(SRRT) was founded. Moon, who was instrumental in the founding of the SRRT, remained a loyal member and supporter throughout his library career.

While still at Scarecrow, Moon transformed this small library press into the major publishing venture in librarianship that it is today. In no small way due to his business acumen at *LJ* and Scarecrow, Moon was inaugurated in 1977 as ALA president at the annual conference in Detroit. The theme for his ALA presidential year, to advocate an egalitarian national information policy, was never fully realized because of the protracted scandal centering on the release of the film *Speaker*, intended to champion First Amendment rights, but which offended the black leaders and membership of ALA along with defenders, black and white, of the civil rights movement.

Moon retired from Scarecrow at the end of 1978 at age fifty-five, and the couple moved to Florida. During the 1980s and early 1990s, Eric remained involved in writing and speaking, while Ilse returned to work, serving as executive secretary of the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) from 1988 to 1992. In 1993, Scarecrow published a collection of his writings and speeches entitled *A Desire to Learn: Selected Writings*. Eric, who turned 79 in 2002, and Ilse, his wife of more than thirty years, are now enjoying a well-deserved retirement in Florida, filled with golf, travel, reading, and family.

An example of Moon the mentor is Robert McFarland Franklin, founder of McFarland & Company, Inc., in Jefferson, North Carolina, publisher of this biography and Moon's number two man at Scarecrow Press during most of the 1970s. Leaving Scarecrow in March 1979, about a year or so after Moon, Franklin had supervised publication of McFarland's first six books by September 1980.

Kister's in-depth biography of Eric Moon is well written, impeccably documented, and extensively indexed. It should be in the collections of academic libraries throughout the United States and the United Kingdom, particularly those serving institutions with graduate programs in library and information science.—*Plummer Alston Jones, Jr., East Carolina University.*

Neely, Teresa Y. *Sociological and Psychological Aspects of Information Literacy in Higher Education.* Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Pr., 2002. 188p., alk. paper, $47.50 (ISBN 0810841053). LC 2002-21214.

"What makes an individual information literate?" This is the question that Neely poses in this slim monograph based on her 2000 doctoral dissertation. Reporting the results of a survey conducted of students at an anonymous research university, Neely attempts to shed light on this question through an analysis of several factors, including: student attitudes toward information skills (and information skills instruction), student performance on information skills assessments, student relationships with faculty, student exposure to the information environment, and student experience in the information environment. Although Neely uncovers important aspects of each of these factors through her review of the literature and analysis of the survey data collected, this monograph ultimately fails to deliver on the expansive promise of its title and leaves the reader feeling that it may have been rushed too quickly from its original dissertation form.

Like many dissertations, this work begins with the identification of a perceived lacuna in the literature. Neely argues that there is a "marked lack of empirical research" on information literacy and that this has left us with little agreement on what information literacy actually means or on how best to design information literacy instruction in higher education. Although there is little doubt that the research agenda for those of us interested in information literacy remains wide open, one cannot help but think that Neely is exaggerating both the scope and the uniqueness of this problem.

Library literature, in general, suffers from the publication of a great deal of prac-

titioner-oriented material of varying quality. It also suffers from an equally great deal of quantitative research that fails to make any impact on the way in which professional practice is conducted. It is for this very reason that the ACRL's Instruction Section has taken pains over the past two years to articulate a research agenda related to library instruction and information literacy. And this problem is not unique to library literature. Debates over the quality of educational research, in general, are long-standing, as is the idea that there is a gulf between theory and practice in education (e.g., Kaestle, "The Awful Reputation of Education Research," *Educational Researcher* 22, no. 1 [1993]: 23, 26–31). This is evidenced by the current strategic priority being pursued by the U. S. Department of Education's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) to transform education into an "evidence-based field." The problems that Neely identifies with research in information literacy instruction are part of much broader issues, but there is little appreciation for this fact evident in her work.

The format of the book also reveals its genesis as a doctoral dissertation and suggests that the publisher provided little guidance to the author as she edited it for publication as a monograph. Not only does the work follow the familiar dissertation format of literature review, methodology, report of research findings, conclusion, and suggestions for further research, but it is full of the repetition often found in dissertations. For example, Neely tells the reader twice within three pages that the time it took for respondents to complete the survey was shortened by approximately eight minutes when the instrument was made available electronically. One is used to seeing this sort of writing in a dissertation, but it is out of place in a published monograph. The author is not at fault here; her editors are.

All this is not to suggest that this book is not worthwhile; it is. Neely is correct to argue, for example, both that we know too little about student attitudes toward information literacy instruction and that our instruction programs could be improved if we knew more. Some of the facts that Neely uncovers through her survey are at once informative and frightening. Among these are her identification of the factors that students consider important in determining whether to make use of a specific resource in their research and of the particular tools that students are most likely to use. Space allows for only one representative example: When given the research topic of violence in American high schools, the option selected as least likely to be used by Neely's student respondents was to "search ERIC and other related databases." Read it again. ERIC was the information resource of last resort for conducting research in education.

This brings up the most interesting aspect of this work. One might assume from its title that it is meant for an audience of researchers and practitioners in the area of information literacy instruction. Although this audience will undoubtedly be interested, in general, in the information provided about how students make choices about which resources to use, the audience that may receive the most benefit from this study is that of education librarians. The survey sample is drawn from undergraduate and graduate students in the field of education, and Neely identifies a number of very useful facts about the way in which these students search for and manage information. To me, her insight into the work of doctoral students alone (drawn largely from her literature review) makes the book worth reading. For anyone providing instructional services to a department or college of education, this work will provide useful citations for further review and informative "nuggets" to be shared with liaison faculty when making an argument for the need for information literacy instruction in their programs.—*Scott Walter, Washington State University.*