This citation analysis of the use of public and business administration literature in the field of library science examined library science monographs and the last four years (1990-93) of "Journal of Library Administration." The monographs were published between 1980 and 1992 and were selected on the basis of a favorable review in the library literature or frequent citation in library sources. Also selected for inclusion were library science monographs which addressed at least one of the following functional elements of management: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, or budgeting. In total, 7,049 citations were analyzed. A general statistical analysis of the total citations showed that overall, 3,853 (55%) of sources cited were those in business and public administration as compared to 3,248 (45%) of library science sources. This figure is even higher (61%) if citations in "Journal of Library Administration" are examined separately. One table presents data on the use of library science versus business and public administration literature as cited in monographs; the data indicate the three areas which draw most on non-library science literature are planning, coordinating, and directing. A graph presents a ranking of the use of library science versus non-library science literature from 1981-92. (Contains 49 references.) (MES)
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In a recent editorial in the *Library & Information Science Research*, Peter Hernon stated that "...research in library and information science [LIS], to varying degrees, draws upon the conceptual frameworks, literatures, and procedures [research designs and methodologies] of other disciplines and professions. As researchers outside the field challenge, revise, and expand existing theories, paradigms, and conceptual frameworks, and refine existing procedures, their innovations may have particular significance for the resolution of library and information science problems. Therefore, LIS researchers should [and do] investigate, understand, and contribute to the development of these innovations". [1] In conducting a citation analysis of the use of public and business administration literature in the field of library science, it is specifically this relationship that my research aimed at investigating.

My research included library science monographs, and the last four years (1990-93) of *Journal of Library Administration*. The monographs selected by me (see attached bibliography) were published between 1980 and 1992 and were selected on the basis of a favorable review in library literature or a frequent citation in other library sources. Further criteria for inclusion was library science management literature which met at least one of the following functional elements of management, specifically: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting, Budgeting. [2]

In total, seven thousand forty nine (7,049) citations were analyzed. A general statistical analysis of the total citations showed that overall, thirty eight hundred fifty three [3,853] or 55% of sources cited were those in business and public administration as compared to thirty two hundred forty eight (3,248) or 45% of library science sources. This figure is even higher - 61% - if citations in *Journal of Library Administration* are examined separately.

A detailed review of the use of library science versus business and public administration literature as cited in monographs examined is represented in Table I. The data in Table I demonstrates that by classifying citations according to previously specified management activities, three areas which draw most on non-library science literature are as follows:

1. planning [71%]
2. coordinating [69%]
3. directing [61%].
In trying to determine whether or not the attempt by library science monograph literature to draw on non-library science literature is predominant during the 1990’s as opposed to a decade earlier, a ranking represented by Chart I was established. Clearly the data in Chart I shows no obvious patterns related to the chronological development in the usage of business and public administration literature.

In conclusion, my research resulted in a number of interesting findings. The most significant one being that writers and researchers in the library science management field are fully aware of research, new developments, and the latest trends in other fields. As a library professional, I find it extremely satisfying and encouraging to witness that library science research does not aim at "re-inventing the wheel" but rather is able to utilize the latest available information in related fields and apply it to the library science field.
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TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS OF MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>BUSINESS &amp; PUBLIC ADMIN.CITATIONS</th>
<th>LIB.SCI. CITATIONS</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF CITATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>242 (71%)</td>
<td>98 (29%)</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-ordinating</td>
<td>401 (69%)</td>
<td>181 (31%)</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing</td>
<td>694 (61%)</td>
<td>441 (39%)</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>1120 (55%)</td>
<td>913 (45%)</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>410 (41%)</td>
<td>584 (59%)</td>
<td>994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>228 (32%)</td>
<td>481 (68%)</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>23 (32%)</td>
<td>50 (68%)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITATION RANKING
BUS./PUB. ADM. vs. LIB. SCI.

Series 1 BUS/PUB.ADM  Series 2 LIB.SCI.