dards in the PH1 and PH4 series. Editorial faults are in places gravely misleading. Xerox Copyflo is described by reference to a "figure 29," but what this figure actually shows is the Electrofax method; nowhere is there a drawing illustrating Copyflo, nor a reference to an illustration of Electrofax. Worse, no mention is made of the essential fact that the paper used in the Electrofax process must be specially coated and that ordinary paper cannot be used.

But by all means the most remarkable part of this unfortunate production is the "full bibliography." It contains nothing later than June 1962, and it is riddled with errors. An article from *American Documentation* is listed as 1957 when it was actually October 1950, and another from the same journal is given as "Americ. Doc. 1, 3" when it was actually volume II, pages 167-70. The same page mentions a publication by "Rutjers" and cites another article negligently as "Office, 1961." R. W. Hale's *Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials* is listed under "Bale," and an article by Charles G. LaHood is listed under "Hood." Included in a list of sixteen "Recommended Books" at the end is a novel by Georges Blond and a book by Rider, Fremont called (believe it or not) "Scholar of the Future Research Library."

The final fillip is a one-page "Subject Index" filled with useless headings such as "Accommodation" and "Activity" (to take the first two) and, to top it all off, an entry for "Fremount Rider" under the F's!

Recommended only for the most comprehensive collections.—*Stephen R. Salmon, Washington University.*

Prospects for Library Cooperation in New York City. Planning for More Effective Utilization of Reference and Research Resources. Nelson Associates, Inc. New York: The Firm, 1963. Unpaged.

This study, which was prepared for "an *ad hoc* committee of leading librarians of New York City and State," was obviously designed to set the groundwork so that the research libraries of New York City might participate at the outset in any program of state support to research and reference libraries. It is, therefore, a testament to the foresight and acumen of the *ad hoc* committee and particularly to the organizers of that committee. The sponsoring group and the nature of the study guarantee the importance of the work, and it is disheartening that in such circumstances the report itself is so poor an achievement.

The city study is interwoven in recent history of library efforts in regard to research and reference libraries in the state, and it cannot be understood fully apart from that record. It is unnecessary to rehearse the multitudinous problems which have beset the larger reference and research libraries in recent years. However, in March 1960 the New York State Commissioner of Education appointed a committee to examine and recommend some solutions to these growing difficulties. In December 1961 the committee's findings were published in *The Report of the Commissioner's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources*, which soon came to be known as "the 3 R's"—how significantly the 3 R's have changed.

The *Report* called for a state-supported system of regional library associations which by utilizing large libraries within each region, could provide for the reference and research needs of the student and research personnel of that area. It recommended the creation of a central state board which at the outset would aid in the development of regional associations and later would provide the administrative corps to carry on the work of coordinating the seven regional associations into a flexible cooperative network.

In 1962 the State Education department hired Nelson Associates, Inc., to do a pilot study "to determine how the proposed legislation . . . could be implemented in and how it would affect a specific area of the State." Their report of the seven-county area around Rochester was published as *A Reference and Research Plan for the Rochester Area.* The publication recommended a research center at the University of Rochester and a reference center at the Rochester public library. With generous support from the state and with true cooperation, not a one-way street, the plan was deemed practical and essential.

An area of specialized research needs of the state was studied in Ralph T. Esterquest's *Strengthening Medical Library Resources in New York State* (1963), and in

that same year Nelson Associates were called on again to analyze the requirements and effects of the implementation of the 3 R's program on a statewide level *(Strengthening and Coordinating Reference and Research Library Resources in New York State).* The statewide report focused on the responsibilities of the proposed state board and the relationship of the regional associations to that board and to the state library. The report stressed again the need for ungrudging state subvention of the program and also recommended that the demands of special subject fields be met within the 3 R's program.

Surveys allied to the 3 R's in nature, but not a part of the state study, were going forward in the city. In August of 1963 Nelson Associates produced a study on the prospects for cooperation among eight educational institutions in Brooklyn *(Brooklyn—A Center of Learning)* and a month later the Council of Higher Educational Institutions published Rice Estes' *Study of Seven Academic Libraries in Brooklyn,* which noted that these small libraries, all within a mile and a half of their most distant neighbor, could profit by planned cooperative measures. The Estes' study was carried out for $3,750, a grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Legislative bills to implement the 3 R's have been introduced and defeated twice in the Legislature, but since the original report of 1961 the 3 R's have gained adherents steadily; and as each new study recognizes the need for state support if New York is to serve its citizens and to keep and attract research industry, passage of the bill is foreseen in the near future. In this context, the New York City committee of librarians decided to have a program ready for implementation at the drop of a gavel, and Nelson Associates were hired "to examine the ways in which the proposed 3 R's legislation would affect library use in New York City."

Working under a deadline and beginning their study at the end of the university and school year, the Nelson group decided to eliminate from their investigation any survey of university graduate and undergraduate use of libraries, and though they do not mention it, also of faculty use of libraries. Since this college-university group probably constitutes the single most important segment in advanced reference and research use, Nelson relied on two previous studies on student use, *Cooperative Library Service for Higher Education* (1960), and *A Study of the Use of Metropolitan New York Libraries by Higher Education Students,* both by Warren Haas. They relied also for their statistics on the Office of Health, Education, and Welfare figures for 1961/62, and made no effort to update, verify, or interpret these figures.

Nelson Associates attacked the survey by an examination of the history of cooperative library efforts in New York City since World War II, a scrutiny of the relevant library literature, correspondence with other institutions which had faced similar problems, interviews with library staff members, and an analysis of the information garnered from forty-five hundred questionnaires completed by reference users in twelve public libraries in the city. The use of the plural terms "correspondence" and "interviews" indicates that more than one of each took place, but exactly how many is left unnoted. Perhaps Nelson Associates felt it was immaterial since the great bulk of the report is based on the replies to the questionnaire.

In the introduction to the first appendix, Nelson Associates list some of the material reasons for approaching the questionnaires with caution, but with little else to guide them, their report is almost wholly an inflated analysis of the responses to the canvass. The findings are unexceptional, much as one would anticipate. The fact that all of the responses could have been foretold is not necessarily a fault, for documentation of an argument, particularly for the purpose of proposed legislation, is extremely important. In this report, however, the documentation, despite the charts and maps, is meager. The most significant replies concern the volume and purpose of the use the respondents made of the library they were then using and of other libraries in the city. Associated with these questions were such queries as the occupation of the respondent and suggested improvements in service.

The recommendations which then follow in sequence do not necessarily follow in consequence. They could have resulted from the finding of this study, of almost any other study, or from no study at all.

The recommendations in order are:

1. The establishment of a New York library service authority.
2. The construction of an undergraduate college-oriented reference library at 42nd Street.
3. A program for interinstitutional library use for undergraduates and doctoral students and faculties.
4. A program of research into library activities in the area.
5. Improved utilization of paperback publications in connection with reserve collections at college libraries.
6. Identification of special subject advanced research level holdings and their designation as the advanced research centers under the 3 R program.
7. A site location study to select the optimum site or sites for the establishment of future college-oriented reference libraries.

Of these, the hortation for the use of paperbacks must be regarded as fatuous. The recommendation on interinstitutional use is idealistic but impractical and could be turned to use by those irresponsible administrations who have always regarded library cooperation as a device to let George and the New York public library handle their problems. The other recommendations are secondary to the prime suggestion for the establishment of a New York library service authority—on which recommendation the value of this report ultimately hangs.

This recommendation, to develop a private legal body, supported apart from any other institution in the city, headed by influential members of the community is the *piéce-de-resistance* of the report. Such an organization could provide the manpower and the facilities to implement decisions and recommendations made in concert by the libraries of the city, an element lacking in the history of previous cooperative efforts since no one institution could afford to carry on the involved time-absorbing operations which would be required in any situation as large and as complex as the library problems besetting the city. Such an establishment could also perform the necessary research and provide the leadership to develop needed cooperative programs on a pay-as-you-go basis, and could be devised so as to conform to the proposed 3 R legislation so that city libraries would be prepared to step into the state-supported program. When the legislation is enacted, the authority could either dissolve into a regional body or help to bring such a body into existence and continue to work alongside it, each with different responsibilities. This recommendation is naturally the one which has fired the interest of the New York City librarians.

The Nelson Associates report was financed by two equal grants from the Old Dominion Foundation and the Council on Library Resources, $32,000—a goodly sum. —*Bernard Kreissman, City College, New York.*

Purdue University Libraries Attitude Survey: 1959-1960. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Library Staff Association, 1964. 51p.

The results of the Purdue survey are both revealing and disappointing. Undergraduates, the group surveyed, possessed strongly favorable attitudes toward the Purdue University libraries, the university in general, and also toward the American library system—evidence of intellectual gerrymandering, or at least as the survey puts it "a social-culturally induced predisposition of the student to regard the institution favorably." Furthermore, the strongly favorable attitude toward the Purdue libraries was independent of frequency of use and scholastic achievement and class in the university. Unfortunately, knowing a student's attitude score toward one institution helped but little in inferring his attitude toward another specified institution.

On the basis of median values students ranked the card catalog first and the reference librarian fourth in a list of nine facilities. Readers are reminded that these are relative rankings and do not suggest the intrinsic worth of the facilities. Interestingly enough, the rankings of the nonfrequent users of the libraries paralleled the ranking of the frequent users.

Both the students and the Remmers-Kelly scale for measuring attitudes toward institutions seem insensitive. That the latter is true might have been expected by the surveyors since the scale has not been altogether well received. It is, however, a simple and