large project of the American Psychological Association, which studied the structure and use of the literature of that subject in the 1950s and early 1960s.

The first part of the book is devoted to definitions, classification, and discussion of the problems involved in using various bibliographic elements in the analysis of primary and secondary literatures. This discussion merely focuses on bibliometrics information already familiar to anyone who has done library cataloging. The middle part, beginning with chapter five on the size and growth of the literature, is the meat of the book, because it deals with specific applications of bibliometrics. The final part is a review of standard statistical methods, including the application of computers, graphic presentations, and sampling.

An appendix includes a glossary, a list of suggestions for projects in the field (which is also a useful summary of the scope of the subject), a list of references cited in the text, and a brief list of suggested further reading. The list of DISISS research reports (p.179) is useful inasmuch as libraries may have missed acquiring some or all of these rather fugitive research reports.

Although one might have wished for a more detailed text (the treatment of content analysis, for example, is inadequate), most research libraries will wish to have this book. Interest in bibliometrics extends well beyond library and information science. The authors are of the opinion—and this reviewer agrees—that statistical methods of literature analysis are spreading from the sciences and social sciences to the humanities. In the field of history, the rise of cliometric analysis will certainly involve the allied field of bibliometrics.

Bibliometric analysis of Nicholas and Ritchie's book would be difficult and probably unrewarding inasmuch as only twenty-eight references are cited. One would come to the invalid conclusion that nothing was done in this field between Hulme's work in 1923 and Louittit's in 1955. The numerous citation studies done at the Graduate Library School by, for example, Fussler in chemistry and physics (1948), McAnally in history (1951), and Hintz in botany (1952) are ignored. Nor is the more recent work (1971) by Lamb at Case Western Reserve University in the literature of mathematics mentioned or cited.

As one might expect, the examples drawn from the work of Maurice Line and his colleagues (including the two authors of this book) at Bath are interesting in themselves. For example, the discussion of obsolescence in literatures (p.122) will give aid and comfort to those who oppose "no-growth" policies in libraries—i.e., the discarding or storing off-campus of older, presumably little used, materials. The authors maintain that statistics showing decline in use of materials with age have been "exaggerated or misinterpreted." One of the reasons given for this is that the corpus of a literature published in, say, 1950, is typically only half that of 1960. Thus a given number of citations or library charge-outs would be a larger proportion of the 1950 than of the 1960 holdings. The other argument is less clear to this reviewer. It involved a distinction between "updating" and "basic" uses of a given item. The former declines rapidly, but the latter remains constant or decays more slowly.

In short, this is an important manual in its own right, another indicator of the significance of the Bath University DISISS project, and is the only recent book in the field.—*Perry D. Morrison, University of Oregon, Eugene.*

Arnold, Denis V. ***The Management of the Information Department.*** A Grafton Book. Institute of Information Scientists, Monograph Series. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, in association with the Institute of Information Scientists, 1977. 143p. $12.50. LC 76-43375. ISBN 0-89158-716-0.

This book is an honest attempt to bring together the principles and practices for the successful management of an information department in an industrial organization. The material presented is grouped into seven chapters dealing with communication patterns, management, planning and design, organization, coordination, control, and analysis. Each chapter has a bibliography.

The treatment of the various topics covered is brief but to the point. They include the objectives and duties of an information

department, planning of specific functions, centralization versus decentralization of information activities, cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit analyses of the services provided, interactions with users (including user surveys), and standards in control and evaluation procedures. They are certainly as useful and timely for the neophyte as for the veteran in the profession.

The presentation is informal and lucid. Nevertheless, the publication is lacking in three respects: First, the amount of material dealing with the application of computers in information processing and dissemination is scanty. Second, it is almost unthinkable to see a book written on the management of an information department with practically no reference to the various subject-oriented data bases, their availability, use, and management. This is especially relevant at a time when interactive, on-line information systems are almost like household items in an average-sized research library or information department. Third, the half-life of the material cited and presented in the text is on a steady decline since there are hardly any post-1972 references included in the end-of-chapter bibliographies.

Having considered the above factors, one wonders if the manuscript of the book was originally completed some years ago and then kept in cold storage. There is no doubt that any professional who has kept abreast of recent developments in the information science field will readily notice this serious built-in time-lag. Overall, however, this is as good a text as any that covers the field.—*Jata S. Ghosh, Ardmore, Pennsylvania.*

Houser, Lloyd J., and Schrader, Alvin M. ***The Search for a Scientific Profession: Library Science Education in the U.S. and Canada.*** Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1978. 180p. $8. LC 77-17563. ISBN 0-8108-1062-X.

Surely one of the most interesting recent works, this book, through its indictment of library education, presents its underlying thesis that we need a comprehensive and purposeful undertaking to develop a coherent theory of librarianship based upon rigorous research. This outcome, the authors argue passionately, is attainable even though previous efforts have been largely frustrated.

To those who have been indoctrinated in the folklore of education for librarianship, the most startling assertion concerns the institution known for years without ambiguity as "the Graduate Library School," or, simply, "GLS." Veterans of the Chicago doctoral wars may be reminded of an exchange often heard:

"GLS isn't like it was in the Good Old Days."

"Yeah, but then it never was."

We may have joked in those terms, but we knew better. We knew very well that GLS, during the golden years of Louis Round Wilson's deanship, had introduced a new quality to education for librarianship. The school, after floundering under the outsider, George A. Works, began to examine with rigorous logic and precise quantitative measurement the fundamental assumptions of librarianship. It produced a whole generation of library leaders. It was a major source of borrowing for the shape and content of the new curriculum introduced around 1950. In innumerable ways it raised the level of librarianship.

The accomplishments during the ten years of the Wilson deanship are evident, and their soundness is secure beyond question. It will be unfortunate and wasteful if—as seems likely—the attention to this book is directed to defending the impregnable or to denouncing the authors and elaborating the flaws of their case. For their indictment of librarianship is valid.

The case is partially stated in an aphorism:

> Librarianship has been deficient in its Science, with the consequence that its Humanity has been tainted with sentimentality and its Technology with meaningless proliferation, uninformed by Theory and unevaluated by Measurement.

(Though surely a Butlerism, its source has escaped me. I shall be grateful for its identification.)

This unfortunate condition was somewhat ameliorated at GLS under Wilson, but Houser and Schrader suggest the advancements were made in spite of Wilson rather than because of him. To raise such a charge and to countenance it in a review just when