behauptet werden. Denn auch 'Neuronale Netzwerke' sind letzten Endes nur Werkzeuge, die auf einer bestimmten Implementierungstechnik beruhen und selbstverständlich nicht den Menschen ersetzen können. Und genausowenig, wie die Schrift das gesprochene Wort verdrängt hat, werden auch die neuen Informationstechnologien nicht den geschriebenen Text verdrängen. Obwohl forschungspolitisch gesehen tatsächlich die Befürchtungen Fugmanns nicht unberechtigt sind, daß gegenüber den computerorientierten Verfahren die am Textmodell orientierte Form der Informationsbereitstellung bis zur Existenzgefährdung ihrer Vertreter vernachlässigt wird.

Fugmanns Buch ist als erster Band einer Reihe, die den Titel "Fortschritte in der Wissensorganisation" trägt, erschienen, und es verdient auch diesen Platz. Denn es ist ein Buch, das man nicht nur einmal liest und es dann wieder weglegt, sondern sein praktischer Nutzen besteht darin, daß man sich immerwieder daraus Ratholen kann, oder als Benutzer eines Informationssystems nach den bereitgestellten Informationen sucht. Es verdient diesen Platz auch deswegen, weil es einen Einblick liefert in die Frage, was überhaupt unter "Wissensorganisation" sinnvollerweise zu verstehen ist. Es gibt auf die Frage, was Wissensorganisation ist, vom Standpunkt eines verantwortungsvollen Fachmannes, der jahrzehntelang mit der Errichtung und Verwaltung von großen Informationssystemen betraut war, eine klare Antwort: Wissensorganisation bedeudet Ordnung schaffen durch ein zukunftssicheres Informationssystem, "das auf Anfrage dem Suchenden die gewünschte Information ermittelt und bereitstellt und zwar gleichgültig, ob diese Information dem Suchenden bereits früher begegnet ist oder nicht" (S.11). Dabei wird unter 'Information' von Fugmann in Anlehnung an Shrejder, Zunde, u.a. jede Nachricht verstanden, die für den Empfänger von Interesse ist. In einer solchen Definition bleibt das hohe Maß an Subjektivität, welches dem Informations-bgriff, wie er auf in formatinswissenschaftlichem Gebiet behandelt werden muß, von Natur aus anhaftet, voll erhalten. Das bedeutet aber auch, daß die Bewertung der Information Sache des Empfängers ist und nicht eine Angelegenheit des Informationsbereitstellers. Folgt man diesen Überlegungen Fugmanns, dann kann auch Wissensorganisation nicht in einer Bewertung des Wissens bestehen, sondern soll vielmehr ein Hilfsmittel liefern, das jedem Fachmann ermöglicht, sich in seinem Gebiet Klarheit darüber zu beschaffen, welchen Wert und Unwert eine angebotene Information für ihn hat.

Erhard Oeser

Prof.Dr.E.Oeser, University of Vienna, Institute for Science Theory and Science Research. Sensengasse 8, A-1090 Wien, Austria.

Hans-Dieter DANIEL: **Guardians of Science: Fairness and Reliability of the Peer Review Process.** Weinheim, New York, Basel: VCH Verlagsgesellschaft 1993. 118p., 9 figs., 27 tabls., ISBN 3-527-29041-9

As a professor at the University of Califorina, Los Angeles(UCLA), as a researcher and writer in information science, and as an Associate Editor of the international journal *Information Processing and Management*, I have been asked to evaluate the suitability of manuscripts for publication in professional journals, the quality of research proposals, and the qualifications of applicants for academic positions. And of course, my manuscripts and research proposals have been evaluated by my colleagues. This practice is known as *peer review*. Although the practice is universal, it is not without its critics. On the one hand, it is claimed that peer reviews are necessaary to maintain and improve the quality of published papers. On the other hand, critics contend that the peer review process is unreliable, invalid, and particularly unfair when evaluating innovative research. Although there have been some past studies of the reliability and faimess of the peer review procedures, Daniel's research adds to our knowledge of this process by investigating the adequacy of the reviewer's judgments concerning inter-referee reliability, fairness, and predictive validity.

The database for the study is the "449 communications received from throughout the world for possible publication in *Angewandte Chemie* during the year 1984. Each communication was evaluated by two external referees working with fully-structured reviewing forms and operating under the principle of one-sided anonymity (i.e. the referees knew the names of the authors, but the authors did not know those of the referees). All reviewers received from the editor-in-chief both a fully-structured reviewing form and a comment sheet", p.71. The research study was well planned, carefully performed, and cautiously evaluated.

This review cannot, and should not, summarize the results of the study, for the report needs to be read in its entirety in order to understand its implications and recommendations. The work provides many insights into the peer review process along with a better appreciation of its strengths and weaknesses. Moreover, it is pointed out that an often neglected aspect of the review process is that authors receive suggestions to help improve their manuscripts prior to publication. In the case of the *Angewandte Chemie*, 63% of all manuscripts were revised by their authors on the basis of the reviewer's comments.

It is a small book, 117 pages, including many tables and figures, plus a long list of references and an index. The work is informative and well-written and should be read by anyone who submits articles for professional publication and especially by those who serve as peer reviewers for such publications.

Harold Borko

Dr.H.Borko, Professor Emeritus,
University of California, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

VENKATAPPAIAH, P., KUMAR, P.S.G.: **Ranganathan Dictionary: Indian Terminology on Library and Information Science.** New Delhi: BR Publishing Corp. 1994. VIII,112p. ISBN 81-7018-762-2

Paradoxically, ordinary language is a barrier in effective and precise communication. Ranganathan ascribes many troubles of society to faulty communications. Ordinary words with their multiple meanings with over- and undertones and various shades of meanings are not fit to be used in an academic

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1994-2-108-1 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY

discipline. Writers exploit these inherent characteristics in a language to make their writing ambiguous and colourful. In scientific and technical writings it will be hazardous if an ordinary language is not shorn of those extraneous meanings. This is done by vocabulary control: first by restricting the entry of keywords to connote concepts and then by precisely defining every word so introduced. No discipline can progress beyond its infancy without its technical terminology. Its progress goes hand in hand with the development of its terminology and vice-versa. Ranganathan was a great advocate of using technical terminology. He always appealed, sometimes emotionally, to his fellow-librarians to use technical terms for the development of library science. He coined many new terms for every branch of the discipline, as he always needed new and precise words to effectively communicate his trail-blazing writings embodied in 50 books and 1500 papers. He had a good habit of pre-defining his terms separately in a section preceding the text, be it a book or a paper. Ironically, it is his use of technical terminology which has hindered access to his revolutionary thoughts. Some find his writings highly-jargon ridden and thus difficult to read. For many his diction is strange and is in Indian English. Some opponents have criticized Ranganathan as a man who reveled in jargon and used it as a means for self-aggrandisement. Ranganathan remained uncompromising on this issue, and now his terminology is considered his fundamental contribution to the discipline and to the English language[1].

Prior to the book under review, no successful effort had been made to cull up all his terms and put them together under one cover. Therefore such a compilation was overdue and is highly welcome. This reference work alphabetically puts together and briefly explains about 800 terms coined and used by Ranganathan. Each entry begins with the term printed in boldface, followed by its briefly expanded meaning ranging from 10 to 100 words on the average. In some cases meanings are exemplified and illustrated with diagrams. The source document is indicated at the end of the entry, although there are many exceptions, too. The sources cited are too highly abbreviated to be understood by every user. No consolidated list of sources tapped is given. The work is not exhaustive, as many characteristically Ranganathian terms are not listed, e.g., "librachine", "ready reference service", to name two at random. On the other hand, some obsolete terms have been included. Some of the entries are not self-explanatory: to be fully understood their context has to be imagined. An index of broader subjects would have enhanced the book's value. Despite its flaws and limitations the work is valuable and of practical use to students, teachers and Ranganathan scholars.

Mohinder Partap Satija

Dr.M.P.Satija, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar-143 005, India

1 Satija, M.P.: Indian sources of library and information science terminology. J.Libr.& Inform.Sci. 16(1991)No.2, p.129-143

HORN, Klaus-Peter; WIGGER, Lothar (Eds.): **Systematiken und Klassifikationen in der Erziehungswissenschaft.** (Systematic Arrangements and Classification Systems in Education Science/Pedagogy) Weinheim: Deutscher Studienverlag 1994. ISBN 3-89271-468-1. (Beiträge zur Theorie und Geschichte der Erziehungswissenschaft Bd. 15)

Scientists from four research projects contributed to this volume. The central theme of the seventeen articles by sixteen authors is the organization of knowledge in the educational sciences.

A few selected quotations from different articles reveal the main line of thought which is ubiquitous throughout the volume:

-... "*at the same time, however, there is no clarity as to what is to be regarded as pedagogy*" (Tenorth, p. 11)

- "... *that terminology and attempts at systematization in the German educational sciences harbor a major conflict potential* ..." (Rost, p. 197)

- ..."*in a 'soft', hardly established science there exists - neither historically nor currently - an unquestioned sytematics of the subject and its domains.*" (Horn/Tenorth/Helm 246)

One does not need much time to find quotations of this kind in the volume under review. They show the basic dilemma of a discipline which was institutionalized only by the beginning of the 20th century (cf. HELM in this vol.).

This dilemma makes it anything but easy to structure articles from different fields of research. HORN and WIGGER chose the following structure:

1. Introduction (Einleitung)
2. Basic Differentiations (Basale Unterscheidungen)
3. Classifications as Tools (Klassifikationen als Werkzeuge)
4. Classifications in the Educational Sciences (Erziehungswissenschaftliche Klassifikationen)
5. Comments (Kommentare)

In their *introduction* the editors provide a disposition of the problem in which they argue against the development of a meta-classification or meta-system for the educational sciences. They are in favor of plurality which is considered to be a chance for the educational sciences when one sticks to Niemeyers' motto "Evaluate everything. Keep the best."

In the *second part* all articles deal with the problem that even basic concepts in educational sciences are not well defined. The different authors pick out concepts which are often used as general concepts but they have to admit that the borders of these concepts are anything but clear.

TENORTH finds it problematic to define just when it is appropriate to apply the term "pedagogical" to a phenomenon. STROSS shows the problematic conceptual relationship of the terms "education" ("Erziehung") and "indoctrination" ("Indoktrination"). NIEMEYER and SCHROER deal with "social pedagogy" in the Weimar Republic which was regarded on the one hand as a part of pedagogy, but on the other hand as the ultimate goal of all pedagogy. LÜDERS, researching the use of pedagogical knowledge in everyday situations, writes about his difficulties to identify parts of interviews as referring to "something" pedagogical. ZYMEK shows in his study of Prussian school statistics in the 19th and early 20th century that the categories for the statistics were established for political, administrative and financial reasons, but not for scientific or pedagocical ones. Although the borders of these categories changed quite often, they served as a basis for

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-1994-2-108-1 https://www.inlibra.com/de/page/agb - Open Access - (cc) BY