

to which citation analysis has long been applied, Bulick examines the degree to which disciplines use their own literatures or borrow extensively from others. Those which rely heavily on endogenous literatures are considered to be "analytical" disciplines whose paradigms, in Kuhn's sense, are well developed; those which borrow heavily from other fields are "synthetic" and have less full and mature paradigms.

Using his measures this way, Bulick argues that economists' focused, or "ethnocentric" use of materials shows a degree of consensus on basic issues of theory and technique not matched by the other social sciences. Geography, with its notoriously unfavorable balance of trade with other disciplines, is ranked lowest on these measures, leaving sociology, anthropology, and political science somewhere in between.

Bulick's discussion of the individual social sciences incorporates a skilled and informed interleaving of the history both of the several disciplines themselves and of their treatment by the LC classification scheme. We too often think of the latter as received from above, but Bulick reminds us that in its developmental stages, LC was an emerging commentary on and attempt to organize emerging disciplines.

Bulick's most interesting conclusion, based both on patterns of cross-disciplinary use and on various measures of association which assess the conjoint reading between pairs of disciplines, is that the boundaries of the individual social sciences may never become as clear as those of the physical sciences. But the social sciences as a whole, with their communal interests in literatures within social science and its special cousin, history, may be blending into a unified social science.

This is not a perfect book. It is somewhat specialized, in that the structure of branch libraries at Pittsburgh necessarily excluded the sciences from consideration, and Bulick chooses not to discuss the humanities. One might ask for more consideration of use patterns between specific pairs of disciplines and of what this means. One can quibble with the misuse

of the term "sociology of knowledge" or argue that the Bradford/Zipf distribution tells us little of interest to librarians that a simple J-curve of use does not convey and that it does not merit the attention Bulick gives it. One can definitely become upset, as I imagine Bulick himself is, that an important table is mislabelled—readers should bring themselves to note in their library copies that the column headings of Table 6.23 should all slide one place to the right.

Imperfect? Of course, and fascinating. The only serious flaw with this book is that we are ignoring it. Reviews have been few and only some 120 OCLC libraries have cataloged it. Either librarians are unsure that an understanding of the disciplines they serve has anything to say about how they should conduct their business, or there is something wrong with the system of gatekeepers that is supposed to help us sort out the big books from the little books.—Paul Metz, *Virginia Polytechnic Institute*.

Career Profiles and Sex Discrimination in the Library Profession. Prepared by Kathleen Heim and Leigh S. Estabrook. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1983. 82p. \$15. LC 83-3838. ISBN 0-8389-3282-7.

Results of statistical surveys frequently pose more interesting questions than those which prompted the survey in the first place. Heim and Estabrook's project is no exception. The task that Heim, Estabrook, and the ALA Committee on the Status of Women in Librarianship (COSWL) set for themselves was a comprehensive career study of librarians, examining in particular the differences in status (salary, administrative responsibility, career advancement) between female and male members of the American Library Association. *Career Profiles and Sex Discrimination* reports the results of their research but, in a mere 46 pages of text, accomplishes much more.

As principle investigators Heim and Estabrook are quite explicit about the dual purpose and goal of their research, this study was designed not only to provide data useful for analyzing and evaluating

the status of women within the library profession, but also, as the researchers state, to "contribute to the positive image of women in librarianship by virtue of the quality of the research." From the preface, where that statement appears, and continuing throughout the work, the reader is constantly reminded of the difficulties facing women in our (numerically) female-dominated profession. This study documents the "how" and "where" of gender-based differences in salary and status. It goes beyond that by anticipating the "why."

Estabrook and Heim succeed admirably in fulfilling both goals set for the study. The research is comprehensive (within the stated limits of the population surveyed) and the methodology sound, but its greatest strength is that it calls into question carefully nurtured assumptions about women and work.

The monograph itself is deceptively simple. It's short, barely 41 pages of text. The language is clear and concise (interpretation of the data doesn't require a tortuous interpretation of the interpretation). Heim and Estabrook clearly want the results of their research to be accessible to the widest possible concerned audience. They do not obscure their findings by adding unnecessary embellishments or, as is so often the case in reports of survey research, by "speaking in tongues," addressing only the initiated.

The first two chapters introduce the study. Chapter One is a detailed literature review; it examines previous studies upon which the researchers drew and notes the areas of possible investigation that have been overlooked. The second chapter, "Methodology of the COSWL Study," describes at length the design of the questionnaire and introduces the population surveyed. The researchers are careful to point out that the population in question consists of members of the American Library Association and is therefore predominately female and predominately white. To its credit, the survey is not presented as a definitive portrait of librarianship.

The final questionnaire (included in the appendix) consisted of 37 questions cover-

ing four major areas: overall career pattern, current or most recent job situation, educational background and professional involvement, personal and family data. The rationale for each section of the questionnaire is fully discussed allowing this chapter to be read both as a description of a completed project and as a model for future research. It was particularly gratifying to note that the section on personal and family data offered, along with the standard categories "married, divorced, single," the option "part of a long-term committed relationship."

Chapter 3, "Analysis of Major Findings," provides the heart of the study. Statistical tables accompany the narrative discussion of the findings. These findings, while interesting and important, serve mainly as tangible evidence of the existence of a situation many have long suspected: significant differences in status and salary are found between women and men in the library profession. Even when the researchers controlled for personal, career, or professional variations, sex was found to be an important determinant of salary.

As a member of the Committee on the Status of Women in Librarianship (though not serving on COSWL during this project) and past-coordinator of the SRRT Feminist Task Force, I may appear to some as a less than impartial judge of a study of this nature. On the contrary, I believe that constant involvement in issues affecting women in librarianship has made me read more critically and accept less readily research on these issues. Heim and Estabrook have completed a study that belongs on every library director's bookshelf, and should be required reading in library school management courses. Apart from the information it gives us about ourselves, this study serves as model of conscientious, principled survey research. I recommend it highly for the questions it answers and the issues it raises.—Ellen Broidy, *University of California, Irvine.*

Communicating Public Access to Government Information: Proceedings of the Second Annual Library Government