

targets in this particular review. Reference to the history of classification systems is certainly appropriate in several of the individual essays but the reader might tire (and be tempted to skip) reading about Dewey and his classification system, particularly when the explanation is intended for nonlibrarians. There is perhaps too much optimism about machine-searched indexes in one essay written in 1961. Shera lists examples of searches on pages 90 and 91 that can be done by machine "as child's play" (his words) and it may be just such a fantasy unless we learn to overcome problems in the selection of documents to be indexed, in indexing, in formulation of search strategy, and in evaluation of search results. But this particular essay was written during our years of innocence in machine searching; we can point to other examples of machine literature searching with few documents included in the index and with extrapolation of results based on too small a sample.

It is interesting to speculate why most of Shera's essays are still fresh and to the point. Is it because of his wisdom in choice and/or treatment of topic, or is it because librarianship has been slow in changing? My guess is that it is a combination of these factors. Jesse Shera has suggested a number of changes that made sense at the time of writing and make sense now. There is still much to be done to achieve standardization among bibliographic services, there is still insufficient cooperation among professional societies in our field, and there is still need for an increased pace of fundamental and applied research in librarianship. Shera's words on automation in the library deserve special attention. He warns us not to close our eyes to automation—it will not go away. Automation has stimulated systematic analysis of library operations and offers the hope of a better understanding of what we are doing. Automation also offers the promise of library service on a higher level to be provided by librarians, if we are prepared to meet the challenge.

Dean Shera writes wisely and well, and, what is rare in our field, with considerable humor. Librarians in research libraries should read or reread what he has to say.—*G. Jahoda, Florida State University.*

**Resources of Missouri Libraries.** Ed. by Robert B. Downs. Jefferson City: Missouri State Library, 1966. 190p.

The origins of this study lie in the desire of college librarians for a study complementary to the survey of Missouri public library resources made by Gretchen Schenk in 1962. This study, however, reports again on public libraries and on school and special libraries as well as two-year, four-year, and graduate institutions of higher learning. It, like the Schenk report and the Community Studies, Inc., survey of public library service in metropolitan St. Louis and Kansas City released a year ago, has been sponsored by the Missouri State Library.

Although Robert Downs lists a survey staff of ten librarians, the materials for this study seem to have come primarily from a lengthy questionnaire submitted to approximately one hundred and twenty-five libraries. Librarians submitted a quantitative breakdown of collections in various subject areas along with the kind of information submitted recently to HEW. They also checked their holdings against a list of one hundred currently published periodicals and *Choice's* "Opening Day Collection" of basic reference books. There were opportunities in the questionnaire also for librarians to make qualitative judgments on their own libraries.

The over-all picture shows that while Missouri librarians have been working for a long time to establish county—and, now in more recent years, regional—library systems, there are still far too many small libraries with inadequate tax bases. Most of the private institutions of higher education have financial problems which are shown in the support of their libraries. Its public institutions reflect the fact that Missouri, in terms of its per capita income, has not supported higher education well. A Robert Downs is needed to show Missouri how its libraries look to an experienced eye from the outside.

Wisely, the work begins with his "Goals for the Future: Summary of Recommendations" because much of the subsequent chapters comprise raw material from the questionnaires analyzed by means of cur-

rent library standards. These chapters will go into matters, however, not always summarized in the "Goals." Downs does not see the university libraries as having responsibility for "statewide library service, except for highly specialized titles unavailable elsewhere." He recommends, therefore, that the state library should develop a strong reference library along with becoming a state bibliographic center. He considers efforts in the state toward library cooperation as being impressive, but sharing wealth works only if there is wealth to be shared. Missouri will continue to be dependent upon seven libraries in particular (the three university, the two large public, the state, and Linda Hall libraries). These libraries should be compensated financially for their extramural services. Here, we get into matters in which the recent surveys do not always agree in their recommendations.

Perhaps Missouri has had enough surveys for awhile and its librarians had better thresh out what should be the master plan—if there is to be one. In the meantime, one hopes that in the future, professional talent and government money can be directed toward making the Library Services Division of the U.S. Office of Education a meaningful statistical reporting organization so that librarians can spend less time gathering data and more time using it. Finally, librarians, especially Missourians, should remember that state lines in terms of library planning mean only one thing: political boundaries which constitute source or channel for funds. They are quite without meaning in terms of economic or cultural areas. Missouri's two great concentrations of libraries are found in interstate economic and cultural regions. The long look perhaps should see state planning as an intermediate step toward interstate or regional planning.—*Kenneth J. LaBudde, University of Missouri at Kansas City.*

***Scientific Management of Library Operations.*** By Richard M. Dougherty and Fred. J. Heinritz. New York and London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1966. 258p. \$7. (66-13741)

Those who consider the essential elements of librarianship to be books and bibliogra-

phy will not find support for their contention in this book. Here are discussed such nonlibrary subjects as flow charting, time studies, cost analysis, and performance standards. The index contains no reference to a book, and the term is seldom used throughout the work. This is a book about things—books as things, people as things—and about methods for studying the manipulation of these things to achieve the most efficient financial advantage.

But no matter how much we may regret this approach to librarianship, library administrators find that more and more of their time is devoted to management, and unless they are to be overwhelmed by this one aspect of librarianship they must be familiar with, and take advantage of, the methods which science can offer to lighten the management load.

Dr. Dougherty and Dr. Heinritz have prepared a beginners' manual describing some scientific management procedures applicable to library operations. There are descriptions of flow charting with examples and definitions of the symbols commonly used. The design and use of forms is discussed, and a chapter is devoted to sampling techniques. Methods of performing time studies, determining unit costs, and establishing performance standards are outlined. The final chapters present, as an example, a study of an actual public library circulation system illustrating some of the techniques previously described and outlining proposals for a new system based on the completed study.

This is not a theoretical discussion of management, nor does it present any new techniques of scientific management. Veteran library administrators will be familiar already with the procedures and techniques discussed. Library school students and beginning librarians, however, can find much useful information in this book which can add to their awareness of the problems of administrators and increase their usefulness as librarians.

The book is printed by an offset method from typed copy and is as attractive as this method will permit. It is well illustrated with appropriate charts and diagrams. It is both legible and readable.—*Paul H. Spence, University of Georgia.*