Supported Catalogs," "On-Line Interactive Catalogs," "Comparison of Catalog Alternatives," and "Implementation of Catalog Alternatives."

"Traditional Catalog Forms" is an analysis of the catalog's objectives, treating theories of Lubetzky, Charles Jewett, Charles Cutter, and Thomas Hyde, plus a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of traditional catalog forms. "Machine-Readable Cataloging Data" describes the Library of Congress MARC format, ISBD, authority control, and the major networks, OCLC, RLIN, and WLN. "Computer-Supported Catalogs" deals with alternative catalog forms such as the automated book form catalog system, printed book catalogs, and COM catalogs. "On-Line Interactive Catalogs" is a study of the automated catalog and how it may be accessed. "Comparison of Alternative Catalog Forms" and "Implementation of Catalog Alternatives" present the problems involved when a library closes its catalog and chooses alternative forms. An especially valuable aid is a hypothetical cost analysis for each catalog form.

The Nature and Future of the Catalog and *The Future of the Catalog* furnish librarians with needed information on how to manage the coming changes in catalog formats. The volumes complement each other, offering different points of emphasis to readers. It should be stressed, however, that these works only scratch the surface in regard to the catalog's future. Librarians are advised to make a thorough study of the literature available. Nevertheless, both volumes are recommended for purchase by libraries. They will be useful additions to a much needed collection on the future of the catalog.—*Lucy T. Heckman, St. John's University, Jamaica, New York.*

Saffady, William. "**The Economics of Online Bibliographic Searching: Costs and Cost Justifications,**" *Library Technology Reports* 15:567–653 (Sept.–Oct. 1979). Single issue $40. ISSN 0024-2586. (Available from American Library Assn., 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.)

The first, and longest, section of this report lays out the cost components of an on-line search service in a library and, by making some not unreasonable assumptions

about volume of traffic, salaries, and overhead, etc., attempts to build up a model of the true and complete costs per search.

The second section uses concepts from value engineering to give an overview of the main arguments that can be employed to justify those costs. Either the on-line service must produce greater efficiency compared to the same task (bibliographic searching by librarians) performed in the old way, or it must be justified by its provision of added value, in the form of enhanced library service to patrons. The report deliberately does not address the question of how the costs of on-line services might be met (the fee-for-service issue).

To juxtapose the costs of an on-line search against the costs of a manual search is, of course, to enter dangerous waters. First, a regular search service encompassing from 250 to 1,000 manual searches per year was not a feature of life in most libraries—not even in most libraries which did adopt on-line services when they came upon the scene. And, second, when performed at all, such a manual bibliographic searching service was not often rigorously accounted for.

Thus, even though Saffady is careful to use the same assumptions for costing out a manual operation as he does for the computerized version, his model inevitably starts to sound somewhat artificial. However, this is more a reproach to traditional library accounting practices than to the author's determination to pursue his comparison to a logically consistent conclusion. Not surprisingly, the on-line search is shown to be less expensive than its manual equivalent would have been—between 37 and 42 percent, on average.

As long as such figures are used only as ratios, for comparison against each other, they are unexceptionable, although minor discrepancies might be argued over. When the author attempts to use the on-line cost figures as real numbers, to be compared against the real cost of subscriptions to printed periodical indexes, then it seems to me the methodology becomes questionable.

Appendix C is presented as a type of decision table, based upon dividing the annual printed subscription cost by the cost of an on-line search, to yield an approximate number of uses per year below which the

printed subscription should not be canceled. Example: if the *Social Science Citation Index* costs $1,500 a year and an on-line search of it costs about $44, everything included, then one can buy about thirty-four such searches a year for the subscription price. Thus if the printed version is used more than thirty-four times, then the printed version is presumed to be more cost-effective and should not be canceled.

Because the author employs only one set of his earlier assumptions, the one least favorable to on-line searching, and simultaneously ignores some major cost factors such as discounts for on-line service and the almost unavoidable purchase of multiyear cumulations if one were to run a manual bibliographic searching service, this table could be off by more than 100 percent and thus is not a reliable tool. But if it acts as a stimulus for libraries to do their own analyses, it will have served a purpose.

Even with these figures, one general conclusion seems unavoidable: A small number of highly priced indexes (*Chemical Abstracts, Excerpta Medica, Science Citation Index*) are becoming serious candidates for cancellation by the smaller libraries which presently purchase them, where usage of such indexes can be measured in the range of 75 to 150 instances per year. Based upon the issues which Saffady's last section raises, rather than upon the numbers given therein, one may expect the on-line community to be studying and discussing this work rather closely in the years ahead.—*Peter G. Watson, California State University, Chico.*

Morrow, Carolyn Clark, and Schoenly, Steven B. *A Conservation Bibliography for Librarians, Archivists, and Administrators.* Troy, N.Y.: Whitston, 1979. 271p. $18.50. LC 79-64847. ISBN 0-87875-170-X.

In their introduction, Morrow and Schoenly state this 1,376-item bibliography cites literature that has appeared since 1966, for it was the devastating flood in Florence that year that focused world attention on the salvage and restoration of the works of art and books inundated by the water. The volume covers broadly conservation administration, environmental protection, information preservation, conservation techniques, and general works on conservation.

While a revised, comprehensive bibliography is shortly expected from George and Dorothy Cunha to replace their 1972 listing (found in the *Conservation of Library Materials*), there has been a need for a selective bibliography covering the vast body of material on conservation published in the period 1971–1979. But because of its organization, this volume will be most useful for those already familiar with the literature and in need of checking a reference, rather than a larger audience.

I am puzzled by this bibliography because I suspect that once the authors compiled their card index of entries on the preservation of library and archival materials they published it without determining what information they wished to communicate to their audience, who that audience might be, and how that audience might want to use the material. It is not, and does not pretend to be, the comprehensive post-1972 bibliography that the specialist needs. Yet it is too narrow and limited for the nonspecialist who needs good, basic information quickly. What, for example, would the compilers consider *the* basic book or article in each section, regardless of publication date?

There is a subject index, but it appears that most of the citations in the bibliography are cited only once. For example, the subject index cites one specific reference on "thymol," but the bibliography includes a number of books and articles that contain helpful information on the use of thymol for fumigation. Thus the bibliography becomes of minimal use for someone not already familiar with the literature.

In their introduction the compilers state that the literature of book and document conservation is diverse and draws from a number of allied fields. The compilers have carefully reviewed the literature in the archival, library, and conservation fields, but the literature of the museum community has been checked only cursorily.

This is a serious lack, because the models that both librarians and archivists have followed in developing sound preservation programs over the past decade have been museum models. The significant difference