

The final chapter deals with the role of the "information officer" in British academic libraries. Should this type of librarian be an instructor or an information specialist?

The entire study is filled with representative quotes from British and American library literature. This work should be required reading for any academic librarian interested and involved in library instruction of any kind.—*Hannelore B. Rader, Orientation Librarian, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan.*

Daiute, Robert J., and Gorman, Kenneth A. **Library Operations Research.** Dobbs Ferry, N.Y.: Oceana, 1974. 368p. \$25.00. (LC 73-20303) (ISBN 0-913338-01-X)

Library Operations Research should not be the title of this work by a professor of management and a professor of quantitative methods. It would be more appropriate to title it *In-Library Book Usage: A Case Study*. The book details the application of a rather sophisticated computer-based statistical sampling method to the in-library book usage at Rider College. Those familiar with the development of the operations research (OR) approach will recognize that the techniques used by Daiute and Gorman are but a fragment of the methodology of the operations research school of thought (Operations Research Society, PERT, linear programming, simulation techniques, heuristic problem-solving). To equate a computer-based sampling study to operations research is unfair to both librarians and operations research advocates.

Operations research people can be incredibly naive concerning the purpose of academic libraries (see p.100, "there is low utilization of the library for the purpose of reading books inside the library"). In their insensitivity to the people aspects (qualified, individual-oriented reference and resource personnel; readily accessible materials; immediate seating space to browse, to sit, to read, to listen, to study, to view; copying service; and easy access and easy use) of academic library service, one can, nevertheless, argue that these OR technologists have taken a more macro, longer view of in-library book usage than their more humanistic brethren. What Daiute and Gor-

man tell us is that better methodology does need to be accepted in the long run, because deeper, largely competitive forces in the economy press them upon individual libraries.

The authors state on page 257, "quantitative standards serve to supplement the judgment of professional librarians. Statistics cannot (repeat cannot) be used independent of the competent librarian's judgment." This same thinking should have been considered when the study was undertaken. That is, a competent librarian would have been a welcomed addition to the team. Perhaps a people-oriented service point of view would have eliminated the "library is synonymous with reading syndrome" from which the authors must be suffering. There is some evidence (see p.93) that the authors may have tried: "In one episode, for example, a subordinate administrator would not permit several chairs to be put in place of a reading carrel in the library. . . . Only after the president intervened were chairs installed." You are right, Bob and Ken, librarians even have to convince other librarians that libraries are more than books and carrels.

The authors present a much welcomed "Summary of the Book" at the beginning. It was here, though, that a good editor was needed. Instead of taking the reader by the hand and leading him through the material, a long and rambling summary resulted. In addition, the summary fails to indicate the audience for which the book was intended. If the book were intended for the library director, then it fails to provide easy-to-use guidelines. If the book were for the library researcher, it gives more detail than one really wants, e.g., on page 92 the attributes of Alpha Phi Omega are described. If the study were for those who want to know who the typical man or typical woman student is, the results reflect only Rider College and should not be applied to all academic libraries.

Few librarians have ever questioned the value that statistical methodology offers library decision makers in selecting among alternative solutions to personnel utilization, personnel costs, book costs, and overdue book operations. However, the book offers little more than how the methodology

can be employed. What the authors have done is establish a statistical model and accomplish one case study.

This book is recommended to the reader with the initiative, interest, background, and time to analyze the authors' methodology carefully. A major value of the work is that it does provide a description of a body of experience gained by individuals who have applied sampling-theory and computer technology to in-library book use and who maintain that the same theory and methodology can be applied to other library components. Long-term evaluation of the "could be" aspects lies in the future.—*Robert E. Kemper, Director of Libraries, Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, Arizona.*

Harris, Michael H. *A Guide to Research in American Library History*. 2d ed. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974. 275p. \$9.00. (LC 74-17113) (ISBN 0-8108-0744-0)

Six years after the initial publication of *A Guide to Research in American Library History* by Michael H. Harris, a second edition has been released. Acknowledging errors and omissions in the original volume, the availability of constructive critiques, and substantial new research, the author indicates that the purpose of the *Guide* remains the same—namely, to assess the extent and nature of research in the field, to discuss the framework and methodology of the library historian, to describe the works dealing with the published literature, and to provide a descriptive bibliography of master's theses and doctoral dissertations on American library history through 1973.

The overriding question that comes to mind is whether this work really is "a guide to research" or, in fact, an annotated bibliography of theses and dissertations in American library history. Moreover, one wonders whether this book could have been far more valuable if the author had concentrated on his bibliography by expanding it into a major work including other contributions in the field in addition to theses and dissertations.

Following the general outline of the earlier edition, Harris opens with three brief chapters on "The State of the Art," "Philosophy and Methodology for Research," and

"A Guide to the Sources," all in the span of thirty-seven pages. Despite the inclusion of ninety-eight notes and twenty-two additional references, the author fails to do justice to his subject. Regrettably, the substantive issues appear less important than the running arguments concerning whether librarians are really interested in library history, the unfortunate decisions of many graduate library schools to drop the thesis requirement, and whether or not those who have written in the field are "serious library historians" (p.8).

Although the author frequently bids for our attention with references or quotes from Pierce Butler, Sidney Ditzion, Jesse Shera, and Haynes McMullen, he also subjects his readers to a number of tiresome and fatuous statements such as, "There are, however, a number of library schools still producing good master's research and American library history continues to be a popular topic" (p.4), and "Now, I do not presume to deny the sometime historian the right to study library history at his whim and fancy, nor do I hold any brief for those who argue that historical knowledge is a panacea for all our ills" (p.8-9). When the author states that "Jesse Shera *recently* issued a call . . ." (p.5) referring to a 1966 article (also contained verbatim in the 1968 edition, p.12), or that "Jesse Shera observed *some time ago* . . ." (p.3), referring to a 1973 publication (which one must search to discover is actually partially reprinted from an article originally published in 1945), the reader is left to wonder about the accuracy and integrity of what follows. Under the heading of "methodology for research" the discussion of Vleeschauwer's philosophy and methodology is all too brief; Waples, Goldhor, Wynar, and others are mentioned, but the reader is not really told what they said or how they influenced the writing of library history.

Part II is by far the more valuable portion of this work. It expands the annotated bibliography of graduate research in American library history from 496 entries in the first edition to 653 by adding 48 doctoral dissertations and 109 master's theses. Moreover, the author has added 18 annotations that were missing for entries in the earlier