

Overall, the report is a laudable, ambitious undertaking. The final chapter is a conclusion that summarizes its findings from the variety of data, spots gaps in holdings, points towards a rational system for document collecting, and suggests a role for the National Library. Together with Edith Jarvis's *Access to Canadian Government Publications in Canadian Academic and Public Libraries*, this report permits one nation to see where its libraries stand in relation to government publications.—*Harry E. Welsh, Government Documents Center, University of Washington Libraries, Seattle.*

Urquhart, J. A., and Urquhart, N. C. *Relegation and Stock Control in Libraries.*

Stocksfield: Oriol Press (Routledge and Kegan Paul), 1976. 154p. \$25. ISBN 0-85362-162-4.

The British Library sponsored this 1973-75 study of practical methods for selecting periodicals and monographs from the open stack for storage and current periodical subscriptions for cancellation. It was inspired by the shrinkage of construction funds plaguing British academic libraries and the concurrent coming of age of national library services that have prompted the revisionist concept of the "self-contained library" (cf. review of *Capital Provision for University Libraries* in *C&RL*, July 1977).

The study's purpose is "to reduce the dangers of arbitrary cuts and restrictions on the operation of academic libraries and to foster their continued health. It seeks to protect them both from the risk of unskilled amputation by the administrator as well as from what might be described as the iatrogenic perils resulting from the ministrations of well-meaning and dedicated librarians" (p.14-15).

Attempting to identify specific quantitative criteria by which materials can be selected for storage, the research used statistical techniques applied to surveys of circulation, in-library use, and national interlibrary loan data in the stack-filled 400,000-volume library of the University of Newcastle on Tyne. Its methodology, statistical findings, and conclusions—much of which must be gleaned from eight appendixes—deserve to be consulted by every librarian faced with the specter of

weeding for storage or discard. The volume includes a useful though not exhaustive bibliography.

Periodicals, the study indicates, can be most economically selected for storage on the basis of national interlibrary loan statistics (in this instance those of the British Library Lending Division), though local circulation and in-library use data are also good predictors. Cancellation of current subscriptions can also be reasonably based on national interlibrary loan data. The "15/5 rule" evolves as a practical approach: Runs of fifteen years or more can be stored if they have not been borrowed during the last five years.

For monographs the study casts serious doubts as to whether past use is a valid predictor of future use (as concluded in the studies of Fussler and Simon, Trueswell, and others) in the case of seldom-used books. Current use is found to be independent of the last circulation date for books that have not circulated in six to fifteen years. The amount of use, however, varies strikingly among subject areas, with the humanities surprisingly appearing to have the fastest obsolescence rate. The researchers conclude that the most practical—and economical—method of selecting monographs for storage is to dispatch the majority of books by entire sections, keeping only the heavily used monographs in the open stack. Catalog cards for only the retained books would be revised to indicate their location. Books borrowed from storage a single time should not be transferred back to the open stack.

Most American library administrators are not yet economically constrained to release a volume to storage or rubbish whenever a new one is acquired. Most do not anticipate a substantial relegation budget, much less one that will soon approach the cost of acquisitions. But many will agree that "the main value in terms of current use of a working academic library lies in its recently acquired stock."

The experience of the British as they face the challenge of strengthening academic library collections by acquiring the recent and used materials while releasing the unused—whether recent or dated—may in time serve as a model for libraries in this

country, hopefully for educational rather than for economic reasons. In the meantime, studies like this will be important technical guides wherever the selection of materials for storage is necessary.—J. Daniel Vann, *CLR Management Intern, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California.*

- *Resources of South Carolina Libraries.* By Edward G. Holley, Johnnie E. Givens, Fred W. Roper, W. Christian Sizemore. Columbia, S.C.: South Carolina Commission on Higher Education, 1976. 126p.

Having moved to the Carolinas from Texas where he had conducted a somewhat similar survey, Dean Holley with his colleagues has coordinated an equally efficacious critique to assist libraries in "strengthening all the state's institutions of higher learning so that quality education will be available for every citizen who wants it and can profit from it," an ideal stated by the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, whose objective is to include full consideration of the library function.

Although ACRL's recommendations for measuring the strengths of collections (checking standard bibliographies, etc.), staffs, and buildings were also evaluated components of the program, this was probably the first statewide survey to apply the measuring techniques adopted as ACRL's standards in 1975.

Two aspects of this survey are of particular interest: the surveyors' acknowledgment of the wide use of public library resources by college students (with good supporting data) and the division and integration of the surveyors' responsibilities. Holley took the "general purpose" universities and the public libraries; Givens, the senior colleges; Sizemore, the two-year institutions; and Roper, the health sciences libraries. In all, more than fifty institutions were included, with some overlaps of visitations. The sections of the survey are individual reports, but the whole book is well coordinated and interestingly presented, with all the necessary documentation, tables, and statistics.

The conclusions suggest that the four classes of libraries do not differ significantly

from their counterparts in most other states or regions. Cogent suggestions accompany the stimulating analyses and reviews of each type of library, with the most urgent needs for development seeming to be in the health sciences and public libraries. Throughout the survey the usual needs for increased financial and staff support, cooperative bibliographic (resource) activity, and service coordination among the libraries are emphasized.

It is a truism, perhaps, that the librarians who are concerned with the recommendations of other experts are already aware of most of the facts that a survey of this kind will reveal. Nevertheless, well-conducted surveys such as this give substantiated support to librarians everywhere and, in the special locale under study, guidance to educators, administrators, and legislators who may not have seen their local special needs in perspective. The problems that can only be solved with their understanding and support are adroitly pinpointed.—Lee Ash, *Library Consultant, Bethany, Connecticut.*

Lancaster, F. W., with the assistance of M. J. Joncich. *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services.* Washington, D. C.: Information Resources Press, 1977. 395p. \$27.50. LC 77-72081. ISBN 0-87815-017-X.

NATO Advanced Study Institute on the Evaluation and Scientific Management of Libraries and Information Centres, Bristol, 1975. *Evaluation and Scientific Management of Libraries and Information Centres.* Edited by F. W. Lancaster and C. W. Cleverdon. NATO Advanced Study Institute Series. Series E: Applied Science, no.18. Leyden: Noordhoff, 1977. 184p. \$19.50. ISBN 0-286-0656-4.

It is rare to have the opportunity to review a book in the field of librarianship that is admirable in almost every respect. It is so rare, in fact, that one hesitates to announce such a judgment for fear of being taken as indiscriminating. With *The Measurement and Evaluation of Library Services*, F. W. Lancaster has indeed written a book that deserves enthusiastic praise, even to the point of overlooking the minor flaws that can always be found if one searches hard enough, if that would encourage the wider