

art, colleges of technology, technological universities, and polytechnics. Consequently, the descriptions may be helpful to those interested in British higher education and its libraries, and a library seeking exhaustive coverage of British librarianship may wish to acquire the book despite its mediocrity.—*W. L. Williamson, The Library School, University of Wisconsin at Madison.*

Danton, J. Periam. *The Dimensions of Comparative Librarianship*. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1973. 184p.

This is a landmark book which will be cited for many years to come. Troubled by the confusion in thinking over the past two decades as to the meaning of "comparative librarianship," Professor Danton here sets out on a rigorous exercise in logic and argument to determine its proper definition and nature, and he succeeds admirably. He groups the main body of his comments into five parts:

1. He points out the benefits enjoyed by other social sciences (law, sociology, education, linguistics) from the application of the comparative method.

2. He finds variety, unclarity, and contradiction in the library community as to the meaning of comparative librarianship, and he proposes a definition.

3. He reviews the several purposes and values to society which can result from the study of comparative librarianship.

4. He examines the present state of education, research, and publication in comparative librarianship and finds it wanting.

5. He discusses the comparative method as it can and should be applied to librarianship.

He concludes with seven recommendations for gaining greater attention to comparative librarianship, and he appends a fine outline for a seminar on the subject, a brief bibliography, and an index.

This book accomplishes in large measure its primary implicit intent of clarifying a previously muddled area of our discussion and doubtless also of our thinking, and it should go far toward bringing greater commonality of direction to this meaningful but inadequately developed aspect of librarianship.

Yet it is also in some ways a painful book

to read. Seemingly as though he did not wholly trust his very considerable powers of logic and dispassionate persuasion, Professor Danton frequently resorts for emphasis to the use of italics, emotion-laden adjectives, and broad generalities, which will to some readers make his book seem more hortatory than reasoned. He finds statements of other authors "absurd," "at best misleading and at worst self-contradictory," "completely counter to accepted definitions," and having "no logical justification." He condemns much existing literature for not having been comparative when it was neither intended nor claimed by its authors to be comparative. He discounts by name Munthe's *American Librarianship from a European Angle*, Bostwick's *Popular Libraries of the World*, Asheim's *Librarianship in Developing Countries*, Esdaile's *National Libraries of the World*, and others of similar authority and significance as not being "useful . . . in the sense of advancing the profession in fundamental ways" because they were not comparative in accord with his definition.

That is pretty sweeping stuff, and although this reviewer for one does not think Professor Danton means it in quite the way it sounds, it could lose him some friends as well as, more importantly, fail to gain adherents to his cause, and that would be a pity because his cause deserves adherents. Comparative librarianship, he proposes, "may be defined as the analysis of libraries, library systems, some aspect of librarianship, or library problems in two or more national, cultural, or societal environments, in terms of socio-political, economic, cultural, ideological, and historical contexts. This analysis is for the purpose of understanding the underlying similarities and differences, and for determining explanations of the differences, with the ultimate aim of trying to arrive at valid generalizations and principles" (p.52). With the possible exception of substituting "or" for "and" as the antepenultimate word in the first sentence, most will doubtless feel that this is a pretty good definition.—*David Kaser, Graduate Library School, Indiana University, Bloomington.*

Lee, Sul H., ed. *Planning-Programming-*

**Budgeting System (PPBS): Implications for Library Management.** (Library Management Series, no. 1) Published for the Eastern Michigan University Library by Pierian Press, 1973. 112p.

This short volume is a compilation of papers presented at the Institute on Library Management held on the campus at Eastern Michigan University, April 1972. It includes as well the introduction to the institute by A. P. Marshall and a lengthy bibliography prepared by Margaret Eide of the EMU staff.

Collections of conference papers often suffer from a lack of unity; *PPBS* partly overcomes this difficulty at least through three of the basic papers—"Program Budgeting—Why?" (Richard Hall); "Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems in Higher Education" (Donald C. DeLong); and "The Effective Use of PPBS to Improve Library Management" (Harold R. Jenkins). The fourth paper, "The State of Michigan Program Budget Evaluation System as Applied to Higher Education" (Philip Jager), is a good general interest summary that may have served the institute well but adds very little to a monograph on PPBS and its implications for libraries. Overall coherence would have benefited had the editor in his introduction developed the topic more and described the place of each paper within the book.

In the opening presentation Mr. Hall very simply traces the historical development of budgeting processes from "how much?" through "what for?" to "why?" highlighting problems and limitations and emphasizing the evaluation as a key thrust of program budgeting. He prepares a usable framework for Mr. DeLong's discussion of the implications of and need for PPBS in higher education, including its benefits, problems of information gathering, and the issues raised. Nevertheless, some of the critical questions are not really answered, such as whether or not PPBS "can be successful in service organizations like colleges and universities." His suggestion that a better job of measurement can be done is undoubtedly true but hardly helpful. Mr. Jenkins in discussing "The Effective Use of PPBS to Improve Library Management" makes a good case for em-

ploying program budgeting in libraries, explains the decision making process, offers advice in setting up a PPBS model, and then provides an example. His suggestion for accommodating administrative costs is simple even if debatable, namely to treat administration as a separate program. For those facing the difficulties of data collecting, he stresses the importance of sampling as input, which is inevitable in measuring service. Not only is this article useful but it is inspirational and offers guidance for additional help in approaching PPBS.

"PPBS; A Bibliographic Survey" is more than an appendix since it comprises 42 of the book's 112 pages. It was designed to be broad and selective and it is, with an easily used section on library applications. Nevertheless, the breadth of coverage is misplaced in this volume as most of the references are far removed from the interest of librarians. An evaluative bibliography or at least one with a more limited scope would better serve the reader.

Except for the bibliography, *PPBS* is a historical record of an institute, and a reading of the presentations suggests that the institute was a good one. However, unlike the collected papers of professional conferences, which hopefully deserve publication, basic lectures designed as an introductory survey to a topic need to be very exceptional before they are published as a book. The substance of *PPBS* could have produced one or more journal articles or even laid the foundation for a primer on program budgeting, but in its present form this volume marks a poor beginning for the Library Management Series.—*Timothy A. Brown, Iowa State University Library, Ames.*

Wilkinson, Billy R. **Reference Services for Undergraduate Students: Four Case Studies.** Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972. 421p.

As the subtitle indicates, Dr. Wilkinson investigates the general subject of reference services to undergraduates by means of four detailed case studies. He describes and compares reference services on two campuses which have undergraduate libraries, the University of Michigan and Cornell