much of the material on composition, typography, printing, etc., which requires detailed explanations and considerable illustrative material. This reviewer feels that the treatment of editing is as full as necessary. Lee writes in an admirably clear style, and he holds the reader's interest throughout some very technical and detailed material. The book retains the same handsome design of the original edition.

This reviewer has long felt that most librarians need to know a good deal more about the products that they spend a lifetime buying than they usually do. While this book was written primarily as an introduction for beginners in the book industry and from the point of view of an insider, it can also be recommended to librarians as the best starting point for gaining a background knowledge of bookmaking.

It presents a happy medium ground between the very simplified presentation of Howard Greenfeld in his excellent *Books:* From Writer to Reader (Crown, 1976), written for young adults but suited for all ages, and the very specialized technical manuals such as Victor Strauss' Printing Industry (Bowker, 1967), which often deal with only one aspect of the subject. (Strauss is also now somewhat out of date because of the many new technical innovations within the industry.) Lee's only rivals in the past have been considered to be Hugh Williamson's Methods of Book Design (Oxford, 1956) and Sean Jennett's Making of Books (Faber & Faber, 1951), but both of these are British in origin and therefore limited in their usefulness to North American readers, although Jennett offers much more in the way of historical background than Lee.

In summary, this is the best book currently available on bookmaking in the U.S.—Richard K. Gardner, University of California, Los Angeles.

Garvey, William D. Communication: The Essence of Science. Facilitating Information Exchange among Librarians, Scientists, Engineers and Students. Pergamon International Library. Oxford, New York:



Pergamon, 1979. 332p. \$42 hardcover, \$19.50 flexicover. LC 78-40530. ISBN 0-08-022254-4 hardcover; 0-08-23344-9 flexicover.

In this book William Garvey, a social psychologist and director of the Center for Research in Scientific Communication at Johns Hopkins University, has addressed the characteristics, peculiarities, strengths, and weaknesses of the scientific communication process. He does this from the standpoint of more than ten years of research, much of it supported by the National Science Foundation.

Garvey has written on this topic on many earlier occasions. What makes this book significant for librarians and information specialists (he states at the very beginning that he uses the terms interchangeably) is that he attempts to show us how knowledge of the information habits, preferences, and biases of scientists can help us to improve service to our user clientele. As a social scientist, Garvey argues that librarians as fellow social scientists should be able to adapt their practices to the needs and preferences of their users.

Garvey's work is important if we are disturbed by repeated user studies that confirm the library is, for scientists and engineers, a low-ranking source of information and the place to which they turn when all else has failed. These studies support Garvey's contention that we do not serve our clientele particularly well because we have paid little attention to their value systems and how they work.

Garvey addresses this book to us in part because "the technology for providing information services to scientists has been less successful than the sophistication of the technology warrants," and because he now finds that his "private concerns were being articulated by experts in the field of library/ information science and technology."

As the author is the first to state, this book really presents no new findings or startling innovations. About 60 percent of it consists of reprints of earlier articles, written over the past ten years, that describe how Garvey and other social scientists planned and executed studies of the full spectrum of scientific communication activities for specific disciplines.

The author hopes that they may, therefore, serve as examples of how librarians might explore the scientific communication of their constituency. The reprints are not redundant, because they appeared in journals that librarians are not likely to read. The effort to tie these previous studies to what librarians should do is probably not as helpful, however, as the author would like, because it leaves much to the initiative of the reader.

The importance of this book, to the reviewer, is in the first five chapters, which describe, more clearly and succinctly than he has seen previously, the process of scientific research, creation of knowledge, and dissemination of findings. The last of these chapters provides a capping stone in examining "The Librarian's Role as a Social Scientist."

The book will be useful and supportive reading for any librarian who aspires to more than passive collection building and to more than fetching and carrying at the sometimes misdirected and confused whim of the scholarly patron, and who wants to become a full and acknowledged partner in the information process, helping users in the areas in which they are not knowledgeable (and perhaps not interested) enough to properly serve themselves.

It is probably the best indication of the reviewer's opinion of this work to report that he has assigned its preface and first chapter as required reading for his library school class in the literature of science and technology.—Herbert S. White, Indiana University, Bloomington.

"The Economics of Academic Libraries."
Allen Kent, Jacob Cohen, and K. Leon
Montgomery, issue editors. Library
Trends 28:1-120 (Summer 1979). \$5.

ISSN 0024-2594. (Available from: Univ. of Illinois Pr., Urbana, IL 61801.)

The title selected by the editors is a bit misleading. Actually, only two of the papers—and the least rewarding ones at that—deal directly with the economics of academic libraries. Jacob Cohen and Kenneth W. Leeson marshal an array of previously published statistics to confirm some propositions that most academic librarians know all too well: library budgets have de-