hardware, software, and system design of the project.


The five papers presented at this symposium are: (1) "The Librarian and the Porcupine; Experiences With Cooperation and Technical Services in New York State," by Peter J. Paulson; (2) "Interlibrary Cooperation; The Academic Areas," by D. A. Redmon; (3) "The Role of Urban Libraries in Cooperation," by John Dutton; (4) "Library Network; Observations on the Chicago Conference," by Clint Lawson and (5) "SCOPEing the Future of Librarianship in Ontario," by John Wilkinson.


The fundamental objective of the study is to obtain a detailed analysis of the book publishing industry and the book printing industry in Canada, in order to determine what steps the federal government might take to assist the industry in improving its viability and in promoting its stability and growth. This objective implies that the study will provide the detailed analysis of the industry necessary to formulate the major policy options which may be open to the industry and to the government of Canada. The primary purpose of the study is statistical and economic data collection. Publishing and manufacturing are the elements of the book industry considered. Publishing includes manuscript selection, editing, copyrighting, marketing, and aspects of physical distribution as they pertain to publishers. Manufacturing encompasses typesetting, printing, and binding. Both English
and French language publishers of Canada are analyzed.

_A Report on Information Services at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill._ By John Callahan and others. 25 Jan. 1972. 39p. (ED 059 731, MF—$0.65 HC—$3.29)

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill community has long been in need of a coordinated and expanded information service. Students, particularly those in the General College, have had great difficulty obtaining information concerning academics, transportation, sports, cultural events, or merely a telephone number. The present services are inadequate for various reasons. They are scattered, overburdened, incomplete, and often overlapping. The problem has been aggravated by the recent growth in the size of the student body. The reorganization and coordination of the present system would render information more accessible and its dissemination more efficient. The following report is intended to study the existing services, discuss the problems encountered with these services, and offer some proposals for solutions. The proposal is broken down into three areas: telephone locator, ticket sales, and general information. Each area is discussed separately.


The major objective of this research study was to gather information about factors which influence collection development and selection decision making in the Smithsonian Institution libraries. The user's judgment of the extent to which the collections met his needs is the only parameter of assessment. Museum curators, the bulk of whose time is spent in research, were asked how well the collections met their needs. Also examined were the resources actually utilized by the curators in their research work, and their participation in and perception of the library material selection process. The study was designed to provide information for policy making, but the implications which are drawn must be considered tentative since only the user's point of view is covered. A more complete analysis must also consider the perspectives of librarians and administrators of the Smithsonian Institution.


The November 1970 general conference of UNESCO proclaimed calendar year 1972 as International Book Year. The general theme is books for all, and the goal is to focus attention on the role of books and related materials in the lives and affairs of the individual and society. The overall objectives are the encouragement of authorship and translation; improved circulation and production of books; promotion of the reading habit; and strengthening the usefulness of books in education, international understanding, and peaceful cooperation. This handbook provides guidelines for United States participants in the following areas: (1) functions and organization of the ad hoc committee and the U.S. Secretariat, (2) techniques for planning activities, and (3) planning for resources, publicity, and promotion. Lists of films, publications, and organizations concerned with the International Book Year are appended.


The two principal goals of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC), as approved during the first annual meeting held October 25, 1967, are: (1) increase the resources for education and research to faculty and students of its member institutions and (2) the deceleration of per-student costs in its member colleges and universities. Plans to achieve these goals are given. The second annual report includes the design of five major subsystems: (1) a shared
cataloging system, (2) a remote catalog access and circulation control system, (3) a bibliographic information retrieval project, (4) a serials control system, and (5) a major technical processing system that will computerize most of library processing. The third annual report discusses the implementation of these five subsystems. The foremost accomplishment reported in the fourth annual report was the implementation of the shared cataloging system.


As used in this handbook, microform retrieval equipment is defined as any device that is used to locate, enlarge, and display microform images or that produces enlarged hard copy from the images. Only equipment widely available in the United States has been included. The first chapter provides information about the most widely and generally used microforms and describes considerations related to equipment requirements. In chapter II, those factors are discussed that affect equipment selection regardless of the type of microform. The next four chapters further describe the equipment available for reference to a given microform. Operational and functional information about the equipment available is compiled in tables in each chapter. Chapter VII briefly describes equipment that does not really fit the classifications used in chapters III through VI but provides types and levels of retrieval and reference that will be of interest to many. The appendix lists the manufacturers who supplied the information about the equipment included in the handbook.
Catalogues of the Berenson Library of the Harvard University Center for ITALIAN RENAISSANCE STUDIES at Villa I Tatti

The nucleus of the Berenson Library near Florence is the magnificent collection of books and photographs on Italian art of the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Current holdings total more than 70,000 volumes and well over 150,000 photographs. The entire collection of the library represents the cultural evolution of the Mediterranean world beginning with ancient Israel, Greece and Rome, continuing with the impact of Byzantium and Islam, and flowering with the rediscovery of classical culture. Other fascinating sections complement and enrich the basic resources: classical and Near Eastern archaeology; medieval illuminated manuscripts; comparative religion, literature and philosophy; the literary classics of England, France and Germany; Oriental art, history and literature. The Harvard University Center which inherited the collection in 1959 has maintained the strength of the holdings in Italian Renaissance art while increasing holdings in Renaissance history and literature.

Author and Subject Catalogs, 7 Volumes.
Prepublication price: $675.00; Price after April 30, 1973: $840.00

ISBN: 0-8161-0973-7

Catalog of the TRANSPORTATION CENTER LIBRARY Northwestern University

The Transportation Center Library Catalog offers a major collection on current developments in transportation socio-economics, highway traffic analysis, and police administration. The holdings, 40% of which have been issued since 1965, include 79,000 books and reports and 1,000 periodicals. Transportation management, operations, planning, economics, regulation and impact for all modes are the main emphases, with important subfields on physical distribution, traffic safety, and the application of quantitative techniques to transportation functions. The police administration component is comprehensive in traffic law enforcement, police patrol, management, personnel administration and manpower allocation. There is substantial representation of transportation developments outside the United States. The publication of this Catalog, containing over 200,000 entries, makes available a broad and detailed resource for modern transportation study.

Author Catalog, 3 Volumes.
Prepublication price: $210.00; Price after April 30, 1973: $260.00

Subject and Geographic Catalog, 9 Volumes.
Prepublication price: $625.00; Price after April 30, 1973: $780.00

Complete Set, 12 Volumes.
Prepublication price: $775.00; Price after April 30, 1973: $940.00

ISBN: 0-8161-0924-9

Invaluable research aids to the scholar and librarian

Author Catalog of The Francis A. Countway LIBRARY OF MEDICINE for Imprints up to and Including 1959

The Countway Library of Medicine contains two of the most venerable and extensive collections of medical literature in the United States: the Harvard Medical Library and the Boston Medical Library. Both collections are renowned for medical education and research because of their size—over 260,000 combined entries—and the richness of their historical and contemporary collections. The historical collection includes European titles printed from 1475 to 1800; American titles issued from 1668 to 1870; English titles printed from 1475 to 1800; one of the greatest collections of medical Hebraica and Judaica from the 1300’s to the 1800’s; manuscript collections and historical subject collections. The library’s resources emphasize clinical and basic science materials with special sections in cardiovascular disease, neoplastic disease, aerospace medicine, legal medicine, demography and human ecology, medical history and biography. The Countway Library of Medicine Author Catalog is unquestionably an essential acquisition for medical research libraries.

Author Catalog, 10 Volumes. ISBN: 0-8161-1024-7
Prepublication price: $1,135.00; Price after April 30, 1973: $1,415.00

Prices 10% higher outside the U.S. unless otherwise noted.
FOLGER SHAKESPEARE LIBRARY CATALOG OF THE SHAKESPEARE COLLECTION

The Folger Library has one of the largest collections in the world of editions of Shakespeare's works and Shakespeareana. The Library contains almost all the important editions published over the course of four centuries as well as significant translations in some forty languages. About ninety percent of the known editions published in the 16th and 17th centuries are represented in the collection. The topics covered run the gamut of Shakespeare studies and, in addition to textual and interpretive critical works, include source material, adaptations, parodies and analogues. This excellent bibliographical record contains over 16,000 entries for works, separate plays, and subjects and is an essential research tool for all students of Shakespeare.

2 volumes (7x10) 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-1009-3

$45.00

FILM RESEARCH: A CRITICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY WITH ANNOTATIONS AND ESSAY

Compiled by Peter J. Bukalski

This new work concentrates on books in film history; theory and criticism; film production; film genre; the sociology and economics of film; national cinemas; film scripts; works about particular films; personalities, biographies and filmographies; film education; film-related works; bibliographies, guides and indexes. Essential works are listed separately with annotations. An introductory essay explores the various approaches to film research and a separate section treats films suited to intensive analysis and available for purchase. This immensely valuable volume is the only work of its kind listing the great proliferation of film books in recent years. Available now.

1 volume (7x10), 215 pp., approx. 3,110 entries. 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-0971-0

$12.50

NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE: A REFERENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1900-1971

With Selected Nineteenth Century Materials

Compiled by Beatrice Ricks, Joseph D. Adams, Jack O. Hazlerig

This new work provides a bibliography of books and articles by and about Nathaniel Hawthorne, plus a cross-referenced subject index reflecting the history and development of interest in his work. The Hawthorne bibliography presents comprehensive coverage for 1900 through 1971 with selected critical items from the 1800s. The editions of Hawthorne's own writings are divided into complete collections; representative partial collections; diaries, letters, notebooks; romances, collected stories, biography. This valuable new resource is an expert guide to the growing scholarly attention given to Hawthorne's work.

1 volume (6x9), 300 pp. ISBN: 0-8161-1021-2

$15.00

INDEX LIBYCUS: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF LIBYA, 1957-1969

WITH SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL, 1915-1956

Compiled by Hans Schlüter

An important contribution to reference works on North Africa, this work is the only complete index to materials concerning the growth and history of Libya. Because Libya has no national bibliography, Index Libycus is an indispensable guide to a wide range of subjects covering the humanities and the sciences—including economics, communications, medicine, public health, law, politics, religion, history, education, geography and geology. An alphabetical list of authors facilitates the use of material in the volume. Available now.

1 volume (7x10), 304 pp., approx. 4,418 entries. 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-0939-7

$19.50

RELACIONES LITERARIAS ENTRE ESPAÑA E ITALIA:
ENSAYO DE UNA BIBLIOGRAFÍA DE LITERATURA COMPARADA

(Literary Relations between Spain and Italy: A Bibliographic Survey of Comparative Literature)

Compiled by Joseph Siracusa and Joseph L. Laurenti

This bibliographical compilation of periodical literature, including essays, monographs, articles, and also literary studies—drawn from extensive research in European and American libraries—documents the progression of Spanish and Italian literary and cultural relations from their medieval beginnings to the mid-twentieth century. Arranged alphabetically and chronologically, Relaciones Literarias assures quick and reliable access to a vast and important field of literary history. An index of authors with cross references is included. Available now.

1 volume (7x10), 255 pp., 2,880 entries. 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-1010-7

$20.00

G.K. HALL & CO.
70 Lincoln Street  Boston, Massachusetts 02111
CATALOG OF THE C. M. DOKE COLLECTION OF AFRICAN LANGUAGES
The University of Rhodesia Library
The Doke Collection, one of the finest private libraries of African languages, contains over 3,000 books, pamphlets and manuscripts, including many very rare items. The total collection represents more than 200 African languages and dialects, with particular strengths in Nguni, Sotho, Shona, Bemba, Zambian, Tonga, Myanja and Swahili as well as Khoisan and West African languages. A number of valuable folklore items are also included. The Catalog is in two sections, author and LC classified subject section. Available now.
1 volume (7x10), 816 pp., 8,394 entries. 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-0997-4 $29.50

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF BOTANISTS REPRESENTED IN HUNT INSTITUTE PORTRAIT COLLECTION - RACHEL McMASTERS MILLER HUNT BOTANICAL LIBRARY Carnegie-Mellon University
The publication of this index makes available the identity of over 11,000 botanists, horticulturists and plantsmen whose portraits are included in the magnificent Hunt Institute portrait collection. Brief biographical data is provided along with the person’s particular botanical interests or horticultural specialty, and the country of his principal activity. Botanists from all countries and all times, including those living, and whether of world-wide or local importance are included. Photocopies of most of the 17,000 portraits of all types are available.
1 volume (8½x11), 432 pp. ISBN: 0-8161-1023-9 $30.00

ANGLO-VATICAN RELATIONS, 1914-1939: CONFIDENTIAL ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE BRITISH MINISTERS TO THE HOLY SEE
Compiled by Thomas E. Hachey
This volume surfaces the confidential annual reports of the British ministers to the Holy See between 1914 and 1939. The accounts represent a valuable new resource for diplomatic studies, and provide a first-hand and revealing view of the Vatican’s foreign relations, and of British diplomatic involvement in the activities of the Roman Catholic Church. They also prove useful for research on various aspects of the Vatican’s internal affairs and its wide range of diplomatic relations. Collectively, they add new dimensions to understanding Vatican politics and the Church and international relations. Available now.
1 volume (7x10), 440 pp. 1972. ISBN: 0-8161-0991-5 $18.00

THE LIBRARY OF JOHANN LUCAS SCHOENLEIN IN THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WURZBURG
On Epidemics and Nosography
The library of the well known clinician, Johann Lucas Schoenlein (1793-1864) is a specialized collection of epidemiological, nosological and nosographical literature of the 15th through the 19th centuries. The 8,000 titles include many rare works from the 16th and 17th centuries. In addition to German and Latin, there are English, French, Italian, Dutch and Spanish language titles. Highly regarded as a bibliographic tool, the Wurzburg Schoenlein medical library catalog provides access to remarkable medical and medico-historical materials, and has great historical value both from bibliographic and medical points of view.
1 volume (7x10), 580 pp. ISBN: 0-8161-1007-4 $45.00

SELECTED REFERENCES TO LITERATURE ON MARINE EXPEDITIONS, 1700-1960 FISHERIES-OCEANOGRAPHY LIBRARY, University of Washington
This rich compilation of some 9,000 references provides an index to ships, expeditions, reports and published papers resulting from expeditions involved in fisheries, marine biology, and oceanographic research from the 18th to the mid-20th centuries. Gathered over a period of twenty-five years, the index is a working research file and, though selective, is particularly valuable in bringing together references to a given expedition scattered throughout a wide variety of sources. Arrangement is alphabetical by ship and expedition name. It is an invaluable reference aid in ship and expedition identification.
2 volumes (7x10), 703 pp. ISBN: 0-8161-1006-9 $20.00 Prices 10% higher outside the U.S. unless otherwise noted.
The Library
Reference Series

Facsimile Reprints of Basic Reference Sources and
Major Writings on the History and Methods of
Professional Librarianship

For many years Gregg Press has been helping libraries build their subject collections by publishing
quality reprints and original works in the fields of American history and literature and Pacific history.
Now, to mark a new beginning as a division of G. K. Hall & Co., a recognized leader in library reference
publishing, Gregg Press announces the Library Reference Series, a new reprint program featuring
37 basic reference works and classic studies of American libraries and librarianship.

Based upon such standard reference works as Constance M. Winchell's Guide to Reference Books,
suggestions from librarians, and the required reading lists for courses in American library schools,
the Library Reference Series is organized into three subseries:

- **Basic Reference Sources.** Included in this collection are standard reference works, cited in
  Winchell's Guide to Reference Books and elsewhere, that have proven their usefulness and
  belong in the reference collection of any library. Ranging from Nathan M. Cohen's Library
  Science Dissertations, 1925-60 through Norma O. Ireland's An Index to Indexes and Local
  Indexes in American Libraries to the monumental Guide to the Study of the United States of
  America, the works in this section continue to serve as basic guides to a broad selection of
  subject fields and information areas.

- **Library History and Biography.** Included here are the standard histories of such major in­
stitutions as the Boston Athenaeum, Chicago Public Library, New York Public Library, New
York Society Library, the Library of Congress, the University of Virginia Library and the H. W.
Wilson Company, as well as Samuel Swett Green's classic The Public Library Movement in the
United States and Louis Shores' The Origins of the American College Library. To balance the
institutional histories, this subseries also includes American Library Pioneers, an eight-volume
set of standard biographies of major figures in the American library movement produced by
the American Library Association.

- **Librarianship and Library Resources.** Included in this section is a selection of purely pro­
fessional books that every librarian should be familiar with. From such eminently practical
works as David Haykin's Subject Headings: A Practical Guide to the Library Institute's The
Reference Function in the Library, the craft and profession of librarianship is well presented
through a broad range of basic studies. Also included is the foundation volume of Robert Downs' American Library Resources.

The Library Reference Series is now in production and all titles will be ready for shipment in December.
Orders received direct from libraries before December 31, 1972 will be billed at the special pre-pub­
lication price.

Special Pre-Publication Price, $380.00
Orders received after December 31, 1972 will be billed at $425.00

For individual titles and full descriptive information, write to:

Gregg Press A Division of G. K. Hall & Co.
70 Lincoln Street Boston, Massachusetts 02111
The American Revolutionary Series:
The Three Sides of the American Revolution

Compiled by George Athan Billias, Professor of History, Clark University

Facsimile Reprints of Vital Documents, Studies and Accounts
Pertaining to the Activities of the Three Major Camps of the American Revolution—the British—the Loyalist—the American and French Allies.

The forty-nine facsimile reprints, drawn from the highly regarded collection of American revolutionary materials at the Boston Public Library, will prove of especially great value with the bicentennial of the War of Independence close at hand. This event will bring intense and far-ranging reassessment of the parties, issues and actions that led to the Revolution and determined its outcome.

- The Loyalist Library is a basic library of 20 works on the actions and attitudes of those colonists who remained loyal to the Crown and who have been generally neglected in most historical studies of the War. This collection includes four works on or by Joseph Galloway, one of the most outspoken critics of British treatment of the Loyalists; detailed accounts of Loyalist activities in the various colonies; and, finally, several accounts of what happened to the Loyalists after the war, their migrations and their claims for losses to the British Parliament.

- British Accounts of the American Revolution offers a broad selection of 15 titles describing the War from the British side. It includes such works as Edmund Burke’s speeches in favor of appeasement, Robert Beatson’s six-volume history of British naval operations in the War, and the Historical Manuscript Commission’s extensive collections of manuscripts, letters and journals relating to the Revolution, as well as individual and collective biographies of major British figures responsible for the conduct of the War.

- American and French Accounts of the Revolution contains 14 titles and emphasizes the military and political maneuverings so crucial to the American victory. It includes such diverse works as Abbe Raynal’s classic treatise on British colonialism and the right to revolt against it; Paul Allen’s first general account of the War from the standpoint of post-War of 1812 Anglo-American relations; and Thomas Balch’s detailed history of the French involvement in all areas of the War.

The American Revolutionary Series will represent a landmark source of unique scholarly materials for the reassessment and continuing study of the American Revolution and will be a marked asset in the holdings of all college and research libraries.

The American Revolutionary Series is now in production and all titles will be ready for shipment in December.

Orders received direct from libraries before December 31, 1972 will be billed at the special pre-publication price.

Special Pre-Publication Price, $985.00
Orders received after December 31, 1972 will be billed at $1200.00

For individual titles and full descriptive information, write to:

Gregg Press, A Division of G. K. Hall & Co.
70 Lincoln Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02111
Englische Studien
Vols. 1-76. (All published).
Leipzig 1877–1944
(Including general indexes to
Vols. 1-25, 26-50)
Clothbound set . . . . . . $2,200.00
Paperbound set . . . . 2,000.00
Vols. 1-75
Per volume, paperbound 33.00
Vol. 76
Paperbound . . . . . . . . . 16.50
General Indexes to Vols. 1-25, 26-50
Per index, paperbound . 11.00
Many single issues available in
the original edition. Please inquire.

Widely acclaimed as one of the
to 3 foremost journals in the field of
English literature and philology, Englische Studien published a
wealth of scholarly articles
dealing with major British and
American authors. Contributions are in English and German.

Journal of Philology
Vols. 1–35. (All published).
London 1868–1920
(Including general index to
Vols. 1–35 in Vol. 35)
Clothbound set . . . . . . $600.00

Critical historical and philo-
logical analyses by prominent
academicians appear in this
journal devoted to Classical
studies. The depth and range
of the articles make this journal
an invaluable tool for all those
engaged in Greek and Latin as
well as Old Testament studies.

Journal of English and Germanic
Philology
(Including Index to Vols. 1–50)
(Partly in the original edition)
Clothbound set . . . . . . $1,780.00
Paperbound set . . . . . 1,535.00

“Devoted to studies of the
English, German, and Scandi-
navian languages and litera-
tures.... It features a wide
range of studies—original and
scholarly—of interest to under-
graduates as well as to
scholars.”
—Katz, Magazines for Librari
North Carolina. University. Studies in Philology
Vols. 1–61, 1906–1984
Clothbound set
in 53 volumes ...... $1,580.00
Paperbound set ...... 1,370.00
"Presents textual and historical research in the classical and modern languages and literatures. All forms and periods of literature are covered. Articles are long, averaging 5,000 words, and include: analysis of poetic language—magery, structure, etymology; examination of newly-discovered texts and original manuscripts, and historical studies...."
—Katz, Magazines for Libraries

Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie
Vols. 1–84, Halle 1877–1944
Clothbound set ...... $1,810.00
Paperbound set ...... 1,650.00
The first German journal devoted to a specialized study of Romance languages, the Zeitschrift encompasses a variety of sub-disciplines. "A significant current bibliography listing books and periodical articles on the language and literature of the various romance languages."
—Winchell, Guide to Reference Books

Slavia. Casopis pro slovanskou filologii
Vols. 1–21, Prague 1922/23–1952/55
Clothbound set ...... $714.00
Paperbound set ...... 630.00
Slavia is the oldest existing international journal of Slavic studies. It is devoted to comparative literature and linguistics and publishes articles, materials, discussions, and reviews in all Slavonic languages, and in French, English, and German.
F.W. Faxon Company, the only fully automated library subscription agency in the world, has an IBM 370/145 computer currently listing 48,222 periodicals for your library.

Our 'til forbidden service – the automatic annual renewal of your subscriptions – provides fast, accurate, and efficient processing of your orders and invoices. It has been acclaimed by librarians throughout the world for the savings in time and effort it offers library personnel. We'd like to serve your library, too.

• almost 50,000 domestic and foreign library periodicals • annual librarians' guide • specialists in serving college, university, public, school, corporate and special libraries • eighty-six years of continuous service to libraries • most modern facilities

Send for free descriptive brochure and annual librarians' guide.

Library business is our only business – since 1886.

and still growing!
"Nonprint media is no longer viewed as solely an enrichment of print, but rather as a basic aspect of communication among a one world population confronted with numerous languages, customs, slang, idioms, writing skills, and unprecedented demands for speed in exchange of concepts, emotions, and expectations."

—PEARCE S. GROVE and EVELYN CLEMENT, editors of

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL OF NONPRINT MEDIA**

The first volume to present the best of current thinking on systems and standards for the control of audiovisual material

With reports and discussions of research activity and current practices in the United States, Canada and Great Britain

by representatives of professional organizations and national centers in library, audiovisual, and information science fields.

at $15.00 from

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Greatest Advance Since the Typewriter was Invented!
No More Smeary Erasing—Covers Mistakes Instantly, Permanently!

SELF-CORRECTING TYPEWRITER RIBBON!

Most exciting, needed advance since the typewriter was invented! As of this moment, every messy, smudgy, smeary typewriter eraser in the world hits the scrap heap for good. No more erasing—ever! Bottom half of miracle ribbon is like a magic wand that makes errors disappear before your eyes. To make corrections, just back space, shift ribbon selector and retype error. Presto! White ink makes error completely invisible. Order extra ribbons for friends. This is one gift they'll love you for! No CODs.

MAIL ORDER MART, Dept. 14
2701 Sterlington Road, Suite 132
Monroe, Louisiana 71201

Please send me the quantity of ribbons checked below. If not satisfied, I will return ribbons within 10 days for full refund.

- 1 ribbon $3.50
- 2 ribbons $6.00

Brand Name of Typewriter—
- Standard
- Electric
- Portable

Name________________________

Address______________________

City_________________________ State________ Zip________
Ralph Crane and Some Shakespeare First Folio Comedies

By T. H. Howard-Hill, University College, Swansea. xvi, 190 pp., index. $7.50

(Bibliographical Society)

Ralph Crane probably transcribed the manuscripts of The Tempest, Two Gentlemen of Verona, Merry Wives of Windsor, Measure for Measure, and Winter's Tale that were used for the printing of the Shakespeare First Folio. This study supports that theory by providing for the first time a detailed description of the habits and characteristics found in Crane's extant dramatic transcripts. These traits, which seemed to change over the years, are then used to analyze this important Jacobean scribe's part in the preparation of copy for the five First Folio comedies. Howard-Hill's work is significant because it establishes Crane as a Folio scribe, studies Crane's preserved manuscripts in great detail, and explores in further depth the actual composition of the Folio.

Jacobean Dramatic Perspectives

By Arthur C. Kirsch, University of Virginia. 134 pp., index. $7.50

Jacobean plays have often been treated as variations of Elizabethan or Shakespearian models. This study shows how they may be better understood and more properly evaluated on their own terms. The author considers the development and popularity of Fletcherian tragicomedy and coterie drama in this period and demonstrates how the kind of self-conscious theatrical experience these genres encouraged affected the works of the major Jacobean dramatists. He examines the extensive and frequently parasitic dependence of the tragedies of Webster and Ford upon Fletcherian premises and shows, at the same time, how similar theatrical ideas contributed to Shakespeare's rich exploration of tragicomic form in the problem comedies and last plays. Mr. Kirsch also considers Marston's coterie plays and illuminates the important and salutary influence of coterie dramaturgy, with its morality play inheritance, upon Middleton's career.

The Fatal Mirror

Themes and Techniques in the Poetry of Fulke Greville

By Richard Waswo, University of Virginia. ix, 181 pp., index. $8.50

The Fatal Mirror is the first full-scale critical study of the nondramatic verse of Fulke Greville, whose best poems rank among the finest lyrics of the English Renaissance. The study surveys past and current scholarly perspectives on Greville and answers the recently felt need for a reassessment of Greville's poetry. The author analyzes the philosophical, literary, and religious issues in which Greville was actively involved and which functioned as a background for his poetry. Much attention is given to Greville's sonnet sequence, Caecilia. Waswo interprets the individual poems and traces general themes as they are developed within the sequence and in relation to contemporary philosophical issues and conventions of religious and amorous verse. Greville's use of these conventions is compared to the practice of his contemporaries, Sidney, Donne, and Herbert.

Long Black Song

Essays in Black American Literature and Culture

By Houston A. Baker, Jr., University of Virginia. 157 pp., bibliog., index. $7.95

In this collection of eight critical essays Houston Baker maintains that black American culture, grounded in a unique historical experience, is distinct from any other, and that it has produced a body of literature that is equally and demonstrably unique in its sources, values, and modes of expression. Black American literature is rooted in black folklore—animal tales, trickster slave tales, religious tales, folk songs, spirituals, and ballads. A knowledge of this literary tradition is essential to our understanding of any black author or work. These essays demonstrate that proper appreciation of the work of black American writers demands an understanding of the tradition of black American literature and of the distinctive culture out of which it has arisen.

University Press of Virginia Charlottesville
THE INDISPENSABLE BASIC RESEARCH TOOL FOR...

historians
studying the first century of American expansion, the development of federal land policy, or local history

genealogists
seeking precisely to locate migrating persons west of the Appalachians, their East Coast origins and evidence of possible Revolutionary War military service

archivists
of collections containing supplementary land records, surveys, bounty-land warrants, or early deeds

land-title searchers or county recorders of deeds
wishing to establish the first link (the land patent) in chain of title to specific land tracts

librarians
holding National Archives microfilms of General Land Office, U.S. Treasury, or Department of State records

FEDERAL LAND SERIES
Clifford Neal Smith, Editor

The FEDERAL LAND SERIES makes available to librarians, historians and other scholars a systematic survey of archival materials on the land patents issued by the United States government from 1788 to 1810. Of special interest are a list of grants to refugees of the Revolutionary War from Canada and Nova Scotia, the names of Connecticut “Sufferers” who lost property to the British, and some military bounty-land warrants issued for service during the Revolution.

THREE-WAY INDEX • Indexes every name encountered • Indexes all subject matter covered • Indexes all tract designations
You will find the Federal Land Series an indispensable basic research tool.

ISBN 0 — 8389-0138-7 (1972) $20.00

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
Chicago, Illinois 60611
June 22, 1815, 1A.M., Downing Street.

Stop the press to insert the following letter received this morning by the Lord Mayor.

"The Hon. Mayor H. Percy is just arrived with dispatches from the Duke of Wellington, dated Waterloo, containing the account of a most decisive and glorious victory over the whole of the French Army with the loss of more than 200 pieces of artillery and a part of the baggage belonging to Buonaparte."

So began a dispatch that alerted London and the world to Napoleon's crushing defeat at Waterloo.

Now for the first time, The Times of London is available in an archival-quality microfilm edition. Refilmed page by page from the original newspaper pages. With every page photographed flat to assure readability. And with every frame microdated for a fast, convenient search.

Since 1785, The Times of London has recorded with unequaled authority the social and political history of Europe. Back issues provide researchers with an important perspective on events at home and abroad—a perspective no American newspaper alone can match.

An annual subscription to The Times of London costs $288; an annual index subscription costs $87.50. For further information, including a free booklet describing historic periods covered since 1785, write to Microfilming Corporation of America, 21 Harristown Road, Glen Rock, N. J. 07452.

The New York Times announces the first archival edition of The Times of London on microfilm.

One outstanding primary source deserves another.
OFFICIAL REPORTS ON CRIME AND THE MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER, PRIOR TO 1949

for the ten largest American cities (1950 census) and for their respective states

Baltimore $128.00 Maryland $4.00
Boston $97.00 Massachusetts $281.00
Chicago $75.00 Illinois $20.00
Cleveland $109.00 Ohio $11.00
Detroit $68.00 Michigan $27.00
Los Angeles $54.00 California $13.00
New York (City) $132.00 New York (State) $486.00
Philadelphia $114.00 Pennsylvania $14.00
St. Louis $59.00 Missouri $6.00
Washington, D. C. $49.00

$1,585.00 total price if all 19 cities and states are purchased at one time (a saving of $162.00 over item-by-item purchase of the collection).

A complete set of printed main-entry catalog cards (Library of Congress format, five for each title) is supplied with orders of the complete collection at no additional charge.

AVAILABLE FEBRUARY 1973

Prices and availability of reports for other cities and states to be announced. Please write or telephone for additional information. Full descriptive brochures are available on request.

Redgrave Information Resources Corporation
Dept. RS
53 Wilton Road
Westport, Connecticut 06880
telephone (203) 226-6963 cable: REDGRAVE
SERIAL PUBLICATIONS 2nd Edition
Andrew D. Osborn
The standard treatise on the selection, processing, cataloging, and serving of serials is here brought up to date. Osborn emphasizes the implications of developments new to the profession: the growth of computer technology, the Anglo-American Catalog Rules of 1967, the use of Codex, and the emergence of the book catalog for serials. He sets forth sound principles and relates them to actual practice.
ISBN 0-8389-0118-2 $15.50

HOW TO CATALOG A RARE BOOK 2nd Edition, Revised
Paul S. Dunkin
Here, in an up-dated version of the 1951 edition, is a method which allows any cataloger to catalog a rare book without having had previous experience. In clear language, with no jargon, the book explains how the catalog description of a rare book can be written in brief, simple English. The author makes the complicated Bowers collation formula readily understandable and describes a concise means of title transcription.
ISBN 0-8389-0141-7 $4.95

REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES An Examination of America's Literary Heritage
John Gordan Burke, editor
Hayden Carruth, George Garrett, Larry Goodwyn, John Knoepfle, and William Everson examine five geographical regions of the United States, the qualities which define them, the literary heritage and important contributions of each, and the characteristics which make each region's literature unique. A bibliography on regionalism and American literature is also included.
ISBN 0-8389-3136-7 Winter

PERIODICALS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES
Revised Edition
Compiled and edited by Marian H. Scott
An evaluation of periodicals for children from kindergarten through grade 12. Covering the realities of curricular demands and the wide range of reading levels and personal interests of students, the publications chosen include key foreign and ethnic periodicals, and all meet the recommendations of the new Standards at all grade levels.
ISBN 0-8389-0139-5 Winter

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION IN A TECHNICAL SOCIETY
Mary Ruth Brown, Eugene Lair Moss, and Karin D. Bright
The first presentation, in one volume, of print and non-print material from widely differing sources: textbooks, reference works, periodicals, government publications, and learning materials available from societies, industries, and organizations. Also included is information on filmstrips, transparencies, and other audio-visual aids.
ISBN 0-8389-0128-X Fall

Sponsored by the United States Office of Education and the American Library Association

Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks presents...
- 31 outstanding papers on available and theoretical methods of extending library service capabilities.
- Definitive summary of plenary sessions, working group reports, and recommendations.

Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks confronts five major problems and proposes solutions...
1. Is there a true need for a national information network?
2. What are the functions and services best suited to a national network?
3. How rapidly can new technology be applied and used in network operations?
4. How will national networks affect libraries and information centers – socially, legally, and administratively?
5. What can be learned about a proposed national network from existing specialized networks.

Here is a work of lasting value to all librarians and information scientists concerned with the future of information services agencies.

cloth ISBN 0-8389-3123-3 $15.00

American Library Association
50 East Huron Street • Chicago, Illinois 60611
THE WALL STREET REVIEW OF BOOKS

Edited by business and financial historian Robert Sobel of Hofstra University,
The Wall Street Review of Books publishes timely, in-depth reviews of
works of interest to the business and financial communities. WSRB reviews
scholarly and trade books, reprints, teaching and research materials, governmental
and foreign-language publications.

WSRB's Editorial Board includes George Benston, University of Rochester/ Michael
Parrish, University of California, San Diego/ Fred Siesel, Weeden & Co./ Melvin Tarr,
American Stock Exchange/ and Sheldon Zerden, Bruns, Nordeman & Co. WSRB will
cover publications in business, banking, finance, investments and other relevant areas.
Reviews range from 1500 to 3000 or more words and appear within six months or less
after book publication; four times a year in 6" x 9" paperbound, 160 pages per issue;
NMA-format microfiche version is available.

Institutional Subscription Rates in the U.S. (outside the U.S. please add $2.00):
full size or microfiche: 1 yr. $25 2 yrs. $48 3 yrs. $70
full size and microfiche: 1 yr. $35 2 yrs. $66 3 yrs. $95

REVIEWS IN AMERICAN HISTORY
A Quarterly Journal of Criticism.

Managing Editor: Stanley I. Kutler, University of Wisconsin
Associate Editor: Stanley N. Katz, University of Chicago Law School

Editorial Board

John W. Blassingame, Yale University
Allan G. Bogue, University of Wisconsin
David B. Davis, Yale University
Carl N. Degler, Stanford University
Sidney Fine, University of Michigan
Frank Freidel, Harvard University
Lloyd C. Gardner, Rutgers University

Harold M. Hyman, Rice University
Winthrop D. Jordan, University of California, Berkeley
Merrill D. Peterson, University of Virginia
Harry N. Scheiber, University of California, San Diego
Anne Firor Scott, Duke University

Reviews in American History is a quarterly featuring timely, comprehensive review-essays
(averaging over 2000 words) of scholarly, professional and non-fiction trade books in
American history and related fields. Reprints, teaching materials and research publications
are covered. Reviews in American History contains 160 pages per issue; four issues a year
in 6" x 9" paperbound; NMA-format microfiche version is available.

Institutional Subscription Rates in the U.S. (outside the U.S. please add $2.00):
full size or microfiche: 1 yr. $20 2 yrs. $38 3 yrs. $54
full size and microfiche: 1 yr. $30 2 yrs. $56 3 yrs. $80

Subscriptions are volume-year only; Shipment cannot be made without payment.
Single issue and back volume prices, and rates for individuals on request.
Descriptive brochures available for both journals – Send orders and inquiries to:
REDGRAVE INFORMATION RESOURCES CORP.
Dept. RS
53 Wilton Road, Westport, Connecticut 06880
(203) 226-6963
An indispensable reference for scholars and students of the Church...

The Official Record of the Decisions of the

ROMAN ROTA

This unique series of documents constitutes the most authoritative collection ever assembled of Decisions by the Sacred Roman Rota of the Catholic Church. It presents the rulings which the Rota, since its reconstitution as an ecclesiastical tribunal in 1908, has handed down on a vast number of matrimonial, ecclesiastical, and criminal cases. Unlike all previous collections of its kind, Sacrae romanae rotae decisiones seu sententiae contains a complete, definitive record of Rotal decisions, compiled annually under the Rota’s own supervision. These superb volumes are an invaluable source of information regarding the Church’s legal and moral attitudes and precepts. In addition, they strikingly illuminate many of the important changes taking place within the modern Church. Because of its profound historical significance, this magnificent work will find a lasting place among the annals of Church history.

For detailed information, please write to Mr. Paul Negri at the New York office.

Johnson Reprint Corporation
NEW YORK AND LONDON
111 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10003

Catholic Church. Rota Romana. S. romanae rotae decisiones seu sententiae

(Partly in the original edition)
Clothbound set / $1,425.00
Paperbound set / $1,220.00

Vols. 1-3, 5-14
Per volume, clothbound / $30.00

Vols. 4, 15-43, 46-54
(In the original edition)
Per volume, clothbound / $25.00

Vol. 44
Clothbound / $40.00

Vol. 45
Clothbound / $45.00

From Vol. 41-, the title is: Catholic Church. Rota Romana. S. romanae rotae decisiones seu sententiae selectae.