

not yet developed to a point where they can replace the older methods.—*Ralph H. Parker, University of Missouri.*

Cost of Library Services

The Cost of Providing Library Services to Groups in the Purdue University Community—1961. By Gerald L. Quatman. Lafayette, Ind.: Purdue University Library, 1962. 58l. Appl.

The purpose of the Purdue study was to determine the average cost of providing library services and facilities to members of the university engaged in research supported by organizations outside the university. This clientele works primarily in the science field, uses more current materials, and needs the material more quickly than others.

The author was a graduate research assistant at Purdue who worked with Purdue librarians and with a representative from the university's business office. The duration of the study was from February 1961—January 1962, a period of one year. Twenty survey days were selected. Entire days were used for a sample of usage. The days were selected to represent as equitably as possible other days with similar characteristics.

The information in this study will provide a basis for including library cost estimates in government and industrial research contract budgets, the purpose for which the study was made. But, in addition, it will provide librarians with a greatly needed study of true library costs. To know that the library cost to serve undergraduates is \$44.22 per year, that the graduate cost is 2.8 times as great as that to undergraduates, and that faculty cost is 2.267 times as great, would be invaluable information to the library administrator. These ratios reflect the fact that faculty members and graduate students use more costly library services than undergraduate students.

The process used by Quatman in arriving at his cost figures is well worth studying. It can be used as a guideline for future cost studies in libraries. These studies are greatly needed. The study was conducted in five steps:

1. The actual use of twenty library services was measured.
2. The costs of the services were computed.
3. The costs of the services were allocated to the using groups on the basis of percentage of use.
4. The total costs chargeable were divided by the number of persons.
5. The ratios of graduate student to undergraduate student library costs and faculty member to undergraduate student library costs were computed.

The tables are numerous, and the presentation is lucid. Table VIII shows the average percentage of time spent on various library services and table IX, the percentage of reference time spent on each type of question; table XII, which shows the distribution of the cost of library services, is exceedingly helpful to busy administrators. Quatman's study of space expenditures is perhaps the most original section of the study.

It is hoped that this study will stimulate other cost analyses in the library profession; all administrators need them constantly.—*Lorena Garloch, University of Pittsburgh.*

Cataloging

Sample Catalog Cards, Illustrating Solutions to Problems in Descriptive Cataloging. By Robert B. Slocum. New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1962. 190p. \$4.50.

Cataloging Made Easy. By A. Stan Rescoe. New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1962. 210p. \$5.

The cataloger is always seeking help with the idiosyncrasies encountered in original cataloging. Here are two books which promise help. As Mr. Slocum points out in his preface, there are printed codes available for describing works with peculiar and unusual characteristics, but they often leave that element of vagueness that produced uncertainty in the first instance. *Sample Catalog Cards* provides, under appropriate headings, examples of what has been done on Library of Congress printed cards. *Cataloging Made Easy* summarizes rules and provides examples. Both will be useful to catalogers.

Photoduplication

Directory of Library Photoduplication Services in the United States, Canada and Mexico. Comp. by Cosby Brinkley. Chicago: University of Chicago Library, 1962. 46p. \$1.50.

The appearance of photoduplication services in libraries about 1900 brought with it complications similar to those involved in interlibrary loans. Applicants needed not only union listings of resources, but also a directory to those institutions which had the ability to make photocopies. The coming of microfilm in the late 1930's aggravated this problem. Besides numerous specialized listings and one international handbook, four directories have been published for general use in this country. The first two were prepared under the auspices of the Special Libraries Association, and the last two by one individual under the sponsorship of the American Library Association.

The first to appear, in 1941, was Ross C. Cibella's *Directory of Microfilm Sources*. This 56-page booklet listed some forty institutions that offered microfilm service with their own equipment, as well as many others that used outside sources or were contemplating the installation of their own equipment. It also listed the type of camera used and frequently the type of reading machines available. More than half of the volume consisted of facsimiles of the order forms used by twenty-one institutions. A short list of commercial firms was also included.

In 1946 the *Directory of Microfilm Services in the United States and Canada* appeared, prepared under the chairmanship of Jurgen G. Raymond. Though a slimmer thirty pages, it raised the number of active libraries listed to fifty-five, as well as increasing the number of fringe institutions. It began the pattern of geographical arrangement that has been followed ever since. The listing of cameras and readers was dropped, as well as the facsimile order forms.

A longer period elapsed before the publication in 1959 of the *Directory of Institutional Photoduplication Services in the United States* compiled by Cosby Brinkley with the help of the Copying Methods Committee of

The arrangement—alphabetical by topic—adopted by both texts makes them particularly suited for reference by the experienced cataloger. Because of this arrangement, however, it seems unlikely that these books will be of first importance to the student of cataloging. To use them to best advantage a person must have experience and background in cataloging. Therefore, this reviewer feels that the chief users of these two volumes will be neither the beginners nor the revisers but those in the middle ranks who are not yet expert in doing original description.

It is plain that Slocum has met the questions that arise from cataloging. Care in the selection and the variety of his examples attest to his sophistication in this respect. Look at his eight illustrations of "Contents Note" and ten of "Physical Description Notes" each of the latter complementing LC 3:15C5. There is, however, a feature which prevents easy use of this book: in spite of alphabetical arrangement, topics do not stand out enough to catch the eye when scanning. This defect could have been corrected by running titles of section headings, and since this style was adopted for *Cataloging Made Easy*, why not for *Sample Catalog Cards*?

Mr. Rescoe is to be congratulated on this new edition of his work. For a decade *Technical Processes* (its first title) has been useful in instructing beginning catalogers. This reviewer has never used it for a text in teaching but expects to do so with reservation: the book seems more useful in finding examples rather than as a basic text. The index, useful to the beginner, is particularly good. *Cataloging Made Easy* is an attractive title for a book. It is perhaps deserved but surely exaggerated, as it may deceive the uninitiated into thinking it simplifies. It does not do this beyond the scope of rules cited. The author knows this and carefully states so in his preface.

In summary: both texts are helpful; neither is self-sufficient. *Cataloging Made Easy* is for the more junior cataloger, both are for the intermediate with various levels of experience. Both will do just what the authors claim in their behalf. The cataloger and the teacher of cataloging can use them with profit.—*Vivian Prince, University of Southern California.*