

The author has posed an important question and examined one aspect of it. Hopefully someone will take the topic from there and examine other aspects.—*Robert D. Stueart, Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado.*

Fussler, Herman H. *Research Libraries and Technology: A Report to the Sloan Foundation*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Pr., 1973. 91p. \$5.95.

In 1970 the Sloan Foundation established a program in educational technology which included "library technology" as one of the areas to be studied. Dr. Herman H. Fussler of the University of Chicago was commissioned to do this study. Upon receipt of the report the foundation felt that it deserved general circulation. The published work is basically the same report that was submitted as an "internal document" not addressed to librarians (preface). The question remains, "What is the purpose of the report and to whom is it addressed?"

The report contains the thoughts of Dr. Fussler, a nationally known and respected library technologist, concerning some of the problems facing large, research-oriented university libraries. The title is slightly misleading since the author has been self-selective in reporting on only a few problems and issues. In addition, there are problems with the report's focus and scope, as well as a scarcity of definitions of frequently used terms.

After a nondescript foreword and an anemic preface, chapter one, "Libraries and Technology from Several Perspectives," contains a review of a few selected studies of technologies used by libraries within the last decade. Chapter two, "Some Current Aspects of the Large University Library," switches from an emphasis on specific technologies to problems involved in library costs. This is the only chapter containing tables, all of which are extracted from existing reports and studies. As noted by the author, a new book by Professor W. J. Baumol, entitled *Economics of Academic Libraries*, was about to be published. It is now available, and it contains a more comprehensive treatment of this topic. Chapter three, "Bibliographical and Library Process-

ing Functions," is seven pages in length and attempts to do the impossible by combining a discussion of bibliographic access and library processing functions. References to more detailed accounts covering these topics are lacking. Chapter four, "Shared Resources, Photocopying, and Facsimile Transmission," combines the conceptual topic of shared resources with the specific technologies of reprography and facsimile transmission; it is at best confusing and at worst inadequate. In addition, there are three paragraphs devoted to copyright problems. Chapter five, "The Computer and the Library," is a sound general discussion of how computer technology can be used to confuse and defuse problems in the management of information systems. Chapter six, "Examples of Computer Applications in Library Operations and Information Access," complements the preceding chapter by giving a brief description of specific locations: Columbia, NLM, Northwestern, OCLC, Ohio State, MIT, Stanford, and Chicago. Each description was based on information supplied by the institution. Chapter seven, "Some General Observations and Conclusions," amplifies the confusion concerning the focus of the report. On page 73 the author states that the report is "limited essentially to the problems of literature and information access" when, in fact, the emphasis is on internal operations and functions of the library. Following the last chapter there is a section containing fifty-nine references, "acknowledgements," and an index. The index contains at least one error (p.89—National Advisory Commission on Libraries, 18 should be 17).

In conclusion, the author has made a report to the Sloan Foundation; he has raised many relevant and poignant points concerning the problems and issues facing the large, research-oriented university library. There are useful parts to this report, especially the up-to-date references made to more complete and empirically based studies and reviews; however, these parts are interspersed with less useful monologues. The remaining unresolved question in this reviewer's mind is, "Who will read this internal document?"

This book is recommended to the reader with the initiative, interest, background, and time to analyze the author's opinions

carefully. It is not recommended either as an initial or as a comprehensive review of these topics. To end on a positive note: the University of Chicago in publishing the report as a monograph has aided in making it easier for a user to gain bibliographic and physical access to the document.—*Morell D. Boone, University Librarian, University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut.*

Hug, William E. *Strategies for Change in Information Programs*. New York: Bowker, 1974. 373p. \$13.95.

It may seem a discourtesy to the author to write a review of a book that one has not read thoroughly, but that, unfortunately, is the situation in which I find myself. I have examined this anthology, but I cannot say that I have read it, nor do I intend to read it, despite the fact that change in libraries is not only a subject which I recognize as being of some importance but also one in which I have an immediate and practical interest.

Mr. Hug's anthology consists of twenty-four articles, mainly dating from 1969 on, arranged in two equal parts. The first part is entitled "The Subtle and Ubiquitous Nature of Change" and the second "Alternative Strategies Or Ways to Aim at a Moving Target." There is also a three-page preface which describes generally the intent of the anthology and a five-page introduction to each part which comments briefly on each of the articles.

There are only four articles by librarians: Wasserman on "Professional Adaptation," McAnally and Downs on "The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries," Atherton on "Putting Knowledge to Work in Today's Library Schools," and, of course, Shera on "Documentation into Information Science." The remaining articles are by people in a number of other disciplines. Many of the contributions by librarians on a topic such as this may not be significant, but a scanning of those articles that are included here leads me to believe that they are not very significant either. One of the articles that I did read, for example, was a two-page one called "Ex-Innovators as Barriers to Change," by Bob F. Steere. Apart from his creation of the incredibly

horrible jargon word "complacentor," one need cite only his concluding remarks: "Look around you, Mr. Ex-Innovator! Are you today's traditionalist? Are you the present barrier to change?" Mr. Hug's description of this article as "thought-provoking"—I would better describe it as "thought-revolting"—gave me no confidence in his ability to identify the most significant articles on this subject. In addition I can readily cite a number of other more substantial and useful articles on this topic such as Victor Thompson's "Bureaucracy and Innovation" (*Administrative Science Quarterly* 10:1-20 [1965]), and my knowledge is somewhat limited.

I am increasingly dismayed by anthologies, generally designed to serve some poorly defined purpose, in which all of the material is readily available in any decent library and for which, therefore, a solid bibliographical article might well suffice and might, indeed, be even more useful since it could cover a wider range of material. Such anthologies only contribute to what can best be described as information pollution. They might have some value as a supplementary textbook in a course, but they have relatively little other value. Surely there are less expensive and less polluting ways to make readings readily available to students. Such anthologies would be more bearable if they managed to include reasonably lengthy, understandable, and useful introductory remarks that put the material into perspective, analyzed it, and used it to arrive at some kind of useful and meaningful conclusions.

In this case Mr. Hug's preface is so brief and so jargon filled that it is of limited value, and he appears to reach no real conclusions. The material is simply presented for the reader to make of it what she/he will. I came away from a scanning of this book with the feeling that to read it carefully would leave me no better informed about the nature and meaning of change and how to effectively accomplish meaningful change in a library setting. I cannot recommend it to others.—*Norman D. Stevens, University of Connecticut Library, Storrs, Connecticut.*

Ford, Stephen. *The Acquisition of Library*