academic boycotts on them. The results of the questionnaires and interviews are laid out clearly. Haricombe and Lancaster state that "The study undertaken was designed solely to determine to what extent scholarship in South Africa may have suffered as a result of various manifestations of an academic boycott." (p. 111)

The results showed that the impact on research were minimal, however, scholars did express psychological effects such as isolation. The authors conclude that the boycott did give increased attention to South Africa itself. "The fact that most participants in our study considered the academic boycott as an irritant and inconvenience, rather than a significant obstacle to scholarly research, does indeed suggest that it was more a symbolic gesture than an effective agent of change." (p. 113)

Not only is this work of value to scholars of South Africa, but it has a much broader scope and will interest scholars and the public in areas including higher education, professional ethics, intellectual freedom, scholarly publishing, library science, and African Studies. Although scholarly in its approach, the book reads well and the general public will also find it of interest.

Koenig, Michael E.D. & Bookstein, Abraham, Eds. *Proceedings of the Fifth Biennial Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics.* Medford, NJ: Learned Information, 1995. 703 pp. $79.00 (ISBN 1–57387–010–2)

Reviewed by **Elisabeth Davenport**, Lecturer, Communication and Information Studies Department, Queen Margaret College, Edinburgh EH12 8TS, Scotland and Visiting Professor, School of Library and Information Science, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

The review of this compendium has been written from the perspective of an outsider, not unfamiliar with the field, who wishes to know what are the current hot spots, and what topic areas attract most effort from researchers. The task has not been easy, as the volume has been produced with a minimum of editorial intervention: alphabetical sorting by author name. The observations which follow are based on the reviewer's ranking (by broadly defined topic frequency) of the 64 full contributions and 29 poster sessions which make up the collection.

The largest cluster consists of 23 submissions that cover what may be roughly called "regional or national science and technology policy." Papers in this group present an assessment/comparison of policy in a specifically named geographic region (EC, Eastern Europe, Latin America), a country or a specific institution to establish benchmarks for productivity, funding and so on. Within this group, the dedicated reader prepared to take notes and flick through pages may choose to assess the material in terms of further subdivisions: the four papers from Spain, the three from Mexico, the three from Australia, the two abstracts from China etc., in an attempt to grasp the features of local use of informetrics. The Spanish papers, for example, are largely concerned with collaboration (imperative for researchers involved in EC programs), and the possible tension between external expertise and the dilution of indigenous capability—clearly expressed in the paper by Gomez et. al.: "Collaboration patterns of Spanish scientific publications in different research areas and disciplines.". In Australia, informetricians are busy with performance indicators,

the backbone of central government resource allocation, and are seeking to establish a level of (dis) aggregation (individual, departmental, institutional) at which informetric or scientometric methods are both reliable and ethical; tensions in this area are clearly articulated in the paper by Bourke and Butler: "The use of bibliometric data in evaluating a research university: issues and measures." The Mexican contributions show a continuing preoccupation with share of world scientific productivity; the paper by Russell et al.: "Institutional production cutting across disciplinary boundaries: an assessment of chemical research in Mexico," places such concerns in a wider discussion of the validity of scientometrics.

Regional or country matters aside, what do the rest of the contributions reveal about the shape of informetrics? A substantial cluster (14 papers) deals with what may be called "field reviews," historical conspectuses (one of the contributions in this group is an anniversary analysis of a decade of the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy*), maps of active relationships and core topic areas, discussion of the validity of the methods of informetrics in a given discipline. Readers may again be frustrated by the fact that material is not collocated at the level of the discipline: physics, or information science, for example. The largest topic area of these residual clusters is devoted to bibliometric coupling (the use of co–word analysis, or co–citation counts to identify, for example, core journals or active research nuclei). Next in frequency ranking is a number of topic groups represented by four or five contributions each. A group of papers (five) discusses re–working the concept of the journal impact factor. Four papers explore bibliolinguistics, three discuss the problems of performance measurement and interdisciplinary research, three suggest that the field may be transformed by relational databases (two of these discuss ISI's Integrated Citation File) and a group of eight 'revisit the classics': Bradford, Lotka and Price. A 'talus' group (set membership of one or two) covers co–authorship, acknowledgments (building on the work of Cronin and his colleagues), costs, the Matthew effect, ageing, the dynamics of chaos in library circulation.

More than half of the contributors mention ISI products as the basis of their research; other databases mentioned are INSPEC, LISA, ISA, MEDLINE, MEDLARS, CORDIS, and products from DIALOG and BLDSC. But it would be unfair to overstate the influence of information industry vendors on informetrics. This is still a field where a poorly resourced institution can contribute to research, *vide* the papers which describe manual analysis of print–based material.

The brief Preface announces the abandoning of the term "bibliometrics" as inappropriate "in this age of electronic information delivery," and the incorporation of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics (ISSI). The first volume produced under this new rubric can hardly be described as exemplary, lacking, as it does, even an index. The lack of editorial intervention is an opportunity lost. Grouping the material into judiciously chosen sections, with cross–references and an index and editorial introduction would have greatly enhanced the volume's value both as an archival resource and as a current review. One must infer that the editors' first priority has been the production of a *vade mecum* for those attending the meeting. Even at this level, the text is not free from errors, which range from the mislabelled diagram (p. 107), to amusing misprints (the "rule of thump," for example, on page 99). The contributions show marked differences in presentation format, fluency and clarity of expression. Some of this is tiresome, some thought–provoking:

one wonders where Groos of the 'Groos droop' fits into "Negative eponomic obso-lescence," for example.

Maack, Mary Niles & Passet, Joanne. *Aspirations and Mentoring in an Academic Environment: Women Faculty in Library and Information Science.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994. 232 pp. $49.95 (ISBN 0-313-27826-9)

Reviewed by **Ellen Broidy**, History and Film Studies Librarian and Library Publications Officer, University of California, 386 Main Library, Irvine, California 92717, ejbroidy@uci.edu

For several months participants on FEMINIST, a listserv for librarians, library school students, and others interested in feminist issues in librarianship, engaged in a lively debate on the subject of feminism and library education. With a few notable exceptions, most everyone who weighed in on the topic agreed that feminism has been given short shrift in many library schools. In fact, several students and practitioners remarked that women's issues in general, even when untainted by the "f" word, were strangely absent from their professional education and their socialization into this predominantly female profession. Students, in particular, expressed frustration at feeling the need to take complete responsibility for using gender as a category of analysis within the context of the library science classroom. In a significant number of cases in this admittedly unscientific sample, the only mention of feminism or gender came in the form of either student-initiated discussion or independent research for a course paper. In light of this perceived lack of attention to a subject that one might argue should be of enormous interest to future librarians, and those charged with teaching them, the appearance of a work on women faculty in library and information science seemed extremely fortuitous.

I approached *Aspiration and Mentoring in an Academic Environment* with great expectations, swayed, possibly, by a desire to find solutions to the dilemmas debated on the listserv. These heightened expectations, perhaps unfortunately, informed my reading of this work. What Maack and Passet have produced is not the feminist analysis I had hoped for but rather a mildly interesting study of the complex and changing relationships women experience as their status shifts from graduate student to faculty member. The book is far more descriptive than analytical, rarely offering more than a record of responses to set questions on predetermined topics. While this approach certainly serves to structure the study, keeping it from wandering too far afield, it also has the unintended effect of making the reader, this reader at any rate, more curious about what wasn't addressed than what was. For example, there appears to be little effort to account for race as a variable. If all the respondents were white, then there is a serious problem with the sample. If, in fact, the faculty women interviewed were more racially and ethnically diverse, the authors ignored this variable to the detriment of the entire study. A similar disinclination to diversity manifests itself with respect to sexual orientation. One would gather from a careful reading of this work that female library school faculty fall into three categories: single (never married), married, and divorced. The authors never raise the possibility of lesbian relationships or other alternative family structures. They present a profes-