

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.*

Duncan, Elizabeth E. *Current Awareness and the Chemist.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972. 150p.

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; we may pass over the simple grammatical errors with the comment that they are far too copious for a doctoral dissertation, and a commercially published one at that. Likewise a writing style which is pervasively lazy (figures are always 'very interesting' or the information explosion 'very serious,' etc.) one can live with. The many lapses of sentential logic in the narrative, however, become 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.

Reichmann, Felix and Tharpe, Josephine M., *Bibliographic Control of Microforms*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1972. 256p. \$12.50.

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