

## Getting into Print

*Editors of thirty-three national library periodicals were surveyed to identify the number of unsolicited manuscripts received and published annually. The review process to select manuscripts for publication was also examined. Our findings reveal a high manuscript rejection rate (77.3 percent) with little reliance on external judges to review potential articles. Journal editors are encouraged to publish the purpose and scope of their periodical, as well as the method and criteria used to review unsolicited manuscripts.*

**R**AMPANT CRITICISM on the quality of library literature is so pervasive that we could be fearful that Katz's *Best of 1978* might contain only one or two articles. This old question of quality has extensive roots, and it generated a renewed concern during the 1950s through the activities of the ALA Library Periodicals Round Table. At one meeting, Bell commented that reputable authors, "plus the maintenance of a standard of selectivity in articles printed, are the basic ingredients for attaining the much needed respect that a publication requires in order to flourish."<sup>1</sup>

A sustained and growing concern about quality is evident in articles selected from the past twenty years: "Dullness in Library Journals" (1953);<sup>2</sup> "Standards for Library Periodicals" (1955);<sup>3</sup> "A Look at Library Literature" (1961);<sup>4</sup> "Popular or Scholarly" (1962);<sup>5</sup> and "The Library Press" (1969).<sup>6</sup> Moon makes a typical observation, "The dearth, the paucity of quality, is most noticeable if you examine only one element among the features of the library press: the articles."<sup>7</sup> The topic has been important enough to merit attention at workshops and

conferences. Examples include a conference held at Brandeis University in 1975<sup>8</sup> and a program of the Library Research Round Table held during the 1972 Annual Conference of ALA.<sup>9</sup>

These activities, however, address neither the question of the opportunity to publish nor the treatment that unsolicited manuscripts receive. If prospective authors are unaware of publication policies and criteria for selection, such ignorance may perpetuate the submission of manuscripts that will continue to generate criticism. Though "quality" is bandied about, it cannot come from situations where authors do not know criteria or where editors face copy deadlines with questionable manuscripts on hand. Sharing of criteria with prospective authors as well as with those involved in the reviewing process might serve as one concrete means of raising quality.

### FOCUSING IN ON TWO ASPECTS

Because of these basic issues, selected national library journals were polled during fall 1976 to identify an author's chances of having an unsolicited manuscript published. An equally important aspect of the investigation was describing the way in which unsolicited manuscripts are presently reviewed to determine how articles are selected for publication.

Librarians publish, ideally, from their desire to communicate ideas with colleagues. There are growing pressures facing library school faculty and academic librarians to advance professionally through this activity.

Such individuals need to have available to

---

*Daniel O'Connor is assistant professor, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey, and Phyllis Van Orden is professor, School of Library Science, Florida State University, Tallahassee. This research was conducted while both authors were on the faculty at Rutgers University, and the authors acknowledge the support of the Graduate School of Library Service there and the assistance of Thomas H. Mott, Jr., Shirley Fitzgibbons, and Ruth Katz.*

them statements of the scope, policies, and criteria used by journals in selection of articles. The opportunities of individuals to share their research is also contingent upon the number of unsolicited manuscripts that can be accepted for publication each year. Besides knowing the appropriate journal for their manuscript, writers need to know the manuscript reviewing process and how much time this takes. These factors are of great significance to any potential author, especially one who is under pressure to establish publishing credit.

Thirty-three English language journals published in the United States and Canada were selected, as ones that accept contributions from members of the field, are indexed in *Library Literature*, and attract national audiences of librarians. Excluded were publications that are internal newsletters, agency or association publications that focus on regional or state activities, publications used as a vehicle for informal exchange of ideas, and national journals that consist solely of solicited articles.

Forty journals originally met our criteria for inclusion in the study. However, three journals were excluded after we realized that one changed its scope (to a newsletter), another ceased publication, and the third was only infrequently indexed in *Library Literature*. Two journals, *Drexel Library Quarterly* and *Library Trends*, consist solely of solicited articles. In addition, we were not able to reach two journal editors by either mail or telephone.

Based on these criteria, several excellent journals were excluded from the study. However, the importance of investigating practices in nationally based publications outweighed the advantages of a more thorough examination of all library periodicals. The journals selected vary widely in their subject matter and in the audiences that they attract; they range from subsidized association publications to commercial endeavors published by profit-making organizations.

#### IDENTIFYING THE OPPORTUNITY TO PUBLISH

The opportunity to publish depends on three basic considerations: (1) the author's interest in matching the subject and scope of a journal, (2) the approximate rate of ac-

ceptance of unsolicited manuscripts, and (3) the ratio of unsolicited to solicited articles published by the journal. Another important factor is the total number of articles published annually.

The responses to these considerations are provided in table 1. As an example, the journal *American Archivist* reports receiving forty unsolicited manuscripts each year, of which 50 percent are accepted for publication. These accepted manuscripts represent approximately 75 percent of the total number of articles published in the journal each year.

The range of subjects dealt with by the journals in this study is diverse. Many journal titles suggest the key interests of their readers. Although an analysis by subject was outside the focus of this study, we did request copies of the information sent to prospective authors. Unfortunately, most of this information directs authors in matters of bibliographic format rather than identifying the scope of the journal. A noticeable exception is *Information Processing and Management*, which specifies its purpose, scope, typical key words, and related journals.

The overall findings of the opportunity to publish include:

1. An unsolicited manuscript stands about one chance in four of being published.
2. After an article is submitted, authors should anticipate a two-month delay before receiving an acceptance or rejection notification.
3. If the manuscript is accepted, an additional five months pass before the article is published.
4. The number of individuals who participate in the evaluation of a manuscript can vary from a single editor to a consensus from a group of individuals who review manuscripts without knowing the identity of the author. In fact, the most common pattern is that two to four readers will review a manuscript to determine if it is suitable for publication.
5. Unsolicited manuscripts account for more than two-thirds of the total articles published by the thirty-three journals identified in this study.

Nevertheless, manuscripts are not mailed to average journals. Instead, they are sent

to a specific periodical, and its practices determine the opportunity of authors to see their ideas in print.

Table 1 identifies for each journal the number of unsolicited manuscripts received annually, their acceptance rate, and the percent of total articles generated from unsolicited manuscripts. It is common knowledge that many rejected manuscripts eventually appear as news items or as articles in other journals.<sup>10</sup> The average acceptance rate for unsolicited manuscripts is 33.8 percent. This is a misleading figure given the extremes in the number of articles selected by different journals. For example, *Argus* reports a 100 percent acceptance rate, but only three manuscripts are involved. *Library Journal*, which receives 650 unsolicited manuscripts, reports an acceptance rate of 10 percent—or sixty-five articles. By computing the actual number of accepted manuscripts for all thirty-three journals, there was a total of 746 published articles from a pool of 3,292 unsolicited submissions, which represents an overall acceptance rate of 22.7 percent.

This unexpectedly high rejection rate of 77.3 percent surprised us when compared to the average rejection rates in other fields. In a review of the refereeing process, Meadows states that, "Only about a quarter of the papers submitted to U.S. science journals are rejected, though in some 'fringe' areas—such as mathematics and anthropology—the rejection rates rise to 50 percent. In arts subjects, on the other hand, over three-quarters of submitted articles may be refused."<sup>11</sup>

This raises the old question of where our field stands in relation to the disciplines. At the present time we obviously reflect the pattern of the arts. If we accept Meadows' analysis, then our more quantitative journals would be expected to have lower rejection rates than less quantitative ones.

This point is borne out in table 1 when looking at the acceptance rates of such journals as *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* (50 percent), *Information Processing and Management* (60 percent), *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* (50 percent), and *Special Libraries* (49 percent). The reasons for this may not be obvious, unless one realizes that scien-

tific journals often accept articles that contribute minor or esoteric advances in the field.

The implications of this raise a provocative question: Should librarians who publish for their own professional advancement in journals with high acceptance rates be required to produce *more* publications than those who publish in journals with low acceptance rates?

Another important consideration is the ratio of unsolicited to solicited manuscripts, which comprise the published articles in a library periodical volume. Column 4 of table 1 lists this publication rate for unsolicited manuscripts. These figures represent great variations in practice, and there are no discernible patterns to account for this in terms of subject area, manuscript reviewing process, or type of journal (i.e., association or commercial).

Questionnaire items relating to table 1 asked for the editor's best estimate; as such, publication rate is highly suspect. Ideally, the number of articles published annually by each journal could be obtained from table 1 by multiplying column 2 times column 3 and then dividing the result by column 4. For some journals, this process yielded highly inaccurate numbers when compared to actual counts of articles published. We surmised that this was due to erroneous publication rate figures.

From actual counts and several estimates, the total number of articles published by these thirty-three journals during 1975 was 1,095. Of these, 746, or 68.1 percent, came from unsolicited manuscripts, and the remaining 349 originated from solicited manuscripts. Thus it is safe to say that about two-thirds of the articles in our national journals come from unsolicited manuscripts. Given the severe rejection rate mentioned earlier, this publication rate constitutes an important commentary on the composition of our national journals: Both the editors of these publications and their respective audiences are dependent upon unsolicited manuscripts for communicating research among librarians.

Paradoxically, it is extremely difficult to have an unsolicited manuscript accepted for publication in a national library periodical, yet these journals are mostly comprised of

TABLE 1  
OPPORTUNITY TO PUBLISH UNSOLICITED MANUSCRIPTS

<i>Journal</i>	<i>Number Received</i> Number of unsolicited manuscripts received annually	<i>Acceptance Rate</i> Percent of unsolicited manuscripts accepted for publication	<i>Publication Rate</i> Of total articles published annually, percent which come from unsolicited manuscripts
American Archivist	40	50	75
American Libraries	200	5	60
Argus	3	100	5
Audiovisual Instruction	250	50	99
Bulletin of the American Society for Information Science	10	20	5
Bulletin of the Medical Library Association	95	50	50
Canadian Library Journal	45	50	50
Catholic Library World	30	20	25
College & Research Libraries	135	25	95
Film Library Quarterly	25	20	15
Horn Book	100	10	25
Information: Reports/Bibliography	10	10	6
Information Processing and Management	70	60	80
Journal of Academic Librarianship	150	24	85
Journal of Education for Librarianship	150	10	88
Journal of the American Society for Information Science	75	50	80
Journal of Library Automation	50	40	95
Journal of Library History, Philosophy and Comparative Librarianship	55	30	100
Journal of Micrographics	15	95	40
Law Library Journal	15	33	33
Learning Today	50	20	20
Library Journal	650	10	50
Library Resources & Technical Services	40	50	85
Library Quarterly	85	15	70
Microform Review	10	80	50
Music Library Association Notes	14	40	40
Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress	30	50	50
RQ	100	20	95
School Library Journal	300	3	5
School Media Quarterly	20	10	10
Special Libraries	170	49	100
Top of the News	50	13	50
Wilson Library Bulletin	250	5	30
Total	3292	Average 33.8%*	Average 53.5%†

\*Actual acceptance rate is 22.7%. See article for explanation.

†Actual publication rate is 68.1%. See article for explanation.

articles that originate from this source. Furthermore, editors still complain about the quality of manuscripts they receive. The following examination of the reviewing and refereeing process sheds some light on this dilemma.

#### REVEALING THE REVIEWING AND REFEREEING PROCESS

A rejection rate of 77.3 percent provides evidence that the article selection process is a tough and vigorous one. Previous treatments of this topic tend to concentrate on the quality of manuscripts submitted to journal editors and not on the closely related editorial review and selection process. In these days of performance objectives, accountability, and evaluation, it seems only fair that editors identify for prospective authors the complex process by which unsolicited manuscripts are reviewed and selected. Confronted here are two fundamental issues: *objectivity* in reviewing manuscripts and the *criteria* used in selecting articles to be published.

The concept of *objectivity* in reviewing unsolicited manuscripts addresses the degree of a reviewer's impartiality in the selection process. Theoretically, objectivity in selecting manuscripts for publication exists on a continuum that can range from no evaluation (i.e., anything received is automatically published) to evaluation of a manuscript where an independent reviewer and a prospective author do not know each other's identity (frequently described as "double-blind refereeing").

From an *a priori* listing of nine discrete possibilities within this reviewing continuum, six emerged as patterns of practice in selecting manuscripts for publication. There were no journals that automatically publish anything received, and thus all manuscripts receive some degree of review. For most of the journals, this review is usually performed by members of an editorial or advisory board who know the identities of prospective authors.

Table 2 lists by journal the six reviewing practices used by nationally based library periodicals; also included are the number of individuals involved in unsolicited manuscript review as well as the time it takes to perform this activity. As a journal moves

from high internal control by an editor to double-blind refereeing, there should be a corresponding increase in the objectivity with which manuscripts are selected for publication.

Although refereeing does not guarantee the production of quality manuscripts, it does inject independence and impartiality into the selection process. Ideally, a referee is an outside expert who judges anonymous manuscripts for their intrinsic worth; the referee also provides substantive suggestions to potential authors to help them improve the quality of their contributions. Though there appears to be movement toward refereeing, only six journals employed a full refereeing system, while the remaining twenty-seven periodicals relied primarily on editors, advisory staffs, and editorial boards to review and select manuscripts for publication.

(Several editors indicated that multiple reviewing practices were used. The assignment of a journal to a level in table 2 was based on the first category that an editor checked.)

For the ten level one journals, where the editor makes the selection, the sheer volume of this work is staggering: seventeen editors evaluate 784 unsolicited manuscripts annually, which amounts to an average of forty-six manuscripts per editor. This is in addition to preparing, coordinating, or evaluating features, editorials, theme issues, regular columns, and solicited manuscripts. Furthermore, many of the association publications have unpaid editors who perform these activities in addition to their regular jobs.

Refereeing is no immediate panacea that ensures the production of quality articles. For science journals, where this practice is widely used, the more prevalent negative aspects of refereeing include: time increases between receipt of manuscript and publication decision; use of different evaluation standards by different referees; difficulties in masking the identities of authors; and an occasional robbing of an author's idea by an unscrupulous referee.<sup>12</sup> Nonetheless, the important consideration here is how these disadvantages of refereeing compare to the present systems of editorial control.

The major difference when adopting a

TABLE 2

LEVEL OF REVIEWING, NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED, AND TIME TO PROCESS UNSOLICITED MANUSCRIPTS

Level of reviewing: Selection of unsolicited manuscripts for publication	Number of individuals involved‡	Average time in weeks from receipt of manuscript to:	
		Publication Decision	Actual Publication
1. Editor decides what is published			
Audiovisual Instruction	1	6-8	52
Catholic Library World	1	2	8
Journal of Micrographics	2	1	10
Law Library Journal	1	4	12-36
Learning Today	1	4	50
Microform Review	2	4	52
Music Library Association Notes	2	4-8	48
RQ	1	1-12	12-24
Top of the News	2	26	52
Wilson Library Bulletin	4	12	20
2. Editor decides with assistance of editorial staff			
American Libraries	5	10	18
Argus	6	12	‡
*Canadian Library Journal	2	8-10	8-16
*Film Library Quarterly	2	3	25
Horn Book	2	8	‡
Information: Reports/Bibliography	3	3-4	24
*Jrl of Lib. Hist., Phil. & Comp. Librarianship	3	4-6	8-12
Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress	4	4	25
School Library Journal	4	20	‡
*School Media Quarterly	4	6	24-30
3. Editor decides with assistance of advisory staff			
*American Archivist	8	15	26
Bulletin of the American Soc. for Info. Science	3-4	3-4	‡
†Journal of Academic Librarianship	12	2-9	12-52
Library Resources & Technical Services	6-7	15	52
*Library Quarterly	13	1-10	30+
4. Editorial Board decides			
*Journal of Library Automation	7	8	34
Library Journal	3-5	4-12	6-24
5. Referees decide; know author's name			
Bulletin of the Medical Library Association	3	8	20
Information Processing & Management	3	6	18
Journal of the American Soc. for Info. Science	2	8-12	30
6. Referees decide; do not know author's name—double-blind			
College & Research Libraries	3	6	40
Journal of Education for Librarianship	3	8	36
Special Libraries	2-3	8	16

\*Also uses outside referees who know author's name †Also uses double-blind refereeing system ‡Did not respond

§The questionnaire did not distinguish between number of individuals who serve as referees and the actual number involved in reviewing each manuscript.

refereeing system would be the decision-making environment within our journals. Instead of a relatively small number of individuals making many decisions on wide ranges of topics, there would be many individuals each making a few decisions in their particular areas of expertise. The time delay between receipt of manuscript and publication decision now averages two months; with a refereeing system this is likely to increase. However, the average five-month time span from publication decision to actual publication should not be affected.

The most serious problems with refereeing are the *criteria* used to evaluate manuscripts and the consistency with which they are applied. Fortunately, several editors from levels 5 and 6 sent us the evaluation forms used by their referees, and these were most enlightening. The best conglomerate form would include specific evaluation criteria followed by a scale so manuscripts can be judged according to originality of ideas, importance to the journals' audience, clarity, appropriateness of method, and similar standards.<sup>13</sup> In addition, an open-ended section for comments would allow referees to state specific criticisms of rejected manuscripts. Because this form is so important, editors should publish it regularly in their journals so prospective authors will know in advance the criteria used and how it is applied in the evaluation of their manuscript.

The other problems with refereeing—masking authors' identities and robbing of ideas—are rare but cannot be easily overcome. These merit close monitoring by journal editors.

Finally, it is our opinion that if journals lack a detailed purpose statement, do not provide for an objective review of manuscripts, and hide their evaluation criteria from prospective authors, then two things might happen: (1) There will be a high rejection rate for unsolicited manuscripts; and (2) there will be widespread complaints by editors that the quality of manuscripts received is very low.

#### QUESTIONING THE QUESTION

Previous writers on this topic have concentrated on vague notions of "quality" that should emanate from library periodicals.

This study does not pretend to address this issue in any direct manner. Instead, our investigation is a very specific one aimed at examining the method by which unsolicited manuscripts become published articles. An examination of thirty-three national journals, whose editors responded to a six-item questionnaire is, admittedly, a limited study. But we feel it is an important beginning in describing an influential segment of the library literature, whose combined circulation exceeds 335,000 subscriptions.

The treatment of unsolicited manuscripts reported here indicates a clear need to reassess the policies and levels of decision making within our national journals. We view a librarian's opportunity to publish as severely limited by the following factors: (1) high manuscript rejection rate; (2) lack of objectivity in the manuscript reviewing process; (3) uncertainty about the journal's purpose; and (4) ignorance of reviewers' evaluative criteria.

These issues deserve an open hearing to resolve the problems facing librarians who would like to communicate their ideas with colleagues. It is not enough to continue the current trend of workshops, where editors and researchers identify for librarians the ideal, publishable manuscript. Instead, journal staffs must reexamine and publicize their policies. This should also benefit the journals in providing them with external measures of stability when editors and editorial boards change.

Of course, we intend to end this on a positive, constructive note. A few journals have already accomplished some of the recommendations suggested in this study. The experiences of these editors should be shared with others to identify reasonable modifications of current practice as journals move toward the development of national guidelines.

The American Library Association can exercise leadership in this area by examining its periodicals to determine the pattern appropriate to each journal's purpose and audience. In addition, a conference of librarians and editors to discuss specific issues would go far in advancing the state of our journal literature.

To keep this in focus, we suggest that the initial considerations address three basic

points: (1) Journals should regularly publish specific statements on their purpose, scope, and audience; (2) journals should publish the criteria used to evaluate manuscripts; and (3) journals should adopt a double-blind refereeing system.

These proposed changes should provide vehicles for the improvement of our literature to the benefit of editors, authors, and readers. Once these issues are resolved, we may look forward to Katz's *Best of 1980* as a two-volume work.

## REFERENCES

1. Ingelis Bell, "Mechanics of Editorial Work," *ALA Library Periodicals Round Table Newsletter* 6:5 (1959).
2. Jean Colquhoun, "Dullness in Library Journals," *Ontario Library Review* 37:86-87 (1953).
3. Leon Carnovsky, "Standards for Library Periodicals," *Library Journal* 80:264-69 (1955).
4. Fay M. Blake, "A Look at Library Literature," *Wilson Library Bulletin* 35:715, 720 (1961).
5. Eric Moon, "Popular or Scholarly?" *Library Journal* 87:2330 (1962).
6. Eric Moon, "The Library Press," *Library Journal* 94:4104-9 (1969).
7. *Ibid.*, p.4105.
8. Jennie M. Harreld, "Report on the Conference on Writing and Publishing for Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 36:177-79 (June 1975).
9. "Is There a Need for a Journal of Library Research?" "Program of the 91st Annual Conference of the American Library Association, Chicago, Illinois, June 25-July 1, 1972," p.81.
10. Moon, "The Library Press," p.4105, and telephone conversation with John Berry, editor of *Library Journal*, on Oct. 25, 1976.
11. A. J. Meadows, *Communication in Science* (London: Butterworths, 1974), p.38.
12. *Ibid.*, p.42.
13. A more thorough listing of criteria can be found in "American Libraries \$1000 Prize Article Competition," *American Libraries* 7:685 (1976).



---

# SPECIAL PRE-PUBLICATION OFFER

---

## ENCYCLOPEDIA OF BIOETHICS

Editor in Chief: WARREN T. REICH, Center for Bioethics, Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University

A groundbreaking reference work—the only comprehensive source of information on social and ethical issues in the life sciences, medicine, health care, and the health professions. In over 300 cross-referenced articles ranging from *Abortion to Zygote Banking*, the major concepts, principles, and problems of bioethics—past and present—have been synthesized, analyzed, and compared. Distinguished international contributors explore significant ethical positions in all philosophical and religious traditions. The implications of these positions, the unresolved issues, and the anticipated developments are examined to encourage ethical reflection on the part of the reader. With an exhaustive index and an extensive bibliography following each article, the *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* is invaluable for researchers, students, educators, and professionals. Available in December 1978.

Four-volume set \$200.00N ISBN 0-02-926060-4  
Special Pre-publication Price: \$180.00  
Order before December and save 10%.

## INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLO- PEDIA OF STATISTICS

Edited by WILLIAM H. KRUSKAL, University of Chicago, and JUDITH M. TANUR, State University of New York at Stony Brook

The most extensive, definitive reference work on statistics in print, covering the development of modern statistical methods and describing the operations, interpretations, and applications of

various statistical techniques. This two-volume set (1344 pages) is fully cross-referenced, alphabetically arranged, and includes: 75 articles on statistics proper, 42 articles on social science topics with special relevance to statistics, 57 biographies, extensive bibliographies following each article, complete index. An essential reference tool for statisticians, social scientists, engineers, medical researchers, market researchers, and anyone who uses or has to understand statistics. Available in November 1978.

Two-volume set \$100.00N ISBN 0-02-917960-2  
Special Pre-publication Price: \$90.00  
Order before November and save 10%.

## BAKER'S BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF MUSICIANS

Sixth Edition

NICHOLAS SLONIMSKY

At last, the long-awaited new edition of *Baker's*—the classic one-volume reference work of musical biography for over 75 years. More than one thousand entries have been added and thousands more have been completely revised, making the Sixth Edition more comprehensive, authoritative, and up-to-date than any previous editions. *Baker's* offers immediate access to the most pertinent information on virtually all the well-known and little-known figures in the music world: composers, singers, instrumental virtuosos, orchestral conductors, critics, librettists, publishers, impresarios, instrument makers, scholars and patrons of music. The approximately 12,000 musical portraits span the history of music from the Middle Ages to the age of rock and include lists of works and selective bibliographies. Musicians, music scholars, and music lovers will find *Baker's* a must—an engaging and enlightening guide to the people who make music.

Available in December 1978.

One volume, 2000 pages \$75.00N  
ISBN 0-02-870240-9  
Special Pre-publication Price: \$65.00

---

Order from:  
**MACMILLAN PROFESSIONAL AND  
LIBRARY SERVICES**

A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.  
100B Brown Street, Riverside, New Jersey 08370

---

# REPRINTS RELEASED in 78 and 79

## REPRINTS UNCHANGED

AUTHOR	TITLE	ORIG. ED.	PAGES	PRICE
Barclay	FOUNDATIONS OF COUNSELING STRATEGIES	1971	470 pp	\$15.75
Bendat	PRINCIPLES AND APPLICATIONS OF RANDOM NOISE THEORY	1958	456 pp	\$18.50
Bernstein	AUDIO SYSTEMS	1966	424 pp	In Prep.
Berwanger	AS THEY SAW SLAVERY	1973	176 pp	ppb \$7.50
Billingsley	ERGODIC THEORY AND INFORMATION	1965	210 pp	In Prep.
Bloom	GAS LASERS	1968	184 pp	\$13.50
Bodnar	STRUCTURAL ADHESIVES BONDING	1966	504 pp	In Prep.
Bowsky	THE BLACK DEATH	1971	134 pp	ppb \$4.50
Broudy	BUILDING A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION	1954	426 pp	\$16.50
Broudy et al	DEMOCRACY AND EXCELLENCE IN AMERICAN SECONDARY EDUCATION	1964	310 pp	\$12.00
Bullough	THE SCIENTIFIC REVOLUTION	1970	136 pp	ppb \$4.50
Butler	CORROSION AND ITS PREVENTION IN WATERS	1966	312 pp	In Prep.
Cater/Lee	POLITICS OF HEALTH	1972	248 pp	In Prep.
Chalmers	PRINCIPLES OF SOLIDIFICATION	1964	336 pp	\$16.95
Chikazumi/Charap	PHYSICS OF MAGNETISM	1964	554 pp	In Prep.
Chua	INTRODUCTION TO NON LINEAR NETWORK THEORY (Subdivided into 3 parts)			In Prep.
Cohn	DIFFERENCE ALGEBRA	1965	372 pp	\$19.50
Connelly	THE EPOCH OF NAPOLEON	1972	208 pp	ppb \$4.50
Dean et al	MATHEMATICS FOR MODERN MANAGEMENT	1963	456 pp	\$16.50
Dean	OPERATIONS RESEARCH IN RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT	1963	302 pp	\$12.95
Denn	OPTIMIZATION BY VARIATIONAL METHODS	1969	438 pp	\$22.50
Disque	APPLIED PLASTIC DESIGN IN STEEL	1971	256 pp	\$15.50
Easton	A SYSTEMS ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL LIFE	1965	507 pp	\$17.50
Eringen	MECHANICS OF CONTINUA	1967	520 pp	In Prep.
Filler	FROM POPULISM TO PROGRESSIVISM: Representative Selections (formerly titled: Late 19th Century American Liberalism)	1962	310 pp	In Prep.
Gel Fand	LECTURES ON LINEAR ALGEBRA	1964	204 pp	\$11.50
Gilbert	SULFONATION AND RELATED REACTIONS	1965	542 pp	\$22.50
Glorig	AUDIOMETRY: Principles and Practices	1965	286 pp	\$14.50
Grazda et al	HANDBOOK OF APPLIED MATHEMATICS	1966	1127 pp	\$20.50
Grinspoon et al	SCHIZOPHRENIA: Pharmacotherapy and Psychotherapy	1972	312 pp	\$15.75
Hecht et al	THE WOMEN. YES!	1973	226 pp	In Prep.
Himwich	BIOCHEMISTRY, SCHIZOPHRENIA, AND AFFECTIVE ILLNESSES	1971	514 pp	\$24.50
Jackson/Messick	PROBLEMS IN HUMAN ASSESSMENT	1967	890 pp	\$32.50
Javid/Brenner	ANALYSIS, TRANSMISSION, AND FILTERING OF SIGNALS	1963	478 pp	\$17.50
Jones	THE FORMATION OF THE CONSTITUTION	1971	142 pp	ppb \$4.50
Keys	THE HISTORY OF SURGICAL ANESTHESIA	1945	224 pp	\$9.50
Kneller	EDUCATIONAL ANTHROPOLOGY: An Introduction	1965	182 pp	\$8.50
Mamatey	RISE OF THE HASBURG EMPIRE 1526-1815	1971	192 pp	ppb \$4.50
Miller	MODERN MATHEMATICAL METHODS FOR ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS	1972	502 pp	In Prep.
Morrison	THE INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY	1971	142 pp	ppb \$4.50
Oldenberg/Holladay	INTRODUCTION TO ATOMIC AND NUCLEAR PHYSICS	1949	424 pp	\$17.50
Olson	MODERN SOUND REPRODUCTION	1972	352 pp	In Prep.
Parrish	ORGANIC REACTIONS—Volumes 1, 14, 15 (complete set available)			\$19.50 each
Pope/Harper	THE CIVIL WAR	1970	158 pp	ppb \$4.50
Rail	HIGH-SPEED WIND TUNNEL TESTING			In Prep.
Rail	COMPUTATIONAL SOLUTION OF NONLINEAR OPERATOR EQUATIONS	1969	236 pp	In Prep.
Rose	CONCEPTS IN PHOTOCONDUCTIVITY AND ALLIED PROBLEMS	1963	178 pp	In Prep.
Ross	THE FRENCH REVOLUTION	1971	136 pp	ppb \$4.50
Salutos	POPULISM: Reaction or Reform?	1968	128 pp	ppb \$4.50
Schwartz	SURFACE ACTIVE AGENTS AND DETERGENTS — Vol. 1	1949	592 pp	\$19.50
Slattery	MOMENTUM, ENERGY, AND MASS TRANSFER IN CONTINUA	1972	702 pp	In Prep.
Seymour	INTRODUCTION TO POLYMER CHEMISTRY	1971	448 pp	In Prep.
Strahler	INTRODUCTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE	1974	722 pp	\$18.50
Thaler	ELECTRIC MACHINES: Dynamics and Steady State	1966	615 pp	\$25.00
Waddell	PRACTICAL QUALITY CONTROL FOR CONCRETE	1962	406 pp	\$19.50
Willis	DeGAULLE: Anachronism, Realist, or Prophet?	1967	128 pp	ppb \$4.50
Wymore	A MATHEMATICAL THEORY OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING: The Elements	1967	361 pp	\$19.50

## REPRINTS WITH CORRECTIONS OR UPDATING

Norton	FINE CERAMICS	1970	524 pp.	In Prep.
Perrin	ORGANIC COMPLEXING REAGENTS	1964	378 pp.	In Prep.
Plann	ZONE MELTING	1958	326 pp.	\$15.75
Ralston	INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAMMING AND COMPUTER SCIENCE	1971	538 pp.	In Prep.
Stipe	THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHYSICAL THEORIES	1967	494 pp.	In Prep.

**ROBERT E. KRIEGER PUBLISHING CO. INC.**  
 P.O. BOX 542 HUNTINGTON, N.Y. 11743 USA (516) 271-5252

# REPRINTS RELEASED in 78 and 79

## REPRINTS WITH CORRECTIONS OR UPDATING

Brems	QUANTITATIVE ECONOMIC THEORY: A Synthesis Approach	1968	532 pp.	In Prep.
Brown	MICROMAGNETICS	1963	154 pp.	In Prep.
Bube	PHOTOCONDUCTIVITY OF SOLIDS	1960	482 pp.	In Prep.
Bykhovskiy	FUNDAMENTALS OF VIBRATION ENGINEERING	1969	360 pp.	In Prep.
Chang	BASIC PRINCIPLES OF SPECTROSCOPY	1971	314 pp.	In Prep.
Chapple/Coon	PRINCIPLES OF ANTHROPOLOGY	1942	730 pp.	In Prep.
Chapple	REHABILITATION: THE DYNAMIC OF CHANGE	1970	122 pp.	In Prep.
Condyannis	SCIENTIFIC GERMAN	1967	174 pp.	In Prep.
Condyannis	SCIENTIFIC RUSSIAN	1969	238 pp.	In Prep.
Fararo	MATHEMATICAL SOCIOLOGY	1973	830 pp.	In Prep.
Gregory	A COLLECTION OF MATRICES FOR TESTING COMPUTATIONAL ALGORITHMS	1969	164 pp.	\$15.00
Hackett/Williamson	ANATOMY OF READING	1970	272 pp.	\$9.95
Harnwell/Livingood	EXPERIMENTAL ATOMIC PHYSICS	1933	486 pp.	In Prep.
Hart	COMPUTER APPROXIMATIONS	1966	356 pp.	In Prep.
Heald	PLASMA DIAGNOSTICS WITH MICROWAVES	1965	470 pp.	In Prep.
Herzberger	MODERN GEOMETRICAL OPTICS	1958	416 pp.	In Prep.
Howell	INTRODUCTION TO GEOPHYSICS	1959	412 pp.	In Prep.
Johnson	MECHANICAL DESIGN SYNTHESIS. Creative Design and Optimization	1971	360 pp.	\$17.50
Johnson	NOMOGRAPHY AND EMPIRICAL EQUATIONS	1962	160 pp.	\$12.50
Lewis	GAS POWER DYNAMICS	1962	544 pp.	In Prep.
Lindmayer/Wrigley	FUNDAMENTALS OF SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICES	1965	496 pp.	In Prep.
McCarthy	INTRODUCTION TO STATISTICAL REASONING	1957	416 pp.	In Prep.
Morgan	INTRODUCTION TO UNIVERSITY PHYSICS—Volume 1	1963	526 pp.	In Prep.
	Volume 2	1963	489 pp.	In Prep.
Morrish	THE PHYSICAL PRINCIPLES OF MAGNETISM	1965	696 pp.	In Prep.
Myself	INTRODUCTION TO COLLOID CHEMISTRY	1959	492 pp.	In Prep.

## ADVANCE INFORMATION ON 1978/79 TITLES (NEW)

AUTHOR	TITLE	ORIG. ED.	PAGES	PRICE
Anderson	*PUBLIC POLICY MAKING	1978	160 pp. approx.	\$10.50
Armstrong	*IDEOLOGY, POLITICS & GOVERNMENT IN SOVIET UNION	1978	256 pp.	\$9.95
Banerji	ENERGY ECONOMY IN DESIGN	1978		In Prep.
Boschmann/Welcher	ORGANIC REAGENTS FOR COPPER	1978	550 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Graupe	THE RISE OF MODERN JUDAISM— An Intellectual History of German Jewry 1650-1942	1978	394 pp.	\$19.50
Hinton	*INTRODUCTION TO CHINESE POLITICS	1978	336 pp.	\$11.95
Iiams	PEACEMAKING FROM VERGENNES TO NAPOLEON	1979	140 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Lang	ABSORPTION SPECTRA IN THE ULTRAVIOLET & VISIBLE REGION—Vol. 22	1978	198 pp.	\$42.50
Mappen	WITCHES AND HISTORIANS: Interpretations of Salem Witchcraft	1979	260 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Martin/Stubaas	AMERICAN REVOLUTION: WHOSE REVOLUTION?	1977	168 pp.	ppb. \$4.50
Meyer	*THE POLITICAL EXPERIENCE	1978	224 pp.	\$10.95
Morgan	THE PHYSICAL BASIS OF MUSICAL SOUND	1979	200 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Poole	BEHIND THE IMPERIAL PRESIDENCY: Six Men Who Shaped U.S. Foreign Policy 1941-1976	1979	120 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Preston/Wise	*MEN IN ARMS	1978	424 pp.	In Prep.
Roback et al	GROUP PSYCHOTHERAPY RESEARCH: Commentaries and Readings	1978	320 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Rooney	LAMENESS: A Horse Owner's Guide	1979		In Prep.
Snead	WORLD ATLAS OF GEOMORPHIC FEATURES	1978	320 pp. approx.	\$16.50
Spanier	*HOW AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IS MADE	1978	192 pp.	\$9.95
Stollak	UNTIL WE ARE SIX	1978	132 pp. approx.	In Prep.

\*Joint publication with Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

## REVISED EDITIONS

Chatfield	A HISTORY OF ACCOUNTING THOUGHT	1974	322 pp.	cl \$16.50 ppb. \$9.50
Chiang	INTRODUCTION TO STOCHASTIC PROCESSES & THEIR APPLICATIONS	1968	313 pp. approx.	In Prep.
Enrick	INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING MANUAL	1962	270 pp.	In Prep.
Firmage	FUNDAMENTAL THEORY OF STRUCTURES	1963	350 pp. approx.	\$14.50
Hughes	OIL PROPERTY VALUATION	1967	324 pp.	In Prep.
Lowenthal	PHARMACEUTICAL CALCULATIONS—A Self-Instructional Text	1969	424 pp.	\$11.50
Luthin	DRAINAGE ENGINEERING	1966	258 pp. approx.	\$16.50
Malloy/Turner	ECONOMIC THICKNESS OF THERMAL INSULATION	1961		In Prep.
Malloy	THERMAL INSULATION	1969	570 pp.	In Prep.
Poole	EIGHT PRESIDENTS AND INDOCHINA	1973	160 pp. approx.	ppb. \$5.25

**ROBERT E. KRIEGER PUBLISHING CO. INC.**  
P.O. BOX 542 HUNTINGTON, N.Y. 11743 USA (516) 271-5252

# GENERAL SCIENCE INDEX

*General Science Index* is a new index specifically designed to help make access to and research with science periodicals more effective for public library patrons and students of all ages. Now, non-specialists may investigate, with greater ease,

a wide variety of scientific topics and studies. Covering all the major areas in science today, *General Science Index* offers indexing for 89 English language periodicals that encompass both numerous and/or individual subject fields.

Carefully selected periodicals in the following areas are indexed:

Astronomy  
Atmospheric Sciences  
Biological Sciences  
Botany  
Chemistry  
Earth Sciences  
Environment and Conservation  
Food and Nutrition  
Genetics

Mathematics  
Medicine and Health  
Microbiology  
Oceanography  
Psychology  
Physics  
Physiology  
Zoology

From questions concerning astronomy to those about zoology, *General Science Index* provides users with a useful guide to recently published material. Using a subject entry format for all articles, indexing is conducted by experienced librarians with subject specialties. A special subject authority file was established at the inception of the *Index* to assure continuity and consistency of the headings, and a complete system of cross-references has been

employed with each issue. Whenever possible, a commonly used name or familiar contemporary term is used with a *see* reference from the traditional, often Latin, or scientific term, thus giving access to many articles through either name. Another valuable source of information in the *Index* is the separate section devoted to citations of book reviews, a feature that appears in each issue.

## The *NEW* Index to Scientific Literature

*General Science Index*, which began publication in July of 1978, is issued monthly, except in June and December. Cumulative issues appear in September, November, February, and May. An annual permanent hardbound cumulation is included in the subscription price. *General Science Index* is sold on the service basis. For a quotation of your service basis rate, please write for the *General Science Index* list of periodicals indexed. Check the periodicals your library now receives or expects to receive during the coming year. Requesting your service basis rate does not, of course, obligate you to subscribe.



## THE H. W. WILSON COMPANY

950 University Avenue, Bronx, New York 10452