

libraries. The only worthwhile pages (three) are excerpts from Richard DeBury's famous *Philobiblion*. They give the flavor of DeBury's times and convey his concern about books.

In his essay on Alexandrian Libraries Dunlap mentions Callimachus' *Pinakes*, but he neither describes them, nor do we learn about the contributions of the Alexandrian Librarians to the production and organization of documents, which are of such amazing actuality today.

About the Middle Ages we read at best some details of monastic book production, but the library development of the Carolingian period remains totally dark. The Petrac selection is taken from Mary Elton's *The Great Book-Collections* published in 1893, when much of the currently available Petrac material was not known.

The obsolescence of the book is also reflected in the bibliography: Of the twenty-six titles from which the author has taken his selections, twelve have been published prior to World War I. In addition, the bibliography is incomplete, since it does not include the great number of sources which are quoted in the authors own essays and his commentary.

Only one of the nine illustrations shows a library. The others show a few writing utensils and famous authors. Among the latter is a charming picture of a round-headed St. Jerome in his cell, nonauthentic, of course, and reproduced with a blur. For five pictures the sources are identified.

I understand that a practicing and highly respected librarian retains a love for history, and that he wants to share what he has collected in "innumerable hours of browsing and gleaning" in the "extensive collection of the University of Iowa." I do not understand a publisher who accepts a manuscript that shows neither adequate knowledge of the subject, nor the information currently available. The only purpose of this book is the setting of a sad example for what should not be perpetuated in library literature.—*Antje B. Lemke, Syracuse University, School of Library Science.*

Palmer, Richard P. *Computerizing the Card Catalog in the University Library; A Survey of User Requirements.* Little-

ton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1972. \$8.50.

This book is the result of work done by Dr. Palmer on a dissertation for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at the University of Michigan. I think the title of the dissertation (*User Requirements of a University Library Card Catalog*) more aptly describes the content of the book than does the title of the printed book. There are several typographical errors in the text. Having made the negative comments, there is much positive comment to make.

Dr. Frederick H. Wagman, director of University Libraries, University of Michigan, requested Dr. Palmer to undertake a use study of the union catalog at the University of Michigan for the purpose of determining what data elements now appearing on a catalog card would be necessary in a computer catalog in order to satisfy the users' requirements.

Dr. Palmer proceeded to do the study by reviewing twenty card catalog use studies and two surveys of use studies. Each of these studies is listed and synthesized under the headings "Purpose," "Methodology," "Relevant Findings." This section of the book is very useful as a research tool for persons interested in the use of the card catalog studies that have been done.

The remaining sections of the book consist of a report of methodology used by Palmer in his survey, the findings, and the conclusion.

Dr. Palmer has made a valuable contribution to the body of literature available on the use of the card catalog. Kenneth Shaffer, in his introduction to the book, states:

"Dr. Palmer's findings . . . are startling. He learned that 84 percent of all users found what they were seeking in the catalogue, and that a preponderance of catalogue use was by graduate students. Again, the preponderance of use of the catalogue, 70 percent, was for known-item searches, a statistic which he points out is higher than was found in previous studies. But paramount to his principal objective, he found that 84 percent of those who used the card catalog during the survey period would have found a five-item computer catalogue sufficient. [The five-items looked for most frequently were title, author, call

number (including location), subject heading, date of publication.] If a contents note were added to make a sixth-item, 90 percent of users would have found a computer catalogue sufficient for their purposes."

The above statement sums up the major points of the study relevant to a computerized catalog. The complete study, however, contains a great deal more information that will be of interest to catalogers, reference librarians, library administrators, and all librarians concerned about the usefulness of the card catalog.

Dr. Palmer has been absolutely honest in his text about the relevance of his study to computerizing the card catalog. He admits that his study does not answer a number of questions that must be answered before we can make wise decisions to develop reduced-data records for a computer catalog. He strongly recommends that much additional research and a great deal of costing be done before decisions are made. Some of the questions he poses are (1) Would the cost of adding certain information to a computer catalog be offset by increased benefits to the user? (2) Is the most economical place to provide certain types of bibliographical information in card catalogs, book catalogs, bibliographies, or in the materials themselves? (3) Is the value of certain catalog information to a small number of users, such as faculty [faculty reported using a greater number of data elements on catalog cards than other groups of users] so great that the information must be included in future catalogs, regardless of the catalog's type or configuration? (4) Should only a portion of the catalog be computerized?

In short, Dr. Palmer has provided us with a useful compilation of card catalog use studies, a valid catalog user study that is meaningful because the methodology employed was sound, and a discussion of what we will have to do before making decisions regarding computerizing catalogs.

Dr. Palmer does not touch directly on all the facets of the computer catalog question, but his book does bring to mind such questions as (1) How complete must the catalog record be? What data must be included? (2) What is the relationship of the national bibliographic record to the local in-house bibliographic record? Should these

duplicate each other or can they complement each other? Should they both be in machine-readable form? (3) Is the catalog a research tool or a location/identification tool? (4) How relevant is the experience of the National Lending Library of Great Britain to us? (The user is required to consult printed bibliographies issued by bodies other than the National Lending Library to identify books before requesting them.) (5) Should we in North America adopt the same philosophy as the British regarding retrospective conversion of catalog records? (The BNB MARC records begin at a given time and will be developed from that time forward. No effort will be made to convert catalog records earlier than the determined date. The user will have to use the printed bibliographies or the card catalog for pre-MARC records.)

I recommend Dr. Palmer's book as a useful and thought-provoking contribution to the existing body of card catalog literature. —Ralph E. Stierwalt, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada.

OTHER BOOKS OF INTEREST TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

Dupuy, T. N., and Blanchard, W. *The Almanac of World Military Power*. New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1972. 373p. \$22.50. (72-2636). (ISBN: 0-8352-0587-8).

Leyda, Jay. *Dianying: Electric Shadows*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972. 515p. \$12.50. (78-175719). (ISBN: 0-262-12046-1).

Hawley, Willis D., and Svara, James H., eds. *The Study of Community Power: A Bibliographic Review*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC, Clio Press, 1972. 123p. \$4.85. (72-83287). (SBN 0-87436-978-7).

Wasserman, Paul, ed. *Library and Information Science Today List 1972*. New York: