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Intuition, Research, and the Academic Library

In 1933, Pierce Butler lamented the fact that the library profession appeared to be almost anti-intellectual in its approach to library problems and seemed to stand alone in the "simplicity of its pragmatism." In 1973, we find Jesse Shera stoically referring to research as an activity "largely foreign to a profession oriented toward service rather than analysis of bibliothecal phenomena or introspection of its own activity." I fully agree with both men when they argue that the library profession has been generally uninterested in research, and I am also convinced that we have reached a point where no substantive gains in the quality of library service will be possible without the initiation of a systematic, aggressive, and long-term research effort. We simply will not see any major advances in theory or practice if we continue to rely on the intuitive infallibility of the professional in the field as we have in the past. This approach appears to be bankrupt.

If one accepts this premise, and it seems to me to be incontrovertable, it follows that research in library and information science, and the intelligent utilization of research findings, become the key to any real progress.

But how, in the face of the economic and socio-political constraints currently facing the profession, can such a research effort be initiated? It appears obvious that the library schools with their small faculties, large enrollments, and practical/technical emphasis, are incapable of undertaking a long-term or large-scale research program. At best, they may be able to train adequately a generation of scholars to fill research positions elsewhere. Similarly, the research institutes which showed some promise several years ago now are dying in the wake of the withdrawal of federal support for research in library and information science.

It now appears that there is only one institution capable of sustaining a research program of the size and extent envisioned here; that is, the American academic library. If the top 500 university and college libraries in this country were to provide shelter for a research/systems office under their organizational umbrellas, a considerable research component might thus be established. The individuals involved, who hopefully would be encouraged to undertake basic as well as applied research, might well constitute a tenfold increase in the size of the research wing of the profession.

Of course, this idea is hardly more than a pipe dream unless academic librarians are willing to commit a part of their resources to an ongoing research program. While they generally have not been willing to do so in the past, there does seem to be evidence of an intensifying interest in this issue among contemporary academic librarians. Perhaps a new age is dawning.

MICHAEL H. HARRIS
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Library Peer Evaluation
For Promotion and Merit Increase: How It Works

Library peer evaluation for promotion and special merit increase was introduced at the Bouillon Library in the 1971–72 academic year. The evaluations, in addition to reinforcing the dean of library services' recommendations, revealed how the librarians rated each other by department, position, and sex.

Central Washington State College is a liberal arts and teacher-training college, with 7,000 students and 380 faculty members. Central's Bouillon Library houses both the audiovisual library and the traditional printed library. Central's librarians were granted faculty status in 1954. In 1962, librarians including media professionals were granted full faculty status. As the M.A.L.S. degree was recognized as the terminal degree for librarians in 1971, most were eligible for promotion.

In the 1971–72 academic year, Bouillon Library had twenty-one library faculty members and forty-five civil service employees. The library's faculty was divided into three divisions, Audiovisual, Public Service, and Technical Service. Each division was headed by an assistant director who reported to the dean of library services. Among the twenty-one library faculty members, there were one professor, five associate professors, twelve assistant professors, and three instructors. All library faculty had master degrees; three had doctorates, five had second master degrees, and one was an ABD.

A five-page faculty evaluation form, developed in 1968–69 was previously used to evaluate library faculty for reappointment, promotion, special merit increase, and tenure. This was the first time that Bouillon Library faculty had used a peer-evaluation system. A Personnel Committee was elected in the 1971-72 academic year, consisting of four members, one representing each of the three divisions and a fourth one elected at large. The Personnel Committee was instructed by the dean of library services to revise the old evaluation form, which had taken much time to process. After several weeks of deliberation, the Personnel Committee presented a new one-page evaluation form which was adopted by the library faculty. (See Appendix)

During the fall quarter, each library faculty member was asked to fill out a professional service record with his latest achievements in working effectiveness, scholarship and productivity, special services to library and college, and professional activities. This record was

---

Mr. Yen-Ran Yeh is assistant professor of librarianship and head, Cataloging Department, Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington.
attached to the faculty evaluation forms and served as the basis for peer evaluation. The Personnel Committee sent evaluation forms to each library faculty member on January 31, 1971. Each member had two weeks to complete the evaluation forms for his peers. After the Personnel Committee received all the evaluation forms, the committee secretary compiled a summary rating sheet for each faculty member.

The Personnel Committee met on February 17, 1972 with the dean of library services, a nonvoting member, since the dean, according to Library Personnel Committee guidelines, serves as an ex-officio member of the Personnel Committee. Each committee member and the dean read all the evaluations, except those forms for himself; no faculty, including the committee members, would discover how his peers evaluated him.

The committee evaluated each faculty member to determine promotion and special merit increase. When a committee member was being evaluated, the member would leave the room. The committee recommended eleven library faculty for promotion: two to full professor, six to associate professor, and three to assistant professor. In addition, seven library faculty were recommended for special merit increases.

The committee later wrote a letter summarizing the recommendations, which all four members signed, and sent it to the vice-president for academic affairs with copies to the dean and each committee member.

The dean of Library Services forwarded his own independent recommendations to the vice-president for academic affairs. The dean recommended eight library faculty for promotion: two to full professor, four to associate professor, and two to assistant professor. The dean also recommended five faculty for special merit increases with the provision that those not promoted be considered for merit. The eight faculty recommended for promotion by the dean were also recommended by the committee. The dean’s special merit-increase list (subsequently increased to twelve) included all faculty recommended by the committee and more.

The dean defended each case for promotion to the College Committee on Promotion at its March 8 session, with assistance from the Personnel Committee chairman. On the basis of the College Committee’s decisions, the vice-president for academic affairs recommended to the president six library faculty for promotion. The president then recommended the nominees to the Board of Trustees who approved the promotions. In all, five library faculty were promoted: one to professor, two to associate professor, and two to assistant professor.

All five faculty promoted were recommended by both the dean and the Personnel Committee. Three library faculty recommended by both the dean and the committee were not promoted. Three faculty recommended by the committee but not by the dean also failed to be promoted. Recommendations of both the dean and the Personnel Committee were necessary, although no guarantee to promotion.

The dean later compiled a priority list of special merit increases. As the library’s fund could only provide five half steps of merit increase, only the top five faculty on the list received this increase.²

The evaluation forms showed that the library faculty tended to endorse promotion more favorably than special merit increase: they cast 51.93 percent yes votes for faculty promotion, and 37.53 percent yes votes for special merit increase (which had been null the previous year).³

One delicate point of peer evaluation is evaluation of supervisors by nonsu-
The supervisor here is a library faculty who supervises one or more library faculty (this does not include supervision of civil-service employees). Supervisors eligible for promotion received 69.05 percent yes votes from nonsupervisors, as compared with 51.93 percent yes votes from all library faculty. Nonsupervisors seem to strongly endorse the promotion of their supervisors.

As for special merit increase for supervisors, nonsupervisors cast 33.33 percent yes votes, which is below the 37.73 percent total library average. Nonsupervisors tended to recommend either promotion or special merit increase to supervisors, but not both. Thus, because the majority of nonsupervisors recommended supervisors for promotion, the percentage of positive special merit increase votes for supervisors was relatively lower.

Perhaps reflecting the women's liberation movement, and the fact that female librarians' salaries are generally lower than those of male librarians, female faculty cast 52.78 percent yes votes for female faculty special merit increases, as compared with 42.42 percent yes votes for male faculty increases.

Ironically, however, because female faculty held fewer advanced degrees beyond M.A.L.S. and listed fewer scholarly activities, female faculty cast only 50 percent yes votes for female faculty promotion and 32.81 percent no votes as compared with 58.73 percent yes votes for male faculty promotion and 15.87 percent no votes. This points out one dilemma for the female library faculty. Although they want equal job opportunity and equal pay, unfortunately, they are handicapped by being less prepared than the male faculty.

The three divisions of the library, Audiovisual, Technical Service, and Public Service, evaluated each other. A summary of the results are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1
Recommendations for Promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service candidates:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Audiovisual division</td>
<td>64.58%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Technical Service division</td>
<td>53.19%</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual candidates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Public Service division</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Technical Service division</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Service candidates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Audiovisual division</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Public Service division</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Recommendations for Merit Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Service candidates:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Audiovisual division</td>
<td>27.08%</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Technical Service division</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiovisual candidates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Public Service division</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Technical Service division</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Service candidates:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Audiovisual division</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Votes from Public Service division</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Audiovisual division received the most favorable endorsement for promotion and merit increase by the other two divisions. Central Washington State College has a strong Audiovisual division, both in quality of faculty and service which might have affected this favorable vote. Technical Services received the least for promotion and merit increase, perhaps because of the nature of technical service work.

Another observation from this study is that promotion from instructor to assistant professor is almost automatic after a person has served five years in the instructor rank. The higher the rank, the more difficult is promotion. The rank of professor is the most difficult to achieve.

Peer evaluation, as demonstrated at the Bouillon Library, allowed every library faculty member a chance to participate in management. Rather than diminishing the dean of library services' authority in recommending promotion and special merit increase, peer evaluation served to strengthen his recommendations. The dean could base his recommendations on peer information and vote. Library faculty opinion and the dean's judgement overlapped. Peer evaluation took more time, but as a result the Bouillon Library received the highest number of promotions among all departments in the 1971-1972 academic year. A longer period of study would be essential, however, for confirmation of the results of peer evaluation.

REFERENCES
1. The author was elected chairman of the committee.
2. In the past, all evaluation forms were destroyed each year after the College Committee had acted upon all of the recommendations. In the 1971-1972 academic year, upon the author's request, it was decided by library faculty that the author be authorized to keep all evaluation forms except his own for further study. He was asked to make the results available to the library faculty that they might better understand the peer evaluation procedure and could improve the procedure for next year.
3. There were a substantial number of abstentions. Normally, if a faculty member received a majority of yes votes, a few abstentions and no votes would not count against him. However, if he received a large number of abstentions, then his yes votes would be reduced, and his chance to be recommended for promotion and special merit increase would be relatively lower. Therefore, to a certain degree, abstentions are unfavorable votes.

APPENDIX
SAMPLE EVALUATION FORM

DEPARTMENT ..................................................... DATE ........................................

EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION FOR ...............................................................

FOR □ REAPPOINTMENT □ SPECIAL INCREMENT □ TENURE PROMOTION TO □ PROFESSOR □ ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR □ ASSISTANT PROFESSOR □ INSTRUCTOR

To be completed by all Library faculty members and forwarded to the vice-president for academic affairs via the Personnel Committee.

The following criteria are to be used in making a decision. Each person is asked to evaluate frankly and objectively each criterion. ("1" is low with "9" the highest rating. N stands for no basis for judgment.) You may prefer to comment on the reverse instead of using the rating.

1. Teaching and/or professional effectiveness. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N
2. Scholarship and productivity. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N
3. Personal qualities (degree to which person exhibits character and personality traits that command respect of associates). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N
4. Special services (acceptance and fulfillment of department and college assignments). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N
5. Professional activities and public services (community, state, or national). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N
6. Overall rating of competence of the faculty member. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 N

REAPPOINTMENT
☐ I recommend reappointment.
☐ I do not recommend reappointment.

SPECIAL INCREMENT
☐ I recommend a special (merit) salary increment.
☐ I do not recommend a special (merit) salary increment.

TENURE (Only tenured faculty recommend on tenure)
☐ I recommend tenure.
☐ I do not recommend tenure at this time.

PROMOTION
☐ I recommend promotion to .................................................. (rank).
☐ I do not recommend promotion at this time.

COMMENTS (may use reverse side):
Signature .................................................................
A CLR Fellowship in 1971-72 enabled the author to examine staff participation in the management of large academic libraries. The report considers the climate of participation, preparation given the staff, areas of decision making, the role of the professional staff association, and the reaction of staff to such participation.

INTRODUCTION

Participation by library staff in the management of the library basically involves representatives of the staff working in task-oriented groups to recommend possible solutions of library problems to the library administrators, to provide for a prescribed system of communication throughout the library, and to promote means for orderly change within the library system.

In the last twenty years libraries in large universities have grown very rapidly. As more books were purchased to serve a larger student body, more librarians were employed; yet the organization of the library remained basically the same. With the unrest on campus and the current social changes across the land in recent years, the library has not gone untouched.

Librarians have shown concern for their status on the campus and an interest in what was going on and why. Since staff size had precluded the informal staff meeting where real discussions could take place, some better way was needed for communication and an understanding of the library operation in order to make better decisions in increasingly complex situations.

Over the years there have been committees in libraries, both standing and ad hoc, which have provided staff opinion on a variety of subjects. It has been only in recent years, however, that a conscious effort has been made to include as many interested staff members as possible in the decision-making process. Informal groups have developed as librarians felt a need to discuss mutual problems. However, in order to best achieve the library goals and to bring the fullest use of the resources of the library to patrons, some system must be designed to cue the staff into what problems are under consideration, how the decision is to be made, and the resulting decision.

Recently there has been more in library literature related to problems of management based on theories of the behavioral sciences. Though most have been applied in the world of business, librarians have begun to study how these theories may be applied in library operations. With the aid of a Council on Library Resources Fellowship in 1971-72, the author sought to discover and understand staff-participation re-
alities in the decision-making processes at ten large university libraries.*

**THE INVESTIGATION**

The libraries selected were chosen because of staff size. It was felt that libraries with near 100 professional librarians had problems of a different order than those of lesser size. A large building with several separate departments plus branch libraries elsewhere on campus compounds the communication problem.

The aims of the site visits were to determine (1) the climate in which participation developed, (2) what preparation was given staff before moving into this kind of organization, (3) what areas in decision making seemed best suited to staff participation, (4) what role the professional staff association plays, and finally (5) what portion of the staff was interested in participation and, in general, the staff reaction to the value of staff participation in the decision-making process.

In each library interviews were held with the chief library administrators, as well as with department heads, branch librarians, and several below the unit head level.

**Climate for Participation**

The climate out of which staff-participation developed was a complex one. Communication problems were widespread, not only within the library system but also between the academic community and the library. Lack of recognition of librarians for their contribution to the academic community contributed to low morale. Discontent was prevalent due to lack of opportunity for expression on matters directly affecting their work. Outside the library, librarians seldom had a vote in the academic council. At Cornell and Columbia it was not deemed desirable to request faculty rank and title, or to be judged by faculty standards but by librarians' standards. However, at all institutions a voice in the academic council seemed generally desirable.

**Preparation for Participation**

Therefore learning to work in this context must be a developmental one. Only with the acceptance of the staff can even a partial success be accomplished. Librarians in general are not experienced in working in groups or conducting meetings. These skills must be learned and there must be constant effort to improve communication. (Cornell had a workshop on how to conduct a meeting.) Considerable responsibility is placed on the participating librarians. Working together in this way takes time before some people are willing to express themselves freely.

Libraries developing staff-participation programs have the traditional pyramidal organization charts. Plans for staff participation provide groups from various departments to work together. This is another overlay of organization providing an interdepartmental fertilization for staff input into decisions. There is horizontal as well as planned vertical communication through the organization of the staff.

Libraries have used committees for years to make recommendations for the solution of library problems, and such committees provide some background for staff participation. Some libraries had standing committees (administration-appointed) to deal with problems in broad areas such as personnel, collection development, technical, and public services. Building on this experience in group work, a system can be developed to give everyone interested an opportunity to contribute to the management of the library.

In all cases there was a considerable

*The libraries visited are: Columbia, MIT, Cornell, Pennsylvania State, Stanford, University of California at Berkeley and at Los Angeles, Washington, North Carolina, and Duke.
period of time during which the staff discussed and studied what seemed desirable in their own particular situation. Staff leadership, as well as that of the administration, plays a major role in determining how staff participation is established and how it functions.

Only at UCLA has the system for staff participation been operating long enough for a thorough evaluation. The consensus of the Evaluation Committee was that the concept of the Library Administrative Network, the UCLA plan for staff participation, had provided wide opportunities for staff participation and should be continued, with the addition of certain amendments based upon experience.

At UCLA in December 1966 the librarians sponsored a meeting to discuss the status of librarians in the University of California. The librarians realized the need to have established policy on such matters as job security, better promotion, grievance procedures, leaves of absence, access to research funds, opportunity for professional growth, salaries commensurate with faculty, and a voice in university and library affairs. The Staff Association, composed of both professional and nonprofessional staff members, had established in November 1964 an Ad Hoc Information Committee. In time, this committee recommended the establishment of a nonacademic personnel advisory committee. The general unrest in 1967 brought into focus recognition of the need for a study of the library’s communication problems. Campus experts in the behavioral sciences and employee-management relations and the university librarians, with the approval of the Information Committee, employed a professional consultant to study the library’s problems in depth. The report focused on the library as a social system, with emphasis on the human element. There followed a series of all-day meetings of the library unit heads, the administrative group, and two consultants with competence in team building and management, some twenty-five people, out of which developed a new structure and plans to review a number of functional committees with “communication” the most important problem.

The acceptance by the staff of the Library Administrative Network was established. Librarians learned to work in groups, to conduct meetings, and to record the ideas expressed in the meetings. Inherent in this plan is the responsibility of the librarians to work with other staff members on library problems and communicate their thoughts through an established line of communication.

Columbia, of course, is the subject of the widely-reported Booz, Allen & Hamilton management study, with reorganization a possible outcome which would establish ways for participation by the staff.

At Cornell, as another example, a doctoral candidate in behavioral management interviewed fifty-five members of the professional staff to learn as much as possible about organizational behavior in the library. Staff reaction to the recently-established plan for staff participation was noted, though the plan had barely had time to be fully understood or the impact observed from this change. Recommendations for strengthening the staff participation included in-house workshops on management theory.

Principal Areas for Participation

Apparently the most successful task oriented group in many libraries where staff were involved was the personnel committee. Responsibility for determining criteria for promotion and recommending individuals who had met this criteria has worked well. In the few areas of disagreement, consensus was achieved between the committee and the library administration.

Staff participated in decisions related
to public and technical services quite satisfactorily. Cornell used these techniques to reorganize the order department, taking a little over a year. Committees need to have a clear charge, or much time is wasted trying to determine purpose. Those with more general charges find themselves discussing areas outside their purview, overlapping other committee responsibilities.

Role of the Staff Association in Participation

Staff associations composed of the professional librarians came into being in the late 1960s. Prior to then, most libraries had a staff association composed of both professional and nonprofessional staff, which served primarily a social function. With changes in attitudes and the search for identity by librarians in academia, the professional staff association developed to provide an avenue for communication among the staff and a voice for the professional librarian. Through these channels many aspects of librarianship were discussed and recommendations made to library administrators, who, in turn, found this organization a way to secure staff reaction to many situations. Administrators have been learning ways of working with the staff associations. In some libraries they seem to be used as an arm of the administration as well as a sounding board for ideas. Some staff associations recommend persons for administratively appointed committees, some work at staff development and programs for orientation. In a few libraries it is not always easy to tell administrative committees from staff association committees. When functioning well, there is good communication. In some libraries the professional staff association appears to be the forerunner of an administration-established structure for staff participation in management.

Task-oriented groups with carefully drawn guidelines seemed most successful. The areas of personnel, technical, and public services appeared best suited for such a process. Budget making seemed unsuitable for the usual pattern of staff participation.

Staff Interest in Participation

In most libraries less than 50 percent of the staff seemed interested. Some people, after observing for a time, grew interested; others felt the scheme only a palliative, and considered it a waste of time. The opinion was expressed, "I like what I am doing and feel it more important than sitting in committees hour after hour." As was to be expected, in no instance was there full approval of staff-participation. Supporting staff were involved where their experience was appropriate. Opinions ran from full support of staff involvement regardless of the time it takes, to those who thought administrators were paid to make decisions and should do so. A number voiced the opinion that it was such a waste of time to have to educate the inexperienced in a group when a few knowledgeable people could have arrived at a good decision in a much shorter time.

However, there seemed to be a portion of the "old line" department heads who felt this interaction had done much, not only for the morale, but for breadth of understanding and insight into the responsibilities of the library overall. Though it is sometimes tedious to have to explain a complex situation to a new member of a committee, such effort contributes to the development of the staff as a whole.

Most younger librarians were reasonably enthusiastic. Some had soon found their particular jobs easily mastered and felt involvement to be an opportunity for growth and learning about what goes on in libraries. The opportunity to meet other young librarians in the system and see what kinds of positions they held was felt to be rewarding. By
having on some committees the experienced librarian, each can observe different viewpoints.

Staff Reaction to Participation in Decision Making

Quite a large portion of the staff did not participate—some for personal reasons, some for lack of interest, some who did not want to take the time from their duties, and some who philosophically disagreed with the concept. A few administrators seemed to feel that at least a part of this unwillingness to participate was a lack of clear understanding of the process and that, in time, should the system prove itself, wider participation could be gained. Not being personally involved did not mean that they were not benefiting, for many of their colleagues passed along information gained through participation.

For the most part, the staff members interviewed had been active participants in the process. There was some negative response in every library, but overall it was considered worth the time and the feeling that the longer they engaged in this process and learned more about working together, the more rewarding it could become. The library administrators generally seemed to feel the need for staff recommendations on a wide range of problems before making a decision. There was never a question but that the final decision is the responsibility of the head librarian.

Among the libraries whose progress will be noted with special interest will be Columbia, Cornell, and UCLA. The report of the BAH survey at Columbia could have a major impact on other libraries. Cornell and UCLA both have been working with management consultants and are moving ahead seemingly with more direction.

Conclusions

From these visits, it seems clear that staff participation will play a larger part in library administration than in the past. Staff participation is nothing new in libraries, but the effort to involve all interested staff in contributing to the management of the library is the recent development. The real impact is yet to be felt. Librarians need to learn how to work in this manner. Every library visited had staff-participation to some degree. The degree seemed to hinge not only on the attitude and personality of the administration but also on the dynamism and leadership within the staff. Ahead lies the challenge of how best to establish the climate and communications necessary to use most effectively the talents within the staff to meet the changes ahead for libraries and their patrons.
Search Versus Experiment—
the Role of the Research Librarian

Medical researchers, clinical specialists, and their supervisors covered by this survey, did not make frequent use of the services of research librarians, even after these services were specifically introduced to them. The potential value of a research librarian seems to depend upon the early education of the researcher and his awareness of the research librarian's professional capabilities.

INTRODUCTION

Despite substantial advances recently made in the indexing, abstracting, storing, and transmitting of scientific and technical information, many researchers continue to duplicate experiments rather than attempt to retrieve the needed information. They find that duplication is often less time-consuming and more certain in its results than is searching through various information channels with no guarantee of success. Yet, most researchers will also admit that although duplication often serves a real function, constant repetition of routine work wastes valuable resources and decreases real output.

New information systems aim to reduce this duplication by making retrieval the more attractive alternative. A multiplicity of highly specialized, mission-oriented services, however, do already exist in thousands of special libraries in universities, research institutes, and corporations. Often these services are bypassed by researchers either because they are ignorant of their availability or because they think services will be too slow and cumbersome.

While we experiment with new information retrieval systems, we should also inform researchers about current services and encourage their use. The services of research librarians, in particular, of medical librarians, best illustrate this issue.

METHODOLOGY

Sites and Participants

As the research was designed to study group reactions to the introduction of a new information service, only well-defined work groups were selected. Because specific organizational constraints and specific disciplines often affect information-seeking behavior, groups were chosen from several hospitals and from various disciplines as well as various orientations (clinical, research, or supervisory). (A "clinician," as used in this study, spends at least 75 percent of his time in patient care; a "researcher"...
spends at least 75 percent of his time in pure or applied biomedical research; and a “supervisor” administers either patient care or various research activities.*

In the Chicago area, the specialties of oncology and cardiology yielded a sample that satisfied the above criteria. Six hospitals were selected, with both an oncology and a cardiology group from each. Membership in the 12 groups initially numbered 110. Eleven individuals were not able to participate beyond the first stage of the experiment. Of the 99 individuals who continued to participate, 71 held M.D.s, 11 held Ph.D.s, and 4 held both degrees. Five of the groups, three in cardiology and two in oncology, reported a high research orientation. Four groups reported a high clinical orientation (two in each discipline), and the remaining three groups reported a dual research-clinical orientation.

**Phases of the Field Experiment**

The research program was divided into three phases. (1) A detailed questionnaire was administered to each participant to gather data about his personal background, educational experience, organization environment, and present habits of information-seeking. (2) An experimental information retrieval system was introduced into each group’s work environment, and the participant’s reaction to it was carefully monitored. Each group had access to the system for seven weeks. The retrieval system linked participants with a remote “storehouse” of information—the John Crerar Library in Chicago—both by means of a telephone for placing requests and a facsimile system for the immediate transmission of requested material to the participant’s place of work. A professional medical librarian was the focal point of the system. She received all requests for information and performed the necessary searches. (3) Six months after the service was discontinued, each participant was asked to evaluate the system, and his evaluation was compared with his actual use of the system.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**A Case History of Search Versus Experiment**

During the pilot study for the field experiment, an event occurred that put into sharp focus the relative merits of search versus experiment.¹ A researcher, working in the basic research department of a major Chicago area hospital, reported that he intended to repeat an experiment because he did not think “it would be worth the time and the trouble” to attempt to retrieve the information he needed. The information he needed was to answer the question: “Can substance X be successfully treated by process Y?” He knew that other less refined substances had been treated with this process, but he was not sure if exactly the same process would work with such a highly refined material as X. As he did not know where the information was readily available, he repeated the experiment. The experiment required four hours of a technician’s time, spread over two days because of a required waiting period. The researcher spent approximately twenty minutes to explain the experiment to the technician. If Dr. B had chosen to retrieve the information, he would have had to perform the search himself, with little guarantee of success, because the data was not available in the sources he knew. He thus de-
ecided not to risk his time on what might have been a lengthy task.

A few days after Dr. B had made his decision, Mrs. A—a specially trained medical librarian—was assigned to work full-time in Dr. B’s program. The librarian was given all the facts from Dr. B regarding his question, including information about the other applications of the process he wished to use. She was instructed to keep an accurate account of the time she spent and the sources she used in finding the information Dr. B needed. Her results are presented in Table 1.

The time taken by Mrs. A to find the necessary information was thirty-six minutes. She spent 70 percent of this time checking written sources that proved to be of no assistance. Because she happened to be at the Crerar Library when she received the request, she decided first to check the written sources. She indicated, however, that if she had had immediate access to a telephone at the outset of her search, she would have tried the verbal sources first. She was relatively sure that she could obtain the information through personal contacts. Had she initially used the verbal channel, it would have taken her only 11 minutes to retrieve the information for Dr. B. (The brevity of her search did hinge upon having a number of personal contacts, but that is not unusual. Part of a special librarian’s job is to cultivate such sources of information.)

Although it did take Mrs. A thirty-six minutes to find the information, that was far less an investment of time than the four hours it took Dr. B and his technician to achieve the same results. Although Dr. B used only twenty minutes of his own personal time, had he been able to delegate the search to Mrs. A, it might have taken him less than half that time to explain to her what he needed. If the research librarian had been a familiar source for Dr. B, he probably would have considered a search the more attractive alternative than a repetition of the experiment. Searching would have been less costly and time consuming than duplication.

Information-Seeking Patterns

This case history is by no means unique. During the first phase of the

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Used</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Crerar Library card catalog</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open shelves at Crerar Library</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned a friend at a chemical company who was familiar with processes related to Y</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Referred to a Dr. C at another hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned Dr. C but spoke to a Dr. D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Referred to another doctor at the same hospital, who recommended Mr. P at a pharmaceutical house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephoned Mr. P at the pharmaceutical house</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, X can be treated by process Y. He gave the names of two pharmaceutical houses that could supply the requested information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The John Crerar Library is a privately supported public library located in Chicago and serving science, engineering, and medicine. Its collections contain over 1,000,000 volumes.
full field experiment, the participants were asked to (1) "indicate with a check mark how frequently you use each of the listed information sources" and (2) to report "what have been the main sources of influence in the development of the way in which you currently keep yourself informed." The results of the researchers' and clinicians' reported frequency of use of the listed information sources are presented in Table 2. Seventy percent of the researchers and 74 percent of the clinicians use the services of a librarian less than once a month.

In comparison with the general patterns that emerge from Table 2, the low utilization of the librarian is surprising for three reasons. First, since both groups make relatively frequent use of written sources and libraries, one would expect a comparably frequent use of librarians. However, this is not the case. Second, the researchers' use of written sources and libraries is significantly greater than that of the clinicians, one would expect an equally greater utilization of librarians. There is, however, no significant difference between the researchers and the clinicians in the frequency with which they use librarians. Third, although both groups reported a high verbal orientation—dependence on colleagues, subordinates, and supervisors for information, the librarian is utilized much less than other verbal sources of information, even though his value as a verbal source can often be greater (as our case history illustrated) than an individual's other personal contacts. It seems that an individual's use of a research librarian is not directly related to the frequency with which he uses a library; and that neither the researchers nor the clinicians regard the librarian as a valuable colleague.

This confidence gap between scientists and librarians has been noted by other studies. Slater and Fisher, during a study of the use made of technical libraries in Great Britain, observed that academic scientists were unwilling to delegate literature searches to the librarians in their respective universities. A 1969 re-

---

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Scientific and Technical Information</th>
<th>Researchers (N=46)</th>
<th>Clinicians (N=42)</th>
<th>X²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRITTEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Books</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbooks</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Journals</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Publications</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERBAL:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinates</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superiors</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians*</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMBINATIONS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1—Less Than Once a Month                        | *p .10             |
2—More Than Once a Month But Less Than Four Times a Week | *p .05 |
3—More Than Four Times a Week                   | NS—Not Significant |

* The librarians referred to in this study were all associated with medical libraries—such as a general medical library like the Crerar Library, or a specially oriented research library like that of the Chicago Argonne Cancer Research Hospital.
port from the British Office for Scientific and Technical Information revealed that, among a sample of students engaged in chemical research, more than 52 percent had never asked a member of the library staff for help in performing literature searches, while 39 percent asked for such help only on rare occasions. Hall has observed that "despite their apparent academic status, librarians are seldom regarded as an equal by their colleagues in teaching and research." He outlines factors possibly accounting for this situation, which will be discussed later.

Researchers in both pure and clinical sciences often lament the vast scattering of important information in books and journals, making it impossible to keep track of what is being published. If a researcher is unable to read a specific journal and asks a colleague for a description of what it contains, at best he will receive a summary description committed to an often faulty memory. A research librarian, on the other hand, has immediate access to all the written sources and should be able to provide a full and accurate account. Such a librarian can also regularly supply current tables of contents, bibliographies of new dissertations, and reprints of new articles according to subject area. The services of a trained librarian could be one of the researcher's most important means for keeping abreast of what is being published in his own field and in related specialties. If these researchers and clinicians were aware that a research librarian like Mrs. A could save them a great deal of time and money, the frequency with which they would use his or her services might be quite different.

One reason many researchers and clinicians are unaware of the potential value of a research librarian (and thus do not regard him or her as a professional colleague) can be traced to their past educational training in the use of information sources. When the participants in this experiment were asked to indicate which factors had been most influential in determining their present style of seeking information, only 13 percent of the researchers and 2 percent of the clinicians mentioned specific education in the use of information sources. (See Table 3.)

This lack of training can be accounted for, in part, by the lack of activity on the part of library directors and librarians. The results of a national survey of the user services offered by medical school libraries in the United States revealed that only twenty-one of the ninety-two libraries surveyed provided "formal" instruction (defined as required or elective courses) designed to help medical students and faculty make optimal use of information sources and services. The authors go on to comment that "at over half of these twenty-one libraries, the courses rely solely on passive instructional methods—lectures, assigned readings, etc.—as contrasted to methods that require the active participation of students, such as small group seminars, practical exercises, etc." In most of the libraries that offer only "informal" instruction, such instruction usually consists of a one- or two-hour orientation tour or lecture. The authors conclude that:

instruction is an area where there is great room for improvement. The usual orientation tour or lecture accomplishes little that cannot be better done by a good written guide to the library and its services; and passive instructional modes are inadequate for teaching the optimal use of information resources.

Lack of financial resources or the absence of enough trained personnel, may prevent many libraries from offering detailed and on-going instruction in the use of information resources. However, if such instruction is to be offered, it seems that the library must be the focal
point for training. Our own informal inspection of the courses offered by six major medical schools in the midwestern and western United States revealed that only one school listed a course in the use of information services, and that course concerned computer use for the storage and retrieval of information. Although universities should be encouraged to offer more courses in the use of information sources and services, the responsibility for training students and faculty in the use of library services can only rest with the library staff itself.

**The Participant's Use of the Experimental Information System**

During the second phase of the experiment, the participants were introduced to a new (to them) information retrieval system. A professional medical librarian was stationed at the John Crerar Library. The participants could request any type of information, ranging from requests for reprints of specific articles, literature searches, and answers to specific questions such as the one posed by Dr. B in our case history. They could request this information by phone or letter and once the search was performed, the information was sent to them immediately by means of a facsimile system connection between the library and each group's work area in the various hospitals. Each group had access to the system for seven weeks.

Of the ninety-nine individuals who were exposed to the new system (forty-six researchers, thirty-one clinicians, and twenty-two supervisors), forty individuals used the system to make a total of 141 requests. The percentage of use by each category is shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
<th>MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCE IN FORMING RESEARCHERS' AND CLINICIANS' INFORMATION-SEEKING STYLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Researchers (N=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (colleagues)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Sources</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Education in the Use of Information Services</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4</th>
<th>USE OF THE NEW INFORMATION SERVICE BY EACH CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Users (N=46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (N=46)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (N=22)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinicians (N=31)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (N=99)</strong></td>
<td><strong>40%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of a 40 percent use of the new information system is debatable. However, in our context, the most interesting part of the data concerns the type of requests made of the librarian stationed at the John Crerar Library. Of the 141 requests for information, 85 were for copies of specific articles, 50 requests were for either reprints of existing bibliographies or the compilation of new bibliographies in a given subject area, and only 6 requests were for literature searches or answers to specific questions. The behavior of the researchers and clinicians, in terms of the types of requests they made of the librarian, corroborate the previously discussed "confidence gap" between researchers and librarians.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Although great emphasis is currently on developing complex new systems for information retrieval, quite possibly a greater emphasis needs to be placed upon informing users about current information services, encouraging them to use these services, and making the ser-

**Eleven of the clinicians did not participate in this phase of the study.**
vices more responsive to their individual needs. Librarians can try to establish themselves as professional colleagues in the eyes of the researchers with whom they interact. As Hall observed, librarians must begin by "participating more actively in the affairs of the university and by insuring that they are always deployed on work which is commensurate with their abilities." This means that librarians should "advertise their expertise in information retrieval." He goes on to remark that one "way of breaking down the physical and psychological barriers between library and teaching staffs . . . is to establish a librarian/information officer" who will be directly responsible for one specific subject area and who will actively make contacts in each university department or research institute that deals with that subject area. Through this type of interaction, the teaching or research staff will learn that the librarian "has some knowledge of their subject area and will be free to concentrate on the practical benefits of such a service."

Although it is extremely difficult to alter the information-seeking style of mature researchers, the librarian can try to reach the younger researchers, the undergraduate and graduate students. The preliminary results from a planned five-year longitudinal study of how information-seeking style is formed among medical students in the United States indicates that these students are not well-trained in the use of information sources and do not take advantage of all the information resources available to them. If researchers could be trained in the efficient use of information systems and services, existing systems and services could function more effectively.
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A Comparison of Six Versions of Science Library Instruction

This study was designed to investigate the instructional effectiveness of six methods of library instruction. University students were randomly assigned to treatment groups, received verbal instruction with/without supplementary visual illustrations and readings. Results indicated that the self-paced audiovisual tutorial study followed by a summary and question/answer session was the most effective way of increasing student achievement on the ninety-item objective test designed to measure the comprehension and retention of the content.

A wide range of library orientation has been reported in books and journals but there is little empirical evidence available to serve as a guide for a librarian to refer to in selecting visuals and media which will be most effective in facilitating student achievement of specific objectives.1

A randomized block design was employed to investigate the relative effectiveness of different types of library instruction as compared with the conventional library lecture at the Science Division of the Portland State University Library.

METHOD

Subjects. The subjects for this study were students enrolled in summer classes at Portland State University. More than 200 subjects were randomly assigned to seven groups.

Treatments. In order to facilitate comparisons, only one or two variables were varied in the treatments described below.

Conventional Library Lecture (Group L). Students in this group participated in a live lecture given by a science librarian who also prepared and narrated the script used in the other treatments. The live lecture covered basically the same contents as the script and in many instances examples were cited almost verbatim. No visual aids other than printed materials (reference books and hand-outs) were used to complement the librarian’s oral lecture. Time was limited to one class period of fifty minutes.

Audio Instruction (Group A). Students in this group listened to the audiotaped instruction via headsets without using any visuals. The total length of the narration was forty-six minutes. The same recorded narration was used in all other treatments.

Slide/Audiotape Instruction (Group S). A total of 179 color slides were produced to illustrate the audiotape instruction. Students in this group viewed the slides synchronized to the tape for automatic advancement at a predetermined time.

Television Instruction (Group AT). In addition to notebooks, students in this group independently studied a film-
strip duplicated photographically from the slides used in Group S. A cassette tape with audible change signals instead of an open reel tape with inaudible signals was used. The notebook included some illustrations, sample pages, annotations and comparison tables of the materials covered in the audiotape instruction to help clarify information. Students were allowed to spend as much time as needed by themselves in their spare time without any additional assistance from librarians.

Audiovisual Instruction (Group AV). Students in this group prepared themselves by the audiotutorial method before joining a fifty-minute follow-up session led by a librarian. The librarian used overhead transparencies copied directly from the notebooks to reinforce the main points and also answered questions asked by the students, thus giving both the librarian and students opportunities to interact with one another.

Criterion Test. A ninety-item objective test was administered to all groups immediately after the treatments. The control group (Group C) drawn at random from the population received no library instruction at all but took the same criterion test.

The test was prepared by two persons who were familiar with the subject matter and test measurement. The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula reliability co-efficient for the odd-even test items was .80.

The test items were evenly distributed to three parts: Part I—Card Catalog (thirty items); Part II—Readers’ Guide, Dictionaries, and Encyclopedias (thirty items); and Part III—Biological Abstracts and Science Citation Index (thirty items). The means for the control group were 12.4 (Part I); 5.5 (Part II); and 1.7 (Part III) out of thirty possible points. It was reasonable to assume that subjects in this sample had not much library knowledge of Parts II and III before the treatments.

In order to discourage guessing, a penalty was applied for wrong answers by using the correction formula: “R–W/ (n-1),” where “R” is the number of questions answered correctly; “W” is the number of questions answered incorrectly; and “n” is the number of answer choices for an item.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The summary of the analysis of variance of all groups is given in Table 1.

The analysis indicates that significant differences exist among the means of all groups (F = 53.2, d.f. = 6/98, p < .001).

Comparisons among the individual means of the six treatment groups and one control group by Duncan’s New Multiple Range Test were further conducted to determine the effectiveness of the various treatments in improving student achievement on the criterion tests. The observed means, each based upon fifteen observations are rearranged in order of magnitude in Table 2 for statistical analysis.

Analysis of the differences between means indicated that all treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>25,200.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,200.08</td>
<td>53.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7,769.50</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>79.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32,970.01</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .001
Comparison of Versions / 289

TABLE 2
DUNCAN’S NEW MULTIPLE RANGE TEST APPLIED TO THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SEVEN MEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>(1) C 18.7</th>
<th>(2) A 38.1</th>
<th>(3) L 39.1</th>
<th>(4) TV 41.6</th>
<th>(5) S 45.3</th>
<th>(6) AT 60.4</th>
<th>(7) AV 70.4</th>
<th>Shortest Significant Ranges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A 19.4</td>
<td>A 1.0</td>
<td>TV 2.5</td>
<td>S 6.7</td>
<td>AT 12.1</td>
<td>AV 10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>c = .01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>a = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Re = 8.58</td>
<td>Re = 9.92</td>
<td>Re = 9.18</td>
<td>Re = 9.36</td>
<td>Re = 9.50</td>
<td>Re = 9.63</td>
<td>Re = 9.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different at the .01 level.
* Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different at the .01 level.

groups which received various methods of library instruction achieved significantly higher scores on the criterion tests than the control group.

The results also indicated that neither the conventional library lecture (Group L) nor the televised instruction (Group AT) was consistently more effective in facilitating student achievement in scores than the oral instruction without a librarian (Group A) or visual illustrations (Group S). The fact that visual illustrations shown on printed books or 22 inch monitor screens were too small to be perceived clearly by all students may be attributed to nonsignificant differences. Another possible explanation may be that in the audio instruction there was no obscure visual stimuli to distract attention from verbal information received through earphones.

The slide/audiotape method (Group S) was found to be more effective than audio instruction and conventional library lecture at the .01 level of significance and than the television instruction at the .05 level of significance. Students who viewed both the slides and the videotape commented on the vividness and clarity of the color slides and the loss of visual quality as a result of television transmission. It was noted that for a given amount of time, unintelligible visual stimuli might have impeded rather than facilitated the subject’s concentration in absorbing information from verbal instruction. The data obtained in this study coincide with the results of Dwier’s study.3

Students receiving the audio tutorial instruction (Group AV) achieved significantly higher scores than did students receiving the slide/audiotape instruction (Group S). One possible explanation may be that since the slides were uniformly externally paced, students did not have adequate time to pay attention to the details of the illustrations. Students in the self-study group were able to set their own learning pace, to review the parts where they experienced difficulty, and had sufficient time to absorb additional information.

Contrary to Kirk’s findings, Group AV in this study was found to be superior to the independent study group without attending the follow-up lecture-discussion session.4 However, it should be noted that the Group AT in this study did not do exercises, as in Kirk’s. The fact that students in Group AV had opportunities to ask questions of the librarian and vice versa may account for the success of this treatment. Further
research is needed to study the human variables in library orientation.

**Conclusions**

Results of this study lead to the following conclusions:

1. The use of certain types of visuals to complement oral instruction do not automatically improve student achievement in the criterion test, as demonstrated in Groups L and TV.

2. When the identical illustrations were presented via television and slides, the slide, but not the television presentation, was found to be more effective than the audio presentation alone.

3. An increase in visibility of illustrations and intelligibility of information by means of the illustrated notebook also produced a corresponding gain in the degree of comprehension and retention, if a student had sufficient time to assimilate the information, as shown in the self-paced instruction of Group AT.

4. Even though sufficient time was available for studying, not all students comprehended the illustrated materials equally well. The use of a librarian to clarify the ambiguous points and to focus students' attention to relevant visual cues by means of overhead transparencies in an externally paced instruction (Group AV) was more effective than the self-paced audio tutorial instruction without the librarian's assistance (Group AT).

**References**


Microfilm for the Library of Congress

In 1969 alone, the Library of Congress produced more than 11.3 million individual microfilm exposures on negative film. More than 5.6 million feet of positive print film were made from these and other negatives. Microfilming has been used to solve the need for storage space; to preserve newspapers and rare and fragile documents; to produce copies for outside orders; to conserve copyright records; and to acquire new materials for the Library collections.

Founded in 1800 by an Act of Congress, the Library of Congress has grown from a few hundred volumes to more than 13 million books and pamphlets, more than 19 million manuscripts, 165,000 bound volumes of newspapers, and many other materials. It has used microfilm to preserve public records since 1938, when its Photoduplication Service was established with a revolving fund grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Many information storage and retrieval techniques now common in the library sciences were initiated here to protect historical documents and also to provide quick access to researchers. Microfilm also has been invaluable as a recording tool, duplicating rare manuscripts and documents that otherwise would have been unavailable. It also is used to preserve deteriorating materials and for the acquisition of new collections. The Photoduplication Service now has 163 employees, with 78 of them working in microfilming operations.

One of the largest of our microfilm-Charles G. La Hood, Jr. is chief, Photoduplication Service, Library of Congress.
one decade after the bound newspaper collection had been moved to the Library Annex, the collection already had become so extensive, comprising over 140,000 volumes, that all available shelf space—approximately eighteen linear miles—was filled. With no other shelf space available, the stack area floor space was used for storage. With the collection growing at the rate of 3,000 bound volumes per year, there was a critical need for microfilm to mitigate the space problem, as well as to maintain long-range preservation requirements.

By 1951, the Library had acquired 21,000 reels of positive microfilm from outside sources and from negatives filmed by photoreproduction. At this time, the library had 88 newspaper subscriptions for microfilm—56 domestic and 32 foreign titles. Newspaper titles received by the Library, however, exceeded 1,000. By 1961, although the Library subscribed to every available microfilm of newspapers it wished to retain permanently, these accounted only for half the 1,200 domestic and foreign titles normally retained. The remaining 600 titles were bound for storage.

In 1962, current and past newspaper files were transferred to microfilm. Of the 165,000 bound volumes of newspapers on file, approximately 25,000 were printed after 1870 on pulp paper. Many were in advanced stages of deterioration. With time running out on many of these files, the goal of replacing all pulp paper with microfilm meant that all 125,000 volumes, averaging three inches in thickness—a total of 75 million pages—had to be committed to positive microfilm from negatives already in existence and available from outside sources, or negatives to be produced by photoduplication.

When a negative microfilm is available, the Library acquires only a positive print, after a cautious quality-control procedure. Existing negatives often are of uneven quality—usually due to exposure of tightly-bound newspapers resulting in incomplete images, or simply poor microfilming techniques. Normally, the Library requires the supplier to furnish sample rolls of each file for quality-control testing before ordering, so that the pulp files are not destroyed prematurely. Since 1962, 25,000 bound volumes have been replaced by microfilm positives. At this writing, we have reached the approximate half-way point in the replacement program—50,000 volumes on film.

Some problems in microfilming historical newspaper files are missing issues in a bound volume, as well as the human errors made in cataloging the original files. Each volume must be checked for the shelflist record of missing pages and/or issues, and for proper indexing. Any material missing from the file must then be secured. The volume is sent to the Government Printing Office bindery, where bindings are cut from the newsprint, reducing the volume to a stack of loose pages held between the binding covers. Wrinkled or creased papers are sprayed with a fine water mist, stacked in a bookbinding press between sheets of plywood and placed under pressure for twenty-four hours. Any remaining creases or wrinkles are removed with a hand iron on the camera table. High-resolution planetary cameras, of which the Library has 24, are used to document the newspapers onto microfilm. All cameras are tested monthly with resolution test charts and with periodic step tests to check proper light intensity levels. In addition, the lighting at various points in the copy plane is checked frequently and adjusted to provide even illumination of the image area. If one light bulb burns out, all are replaced to achieve more readily-balanced lighting.

Negative microfilm exposed in the cameras is processed automatically in a custom-built machine capable of handling 100 feet of film a minute. After
processing, the 1,000-foot rolls of film are broken into individual orders and reels by an inspector who simultaneously makes a pre-editing check for scratched film, blurred images due to page movement, and camera troubles. This check allows correction to be made in cameras or processing as quickly as possible, minimizing the damage done—a necessary precaution when 7,000 feet of negative film is produced each day.

Negative film passing the first inspection is assigned to an editor who makes a frame-by-frame inspection to see that all pages were filmed and in proper order, the film images are properly aligned, the proper targets were used, and that each image is in focus, properly lighted, and has good contrast. The background density of each frame is checked by eye, and an electronic densitometer is used to make a spot check every few feet along the film.

Editing is done at specially-designed consoles with built-in light panels, rewinds, and specially-mounted heat-weld splicers. Loupes used to check negative film are padded to prevent film scratching. Film readers also inspect newspaper microfilm. Each reader is equipped with glass flats that are pushed away from the film manually before the film is advanced, giving positive protection against scratching.

In the Library of Congress system, the original negative microfilm is used to make an intermediate negative print, from which release positive prints are made. The original negative is placed in permanent storage. In this process, the negative film is checked for variations in density. If a variation is noted, a notch is made in the edge of the film twelve inches before the variation occurs. The light values corresponding to the changes in density in the film are recorded on a light strip that is used to set resistor bars on the control board of the printer.

When the printer is operated, each notch in the film negative activates another switch that varies the intensity of the light source in accordance with the values preset into the control panel. Variations in density in the negative are thus eliminated in printing, and the resulting intermediate negative print is of even better quality than the original negative. The light strip for each negative roll is retained with the reel, so that if an additional intermediate print is required, it, too, can be corrected automatically.

From the intermediate film, positive prints are made for the library's reading rooms or for distribution to subscribers. The positives are checked after processing for printing or processing errors and spooled for storage.

Completing the newspaper microfilming operation, the master negatives are stored in the negative vault, where they are inspected frequently to ensure against damage. Then, and only then, are the subject newspaper files cleared for disposal.

The microfilming of newspaper files has many advantages for the library and its users. Not only are the pages of newsprint captured permanently on film, but the space required to house the printed volumes is reduced drastically. And, from the user's viewpoint, a small reel of microfilm is much easier to handle and use than a fifteen-to-twenty-pound, three-inch thick, bound volume of print.

The microfilm preservation program is not limited to newspapers. Irreplaceable reference works and other materials in a deteriorating condition are being microfilmed and then reproduced, either on full-size electrostatic prints or on positive microfilm. Presidential papers—from Washington to Coolidge—are microfilmed to insure preservation, and also to make positive reproductions readily available without additional handling of the original document and the consequent possibility of damage.
Since 1962, rare monographs have been put on microfilm, at the rate of 5,000 a year. Of the 13 million books in the library, at least 2 million have become brittle and fragile with age. A number of the microfilm cameras are equipped with a special book cradle to allow page-by-page filming. Once filmed, the book is withheld from the stacks and reference is made via a microfilm positive.

Acquisition of library material is as important an application of our microfilming equipment as is the preservation program. Recently, for example, a fine collection of material at St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mount Sinai was added via 1,694 reels of microfilm shot on the site. At the same time, we added 1,000 reels of microfilmed materials on Jerusalem.

Microfilm also has become a favorite way for the library to acquire rare materials. The early records of the states—legislative records, statutory laws, court records, constitutional records, for example—are scattered throughout the land. Desiring this material for the Library of Congress, the only recourse was to travel to the various state capitals and microfilm the documents and manuscripts. This was done, using a total 120,000 feet of microfilm, making this data available to library users.

As our files of microfilm grow, they are playing an increasingly important role in what has become the largest library copy service in the country. Any material in the library can be reproduced—unless covered by a copyright—either photostatically, or by producing positive paper copies or positive film copies of microfilm. In 1969 alone, 88,000 requests covering 172,000 different items to be copied were received.

Peripheral uses of microfilm at the Library of Congress include retention of library catalog cards and Copyright Office records. The Copyright Office has nineteen different application forms, submitted by authors, composers, and publishers, which the office microfilms along with the original document to insure against loss. In addition, the copyright card catalog containing records of the more than 11 million works that have been copyrighted—the list is expanded by about 300,000 items a year—is retained on microfilm.

Microfilm is the Library of Congress’ best protection against loss of original materials and valuable documents. Never again will the Library of Congress be wiped out of existence, as it was during the War of 1812, when the 3,000 volumes that constituted the entire Library were burned, along with the rest of Washington.
Selected Reference Books of 1972-73

INTRODUCTION

This article continues the semianual series originally edited by Constance M. Winchell. Although it appears under a byline, the list is actually a project of the Reference Department of the Columbia University Libraries, and notes are signed with the initials of the individual staff members.¹

In the past, mention in this column of supplements and new editions has been the exception rather than the rule. A departure from that practice is made in this issue, and a brief roundup of such items is presented at the end of the column.

Since the purpose of the list is to present a selection of recent scholarly and foreign works of interest to reference workers in university libraries, it does not pretend to be either well balanced or comprehensive. Code numbers (such as AA71, 2BD89) have been used to refer to titles in the Guide to Reference Books and its supplements.²

BIBLIOGRAPHY


An important achievement, this book both updates and extends the period of coverage of Ronald B. McKerrow’s 1928 classic in the field of bibliographical studies, An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students (Guide AA4). Entirely new, not simply a revision of McKerrow, the volume describes methods of book production and distribution from the early years of printing to the middle of the twentieth century. Divided into two major sections, the handpress period (1500-1800) and the machinepress period (1800-1950)—the latter not covered by McKerrow—it includes information on type, composition, printing practices, and the book trade, as well as topics peculiar to each period. The last section of the book demonstrates applications in bibliographical description and studies on the transmission of texts. Incorporating scholarship of the forty years since McKerrow’s work in this relatively young field of descriptive and historical bibliography, Gaskell does an admirable job of conveying the information clearly and in a well organized form. Extensive bibliographies (more nearly bibliographic essays) at the end of the volume make it an even more valuable reference tool.—D.A.S.

NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Répertoire des livres de langue française disponibles, 1972-. [Paris], France-Expansion, 1972-. 2v. $80.00. (Distr. in U.S. by Bowker.) 72-626991.

Contents: v.1, Auteurs; v.2, Titres.

Here is a welcome addition to the books-in-print shelf of the large library, especially since the Catalogue de l’édition française (first published for 1970) will next cover 1973. The aim is to record all French language in-print trade books regardless of country of origin. This first issue, however, includes, in addition to the output of
French publishers, only those foreign books that are distributed in France. Future editions are to be more inclusive. Also listed are the foreign language publications of francophone publishers.

Volume 1 is an alphabetic arrangement by author, with very full bibliographic details; volume 2 entries, by title, are somewhat shorter. Two long lists, one of publishers' series and the other of publishers' names and addresses, are appended to the first volume. A third section of the work, "un volume analytique," is promised and presumably will be a subject index to the more than 100,000 books included.—R.K.

ARCHIVES


This directory-bibliography, addressed primarily to "the foreigner planning research in the Soviet Union" (Pref.), will appeal also to others interested in the history of Russian archives and the location of manuscripts, and surely to the librarian responsible for maintaining a reference collection on such materials.

Preliminary sections cover the history and organization of Soviet archives and such procedural information as access and research conditions. The bulk of the work is a series of descriptions of important manuscript repositories, together with valuable annotated bibliographies of the finding aids (both books and articles) pertaining to them. Six sections cover: the Central State Archives; archival collections of the Academy of Sciences; special archives such as those of the Communist Party and Foreign Ministry; manuscript divisions of libraries and museums of Moscow and of Leningrad; and republic and local state archives. There is also a long, annotated bibliography of general archival and research aids. Full bibliographical information for entries (with locations and class numbers at Library of Congress and/or Harvard), a useful glossary, a list of abbreviations used, author/title and subject indexes all add to ease of use and reference value.—R.K.

Dictionaries


This is a dictionary of about 10,000 words which, for reasons of pronunciation, usage, gender, spelling, or foreign origin, pose problems even to educated native speakers of French. Each entry presents the opinions of one or more of five major French dictionaries, and supplements these, if necessary, with citations from grammarians, thus saving the reader a time-consuming search through many sources for the information he needs. Where disagreement exists, the editors have suggested a reasonable solution, taking into account the most recent changes in the language; this commentary, however, is intended as a synthesis, not a prescription. Useful features are a lexicon of linguistic terms and a section on important dictionaries and grammarians.
Though intended for a French-speaking public, this dictionary should be of great value to advanced students of the French language.—N.S.


Contents:

This dictionary is intermediate in size between the *Petit Larousse* (Guide AE223) and the *Grand Larousse encyclopédique* (Guide AD31), but unlike them is strictly a language dictionary. More inclusive and detailed than the *Dictionnaire du français contemporain* (Suppl. 2AE30), it gives for each entry: transcription in the International Phonetic Alphabet, etymology and date of first attestation, definitions, examples of usage (either as quotations from authors or as phrases made up by the editors), indication of level of usage, and synonyms and antonyms. It is limited to words in use in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and includes a generous number of current technical terms. Special features are a seventy-two-page analysis of French word formation, with tables of Greek and Latin roots and their meanings; frequency tables; and conjugation charts. Brief articles on linguistic terms such as “accent” and “alphabet” are interspersed throughout the text.

Since the above information, though well presented, is available elsewhere, the other language dictionary of comparable size, Robert’s *Dictionnaire alphabétique et analytique de la langue française* (Guide AE226) with its 1970 supplement is still to be preferred: Robert is more comprehensive, as a rule more generous with examples (to which it gives full citations; Larousse gives no page references), synonyms and antonyms, and cross-references. Libraries already owning Robert will probably not find this new Larousse an essential purchase.—N.S.

**PERIODICAL INDEXES**


One hundred periodicals and five yearbooks associated with the expressionist movement in Germany and reflecting its influence on the whole range of German culture, literature, and the arts are analyzed in this new index. A full citation to each article, poem, drama, etc. is given in *Serie A*, the alphabetical author index, and in *Serie B*, which offers a subject approach. The indexes by title (*Serie D*) and by genre (*Serie E*) give briefer information, and it is necessary to refer to the author index for the full citation. *Serie C* is arranged by title of the periodical and offers a printout of the contents of the full run of each publication indexed, with contributions arranged alphabetically by author; the full citation is given in each entry.

While it is interesting, and occasionally useful, to have so many approaches to the contents of these publications, series C, D, and E seem an unnecessary luxury, if not largely an exercise in computer capability—particularly so in view of the liberal spacing and the repetitiousness of the entries in *Serie C*. (Thus, the whole of v.12 becomes an author index to *Die Aktion*, and virtually all of v.11 is a similar treatment of *Der Sturm.*) Specialist scholars will welcome the index as it stands; librarians concerned with problems of budget and space would have settled for an author-subject index in a more compact format.—E.S.

**BIOGRAPHY**


Not only national figures in the British
labor movement, but also activists at the regional and local levels are to be included in this ambitious new biographical dictionary. Indeed, it intends to include “everyone who made a contribution, however modest, to any organisation or movement, provided that certain basic details of their career can be established.”—Introductory. The period of coverage is from 1790 to the present, but living persons are excluded. It is expected that fifteen to twenty volumes will be required to treat figures down to 1914 alone. Each volume will be alphabetically arranged and will include biographies without regard to date of the subject’s activity. The decision to begin publication with what material was at hand has meant that v.1 shows a predominance of miners’ leaders and cooperators, since mining is the best-documented trade union field. However, the editors have tried “to include a fair selection of other types of radicals, reformers, and trade unionists.” Articles are signed; sources are cited; and cross-references are provided to articles within the present volume and to names to be treated in later volumes. A consolidated index is promised for each successive volume.—E.S.

RELIGION


Not simply a list of books, this work is, rather, a collection of thoughtful essays on important problems in Jewish studies. Heightened interest in this field in many colleges and universities will make it a popular reference work, although ease of use is hampered by the essay format and lack of a subject/name index. However, the background material (though duplicated in many standard sources) along with the critical annotations and chapter arrangement will serve to give the reader a general overview of such issues as the “Holocaust” and the “Contemporary Jewish Community.” In addition, almost all of the works cited are in English or one of the more common Western European languages, making this a particularly useful volume for the undergraduate or nonspecialist.—B.W.

LINGUISTICS


The distinguished linguistics scholar, lexicographer, and translator, Clement M. Doke is perhaps most widely known for his work on Zulu-English dictionaries (Guide AE585-87), but his work in the field of African languages was wide-ranging and varied. His excellent working collection of books, pamphlets, and manuscripts “constitute the nucleus, and still the major part” (p.xxvii) of the collection of more than 3,000 items represented in this catalog. A reproduction from typewritten catalog cards, the work is in two sections, authors and subjects. The subject section is arranged by Library of Congress classification, with typewritten guide cards interfiled as subject indicators. The lack of running heads and the reduction in type size make the subject section difficult to use. Surely a key to the major LC classes represented (there is a heavy concentration in PL8000-8844) could have been provided, and an alphabetical list of languages with corresponding class marks or page references would have been helpful. Doke’s own works are not included in the collection, but a bibliography of his published and unpublished writings is furnished in the prefatory matter.—E.S.

LITERATURE


Second in the series “Contemporary Writers of the English Language” (Contemporary Poets was published in 1970 and Contemporary Dramatists is in preparation), this volume is a critical biobibliography of novelists and short story authors writing in English since 1940. The selection is based on the recommendation of an advisory board, but generally follows a definition of the novelist as the author of “a broadly realistic representation of man’s
life in society which is also a criticism of life and of society."—Pref. The format of each entry is: brief biography, bibliography (principally works by the entrant, arranged by genre), location of manuscript collections, comment by the author on his work, and a signed critical essay. Entries vary in length from two to six pages. A brief section identifies the advisers and contributors to the volume. Omissions (e.g., Kerouac, Momaday) can always be noted, but this is a useful "something-about-the-author" book, and the critical essays—often stimulating—may lead the reader to the novels themselves.—D.G.


Through critical texts chosen "to convey . . . something of an author's achievement and, secondarily of the critic's point of view," this work seeks to "acquaint its readers with twentieth-century German literature as seen by critics of this century."—Introduct. Excerpts averaging about 150 words in length deal with more than 200 authors of fiction, drama, and poetry from East and West Germany, Austria and Switzerland. Arrangement is alphabetic by author covered; the texts, drawn from British, American, and European journals, newspapers and books, appear in chronological order and carry full bibliographical information. German selections have been specially translated for this compilation. Excerpts number from four to five for lesser figures to more than thirty for well-known writers. Each section ends with a selected listing of the writer's works with publication dates for both the original and the English translation. The volume will be useful primarily for the less well-known figures and for the English translations listed.—R.K.


If you were expecting a kind of English-language Enciclopedia dello spettacolo concentrating on drama, disappointment is in store. Concern here is almost exclusively with dramatists and the literature of the theater; aspects of production and stagecraft are virtually ignored. Apart from about 100 brief entries for terms, theater movements, genres, etc., the work consists wholly of entries for playwrights. For each major dramatist there is a biographical sketch, a brief critique of his work, a selection of synopses of his plays, and a bibliography of editions (including references to individual plays published in anthologies) and, usually, a list of critical and biographical works. For the lesser dramatist there is a brief account of his career, achievement, and dramatic output, and occasionally a synopsis of one or more plays. There is an admitted emphasis on English, American, and Western European dramatists. Although there are hundreds of good-quality illustrations, many of them are unsatisfactorily captioned as to date or identity of players, and much of the space expended on close-ups of star performers might better have been devoted to adequate representations of stage settings. For the reference librarian the bibliographies are likely to prove the most valuable feature of this set. —E.S.


This is an annotated bibliography of bibliographies for British writers born after 1840, who published most of their work in England or Ireland after 1890. Emphasis is on the humanities and "imaginative" authors, with only the "better-known" scientists and social scientists included. For each author Mellown lists primary bibliographies (the author's work), secondary bibliographies (criticism), and appearances in any of about twenty general sources such as the New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature, Who's Who, Twayne's American and English author series, etc. Each primary and secondary bibliography is annotated as to scope, arrangement, and critical evaluation. Many bibliographies in progress are noted, but some published supplements have been omitted. Mellown's audience is the student and the general reader, so he has not included some of the more specialized bibliographies (e.g., exhibit catalogs) listed in Howard-Hill's Bibliography of
British Literary Bibliographies (Suppl. 3BD25). Altogether, this is a clearly presented, generally comprehensive, and useful work.—D.G.

FINE ARTS

Founded as an independent organization in 1954 and now part of the Smithsonian Institution, the Archives of American Art have become increasingly important as a repository for the documentary evidence of art in America. Papers have been acquired or borrowed from artists, dealers, critics, collectors, curators, and institutions, and they have been microfilmed so that all two million items in the Archives are readily available for use by direct visit to, or interlibrary loan from, one of the five regional centers with duplicate collections in New York City, Washington, Boston, Detroit, and San Francisco.

The purpose of this slim volume is to describe in compact detail the contents of the 555 groups of papers. Arrangement is alphabetical by the key personality or institution with whom the specific collection deals. Information given includes sources of the documents, their form (i.e., letters, notebooks, etc.), quantity, inclusive dates, and the names of major correspondents when appropriate. There is a personal and institutional name index. Since the collections are heavily weighted toward twentieth-century materials, this guide will be of great help to scholars working in the field of modern art where original source materials are still hard to locate. For this reason, regularly published new editions or supplements listing new acquisitions would be welcome.—E.L.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

The compilers have produced a truly excellent bibliography within the bounds of their definition of population policy: "both direct and indirect measures, formulated and implemented by the whole range of social institutions including government, which, whether intended or not, may influence the size, distribution, or composition of human population."—Pref. They have covered systematically and comprehensively the literature published between 1940 and 1969 in 3,519 entries, most of which are annotated. The work begins with 1940 because D. B. Glass’s Population: Policies and Movements in Europe (London, 1967) covers the small body of literature to that time. The author index and an excellent subject index enhance the arrangement which is by major area, component region, and nation, plus a large "interregional" section. Of further help is Driver’s prefatory explanation of his method and major bibliographical sources.—M.M.


These volumes present a compilation of statistical data from more than 7000 Gallup Poll reports dating from the founding of the poll in October 1935 to December 1971. The polls are the work of the American Institute of Public Opinion, an independent fact-finding organization supported by its subscriber newspapers (which have the exclusive right to publish the Gallup findings). Until now the only finding aids to the published data had been newspaper indexes and the index entitled Gallup Poll Reports, 1935-1968 (Princeton, 1969), which gave only the date of the poll and a very brief summary of the findings. In contrast, this new work contains all of the statistical data released to the subscriber newspapers. The newspaper release date is also given to facilitate location of the editorial and interpretative material which has been omitted from this compilation. The polls are further identified by survey, index and question numbers. A detailed explanation of the sampling and survey procedures can be found in the introductory material; a personal name/subject index is appended.—B.W.

Index to Literature on the American Indian,

Contents: v. 1-4, Absolutism-Judicial system.

What do the Communists believe about genetics? What is the role of banking in the USSR? What is the “German question” to the Germans?—to the Russians? The conflicting answers the East and West give to such questions, the scholars writing in this work feel, are “rooted in incompatible systems of thought” as well as in divergent interests. Thus, this encyclopedia endeavors to cover all areas in which there is disagreement between East and West: biology, economics, history, law, literature, military science, pedagogics, philosophy and ideology, physics, politics and sociology, psychology, and religion. “An international team of scholars and experts, working together over a number of years, has attempted to discover the origins and structure of these conflicts, to analyze why interpretations of these conflicts differ, and to determine the methods adopted in the various approaches.”—Pref.

An outline preceding each article shows at a glance how the subject will be treated. Articles often begin with the general theory and history of a term before launching into the Communist interpretation and application; in others, the subject is treated first from one viewpoint and then from the other, followed by a comparison. Most articles are signed (a few were written by the editorial staff), and include full bibliographical references. That they were carefully researched is evidenced by the length and scope of the bibliographies.—M.M.


Designed as a counterpart to PAIS Bulletin (Guide CA22), this useful new tool indexes writings on public and economic affairs in the French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish languages. Emphasis is on factual and statistical material. Volume 1, covering mid-1968 through 1971, includes periodical articles only. The editors intend, however, to produce a quarterly beginning with volume 2, 1972 (the fourth issue being the annual cumulation), and these succeeding volumes are to include a “selective listing of current books, pamphlets, government publications, and other useful library materials in addition to articles in periodicals.”—Pref. It is hoped that other languages can also be included in the future.

As in PAIS Bulletin, the arrangement is by subject, but here the individual entry is listed by author rather than title. The author index is a welcome addition. Full citations are provided in the subject section, including notes about summaries in other languages and articles originally prepared as conference papers; entries in the author section are shortened forms of the subject entries. The completeness of information is extended to the periodical key which includes cost and publisher’s address as well as full title. This promises to be a very important index for foreign language material in public and economic affairs.—J.S.

This welcome reference tool serves as a guide to the numerous publications of the United Nations system. A brief survey of the twenty-two organizations and their publications is provided in the first part; the headquarters address, other principal offices, aims and membership, and the structure of each agency are followed by a list of agency publications, material about the agency, basic instruments and official records. The second part is comprised of selected reference materials arranged by broad subject categories ranging from agriculture to treaties and other international agreements. Title entries are grouped according to type (e.g., statistics, directories, bibliographies, catalogs). Complete citations and detailed annotations are provided.

The last part of the work is a list of periodicals and other selected recurrent items, both subscription and unpriced, published by the United Nations system. Citations include periodicity, availability, first year of issue, language, and a brief subject analysis. Mr. Winton has compiled a handy, useful guide which indicates the scope as well as the number of publications of the U.N. system.—J.S.

ATLASES


The editors of this atlas have a definite and obvious point of view—specifically, a belief in the importance of ecology—which they promote throughout the book. The method of promotion is to provide very short articles surrounded by striking color photographs and illustrations, on topics ranging from the relationship of the earth to the rest of the solar system, to prospecting for minerals, and even including the religions of man. Nearly a third of the volume is taken up with this kind of material which is infused with a great amount of editorializing. Maps comprise only slightly more than one-third of the work (the remaining portion is the index). The maps themselves are reasonably clear, and the projection used is identified in every case. As one might expect with a British atlas, there is extensive and detailed coverage of Great Britain. For each area of the world, however, there are maps showing topography, political divisions, natural vegetation, annual rainfall, climate, and population. Unfortunately, there are no citations to sources, so that, for example, one cannot tell whether 1970 census data are utilized in the population map of the United States. The reference value of this atlas is not significantly increased by the large section devoted to articles, illustrations, and photographs, however attractive they may be: what little factual information they provide can readily be found elsewhere.—D.A.S.

HISTORY


The Public Records Act of 1967 changed the "closed" period of British public records from fifty to thirty years, permitting the early records of World War II to be opened. Realizing that papers occupying seven miles of shelving could not all be released at one time (as was done with World War I papers), the Public Record Office arranged to make accessible papers of the greatest public interest by early 1972. In conjunction with the general release of papers in early 1972, the office prepared a guide which describes each class of papers in the 1939-1945 war files, indicating the number of pieces in each file and giving one or two sentences of description. The evolution of the internal governmental structure during the war "is described in broad terms... and these descriptions are expected both to contribute towards comprehension of the records and to signpost the nature of the material to be found."—Intro. Concluding the volume are four helpful appendices: a dictionary of code names in use during the war; a list of abbreviations used in the Official Histories of the Second World War; a general index to war cabinet committees; and a list of the Official Histories of the Second World War.—E.M.

The first of a series of lists of officials in the central government in Great Britain from the Restoration to 1870, Treasury Officials sets the pattern for further volumes to be issued—very soon, one hopes. First comes an introduction to the history and the growth of the Treasury from a Treasurer with five assistants in 1660 to over 100 officials in 1870. Then follows a chronological list of appointments arranged by office; a list of Treasury officials at a particular date (coronation or formation of new government); and an alphabetical list of names indicating all the offices held by one individual in the Treasury and the source of the information. The introduction to the chronological list of appointments gives a short survey “which brings together information concerning such matters as method of appointment, remuneration and relevant statutes and Treasury minutes.”—Note, p.xii.

A great amount of research went into the compilation of the lists, for, until 1714 when records became more complete, the names are often buried in manuscript lists of accounts and fees. Scholars should be grateful for the aid to research which this project will provide.—E.M.

New Editions and Supplements

The fourth edition of the Totok-Weitzel Handbuch der bibliographischen Nachschlagewerke (Frankfurt am Main, Klostermann, 1972. 367p.; 3d ed., 1966, Suppl. 1AA1) has been updated through 1971. Volume 1, A-E, of the second edition of Donald G. Wing’s Short-title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and British America (N.Y., Index Committee of the Modern Language Association of America, 1972) follows the scope and method of the earlier edition (Guide AA504), and, “as far as possible,” item numbers remain the same; the number of libraries represented for locations has been increased to more than 300.

The much-publicized first volume of A Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford, Clarendon Pr., 1972; contents: A-G) scarcely needs mention here. Superseding the 1933 supplement (Guide AE21), the three volumes of this new supplement will contain an estimated 50,000 main words. Bringing to the half-way mark the project of indexing forty of the principal monthlies and quarterlies of the period, the second volume of The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals (Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Pr., 1972) indexes twelve periodicals as opposed to eight in v.1 (Suppl. 1AF27). Percy and Grace Ford’s useful Guide to Parliamentary Papers (Guide AH52) has appeared in a third edition (Shannon, Irish Univ. Pr., 1972. 87p.).

A supplement (Detroit, Gale, 1972. 852p.) to Robert B. Slocum’s Biographical Dictionaries and Related Works (Suppl. 2AJ1) contains approximately 3,400 additional entries, with some new editions and corrections noted. Biographical sketches of 573 significant figures who died during the 1941-45 period are included in the Dictionary of American Biography, Supplement Three (N.Y., Scribner’s, 1973. 879p.). The volume was edited by Edward T. James, has signed contributions by 475 scholars, and includes a consolidated list of the biographies in all three supplements. A sixth volume (London, Black, 1972. 1243p.) in the Who Was Who series includes biographies of persons who died in the years 1961-1970, with an addenda of sketches of some who died before the end of 1960 but who were omitted from the 1951-60 volume (Guide AJ152). Inasmuch as the Dictionary of South African Biography (Suppl. 3AJ36) is not governed by any overall chronological or alphabetical sequence, the second volume (Pretoria, Nationale Boekhandel Bpk., 1972. 870p.) presents sketches of another diverse group of personalities from all periods of South African history.

Compiled by James D. Pearson and Ann Walsh, the third supplement to Index Islamicus (London, Mansell, 1972. 384p.) contains about 8,000 entries for the 1966-70 period. Mansell has also announced a reprint of the basic volume of the Index (Guide BB264) and plans for annual supplements covering 1971 through 1974, with a quinquennial cumulation for 1971-75.
Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales (N.Y., St. Martin’s Pr., 1972. 565p.), by David Knowles and Richard N. Hadc­ock, is a revised, expanded and corrected edition of their 1953 volume of the same title (Guide BB244).

The English Romantic Poets, previously edited by Thomas M. Raysor (Guide BD394), appears in a third edition under the editorship of Frank Jordan (N.Y., Modern Language Association of America, 1972. 468p.). This useful survey of research has been updated to cover publications through 1970, with a few early 1971 items included. The period of coverage in Reginald E. Watters’s Checklist of Canadian Literature and Background Materials (Guide BD301) has been extended through 1960 in a revised and considerably enlarged edition (Toronto, Univ. of Toronto Pr., 1972. 1085p.). Carl J. Stratman’s Bibliography of Medieval Drama (Guide BD134) has appeared in a second edition (N.Y., Ungar, 1972. 2v.) The work has been greatly expanded, with the addition of about 5,000 entries, some rearrangement of the sections, and increased emphasis on the liturgical Latin drama.

An aid for political scientists, sociologists, and economists, the second edition of the World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators by Charles L. Taylor and Michael C. Hudson (New Haven, Yale Univ. Pr., 1972. 443p.) follows closely the format of the 1964 edition by Bruce M. Russett. This “attempt to compare nations on a great variety of politically relevant indices” is presented mainly in tabular form, with introductory and explanatory text.

A welcome supplement to Warren F. Kuehl’s Dissertations in History has been designated as “volume 2” of the work (Lex­ington, Univ. of Kentucky Pr., 1972. 237p.). It lists about 5,900 dissertations completed in history departments during the 1961-June 1970 period. Some dissertations accepted earlier, but omitted from the 1873-1960 volume (Suppl. 1DA4) are also included.—E.S.
To the Editor:

I agree with Raleigh DePriest ("That Inordinate Passion for Status," CRL, March 1973) that the desire of librarians for academic status is not merely an empty and ignoble thirst for admiration. Many librarians feel, probably correctly, that the regard society has for their work is inadequate, and that attaining academic status will automatically give them a more elevated station. The desire for recognition rises out of deep psychological needs and is therefore by no means unimportant; I believe, however, that the more tangible benefits of academic status—tenure, higher salaries, sabbaticals—constitute the authentic appeal that it has for librarians.

Consequently, I have no quarrel with those librarians who see their work as a direct contribution to the educational goals of their institutions, and who aspire to academic status with its benefits, tangible and intangible. I have difficulty, however, with the view, evidently shared by Mr. DePriest, that librarians should be granted, or should attempt to secure, status as full-fledged members of the faculty. Let me mention three problems, about which Mr. DePriest is silent, but which librarians must face if they wish to attain faculty status. There are other obstacles to the attainment of faculty status, but these seem to me important and worth restating here.

First, the institution in which librarians practice their profession vary widely. It may be, as Mr. DePriest states, that the amount of preparation required of librarians in the state colleges of Pennsylvania is greater than that demanded of faculty. This is scarcely the case, however, at institutions elsewhere. At Big Ten or Ivy League institutions, the preparation that most librarians have would compare unfavorably with that of the faculty, and librarians would be unwise to use the extent of their training as a basis for requesting faculty status. No one can pretend that librarians at prestigious institutions are more able than librarians elsewhere merely by virtue of the positions they hold; nevertheless, the criteria for faculty appointments are more severe at some institutions than at others, and librarians would be hard pressed to meet them. Some institutions, perhaps regrettably, are more equal than others.

Second, librarians have different specialties. Mr. DePriest is able to make a reasonably convincing case for faculty status for reference librarians and bibliographers on the ground that they teach library use or descriptive and analytic bibliography, formally or informally. No such case can be made for librarians in cataloging or acquisitions work, many of whom do not see a student or faculty member, except at a distance, for days at a time. Instruction, in the classroom or elsewhere, is not a factor in their lives. That their contribution to the development and use of library collections is as important as that of reference librarians or bibliographers may not be doubted, and any program to elevate the status of librarians which excludes catalogers or acquisitions librarians is unfair and, I believe, will ultimately work to the disadvantage of all librarians.

Third, not all librarians are employed by academic institutions. For librarians in public or special libraries, the issue of academic status simply does not exist, and one imagines that they must take a very detached view of the entire controversy. Librarians at academic institutions who are distressed because they do not have faculty status must decide where their primary loyalty lies, with their own profession or some other. I think of myself as a librarian, and share with colleagues at public and special libraries certain skills and work attitudes. I have considerably more in common with librarians at other institutions than with faculty at my own, and I suspect that this is true of librarians in general. In my experience, it is certainly true of other
professions: physicians who are attached to schools of medicine are physicians first and faculty second; similarly, lawyers are lawyers first, clergy are clergy first, and so on. The primary recognition which the practitioner of a profession receives comes by way of his profession; genuine recognition will come to librarians only to the extent that we are able to establish a social need for our services, not because we have been successful in attaching ourselves to teaching faculty.

None of this is meant to disparage the importance of the role librarians play in the educational process. Recognition for this role, however, must be based on the work librarians do, not on our occasional participation in teaching. Nothing demonstrates our contempt for our own profession more surely than our continual agitation to be made part of the faculty.

First steps toward recognition for librarians as librarians have been taken at some institutions. A recent management study at Columbia, for example, recommended three general classes for university staff, officers of instruction, officers of administration, and officers of the library. Something like this, providing recognition for librarians as a separate academic group, is to be preferred to straight faculty status, since it would recognize the unique nature of the work done by librarians, and it would go a great way toward resolving the profitless debate about faculty status in which we now find ourselves.

Robert Balay  
Head, Reference Department  
Yale University Library  
New Haven, Connecticut

To the Editor:

Library literature is so often characterized by the same kind of drivel found in other educationally oriented journals that one despairs of ever finding an original observation couched in a felicitous style. For that reason, I found Raleigh DePriest's "That Inordinate Passion for Status" in the March 1973 issue of CRL, a stimulating and enjoyable experience. The well-written article provides ample evidence of wit and learning on the part of the writer. One nodded with approval when DePriest slighted out Gore and scolded him for his blatant and fatuous exhibitionism.

In the same issue of the journal, one had to regret that editorial revision of the McAnally-Downs article had not removed some of the redundancies. Fred Kilgour came through again with the same clichés. Rolland Stevens, as part of a great institution which recognizes the importance of the librarian as a faculty member, does a great disservice to the Illini.

To the Editor:

There is enough material in McAnally and Downs to keep the ink of commentary, if not the blood of controversy, flowing for months. The laconic Buckman note about "some effective attack on major national problems" is alone worth a major national address to the academic profession by one of the former university library directors who "opted out of" his job.

In a letter to the editor it's more logical to comment on one or more of the many intramural problems turned up by Mc. and D. I select two, both related to the library's deteriorating position in the university. (1) The library director should be a dean, or better yet, a vice-president in the manner of modern administration. Incidentally but surely, this would reestablish any lost relationship between the director and the university president. (2) A library planning committee has been suggested. But the committee should also be permanent or standing. "Planning" is useful in the title as a missionary device to keep the committee "honest," to prevent its agenda from slipping off into the trivial. The work of a library committee considering new facilities always seems vital. But there are other major issues and problems developing all the time though too often they are not recognized as such.

To the Editor:

Robert C. Sullivan's otherwise compre-
hensive basic collection of publications in the area of microform acquisitions (CRL, Jan. 1973) should have included Microform Review. Since Jan. 1972, this quarterly has published reviews of more than seventy major microform publications. Written by a subject specialist, the reviews are critical and give basic information on physical format, bibliographic apparatus, availability, and terms of payment. Each issue also includes articles and brief news items on microforms, a bibliography of recent books and articles, a list of new books appearing simultaneously in hard copy and microformat, and notices on current filming projects.

As one of the few substantive, independent journals devoted to reviewing micropublications, Microform Review has been of considerable value in our acquisitions program and should be consulted by librarians interested in microform acquisitions.

Diane K. Goon
Reference Librarian
Columbia University Libraries
New York

To the Editor:

Robert Sullivan's paper, "Microform Developments Related to Acquisitions" (CRL, Jan. 1973) is a useful and needed review of the subject. Of the several microforms he discusses, the least familiar is Computer-Output-Microfilm (COM).

Mr. Sullivan states that applications of COM are apt to be "painfully slow and expensive" and that COM is "not suitable in a situation where the data base changes rapidly." But as an alternative to publishing in hard copy, COM can be produced at such an extraordinarily low cost (one quotation: $25.00, for the first run of ten pieces of 42X microfiche containing nearly 125,000 lines of data, plus $3.00 for each copy) that data change might be excessive only if daily updating were required. His cautious optimism about its application is probably because there are so few known applications to library operations.

One application of COM whose cost has been so low it could be called "unpriceless" is the Louisiana Numerical Register (LNR), the new regional union catalog containing locations for 1,100,000 volumes in twenty-one libraries. After all costs were added including absorbed costs (keypunching, computer time, travel, salaries) and actual dollar outlays, unit costs (each data record entry) were computed to be 5.6¢ per entry, or 2.8¢ per title. One factor in the low cost is the short data record which consists entirely of the LC card order number and the letter code designating the library. Initial purchase price of the fiche for participating libraries has been set at $8.00 for the fiche, a six-page manual, and a notebook-container. Annual updates will be $3.00 or $4.00 per copy.

Statistics of use on the first conventionally printed edition of the Register containing half the number of volumes as the new COM edition, show that 50 percent of all interlibrary loan titles searched in the LNR were found in at least one of the sixteen original cooperating libraries. It would seem reasonable to expect that the new COM edition containing double the original entries would satisfy a greater number of searches and that, for the low cost of continued input and updating, would identify COM as a technique warranting considerable optimism for union catalogs and other compilations with a large number of short data records.

William E. McGrath
Director of Libraries
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Lafayette, Louisiana

To the Editor:

Despite Ellsworth Mason's long and successful association with the academic community he shows a lack of understanding of some of the processes of academic life (CRL, Nov. 1972). His statement that "in any university of quality, this means no promotion above the rank of instructor without the Ph.D. degree" is, of course, absolutely false. Many situations and disciplines do not require the Ph.D. degree for advancement. It would seem that Mr. Mason's prejudice against faculty status for librarians has prevented him from appreciating the diverse composition of college and university faculties.

In considering the "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians" I would suggest that CRL readers look beyond the inflamed rhetoric of
Mr. Mason's editorial to the facts of faculty status and investigate how it has been successfully implemented in many academic institutions.

Alan D. Hogan
Assistant Director
Systems and Processing
University of Toledo, Ohio

To the Editor:


The review states that "during one recent period 21,000 women were turned down for admission to the University of Virginia, while not one male was rejected." The reviewer was referring to testimony given by Miss P. Dee Boersma, a graduate student from Michigan, before a Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, May 7, 1970 (p. 180 of the Stimpson volume). Miss Boersma, in turn, was referring to a statement by Congresswoman Griffiths before the House of Representatives on March 9, 1970, in which she said (without providing documentation): "In the State of Virginia 21,000 women were turned down for college entrance, while not one male student was rejected." (Congressional Record, March 9, 1970, p. 6396).

The review attributed to one institution within the state figures that were supposedly applicable to the entire Commonwealth of Virginia. The review also used the phrase "during one recent period." It is true during the nineteenth century that the University of Virginia and several other institutions within Virginia were all-male schools. The University, however, became co-educational at the graduate and professional levels during the first half of the twentieth century, and was co-educational at all levels in 1970.

Although less serious than the error in quotation, the review as published stated incorrectly the title of the book and also misspelled the author's first name.

Kenneth G. Peterson
Associate University Librarian
University of Virginia
Charlottesville

To the Editor:

Anent the illuminating and gratifying article by Ms. Pamela Reeves, "Junior College Libraries Enter the Seventies" CRL, Jan. 1973): in the last paragraph she paid a nice compliment to Macomb-South (Michigan).

In 1964 I started the library, developed the concept of a learning media center (library, A-V/ETV, programed education), helped design and equip an 89,000 square foot, three-level building, etc., etc.

On January 5, 1973, I was informed that my contract was not to be renewed for 1973-74. Moreover, the position, library director, has been eliminated.

A real gasser, wouldn't you say?

Laurence R. Ebbing
Library Director
Macomb County Community College
Warren, Michigan

To the Editor:

Impressed by the following article in CRL and would like five reprint copies to share with our administration.—McAnally, Arthur M. and Downs, Robert B., "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," CRL 34:103-25 (March 1973).

Although addressed to directors of university libraries, I found much of the material very relevant to my work as director of a modest-sized but growing college library.

Professionally, I have two suggestions. It would be good to develop a symposium around our " . . Changing Role." After more than a decade of service in three college libraries, I have concluded that not only the director but each professional librarian has a unique status and service role as a librarian. We are neither administrators although we have administrative duties—nor are most of us "full" faculty. The faculty will be the first ones to inform us that we are not teachers as they are. Yet most of them admit that we have a supportive teaching service. Caught in this profes-
sional dilemma, I have been working on an article, “The Librarian as a Tertium Quid” or third substance, neither divine faculty nor down-to-earth human administration; but a librarian—the best of both, of course.

My other suggestion is to share with my colleagues the following poem. The McAnally-Downs article stresses, along with other things, our need for more money in the library. It is a comfort to know that large university libraries have the same problems we do in colleges across the country. More than once a week I gain some solace from the perspective of the lines which Sam Walter Foss read at an ALA meeting in 1906. It is good to know that more than two decades before I was born, librarians were concerned about their need for more money. The following poem sits on my desk:

“Sing, O Muse! the Head Librarian . . . weighted with the lore of time, Trying to expend a dollar when he only has a dime; Tailoring appropriations—and how deftly he succeeds, Fitting his poor thousand dollars to his million dollar needs.”

From The Song of the Library Staff, written by Sam Walter Foss and read by him at the 1906 Annual Meeting of the American Library Association.

Charles E. Nairn
Director of Library
Lake Superior State College
Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan

To the Editor:

The late Arthur M. McAnally and Robert Downs’ very interesting piece, “The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries,” (CRL, Mar. 1973) seems to raise more questions than it answers. The issues and solutions that are presented only partially identify and treat the ailments generated by the increasing number of head librarian positions vacant at major universities in the United States. Some of the problems that were omitted or briefly discussed are: the lack of leadership by library directors, the errors in the selection and appointment process for new library directors, the poor administrative preparation, the myth of the Ph.D. as a credential for administration, the composition of faculty search committees and their reliance on other head librarians, the limited administrative talent available in the heirs apparent, and the failure of librarians to orchestrate their opinions concerning the changing role of library directors to faculty and university administrators and decision makers.

Many head librarians could generate considerable support from their presidents, chancellors and upper echelon administrators if they could marshal information concerning their problems and then disseminate it via a medium used by these individuals. Before this happens, however, all of the problem areas should be uncovered, even if they cause several head librarians and aspiring young directors anxiety. I believe that Paul Wasserman’s words on library leadership should be read carefully (in his recent book The New Librarianship: Challenge for Change), along with Warren Bennis’ recent article on “The University Leader” (Saturday Review, Dec. 9, 1972).

Concerning the development of a screening mechanism for library managers, Robert C. Albrow’s article, “How to Spot Executives Early,” based on Dr. Saul Gellerman’s research (Fortune, July 1968) should be required reading. This leaves ACRL, ARL, and the Council on Library Resources with the question, “what are you doing about this problem and how do you intend to communicate it to academic faculty and administrators?” If more research is needed, how about letting some young Turks get in on it?

Obviously, the changing role of library directors is a growing problem. However, all aspects of the problem should be investigated. For getting us to focus our attention on this matter, the article by McAnally and Downs deserves great praise. Thank you, CRL, for printing it.

Robert P. Haro
Associate University Librarian
University of Southern California

To the Editor:

Arthur McAnally and Robert Downs have written one of the finest articles I’ve seen in CRL. Directors must adapt to endure, they say. True enough. But others will say this makes directors mere pawns of the times. I say the pawns who gain con-
To the Editor:

If and when you are ready to move with a separate organization for academic librarians, you can be assured that I will be available to do whatever is needed to get it off the ground.

Hendrik Edelman
Assistant Director
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

To the Editor:

I am writing to answer a question you asked in the editor's note preceding the article “The Academic Job Crisis: A Unique Opportunity, or Business as Usual?” by W. A. Moffett, CRL 34:191-97 (May 1973).

In response to the question, “Should a subject specialist Ph.D. be required to obtain a library degree as a demonstration of professional commitment?”, I feel he most certainly should. How can librarians refer to themselves as members of a profession if the library degree is not required for membership?

Though we all know it is possible to achieve competency in many fields without a degree and that a degree itself is no guarantee of competency, formal educational requirements are prerequisites for membership in most professions. To teach in an elementary or secondary school one must complete certain education courses, even though it is possible for one to become a successful teacher without education courses. One can learn law without obtaining a law degree, but a law degree is required in most instances to qualify one to take the bar examination.

Why should librarianship be different? If librarianship is a profession, there should be formal degree requirements for membership. Perhaps the library school curriculum should be changed but not the requirement that one must first obtain a library degree to become a member of the profession. This requirement should be vigorously supported as a demonstration of professional commitment. Not to require the degree defeats the integrity of the profession which many have worked to achieve.

John E. Pickron
Head, Acquisitions Department
Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana

To the Editor:

As a recent library school graduate who is a subject specialist as well as former Ph.D. candidate in English, I believe I am in a very good position to comment upon the issues raised in Mr. Moffett’s article. Mr. Moffett cites a surplus of Ph.D. holders “in every major discipline,” and as an historian, goes on to discuss the especially critical oversupply in his field. My own field is English literature which most observers agree is as overcrowded as history. It is my belief that it is primarily from these two fields, English and history, that the library profession is getting the greatest number of refugees. There are other routes for the job-hungry mathematician or sociologist to take, but the options available to the exprofessor of history or literature are strictly limited. We need more subject experts in the fields of physics, economics, and especially computer science, to become librarians. How many history or English bibliographers can the nation’s libraries employ?

Also, I believe that the library schools are currently attracting many applicants like myself who switched from a Ph.D. program in English (or history, philosophy, languages, or art) into library science. My own decision was made after I taught in a liberal arts college for a short time and came to the conclusion that it simply was not worth the effort, time, and money required to finish my Ph.D. degree (at least not at that time) when I would probably not find a teaching job after I completed it. I did a small scale study of the changing job market for librarians while I was in library school in which I came to the conclusion that the library profession is facing a massive influx of frustrated humanists who have not been able to find teaching jobs, especially on the college level. My reading, conversations with colleagues, and experi-
ence as a job seeker have all been confirming this opinion in the almost two years since I wrote that paper. I sincerely believe that we librarians are in danger of allowing our profession to become as overcrowded and suicidally competitive as the profession of college teaching in the humanities. We seem to have learned nothing from the experience of these other fields. Enrollment in our library schools grows and grows, despite a contracting job market and a generally gloomy economic climate. Enrollment at my own library school rose 30 per cent the year that I began my studies there.

Who is going to take the responsibility for trying to prevent our already tight job market from becoming ridiculously overcrowded? I feel that many library school administrators are deceiving themselves by saying, "There are plenty of jobs available, look at the vacancy listings in Library Journal, CRL Newsletter, American Libraries, and the Sunday New York Times." Yet, upon closer examination, these advertisements usually are for middle level management positions or for other types of jobs which require experience in the profession. It seems to me that this problem simply must be faced immediately by both the library schools and our professional organizations. ACRL should strongly recommend that library schools consider limiting enrollments. Perhaps even some kind of quota system is needed for limiting the influx of excollege teachers in the humanities. Academic libraries need economists, psychologists, mathematicians, computer experts, and not an ever increasing horde of humanists.

I would also like to comment on the editorial remarks at the beginning of Mr. Moffett's article. I am aware that some people have contended that subject specialists do not need a general knowledge of the principles of librarianship, and I disagree with this contention. It is vitally important that the subject specialist librarian know intimately the book trade, and the bibliographic structure of his discipline as well as possess a vast knowledge of the subject matter itself. The mere possession of an M.A. or Ph.D. degree certainly does not qualify the holder as a subject specialist librarian. This is not to say that the possession of an M.S. degree in library science qualifies its holder as a librarian either. What is essential is a lot of experience with libraries, and with library related work. This includes a real understanding of the operations of a library, e.g. acquisitions procedures, classification systems, etc. This is the knowledge that is needed by the subject specialist if he is to effectively serve the needs of his academic constituents. He must be able to interpret the library and its operations to the members of his department. We all know many professors who are very competent in their narrow specialities, but who do not have the bibliographic sophistication needed to carry out a literature search in some other related area, even one that is within the limits of their own disciplines. Thus it seems to me that a subject specialist Ph.D. needs this grounding in the principles and practices of librarianship not only "as a demonstration of professional commitment" but also as a real preparation for offering quality library service to the academic community.

Eric J. Carpenter
Bibliographer, English and American Literature
Lockwood Memorial Library
Buffalo, New York

To the Editor:

The librarian has been called the "last of the generalists," and Dr. Moffett's suggestion in your May issue of CRL that having a specialty piled higher and deeper is a necessary advantage is erroneous, except for those few huge academic libraries that can support a subject specialist in a specific subfield.

Thank God the day is past when the typical librarian was a retread from another profession who averted his glance and muttered in embarrassment when you asked what he did for a living. Today's librarian is a proud librarian who may go back for some additional training which he has judged will improve his performance.

So, when Dr. Moffett receives his library degree, I'd advise him to apply for a position as a librarian who just happens to have an advanced degree in history which might be of some use.

After all, it's a truism in personnel administration that you never offer a position to the applicant who can't find another job;
you offer it to the one who is already in demand.

Phillip Wesley, Director
Educational Resources Center
California State College
Dominguez Hills, California

To the Editor:

It was touching to read “Professionalism Dismissed?” The usual present day debunking, iconoclastic, and hopeless viewpoints were expounded with sophomoric academicism.

It is unnecessary and inappropriate to discuss one of the newer, lesser professions analogously with older, prestigious ones. Let real librarians rather be busy, as they have been, doing their often demanding, and intricate work (for example, the cataloging of rare books) in their own unassuming, ethical, and professional manner. May the present, and future generations carry on this fine and commendatory work with “their eyes straight before them,” instead of being diverted by present day systems of looking in all directions, and getting little of worth accomplished, but rather, attend to their own business, and a higher and more recognized professionalism will be the inevitable result.

Harold B. Martin
Librarian, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

To the Editor:

I found Simmons student Leo N. Flanagan’s article on “Professionalism Dismissed” (CRL, May 1973) interesting and provocative.

Carefully avoiding the dust-worn traditional Webster’s 3rd outside my office door, I came home this evening to my Random House to seek out advice on what the word “professional” means in a modern context. The first definition stated that it meant “following an occupation as a means of livelihood or for gain.” The ninth and last was “an expert player, as of golf or tennis, hired by a club, community, etc.” The rest were not much better. Several were worse! Frankly, it appears that the term “professional” has lost its meaning in recent decades.

Could it be that we could drop this whole fetish about professionalism and bury Melvil Dewey’s unfortunate statements about it? It is possible to replace it with having our nameplates followed with our advanced degrees: M.L.S., M.S.L.S., Ph.D. We should notice that our doctor does not call himself “doctor” but rather John Doe, M.D. And your dentist calls himself a D.D.S. Why not a similar identification for librarians?

David Y. Sellers
Planning and Budget Officer
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

To the Editor:

Leo Flanagan’s “Professionalism Dismissed” (CRL, May 1973) has several interesting and some valid conclusions, but his discussion is not sufficiently rigorous. For example, he falls into the error of assuming that because all librarians are not at the top peak of professionalism, that librarianship is not a profession! But the existence of unlicensed (or bad) doctors or accountants does not invalidate these professions.

What should have been mentioned in the very valuable article is a real definition of what professionalism involves. If I may attempt an ad hoc description, it would be along these lines:

A professional person is one with a specifically trained capability in a definite field of intellectual knowledge or service. This field is so specialized (e.g. tax law) that the majority of the public is obliged to consult the professional in his professional capacity in order to get any insight in the field.

But the catch to all this as far as library work is concerned is that librarians are supposed to be familiar with all knowledge, or at least know where to find out about virtually anything.

So perhaps in the strictest sense of being professional, that one knows everything about one’s field, it is impossible for a librarian. Even Goethe, as the Duke of Hesse-Weimar’s librarian, could not know everything. (But which doctor knows everything about medicine?)

Yet in a very real sense, a librarian can know where to find out about say 90 percent or more of what he is likely to be asked, which is something only an excep-
tionally well-trained professional could be expected to do. Evidently, no untrained or unprofessional person could handle this type of work, on this level.

Flanagan's comparison to a grocer is invalid; even a supermarket does not need a card index, and most people shop unaided. I have liked to compare a library with a shoe store, in that all sizes have to be kept in stock, in spite of knowing that they will not all be used. But for a real comparison to a library, it is necessary to come up with a competitor, e.g. a book store. Now a book clerk with the subject guide to *Books in Print* under the counter can be fairly knowledgeable, but I think it is evident that he will not know books and information sources as a librarian will. And of course a librarian has more reference books at hand. So a librarian is a professional informant in a way that a book clerk is not expected to be.

But it seems a little extreme for Mr. Flanagan to imply that without the library equivalent of the A.M.A., we are not a profession! We know that national associations of this type have a tendency to become more interested in lobbying than in maintaining professional standards. But the criteria for a professional association are not its wealth and its clout, but whether its members are a profession. (And the definition of a professional as a member of a professional association is putting the cart before the horse. Training, ability, and expertise are the criteria of professionalism, not simply card-holding.)

There may not be any way of determining what the relative percentage of request types is on a general basis, but I would say that the average inquiring patron wants to know:

1. the answer to a specific question (i.e. information), or
2. a book or article on a specific subject (say, "book").

Thus it is not as important for the librarian to know "everything" as it is for him to know how to put information in the patron's hands in usable form. I.e. knowledge is most valuable as improving communication technique.

Also it is vital for a librarian not to be an ideologue who has the "authority" to force his views on a patron. The patron is assumed to be able to make up his own mind on presentation of the "evidence." Any librarian worthy of the name will learn as much or more from an unusual or differently stated question than the patron himself, rather than being an omniscient superior being who can lay down the law.

The comparison with a druggist (or rather pharmacist) is also invalid; the pharmacist bears the same type of relationship to a doctor that a bookseller does to a librarian.

Of course librarians who are more involved with management or processes are not as directly concerned with information-giving to the public. But I don't see how anyone can claim that managers are not professional, even if it is a different type of profession.

Nor is the librarians supposed to be concerned with the souls of men, except to the extent of presenting the truth to make men free to discover their own souls. Even a philosopher could not give usable "soul" information to the average patron; this is a field for the professional social worker or minister. It would not be reasonable to expect librarians to take on such moral responsibilities outside their profession. But they should fully explain to the patron what advisory services of this type are available, and provide direct contacts if necessary. (This doesn't mean that one can never offer a patron a book that will inspire him.)

The library profession is not one of faith (except in knowledge), but of works. The last thing that a librarian should be is the priest of a faith, even of Dewey. Information is often too transient to become a matter of dogma to be imposed on the public. Besides, the average patron would refuse to be brainwashed in this way.

(The "lifetime of personal growth" that a librarian should strive for is not a matter of faith, but of expanding his professional capacity, i.e. his works) [ditto, his wanting to "serve his fellow men"].)

It is unreasonable to expect librarians to "first become masters of" all subjects before providing information on them. No one, not even a scientist, knows what electricity really is. Yet librarians must be able to recommend appropriate books on electricity every day. Nor does anyone know the solutions to all of the social and econom-
ic problems of today. But we still must know the best answers that are available, and go to any reasonable (or unreasonable) lengths to provide such material for patrons. Librarians should be masters of books (in preference to theoretical knowledge as such) and lackeys, or rather servants, of the public. (cf. Gilbert’s “We are Venetian gondoliers—your equals in everything except our calling, and in that at once your masters and your servants.”)

“When librarians acquire professional faith and professional competence . . .” is clearly the wrong emphasis. Not all the faith in the world can substitute for the minimum adequate competence that a librarian must possess before he should attempt to stand before the public as an expert.

Mr. Flanagan’s credo, “Professionalism . . . implies the power to do what one says one wants to do” is unclear. All librarians should work for the reform of their institutions, and maximizing their effectiveness in providing the public with required information. But the very professionalism that Mr. Flanagan so forcefully and ably urges would not be furthered by having each librarian be a power unto himself to do his own thing as if in a vacuum. Professionalism means working within the profession.

It is difficult to believe that most librarians would not find the following activities mentioned by Mr. Flanagan a drag, and a distraction from their primary informational function:

1. “deciding new systems” (only a board can do this);
2. “finding money and spending it” (fund raising?!);
3. “diverting government spies” (1) (Mata Haris in the stacks?);
4. “diverting shifty politicians”; 
5. “diverting self-appointed censors.”

“The broad knowledge” that librarians should acquire in these mostly extraneous fields could only be at the expense of professional requirements. The picture of the librarian as vigilante and self-righteous crusader is not an attractive one. A librarian who seeks to impose his views as infallible on everyone inside and out of the library is primarily an indoctrinator on an ego trip rather than someone who genuinely wants to improve both institutions and public service. Would a lawyer who wanted to write his own law be considered professional?

Most of Mr. Flanagan’s recommendations for longer education for librarians are sensible and valuable. (Although Ivan Illich’s cure for the schools, i.e. closing them, would not work for libraries either.)

But implying that the A.L.A. should be the equivalent of the A.M.A., is again the wrong emphasis; professional standards criteria are more important. Perhaps what we need is something like the British chartered librarian standard; like the C.P.A. certificate for accountants.

It is not clear what Mr. Flanagan means by “big unions” “taking over libraries and librarians’ functions.” The other biggies are all too evident. But should libraries try to compete with IBM by buying a computer system? And the implication that indoctrination or “political” type polarization of librarians is the answer for combatting the electronic information media monopoly is a delusion.

(The author evidently needs more experience in the field, where he will surely make his mark. His idealism is tonic, and may his sense of the practical soon be equally impressive.)

Philip L. Forstall
Rand McNally Library
Skokie, Illinois

Following by several years his compilation The Black Librarian in America, E. J. Josey, chief of the Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries for the New York State Education Department, has submitted another collection of statements and remarks from black librarians throughout the nation. What Black Librarians Are Saying is a highly uneven and disjointed conglomeration of relevant and irrelevant essays and articles on a diversity of subjects ranging from outreach programs designed to support in a flexible manner the needs of inner city residents to pleas for a greater utilization and awareness of nonprint media. Little effort was apparently made to edit the selections, with the result that the various articles are terribly repetitive. The publisher of the work has not helped matters along, given the careless proofreading of the typescript.

Josey's compilation is divided into seven parts: A Theoretical But a Pragmatical Problem; Black Communities and Informational Needs; On Academic Libraries; An Intellectual Freedom Question; Critical Issues in Library Education; Organizing for Professional Action; Toward Better Public Library Service for Black People; and Librarians as Perpetrators of Change. There is considerable overlapping between the sections. The first section of the work is taken up with a long, garbled and almost impenetrable essay by Walter J. Fraser concerning the dilemma faced by the black librarian deeply immersed in the techniques of his profession while at the same time feeling the compulsion to use his painfully acquired skills to better the lot of the black community. Part Two contains four essays dealing with the problem of designing materials that will be of the greatest possible use to the black community as well as imploing librarians to use a variety of approaches in attempting to communicate with ghetto children. Edward C. Mapp contributes an essay covering in summary fashion the varying approaches used by different public and private institutions in Brooklyn to accomplish the above.

The section concerning the relationship of academic libraries to blackness describes ways and means by which college and university libraries might open their doors and offer their services to minority populations along with basic data illustrating the creation of black studies sections within university libraries and accompanying black studies programs. Several of the contributors to this section discuss current programs designed to build up the resources of libraries in predominantly black universities and provide additional training for the staffs of these institutions.

Jeanne English's "What Price Freedom, Angela Davis?" constitutes the fourth division of the text, describing her efforts to preserve from censorship a display concerning Angela Davis' fight for freedom in the Evanston (Illinois) Township High School. Although she emerged triumphant in this struggle, Ms. English uses the embroilment to illustrate the implicit racism to be found in even the most supposedly liberal educational establishments and the need for black faculty and librarians to unite in remaining alert to such conscious or unconscious establishment efforts at thought control.

The last four parts of Josey's compilation contain essays varying in content from pleas for librarians to organize into unions; the necessity for professionals including black librarians to form caucuses within their respective professional societies and even within library systems; the manner in which blacks should be encouraged to use the resources of special libraries and a call for a great increase in the recruitment of
blacks by library schools and, if need be, preferential treatment by these agencies.

In summary the contributions to this compilation are remarkably sober and rational in tone, with very few of the essayists engaging in polemical attack for its own sake. There is a great deal of merit in the views expressed which makes the lack of editorial coordination and condensation all the more deplorable.—Norman Lederer, Director, University of Wisconsin System Ethnic & Minority Studies Center, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point.


Charles Berlin has made an important and valuable contribution to Jewish bibliography. He has compiled an index to 243 Festschriften in Jewish studies by author and subject. To this he has added a “List of Festschriften indexed.”

“An index to 243 Festschriften (in 259 volumes) is provided here. It should be noted that occasional articles in Jewish studies that are to be found in Festschriften dealing with other subjects are beyond the scope of this Index.” (p. ix.) Charles Berlin has done yeoman work in gathering together such a vast number of Festschriften and indexing them in competent fashion. It is true that these many Festschriften were an “hitherto uncharted body of literature.” However, an even more uncharted body of literature are the occasional articles in Jewish studies that are to be found in Festschriften dealing with other subjects. It is certainly a tremendous undertaking to index 243 Festschriften. Berlin accomplished the task well and the world of learning is indebted to him for it. But, the world of learning remains without an index to those “occasional articles” scattered throughout the volumes of published scholarship. It is regrettable that Charles Berlin was not willing to undertake this crucial task as part of this Index. Somehow one also has the feeling that the list itself is hardly exhaustive.

Berlin has wisely composed and listed separately from his Index a “list of Festschriften indexed” in which the Festschriften are arranged according to the name of the honoree. This list can serve as a check list of library holdings. Beneath the collation is a note indicating the name of the editor, if any. This note is not always an indication of the form of main entry in use by the Library of Congress. In those cases when the main entry is a corporate body one is often at a loss to determine the correct form of entry.

For example, the Ginzberg Festschrift was entered under the American Academy for Jewish Research. The Kaplan Festschrift was edited by Moshe Davis but the main entry is the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The Marx Festschrift (1950) is entered under the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Finally, the Wolfson Festschrift although edited by Saul Lieberman is entered under the American Academy for Jewish Research.

“It should be noted that the Index is not a library catalogue: an author’s name has generally been recorded as given in the article. .. . It should be stressed that the very exacting and time-consuming procedures employed to ‘establish’ an author’s form of name in an official library catalogue have generally not been used here. Nevertheless, an effort has been made to see to it that all articles by the same person are entered under the same form of name. .. .” (p. xii.)

It would indeed have been better to have established the forms of names of authors in accordance with the requirements of the standard manual for bibliographers in the Library of Congress entitled Bibliographical Procedures & Style, by Blanche Prichard McCrum and Helen Dudenbostel Jones. Were that done it might have been possible to avoid a group of errors in form of entry:

Irving A. Agus was entered in that form as well as Abraham Isaac Agus on the same page 2.

Shaul Esh was entered as Shaul Ash on page 5.

Yehudah Avida (p. 7) was entered as Jehuda Leib Zlotnik on page 118, but as Judah Loeb Zlotnik on page xi.

Naphtali Ben-Menahem (p. 12) was also entered under his former name, Naftali Fried (p. 36).

Haim B. Rosen was entered under that form of name on page 88 but under his earlier name, Haim Rozenraukh on page 90.
There is a basic rule of entry for authors who have changed their names. They are to be entered under the latest name used. This is clearly stated in rule 41 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, North American text. The Library of Congress' manual for bibliographers specifies that "the basic principles governing author entry are expressed in rules provided in ALA." (p. 31.) Underlying these rules is the fact that readers are not prone to remembering old names that are no longer in use. In point of fact, who can remember that Zalman Shazar was born Salman Rubaschow, for example?

What is to be gained, therefore, by entering Shin Shalom as Schalom Josef Schapira with a cross-reference from Shin Shalom? Who will recall in future years that Meir Bar-Ilan was once known as Meir Berlin (p. 15) or Meyer Berlin (p. 134)? In the later case not even a cross-reference is provided.

"The subject index lists some 1,600 subject headings arranged alphabetically. . . . Subject headings have been adapted from the Harvard College Library List of Subject Headings Used in the Public Catalogue. Cambridge, 1964." (p. xii.) This decision is to be regretted since the Index is hardly part of the public catalog of Widener Library. Since the Index is intended for national and international use, Berlin would have been better advised to use the list best known on a national and international basis, that of the Library of Congress.

Even if the choice of subject heading list were satisfactory, much remains undone within the subject index. Whereas many subject headings were subdivided in good fashion, many were left without adequate treatment. For example, Arabic language and literature has a total of forty-three articles which received a total of six subdivisions. Aramaic language and literature has a total of thirty-one articles which received a total of three subdivisions. However, Akkadian language and literature has a total of forty-three articles which are all grouped together without any subdivisions at all.

The same holds true for many other subject headings. Dead Sea Scrolls has eighty-eight articles with no subdivisions. Germany, Italy, Jerusalem, Law—Jewish, Liturgy and Ritual, Moses ben Maimon, New Testament, Talmud Bavli, Zionism all extend for several pages each with no subdivisions whatsoever.

Personal subject headings are abundant. One would have hoped for a greater concord between the form of entry in the author index and that of the subject index. Such an attempt at concord might have prevented the following series of conflicts in form of entry:

**Author Index**
- Amiel, Moshe Avigdor p. 4
- Aptowitzer, Avigdor p. 5
- Hoffman, David Tsevi p. 51
- Rowley, H. H. p. 89
- Thomas, D. Winton p. 104
- Yalon, Henoch p. 115

**Subject Index**
- Amiel, Moses Avigdor p. 125
- Aptowitzer, Victor p. 126
- Hoffmann, David p. 212
- Rowley, Harold Henry p. 284
- Thomas, David Winton p. 304
- Yalon, Hanokh p. 312

Sometimes the same person is entered in two ways within the same Subject index. On page 289 the reader finds Moses Schreiber whereas on page 294 the reader finds Moses Sofer.

Sometimes the author and subject indexes agree on one form of the name so as to disagree with the form of the name used for the honoree in the "List of Festschriften Indexed." Yitshak Baer (p. 8, 132) is the form of name in the author and subject indexes whereas Yitzhak Fritz Baer (p. xvii) is the form in the "List of Festschriften Indexed." Sometimes the subject index agrees with the "List of Festschriften Indexed" and disagrees with the author index. It is Pinkhos Churgin (p. xx, 165) in the former two and Pinchas Churgin (p. 22) in the author index. The reader may similarly choose between Morris R. Cohen (p. xx, 165) and Morris Raphael Cohen (p. 23).

In short, it is not hard to cite examples of what may go wrong if one decides not to "establish" authors and personal subjects.

It is to be regretted that there is no title index nor is there any justification given for not having such an index. The manual for bibliographers issued by the Library of Congress (p. 45) requires romanization of titles in Hebrew characters. Regrettably this was not done in the Index.
Despite all these shortcomings the fact remains that Charles Berlin has performed well an important and much needed task. Jewish scholarship now has a valuable reference tool. The world of learning is much indebted to Charles Berlin for it.—Sheldon R. Brunswick, Head, Near Eastern Office, University of California Library, Berkeley.


The time lapse between preparation and publication is a drawback to this supplement, whose materials themselves reflect the same time gap. Both the author’s preface and the publisher’s releases stipulate that the items summarized range from mid-1964 through 1969, which of necessity restricts information in the items themselves to early in the year of 1969, allowing for preparation and publication. This information cannot be considered the most recent advances in the field.

There is virtually no information on networking. Due to the time lapse, there is no reference to FAUL, OCLC, NELINET, BALLOTS, CSLSI, or TIE. The user should note these limitations and search elsewhere for recent advances. A significant article on the Colorado Academic Libraries Book Processing Center, which was published in the Winter 1969 issue of *Library Resources & Technical Services,* well within the preparation period of this Supplement, is not included.

References from both the author index and the subject index are sometimes difficult to locate in the text. The author referral may be to a name listed within an abstract. Indexing is not complete or entirely clear. SDI (Selective Dissemination of Information) systems are referenced in a group from pages 415-26, where they appear in alphabetical author order under that heading, yet several articles on SDI are introduced in a separate section on Current Awareness. The distinction between Current Awareness and Selective Dissemination of Information is blurred when an abstract states that a system “promotes current awareness—through SDI notifications” (p. 410).

Although emphasis is laid upon the inclusion of the widespread use of computers in this supplement, the user is advised to consult additional sources with more detailed and precise subject entries and more comprehensive coverage of the material.

In general, the clarity of the abstracts reflects the care exercised in their preparation. There is a generous amount of retrospective information, particularly in the more stable fields of planning library facilities, noncomputer acquisition and cataloging techniques, and handling special types of materials. For those with limited access to the standard indexes and abstracts in the field of library and information sciences, this monograph could be of assistance.—Gloria Terwilliger, Director, Learning Resources, Northern Virginia Community College, Bailey’s Crossroads, Virginia.


One of the aspects so often criticized in library and information science by the users and designers of organized systems of information is the inefficiency of subject retrieval. Most of the criticism stems from personal frustration and not from any evaluative investigation. Mr. Christ recognizes this state-of-the-art and has developed an investigation into the structure of the subject heading provided in academic library card catalogs. The study examines the meaning and function of headings in the area of social science, the main purpose being to determine the congruence between terminology in the social sciences and subject headings used by libraries. The three specific objectives are: (1) to determine if key social science terms are connotatively similar to subject headings, (2) to determine if such similarity, or lack of it, facilitates retrieval, and (3) to determine if the degree of similarity varies for different types of social science terms.

There are several secondary issues introduced which of necessity may affect the data and conclusions of the study. These include the nature and use of the academic library card catalog, how and why re-
searchers need to know literature searching techniques, and the importance of interdisciplinary developments on the effectiveness of bibliographical activities. Chapter one compares 665 general social science terms with those found in the Library of Congress Subject Heading List; chapter two relates the subject heading and interdisciplinary social science terms; chapter three compares subject headings and terms in sociology; chapter four compares subdivisions in social science with subject headings; chapter five compares the term “value”; and chapters six and seven deal with the degree to which subject headings refer to books basic to the study of the field.

The author draws both general and specific conclusions. He finds that there is a wide conceptual gulf between social science and library science (or rather how library science looks at social science) and that it seems evident that such a gulf only complicates research and teaching in social science. The results indicate a need for a philosophical change within library science to perhaps a more contemporary approach. The subject heading approach of library science does not meet the needs of social science.

The author has made a relatively simple exploratory step into a much needed area of research. He has designed a methodology which is relatively sound and within a narrowly defined area is valid. There might be some question as to the validity of comparing two schemes which are philosophically opposed to start with, one designed as an index to an encyclopedia, and the other designed as a broad subject access to a general collection of books. This may be somewhat incidental to the problem however. More fundamental is the question that aside from proving that library terminology is dated, is there evidence of a need for a philosophical change in approach? The subject heading approach of library science does not meet the needs of social science.

The author has made a relatively simple exploratory step into a much needed area of research. He has designed a methodology which is relatively sound and within a narrowly defined area is valid. There might be some question as to the validity of comparing two schemes which are philosophically opposed to start with, one designed as an index to an encyclopedia, and the other designed as a broad subject access to a general collection of books. This may be somewhat incidental to the problem however. More fundamental is the question that aside from proving that library terminology is dated, is there evidence of a need for a philosophical change in approach?

What is demonstrated beautifully in this study is the proverbial iceberg. The reader is presented with a picture much larger than what is actually explored, a whole series of variable factors, implications, and generalizations which occasionally eclipse the basic objectives. This is perhaps a stylistic problem but it does detract somewhat from the palatability of the study. It should not detract however from the uniqueness of approach, the attempt to establish valid measures where none existed before, and the identification of many much more complex problems and needs for further research. In this sense the study could prove to be a cornerstone.—Ann F. Painter, Associate Professor, Drexel University, Philadelphia.


Congratulations to editor Ellis Mount for producing this attractive and well-designed volume of readings which is something of a landmark reference work in library planning. Compiled from a series of papers presented at a seminar entitled “Blueprint for the ‘70s,” sponsored by the New York Chapter of SLA on April 23, 1971, this guide is, by the way, a sequel to the volume edited by Chester M. Lewis in 1963 entitled Special Libraries: How to Plan and Equip Them, which grew out of a library planning seminar sponsored by SLA in 1958.

It is gratifying to see so many familiar names among the contributors to this manual. Anything Liz Gibson writes might well be accepted as gospel even without reading it! We feel the same way about Gordon Randall, Jeanette Rockwell (née Sledge), Jean Flegal, Jean Deuss, and our other SLA author-colleagues. These people know their business and their essays prove it.

The papers cover all aspects of the planning process, from initial concepts through layout, interior design, and selection of furniture and equipment. Procedures for moving and remodeling libraries are also discussed. Each article is concise, factual, practical, well-defined, and illustrated, if appropriate. “Space Utilization in a Special Library: Making Do with What You Get,” by Gordon Randall, offers some particularly helpful formulae for estimating the collection area.

In addition to the essays, special mention should be made of the two excellent checklists and the bibliography of selected literature contained in the manual. The Rockwell/Flegal “Checklist with Guidelines for Library Planning” is a remarkably thorough ready-reference for the library ad-
ministrator to use in developing initial planning concepts, in formulating the planned program, and in organizing the details of layout, construction, and moving. Loretta J. Kiersky's "Selection of a Microfilm Reader: A Checklist" is noteworthy for offering a basis for examining new or updated equipment. Janice Kreider's "Bibliography on Library Planning" is useful, listing entries covering the period 1963-70, this updating Gertrude Schutze's bibliography which surveys the literature through 1962.

Seven well-selected examples of special library floor plans, six examples of new libraries, and one example of a remodeling, are also included at the back of the manual. These examples of library planning represent a variety of types, from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York Library to the Metropolitan Museum of Art Slide Library. Each example is appropriately annotated in order to be of maximum use to the reader.

Further features of the manual include a brief classified directory of manufacturers and suppliers of library equipment. A section entitled "Location of Manufacturers and Suppliers" provides addresses for the agents mentioned in the classified directory. This section is followed by a general index to the volume.

We highly recommend this impressive manual. It can be used by anyone faced with the challenging prospect of planning a library—not just us "Specials" but any kind of librarian.—Charlotte Georgi and Judith Truelson, Graduate School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles.


This is the author's dissertation for the Information Science Ph.D. at Pittsburgh. A broad statement of its aims (they change in some important details as the book progresses) is (a) to study the effects of a new mechanized information service—SDI from CA-Condensates, the machine-readable version of Chemical Abstracts—upon existing library services, specifically the availability of those current chemical periodicals subsequently requested by users of the search service, and (b) to try, from this, to construct a decision model for the acquisition of such periodicals. The first of these is a problem currently exercising almost everyone working in this area; realization of the second seems still some way off, but both are certainly reasonable topics for a doctoral project.

The usual dissertation format is followed; review of the literature, background to the investigation, method of operation, report of work, evaluation of results. However, it transpired that the first part of the work yielded no data on usage, because no usage could be observed; the second part was thus never even approached.

It is a commonplace that some investigations do turn out to be dead ends; that is in the nature of honest scientific inquiry, it need not render the effort valueless, and it is not the point at issue here. Unfortunately Ms. Duncan apparently neither saw nor was shown an appropriate means to extricate herself, and the result is a confused and disappointing study. One example will suffice. Her data showing no discernible relationship between the CA-Condensates output sent to a chemist and that chemist's demand for current periodical literature, Ms. Duncan decided to observe in the Pitt Chemistry Library the use of the printed Chemical Abstracts, in hopes of discovering by field-work something of a chemist's information habits. She watched for one hour forty minutes at different times of day for five working weeks and she logged precisely one usage, which was not, as ill-luck would have it, connected to the computerized information search service at all. We then get a table of complete (twenty-four-hour) usage of CA for those weeks, which the library was gathering anyway, followed by an imposing Poisson equation to calculate the precise probability of there being only that one usage in the more than forty hours poor Ms. Duncan was on the job.

Ultimately more disturbing than these expected "sledgehammer and nut" situations, or the desperate digressions such as the entire last chapter, are the failings which may fairly be regarded as independent of the direction the work took. First, the author's credentials as a researcher are questionable: in the opening of the preface we read that the data gathered in part (a) of the work "was to be used to develop and to test a decision model."

Obviously, if one tests one's model using
the data or specifications by which one developed it, it may safely be assumed that the model will be found to work beautifully. Further evidence can be found in the repeated misinterpretation of charts, data, and other authors' statements. Second, although the author is attempting to study library-related activities, she gives every indication of not knowing, and not caring to find out, how libraries work, and what librarians see themselves as doing. Third, general presentation is inexcusably sloppy; an author's argument in one sentence would be a real obstacle to comprehension. An author's argument in one sentence became "this fact" in the next; chemists are assumed at one point to be unconcerned with a journal's editorial policy, at another, to be consciously utilizing it, etc. Writing like the following should never have passed so much scrutiny: "Although much research has shown that the average chemist limits his reading to only a few hours a week, there seems to be a prevailing idea that he would be a more creative (or productive) chemist if he read more. Though many surveys show that the creative scientist reads on the average more than the noncreative scientist the occurrence of these phenomena gives no justification for assuming that what is being observed is a cause and effect phenomenon. There is no inherent knowledge in the printed or the spoken word. Creativity in the chemist, like creativity in anyone else, takes place in the mind of the individual. That this creativity may be stimulated by colleagues, by reading the published literature, or by hundreds of other ways may very well be true; but it may not be true." (p. 112.)

Kent, in his foreword, far from giving any support to a student who is in a thorny predicament at least partly, one must conclude, due to a lack of useful guidance, leaves the unmistakable impression that his main aim is to disassociate himself from the whole embarrassing affair. He largely avoids discussing the work he is supposed to be introducing and what he gives us instead is self-serving reminiscence, abysmal punning, unrelated generalities, and bad grammar of his own variety.

The whole production leaves a sorry impression of library and information science education at the Ph.D. level.—Peter G. Watson, Head, Center for Information Services, University of California at Los Angeles Library.


In acknowledgement of the need for improved bibliographic control of microforms, the Association of Research Libraries, under contract with the Office of Education, sponsored a study "to determine the elements of an effective system of bibliographic control of microforms which would permit the expeditious selection, acquisition, cataloging and use of micropublication both current and retrospective." The book under review is the product of this study.

Major findings include the following: cataloging, shelflisting, and classification practices vary enormously; many libraries fail to report their microform holdings to the National Register of Microform Masters; analytics for microform series are not adequately represented in public catalogs. As the ultimate solution to these problems, the authors recommend that "a national, machine-readable index to microform publications should be established."

Reichmann and Tharpe solicited information from "250 American libraries and scholarly organizations and about 150 foreign institutions through approximately 1,500 letters and scores of telephone calls." The results of this monumental enterprise are documented in thirty-three pages of text. Almost half of that space is devoted to a description of micropublishing activities in some seventy foreign countries; addresses of agencies engaged in production and sale of microcopy are given. Thus the bulk of the analytic study itself is limited to just a few pages. As much as the authors' aim of conciseness is to be applauded, it becomes all too obvious to the reader that such a concentrated treatment cannot possibly do justice to the complex and far-reaching subject matter. Significant issues
are either ignored, or, at best, granted summary attention. No attempt is made to isolate the components of the existing bibliographic maze; nor are the expected benefits of the proposed machine-readable index delineated in any detail. To cite but one example: libraries' inability to cope with the filing of analytics is identified as a major problem in bibliographic control; and yet, the extent to which the proposed machine-readable index would alleviate the need to continue filing analytics in public catalogs is not discussed.

Four appendixes are added to the body of the text:
1. The United States Government as microform publisher.
3. American university presses that plan to publish microforms.
4. A microform bibliography, with the cooperation of Suzanne Dodson and Laura L. Jennings.

Appendixes 1 and 3 appear to be largely superfluous. Appendix 2 is a brief outline, showing "a possible method of using the computer and associated hardware devices to produce one or more indexes to be used as a finding tool to the material contained in microsets."

Appendix 4 represents the book's principal contribution. Although the authors confide their misgivings at including the microform bibliography in their final report, being "woefully aware of its shortcomings both in admissions and omissions," the bibliography does constitute a useful tool; 493 items are listed, subdivided in four categories:
1. Catalogs and Lists.
2. Collections and Series.
3. Manuscripts and Archival Collections.

A good index, and a bibliography of related literature, complete the volume.

While Bibliographic Control of Microforms contains some valuable bibliographic data, nevertheless, the book in no way fulfills the reader's expectation of a systematic examination of the subject under study.—S. Micha Namewirth, Assistant University Librarian, Collection Development, University of California, Berkeley.

OTHER BOOKS OF INTEREST TO ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS


Hegener, Karen C., ed. Annual Guides to Graduate and Undergraduate Study, 1973. New Jersey: Peterson's Guides, Inc. $75.00 per set. (8-volume set, individual books also available.)


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.


This collection of documents contains the following: (1) Proposal to Implement a Plan to Create a Retrospective Union Catalog of Books Based on Library of Congress Card Numbers in Selected Louisiana Libraries Using a Computer to Sort and Print the Numbers; (2) Proposal to Create a Retrospective Union Catalog of Books in Participating Louisiana Libraries Based on Library of Congress Card Numbers Using the Computer to Sort and List the Numbers in Printed Form; (3) A One Million Volume Computer Output Microfiche Numerical Union Catalog in Louisiana, with a Statistical Summary; and, (4) Predicting Title Multiplication (Overlap) in a Union Catalog of Sixteen Louisiana Libraries Using Regression Analysis.


This collection of documents contains the following: (1) A Least Squares Polynomial Exponential Model for the Multiplication of Books in Sixteen Libraries; (2) Sample Letter of Agreement; (3) Instructions for Keypunching LC Numbers; (4) Estimated Times for Keypunching and Processing Data by Computer; (5) LNR Source Program Listings and Documentation; (6) System Flow Charts; Sample Output; and (7) LNR: Numerical Register of Books in Louisiana Libraries. First Computer Output Microfiche Edition.

Managing the ERIC Data Base. (Technical and Managerial Considerations in Operating a Computerized Information Processing Center in Support of a Multi-Disciplinary Network.) By W. T. Brandhorst, ERIC Processing and Reference Facility, Bethesda, Md. 1972. 34p. (ED 069 303, MF—$0.65, HC—$3.29).

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system and the ERIC Processing and Reference Facility are briefly discussed as introductory and background material to this paper on the technical and managerial aspects of operating an information processing center. The following topics are covered under the subject of managing the ERIC data base for dissemination: file protection, maintaining a dynamic data base, file analyses, a documentation package, file availability, customer relations, access tools, and schedule adherence. Communication, coordination, and monitoring and feedback problems of networking are discussed. Various forms used in the ERIC system and statistical information about the data base are appended.
THE Reference Book for Audio & Video Equipment, Accessories and Tape—SIGHT & SOUND TAPE DIRECTORY

IS AVAILABLE TO LIBRARIES at a 30% PRE PUBLICATION DISCOUNT

The 1973/74 Sight & Sound Tape Directory is the first complete and authoritative industry-wide tape directory for all audio and video tape products. On sale in September at $10.00 per copy, you can

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW for only $7.00.

No modern reference library in today's technological world is complete without this comprehensive volume of over 200 pages.

Gentlemen:
I wish to take advantage of the SPECIAL PRE PUBLICATION OFFER on your TAPE DIRECTORY. Please reserve ______ copies of the TAPE DIRECTORY at $7.00 per copy (to be shipped upon publication). My check in the amount of $________ is attached.

NAME ___________________________
ADDRESS ________________________
CITY ____________________________
STATE ______ ZIP ________________

DORBAUGH PUBLICATIONS, INC.
SIGHT & SOUND TAPE DIRECTORY
51 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
Your Order Deserves and Gets the Dedicated Efforts of Our Entire Staff of Professionals!

From President Jack Ansett and General Manager Ed Lockman down through our entire organization is a sincere desire to serve you quickly, accurately and in the way that meets your special requirements best.

We call it "Concerned Service" because we are concerned that you get the best and most personalized service available in the wholesale book trade. Your rush orders are handled by special, separate procedures that assure you there can be no slip-up or delay in getting them completed.

Our Concerned Service assures you that the average elapsed time of delivery will be less when you order from the Book House. Surveys by several major academic libraries have confirmed this. (names on request)

Book House will deliver any book in print including all university presses, professional and non-profit associations, Government publications, Canadian titles and ALL paperbacks from any publisher.

Discount schedules are competitive, naturally! Isn’t it time you gave Book House a trial order and found out how well Concerned Service can do the job for you!

ANY QUESTIONS? CALL 517-849-9361 COLLECT!

The BOOK HOUSE
The House of Superior Library Service
208 West Chicago / Jonesville, Mich. 49250
NEW UP-TO-DATE BOOKS FROM NOYES DATA

Noyes Data has developed specific publishing techniques that allow the publication of technical and business books in hard cover within a matter of months after acceptance of manuscript. Due to rapid changes in technology and business conditions, the publication of these latest developments in a durable binding is important to you.

We have by-passed the delays inherent in the conventional book publishing cycle and provide you with an effective and convenient means of reviewing up-to-date basic information in depth.

Hardcover Books Published Summer 1973


POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE PETROLEUM INDUSTRY by H.R. Jones: Gives practical technology for avoiding or reducing harmful emissions into the air and water by this industry. Also investigates economics and costs of pollution control. ISBN: 0-8155-0494-2; 324 pp.; $36

PLANT GROWTH REGULATORS by L.P. Hanson: Technology for destroying unwanted plants, preventing germination of seeds; stimulate rooting, increase or retard growth, induce flowering and fruiting, and increase the nutrient content of crops. ISBN: 0-8155-0495-0; 276 pp.; $36

SUGAR SUBSTITUTES AND ENHANCERS by R. Daniels: Describes technology of substances which induce or expand the sweetness of various sugars, so that lower sugar levels can be used in foods and beverages. ISBN: 0-8155-0492-6; 275 pp.; $36

NEW CURING TECHNIQUES IN THE PRINTING, COATING AND PLASTICS INDUSTRIES by M.W. Ranney: Technology of pollution-free coating methods with minimal odors and low volatility, based on energy-sensitive systems cured by ultraviolet and electron beam sources that can be applied at relatively high rates. ISBN: 0-8155-0491-8; 338 pp.; $36

BLEACHING AGENTS AND TECHNIQUES by J.A. Szilard: Discusses recent advances such as the use of activators and less polluting methods which can operate at lower temperatures. Technology for bleaching wood pulp, textiles, dye stripping, and bleaches for commercial and household laundering. ISBN: 0-8155-0490-X; 342 pp.; $36

METALLOCENE TECHNOLOGY by J.C. Johnson: A class of compounds which have found diversified uses as catalysts, propellant stabilizers, and as additives for polymers. Describes processes for making and using metallocenes. ISBN: 0-8155-0488-8; 274 pp.; $36

EXPORTER'S FINANCIAL AND MARKETING HANDBOOK by C.M. Jonnard: Provides the necessary background and fundamental guidelines for the successful development and the effective financial management of an overseas sales enterprise. ISBN: 0-8155-0493-4; 300 pp.; $18

ndc

NOYES DATA CORPORATION
Noyes Building, Park Ridge, N.J. 07656
Order your books from this source to get them FAST.

This is one of five Baker & Taylor Library Service Centers. It stocks about 2,000,000 books. It has a computerized file of over 200,000 titles. If a book you order is not in stock or in computer file, it will be specially ordered for you. Baker & Taylor will supply any book available through wholesalers. And a Baker & Taylor Library Service Center is located close to you, wherever you are.

These resources, plus prompt claiming and reporting, are the reasons why Baker & Taylor serves the book needs of so many academic libraries throughout the country. With resources like these, your books are delivered faster — and at lower cost. The utility of your budget is multiplied. Your books get onto shelves and into circulation faster. And a variety of programs and services are available, geared specifically to the needs of academic libraries, large and small. Write to the division nearest you, listed below, for full details.

The Baker & Taylor Co.

EASTERN DIVISION
SOMERVILLE, NEW JERSEY 08876
50 Kirby Avenue, Tel: 201-722-8000
N.Y. City Tel: 212-227-8470

SOUTHEAST DIVISION
COMMERCE, GEORGIA 30529
Tel: 404-335-5000

MIDWEST DIVISION
MOMENCE, ILLINOIS 60954
Gladiola Avenue
Tel: 815-472-2444
Chicago Tel: 312-641-3233

SOUTHWEST DIVISION
CLARKSVILLE, TEXAS 75426
Industrial Park
Tel: 214-427-3811

WESTERN DIVISION
RENO, NEVADA 89502
380 Edison Way
Tel: 702-786-6700

New Books Inspection Center
5820 Wilshire Blvd., Los Angeles, California 90036, Tel: 213-938-2925
when
you
bought
that
microform
reader
did
you?

consider consult

THE MANUFACTURER'S CLAIMS:

The [reader] has no complicated controls or touchy adjustments; maximum ease of operation is built into the reader. Just insert the fiche in the precision holding and transporting mechanism, flip the switch, adjust focus, and scan.

Consult LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS:

The design of the reader does not provide for a page indicator grid. The platen moves awkwardly and binds, especially when moving from side to side.
The user must reach to the left side of the reader and move a short arm back and forth to focus the image.
None of the controls are labeled. The user must experiment with the various levers and handles to learn how to use the reader.
The bracket holding the platen handle allows the film to catch between the bracket and glass, which can tear the film if the user is not careful.

From an evaluation of the same machine in the July, 1972 LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS.

Quoted from the manufacturer's literature.

library technology reports
A Product Testing and Evaluation Service

American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611
How much can a subscription agency save your library?

In the long run, depending on the size of your library, you can end up with worthwhile savings. Just consider how long it takes to order one subscription, how much it costs to process one invoice for payment and send one check. Estimates run from $10.00 to $18.00 for each order. Multiply by the number of subscriptions your library orders, and see how much you'll save by sending one order and one check for all your periodicals to F. W. Faxon Co.

Send for our free descriptive brochure and annual Librarians' Guide listing more than 50,000 domestic and foreign periodicals.

*Library business is our only business—since 1886.*