ening skills, promotion of potential candidates. She concludes that mobility for these individuals is severely limited by the way in which academic administrators are chosen. Selection from the ranks of faculty may well not be the best way to acquire competent administrators. Similarly, movement from community college administration to a college or university, or from a black college to a comprehensive university is very limited, and is particularly discriminatory to women and minorities whose administrative credentials might otherwise qualify them for serious consideration.

The editors list the following five-point agenda for the future. (1) Commitment to the advancement of women and minorities has diminished; new intervention strategies need to be designed. (2) Financial support for new strategies is crucial; where it is to come from must be addressed. (3) Longitudinal studies of both men and women administrators are needed to provide information about factors which hinder or promote advancement. (4) The reward structure and the status structure of higher education may change dramatically as the issue of comparable worth is addressed. (5) The first generation of leaders of the organized movement to advance women and minorities—among whom are the contributors to this volume—have largely moved on to other stages of their careers, and a new generation of leaders has yet to be identified.

This is an important source book on the status of organized efforts to advance women. It is essential reading for women and other library administrators who want to further their understanding of colleges and universities as social organizations. As a librarian, one finds that the position of women in academic administration, in general, is not unlike their position in libraries, and that the barriers and the strategies for overcoming them are much the same.—Joanne R. Euster, San Francisco State University, California.


The use of citations is a crucial part of the creation and dissemination of information in both the natural and social sciences. Some sociologists of knowledge (the normative school) have held with Robert K. Merton that the citation process, like other aspects of scholarly communication, is conducted with widespread adherence to commonly accepted standards. But more recent work has contended that scholars, in their lust for rewards and recognition and with normal human carelessness and inconsistency, usually fail to adhere to standards. (The latter view is called the microsociological or positivist.)

Blaise Cronin’s *The Citation Process* reviews the controversy between the normative and microsociological schools. Most of the book summarizes theoretical arguments and perspectives that have been brought to bear on various aspects of the controversy. While many of the arguments of the opposing sides are backed by powerful rhetoric, none are fully persuasive. All finally fail, Cronin reminds readers several times, because no student of the citation process can ascertain the motivation that inspired a citation at the moment it was made.

In his review of the literature, Cronin recounts some interesting research. He points to studies that high citation counts of the work of individual scientists have correlated positively with recognized quality indicators such as honorific awards and Nobel laureateships. At the same time, he describes research that contends that between one-fifth and two-thirds of citations are not essential to the papers that refer to them. Perhaps most revealing is his own experiment that tests for the degree of commonality of views on when an author should cite. In his experiment he distributed “unpublished journal articles denuded of their original citations to carefully selected samples of readers, asking them to suggest where citations were required.” This resulted in “some evidence of a shared understanding as to how and where citations should be affixed.
to a scholarly journal article." The experiment, however, did not support the speculations that citation practice is universal enough to allow for future assignment of citations to papers by some automated mechanism.

Of particular interest to librarians is a discussion of the work of Ben Ami Lipetz, Carolyn O. Frost, and E. B. Duncan et al. who have attempted to classify the different functions of citations in order to enhance the effectiveness of citation indexes in information retrieval. Cronin points out their classifications do not include a category of citations that are perfunctory or unessential. In view of the extensive literature covered, it is somewhat surprising that Cronin does not treat the work (most of it done by librarians) that shows that citations are among the most important means by which scholars learn of the documents they read in the course of their research.

Questionable organization lessens the book’s impact. In the next to last chapter Cronin proposes that citations be studied in terms of the quality controllers (journal editors and referees), educators, consumers, and producers who are involved in the citation process. This is an original proposal, and the book would have been much stronger had it concluded with this rather than with its reiteration, more or less, of opposing views in the normative-microsociological dispute. But despite its deficient organization and repetition, this is a thorough review of a large body of literature. It explicates a wide variety of viewpoints about the complexity of the citation process, a central aspect of the use of information by scholars.—Stephen E. Wiberley, Jr., University of Illinois at Chicago.


The seven papers and one reminiscence contained in this volume were delivered in 1981 at a seminar held at the School of Librarianship and Information Science of the State University of New York at Albany. The seminar marked the fiftieth anniversary of Melvil Dewey’s death, and was sponsored by three agencies that were significantly influenced by Dewey himself: the Library School, the New York State Library, and the Forest Press Division of the Lake Placid Education Foundation.

Although the processes of publication that cause proceedings to be issued two years after the event they record are generally to be deplored, this is one case where a delay may actually have been beneficial. The papers, which are predominantly historical in focus, are not at all devalued by the passage of time, and classification, a topic of relatively low interest in 1981, is now in the ascendant, as present and potential uses of classification access in an online context are capturing the attention of library professionals.

This work is not, however, just about classification. It is neither procedural nor theoretical. The first two sections ("Background" and "Dewey: The Man, the Innovator, the Organizer") are quite simply history: Dewey’s personal history, the place of libraries in American society, the changes envisioned by librarians for libraries, the evolution and growth of the profession, the early years of ALA, and so forth. The papers in Part III ("Dewey: The Classification") are also historically oriented, covering the development and diffusion of the Decimal Classification system and the relationship of close classification to open shelf access. They also remind the reader of such basic matters as the place of classification in subject retrieval, and of the battle fought between the classified and dictionary catalogs for predominance in library subject retrieval.

The papers are all of high quality and interestingly written. Many (especially Dee Garrison’s "Dewey the Apostle," Francis Miksa’s "Melvil Dewey and the Corporate Ideal," John Comaromi’s "The Foundations of the Dewey Decimal Classification: The First Two Editions," and Gordon Stevenson’s "The Classified Catalogue of the New York State Library in 1911") achieve the rare feat of informing and engaging, and also inspiring further