when it’s good, it is not enough.—William A. Moffett, Oberlin College Library.


This slim volume reports on research sponsored by the British Library Research and Development Division (BLRDDD) to discover the: “extent of awareness of ongoing research amongst practitioners; their attitudes towards research (and reasons for holding them); assessment of the utility and relevance of research to their day-to-day work; the kind of research that ideally they would like to see in progress.” It builds on two earlier and related BLRDDD-supported studies—one on the dissemination of research to library educators and one on the dissemination practices of researchers. Marketing concepts and terminology are used throughout.

The report describes responses to a questionnaire mailed to 1,950 library-information workers selected from three sampling frames: the membership of Aslib (the Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux), the membership of the Institute of Information Scientists, and the Library Association (Great Britain). Chapter 2 summarizes results succinctly in one or two paragraphs devoted to each of the remaining chapters of the report which are: the potential audience for research; participation in professional groups and activities; reading habits: use of the professional literature; the practitioner as researcher and author; how practitioners hear about research; awareness and evaluation of research. A final chapter called “Let Them Speak for Themselves” provides verbatim comments.

The potential audience for research was segmented in three different ways: by current employment (industry, commerce; central government; societies, associations; local government; education), by extent of experience (six categories beginning with “under 3 years” and ending with “over 20 years”), and by qualifications (none, Library-information only, other (subject) only, dual (library-information and other). These variables were correlated with responses on all other topics. Current employer is the one which revealed the greatest number of significant differences among respondents.

Many of the results provide an interesting perspective on the field although they do not relate directly to the dissemination of research. Of those that do so relate, none are surprising but a few seem worthy of mention. Only 27 percent of the practitioners had been involved in research and the involvement usually meant in-house studies rather than generalizable ones. Only 23 percent felt that they were well informed about research and only 32 percent claimed to be “fairly” or “greatly” interested in it.

Although talks at meetings might seem to be a good way to disseminate research findings, learning about research is not one of the reasons why respondents attend meetings. In view of reasons why they do not attend, the authors suspect many would cease to come if research were featured. When the various media where one might read about research were considered (secondary services, newsletters, primary journals, research reports, theses) the journal article was easily the most popular. This remained true even when informal means of learning about research were also considered (i.e., various forms of personal contact). Research reports were not heavily used partly because they are hard to locate. The authors found this a “perturbing finding” since many researchers believe dissemination is completed once they have produced a research report.

The United States has no agency like the BLRDDD to exert leadership in matters related to research. If it did, and a similar study were conducted, the results would probably be very similar in the U.S. Researchers interested in disseminating their results and library educators interested in helping practitioners to appreciate research should take heed.—Mary Jo Lynch, ALA Office for Research.

Precise online retrieval for organic chemists

Introducing:... the first in a series of Chemical Information Data-bases from the Institute for Scientific Information/Chemical Information Division (ISI/CID). The initial version of this new organic substructure data-base will be available online in early 1984 through Questel, using the DARC system.

Extensive coverage
The ISI/CID organic compound data-base offers fast, accurate access to new organic chemistry as reported in the chemical journal literature. The initial version of the data-base will contain compounds, with their related bibliographic data, reported from 1977 to date and from 1962 to 1965—giving access to information not readily available online from any other source. When completed in 1984, the full file will contain over 3,000,000 organic compounds which were first reported as new from 1962 to the present.

Substructure searching
Full graphic input and output, plus DARC’s easy-to-use text structure input facilitate fast, complete substructure searching.

Precise searching
ISI/CID’s organic compound data-base helps you identify articles of interest quickly, and precisely, as well... because you get enough total information to distinguish articles of specific value to you—before you order and read them.

Like its popular print equivalent, Current Abstracts of Chemistry and Index Chemicus®, the data-base provides access to: analytical techniques, a new synthetic methods indicator, the amount of experimental detail, as well as detailed bibliographic information.

To find out how ISI/CID’s new data-base can help you get the precise information you need from the chemical journal literature, call or write us at the address below.

Institute for Scientific Information®
Chemical Information Division Marketing
3501 Market Street, University City Science Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104 U.S.A.
Telephone: (215) 386-0100, Cable: SCINFO, Telex: 84-5305
This is an important book. It defines, and provides a context for, preservation as a library function equal to cataloging or reference work. It is for seasoned, senior administrators, who have just realized the need for a coherent preservation program, and for novice preservation administrators, who have just been handed the task of starting one. Library administrators will find all the arguments they need to convince their colleagues and university officials of the necessity for allocating budget dollars for preservation; preservation administrators will find graphically illustrated organization plans, position descriptions, decision-making apparatuses, case studies, and enough technical information to point them in the right direction.

Morrow begins by succinctly describing the organic composition of library materials from books to videotape and why they tear, fade, crumble, warp, break, mold, or spontaneously combust. Enough scientific data is offered to underscore the arguments for the preservation practices offered, but not to impede general understanding by the intelligent reader. Discussions of preservation issues for each type of material focus on special problems, controversial points of view, and trade-offs between treatment options and costs.

The strength of Morrow’s work lies in the chapters on how to develop a preservation program and case studies concerning conservation of rare and unique items. Administrators will find useful the budget and cost figures that appear throughout; this kind of data is elusive, and even more cost analysis would have strengthened the work. Morrow concludes with an overview of the latest technological experiments, including optical disk, deacidification, freeze and vacuum drying of water-damaged materials, accelerated aging tests, cold storage, and encapsulation. A final chapter describes the various organizations and funding agencies active in preservation matters.

Gay Walker contributed a chapter on preserving the intellectual content of printed materials, based on her very successful program at Yale. While she concentrates heavily on the process of preservation microfilming (or “microfiching”), there is a section on in-house photocopying that may be unique in the literature. In her introduction, Pam Darling, author of the profession’s most readable preservation lore, gently but firmly explodes yet another myth. “The survival of thoughts beyond the life of the thinker gives significance to the human experience,” she writes, “and so we are comfortable in believing that the materials on which we record those thoughts will live on after us. But it has never been true.”


Trained conservators don’t need this book. Libraries that have not yet accepted the preservation challenge do.-Nancy E. Gwinn, Research Libraries Group, Inc.


If one accepts the fact that Myers and Jirjees have developed a statistically valid research study, and they spend the great majority of this book explaining their methodology in such detail that this reviewer is convinced, then they have some important conclusions that every public service administration should find interesting. According to past studies, which have only been done in-depth for public libraries, telephone reference service is only about 50 percent accurate. These studies done in the Southeast by Myers involving forty academic libraries ranging from two-year colleges through universities and in the Northeast by Jirjees (in five, four-year state colleges with graduate pro-