Those who read it for pleasure may find that six hundred pages on book-trade history is at times grim going.—*D. W. Davies, Lloyd Corporation Ltd., Claremont, California.*

Thompson, Donald E. *Indiana Authors and Their Books, 1917–1966.* Crawfordsville, Ind.: Wabash College, 1974. 688p.

In a superficial sense this volume represents an exercise in vanity. Funded by Hoosiers, sponsored by Hoosiers, prepared, published, and distributed by Hoosiers, it is a biographical directory of Hoosier authors of the half century from 1917 to 1966. We take care of our own. . . .

But the motivation for the present volume has some nobler aspects as well. Indiana *has* produced substantially more and better authors than one would normally expect. When the ten best-selling American novels for each year from 1895 to 1965 are assigned points (ten for first place, nine for second place, etc.), and their authors' native states are determined, the total points amassed by Indiana authors are second only to those of New York State. Indiana is also second only to New York State when fiction and nonfiction are taken together. Yet the population of Indiana has never attained one-fifth that of New York State.

No one knows why authorship has so flourished in Indiana, and although the present volume does not attempt to explain it, it does lay out the data necessary for future analysis. Here are biographical sketches of the 2,751 authors who made it happen. Every author included either was "born in the state, or [if] born elsewhere, chose to spend the majority of his or her maturity within Indiana bounds." Authors solely of pamphlets, periodical articles, textbooks, genealogies, and similar publications are not included. A wide net has still been cast, however, and as a result the volume contains biographical sketches of authors as different as Kenneth Rexroth is from Vance Hartke, and as Ernie Pyle is from Alfred C. Kinsey. Much of the information presented on the lesser figures is virtually unobtainable through any other source.

The present biographical directory is a continuation of a similar work compiled by R. E. Banta and published in 1949 entitled *Indiana Authors and Their Books, 1816–1916.* The two works together, therefore, now provide coverage for Indiana's first century-and-a-half of statehood. The new work matches the Banta volume both in quality of contents and in format and design. Yet it also suffers the same basic weakness. Since the coverage attempted is so broad, it is unlikely ever fully to be attained. It is ironic, for example, that this reviewer, although gratified to find his own name in the new volume, must point out that his father, who also meets the criteria for inclusion, is unaccountably omitted. Other and more important omissions will be turning up for years. Such oversights, however, do not mean that this book will not serve a useful reference function in large libraries or in smaller ones with special interest either in authorship or in the Hoosier state.—*David Kaser, Graduate Library School, Indiana University, Bloomington.*

Palmer, Richard Phillips. *Case Studies in Library Computer Systems.* New York: Bowker, 1973. 214p.

This book consists of twenty case studies of computerization of classical library procedures and comments; there are no cases of network computerization. Six cases deal with circulation systems, eight with serials systems and six with acquisition systems. Graduate students in the School of Library Science at Simmons College did "much of the initial gathering of information." The author made additional on-site visits and wrote up the cases. He also introduces the book and summarizes it.

The purpose of the book "is to describe and document a number of operational library computer systems, including their cost, so that librarians and library school students may better determine whether computers should be stamped out or whether they are appropriate for library use." (The phrase "stamped out" comes with Ellsworth Mason.) The author concludes that although there have been failures in library computerization, there also have been successes, and some of these successes are cases that appear in the book. He anticipates that there will be an increasing number of successful library computer applications in the decade that lies ahead.

By and large, the objectives of the cases

presented do not make possible new library objectives as do computerized networks. Rather, the goals are managerial and the provision of new service. It is the attainment of these objectives in some of the cases that clearly entitles the computerization described to be successful.

Case Studies in Library Computer Systems is a good book. Library school students and those librarians continuing to be students will learn much from this work.— *Frederick G. Kilgour, Executive Director, Ohio College Library Center, Columbus.*

Dougherty, Richard M., and Blomquist, Laura L. *Improving Access to Library Resources: The Influence of Organization of Library Collections and of User Attitudes Toward Innovative Services.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974.

In a study supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, Dougherty and Blomquist state that they will investigate the influence of academic library organizational structure on the effectiveness of the library's document delivery service. The title of the study leads one to expect a broad investigation that will cover the many different aspects of the relationships between organizational structure and library effectiveness, but the investigators have focused their attention on a very small portion of this topic. They are interested in the decentralized organizational structure of an academic library and the research needs of one group of users in the university community—academic faculty. The scope of the study is disappointingly narrow.

The stated purpose of the study is to probe faculty attitudes toward library effectiveness, to examine the effect of dispersion of resources on these attitudes, and to determine whether document delivery systems produce changes in user attitudes toward the library. The libraries and faculties at Syracuse University and Ohio State University were used in the study.

The methodology developed by the investigators includes a sampling design, data collection instruments, and statistical analysis. The sampling design is a major weakness of the study because the samples of faculty members drawn at the two universities are not comparable. A random

sample of 10 percent of the Syracuse University faculty was drawn, but a self-selected sample of less than 1 percent of the Ohio State University faculty was used. Although the authors note the limitations of the samples, they use them, because they feel that the attitudes expressed by the faculty members in the sample are indicative of those of the total faculty. In a research study this procedure is not acceptable.

Six methods were used to collect data for the study: personal interviews, subject interest profiles, shelflist location counts, distance measurements, a document exposure index, and an expectation rate. Limitations of two of the measures (interest profiles and the shelflist count) are discussed by the authors. The document exposure index and the expectation rate are special instruments developed to measure faculty members' attitudes toward the library system and their success in retrieving resources from the collection; both are based on a ten-point scale. The instruments used and the tabulations of the data collected appear in the appendixes and constitute one-half of the report.

Upon examination, the data collection instruments appear to be more complex than the problem under investigation warrants. The appropriateness of the ten-point scale used in the two special measures is open to some doubt because such a scale implies a precision that does not exist in these data.

The major portion of the study is devoted to reporting the results of the data analysis, as is proper in a research report. Data collected at Syracuse University were subjected to sophisticated statistical testing, such as analysis of variance and regression analysis, to determine if hypothesized relationships were present. The major finding of these analyses is that "many users apparently are willing to forego accessibility to potentially relevant materials in favor of convenience of access." While this is hardly new information (it has been reported regularly in the *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*), it does have implications for libraries.

At the beginning of the section comparing faculty expectation rates at the two universities, the authors state that "the two samples are not comparable statistically speaking." Since the authors discount the