

addition to that *genre* of reference work whose purpose it is to give the library patron a good start toward the mastery of a subject in which he expects to have a sustained interest. It fits into that category which already contains, in addition to a large number of works in historiography, such items as Louttit's *Handbook of Psychological Literature*, Mellon's *Chemical Publications*, Soule's *Library Guide for the Chemist*, and Parke's *Guide to the Literature of Mathematics and Physics*.

As a bibliographical start for the writer of a term paper or a full-fledged dissertation in educational history, it does its work well. There are few omissions of which the reviewer would wish to complain. Among the compiler's oversights are *The Literature of Adult Education*, by Beals and Brody, and the issue of the *Review of Educational Research* (October 1936) on the "History of Education and Comparative Education." Item 290 of Dr. Brickman's bibliography leads the reader to the issue of *Review of Educational Research* which covers the same field for the years 1936 to 1939, but somehow omits the basic bibliography published three years previous. Needless to say, there is a great deal of overlapping between the 1936 *Review of Educational Research*, which offers 975 bibliographical items, and the book under review at the moment. It should also be noted that the former, because of its running commentary and subject breakdowns, is in many respects a more usable bibliography than Dr. Brickman's. The *Guide* approach (which lists items by form of issue) must certainly relinquish many of the advantages of subject and period divisions.

The author feels that his detailed table of contents and subject index (to the bibliography only) obviate this difficulty and, in fact, "make a complete index unnecessary." From the user's point of view, no index could be too complete. For although the bibliographical

items and their annotations reveal "time" and "place" values excellently, the index does not light the way to them well enough. Many of Dr. Brickman's ablest critical evaluations of individual sources appear in the textual portion of his book. An expansion of the index to include these would greatly enhance the value of the book without substantially increasing its bulk.

Those who look to this *Guide* for assistance in the area of library history—which, after all, is a branch of educational history—will be disappointed with its meager coverage. The five monographic works in library history which Dr. Brickman has included are apparently selected for their broad coverage and because they meet the requirements of modern historical scholarship. They afford a fine entree into some aspects of library history but are not sufficient. It would be helpful if, in a future edition, the compiler could at least do more with the bibliography of library history. He has not even listed Cannon's *Bibliography of Library Economy* and the volumes of *Library Literature* which bring it up to date.

Perhaps we should not complain so much of neglect when we ourselves are guilty of having neglected to investigate thoroughly the past of our profession. There is a special need for guilt feelings in a group which is so well trained to handle source materials. It is surely overoptimistic to hope that education for librarianship, in its current transition toward a greater concern with principles and backgrounds, will emphasize the research point of view. One hint given last year by President Harold Taylor of Sarah Lawrence College, at a meeting of the New York Library Club, is that it may be possible to do a sizable part of the job of training for the profession by requiring library school students to do meaningful subject projects which involve the extensive use of well-arranged libraries.—*Sidney Ditzion, College of the City of New York Library.*

Communications Research

Communications Research, 1948-49. Edited by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Frank N. Stanton. New York, Harper and Brothers, 1949. xviii, 332p. \$4.50.

Inasmuch as the editors of this third

volume of a series begun in 1941 under the title of *Radio Research* have found it desirable to use a more general term for the title of the first postwar volume, it should be interesting and instructive to make at

least a casual comparison between this volume and the two which preceded it. The editors' justification for the change in title is made in these words from the preface: "The techniques which are used to study the attitudes of readers are similar to those by which radio listeners are investigated. We understand the audience structure of one medium better if we use for comparison data available on all the others. It was, therefore, finally decided that now that the publication of the series is resumed they would use the more general title 'Communications Research'."

An examination of the first volume¹ reveals a content of six studies, of which five are specifically concerned with radio; four of these are concerned entirely with radio. The fifth, entitled "Radio and the Press Among Young People," is concerned with the competition of radio with another medium in the purveyance of news to young people. A sixth study, entitled "The Popular Music Industry," touches on radio as one of the media through which a song comes popular. It seems clear that this first volume of *Radio Research* was indeed concerned entirely with radio.

The second volume² contains a total of 17 studies, of which 14 are concerned entirely and exclusively with radio. Two others examined research techniques which are applicable to radio and other media, and were not specifically related to radio. A third entitled "Biographies in Popular Magazines" is a study of another medium entirely and is not related to radio at all. Fourteen out of 17 is a high proportion and the title *Radio Research* is clearly justified.

Looking now to the volume at hand, we find that it contains eight studies, of which only three are concerned specifically with radio. Three others are studies of other media; namely, comic magazines, newspapers, and general magazines. The two remaining studies are concerned with analyses of research techniques, which are related no more to radio than to any other medium. The contents of this new volume seem to amply justify the use of the broader title of *Communications Research*.

¹ Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Stanton, Frank N. *Radio Research, 1941*. New York. Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1941.

² Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Stanton, Frank N. *Radio Research, 1942-43*. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944.

Since more than a third of the book's 332 pages is concerned with the medium of radio, it is well to consider these studies first. Probably the most important is called "An Analysis of Radio Programming" by Kenneth Baker, who describes in considerable detail the program pattern obtaining on a stratified random sample of 85 members of the National Association of Broadcasters during the third week in November 1946. Many detailed tables are ultimately summarized in the following fashion: Very nearly half of all radio programs are musical in character. More than half of this musical time is devoted to popular music. Dramatic programs occupy second place in the field of programming, while third place goes to news and news commentary. The 85 stations were found to be heavily dependent upon network programs. It was found that about one-third of radio time is not sponsored and that about 14 per cent of the total time on the air is devoted to commercial announcements. These facts and information are presented for what they may be worth to the industry as a base upon which to measure such changes in programming as may occur in future years. The study makes no judgment as to whether this particular pattern of programming is good, bad or indifferent.

The second study concerned with radio, entitled "Research for Action" was conducted by the senior editor and Helen Dinerman, who are here concerned entirely with the weekday morning radio audience; or, more accurately, with a potential morning audience which for one reason or another does not bother listening to the radio. The research was directed to the general objective of providing a program of action for broadcasters to bring these recalcitrants into the fold. That this should be considered a worth-while objective is reflected in the fact that 37 per cent of a sample of 2650 women insisted that they never listen to the radio on weekday mornings.

Major attention was given to this group of nonlisteners, resulting in the discovery that they fall into four fairly clearly definable types. Eighteen per cent are nonlisteners because their morning activities take them to parts of the house where they cannot hear the radio. The authors are not sure what to do about this group, but suggest that it

might be possible for local radio stations to offer the services of a household engineer to advise these nonlisteners on the best location for their radio.

Another group, amounting to 58 per cent of the nonlisteners, was found to have a one-track mind. That is, they claim they are unable to listen to the radio and do their work simultaneously. Being somewhat conscientious, they chose to do their work. The suggested solution is better programming which will cause these listeners to neglect their work.

A third group, amounting to 12 per cent of the nonlisteners, is referred to as a "radio resisters group." These people apparently do not like radio at all and the authors of this study write them off as impossible to reach. The fourth group is referred to as the "program resisters group," which accounts for another 12 per cent of nonlisteners. This small group of women do not listen to the radio in the morning because they do not like the programming and do not mind saying so.

Rather than being entitled "Research for Action," this particular study would better have been called "Research with a Purpose." The authors are concerned not so much with studying a situation or with discovering a new pattern of activity, as they are with seeking ways and means of attracting more people to their loudspeakers. This is, we suppose, a good enough objective for a research department of a radio network, but must be looked at somewhat askance as an objective of a university research bureau.

The third study concerned with radio, written by Alex Inkeles, is entitled "Domestic Broadcasting in the U.S.S.R." and describes the history of Russian radio from its beginning to comparatively recent times. It is essentially a synthesis of the author's experience with domestic Russian radio and material variously available in print. Detailed and complete, it covers such aspects of radio as administration, the broadcasting network, radio reception, programming and program policy, the radio audience, and concludes with the place of radio in the Soviet system. Careful reading of this well-integrated synthesis will do much toward developing an understanding of the way in which an authoritarian state can bend a medium of communication to

the furtherance of state policy.

In a study entitled "The Children Talk about Comics," Katherine M. Wolf and Marjorie Fisk go beyond the sound and the fury which educators and parents have been raising about the effects of comic book reading, to ask the children what they think of the comic books they find in their society and to which they are so easily and constantly exposed. The study is based on hour-long interviews with a carefully stratified sample of 104 children between the ages of seven and 17, more than half of whom were either 11 or 12 years old. The study is remarkably free of tables and charts and draws a good deal of its interest and significance from quotations from the children's comments about comics in general, about their parents' attitudes toward them, and about specific comic book titles. It seems clear from the study that children go through a fairly regular pattern of comic book reading which affects some more than others, but is fairly common to all. The authors conclude that comics satisfy a real developmental need in normal children and are harmful only for children who are already maladjusted and susceptible to harm.

It is an ill wind that does not blow some good, and the paralyzing strike of newspaper distributors against eight major New York newspapers for 17 days in June 1945, served as a golden opportunity for Bernard Berelson to find out whether missing the newspaper made any difference to the people of New York. His results are interesting and significant to those concerned with the sociology of reading.

Most people he asked were very sure that it is important that people read newspapers every day, but very few of them were able to indicate specific news of importance they had been reading before the strike, which they were then missing. Our society seems to have developed an aura of respectability about reading to the extent that people without their newspaper, and thus having nothing to read, had a sense of wasting their time. People feel that it is somehow immoral to waste time, and that time is not wasted if one is reading, because reading per se, is worthwhile. In Berelson's words, it may be said that "the act of reading itself provides certain basic satisfaction, without primary re-

gard for the content of the reading matter." In addition to the usual reasons for reading a newspaper, which may be listed, (1) for information, (2) as a tool for daily living, (3) for respite, and (4) for social prestige, Berelson found that many readers use the newspaper as a source of security. One man, for example, reported that he felt uneasy "because I don't know what I am missing—and when I don't know I worry." A newspaper, in short, "is missed because it serves as a source of security in a disturbing world," and, "because the reading of the newspaper has become a ceremonial or ritualistic or near-compulsive act for many people."

The third study of media other than radio is concerned with the popular magazines and the extent to which their readers overlap one another. The study, written by Babette Kass, is based on the 5344 women in Iowa who were interviewed in connection with a study of the Iowa radio audience. The study considers directly the 17 magazines which at least 200 women indicated they read regularly. Since it is generally assumed to be true that a man is known by the reading he does, so is a woman known by the magazine she reads. In order for such a generalization to have meaning for social research, however, it is necessary to develop an index of the cultural value of periodicals so that we can know precisely what it does mean when it is discovered that a given individual or group regularly reads the *American Magazine* or the *American Mercury*. This study provides an approach to such a cultural index for the magazines under examination.

The two studies devoted to research techniques are too detailed and too technical in nature to warrant full description here. The first of these, by Patricia L. Kendall and Katherine M. Wolf, entitled "The Analysis of Deviant Cases in Communications Research," is a description of an apparently successful attempt to make hay of the deviant cases in a research study which are usually a source of embarrassment to the researcher. The authors find that special analysis of deviant cases serves two basic research functions: "(1) to discover additional relevant factors, and (2) to refine the measurement of factors already considered."

The other study of research technique is by Robert K. Merton and is entitled "Patterns of Influence: A Study of Interpersonal Influence and of Communications Behavior in a Local Community." In the words of the author, the aim of this pilot study was fourfold: "(1) to identify types of people regarded as variously 'influential' by their fellows; (2) to relate patterns of communications behavior to their roles as influential persons; (3) to gain clues to the chief avenues through which they came to acquire influence; and (4) to set out hypotheses for more systematic study of the workings of interpersonal influence in the local community." The author considers this to be an exploratory study focused upon the sociology of mass communication in relation to interpersonal influence. It is based primarily on interviews of 86 men and women from diverse social and economic strata in a town of 11,000 on the eastern seaboard. Thus it is more a succession of case studies than a statistical analysis. Still, it serves very well the purpose of pointing out the painstaking care and diligence necessary to a study of interpersonal relations. And it goes a long way toward providing evidence in support of the author's fourfold aim.

Although it is certainly true that this first postwar volume of *Communications Research* has given attention to several media other than radio, radio has received three times as much attention as any one other medium. And several media have received no attention in this volume at all. There is nothing, for example, on the motion picture as a medium of communication. There is nothing on the use of books in libraries or elsewhere. It is true, of course, that these latter media are not dependent on advertising in the same manner as is the radio, the newspaper and the magazine. We hope, however, that it is not too much to expect *Communications Research* in future volumes to concern itself with all fields of communication, whether or not it is possible to find some interested party to support the necessary research basic to an understanding of the role of each medium of communication in modern society.—*LeRoy Charles Merritt, School of Librarianship, University of California.*