

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

validity of their sample and give no reasons why the reader should accept its validity, it does not seem worthwhile to consider the results of these analyses. The section on the evaluation of the document delivery service deserves only slightly more attention because the quality of sampling at Ohio State University affects the quality of the data collected. Not surprisingly, the authors found that "Ohio State University faculty who used the document delivery service held much more favorable attitudes toward the library as an information source and were very enthusiastic about the value of a document delivery service for faculty and graduate students." In the final chapter, "Other Findings of the Investigation," an interesting group of miscellaneous facts is presented. There are no suggestions for further research.—*Barbara Slanker, Director, ALA Office for Research, Chicago.*

Thompson, Lawrence S., comp. *The New Sabin; Books Described by Joseph Sabin and His Successors, Now Described Again on the Basis of Examination of Originals, and Fully Indexed by Title, Subject, Joint Authors, and Institutions and Agencies*. Troy, N.Y.: Whitston, 1974. v.1 and index (in 2v.). v.1, \$25.00; index, \$10.00.

Do we need a new Sabin? By rough calculation, the cost of this projected set is likely to be at least \$1,500 (assuming prices remain at their present level), so librarians will want to examine it very carefully before deciding to invest this sum.

The ultimate scope of *The New Sabin* has not yet been established; although initially limited to items from Joseph Sabin's *Dictionary of Books Relating to America*, the compiler speaks in the preface of the possibility of adding items from other bibliographies such as Lyle Wright's *American Fiction, 1774-1850* in future volumes. This first installment consists of two volumes, one of which is an index to the other. Each main volume is to be a complete alphabet, but future index volumes will be cumulative and will include author entries. The main volume under consideration here "represents books which have been seen by the compiler in the original or one [sic] film, and the entries are copies of the descriptive portions of Library of Congress

cards for the most part" (Preface). Although Sabin's original entries are often abbreviated and sometimes inaccurate in their particulars, most Sabin users are able to locate the Library of Congress entry, if one exists; this *New Sabin* innovation is actually a minor convenience. Moreover, Sabin's original annotations have been omitted entirely from the new work. For access to these valuable notes, often including information about other editions, the reader will have to use the original Sabin bibliography, making the new arrangement even less of an advantage. And since no provision has been made for correlating *New Sabin* and *Dictionary* entry numbers, working back from *New Sabin* to the *Dictionary* is not always an easy matter.

No location information is given in *The New Sabin*, even though the compiler has seen each item in the original or on film. It is left to the reader to locate copies through the use of other bibliographies, whether union lists or indexes to microform sets. Although Lost Cause Press is publishing selected works from Sabin's *Dictionary* in microform (for which Lawrence Thompson is also doing the bibliographic work), there is no indication that *The New Sabin* is connected with that set. Lost Cause Press itself is issuing catalogs which give Library of Congress entries for the Sabin works it is publishing in microform.

According to the compiler, "the greatest value of the present work is the subject index, combined with all other useful entries such as those for joint authors, issuing agencies, sub-titles, etc." The subject index, apparently based on Library of Congress headings, is certainly adequate for subjects on which little has been written; but, if the topic is the Civil War or George Washington, the reader is faced with a discouraging mass of undifferentiated item numbers. As the set grows larger the numbers will multiply, and many headings will become virtually useless. If the main arrangement of the new work were by subject, or if the complete entry were listed, the reader could more easily pick out appropriate items. It does seem that if *The New Sabin* has any contribution to make, it is by providing subject access to these early printed books and pamphlets, many of which may not turn up in subject bibliographies.