in library education. Indeed, his emphasis on "bibliography" (in however broad a sense) as the heart of the course at the University College School of Library, Archive and Information Studies will seem old-fashioned even to many British librarians nowadays.

Three papers are concerned with other aspects of Pafford's various interests. Professor Arthur Brown's "The Growth of Literary Societies" is a fascinating account of these curious institutions, most of them founded in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. "The Editor and the Literary Text: Requirements and Opportunities" is an opportunity for Howard Brooks to write about a subject where Jack Pafford made notable contributions; indeed, a look at the list of publications which constitutes the ninth contribution to this anthology shows that a great many of his published articles are concerned with textual criticism. Lastly, Professor Wilmot writes about a thirteenth-century illuminated manuscript which Jack Pafford acquired for the University of London Library.

Pafford is an excellent example of the librarian-cum-humanistic scholar. It is doubtful if bibliographies of librarians in the future will resemble that of Jack Pafford at all. His writings are tributes to the range of his mind, and this collection of essays is a not unworthy tribute also. It is a pity that the book should be marred by a number of irritating misprints and some mistakes. The most glaring misprint, which could well be misleading to American readers, is on page 14, where "the National Science Reference Library and the National Landing Library for Science and Invention" are mentioned; this should of course read "the National Reference Library of Science and Invention and the National Lending Library for Science and Technology."—*Maurice B. Line, University of Bath.*

User-Requirements in Identifying Desired Works in a Large Library. Ben-Ami Lipetz. New Haven: Yale University Library, 1970.

In light of all that has been said for so many years about the needs of the user as a key element in cataloging, it seems strange that it is only now that we have a careful and reliable, large-scale study of how the patrons of an academic library use the card catalog. This study of the use of the main card catalog of Yale University over a year's period of time is outstanding in terms of the care and detail which went into its planning and implementation and into the analysis of the data involved.

Its main purpose was to examine "the question of how to design a computerized catalog for a very large library that can be expected to give the best possible performance." A second objective was to see "whether, and, if so, how, existing card catalogs in very large libraries may be made more responsive to user requirements." Can a study of this kind be of primary value in planning computerized tools without being substantially supplemented by other kinds of studies of user needs? "One cannot create an ideal tool of any sort on a rational basis . . . without knowing a good deal about the purposes for which the tool is to be used, and about the manner in which the users interact with the tool. In the literature on libraries, there is a dearth of reliable information on the utilization of catalogs." So we have created card catalogs on a less than rational basis and have foisted upon the user a complex tool which must have by now materially affected the ways in which he attempts to define his needs. If we now ask him how he satisfied information needs by the use of the card catalog, we are only asking him how he has adapted his needs to the tools we have made available to him. This may be analogous to planning new transportation systems by conducting an automobile traffic survey.

For the possible improvement of existing catalogs, the thirty major findings of this study are of unquestioned value. Those that may be briefly summarized here include: (1) 73 percent of the searches were for a known document (26 percent for a document that the user is already familiar with), 16 percent are subject searches, 6 percent author searches, and 5 percent bibliographic searches; (2) many users look for known documents as an indirect way of conducting a subject search so that in total 56 percent of the searches were for a known document and 33 percent were sub-

ject searches; (3) 84 percent of the searches were successful, with author and subject searches being equally successful in that the desired items were identified in the catalog; (4) of the sixteen searches in 100 that were not successful, ten failed because the document was not listed in the catalog (one fifth of those were added to the catalog between the time of the user's search and the project follow-up search), five were for documents which were listed in the catalog and could have been located with the clues available to the user, and one failed because the user had inadequate clues; and (5) users can locate material despite incomplete information or misspelled words, and can do so better than either of two computer algorithms tested.

The most intriguing aspect of this report is the comment that "the interpretation of these results can vary greatly, depending on whether a librarian is more interested in expanding service or in conserving money and labor." The only real conclusions that Lipetz draws are that arranging the cards within a subject heading by date may be helpful; that more title-like entries would seem to be of value; that more should be done to acquire material promptly and in anticipation of need and to notify users of books that are on order or on hand but not yet cataloged; and that strong consideration should be given to improved user orientation and user assistance.

It will be of most interest to see how the Yale University Library finally interprets these results and what impact, if any, this study has on the existing card catalog at Yale and on the planning for a computerized catalog.—*Norman D. Stevens, University of Connecticut.*

The American College and American Culture. Socialization as a Function of Higher Education. Oscar Handlin and Mary F. Handlin. New York: Mc-Graw-Hill, 1970. 104p.

This essay, written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "aims to clarify the history of the role of socialization as a factor in the development of the college." This promise to add to the disciplined knowledge of the relationship of a particular institution to a specific societal function is an objective of great importance.

A successful study of this sort would make a valuable contribution not only in its substantive conclusions but also in its usefulness as a model for similar investigations.

The difficulties of the problem demand great capacity for its solution, and the authors bring good credentials to their task. Handlin, director of the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History at Harvard University, has long experience and a high reputation; his wife has frequently worked with him on his research. The importance of the problem and the high aspirations of the authors promise a great deal.

The result is an interesting and well-written summary of the development of higher education as part of American life. Judged in terms of the goals set for it, however, it does not succeed. The failure was made inevitable by the Handlins' decision not to define socialization exactly. They simply describe it as a "nonreligious, nonvocational function . . . connected with the desire to adjust the individual to the society." If by socialization, the Handlins do not mean to include promotion of religion, preparation for an occupation, profit to the larger society, or advancement of the graduate in society or career, the reader is left to wonder just what they do mean, especially since much of the discussion concerns these very matters.

If the study is not to be judged in terms of its stated goal, the reader must turn to the canons of historical investigation, to the nature of the evidence presented, and to his own perceptions of the subject as compared with the work in hand. The Handlins cite their sources in clumps, paragraph by paragraph. The reader is often unsure which assertions—and even quotations—are based on what sources. In a single paragraph, a number of quotations may appear without clear indication that their sources are separated by fifty years or more. Only the encyclopedic specialist could judge authoritatively what proportion of the evidence the Handlins have gathered is relevant or whether their conclusions are valid, but even a reader with a nodding acquaintance with particular aspects of American educational history will find troubling omissions and will be likely to question some of the detailed assertions and some of the broad