

it easier to get at knowledge and information of importance to all of us . . . , to throw light on the workings of the social science information system, and to support subject bibliography as a branch of study." While the intent may be simple, no doubt execution of the intent was not. The book clearly is a result of meticulous scholarship, creative effort, and thoughtful selection. These combine beautifully under Dr. White's direction into a thorough, scholarly contribution to bibliographic literature.

The guide is divided into nine sections; social sciences in general, history, geography, economics and business administration, sociology, anthropology, psychology, education, and political science. Each section, as in the first edition, is made up of a bibliographic essay on the discipline and its literature, followed by guides to the literature and major reference works. The essays are excellent and readable. The lists of sources and guides have been selected and annotated by authorities active in their respective fields. Biographical and professional information about each contributor is included in the introduction and each section is signed.

A library would do well to keep both editions in its current reference collection. Because Dr. White's associates have changed, the essays and emphases have changed. In the case of anthropology, Bernard J. Siegel (professor of anthropology, Stanford University, and editor of *Biennial Review of Anthropology*) states specifically that his survey in the second edition covers the literature in anthropology between 1960 and 1971. It is inevitable that his bibliographic essay differs tremendously from that written by Felix Keesing in the first edition. The guides to the literature sections and reference materials sections are obviously more repetitive.

The format of the second edition is, in my opinion, far more inviting and pleasing than the first. The annotations are authoritative and useful. Cross-references are used extensively and well in dealing with this overlapping body of literature of the social sciences. The index is thorough.

I would recommend that general reference librarians at the college and university level not only *buy* this guide but *read* it as

well. We all need to be reminded of current developments in each of these fields, to be reminded of sources we do not use frequently, and to be reminded that guides of this quality exist. Many sit forever on the shelves unused unless recommended to the scholar by the librarian.—*Joyce Ball, University of Nevada Libraries, Reno.*

Archives Procedural Manual. St. Louis, Missouri: Washington University School of Medicine Library, 1973. 118p. \$5.00.

Consistency. If one word must catch the attention of a librarian or archivist, be this it. Perhaps more so for the archivist who must maintain a complexity of specific procedures within his/her department to provide adequate bibliographic control and organization. The entire gamut of acquisitions, processing, storage, and reference are involved within the archival limits. Recently, many archival institutions have been formalizing daily procedures within their department by way of a manual. Such attempts at standardization are commendable, for without procedural manuals archival consistency cannot be maintained. It is to this point that the staff at the archives of the Washington University School of Medicine Library addresses itself. This manual has been published to aid other archivists who might be considering setting up their own procedural system. Although the directions and forms apply to the specific situation at Washington University, the Washington University archival staff believes that the manual should be useful to the larger profession of archivists.

The format is a spiral-type notebook printed in typescript with accessibility somewhat restricted due to no index and an insufficiently concise table of contents. The manual lists in minute detail the established steps entailed for the archival process from acquiring material through providing reference service. In addition to the textual explanation, excellent work-flow charts provide an added depth to the work. Also included are chapters that deal with procedures for such material as sound recordings, pictures, maps, and microforms. Examples of specific request forms and internal control forms employed at the Washington University Archives are also present-

ed, but unfortunately, are carried to extremes—such as thirty-three pages of targets used for microfilming. Such examples illustrate the attention to detail apparent throughout this manual.

Criticism of specific procedures would be both unfair and unwise. In the larger context, many ideas contained within the manual are applicable to other archival institutions. Yet, a large degree of success with archival organization is rooted to the pragmatic qualities exhibited by the head of the archives department. Thus, procedures that might be applicable to specific institutions with certain characteristics may not be workable at another institution. Future archival procedural writers hoping to glean insight into archival organization and processes should keep in mind that this manual represents procedures developed for a medical archives and that such an archival collection is somewhat restricted in both scope and size compared to many college and university collections. Nonetheless, the manual will provide guidance to those attempting to produce a procedural manual for their own institution—especially if used in conjunction with *Forms Manual*, published by the College and University Archives Committee of the Society of American Archivists (1973). One hopes that archives with procedural manuals will respond positively to Washington University Medical Archives' suggestion to make them available for outside examination. The creation of more such manuals will help standardize procedures and will lead directly to the improved control, service, and benefit of an archives—and most importantly—consistency.—*Charles R. McClure, Head, History-Government Department, University of Texas at El Paso Library.*

Boyer, Calvin James. *The Doctoral Dissertation as an Information Source: A Study of Scientific Information Flow*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1973. 129p. \$5.00.

Libraries acquire for use by their patrons only a small fraction of the doctoral dissertations written annually in the United States. If the research is not acquired extensively in its original format, do dissertations serve as information sources in other

traditional formal communication channels of open literature?

That question is addressed in this monograph, which was originally written for a Ph.D. at the University of Texas. The investigation was undertaken to determine to what extent dissertations serve as information sources and what are the characteristics of assimilation and diffusion patterns of dissertation contents. After all, with the average cost of each dissertation in the sciences being \$62,000, shouldn't the findings be available to a wider audience? Using the proper research methodology of defining the population and then selecting the sample, the author chose the four disciplines of botany, chemical engineering, chemistry, and psychology to prove his point. He further refined his sample to three universities, and his final sample included 441 dissertations. The original portion of the study is preceded by a brief history of the dissertation and a more lengthy review of related literature.

Boyer found through his literature search that dissertations as a form of literature represent a miniscule percentage of cited literature and that they represent an even more miniscule percentage of materials acquired by libraries.

In his research he found that most dissertation-based materials, in the sciences, appear in journals with an average of 1.43 articles per dissertation. Fifty-three percent of those had not been cited, and of those cited nearly two-thirds of the citations were made by persons known to the dissertation author, including 22 percent self-citations.

One weakness of the research, readily admitted by the author, is that examination was made of the formal written communication channels only—including journal articles, books, or chapters of books. It completely excludes oral communication in seminars, conferences, symposia, interpersonal communications, and closed literature such as preprints, reprints, and technical reports. Therefore this study covers only one part, perhaps the less important one, in the communication process.

Another point which should not be overlooked in the information flow is that, particularly in the sciences, the value of the content may be transitory or the quality may be questionable.