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Editorial

Collegial and Administrative Interface in Faculty Governance

In May, College & Research Libraries News published the newly ratified standards for faculty status for librarians. Library governance under this philosophical stance varies from pure faculty models such as that described by Joan Bechtel at Dickinson College to dictatorships with only a shadow of faculty participation. For most libraries, neither extreme works. What does work is a carefully constructed and nurtured balance between the responsibilities of the faculty for self-governance and the responsibilities of the administrators for meeting university requirements. Pitfalls in achieving a balance between collegial and administrative roles may develop in the areas of personnel, planning and budget, and communications.

Although infrequently acknowledged by librarians, teaching faculty departments are at times run as dictatorships by the chair or oligarchies of the senior tenured professoriate. Clark Kerr's oft repeated maxim that governing faculty is like herding cats troubles library administrators because running a library requires a greater degree of cooperation than does running an academic department. In teaching departments, faculty advise academic administration, while administration, in the guise of department heads or deans, manages the day-to-day, planning, and long-term operations of the departments. In libraries where faculty status exists, the collegial structures advise the dean, university librarian, or director. Because faculty often forget the advisory nature of their input to decision making, a level of organizational dissatisfaction occurs just as it does in other academic departments on campus.

Several examples may be useful. Many personnel decisions involve both collegial input and administrative decision making. When hiring new faculty, a search committee may be charged to seek candidates and to create a short list for administrative consideration. Typically, search committees are not charged to select one candidate, although members often believe that is their duty. In reality these committees may have no role to play in actual selection of the final candidate. Promotion and tenure committees also advise about the suitability of candidates for the particular traits needed for a faculty assignment. But ultimately, selection of the best candidate, at a given salary, is an administrative decision based on consultation with library faculty. The concepts of seeking, screening, and advising often get lost as the committees work through the process.

Similarly, in faculty structures, peer promotion and tenure recommendations are a key part of the academic governance process. Although the library dean or director may not always heed the advice given, faculty input to this process is critical to its integrity. Recommendations by peer committees for nonrenewal of appointments, a collegial mechanism, probably effects the dismissal of more faculty than does administrative decision making.

Based on ideas presented as an invitational talk to the faculty at the University of Pittsburgh Libraries on May 27, 1992.
Planning and budget are two other areas requiring cooperation between the two governance styles. University faculty documents often require that administrators involve faculty in a planning process. Of course, good management practice argues for full participation, if governance documents do not. Faculty acceptance of a strategic plan is crucial for its successful implementation. For the administrator, a set strategic plan makes it difficult to take advantage of unexpected opportunities. The university librarian who seizes such an opportunity should explain that decision to planning participants. Both the collegial and the administrative structures need to encourage active participation in the creation and continuing revision of strategic plans.

Budgeting ties closely to the planning process. In some states, public university budgets are open documents, and the two processes may proceed openly and in consultation. In other states, budget information is closely guarded and tradition­ally not shared with faculty or with the public. My informal research indicates that library faculty have only very foggy ideas about the amount of money available for such discretionary items as travel, equipment, and supplies even in those institutions with full disclosure. Although openness about availability of money does not bring happiness, the process within the library should be open and participative. Even in institutions without open information requirements, select faculty budget committees sometimes have an overview and advising function.

Dividing the collections budget is another responsibility typically shared among administration, faculty, and teaching faculty. Often the assistant dean or director responsible for collection management will seek the advice of an internal library committee. Further, a faculty senate appointed committee may want to study the division for equity among the departments and for balance between monographs and serials. While such discussions should create goodwill and a spirit of cooperation, they sometimes devolve into verbal altercations over specific allocations. As painful as these sessions might be, they are a part of an essential interaction between the library and the university.

Open communication and understand­ing of the unique nature of cooperation are key to a successful coalition between col­legial and administrative governance structures. When we as faculty get our own ways, communications have been good. When we do not, communications have failed. Yet, knowing that our concerns are being heard and used in the decision-making process is preferable to thinking that our ideas were not con­sidered. Dividing decision making between collegial and administrative structures requires added efforts at communi­cations. University faculty senates are notoriously sticky about decisions made without their knowledge. Library faculty share that sensitivity. Organizational communication is a rapidly developing field; librarianship needs more research about effective methods for communicat­ing in mixed collegial organizations.

Mark Shields of the “The McNeil/Leh­rer News Hour” often comments on how the divided U.S. government, with a presi­dent of one party and a congress of another, results in gridlock and stagna­tion. Competing agendas from a col­legial and an administration structure can create library gridlock and organiza­tional dysfunction. Each structure has its own responsibilities and roles. Together they can provide a stronger and more cohesive leadership for a library than either can provide separately. Clear per­sonnel decision making, open planning and budget processes, and effective com­munications can optimize the Associa­tion of College & Research Libraries’ heritage of library faculty status.

GLORIANA ST. CLAIR
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On Becoming Faculty Librarians: Acculturation Problems and Remedies

W. Bede Mitchell and Bruce Morton

The acculturation of librarians to faculty librarian positions is compared and contrasted to the socialization process of the professoriate. Substantive differences in graduate library education and the attitudes it cultivates are discussed. Librarians are seen, for the most part, as being ill-prepared to assume peer roles within a university faculty. Suggestions are offered to remedy this dysfunctional pattern.

During the past two decades there has been discussion ad nauseam in the library literature about the pros, cons, and mechanics of librarians performing as faculty.¹ The lack of consensus among librarians about the desirability of faculty status has had various consequences, not the least of which is impeding librarians' acculturation to the academic environment. Some evidence indicates that many academic librarians do not understand the fundamental tenets of being members of a faculty.²

Not surprisingly, the transition from student to professional is usually stressful in any profession.³ For librarians, however, the stress naturally inherent in the process of socialization to a new job and a new work environment is exacerbated by ingrained characteristics of education for librarianship, by the attitudes articulated in the literature of librarianship, and by reinforcement of both by more senior librarians.

Librarians who do not understand what it means to be faculty members find themselves uncomfortable and therefore at a disadvantage. They may find themselves unprepared or unwilling to carry out faculty responsibilities; if this is the case, they are likely to be unhappy or ineffective. The resultant ebb in morale may result in the declining performance of new and veteran librarians alike. Such factors could lead to short tenures and high staff turnover for newer library faculty. Indeed, a high turnover rate, whether it be because of frustrated expectations or because of not meeting performance criteria, is an indicator of ineffective socialization.⁴

The lack of consensus among librarians about faculty status seems to be rooted in two controversies. First, there continues to be disagreement over whether librarians qualify as faculty. Are their duties and responsibilities sufficiently scholarly, academic, and professional to warrant having the same rights and similar performance expectations as the instructional faculty? Officially, this issue was affirmatively resolved among librarians in the affirmative when the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) adopted the "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians."⁵ The second controversy is whether the performance criteria for librarians should be identical to
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that of the instructional faculty or modified to allow for differences in duties and schedules. In other words, are librarians faculty of a somewhat different sort? The ACRL "Standards for Faculty Status" state that librarians should be regularly and rigorously reviewed and that promotion and tenure provisions should be the same as those for the instructional faculty, but there is no explicit statement as to whether librarians' evaluation criteria should be identical to the instructional faculty's. The "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians" indicates general categories of performance, such as scholarship and effectiveness as a librarian, that should be considered when evaluating librarians for promotion or tenure, but because the "Model" is intended to propose only minimal criteria, it is restricted to general language that allows for substantial local interpretation.

THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM: ACCULTURATION TO WHAT?

The "Model" and "Standards" provide little effective guidance to an academic librarian interested in learning about what might be specifically required in faculty status positions. At some institutions the performance criteria might be identical with the criteria used for evaluating instructional faculty, while elsewhere substantial differences may exist. It is important to understand that inadequate acculturation to the academic model and the role of faculty lead to other performance problems beyond the frequently expressed difficulties in meeting research requirements. Implicit in having faculty status rather than merely being faculty is an underlying assumption that there is somehow a difference and therein turns the worm of doubt. Being a member of the professoriate of a university or college faculty is a state of mind that transcends the niceties and formalities of employment. It is a commitment to a transcendent academic culture, to an intellectual community, and to the pursuit of inquiry. Thus, most faculty perform as they do not because they are made to, but because they want to and need to, for that is what they are about. The academic culture is self-selecting in this regard; those who do not conform are winnowed out.

Librarians new to librarianship and the academy may be justifiably confused about what to expect in a faculty appointment. The lack of consensus in the profession about faculty status and performance criteria cannot but help to contribute to undermining and impairing the acculturation of academic librarians to the faculty model. In contrast, colleagues in the nonlibrary faculty go through a socialization process when they study to become members of the professoriate. The experiences of graduate students in other fields are shaped by values and expectations that prepare them for their rights and responsibilities as faculty members. This is far less true in librarianship.

THE PROCESS OF ACCULTURATION

How do fledgling faculty members become acculturated to their new roles? A professional community like the professoriate produces its next generation by controlling the selection of professional trainees, sending recruits through a distinctive socialization process. Carol Shulman summarizes the faculty socialization process in her discussion of graduate schools, seeing the graduate experience as the period when the primary transmission of faculty values takes place. It is in graduate school that students learn that academics are a professional group that claims the right to regulate itself, determining its own methods and judging its own members. It is in graduate school that the importance of research and loyalty to one's discipline are stressed. The professional self-images of graduate faculties and their interest in advancing knowledge and their disciplines or professions dovetail with another central value of the academic model, academic freedom. As explained by Shulman, the academic model that is inculcated in graduate students consists of four tenets: (1) research is the primary focus of the university; (2) academic work
requires peer judgment; (3) scholarship is a vocation in its own right; (4) the academic profession serves important social goals. These four points, in large part, comprise the state of mind that is characteristic of a member of the professoriate.

Shulman's academic model is consistent with the sources of integration that Burton Clark believes serve to make the professoriate a true community of scholars in spite of the superficial differences existing among the various disciplines. Clark cites academic freedom, scientific norms, scientific methodology, and ethics of scholarship as comprising a set of shared values that override differences among disciplinary faculties.

Sherlock and Morris have developed a professional-evolution paradigm that serves as a useful guide for examining how the scholarly values identified by Shulman and Clark are transmitted by graduate schools. In the Sherlock and Morris paradigm, socialization is an institutionalized sequence of processes that represent the collective judgment of a profession as to the best means of reproducing itself. The processes are intended to find the appropriate recruits (selection); isolate them from competing influences (sequestration); inculcate necessary knowledge (didactic instruction); develop skills, values, and role models (apprenticeship); motivate them to attain the profession's goals (sanctioning); certify those individuals who are demonstrably competent (certification); and launch the newly certified professional upon a career (sponsorship). There follows a discussion of this sequence of processes and the inherent difficulties as they specifically apply to librarianship.

**Selection**

Selection of appropriate candidates for the professoriate involves both self-selection and recruitment. Interested undergraduate students develop an understanding and identification with subject content, jargon, and research paradigms. Those who are not interested in terminating their formal higher education with a bachelor's degree may choose to apply for admission into graduate school (self-selection), thus constituting a candidate pool from which the graduate schools will accept those they believe are the most promising students, based upon past performance, degree of present commitment, and level of demand for new professionals in the field. Given this pattern, librarianship as a discipline is at a distinct disadvantage in that most undergraduate library education programs are not designed to serve as feed-in programs for library graduate schools. Few new graduate students in library science have entered the program because they have been stimulated by undergraduate curricular experience, but rather because they think they will find it appealing on the basis of the experience they have had in a place—the library. The fact that the performer (the librarian) is named on the basis of place, rather than on what is done in the place (assembling knowledge, creating pathways and gateways to knowledge, providing introduction to knowledge or to the pathways and gateways, etc.) skews attitudes and focus away from the intellectual fabric of the enterprise.

**Sequestration**

The sequestration or isolation aspect of socialization attempts to eliminate influences, usually of an extracurricular nature, that interfere with students' learning the desired professional model and values. Sherlock and Morris speak of selective patterning of experience that promotes the role of professional student and subordinates other sources of identity. It seems intuitive that this selective patterning of experience is most effective with full-time students in that "the intensity of any socializing experience is probably related to the degree of separation, for separated settings are able to reduce potentially conflicting influences. They can command more of the recruits' time and energy." Evidence suggests that the process of sequestration in graduate education for academic librarianship falls short.

**Instruction and Apprenticeship**

The inculcation of necessary knowledge is the formal transmission of a discipline's theory and knowledge base
through classroom instruction, study assignments, and laboratory exercises. This aspect of socialization, the phase of didactic instruction, contributes significantly to the attrition of marginal or uncommitted students. Closely related to didactic instruction is apprenticeship instruction, a phase of socialization in which graduate students gain firsthand experience in teaching and research. Didactic instruction and apprenticeship are the phases of socialization where the process is explicit. According to Sherlock and Morris, apprenticeship is one of the most important aspects of socialization because "the hallmarks of a professional are acquired in the apprenticeship period. It is at this stage that concerns with regard to actual clients, ethical and technical problems, and career plans emerge as important preoccupations."15

Of course, the key nonlibrary faculty roles are teaching and research; for academic librarians librarianship may be regarded and performed as analogous to those roles. Rather than thinking passively of librarianship as the organizing and retrieving of knowledge, librarians should think of it in dynamic terms: assembling knowledge, creating pathways and gateways to knowledge, and providing introductions to knowledge or to the pathway and gateways. In many disciplines, students have ample opportunities as graduate teaching assistants to practice both literally and figuratively their trade didactically. For the most part, new librarians in the academic setting are no more prepared for the demands of instructional programs or collection development than are nonlibrary faculty who did not have the opportunity to train as teaching assistants while in graduate school.

Research skills are mastered through the highly structured experience of designing, conducting, writing, and defending a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation. Such apprenticeship experiences are carefully tailored to suit the variations of knowledge contexts that exist between disciplines. The research methods and problem-solving techniques in a discipline tend to dictate how faculty interact with students and colleagues, and hence the apprenticeship period for aspiring faculty will reflect those relationships and working styles. For example, graduate students in the pure sciences (e.g., physics, chemistry, biology) often become members of a collaborative research enterprise in which their research supervisor controls their research theme and dictates the schedules and performance habits to which the students must abide. This approach works well in the pure sciences because problems tend to be easily divisible. Thus, an effective method of solving the problem is by synthesizing the solutions to the various sub-problems found by a team of researchers, with teamwork naturally implying conformity to group norms and a readiness to accept the authority of the team leader.16

Colleagues in the nonlibrary faculty go through a socialization process when they study to become members of the professoriate.

This contrasts strongly with the way research tends to be done in disciplines like history or anthropology, in which collaboration is less frequent because, as Tony Becher has observed, "problems tend to be broadly defined and not readily amenable to subdivision...."17 The individual approach to research in such disciplines is naturally reflected in the way doctoral candidates conduct their dissertation studies. Becker stated that "far from being regarded as employees, they are treated like self-employed persons or individuals of independent means. They are not required to observe any firm rules of attendance .... Contact with their research supervisors is usually sporadic."18

The apprenticeship experience is intended to give students the opportunity to gain hands-on experience and work with role models, both in teaching and research. By contrast, students in librarianship rarely have teaching experiences because there are not many under-
graduate library classes for them to teach, and only a very few of the students will become professors of librarianship. Instead, it seems more appropriate for library students to serve internships that enable them to perform in a library, doing whatever the students think they may do when they graduate, such as cataloging or working in a reference department. Such internships offer the opportunities for hands-on experience and for working with role models. However, students seeking the M.L.S. do not conduct a dissertation research project because the M.L.S. program is not designed to produce researchers. Although some M.L.S. programs require a master’s thesis, such projects are not comparable to doctoral research either in rigor or substance, and even then, most programs permit the graduate student to opt for more courses in lieu of the thesis. Therefore, academic librarians usually lack socialization to research that other faculty gained in graduate school. As a result, librarians not only are unprepared to meet research requirements found in promotion and tenure criteria but also lack an empathetic appreciation for the rigors and methodology of research, which may be reflected in decisions about service policies. These very weaknesses are the primary reasons why a graduate degree in addition to the M.L.S. is so desirable for academic librarians. The subject expertise gained from the additional graduate degree is a residual benefit.19 William G. Jones asserts that “another advanced degree would, however, assure that librarians who provide services to scholars understand the intellectual norms of disciplines recognized within the scholarly community and the importance of primary and secondary sources in them.”20

Sanctioning

Throughout every step of the acculturation process, performance is influenced by rewards and punishments. Such performance sanctioning takes place mostly in didactic instruction and apprenticeship, but at any point students’ appearance, demeanor, and behavior may also be judged. Library schools are no less inclined to sanction classroom or behavioral performance than are other professional schools. However, little if any evidence exists that library schools attempt to teach prospective academic librarians to think or act as faculty members or to relate with nonlibrary faculty as colleagues. It seems that the prevailing attitude is that they are training professionals, not scholars. Emphasis is placed on models that present nonlibrary faculty to be clients, or that describe librarians as playing important but supportive or subsidiary educational roles to the nonlibrary instructional faculty. This is consistent with the service model that pervades library education, regardless of tracking into public, special, or academic librarianship. The emphasis on service—the server and the served—severely handicaps librarians who will eventually find themselves assuming positions where the collegiality of academic peer relationships with nonlibrary faculty is an expected norm. Library education unintentionally inculcates librarian stereotypes in the prospective academic librarian.21 All members of the professorate are professionals. The term professional should not be conveniently misconstrued by librarians as one of exclusivity; just the opposite is true.

Certification and Sponsorship

The final socialization phases are certification and sponsorship. Students receive a school’s certification, usually in the form of a degree, once academic requirements have been met satisfactorily. “Certification . . . provides visible and creditable evidence that the individual is a professional in the legal sense of the word.”22 Certification is also intended to contribute to the sense of professional identity that the socialization process is meant to create. Sponsorship works as a continuing influence on professionals after they have graduated through such acts as collaboration or recommendations to colleagues via the old-boy or -girl network. Such activities include job placement efforts and assistance in gaining desired postgraduate internships or fellowships. Sherlock and Morris note that “differential sponsorship exists so
that the best positions are not equally available." Clearly, certification and sponsorship can be powerful tools for controlling the quality of new professionals. Students who are weak performers or who do not conform run the risk of not receiving certification, and those marginal students who do obtain certification may receive little in the way of sponsorship, thus achieving limited professional opportunities.

**Mentoring**

Even in the best of circumstances preparatory education does not completely prepare the new faculty member for the workplace. One library school professor used to say in a mixture of truth and hyperbole that the M.L.S. would only get one past the first day on the job. More senior faculty colleagues must be prepared to provide mentoring to a junior colleague. Mentoring is often assumed to be synonymous with looking out for someone. This is simplistically incorrect and will inevitably lead to shortchanging those in need of mentoring. It is essential that library faculty, as part of their professional development, learn what it is to be a mentor. They must understand the needs of faculty, based not on an articulation of those needs by the novice, but rather on their own knowledge of librarianship, the local institution, and academe in general, and their experience in all three. They must expect to be friend, career guide, information source, and intellectual guide. If senior librarians do not have an adequate understanding of these fundamental aspects of their environment, they will acquire such an understanding. It is no good to teach when it is the wrong things that are taught. Only in this way will the pattern of dysfunctional academic behavior be broken.

Most library faculty have not been trained in the mentoring process and have little real experience in it. It is therefore imperative that faculty and administrators recognize the need to develop not only mentoring programs for their new library faculty but also to develop faculty who will be able to mentor successfully.

**IMPLICATIONS OF THE SOCIALIZATION MODEL**

While nonlibrarian faculty members in their first professorial positions still have much to learn, they have already developed a set of expectations, an understanding of their disciplines’ typical modes of operation and inquiry, a set of professional and scholarly ethics, and firsthand experience performing the activities that are rewarded with promotion and tenure. Many or most new academic librarians have also undergone a socialization process and have developed expectations, a set of ethics, and so on, but the socialization process for librarians is different from that for instructional faculty. The process for librarians lacks certain components and emphases found in the process for instructional faculty, and the consequence of these differences is that academic librarians may not be fully prepared to function as faculty. Faculty members are part of a scholarly community because they share a common set of values and beliefs. Shulman has called these values and beliefs the academic model, while Clark regards them as sources of integration. In either case, core values and beliefs serve to unite faculty members and provide focuses that direct faculty activities. Therefore, instructional faculty members from different disciplines may be said to relate similarly to shared values and beliefs. However, there is serious question as to whether librarians relate to the academic model in the same way as do instructional faculty. Specifically, the role of research and scholarship is not so central to the duties of academic librarians as it is to instructional faculty. This is exacerbated by what Steven K. Stoan sees as librarians’ and instructional faculty’s differing views of information. The emphasis on information-retrieval techniques that link researchers directly to the ideas, interpretations, suggestions, comments, and views of their peers dovetails neatly with the sizable literature on the intellectual processes involved in research. These studies point to the powerful influence of creative in-
sight and intuition that come only from a well-instructed mind working continually with the subject matter of the discipline." Despite the popular conception to the contrary, research is normally random, nonlinear, and nonsequential. Consequently, librarians too often have difficulty thinking as faculty do about knowledge as a dynamic and expanding realm, rather than as an accreting mass to be stored and retrieved. The education of librarians has conditioned them to be myopic, to think in terms of bibliographies, indexes, and abstracts, not in terms of ideas.

Librarians not only are unprepared to meet research requirements . . . but also lack an empathetic appreciation for the rigors and methodology of research.

Undeniably, academic librarians do a considerable amount of scholarly work every day as they carry out their library responsibilities. But in spite of this, they are for the most part out of the faculty research loop. Studies continue to show that research-and-publication activity is not a central part of the performance expectations for many academic librarians. Research also indicates that among the competencies deemed necessary for the practice of academic librarianship, research skills are recognized as desirable but are not deemed to be a particularly high priority. Librarians apparently believe that research, although central to the university's mission, is only to be supported by librarians, not done by them. One returns to the question of whether librarianship is to be thought of as a service profession or an academic discipline.

The concern is not simply that many institutions do not appear to consider librarians to be scholars, but that there are not enough senior librarians trained to do research and to publish, or who have excelled in the faculty model to serve as mentors for the new librarians. It is a chicken-and-egg problem. Barton and Gaughan correctly note that "course work and research are the formal expressions of socialization." As long as there is no commitment to the notion that librarians should be required to do research and publish, there will be little incentive for library schools to socialize their students fully to the same kind of scholarly attitude and commitment expected of instructional faculty. But it is in the graduate library schools that academic librarians are formed, nourished, and hatched. There neither can nor will be an immaculate inception of academic faculty attitudes and inclinations among library school students. Library educators must begin tracking potential academic librarians early on so that the students' vision of this particular kind of librarianship is not confused with that of public or special libraries.

If graduate school is the best place for the acculturation of faculty values, then it is disturbing to note research questioning the extent to which library science faculty have absorbed those values. In discussing the results of a survey of graduate library school deans, Mary Kingsbury notes that while the library schools' faculty evaluation criteria emphasize research and teaching, "comments from respondents to this study reveal that many library schools have yet to build a tradition of research and publication." The impending crisis caused by the graying of library school faculty as discussed by Elizabeth Futas and Fay Zipkowitz provides alternatives for both concern and hope. There is concern that the entry-level professoriate in the graduate library school is not lucrative to librarians who have built a base of professional experience. The fear is that "the inability to recruit faculty may soon be mirrored in the profession as a whole." Such a scenario may only serve to exacerbate the current situation described by Kingsbury by compounding it with inexperience or high faculty-to-student ratios. On the other hand, the opportunity presented by entering into a sea-change period in which there will be a greening of graduate library school faculty offers
the possibility of developing faculty who can provide both positive role models and mentoring opportunities for graduate students who will become faculty librarians.

Undoubtedly, library schools are at a disadvantage when competing for applicants. Few undergraduate library programs act as feeders to the graduate library schools. Moen and Heim have shown that the graying of library school faculty is compounded by the relative maturity (i.e., more than half are over thirty years old) of library school students. It is natural to inquire whether anything can be done to select applicants who have the potential and interest to become academic librarians and who are fully socialized to the academic model. Nevertheless, the wrong signals are being sent. As long as librarianship is viewed as a core of skills through which can be cycled all prospective librarians if an academic model is to be embraced it must be embraced for all that it is—academic freedom, scientific norms, scientific methodology, and the ethics of research and scholarship.

regardless of the kind of librarianship (public, special, or academic) they wish to practice (if they even know), and as long as library educators see no choice but to prepare their students for jobs with the emphasis on providing the tools to compete in the job interview and ultimately gain employment, librarians will have difficulty in acculturating to the professoriate, and library school faculty and library administrators will continue to give low priority to the intellectual fiber that forms the fabric of the academic environment. If library school faculty members are not inculcating the academic model, for whatever reason, then clearly they are not sanctioning behavior that conforms with the professoriate’s characteristic behavior. However, there seems to be no reason why such sanctioning could not be done if library school faculty members chose to do it. The same may not be true for sequestration. Many library school students are of necessity part-time students. They must hold down jobs or help with family responsibilities while completing their studies. Therefore these students have many influences that distract from, if not conflict with, the transmission of the professional values that sequestration promotes. However, this is also certainly true in all disciplines and institutions, and varies in extent or effect based on extenuating factors, such as size of faculty, faculty-to-student ratios, institutional philosophy, tuition levels, and urban-versus-rural geography. If these pressures are not peculiar to library education, why are library science graduate students different from their counterparts in English, political science, or biology? Perhaps it is because librarians fortify themselves with the notion that they are different. They are not, but the myth perpetuated becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

IMPROVING THE ACCULTURATION OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS

There is a temptation to say that the profession must decide whether it is truly committed to the “Standards for Faculty Status” and the sentiments embodied therein, but this is a red herring. What the profession says or thinks really is incidental. There are academic institutions that see advantage to having librarians who are faculty peers. They will set their own standards. Then, of course, some librarians actually prefer being faculty. They seek out the institutions that offer them the opportunity, and as long as this is the case, librarians, library educators, library administrators, and applicants must each respond in kind. Rather than to continue fruitless discussions about how to act like faculty, it is long past time for librarians to be faculty. To invoke Nike’s popular advertising slogan—“just do it.”

No single prescription exists for solving the malady that infects academic librarianship. Here are some substantive suggestions that, if implemented, will contribute to increasing librarians’ confidence and performance as faculty. These suggestions constitute a therapeu-
tic program, a multifaceted regimen, that, if followed by all participants, may finally treat the pathology at work instead of the symptoms and produce a confident and productive generation of library faculty.

**Library Educators**

Clearly, library school professors need to be part of the solution, for they will be instrumental in carrying out the graduate school acculturation process and will serve as role models for novice librarians who intend to become practicing academic librarians with faculty status. Things that those in library education can do are:

- Track M.L.S. students in academic librarianship separate from those pursuing other genres of librarianship. This will allow for more homogeneous concentration on the academic environment and ethos.
- Offer financial enticement in the form of postgraduate fellowships to draw those who already have doctoral or master’s degrees into M.L.S. programs.
- Demand substantive evidence of scholarly research and creativity from library school faculty. Provide students with opportunities to participate in faculty research as part of a mentoring process; among other ways, this might be accomplished by budgeting for graduate research assistant positions.
- Require a research thesis for those M.L.S. students pursuing the academic librarianship track. This will provide a solo research experience under the guidance of a committee of faculty. This experience will provide future empathy with nonlibrary faculty, provide some familiarity with research methodology, and sow the seeds of confidence for future scholarly activity.
- Provide formal instruction that addresses the duties and expectations for librarians with faculty status, especially vis-à-vis the areas of research and creativity (including publication), service to the local institution and the profession, and continuing professional and intellectual development. This will reduce considerably the too-frequent shock experienced by new librarians when confronted by such performance expectations beyond librarianship per se.

- Make the Association of College and Research Libraries instead of the American Library Association the accrediting body for programs that train graduate students for academic librarianship. It is left to library educators to struggle with the question of whether the aforementioned program can be accomplished through a restructuring of the current curriculum or whether they must, as have their Canadian colleagues (along with the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the University of California at Los Angeles), go to a two-year M.L.S. program. It is somewhat disturbing to observe the closing of graduate library programs over the past decade. Concern is based not so much on the closures per se, but rather on the fact that most have been at research universities, a phenomenon at cross-purposes with the need for research training for academic librarians.

**Library Administrators**

Library administrators bear the responsibility for formulating performance criteria for faculty librarians in accord with general faculty expectations at their institution. To them also falls the responsibility of assuring that their librarians have credibility in their roles as faculty by not assigning them duties that should be performed by support staff. Specific things that the library administrator should do to facilitate acculturation to the faculty model are:

- Clearly express in job announcements the performance expectations for librarians at the institution in question. This will discourage potential

---

Librarians apparently believe that research, although central to the university’s mission, is only to be supported by librarians, not done by them.
applicants who are not interested in a faculty position.

- Make clear during employment interviews just what the library faculty performance expectations are. This will discourage candidates who did not fully understand the implications of being faculty as well as encourage those who wish to pursue the faculty model.

- Hire intellect and competence first and foremost. Intellect and competence will acculturate better and more quickly and will be appreciated by library and nonlibrary colleagues alike. Avoid judging intellect and competence merely by the acquisition of a second graduate degree or the luster of alma mater. However, all other things being equal, opt for additional graduate education.

- Pair the new faculty member with a seasoned librarian who can mentor him or her in regard to organizational and campus culture. This will help acculturate the new librarian to things academic beyond the immediate aspects of librarianship.

- Encourage new faculty who are not confident in the area of research and publication to work with a colleague(s) in collaboration on a project; concomitant with this is encouraging other faculty to be receptive. If such opportunities are not immediately apparent, encourage the new faculty member to take advantage of the ACRL’s mentor program.

- Provide adequate opportunities and support to carry out the kinds and level of scholarship expected of faculty.

- Identify senior faculty who are worthy role models and direct new faculty to the best peer models. Reward senior faculty for serving in this capacity. There must be an understanding that some colleagues may have been “grandfathered” into faculty positions, but have not bought into the faculty model. Special sensitivity will be necessary to assure that the new faculty member does not follow such colleagues as a model in regard to faculty performance expectation in certain areas.

- Recognize and budget adequately for travel and research support so that librarians will be on a level playing field (vis-à-vis support) with other faculty at the institution. This will serve to build morale, increase self-respect, encourage productivity, and diminish excuses.

- Neither tenure nor promote any faculty member who is not worthy. This, over time, will build a solid base of senior faculty role models.

**Faculty Librarians**

Once a new librarian comes on the job it is his or her colleagues that will have the greatest daily impact on professional development. It is they who will be observed as models and from whom advice will be sought. The collegiality of the faculty model imparts special responsibilities to colleagues. Things that library peers might do to facilitate acculturation to the faculty model are:

- In the interview process probe deeply for understanding and commitment to the faculty model. Support no candidate who does not show compatible potential.

- Understand the faculty model, be committed to it, and demonstrate this in every professional action. Remember, the cliché has truth—actions do speak louder than words.

- Accept a responsibility to contribute to the development of junior colleagues. This entails taking on the extra work of mentoring them daily on the job or offering to work collaboratively with them on a research or writing project.

- Introduce a new librarian to nonlibrary colleagues in other academic and administrative departments.

- Support no colleague during preliminary, tenure, or promotion review who is not completely worthy. If compassion should prevail instead of responsibility, colleagues, the library, and the university will suffer in both the short and long term.

**Applicants**

Applicants who do not understand academe and understand what it means to be faculty and who are not committed to being faculty should not apply for faculty positions. Some things that prospective faculty librarians might do to assure their success in a faculty position are:
• At the interview inquire about and understand performance expectations and evaluation criteria for annual, intermediate, tenure, and promotion reviews.
• Understand that faculty do not work forty-hour work weeks; usually on-campus and off-campus academic work exceeds forty hours. This means that librarians should not expect release time from a mythical work week in order to do research.
• Be honest with yourself and those who interview you. Admit when a faculty position is not right. Do not become an impostor; impostors are discovered.
• Make sure that you have developed writing and research skills before taking the first faculty position.
• Be committed to the extra librarian-ship implications of being faculty.

CONCLUSION

If the academic model is to be embraced it must be embraced for all that it is—academic freedom, scientific norms, scientific methodology, and the ethics of research and scholarship. But valid concerns must be acknowledged that librarians with faculty status may become trapped by the same publish-or-perish quandary that traps other faculty at many institutions. In response to this dilemma, promotion and tenure criteria must encourage and recognize all aspects of scholarship, not just one aspect.

Most faculty members do very little scholarly publishing. Librarians can successfully address institutional demands, the desirability of personal and professional intellectual development, and contribute to the growth of knowledge in librarianship or any of the other disciplines. Four kinds of scholarship should be recognized in the promotion and tenure process: scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching. The scholarship of discovery is often called pure and applied research, the pursuit of new knowledge, and is the model of the research-and-publish paradigm on which librarians usually focus when they debate the appropriateness of the faculty model. The scholarship of integration involves synthesizing and interpreting knowledge, giving meaning to isolated data, and providing perspective. The scholarship of application is applying the knowledge of one's own discipline to solving problems of a larger community. The act of application can generate new knowledge and understandings. Finally, good librarianship sparks learning and creative thinking. New and different insights can result from different kinds of scholarship.

While there may be legitimacy to the claim that librarians do not do enough scientifically to advance librarianship, it is also true that more could and should be done to integrate and apply what has already been established. The results should be improved library effectiveness, new ideas, new connections between old ideas, and better integration of librarianship with the pedagogy of other disciplines; librarians will gain an intellectual edge. The results must be shared and judged by professional peers, for these acts complete acculturation to the academic model by expanding the librarian's relationship to knowledge. Indeed, the peer review of the tenure and promotion review is a microcosm of this process.

By pursuing any or all of the four kinds of research and creativity librarians will move beyond a storage-and-retrieval relationship with knowledge and become academic in the fullest and most dynamic sense. What is at stake? Tenure? No, it is credibility.
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Strategic Planning as a Catalyst for Change in the 1990s

Meredith Butler and Hiram Davis

If research libraries are to have desirable futures, they will have to create them. Strategic planning can assist library administrators in assessing their environments, identifying alternative futures, and creating change in their organizations. It can also serve as a vehicle to empower library staff and to increase the library's external visibility. Two recently appointed research library directors of ARL libraries discuss the importance of strategic planning and offer several examples of ways to engage library staff, university faculty, administrators, and students in the planning process. The expected outcomes of such a group process will be library plans which are relevant to the institution, which relate decisions to resources and opportunities, and which increase visibility for the library on campus and in the community.

In A Raisin in the Sun, Lorraine Hansberry's character, Beneatha, presents a disturbing image of the human condition: "Don't you see there isn't any real progress, Asagai, there is only one large circle that we march in, around and around, each of us with our own little picture—in front of us—our own little mirage that we think is the future." Some would argue that Beneatha's pessimistic judgment about the inability of humans to see "the big picture" and the circular nature of human progress accurately describes the condition of today's institutions of higher education. Erosion of public confidence in higher education and continuing dramatic reductions in fiscal support severely limit opportunities for educational renewal, growth, and change at this critical juncture in our nation's industrial and technological development. Nowhere are these limited opportunities more immediately felt than in the nation's research libraries because they are, by definition, concerned with "the big picture" and because their progress is most immediately affected by fiscal conditions. Today's academic librarians may not be marching around in a circle, but we surely feel that we are running on a treadmill. As we librarians struggle mightily to maintain forward momentum, we are continuously pressed back by the relentless pressures exerting force in the opposing direction.

For those of us leading academic libraries in the 1990s, the forces pressing us back include budgetary reductions, rapidly rising costs, reduced staffing, increasing complexity, escalating demands, and a national temper that has lost patience with higher education—some might say, a national temper that has lost faith in the value of higher education. Pushing us forward is the vision of a technologically enhanced future which will allow fundamentally different approaches to teaching and learning and will enrich the research enterprise. As we run on our
treadmill, trying to cope with these opposing pressures, realities, and visions, we are turning increasingly to strategic planning as a powerful management tool to help us analyze, reconcile, and integrate disparate and often conflicting individual images of the future into a coherent, compelling, and shared vision toward which we can progress with optimism, vigor, and conviction.

The accelerating rate of change and the increasing complexity of our professional environments in the past ten years make it no accident that strategic planning came into its own in academic libraries and professional associations during this same period. The literature on strategic planning in the business world is extensive and rich. The literature on strategic planning as it applies to higher education and, more particularly, to academic libraries has been slower to emerge but has been developing rapidly in the past five years. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, authors like Robert Cope, Philip Kotler and Patrick Murphy, George Keller, and Richard Jonsen took the basics of strategic planning, as defined in a standard work like George Steiner's *Strategic Planning: What Every Manager Must Know,* and applied them to higher education. These articles defined the characteristics of strategic planning, discussed how it could be implemented, related it to organizational environment and the allocation of resources, and laid the foundation for strategic planning in higher education. Building on this foundation, articles by Charles McClure, James Healey, and Richard Lenz et al. began to focus on the importance of planning for academic libraries. These authors defined strategic planning and compared it to other types of planning. They described each stage of the planning process, provided strategies for implementation, and advised on the development of effective group processes and the strategic thinking skills of library managers.

By mid-decade, articles on strategic planning and its application to library management were growing in number and scope. Elizabeth Wood, in a forward-looking article, showed how the basic principles of marketing and strategic market planning might be applied to libraries as a response to the issue of library survival. In 1984, Donald Riggs produced the first handbook devoted exclusively to strategic planning in libraries to "provide general and procedural information on how to go about adopting strategic planning into the library management construct." In 1985, Barbara Moran provided a brief overview of strategic planning and its application in libraries and made reference to an ARL SPEC Kit survey of thirty members' planning efforts which evaluated these planning documents as primarily "descriptive" with "some strategic features."

If librarians and their libraries are to benefit fully from strategic planning, they must first understand and confront the environment in which they work and in which libraries exist.

A 1987 study paper by Mark Meredith et al. provided guidance on the ways in which strategic planning differed from other types of planning and reported results of a survey of one hundred higher education institutions that showed a "smaller proportion of institutions than previously indicated appear to be actually conducting strategic planning." Peter F. Drucker, whose 1974 book *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices,* served as a primary textbook for many library administrators interested in planning, emphasized the necessary connection between strategic planning, innovation, and entrepreneurship in his 1985 publication on entrepreneurs and creativity. Robert A. Hayes stressed the need for strategic plans to focus on quality rather than quantity, to focus on a set of activities and goals to be pursued rather than things to be counted. Robert C. Shirley provided helpful guidance for the novice planner in the form of case studies.

Ida Vincent raised questions about the applicability or the "fit" of the strategic planning model to libraries and offered six case studies to illustrate her conten-
tion that libraries may lack the requisite autonomy, power, and funding stability that the strategic planning process requires. Vincent concluded that "the most valuable outcome of a strategic planning exercise is not the planning documents which result, or even the process of examination and re-examination of objectives and activities, but rather the attitudes and habits of mind which the exercise requires and can help to develop." She called this "a planning mentality." In a 1987 article, Riggs stressed the connection between strategic planning and entrepreneurship in library management, the need to plan for calculated risks and to develop contingencies. Riggs assigned the library director an essential role in strategic planning in both providing leadership to the planning effort and creating and fostering "a management climate that encourages innovation and change." In a later article, Riggs broadened his focus on strategic planning and reminded library leaders to factor in the benefits of networks in their institutional planning. A 1990 article by Rick B. Forsman underscored the importance of organizational and employee values in a strategic plan. "By acknowledging values and making an effort to blend them into the plan itself, the chances of successful and timely completion are increased."

A recent and excellent addition to the literature on strategic planning in higher education is the special issue of the *Journal of Library Administration* which contains a series of articles on strategic planning in academic institutions and their libraries. Articles discuss aspects of strategic planning in institutions as various as the University of Iowa, Wayne State University, the University of Cincinnati, and The Pennsylvania State University. Of considerable interest in this collection are the diverse views on planning as seen through the eyes of college and university presidents, campus planners, and librarians. The articles by James Rosser and James Penrod and by Gordon Eaton and Jean Adams illustrate the importance of presidential leadership in institutional planning, while Nancy L. Eaton discusses how the library might be integrated into an ongoing institutional planning process. Beth Shapiro describes an institution with a well-developed planning process that most often overlooked the library or included only top library administration in key discussions. As a result, the institution's collective vision statement was uninformed by the knowledge and wise counsel librarians could have contributed, and

Strategic planning processes create opportunities for staff at all levels of the organization to inform themselves about the organization and its environment and empowers them to work creatively.

library staff were unprepared to make difficult choices between competing programmatic priorities or decisions about budgetary reallocations. Nancy Cline and Salvatore Meringolo trace the evolution of planning process at Penn State and discuss the impact of planning on the organization in an institution where planning is closely tied to resource allocation. In short, this special issue of *The Journal of Library Administration* is an excellent point of departure for any researcher exploring the diversity of approaches to strategic planning in higher education.

Equally useful is the recent article by Bonnie Gratch and Elizabeth Wood which not only details the planning process undertaken by the library at Bowling Green State University but also provides information about the implementation of the plan, its effects on library operations, and a candid assessment of the plan's impact in its first year with suggestions for revision and improvements. A recent article by Brice G. Hobrock reminds us that strategic planning, however, is not without serious consequences. Hobrock underscores the importance of strategic planning for organizations where resources are declining and reminds readers that all choices are choices among alternatives competing for resources and that the effect of
strategic choices is to eliminate or modify existing programs and reallocate resources to new programs seen as more facilitating of future success.17

These and other examples in the literature attest that, in 1991, strategic planning has come into its own in institutions of higher education and their academic libraries. While the literature on strategic planning is growing and becoming richer in both content and variety of approach and example, many issues have yet to be examined and many areas of research have still to be explored.

Unlike many of the articles discussed above, this article moves away from the usual focus on what strategic planning is and how an academic library does strategic planning. It explores why strategic planning is important and why it is particularly important to engage in strategic planning in periods of austerity or rapid change. The authors will discuss the benefits to the organization and the library staff to be derived from the planning process, and equally, if not more importantly, how strategic planning may influence some of the political realities faced by most academic libraries and their directors.

THE CULTURE OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTION AND ITS LIBRARY

As is evident from the literature, higher education has adopted strategic planning with enthusiasm and, in the past decade, many colleges and universities have used the processes of strategic planning to help chart their future directions and position themselves to best advantage. Many academic libraries have also engaged in formal strategic planning processes, often with the expert assistance of staff from the Association of Research Libraries' Office of Management Services or other knowledgeable library professionals. Examples of ARL libraries which have completed strategic planning processes recently and have made their plans widely available include the libraries of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Rutgers, Brown University, Wayne State, the University of Tennessee, the University at Albany, State University of New York, and Michigan State University.

While many librarians are attempting to manage strategically and are trying to position their libraries to function more strategically, what does it all mean? Why is strategic planning important, and what benefits may be derived from what is, after all, a difficult and enormously time-consuming process? The authors hope to answer these questions in the second part of this article and to illustrate their answers with examples from their own experiences of strategic planning.

If librarians and their libraries are to benefit fully from strategic planning, they must first understand and confront the environment in which they work and in which libraries exist. Perhaps the greatest strength of strategic planning is that it provides a process whereby library administration and staff can analyze their environment and relate the results of their analysis to organizational goals, objectives, and future plans.

It has been argued that, organizationally, academic institutions are among the most complex structures in modern society.18 In his 1988 book, A Free and Ordered Space, A. Bartlett Giamatti asserts: "American institutions in general and those for higher education in particular have been coping, but they have not adapted to changing times, and they are no longer perceived as leading."19 Giamatti makes the distinction between being competently managed and being led. He sees leadership as an essentially moral act in which the leader asserts a vision of the future and has the intellectual energy to persuade others of the validity of that vision.20 When leadership and common agreement on a desired vision of the future are lacking in higher education, the void is most immediately felt in the academic library. The academic institution provides the setting, impetus, and model for the structural organization of the library, and the latter must conduct its functions with respect to and within the culture of the larger academic environment. The academic library, similar to other organizations, is dependent on its environment for its survival, its resources, and the definition of its mission and objectives.
At the same time, the parent institutions present academic libraries with perhaps their greatest problems and challenges. For example, Michael Cohen and James March have characterized the academic environment as an “organized anarchy,” and point out that such institutions have multidimensional and problematic goals, inadequate information technology, fluid participation, and turbulent environments. Other significant characteristics of academic environments can include outdated hierarchical structures, organizational fragmentation, sexism, racism, significant demographic shifts in the composition of student populations, competitiveness, high personnel costs and labor intensive practices, and economic stringencies. Thus, within the academic culture, academic libraries occupy, according to Keller, special “hazardous zones”—marked by unprecedented changes and adjustments, growing expectations, turbulent environments, increasing austerity, and uncertainty about the future.

The political reality for most academic libraries is that while there is a great deal of institutional rhetoric espousing the centrality of libraries to teaching, research, and learning, libraries are often excluded from policy decisions that have major impact on their services, funding, or staff. Ample evidence from experience and from the library literature indicate that research libraries, their directors, and their librarians often suffer from benign neglect, a lack of contact with upper-level administrators, and a lack of access to the upper levels of the academic power structure. University administrators may think well of the library, but they don’t think about it often, and they frequently overlook it when developing plans and determining strategies for the future. The challenge then is how to thrive in this kind of environment.

THE IMPORTANCE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING

Active engagement in the institution’s planning and policy-setting processes has particular importance for today’s academic libraries. Strategic planning provides library directors and their staffs with an excellent process for addressing policy vacuums and for overcoming some political limitations and organizational barriers. It is a process that shifts the library, both organizationally and functionally, from a reactive mode of coping with the present to a proactive mode of envisioning and moving toward a clearly defined and desired future. It requires both staff and administrators to think strategically about the future and to choose from among many possible alternatives and competing pressures only those strategic choices that are consonant with institutional and external opportunities, and only those choices that maximize resources and move the organization most efficiently toward its goals and toward a viable future.

Strategic planning assists the library in being responsive to constituent and organizational needs in order to develop strategies sufficiently flexible to take advantage of today’s unprecedented confusion of opportunities. In fact, successful strategic planning can help libraries develop and maintain a strategic fit among resources, organizational needs, and the changing opportunities in their environments.

A successful strategic planning process also requires the active participation of many library staff and faculty, staff, and student constituents. Healey and others note the value of using group process as a means of involving staff in planning and decision making and the benefits derived for the organization. Academic libraries are complex organizations with interlocking and interdependent operations. They must rely on shared expertise and group problem solving if they are to operate with increased effectiveness and achieve their goals. Strategic planning processes create opportunities for staff at all levels of the organization to inform themselves about the organization and its environment and such processes empower them to work creatively and cooperatively to choose effective strategies and reach common agreement about goals.

Strategic planning also provides wonderful public relations opportunities and can serve as the vehicle for moving the library more dynamically into the university environment. For example, it can set
the stage for engaging university officials, faculty, and other major stakeholders in discussions about institutional policies and priorities for library resources and services. Active engagement of campus faculty and administrators in discussions about library plans and services is especially important in times of fiscal austerity and in environments characterized by fierce competition for limited resources. Such discussions can lead to a new consensus or reaffirmation of the significance of the library's role within the academic environment. This is especially important as academic libraries move to a new paradigm of electronic storage and access in order to remain viable information systems in the twenty-first century.

Perhaps one of the most important benefits of strategic planning is the opportunity to do environmental analysis or scanning. J. William Pfeiffer identified five distinct and overlapping environments which must be taken into account: the macro environment, the industry environment, the competitive environment, the customer environment, and the organization's internal environment. Organizational survival is directly tied to the need to be aware of what is happening in all these environments. Given the wide range of existing campus and library issues (e.g., changing demographics, funding accountability, curriculum revisions, internationalism, diversity, aging physical plants and equipment, emerging information technologies, to mention a few), libraries and library administrators need to be especially aware of and responsive to their organizational environments. They also need to assist other academic colleagues to understand the very complex and rapid changes taking place in the library and information industry. In-depth examination of each of these environments and related factors can provide substantial information and data to position the library more strategically within the larger academic environment.

Environmental scanning can be an enormously enriching process. First, it serves as a reality check and helps to underscore institutional goals and objectives and, more importantly, institutional priorities. Careful environmental analysis answers such questions as: What academic programs are well supported? What programs are exempted from budget reductions? What new facilities are being built or remodeled? What is the nature of key institutional appointments and promotions at faculty and administrative levels? Environmental scanning also highlights emerging trends and issues and can serve to identify opportunities, competitors, and potential partners. Finally, environmental scanning provides a mechanism for relating library plans and goals to those of the institution. However, a note of caution is in order. Environmental scanning is not a one-time function. It should become an integral part of the way in which the library conducts its business and must be done on a cyclical basis to be an effective part of a strategic planning process.

LIBRARY EMPOWERMENT

Strategic planning has been particularly successful and empowering for two academic libraries that have recently completed the process, the libraries of Michigan State University (MSU) and the libraries of the University at Albany, State University of New York (SUNY). When Michigan State University Libraries launched its year-long strategic planning initiative, the process was structured to change (or perhaps more realistically, to influence) the external and internal culture in which the MSU Libraries operated. The intent was to implement change strategies that would benefit the university, the faculty, the users, and the library. The goal was to integrate the library into the university's ongoing strategic planning process. The library deliberately involved others in making decisions about the library's future. In so doing, the library staff gained a better understanding of its external environment; at the same time, others gained better insight into the library's internal environment. The process resulted in enhanced visibility for the library and produced substantial information and data for better positioning the library within the university. MSU
Libraries' strategic planning served as an excellent reality check. First, it helped staff learn about institutional priorities. Second, it highlighted emerging trends and issues and assisted staff in recognizing opportunities, assessing the strength of competitors, and identifying potential partners. Third, it provided a mechanism for identifying and clarifying library goals and plans and relating those goals and plans to those of the institution.

Strategic planning at the University at Albany, SUNY, proved to be similarly empowering. Although the university and the university library had engaged for many years in a well-developed campuswide planning process in which every department, school, and college prepared a five-year plan with annual updates, the planning was a top-down administrative process. Plans were not shared among schools and colleges, each unit planned independently with little outside consultation or coordination, and little opportunity existed for staff and faculty involvement. Library planning was an internally focused process done with minimal consultation with faculty, students, or staff, and little correlation between planning priorities and budget allocations. Since strategic planning requires a thorough examination and analysis of challenges and opportunities posed by the external environment, the lack of a comprehensive environmental scan was a serious weakness of these plans.

Albany's fifteen-month strategic planning process was designed to address these weaknesses: to involve library staff, campus faculty, and administrators; to do a thorough environmental analysis and internal assessment; to set goals and priorities and relate them to the budget; to inform the library's public of plans and priorities; to increase the visibility of the library, its staff, and services within the university and the community; and to foster a more forward-looking environment in which change was seen as necessary and positive.

STRATEGIC EXECUTION

Much of the benefit of strategic planning is derived from the careful execution of a well-developed and strategically sound process. Robert H. Waterman, Jr., underscored this point in his article, "The Seven Elements of Strategic Fit," when he asserted that "a good strategy is not synonymous with a doable one. Nor is a doable strategy synonymous with a good one. The challenge is to find a good doable strategy." To assist his readers in determining whether a particular strategy is doable, Waterman offered a planning framework which he called the 7S Framework: strategy, structure, systems, style, staff, skills, and shared values (see appendix A). Waterman believed that all of these interdependent factors must be taken into consideration in strategic planning if the process is to be successful. Given the wide range of existing campus challenges facing academic libraries, librarians are confronted with the necessity of making major changes in their organization's culture, their organization's structure, and, perhaps, in its shared values. They require not only new strategies, but doable ones. Illustrated below are some of the strategies used in the strategic planning processes of both the MSU Libraries and the SUNY Albany libraries which proved to be both doable and successful. Both libraries took the seven elements of strategic fit into consideration in their planning processes.

Albany built its strategic planning process around a series of events that served as vehicles to involve many people in the process. These events also served to focus and strengthen the process and to foster group solidarity. The first event was a catered "working dinner" hosted by members of the strategic planning committee and held in an elegant setting to acknowledge both the value placed on everyone's commitment of time and energy and the significance of the undertaking. The university's vice presidents and the director of university planning were invited to discuss environmental trends in higher education and their plans and goals for the institution. The evening was very interactive. Members of the strategic planning committee read campus planning documents prior to the
event and were prepared to ask questions, raise issues, and integrate library concerns into broader campus planning. This dinner was followed by a series of scheduled individual and small-group interviews with university deans, directors, and leading campus faculty as committee members gathered data for the environmental scan and used each meeting to highlight library issues and plans. In many cases, these meetings were the first opportunity faculty and librarians had ever taken to engage in substantive conversation about faculty needs and interests and library services and plans. Another event, a day-long seminar on strategic planning cotaught by the director of libraries and the director of university planning, brought all committee members up to speed on the content and process of strategic planning and provided them with a common base of information and a common opportunity for problem solving. Involving the director of university planning so actively in the library’s planning process served several important goals, not the least of which was to increase library visibility since the incumbent in this position reported directly to the university president. Other goals realized by the experience included the opportunity for the director of libraries to work closely with the director of university planning on library planning and to exchange information about trends in higher education and the external and internal environments and for the library staff to be seen by the director of university planning as knowledgeable about trends and issues in information management and as engaged in the academic life of the institution.

Much of the work of Albany’s strategic planning was done in small-group sessions. Full committee meetings were reserved for generating and discussing ideas, clarifying goals, planning the ongoing process, and for solving problems and building consensus. A special working retreat took place as each stage of the planning process drew to its conclusion to allow members to focus on content without distractions. Time for social fun and group bonding was always built into these retreats. Retreats were also planned to allow for full library staff participation at critical stages in the process and before draft documents were issued in their finished form. Not only did an excellent planning document emerge from this interactive process, but, more important, an esprit de corps developed in a variety of settings and especially among members of the strategic planning committee and its subcommittees. Through the strategic planning process, it became clear to everyone that although the library had a traditional hierarchical organization, the organization actually functioned on horizontal planes in which complex problems were analyzed and resolved by teams of experts from various levels of the organization. The entire strategic planning process used this group process approach to examine both the external and internal environments, to determine priorities, to solve problems, and to set directions. The authors believe that a planning approach which reduces the influence of hierarchy and emphasizes teamwork, shared expertise, and group problem solving is not only a doable, but a necessary strategy if libraries are to be successful in the fast changing and complex environment of higher education.

Similarly, Michigan State University Libraries’ strategic planning process emphasized doable strategies. The first was to integrate the library more directly into the university’s ongoing planning, and the second was aimed at reassessing, redefining, and reshaping the library program. The former was facilitated in part when the university’s provost wrote articles that appeared in several campuswide publications outlining the nature of the library’s strategic planning initiative and underscoring its importance to the university’s programmatic planning efforts. In addition, letters inviting members of the library staff to serve on the library planning team came from the provost, who also sent letters to members of the strategic planning advisory committee which had representation from all major academic units. To ensure broad campus understanding and
involvement in the process, a strategic planning newsletter, *Visions of the Future* MSU Libraries Strategic Planning Process, was mailed to all members of the campus community at key intervals. Finally, the strategic planning team identified a number of major stakeholders, i.e., individuals and groups that have an interest in the library’s future, including university officials, faculty, deans, students, alumni, donors, and major campus departments. Stakeholder luncheons were held to provide the opportunity for substantive dialogue about university plans. The central focus of these discussions was on areas that required change, attention, and improvement, either within the university or library, to strengthen the library’s future role and performance. As with the experience at Albany, these meetings at MSU were often the first opportunity for library staff to engage in substantive conversations with university administrators and faculty, to discuss needs and interests, to highlight library issues and plans, and to integrate these into universitywide planning.

MSU’s strategic planning process was organized into three phases. The initial phase—strategy development—identified and clarified current and future issues and elaborated areas of concern in shaping the library’s future. The second phase—information gathering—involved an in-depth analysis of the issues emerging from phase I, the identification of major themes, and the development of recommendations based on subgroup analysis. The third phase—strategic implementation/integration—will guide the MSU Libraries through the transition from their current orientation to the academic library of the twenty-first century. As noted in the earlier discussion of Waterman’s strategic fit, this third phase is actually the beginning of the MSU Libraries’ strategic planning. While the library faces many challenges, MSU’s staff has gained a sense of self-renewal because strategic planning has provided them with a process to identify and examine opportunities, assess risks, develop flexible strategies, and create their desired future.

**STRATEGIC FIT IN THE MSU AND SUNY ALBANY LIBRARIES**

By focusing sharply on all of Waterman’s 7S framework, both libraries have been able to test the effectiveness of their strategic planning processes and to identify areas of incongruence between strategic aspirations and organizational realities. By focusing on doable strategies, both libraries improved their operational effectiveness, increased their visibility, and repositioned themselves within their universities. Through environmental scanning and internal assessment they discovered a number of changes that were needed to achieve strategic goals and developed plans to make those changes. Both libraries had to develop an organizational structure that was more horizontal and more client-centered. Both libraries have encouraged a management style that empowers staff to engage in group problem solving and decision making and encourages group solidarity. Both libraries are now more focussed on the external environment and work actively and opportunistically in the external environment to develop strategic alliances and promote services. Both libraries have gained immeasurably from increased staff understanding and support for library goals and objectives, for revised mission statements, and for new shared values and vision statements. To ensure that library staff function in their rapidly changing information environment, both libraries increased the emphasis on and support for staff training and development of skills. The libraries of both the Michigan State University and the University at Albany, SUNY have
used strategic planning effectively to identify opportunities, assess risks, define goals, develop strategies to accomplish these goals, influence political realities and change academic cultures. They have been able to sustain their planning efforts and develop doable strategies that work. They are achieving organizational success within as well as outside their libraries and have created more positive environments in which change can be seen as an opportunity for growth and development and in which staff are empowered to take on new challenges.
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APPENDIX A

A SUMMARY OF THE 7S FRAMEWORK

1. **Strategy.**
   
   A coherent set of actions aimed at gaining a sustainable advantage over competition, improving position vis-a-vis customers, or allocating resources.

2. **Structure.**
   
   The organization chart and accompanying baggage that show who reports to whom and how tasks are both divided up and integrated.

3. **Systems.**
   
   The processes and flows that show how an organization gets things done from day to day (information systems, capital budgeting systems, manufacturing processes, quality control systems, and performance measurement systems all would be good examples).

4. **Style.**
   
   Tangible evidence of what management considers important by the way it collectively spends time and attention and uses symbolic behavior. It is not what management says is important; it is the way management behaves.

5. **Staff.**
   
   The people in an organization. Here it is very useful to think not about individual personalities but about corporate demographics.

6. **Shared values (or superordinate goals).**
   
   The values that go beyond, but might well include, simple goal statements in determining corporate destiny. To fit that concept, these values must be shared by most people in an organization.

7. **Skills.**
   
   A derivative of the rest. Skills are those capabilities that are possessed by an organization as a whole as opposed to the people in it. (The concept of corporate skill as something different from the summation of the people in it seems difficult for many to grasp; however, some organizations that hire only the best and brightest cannot get seemingly simple things done while others perform extraordinary feats with ordinary people.)
UNLOCK THE "BILLION-DOLLAR SECRET" OF GRANT FUNDING FOR YOU AND YOUR PATRONS ...

Annual Register of GRANT SUPPORT 1993
26th Edition

"Comprehensive in scope and number of entries. Well-indexed and easy to use. One of the first resources I'd recommend to individuals seeking information on sources of funding."

— Marcia L. Zuzolo
Assistant Director of Sponsored Research Studies
Indiana University

How can your patrons qualify for grant support? What are the requisites and procedures of some 3,000 funding entities — including unique and nontraditional sources? The Annual Register of Grant Support 1993, now published by R.R. Bowker, has the answers!

Give your patrons access to the billions of funding dollars available from private foundations, corporations, individuals, charitable organizations, and agencies.

The only resource on the subject you'll need in your library, the Annual Register of Grant Support details the application process from the first steps in research to the completion of an effective proposal. Order your copy today!

Annual Register of Grant Support 1993
September 1992 • 0-8352-3293-X • 1,280 pp. • $165.00

Available on Standing Order. Available through your local wholesaler or distributor.

Call 1-800-521-8110.
Dial 1 for Customer Service, and ask for Operator "FHA."
College Libraries and Resource Sharing: Testing a Compact Disc Union Catalog

Charles T. Townley

In 1990, the seventeen collegiate members of the Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania tested a compact disc union catalog to determine its effect on resource sharing in a college library consortium. This article reports the outcomes of the test in the areas of bibliographic quality, user evaluation, public relations strategies, and operating guidelines. Desired enhancements and additional research needs are identified. Recommendations are made for the use of compact disc union catalogs in college library consortia.

College libraries form networks and consortia to improve local services through coordinated action. Nowhere is this more true than in resource sharing. Alone, a college library cannot afford enhanced collections in more than a few subject areas. Yet, by banding together, college library collections can form a virtual research library to the benefit of faculty and students at all participating institutions.

The practical problem has been how to identify, request, and deliver desired material among participating libraries in an effective manner. This can be likened to building a three-legged stool for resource sharing where all three legs are necessary for effectiveness. Over the years college library consortia have developed several means for sharing resources, including union card catalogs and serials lists for identification, inter-library loan for requests, and the use of mail, reciprocal borrowing, and delivery services for exchanging materials.¹

Recent technological advances create both opportunities and challenges for resource sharing among college libraries. Machine-readable bibliographic records and electronic public-access catalogs improve local access but are difficult and expensive to link together with a common command language. Enhancements in telecommunications make contact possible, but most college library consortia cannot afford dedicated telecommunications among members. And national networks, like Internet, currently do not reach many smaller colleges. Delivery services can be expensive, and telefacsimile quality can be inadequate, particularly for tables and illustrations.

CD-ROM technology offers convenient and inexpensive local copies of a machine-readable union catalog within a college library consortium. Updated on a periodic basis from member library records, a CD-ROM union catalog offers the potential to achieve bibliographic control necessary for effective college library resource sharing. CD-ROM union catalogs at each participating institution can be used for identifying needed material, initiating requests, and encouraging
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use of preferred delivery techniques. This article reports on a CD-ROM union catalog, named C. D. Cat, developed by the seventeen members of the Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania (ACLCP).\(^2\) Reported are outcomes of the project in the areas of bibliographic quality, user evaluation, public relations strategies, and guidelines for continuing operations. Additional research needs are identified and desired enhancements described. Recommendations are made for the use of compact disc union catalogs in other college library consortia.

**BACKGROUND**

The Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania is a consortium of seventeen college libraries, the Dickinson Law School, and the State Library of Pennsylvania. Now celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary, ACLCP has long been a leader in college library cooperation, attracting more than $1,000,000 in grants and projects during its existence. In 1968, it undertook the formation of Interlibrary Delivery Service, now a separately incorporated service transferring materials among more than 150 Pennsylvania libraries.\(^3\) In 1983, ACLCP organized teletacsimile communications among academic libraries throughout Pennsylvania. These two services compose two legs of the resource-sharing stool for academic libraries in central Pennsylvania.\(^4\)

In 1988, two external events encouraged ACLCP to add bibliographic control as the third leg of an effective resource-sharing stool. First, through the success of Access Pennsylvania (a union catalog of school, public, and publicly supported academic libraries), CD-ROM technology demonstrated that it could create a union catalog at low cost.\(^5\) Second, funding became available through Title II-D of the Higher Education Act to help defray the cost of developing and testing a CD-ROM union catalog among the seventeen college libraries. ACLCP prepared and received funding for a $134,000 proposal based on the Intelligent Catalog product developed by the Library Corporation. ACLCP personnel spent the first eighteen months of the project in planning and development activities described in a previous article.\(^6\)

In January 1990, each ACLCP collegiate library received an Intelligent Catalog station and a test CD-ROM disc containing 1,086,778 bibliographic records from seven of the seventeen participating libraries (see table 1). ACLCP personnel used the catalog to test a new linked-and-merged database design that joined records with the same Library of Congress card and/or OCLC control number. The test reduced the number of entries by 35 percent to 709,523 master records. Authority control was not attempted, but Library of Congress cross-references were included. The Intelligent Catalog software permitted searching, using traditional author, title, and subject approaches, Boolean (keyword) searching, and several artificial intelligence techniques, including mapping and readers' adviser services. Users

| Member Library                  | No. of Records Used | No. of Master Records |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Bucknell University             | 316,880             | 206,848               |
| Dickinson College               | 221,573             | 98,854                |
| Elizabethtown College (partial) | 7,879               | 2,954                 |
| Franklin & Marshall College     | 213,587             | 213,541               |
| Harrisburg Area Community College | 64,600             | 29,484                |
| Juniata College                 | 70,607              | 30,414                |
| Kutztown University             | 191,652             | 127,520               |
| Total                           | 1,086,778           | 709,523               |
could manipulate records they selected, leave notes for library staff, and print out their results.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES, TESTING

The ACLCP union catalog seeks to complete a bibliographic resource-sharing system among the member libraries of the Associated College Libraries by providing bibliographic control through a CD-ROM union catalog. Objectives include:

1. Assuring adequate bibliographic quality to permit identification of materials held in member libraries;
2. Providing user-friendly access to library users;
3. Developing user-education programs that result in desired user behavior;
4. Generating user support adequate to assure continued production of the catalog.

The test period extended from January to June 1990. Each participating library provided a minimum of six weeks of public access during the test period. Each ACLCP library helped evaluate C.D. Cat and its success in achieving union catalog objectives.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC QUALITY

The project advisory committee named an evaluation committee comprised of individual members of ACLCP with experience in technical services and automation to evaluate the bibliographic quality of bibliographic database. This committee solicited comments from all project participants. The committee evaluated this information and made recommendations to the vendor.

The evaluation committee found the database capable of identifying materials held in member libraries. The committee found the linked-and-merged design a very effective means of controlling multiple entries without the cost of a fully de-duped database. While duplicate records did occur because some records did not contain the linking Library of Congress card or OCLC control number, many records were merged using this process. Indeed, the number of entries in the database was reduced by 35 percent from 1,086,778 records to 709,523 records by using the linked-and-merged design. The danger of false merges—when matching records do not contain correct LCCN or OCLC control numbers—proved to be an insignificant issue. Some 497,641 (70 percent) records showed only one location, suggesting the uniqueness of college library collections and the strength to be gained when cooperating college libraries develop a common source of bibliographic information.

The role of public relations and bibliographic instruction should be to guide responsible use of the consortially created research library.

Several troublesome bibliographic problems did occur in the test database. One member's location stamps were incorrectly read so that all holdings were placed in a branch library. A number of minor call number variations, which might make it difficult to identify shelf locations from C.D. Cat data alone, were identified. The committee identified several sorting problems with the title fields. The vendor did not follow the requested order for entering member library databases, which resulted in less complete bibliographic records serving as a master record from time to time.

The evaluation committee observed that the current database organization is inadequate in its handling of articles in foreign languages. The committee believed that if catalogers go to the trouble of providing indicators for articles in foreign languages, the vendor should be able to read and ignore them for filing purposes.

As an unexpected bonus, the creation of the catalog has enabled member libraries to identify and resolve a potentially disastrous problem with the hex code used for diacritical marks in foreign language material. The regional provider of data from a national bibliographic database had inadvertently set its hex code incorrectly when creating databases for member libraries. This resulted in
spellings of prelude, for example, as prbelude. An analysis of records in C. D. Cat by personnel from Shippensburg University identified the source of this problem, which is now being corrected with the full cooperation of the regional provider.

The evaluation committee has approved the bibliographic quality of the C. D. Cat database for use in ACLCP. Committee members recommend the linked and merged design for operational use as an effective and inexpensive means of identifying bibliographic resources in a college library union catalog.

USER EVALUATION

A local coordinator named by each library director organized user evaluation at member libraries. Each local coordinator was trained on project objectives and guidelines, equipment, and use of the database at the beginning of the test period. Each local coordinator prepared a strategy for introducing the catalog intended to meet the needs of the local institution. Some coordinators emphasized direct use of C. D. Cat on a reference referral basis. Others developed bibliographic instruction programs, usually supporting courses with significant research assignments. Local coordinators kept a diary in which they indicated observed strengths and weaknesses of C. D. Cat as well as their suggestions regarding the catalog and its improvement.

Students, staff, and faculty who used the test database were asked to complete an evaluation questionnaire regarding its usefulness. These questionnaires were collected and analyzed by project personnel, and the results are incorporated in this article. Local coordinators discussed suggestions of particular merit at a summer workshop where they shared their experiences and plans.

Users reported using the catalog for the full range of subjects common to liberal arts colleges (see table 2). Historical topics were most popular, followed by arts and sciences. The catalog was useful for most subjects, including professional topics like business and health.

### TABLE 2

| Topic             | Frequency | %  |
|-------------------|-----------|----|
| History           | 42        | 19.4|
| Arts              | 28        | 12.9|
| Sciences          | 26        | 12.0|
| Literature        | 25        | 11.5|
| Business          | 20        | 9.2 |
| Religion          | 20        | 9.2 |
| Political science | 16        | 7.5 |
| Health            | 15        | 6.9 |
| Psychology        | 14        | 6.5 |
| Sociology         | 11        | 5.1 |
| Total             | 217       |    |

The ease and speed of the catalog are its most popular features (see table 3). Screens are easily read and the keyboard is simple. Most users come with a known item or subject and are pleased to be able to find it quickly. The value-added features, including keyword searching and indexing, and artificial intelligence, like maps and first page of popular works, drew mildly positive responses from the small number of users who explored these features.

Many respondents indicated that there are no bad features in the union catalog. They cited as a negative feature that the test database only contained holdings from seven of the seventeen libraries. Staff users expressed dissatisfaction with slow speed when searching three or more keywords, which can take more than a minute.

Users reported overall success in using the compact disc catalog. Some 93 percent of users report finding useful information. Even when known item searches are carried out, users succeed 85 percent of the time. Several local coordinators and users prefer C. D. Cat features to their local public access catalog.

User behavior during the test period is considered predictive in estimating growth in delivery services that will be associated with the operational version of C. D. Cat (see table 4). During the test
period, direct reciprocal borrowing and personal use of other libraries were strongly encouraged, but use of this service by these patrons was disappointingly low (12 percent). Usage patterns do not appear to differ significantly, based on whether users learned about the database in bibliographical instruction or through a reference referral. Interlibrary loan remains the primary means of obtaining materials not available locally (28 percent). Allowing for the novelty of C. D. Cat during the test period, the data suggest that one hundred sessions on the CD-ROM catalog will generate at least fifty interlibrary loan requests, or one-half of a request per use (see table 5).

Several ACLCP libraries have decided to use C. D. Cat as a high quality backup for their local OPAC. During the test period, these libraries had occasions to test its adequacy when their local system was down. All reported it to be successful. Indeed, 31 percent of public users indicated they found material in the local library that was previously unknown. At least one library has ordered an additional C. D. Cat station for local OPAC backup purposes.
TABLE 4
OVERALL USER SUCCESS

| Found useful information | Yes | No | %  |
|--------------------------|-----|----|----|
|                          | 282 | 20 | 93.4 |
| Found known item         | 45  | 8  | 84.9 |

PUBLIC RELATIONS AND BIBLIOGRAPHIC INSTRUCTION

Local coordinators and other interested ACLCP members, including representatives from the reference, bibliographic instruction, and circulation committees, met in June 1990 to review the recommendations of the technical committee, local coordinator diaries, and individual user data regarding the catalog. Local coordinators developed public relations strategies and bibliographic instruction models that would guide users in desired directions. Local coordinators concurred with the technical committee that bibliographic quality was excellent. They confirmed that the database had been well received among most participants.

Reference librarians recommend several changes to enhance public access. They believe that the reference librarian must introduce and interpret the union catalog. This introduction is especially important in college environments where connectivity with other colleges is usually limited to social and sporting events and does not include academic contacts like cross-listing of courses or shared computer resources. Further, it is considered important to guide users into desired behavior patterns, like reciprocal borrowing or valuing quality of references, rather than quantity that can reduce delivery demand.

Local coordinators made several recommendations regarding changes to introductory screens so users can quickly determine that C. D. Cat is indeed a union catalog. Four ACLCP libraries also use the Intelligent Catalog technology for their local public access catalogs, and their users have particular problems distinguishing between the local and union catalogs. Another area of concern is that printouts provided by the machine should carry a banner indicating the availability of direct reciprocal borrowing to discourage interlibrary loan requests.

Addressing bibliographic instruction, local coordinators recommend that C. D. Cat be presented in faculty workshops at each college. They also suggest developing and using a common descriptive brochure in local workshops and bibliographic instruction. They feel C. D. Cat is most useful in advanced research courses and in support of faculty research.

Reference librarians, in general, do not like the artificial intelligence features of C. D. Cat. The mapping feature that provides access to geographically related topics is not detailed enough. The readers' adviser is for current best-sellers not academic works. Local coordinators believe the components developed as a part of Intelligent Catalog software are aimed at a school or public library audience and should be disabled or replaced with information appropriate for a collegiate audience.

TABLE 5
USER BEHAVIOR

| Behavior               | 7 Test Libraries | All Libraries |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------|
|                        | No.  | %   | No.  | %   |
| Used local library     | 48   | 30.9| NA   | NA  |
| Used direct borrowing  | 9    | 5.8 | 21   | 6.7 |
| Used other library     | 9    | 5.8 | 21   | 6.7 |
| Requested ILL          | 44   | 28.4| 157  | 50.2|
| Nothing                | 19   | 12.3| 67   | 21.4|
| Other                  | 26   | 16.8| 47   | 15.0|
| Totals                 | 155  |     | 313  |     |
Finally, local coordinators believe that the compact disc catalog sells itself. Once users are aware of the catalog, they are interested in using it. The role of public relations and bibliographic instruction should be to guide responsible use of the consortially created research library as a supplement for each library’s local collection.

Interlibrary loan personnel are understandably concerned about the potential impact of C.D. Cat. With each two sessions on C.D. Cat predicted to generate one interlibrary loan request, interlibrary loan personnel believe the ACLCP library directors must provide additional support for interlibrary loan operations. They encourage reference librarians to counsel students to use the local library and reciprocal borrowing before requesting interlibrary loans. Interlibrary loan personnel also suggest that it might become necessary to limit the number of interlibrary loan requests from students, to encourage awareness of the differences between quality and quantity in terms of overly large bibliographies, or to follow the lead of one ACLCP library and charge fees for interlibrary loan copies.

Interlibrary loan personnel think it is essential that the OCLC control number and/or the LCCN number be provided as a part of the C.D. Cat printout to expedite the interlibrary loan process used by most ACLCP libraries. They also look forward to the creation of an interlibrary loan form on the C.D. Cat equipment that can be completed by users, down-loaded, and held for review and processing by interlibrary loan personnel. Both features will help in coping with increased demand.

Reciprocal borrowing needs additional encouragement and publicity. Signs on C.D. Cat stations and printout banners should encourage reciprocal borrowing. Bibliographic instruction should tout the advantages of using other libraries in person. One possible method of encouraging direct borrowing is to provide some form of reinforcement, possibly through gift or discount certificates, for those people who use it. While one concern is that a student without transportation is unable to use reciprocal borrowing in an effective way, it has been noted that many can find transportation for social and athletic events. Finally, librarians believe they have to encourage reciprocal borrowing by offering to call ahead to check on the availability of desired material until availability information is accessible on C.D. Cat, possibly through a dial-access modem to member library circulation systems.

CONTINUING OPERATIONS

Based on the positive assessments of bibliographic quality and user acceptance as well as on the development of promising public relations techniques that will guide use into desired areas, the General Policy Committee has endorsed the implementation of C.D. Cat on a continuing basis. Participating libraries will pay $550 per year for equipment maintenance, staff coordination, and two CD-ROM databases each year. A C.D. Cat director will coordinate training, evaluation, and submission of local tapes. An advisory committee will continue to monitor the project and undertake substantive reviews every three years.

DESIRED ENHANCEMENTS

College libraries recommend several enhancements to make compact disc technology more effective in college library consortia. Interlibrary loan personnel believe college users are capable of creating and storing their own interlibrary loan requests directly on the C.D. Cat workstation. This will save valuable staff typing and verification time. In addition, ACLCP wants to add a telefacsimile or electronic mail card to the C.D. Cat station so that libraries can communicate interlibrary loan requests directly with other members without having to leave the union catalog workstation.

The consortium wants to add an already existing union list of periodicals to the catalog to reflect the complete serials collections of the participating libraries. At present, some local catalogs provide information on periodicals and others do not. Some show holdings and others do not. Using the union list as the only source of bibliographic information for serials will eliminate this inequity in records.
Finally, ACLCP should take advantage of the presence of the union catalog to introduce articulated collection development among member libraries. While some duplication is desirable to support local instructional needs, C. D. Cat permits much better articulation for purchasing esoteric materials.

NEEDED RESEARCH

Additional research is required in creating components of artificial intelligence that are meaningful for academic library users. As a discipline, artificial intelligence has much to offer libraries in access bibliographic information. Students need guidance to appropriate information and an opportunity to become excited by the labyrinth of knowledge available in academic libraries. A readers' adviser function that could guide freshmen and sophomores to basic paper topics would be useful. Faculty need to be guided to the best research in their fields of study. Reference to related subject headings or related keywords would be helpful for faculty. Efforts to introduce artificial intelligence features into public catalogs should continue.

User behavior also needs to be better understood. Appropriate materials to support instruction need to be developed. Strategies that encourage direct reciprocal borrowing should be developed and evaluated for their effectiveness. Efforts stressing quality as well as quantity of information need to be developed. The effects of a union catalog on distance learning, student recruiting, and library use should be analyzed.

Costs and benefits of union catalogs versus linked systems and common command languages should continue to be analyzed. ACLCP members are inclined to see linked systems as the long-term solution to full resource sharing. But significant additional funding and research are needed. In the meantime, protocols for collection articulation can be developed, tested, and applied in a CD-ROM catalog environment. Perhaps availability information can be delivered from local catalogs on demand through modems. Periodical and serial subscriptions may constitute a good starting point for articulated collection development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

C. D. Cat represents the completion of a three-legged stool for resource sharing among the member libraries of ACLCP. Materials can be identified in C. D. Cat, solicited through interlibrary loan, and delivered through already existing delivery services, reciprocal borrowing, or telefacsimile. While much enhancement is possible and desired, ACLCP member libraries now provide virtual research library access to their collegiate communities and are well positioned to initiate articulated collection development among themselves.

The successful test... indicates that CD-ROM technology can effectively address the resource-sharing needs of college library consortia.
REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. Norman D. Stevens, "Library Networks and Resource Sharing in the United States: An Historical Overview," American Society for Information Science Journal 31:405-12 (Nov. 1980).

2. Member libraries include Albright College, Bucknell University, Dickinson College, Dickinson School of Law (not participating in this project), Elizabethtown College, Franklin and Marshall College, Gettysburg College, Harrisburg Area Community College, Juniata College, Kutztown University, Lebanon Valley College, Messiah College, Millersville University, The Pennsylvania State University at Harrisburg, Shippensburg University, State Library of Pennsylvania (not participating in this project), Susquehanna University, Wilson College, and York College of Pennsylvania.

3. Charles H. Ness, "Interlibrary Loan Developments: Pennsylvania," RQ 7114-116 (Spring 1968); Dwight Huseman, "Access to Materials in Pennsylvania: Interlibrary Delivery," Wilson Library Bulletin 59:262-63 (Dec. 1984).

4. Mark Wilson, "How to Set Up a Telefacsimile Network—The Pennsylvania Libraries Experience," Online 12:15-25 (May 1988); Charles Peguese, "Telefacsimile, The Pennsylvania Experience: A State Library's Perspective," in Research Access through New Technology ed. Mary Jackson (New York: AMS, 1989), p.88-89.

5. Doris M. Epler and Richard E. Cassel, "ACCESS PENNSYLVANIA: A CD-ROM Database Project," Library Hi-Tech 5:81-92 (Fall 1987).

6. Charles T. Townley, "The Value-added Compact Disc, Union Catalog of the Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania: A Progress Report," College & Research Libraries News 51:835-39 (Oct. 1990).

7. Members of the Evaluation Committee include Robert Gimmi (Shippensburg); Cathryn Hintze (Harrisburg Area Community College); Soo Lee ( Messiah); Michael Lynch (Bucknell); Kristin Senecal (Dickinson); and James Fogarty (ACCESS Pennsylvania).

IN FORTHCOMING ISSUES OF COLLEGE & RESEARCH LIBRARIES

An Authority Control Alternative for Small Colleges
Joan M. Bechtel

Information Delivery Strategies and the Rural Student
Sharon M. West

On the Merits of Direct Observation of Periodical Usage: An Empirical Study
Marilyn Bost

Literature Reviews and Inaccurate Referencing: An Exploratory Study of Academic Librarians
Peter Hernon and Cheryl Metoyer-Duran

Job Satisfaction Among Support Staff in Twelve Academic Libraries in Ohio
Coleen Parmer and Dennis East

The Organizational Misfits
Patricia A. Suozzi and Sandra Kerbel

Research Notes
Conference Proceedings in Physics
H. H. Barschall and W. Haebler
THE CORNERSTONE
OF YOUR SCI-TECH
INFORMATION NEEDS:

SciTech Reference Plus™

SciTech Reference Plus™ is the instant answer when you and your patrons have sci-tech questions. Covering everything from books and periodicals, to small R&D labs and mammoth industrial testing facilities, this singular CD-ROM information retrieval tool gives you instant access to these cornerstone references:

• all sci-tech citations from both Books in Print and Ulrich's International Periodicals Directory
• all of American Men & Women of Science
• all of the Directory of American Research & Technology
• all of the Corporate Technology Directory (Corptech)

You get complete, creative control over a broad spectrum of records on sci-tech publications, personnel, and industry activities. Explore a single database or review the complete "mega" file based on any combination of 27 criteria, and use full Boolean logic. It takes only seconds to...

• find practically every sci-tech book on virtually any sci-tech topic
• retrieve citations for every sci-tech periodical, annual, and irregular published around the world
• learn about the research and development capabilities of industrial organizations across North America
• locate experts in all the physical, biological, and related sciences—from Acoustics to Zoology
• plug into vast amounts of corporate and industry high-tech research

Order your copy of this vital resource today!

SciTech Reference Plus™ • $995

Call 1-800-323-3288

Bowker Electronic Publishing
121 Chanlon Road • New Providence, NJ 07974

"To have all these references searchable at one time is fantastic...It takes so much less time and...you're sure you haven't missed anything."

—Helen Stepp, Research and Development Librarian
Selected Reference Books of 1991–92

Eileen McIlvaine

This article follows the pattern set by the semiannual series initiated by the late Constance M. Winchell more than thirty years ago and continued by Eugene Sheehy. Because the purpose of the list is to present a selection of recent scholarly and general works of interest to reference workers in university libraries, it does not pretend to be either well balanced or comprehensive. A brief roundup of new editions of standard works, new titles in series already considered reference, and pieces received on continuations orders is provided at the end of the article. Code numbers (such as AD540 and CJ331) have been used to refer to titles in the Guide to Reference Books, 10th ed., (Chicago: American Library Assn., 1986) or to the Supplement...Covering Materials from 1985–1990 (Chicago: 1992).

NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIES

CLIO: catalogo dei libri italiani dell'Ottocento (1801–1900)/Catalogue of Nineteenth Century Italian Books. Milano: Ed. Bibliografica, [1991]. 19 v. L6,500,000.

CLIO is a catalog of nineteenth-century books published in Italy and Ticino, the Italian-speaking canton of Switzerland. There were some earlier general catalogs of Italian books such as Attilio Pagliaini's Catalogo generale della libreria italiana dall'anno 1847 a tutto il 1899 (Guide AA905) and a publication of the Austrian censorship office: Elenco delle opere stampate e pubblicate in Milano e nelle province lombarde (1815–1847), on which this publication is partially based. CLIO contains more than double the number of titles in those earlier compilations.

The bibliography includes not only books proper but also pamphlets and fascicles longer than twelve pages. Excluded are texts not in Greek or Roman alphabets, periodical publications from academies, corporations, societies and institutes, offprints, laws, decrees and ordinances, administrative publications of local governments and associations, legal papers, sales catalogs, cartography, and music without text. In total, it lists 420,898 publications, giving the location of titles in Italian public and university libraries. Only one library location is listed for each title, so this catalog has a limited usefulness as a union catalog. If the title is in the Biblioteca Nazionale in Florence, this library is given as the location; if not, a library in the region where the book was published or printed is given. There are some titles in the list without any location: works found only in bibliographies.

The bibliography is divided into three parts: (1) author/title catalog, listing works alphabetically by author, or by title for anonymous and corporate authors and works by more than three authors; (2) a list by publisher or printer, showing works chronologically arranged by year and then by author; (3) place of publication arranged alphabetically by region and town, then by year and, within the year, by author. The index is by secondary author (editors, translators, authors of prefaces, illustrators and composers) with cross-reference to the principal author and a brief

Eileen McIlvaine is Head of Collections and Reference in the Humanities and History Division, Columbia University Libraries, New York 10027. Although it appears under a byline, this list is a project of the reference departments of Columbia University Libraries, and notes are signed with the initials of one of the following staff members: Kathe D. Chipman, Acery Library; Mary Cargill, Beth Juhl, Robert H. Scott, Sarah Spurgin, Junko Stuveras, Butler Library; Olha della Cava, School of Library Service Library; Elizabeth A. Davis, Music Library; Leigh Hallingby, Psychology Library.
title. The index ends with a geographical list of publishers and printers.—J.S.

ABBREVIATIONS
Zalucky, Henry K. *Compressed Russian: Russian-English Dictionary of Acronyms, Semiacronyms and Other Abbreviations Used in Contemporary Standard Russian with Their Pronunciation and Explicit Correlates in Russian, and Equivalents in English.* Amsterdam, New York: Elsevier, 1991. 890p. (ISBN 0444987282). LC 90-42785.

The march of bureaucracy and technology through the twentieth century has left in its wake a burgeoning population of acronyms and abbreviations. In this field of human endeavor, probably no other modern society has been as productive as the former Soviet Union. (It will be interesting to see how fully the tradition is continued in the various successor states of that empire.) A dictionary to assist in decoding these elliptical structures has thus always been an essential reference tool for any student of Russian or Soviet affairs. The latest such guide for the perplexed is offered by this work compiled by Henry K. Zalucky in the United States, printed in Poland, and published in Amsterdam. With slightly fewer than forty thousand entries, it provides a key to a host of shortened forms of the Russian names of domestic and foreign government bodies, political parties, economic enterprises, educational and research institutions, archives, journals, units of measurement, countries, languages, concepts, substances, machines, etc. The material has been compiled largely from Soviet printed sources, with a particular debt to the third edition of D. I. Alekseev’s *Slovar’ sokrashchenii russkogo iazyka* (Guide AD672). The author has aimed primarily to include those forms in current usage, but many terms of historic significance, particularly the names of earlier political organizations and state institutions, are provided as well, along with some indication of the period of their existence.

While the dictionary is designed above all for use by students and specialists, pains have been taken to accommodate the needs of a more general Russian-language readership as well. Individual entries include a guide to pronunciation where needed (e.g., to indicate whether an acronym is pronounced as if it were a single word or whether it is spelled out), a full Russian-language version of the abbreviated term, a translation into English, and, where appropriate, notes indicating such things as the field in which a term is used, geographical location, or historical period. Where the same acronym is used for several different terms, each instance is treated as a separate entry, and the terms are arranged in alphabetical order of their full Russian-language equivalent. The brief supplementary list of abbreviations, several tables of symbols and units of measures such as a table of Roman numerals, a Roman-alphabet listing of chemical elements, and a list of the caloric and nutritional content of various foods are clearly aimed at the general Russian-language reader.

Inevitably, comparisons are likely to be made with another work issued by the same publisher just six years ago—*Dictionary of Russian Abbreviations*, compiled by Edgar Scheitz in the German Democratic Republic (*Suppl.* AD154). Curiously, this work does not figure in Zalucky's list of lexicographical sources. While both works report that they contain about 40,000 abbreviations, the earlier work in fact covers much more material, since it groups all the terms designated by a single acronym under the same entry. It does not, however, provide English translations. Naturally, too, as a work produced in a country that was at that time still firmly ensconced in the Warsaw Pact, it does not, in contrast to the Zalucky work, include such popular terms outside the bounds of official Soviet sensibility as *zek* [labor camp inmate], *tamizdat* [emigre literature], or *porno* [pornography]. In addition, of course, it is slightly more out-of-date than Zalucky’s volume.

Probably any library with a serious Russian reference coverage will want to add this new dictionary to its collection, although neither this book, nor probably
any printed reference, can possibly pretend to genuine currency in today’s fast-changing Russia. An increasing number of the names and even many of the institutions listed in this 1991 publication are now history, and one would search it in vain to decipher the acronyms for the country itself (RF for the Russian Federation or SNG for the Commonwealth of Independent States), let alone the host of new names and agencies springing up to replace those of an earlier age.—R.H.S.

LIBRARIANSHIP

Directory of Ethnic Professionals in LIS (Library and Information Science). Comp. George C. Grant. Winter Park, Fla.: FOUR-G Publ., 1991. 254p., 60p. $52.95 (ISBN 0-962542324). LC 90-85845.

The Directory of Ethnic Professionals in LIS includes biographical sketches of sixteen hundred deceased, retired, or currently employed African-American library and information science professionals. The Directory was born out of the compiler’s frustration with the inability to locate information about librarians in national, regional, and professional biographical sources. He has, however, extended his coverage to “all ethnic librarians,” and whereas the inclusion of a number of professionals of Chinese American, Japanese American, Hispanic, Mexican American, and Native American heritage is understandable, the extension of the work to include some foreign librarians working in their native countries, such as Ghana, Senegal, or the Philippines, seems out of scope for an American ethnic librarians’ directory.

The Directory is arranged alphabetically by last name, and one index lists entrants by employer/alma mater. In content the entries parallel closely those in ALA’s two-volume Directory of Library and Information Professionals/ DLIP (Suppl. AB39) including, not only the name, ethnic heritage, and current employer of each person listed but also information about his/her career, educational background, publications, and subject/consulting expertise. Although the DLIP is a much more comprehensive work, containing some forty-three thousand entries, only about 25 percent of the entries in the Directory of Ethnic Professional duplicate those in the DLIP. This mass of new biographical data for a category of professionals underrepresented in standard biographical dictionaries of the library profession is reason enough for purchasing this reference tool, which the compiler hopes to expand in subsequent editions.—O.dC.

RELIGION

The Coptic Encyclopedia. Aziz S. Atiya, ed. in chief. New York: Macmillan, [1991]. 8v. (2372, 371p.) $900 (ISBN 002897025X). LC 90-23448.

Most of us know little about the Copts or their contributions to the history of Egypt and to the development of Christianity. As Lola Atiya writes in the foreword to the Encyclopedia, “It [the Coptic period] falls between the glamour of Pharaonic Egypt and the stupendous surge of Islam that swept the world.” However, Coptic civilization remains a key component of both the language and landscape of modern Egypt and the spiritual and ritual foundations of the Christian church. This eight-volume set treats the people and culture, centered in Egypt, Nubia/Sudan, and Ethiopia. Coptic civilization began with the preaching of the evangelist Mark to the citizens of Alexandria in the first century A.D., reached the height of its influence in the third century, and declined—but endured—through over sixteen hundred years of Byzantine and Arab dominance. This project, originally conceived in the 1950s by Professor Aziz Atiya, author of wide-ranging studies of Eastern Christianity and Coptic civilization, and his colleagues in the Higher Institute of Coptic Studies, was begun in earnest in 1979 and completed after twelve years and the contributions of over two hundred scholars.

The twenty-three hundred signed entries in these volumes range in length from a few sentences (“Archangel”) to a dozen or more pages (“Saints”); all include bibliographies, some of which are quite extensive. Most articles are by well-known authorities in the field, such
as P. M. Fraser writing on Alexandria, Bruce Metzger on papyri, and Elaine Pagels on texts from the Nag Hammadi Library. Many entries include black-and-white illustrations or photographs, maps, diagrams, or tables: the article on the Coptic religious calendar, for example, presents a seventeen page list of saints' days and feasts. In addition to entries covering historical and cultural persons and topics, there are also biographical sketches of coptologists, archeologists, and theologians, as well as portraits of prominent Copts in modern Egypt. Particularly useful to the generalist are the concise and comprehensive discussions of specific monasteries, archeological sites, or other topics which are otherwise available only in (sometimes obscure) non-English publications, e.g., "Karnak in the Christian Period." The wide variety of subjects addressed testifies to the widespread influence of Coptic civilization. Alongside articles treating the Roman bureaucracy in Egypt or the development of Christian wedding customs, one finds discussions of the development of the codex book and bookbinding techniques and, following a cross-reference from the Book of Kells, a study of Coptic elements in Irish art and monasticism.

Cross-references to related subjects are indicated within the text. One needs the excellent index to locate some articles filed under confusing or unlikely headings (e.g., Saint Catherine's Monastery is under "Mount Sinai . . ."). An annoying feature of the index is its use of page rather than volume numbers in references, though volumes and corresponding page numbers are provided at the bottom of each index page. Besides the index, Volume 8 also includes twelve maps and a lengthy appendix on the Coptic language, with entries on topics such as alphabets, etymology, dialects, and paleography. Volume 1 provides a general bibliography.

At $900, The Coptic Encyclopedia is not an automatic purchase for any library, but its unique focus and depth will fill a real lacuna in reference publishing and will satisfy students and scholars in fields ranging from archeology to theology.—B.J.

Encyclopedia of the Early Church. Comp. Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum and ed. Angelo di Berardino; tr. from the Italian by Adrian Walford; with a foreword and bibliographic amendments by W. H. C. Frend. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1992. 2 v. $175 (ISBN 0-19-520-892-7). LC 91-23934.

This two-volume encyclopedic guide to the first seven or eight centuries of Christianity is a translation of an Italian work, Dizionario patristico e di antichità cristiane, originally published between 1983 and 1988 (Guide BB310). Representing the collective efforts of a team of 167 scholars from seventeen different countries (although nearly half of them represent scholarly institutions in Rome), it covers an impressive range of topics relating to the history, geography, theology, philosophy, literature, languages, terminology, liturgy, art, architecture, archeology, and material culture of the early church from its origins until the middle of the eighth century. Considerable attention is also devoted to heresies, Gnosticism, Judaism, and the culture and philosophy of classical antiquity. An impressive effort has been made to provide coverage of the whole of the Christian world, from Mauritania to Persia, from Ireland to Aksum. Finally, a special emphasis on the biography makes this a rich source of information even on many lesser-known figures.

The individual entries, ranging from one or two paragraphs to five or six pages in length, are often accompanied by substantial bibliographies of sources and major secondary works, updated by Frend for this English-language edition. Adrian Walford's translation from the Italian reads clearly and smoothly, and a well-designed layout, numerous cross-references, and an extensive index facilitate use of this work. Included at the end of the text are a chronological table, forty-four maps, and over three hundred illustrations, some in color.

The Encyclopedia is an outstanding contribution to the English-language literature in a field that certainly has not lacked for coverage in the past. It belongs in any serious research or col-
lege-level collection attempting to provide coverage in the areas of Christianity, late antiquity, or Western civilization in general.

Its appearance comes close on the heels of the very similarly named Encyclopedia of Early Christianity (New York: Garland, 1990), reviewed in an earlier issue of this column, but the differences between these two works are considerable. While the Garland volume is designed primarily for the nonspecialist, this work, given the depth and quality of its treatment, promises to be a regular source of reference for the specialist (although it will serve as a valuable introduction for the general reader as well). The breadth of coverage is also much greater in the volume under review here: it contains more than twice as many articles, covers a longer time period, and addresses a broader range of issues. In those cases where both provide an article on the same subject, the Oxford volume is usually (though not always) more detailed in its coverage. To be sure, there are some areas where the Garland volume provides fuller coverage or at least more ready access: two notable examples are its entries on individual canonical and uncanonical scriptural works and its occasional articles on modern scholars who have contributed significantly to the study of the early church. Finally, the Encyclopedia of Early Christianity includes valuable additional bibliographic references on many topics. Ideally, it would be good to have both, but if one could have only one, the Encyclopedia of the Early Church is clearly the superior choice.—R.H.S.

Haddad, Yvonne Yazbeck, John Obert Voll, and John L. Esposito. The Contemporary Islamic Revival: A Critical Survey and Bibliography. Bibliographies and Indexes in Religious Studies, 20. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 230p. (ISBN 0313247196). LC 91-12618.

The bibliography, which contains three essays and a bibliography on the Islamic resurgence, includes 1,225 books and articles and is classed by geographic area, except for the chapter "General Studies," which is divided into three parts: Interpretive Studies, Economics, and Women. Entries for books and some articles are annotated. The cited articles are drawn from over one hundred journals in Islamic and area studies. The indexes are by author, title, and subject. The subject index includes personal and place names, organizations, and broad topics.

The subject index is unfortunately not very helpful. Since the organization of the bibliography is by country and continent, a good, nongeographic topical index would have been useful. Some index terms such as development are too vague to be useful. Egypt has sixty-six items, and some of the same items are repeated on the same page under "Egyptian history," "Egyptian nationalism," etc. A reorganization of the subject index would much enhance the usefulness of the bibliography.—J.S.

Jewish-American History and Culture: An Encyclopedia. Ed. Jack Fischel and Sanford Pinsker. Garland Reference Library of the Social Sciences, 429. New York: Garland, 1992. 710p. (ISBN 0-82406622-7). LC 91-14188.

In recent years, librarians have been nearly overwhelmed by an alarming array of specialized subject bibliographies; the past few seasons have seen the publication of bibliographies on the history, religion, literature, theater, and film of Jews in the United States. Unfortunately, there was no comprehensive source for locating brief information on different aspects of Jewish-American life. Happily, Jewish-American History and Culture remedies this situation quite nicely, aiming to combine a "celebration" of the extraordinary richness of Jewish-American culture with "the sober judgments of scholarship, analysis, and critical detachment" (preface). The result is such a fascinating, compendious resource that reference departments will have difficulty in deciding where to place this volume; it could find a place in American history, religion, biography, popular culture, or several other sections.

This encyclopedia presents signed topical essays and biographical sketches, most
with bibliographies, arranged in alphabetical order, and followed by a general index. An introductory table lists all articles under a series of main themes or subjects so that readers may find other entries on similar topics. These main themes, which give an idea of the scope of coverage, include arts, biographies, economics, history, humanities, Jewish organizations, libraries, literary biographies and studies, media and communications, military, Nobel Prize, political theory, pop culture, religion and religious theories, science, and social sciences. The editors have deliberately excluded some topics, such as foods or stereotypes, feeling that such materials had been adequately covered elsewhere, and that “there was little profit, and a possible danger, in confusing the trivial with the decidedly more important” (introduction).

Much of the information presented here would be difficult to locate without a lot of effort and a very large reference collection. Articles cover topics as diverse as agriculture and American attitudes toward Ethiopian Jews and include lists of all Jewish-American Nobel Prize winners as well as addresses and descriptions of American libraries with extensive Judaica collections. Recommended for all research collections.—B.J.

MYTHOLOGY

Bell, Robert E. Women of Classical Mythology: A Biographical Dictionary. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO, [1991]. 462p. $49 (ISBN 0-874365813). LC 91-26649.

Students already have Robert Bell to thank for two other works on classical mythology, Place Names in Classical Mythology (Suppl. CF10) and Dictionary of Classical Mythology (Guide CF23). His latest work provides twenty-six hundred biographical sketches of goddesses, nymphs, and mortals, many of whom are too obscure or peripheral to appear in other dictionaries of mythology. Entries range in length from a sentence to several hundred words; most include references to classical sources. Longer essays for principal deities (e.g., Artemis) provide lists of birthplace(s), lovers/consorts, children, principal places of worship, sacred attributes, companions, and epithets. Cult titles or epithets make up a significant proportion of the shorter entries (e.g., “Glaucopis” for Athena). Though some readers may be put off by the occasionally flashy prose style (for example, references to mythological character’s “sex lives” or a description of Hera as “coaddictive”), entries present fairly full information. One small quibble is Bell’s failure to indicate which ancient authors provide us with which variants of myths and whose story he prefers.

Major cross-references are indicated in the text by capital letters, but the careful reader will find many additional related articles by checking other names mentioned in the course of an entry. An appendix, “The Men in Their Lives,” lists male characters which figure in the main text; thus, by checking “Romulus” in the appendix, one can eventually find the name of the she-wolf who nursed the Roman twins. However, without a general index, Women of Classical Mythology will, to a certain extent, only serve those who already know the name of the mythological figure for whom they need information. To locate a list of all the characters associated with the Acropolis or all those goddesses who protect women in childbirth, one needs to consult Bell’s other works.—B.J.

Recent Studies in Myths and Literature, 1970–1990: An Annotated Bibliography. Comp. Bernard Accardi (and others). Bibliographies and Indexes in World Literature, 29. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 251p. $45 (ISBN 0-313-27545-9). LC 91-18070.

This bibliography in part attempts to inquire into post-modernist influences on the study of literature in relation to myths. Primarily compiled for scholars of Anglo-American literature, the bibliography is divided into sections such as theory and themes, classical literature, British and American literature by time period. Within the time period, the arrangement is by subject and author. All entries are accompanied by notes from one line to nearly half a page in length. Some English translations of foreign
works are included; however, dissertations and book review are not. The index is by author (of books and articles) and subject, such as literary authors, mythological figures, themes, and scholars of mythology.—J.S.

van Keuren, Frances Dodds. Guide to Research in Classical Art and Mythology. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1991. 307p. $35 (ISBN 0838905641). LC 91-11122.

Beginning students, as well as scholars and librarians who have never had the time or inclination to develop a firm grip on the complex and confusing array of bibliographies, dictionaries, catalogs, and site reports from the fields of classical archeology, art, mythology, and iconography, should be grateful to Professor van Keuren for this new guide. Her book takes the form of a narrative bibliography in seventeen chapters, each of which discusses one or two major works in a specific field, covering the nature of research in that discipline and the organization and uses of the work in question. Following these major works are essays on and bibliographies of complementary reference works, handbooks, and additional sources. These chapters are grouped into three main sections: "General Research," which includes chapters on Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art and archeology; "Mythology," which includes chapters on myth and ancient art, literature and iconography, as well as portrayals of myth in later art and literature; and "Media Studies," which treats individual art forms, from sculpture and vase painting to interior decorating and numismatics. Author-title and subject indexes complete the volume.

Particularly helpful are Professor van Keuren's remarks on the currency and utility of certain works and on the controversy surrounding specific topics as well as her suggestions on how one might proceed in a research project after consulting one of these reference tools. English titles are provided for many foreign works, helping readers to identify in advance which German sources may be pertinent to their interests. Though librarians are not the primary audience for this work, many will benefit from the lengthy descriptions of the scope and organization of important sources, such as Beazley's catalogs of Athenian vases or the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum. Overall, the Guide to Research in Classical Art and Mythology is a good introduction for the novice and a perfect refresher course for the more advanced scholar.—B.J.

LITERATURE

Benét's Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature. Ed. George Perkins, Barbara Perkins, and Phillip Leininger. New York: HarperCollins, [1991]. 1,176p. $45 (ISBN 0-062-70027-8). LC 91-55001.

Although the name echoes the new title of Benét's Reader's Encyclopedia (Suppl. BD24), this is in fact a revision of Max Herzberg's Reader's Encyclopedia of American Literature (Guide BD408); the new title reflects a change in publisher, not the posthumous involvement of William Rose Benét.

Like its predecessor, this compilation claims to be "the most comprehensive one-volume reference book in its field" (preface), and it has many more entries than the Oxford Companion to American Literature (Guide BD407), though the latter work does have information not provided in Benét's.

The new edition has retained many of the original entries, revised or eliminated others, and added some twenty-five hundred new headings "in response to contemporary critical perspectives." Many of the evaluative comments in the earlier edition have been dropped, leaving its flavor somewhat bland: the reference to "Owen Wisteria" is gone, as is Hemingway's description of Huckleberry Finn. The new edition has added entries on major Canadian and Latin American writers, many taken from Benét's Reader's Encyclopedia. It has longer, signed essays of general topics, which provide a useful overview of major trends in American literature, but some of the essays lack subtlety. One essay opines that "before the 1970's everyone knew what the classics of American literature were supposed to be" (p.327). The entry on Longfellow,
however, has a good description of the fluctuation of his reputation.

The new edition is very useful for its entries on current American literature, but libraries will want to keep the first edition.—M.C.

Fenwick, M. J. Writers of the Caribbean and Central America: A Bibliography. New York: Garland, 1992. 2v. $200 (ISBN 0-8240-4010-4). LC 91-35701.

Although this bibliography of primary works includes significantly more writers than are included in other recent bibliographies of Caribbean and Central American authors, the citations are often so incomplete that tracing the cited work would be difficult if not impossible. Writers are arranged alphabetically by country of origin, and each entry lists birth and death dates (if known), literary form, and books (giving only dates, not place or publisher), followed by work published in serials or anthologies. This last section is the most frustrating because the citations do not include the titles of the short stories, plays, or poems, and give only the title of the journal and the year that the journal was published. No issue date or page number is provided. (Often only the title of a journal is listed with no other information.) Works published in anthologies fare slightly better. Although the title of the work is not included, the editor, title, and date of the anthology are usually provided. The volumes are indexed by writer only.

Despite its considerable limitations—it can't be used to find a poem, short story, or play, no works are included after about 1988, and some citations provide only the title of a newspaper—this bibliography could still be useful to libraries with significant collections in Caribbean literature.—S.S.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory. London: E. Arnold, (dist. in United States by Routledge, Chapman and Hall, New York), 1992. 282p. $49.95 (ISBN 0340539127). LC 91-32095.

This glossary of literary terms offers substantial explanations of terms frequently used by recent literary critics and theoreticians, roughly covering the time period since 1970. As such, it is a valuable supplement to other dictionaries of literary terms, for example, M. H. Abrams, Glossary of Literary Terms (Guide BD31) and Hugh Holman, Handbook to Literature (Guide BD39).

The entries in the glossary are longer than the usual entries in other dictionaries of literary terms and read more like short essays on literary criticism. Quotations from original sources help to elucidate the meaning of a term. Related terms are grouped together and extensively cross-referenced. The additional matter includes a list of key terms by critical school (p.xii-xv) and a bibliography of reference sources (p.xv-xvii), and a list of quoted works (p.269-82).—J.S.

MUSIC

Gooch, Bryan N. S. and David Thatcher. A Shakespeare Music Catalogue. Oxford: Clarendon, 1991. 5v. (2,847p.). $635 (ISBN 0-19-812359-0). LC 89-9270.

Contents: v.1-3, The catalogue of music; v.4, Indices; v.5, Bibliography. This catalog is a thorough compilation containing 21,362 compositions of published and unpublished original music related to Shakespeare's literary work, composed from his day through 1987.

Volumes 1 through 3 contain the catalog, beginning with the plays presented alphabetically by title. Volume 3 includes the sonnets, listed numerically from 1 to 154 with an index to their first lines, and other miscellaneous texts. Contained also in this third volume is a list of anthologies with each of their contents cross-indexed to its entry in the main catalogue.

Volume 4 contains four indexes: Shakespeare's titles and first lines; titles of musical works; composers, arrangers, and editors; and librettists and other writers. The selected bibliography comprising Volume 5 rounds out the work. A useful reader's guide, along with abbreviations used for musical terms, library abbreviations, and, interestingly, a list of publishers' names and addresses begin volume 1.

Under each literary title, the musical works, numbered sequentially, are ar-
ranged in seven categories: incidental music, operas and related music, nontheatrical vocal music, nontheatrical instrumental music, settings of combined and/or unidentified texts, obliquely related works, and non-Shakespearean works. Further subarrangement is alphabetical by composer with title and other bibliographical information, instrumentation, first performance details, repositories of the music, and the author's informative annotations. An overview of musical stage directions for each play precedes its musical listings.

Unlike earlier bibliographies, the author includes works from the vast literature of incidental music, but limits this chiefly to major productions. Other new features include projected works or works left unfinished, as well as compositions misattributed to Shakespeare or easily mistaken for settings of his work.

The audience for this work is wide. Literary scholars expanding their understanding of Shakespeare's texts, musicologists studying relationships between text and music, producers and performers wanting source material for performance, cultural historians documenting changes in cultural tastes will all find useful information.

Most importantly, this work reveals the importance that music played, both in Shakespeare's conceptions of his works as well as in the popular reception accorded them over the past three hundred years. Only one play, The Comedy of Errors, does not explicitly require some form of music functional to the dramatic action. The authors indeed provide ample documentation for their assertion that "one reason that Shakespeare's genius is now recognized in all parts of the world is surely the role which the art of music has played in the dissemination of his works."—E.A.D.

ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Lerner, Loren R., and Mary F. Williamson. Art and Architecture in Canada: A Bibliography and Guide to the Literature to 1981/ Art et architecture au Canada: bibliographie et guide de la documentation jusqu'en 1981. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Pr., 1991. 2v. $250 (ISBN 0-8020-5856-6). LC CE91-93656.

A bilingual "reference guide to the most significant contributions to the literature of Canadian art and architecture published in Canada and abroad from 1825 to 1981" (preface). The 9,555 bibliographic entries are annotated, many with abstracts in French and English. They are based on references located in four existing periodical indexes and specialized bibliographies and on the National Gallery of Canada catalog holdings for monographs, exhibition catalogs, some theses, journals and journal articles, and association reports. "Emphasis is on the elusive retrospective literature, the indispensable foundation for art historical research."

Volume 1, the bibliography, is organized by topic, geographical area, and chronological period, as outlined in a detailed table of contents, and is preceded by a preface that serves as a solid and thoughtful introduction to the study of Canadian art history. Volume 2, the index, provides access by author and by English and French subject entries. The overall effect is similar to that of Arts in America: A Bibliography (Guide BE11).

Two related and recent bibliographies for Canadian studies, both also bilingual, are Claude Bergeron's Index des periodiques d'architecture canadiens, 1940–1980/Canadian Architectural Periodicals Index (Suppl. BE117) and Repertoire des dossiers documentaires traitant de l'art et de l'architecture dans les regions representees a la section ARUS MOQ/Directory of Vertical File Collections on Art and Architecture Represented by AR LIS M/O/Q (Suppl. BE51).—K.D.C.

Thomison, Dennis. The Black Artist in America: An Index to Reproductions. Metuchen, N.Y.: Scarecrow, 1991. 396p. $47.50 (ISBN 0–8108–2503–1). LC 91–33050.

This index was "published in order to provide easy access to the published reproduction of fine art by American Black artists... in books, periodicals, and exhibition catalogs" (introduction) and is part of the growing genre of such publications.

The body of the work is an alphabetical listing of some one thousand artists from the colonial period to the present, giving names, dates, birthplace when available, and media, followed by citations.
for biographical sources, portraits, published reproductions, and further references, as pertinent. Citations are to a list of some 560 American publications, most from the 1960s through the 1980s. Front matter also includes names of the hundred institutions and collections consulted. A "Sources of Information" section is "designed to help the researcher do more extensive investigation" and includes monographs devoted to single artists, periodical articles, and bibliographies and then goes further to include doctoral dissertations, audiovisual materials, audiovisual producers and distributors, and exhibition catalogs. A modest subject index completes the volume.

While multiple references are made to earlier reference works—most notably Theresa Cederholm's Afro-American Artists: A Bio-Bibliographical Directory (Guide BE180)—there are no references for the field of photography. In fact, this subject is overlooked entirely in the front matter, which is surprising given the decision to include folk art and in light of the author's position as a librarian and faculty member at the University of Southern California. Thus, the two works by Deborah Willis-Thomas will be useful with the current volume: Black Photographers (Suppl. BF64n) and An Illustrated Bio-Bibliography of Black Photographers, 1940-1988 (Suppl. BF64).—K.D.C.

POPULAR CULTURE

Handbook of French Popular Culture. Ed. Pierre L. Horn. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 307p. $55 (ISBN 0-313-261210). LC 90-23170.

Inspired by scholarly studies of daily life, such as Fernand Braudel's Structures du quotidien, and modeled after the Handbook of American Popular Culture (Suppl. CF34), this collection of bibliographic essays by thirteen American and French scholars explores areas of popular culture: advertising, comics, detective stories, science fiction, cartoons, film, broadcasting, culinary matters, leisure, love, music, serial publications, and sports.

Each chapter surveys historical background, analyzes trends, comments on relevant studies, and offers suggestions for further research and reading. Notes and bibliographies cite both English and French works. The volume concludes with a bibliography of general sources, a list of museums, and an index by topic and cited author.—J.S.

WOMEN'S STUDIES

Women in the West: A Guide to Manuscript Sources. Ed. Susan Armitage and others. Women's History and Cultures, 5; Garland Reference Library in the Humanities, 1086. New York: Garland, 1991. 422p. $59 (ISBN 0-8240-4298-0). LC 91-24898.

Intended to supplement Andrea Hinding's Women's History Sources (Guide CC554), this guide includes repositories in twenty western states, from Minnesota to Hawaii. Entries are arranged geographically, list addresses and hours, and describe services, principal holdings, multicultural materials, collections of special note, and guides. There are no indexes, although a list of repositories arranged alphabetically by state completes the volume. This volume expands descriptions and includes some repositories not listed in Hinding.—S.S.

AREA STUDIES

Hartness, Ann. Brazil in Reference Books, 1965–1989: An Annotated Bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1991. 351p. $39.50 (ISBN 0-810-82400-0). LC 90-28356.

Haiti: Guide to the Periodical Literature in English, 1800–1990. Comp. and ed. Frantz Pratt. Bibliographies and Indexes in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 1. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 310p. $45 (ISBN 0-313-27855-5). LC 91-7572.

Latin America is a hot topic in many libraries today and librarians will welcome any guide to the literature. These two bibliographies, unfortunately, though useful, do have faults.

Brazil in Reference Books was compiled by the acting field director of the Library of Congress Office in Rio de Janeiro and is an annotated listing of reference books published in any language, though Portuguese dominates. It is divided into broad chapters (agiculture,
ranged in seven categories: incidental music, operas and related music, nontheatrical vocal music, nontheatrical instrumental music, settings of combined and/or unidentified texts, obliquely related works, and non-Shakespearean works. Further subarrangement is alphabetical by composer with title and other bibliographical information, instrumentation, first performance details, repositories of the music, and the author’s informative annotations. An overview of musical stage directions for each play precedes its musical listings.

Unlike earlier bibliographies, the author includes works from the vast literature of incidental music, but limits this chiefly to major productions. Other new features include projected works or works left unfinished, as well as compositions misattributed to Shakespeare or easily mistaken for settings of his work.

The audience for this work is wide. Literary scholars expanding their understanding of Shakespeare’s texts, musicologists studying relationships between text and music, producers and performers wanting source material for performance, cultural historians documenting changes in cultural tastes will all find useful information. Most importantly, this work reveals the importance that music played, both in Shakespeare’s conceptions of his works as well as in the popular reception accorded them over the past three hundred years.

Only one play, The Comedy of Errors, does not explicitly require some form of music functional to the dramatic action. The authors indeed provide ample documentation for their assertion that “one reason that Shakespeare’s genius is now recognized in all parts of the world is surely the role which the art of music has played in the dissemination of his works.”—E.A.D.

ART AND ARCHITECTURE

Lerner, Loren R., and Mary F. Williamson. Art and Architecture in Canada: A Bibliography and Guide to the Literature to 1981/ Art et architecture au Canada: bibliographie et guide de la documentation jusqu’en 1981. Toronto: Univ. Toronto Pr., 1991. 2v. $250 (ISBN 0-8020-5856-6). LC CE91-93656.

A bilingual “reference guide to the most significant contributions to the literature of Canadian art and architecture published in Canada and abroad from 1825 to 1981” (preface). The 9,555 bibliographic entries are annotated, many with abstracts in French and English. They are based on references located in four existing periodical indexes and specialized bibliographies and on the National Gallery of Canada catalog holdings for monographs, exhibition catalogs, some theses, journals and journal articles, and association reports. “Emphasis is on the elusive retrospective literature, the indispensable foundation for art historical research.”

Volume 1, the bibliography, is organized by topic, geographical area, and chronological period, as outlined in a detailed table of contents, and is preceded by a preface that serves as a solid and thoughtful introduction to the study of Canadian art history. Volume 2, the index, provides access by author and by English and French subject entries. The overall effect is similar to that of Arts in America: A Bibliography (Guide BE11).

Two related and recent bibliographies for Canadian studies, both also bilingual, are Claude Bergeron’s Index des périodiques d’architecture canadiens, 1940–1980/ Canadian Architectural Periodicals Index (Suppl. BE117) and Repertoire des dossiers documents traitant de l’art et de l’architecture dans les régions représentées à la section ARLIS MOQ/Directory of Vertical File Collections on Art and Architecture Represented by ARLIS M/O/Q (Suppl. BE51).—K.D.C.

Thomison, Dennis. The Black Artist in America: An Index to Reproductions. Metuchen, N.Y.: Scarecrow, 1991. 396p. $47.50 (ISBN 0-8108-2503-1). LC 91-33050.

This index was “published in order to provide easy access to the published reproduction of fine art by American Black artists... in books, periodicals, and exhibition catalogs” (introduction) and is part of the growing genre of such publications.

The body of the work is an alphabetical listing of some one thousand artists from the colonial period to the present, giving names, dates, birthplace when available, and media, followed by citations
for biographical sources, portraits, published reproductions, and further references, as pertinent. Citations are to a list of some 560 American publications, most from the 1960s through the 1980s. Front matter also includes names of the hundred institutions and collections consulted. A "Sources of Information" section is "designed to help the researcher do more extensive investigation" and includes monographs devoted to single artists, periodical articles, and bibliographies and then goes further to include doctoral dissertations, audiovisual materials, audiovisual producers and distributors, and exhibition catalogs. A modest subject index completes the volume.

While multiple references are made to earlier reference works—most notably Theresa Cederholm's Afro-American Artists: A Bio-Bibliographical Directory (Guide BE180)—there are no references for the field of photography. In fact, this subject is overlooked entirely in the front matter, which is surprising given the decision to include folk art and in light of the author's position as a librarian and faculty member at the University of Southern California. Thus, the two works by Deborah Willis-Thomas will be useful with the current volume: Black Photographers (Suppl. BF64n) and An Illustrated Bio-Bibliography of Black Photographers, 1940-1988 (Suppl. BF64).—K.D.C.

POPULAR CULTURE

Handbook of French Popular Culture. Ed. Pierre L. Horn. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 307p. $55 (ISBN 0-313-261210). LC 90-23170.

Inspired by scholarly studies of daily life, such as Fernand Braudel's Structures du quotidien, and modeled after the Handbook of American Popular Culture (Suppl. CF34), this collection of bibliographic essays by thirteen American and French scholars explores areas of popular culture: advertising, comics, detective stories, science fiction, cartoons, film, broadcasting, culinary matters, leisure, love, music, serial publications, and sports.

Each chapter surveys historical background, analyzes trends, comments on relevant studies, and offers suggestions for further research and reading. Notes and bibliographies cite both English and French works. The volume concludes with a bibliography of general sources, a list of museums, and an index by topic and cited author.—J.S.

WOMEN'S STUDIES

Women in the West: A Guide to Manuscript Sources. Ed. Susan Armitage and others. Women's History and Cultures, 5; Garland Reference Library in the Humanities, 1086. New York: Garland, 1991. 422p. $59 (ISBN 0-8240-4298-0). LC 91-24898.

Intended to supplement Andrea Hinding's Women's History Sources (Guide CC554), this guide includes repositories in twenty western states, from Minnesota to Hawaii. Entries are arranged geographically, list addresses and hours, and describe services, principal holdings, multicultural materials, collections of special note, and guides. There are no indexes, although a list of repositories arranged alphabetically by state completes the volume. This volume expands descriptions and includes some repositories not listed in Hinding.—S.S.

AREA STUDIES

Hartness, Ann. Brazil in Reference Books, 1965-1989: An Annotated Bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1991. 351p. $39.50 (ISBN 0-810-82400-0). LC 90-28356.

Haiti: Guide to the Periodical Literature in English, 1800-1990. Comp. and ed. Frantz Pratt. Bibliographies and Indexes in Latin American and Caribbean Studies, 1. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1991. 310p. $45 (ISBN 0-313-27855-5). LC 91-7572.

Latin America is a hot topic in many libraries today and librarians will welcome any guide to the literature. These two bibliographies, unfortunately, though useful, do have faults. Brazil in Reference Books was compiled by the acting field director of the Library of Congress Office in Rio de Janeiro and is an annotated listing of reference books published in any language, though Portuguese dominates. It is divided into broad chapters (agriculture,
architecture, etc.), which are further subdivided into types (bibliographies, dictionaries) or subtopics. This is a useful arrangement, though a classified table of contents would help immeasurably in locating the subtopics. And the arrangement is sometimes too general to be of much use. The chapter on bibliographies, for instance, lists in one alphabetical sequence publications ranging from the various national bibliographies to a bibliography of agrarian reform. The very useful book on Brazil in the Area Handbook Series is listed under “General sources—other sources,” not under “Politics and government,” and seems to be impossible to locate through the subject index. The book described in the annotation as providing “explanations and instructions for practicing the rituals of candomble written for the novice” (p. 274) seems to be stretching the definition of a reference book. The beginning date of 1965 also means that this guide, while it contains many useful references, can never be as useful as a retrospective bibliography.

Any librarian who has used the useful but cumbersome Complete Haitiana (Guide DB439) will be thrilled by the thought of Haiti: Guide to Periodical Literature in English. But opening the book is like déjà vu all over again, understandable when one learns that the compiler is associated with Lambros Comitas’s Institute for the Study of Man. It is arranged by nine broad topics (the physical setting, the human element, philately, etc.), then by subdivisions which are explained in the “Notes to the User.” Entries are arranged chronologically under each subdivision. Once the shock of the typefaces wears off (the entries are completely capitalized, with the article titles italicized and the journals in boldface) the reader can find a great deal of useful information, though this must be used with care. Surely the Nation and the National Catholic Reporter did not both publish C. McGill’s article “Haitians in Limbo” on the same date and page.

There are author and journal title indexes, but no subject index. The indexes again use all capital letters, strung across the pages with no punctuation separating the different references; they are essentially useless. It is disappointing that the publisher allowed such a useful title to be so poorly presented.—M.C.

HEALTH SCIENCES

Vision and Visual Dysfunction. Ed. John R. Cronly-Dillon. Boca Raton, Fla: CRC Pr., 1991. 17v. (each paginated separately). $1,995/set, $215/volume (ISBN 0–8493–7500–2). LC 90–1881.

This seventeen-volume encyclopedia, originally published in England by the Macmillan Press (1990–91), is constructed around sixteen subject areas. Each comprises a volume on a topic such as visual optics and instrumentation, perception of color, spatial vision, dyslexia, and pattern recognition. The general editor, John Cronly-Dillon, is professor and chairman of the Department of Optometry and Vision Sciences at the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology in England. His purpose is to reflect the multidisciplinary trend in vision science and to provide a repository of current knowledge in the main areas of the field.

Each volume is edited by one or more subject specialists and stands as a coherent work in its own right. The contributors are from the United States, the United Kingdom, Europe, Canada, and Australia. All chapters have been refereed, and the aim throughout has been not only to review current material, but also to explore new ideas and issues that may stimulate novel directions in research. Each volume has its own index, and Volume 17 is a complete contents list and index to all the volumes.

Vision and Visual Dysfunction will be kept up to date by the publication of supplementary volumes that will contain brief summaries of important experimental research results and their developments. It is a unique encyclopedia of by far the greatest breadth and depth of any work ever published on the subject of vision. Scientists, clinicians, and engineers have an extraordinary new reference work on the many facets of a topic that has been the subject of intense activity
over the last forty years. Fortunately this resource can be purchased as a whole or in individual volumes.—L.H.

NEW EDITIONS AND SUPPLEMENTS

Ralph DeSola has expanded the Abbreviations Dictionary (6th ed., 1981. Guide AD36). Now in an eighth edition (Boca Raton, Fla.: CRC Pr., 1992. 1,300 p. $69.95; 7th ed., 1986), the volume offers such features as special lists of zip-coded automatic-processing abbreviations, bell-code signals, criminal and military terms (also featured in DeSola’s Worldwide What & Where and his Crime Dictionary), frequently used signs and symbols such as abbreviations of the airline industry and of naval craft. An appendix includes a list of musical superlatives and of eponyms. The volume is not indexed.

The American Men & Women of Science, 1992–1993: Physical and Biological Sciences is the eighteenth edition (N.Y.: Bowker, [1992]. 8 v. $750; 17th ed., 1989. Suppl. EA75) and has grown to 122,817 engineers and scientists including 7,021 entirely new entries. A small statistical section begins Volume 1.

The Index to Volumes 1–12 of the Australian Dictionary of Biography, 1788–1939 (Melbourne: Univ. Pr.; London: Cambridge Univ. Pr., [1991]. 326 p. See Guide AJ115, Suppl. AJ33 for the set) “references the names of 10,442 individuals, including the 7,211 major entries in the A.D.B. as well as every minor (small-capped) entry and many lesser ones. It also divides these people into 379 separate occupational categories. It further sets out the 612 different countries in which they were born, subdividing these places into states or counties, cities or towns, villages or pastoral stations” (Preface). A consolidated list of corrigenda is included.

In 1977 J. Gordon Melton compiled Religious Bodies in the United States: A Directory based on files at the Institute for Study of American Religion in Santa Barbara, California. He has gone back to these files and has compiled a listing for each religious group known to be operating in the United States as of the summer of 1991, along with its headquarters address and telephone number and a brief paragraph of identification (New York: Garland, 1992. 312 p. $55 Adding to its usefulness is an alphabetical index which includes alternate names.

Invest Yourself: The Catalogue of Volunteer Opportunities. Ed. Susan G. Angus (New York: Commission on Voluntary Service and Action, 1991. 128 p. $7.95) has grown to include about two hundred nongovernmental organizations which offer voluntary service opportunities. Alphabetically organized, the volume provides geographical and category indexes.

Index Islamicus (Guide BB518) has a sixth supplement covering 34,382 entries from the Quarterly Index Islamicus for 1981–1985 (ed. G. J. Roper. London: Mansell, [1991]. 2 v. (1,347 p.). £130). This cumulation takes into account the new sections on music and drama, economics, politics, and Muslim minorities which appeared with the 1983 issues, as well as elaborated subheadings. A subject index is also new. The editor points out that the output of scholarship on the Muslim world is doubling every ten years.

The Reference Library of Black America (Philadelphia: Afro-American Pr., [1990]. 5 v. $179.90) is a repackaging of the fifth edition of the Negro Almanac (Detroit: Gale, 1989) “to facilitate usage among students” (title page).

Gale has been reprinting excerpts from critical writings about various authors and their works, e.g., Contemporary Literary Criticism (Guide BD43), Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism (Guide BD47), Short Story Criticism (Suppl. BD99). There are two new collections which are partly drawn from the earlier volumes in the Literary Criticism Series: Poetry Criticism (v.1, 1991) whose compiler states that this title does not duplicate CLC more than 15 percent and Black Literature Criticism (1992. 3 v.), with about half the entries selected from earlier volumes, but revised.

Richard A. Lanham has reviewed his Handlist of Rhetorical Terms (Berkeley: Univ. Calif. Pr., [1991]. 205 p. $35; 1st ed. 1968. Guide BD347) to provide for easier use, to supply more and more modern examples, and to revise and update the bib-
liography. It is still very much a beginner's guide.

The second edition of the *Oxford Companion to American Theatre* by Gerald Bordman is still as opinionated, entertaining, and useful as the first (New York: Oxford Univ. Pr., 1992. 734p. $49.95; 1st ed., *Guide BG56*). Added are "significant figures, groups, and plays which have appeared since our first writing and the end of 1990" (preface). There are one-sentence updates to many of the articles, and there is still no index.

Christoph Kimmich has updated his *German Foreign Policy, 1918–1945: A Guide to Research and Research Materials* (Wilmington, Del.: Scholarly Resources, [1991]. 264p. $40; 1st ed., 1981, *Guide DC197*). Entries for the archives and libraries have been updated, but it is in the bibliographic portions that the most new material has been added both in the footnotes and in the bibliography chapters. Similar updating has occurred with the French, Italian, German, British, and International Organizations volumes, and new guides for the Soviet Union and for International Economic Relations have appeared.

*Research Guide to Libraries and Archives in the Low Countries*, comp. Martha L. Brogan (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, [1991]. 546p. $75) is similar in arrangement and information to the others in the series commissioned by the Council of European Studies (see the two volumes by E. K. Welsch on France and Germany, *Guide AB133, AB136*, and by Lewanski for Italy, *Guide AB148*). This volume covers libraries and archives in Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg and gives references to any user's guides or books and articles for further reading as well as the expected information on size, address, classification, services, and description, but not hours as the other volumes have done. Additional bibliographical sections feature lists of national bibliographies, union catalogs, national biographical dictionaries, directories and guides to collections, subject guides, and bibliographies. The volume is well indexed.
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New Norms for Reference Desk Staffing Adequacy: A Comparative Study
Deborah Rinderknecht

Severe economic conditions have resulted in budget cutbacks and hiring freezes in many colleges, universities, and their libraries. With the financial crisis in higher education showing no sign of easing, libraries must use their staff efficiently. Norms for reference desk staffing were first compiled by Marjorie E. Murfin in 1983, using 1978–79 data from 73 academic libraries. In order to assess reference desk staffing adequacy ten years later and analyze comparatively any possible fluctuation, this article presents new norms using 1988–89 statistics from more than one hundred academic libraries. These norms may help libraries assess their current and desirable staffing levels and recognize potential problems in providing public service. They establish a basis of comparison with similar institutions and a method of appraisal for measuring the impact of change.

The adequacy of public service desk staffing is a persistent and historical concern of library administrators. In the past decade, higher education institutions have faced severe economic constraints. Budget cutbacks and hiring freezes have become common in colleges, universities, and their libraries. Have these economic conditions affected reference departments’ desk staffing and service?

Norms for reference desk staffing were first compiled by Marjorie E. Murfin in 1983, using a method recommended by the Library Administration and Management Association (LAMA) Task Force on Comparability of Reference Statistics and 1978–79 data collected from 73 academic libraries. Dividing academic libraries into five groups by gate count/enrollment, Murfin calculated norms based on the number of reference transactions and the number of individual reference desk person-hours. In order to assess reference desk staffing adequacy ten years later and to analyze comparatively any possible fluctuation, the author has compiled new norms based on 1988–89 statistics from over 100 academic libraries across the United States and Canada. Such norms have implications for administrative policy and budget planning. They may help libraries assess their current and desirable staffing levels and recognize potential problems in providing public service by establishing a basis of comparison with similar institutions and a method of appraising the effects of change.

**METHOD**

In order to facilitate comparability, as in the Murfin study, data were collected only on main library central reference
Survey data were requested from over 220 academic libraries at four-year institutions of all sizes. ARL member libraries at institutions of higher education were targeted first. The remaining libraries in the study were selected randomly from the American Library Directory, with attention given to providing a balanced representation of libraries by their size (based on holdings) and a minimum of two academic libraries from each state. Information requested in the survey included:

1. Gate (turnstile) count indicating the number of patrons in the library during a typical week (i.e., third to sixth week in the academic term) in the fall of 1988;
2. Number of hours the department is open for service;
3. Individual person-hours (number of individuals staffing the desk each hour it is open) for the reference desk in the same week;
4. Number of reference question transactions, using Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) transaction definitions, for a typical week (i.e., third to sixth week in the academic term) in the fall of 1988, preferably from or comparable to data supplied to the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS).

The use of gate count to explain variance in the number of reference transactions has been supported by several studies, including one by John J. Regazzi and Rodney M. Hersberger, who found that the relationship between the number of reference transactions moderately correlated to the number of users present (.74 correlation). Another study by Murfin and Fred Ruland found that .80 of the variation in the number of reference transactions could be explained by two factors: (1) the number of library patrons present, and (2) the number of individual reference desk person-hours during that time period. By using both gate count and person-hours, it is possible to estimate the probable number of reference transactions during a typical week. When libraries with similar gate counts were studied, the library with more person-hours usually had the larger number of reference transactions. While gate count is one of the best predictors of public service activities since it tallies actual library users, it is not always recognized as such. Some libraries do not take a gate count, while others sometimes take it in an inaccurate, careless fashion. Certain organizational factors can sometimes inflate gate count. Such circumstances as the presence of academic classrooms in the library building or the library serving as a walkway connecting other classroom buildings were taken into account when determining which returned surveys had usable sets of data for compiling new norms.

In a few cases enrollment was substituted for gate count, though it is a less desirable statistic to use in compiling the new norms. Calculating reference desk staff person-hours for a sample week is accomplished by counting the number of individuals staffing the reference desk each of the hours the desk is open for service. This information can usually be obtained quite easily by referring to the weekly reference desk schedule. These numbers are then totalled to obtain the person-hours per week. The number of person-hours is also a good predictor of public service activities. Richard Strayner, in his study of public library effectiveness, found person-hours data to have the highest correlation of all the performance measures he assessed. Murfin's study of 1978 norms also recognized the significance of person-hours in assessing the adequacy of reference desk staffing. Using person-hours data, reference transactions totals, and gate count it is possible to assess factors such as library demand, individual workloads, and potential workloads.

Reference transaction totals are most important when studying the workload of staff, especially since workload may affect the quality of service provided. The number of reference transactions in relation to gate count may also shed light on the level of success a reference department has reaching its users. While many
libraries are accustomed to recording statistics at the reference desk, it is recognized that there are some dangers in attempting to use such data. Some libraries do not apply the HEGIS definitions for reference and directional questions strictly when recording reference desk transactions. The knowledge of the actual workload of reference librarians would be enhanced if a differentiation by type of reference question and time spent answering were included in the study; however, this information is not collected in a sufficient number of libraries at the present time. Unorthodox methods of gathering statistics were also revealed in a few instances. Every attempt was made to verify the validity of any unusual or questionable survey responses. When the factors mentioned above were present, that institution's survey data were omitted. Only a small number of libraries fell into this category. The author also recognizes that some library reference departments and their desk staff are more conscientious than others in collecting reference transaction data. However, while some librarians may underrecord reference transactions, others may overestimate the number of their transactions, preserving the value of these data.

With many different sections of a university competing for diminishing economic resources, library administrators must use relevant performance indicators and output measures to demonstrate the ability of the library to manage its resources congruent to its mission. Reference service has always been perceived as difficult to quantify and therefore assess, but many reference departments already record statistics in several areas of activity. With an emphasis on accountability in the face of the present economic climate, reference departments and library administrators should consider the ways in which quantifiable data (often already available) can be useful. By using gate count and person-hours, it may be possible to explain some of the disparity between similar libraries’ differing reference question transaction totals and to help identify staffing inadequacies.

More than 60% of the surveys were returned, 103 libraries providing usable sets of data. Of these, 26 libraries (25%) were included in the Murfin study of 1978–79 norms. In order to facilitate comparison with the Murfin study, returned library survey data were again stratified into five groups by their gate counts (occasionally substitution was made with their institution’s enrollment). Sixty-one libraries had less than 20,000 library users, and 42 libraries had more than 20,000 library users, based on their gate counts for one week.

When gate counts increase and person hours decrease … the quality of reference service may suffer.

In order to preserve the comparability of the two studies, the present data are defined (as in the Murfin study) in the following way:

| Group I | Under 10,000 gate count |
|---------|------------------------|
| Group II| 10,000–19,999 gate count |
| Group III| 20,000–29,999 gate count |
| Group IV| 30,000–39,999 gate count |
| Group V | 40,000 plus gate count |

Several key areas in the assessment of reference desk staffing adequacy include demand, potential demand, and workload. Using the data from returned surveys, the author compiled new norms for each of the above library groups by size.

MEASUREMENT AND NORMS

Norms are imperfect approximations and should not be used to provide absolute answers. Rather, they are only one of many tools for assessing the adequacy of staffing. Norms should not be used as standards since they represent the existing situation, which may fall far short of the most desirable level. Attempts were made to identify reference departments with such dissimilar physical configurations as to threaten the comparability of the norms. Some libraries with subject
division arrangements (separate reference desks), or where no central general reference desk service could be identified, are two examples of dissimilar configurations that were revealed. In cases such as these, the author chose to exclude data and maintain the integrity of the norms being compiled. If a library, comparing itself to the norms of libraries of the same size, should fall outside the norms presented here, it should exercise care in its interpretation, considering any possible differences in usage, individual internal structure, or other factors which might account for it. These norms should act primarily to alert libraries to possible staffing inadequacies, and to help reference departments and administrators to monitor reference desk staffing in their libraries on an ongoing basis.

GATE COUNT AND DEMAND

As previously stated, gate count has a high correlation to the number of reference transactions a library will log. This makes gate count an important variable to consider in any study of reference desk staffing adequacy. Table 1 illustrates the average gate count of each of the five library groups during 1978 and again in 1988.

The average gate counts do not generally show an increase, except in group V. The most dramatic increase in the number of users appears to be in the largest libraries (group V), where the 1988 average gate count reflects a 6% increase. This information alone may have limited value, but if it is used to study demand and other factors relevant to staffing adequacy, then its significance may become more apparent.

| GATE COUNT: USERS IN THE LIBRARY | 1978 | 1988 |
|----------------------------------|------|------|
| Group I                          | 6,029| 6,051|
| Group II                         | 14,978| 15,014|
| Group III                        | 23,794| 23,699|
| Group IV                         | 34,574| 33,827|
| Group V                          | 42,508| 45,208|

Historically, librarians have focused on the number of reference transactions as the key to assessing patron demand at the reference desk. By examining reference transactions over an extended period of time (i.e., an academic term), librarians can learn when the greatest volume of reference questions are asked. However, this method does not account for those patrons who walk away during busy periods without receiving assistance or for patrons who simply do not approach because they are dissuaded by long queues and the prospect of a long wait at the desk. For this reason, when considering reference desk staffing adequacy it is important not to equate the number of reference transactions with demand. As previously stated, studies have shown that if the number of users (gate count) were equal among libraries, then the one with more person-hours staffing the desk would be most likely to have the highest total of reference transactions. Therefore, the number of reference transactions is only representative of demand demonstrated and met within the limitations of current staffing.

Three of the five groups show an increase since 1978 in the average number of reference questions received during the sample week, and the average number of reference questions received overall increased 6% between 1978 and 1988. The same library groups that showed the increase in average gate count also showed an increase in the average number of reference question transactions. Group I libraries (gate counts under 10,000) had the largest average increase in reference transactions handled, with a 12% increase, followed by group V libraries (the largest libraries, with gate counts of 40,000 plus) with an increase of 9%, and group II libraries (gate counts 10,000–19,999) with an increase of 5%.

One measure used in the Murfin study to assess the extent to which reference service is meeting demand is the ratio of library users per reference question. This
TABLE 2
REFERENCE QUESTION TRANSACTIONS

|       | 1978 | 1988 |
|-------|------|------|
| Group I | 337  | 378  |
| Group II | 898  | 939  |
| Group III | 1,320| 1,228|
| Group IV | 1,158| 1,054|
| Group V  | 1,276| 1,387|

TABLE 3
DEMANDS AS MET BY PRESENT STAFFING: REFERENCE QUESTION RECEIVED IN PROPORTION TO USERS PRESENT

|       | 1978       | 1988       |
|-------|------------|------------|
| Group I | 1 in 17.86 | 1 in 16.00|
| Group II | 1 in 16.68 | 1 in 15.99|
| Group III | 1 in 18.02| 1 in 19.30|
| Group IV | 1 in 29.84| 1 in 32.09|
| Group V  | 1 in 33.30| 1 in 32.59|

TABLE 4
GATE COUNT: USERS IN THE LIBRARY

|       | 1978  | 1988  |
|-------|-------|-------|
| Group I | 5.6%  | 6.2%  |
| Group II | 6.0  | 6.2  |
| Group III | 5.5  | 5.2  |
| Group IV | 3.4  | 3.1  |
| Group V  | 3.0  | 3.1  |

TABLE 5
PERSON HOURS AT CENTRAL REFERENCE DESK

|       | 1978  | 1988  |
|-------|-------|-------|
| Group I | 92    | 96    |
| Group II | 141   | 129   |
| Group III | 161   | 164   |
| Group IV | 147   | 129   |
| Group V  | 169   | 170   |

is attained by dividing the HEGIS week gate count by the number of reference questions during the same week. Table 3 displays library demand as met by present staffing from the 1978 data survey and the author's study based on 1988 data.

Another measure used by Murfin to determine the capacity of reference departments to reach their users is the percentage of library users involved in asking reference questions. This is an alternative way of using the same data to study demand. To obtain this percentage, the total number of reference questions for each group was divided by the total gate count in the same group. Table 4 shows the results of this measure using 1978 and 1988 data.

There may be several possible reasons why the libraries with the largest gate counts seem to be reaching the smallest percentage of their users. One likely explanation is that while gate counts increase in libraries, person-hours staffing the reference desk rarely increase proportionally. Another reason, cited in several studies, is that as gate count increases, fewer patrons in the library will ask reference questions. Waiting to consult a librarian, queuing at the reference desk, and competing for the assistance of reference desk personnel will discourage some patrons from getting the help they need. Eventually high gate counts may reach a point at which current staffing can no longer assist patrons at the same level of success (percentage of patrons reached) and/or maintain the standard or level of reference service a library has traditionally offered its patrons. If it is desirable to improve or maintain the level of success and/or the standard of reference service in a library, then it is appropriate to monitor library demand.

PERSON-HOURS AND WORKLOAD

To appreciate fully the impact of fluctuations in gate count and reference transactions on the adequacy of reference desk staffing, it is necessary to scrutinize the individual person-hours scheduled at the reference desk during the same survey week. Table 5 reveals
the person-hours norms for each library group (by gate count size) in 1978 and 1988.

While the total average gate count and the number of reference transactions increased 7% and 6% respectively, new norms for person-hours staffing the reference desk indicate a total average decrease of 3%. Certain individual libraries that participated in both data studies showed such extreme increases or decreases in some areas that might warrant special attention and caution. Table 6 gives several examples of such libraries.

Libraries A and B in table 6 have substantially increased their reference transactions and gate counts, despite a sizable decrease (21% and 40% respectively) in their person-hours at the reference desk. Library C increased its gate by 15%, but decreased its person-hours by 16% and reference transactions by 31%. Library C is possibly responding to the increased gate count and lower person-hours at the reference desk in a different manner than libraries A and B. When gate counts increase and person-hours decrease significantly outside the norms, as in these examples, the quality of reference service may suffer as staff members may try to compensate to satisfy the growing demand of users, or the number of reference transactions will also decline proportionately as desk staff try to prevent an erosion of quality in reference service. Although individual library circumstances might be responsible for some disparities, differences outside the norms, such as those in table 6, should alert administrators to the possibility of a severe problem in staffing adequacy.

Among the matching 26 libraries that participated in both the 1978 and 1988 studies, 16 (62%) had increases in the number of reference transactions and 14 (54%) had fewer person-hours staffing the desk (one library maintained the same number of person-hours). The matching library groups have shown the most fluctuation in the largest size (by gate count) libraries. The matching libraries in group IV (gate counts 30,000–39,999) show an average increase of 20% in gate count (users), while average person-hours and reference transactions have declined 20% and 3% respectively. Group V of the matching libraries increased its average gate count 44% and reference transactions 10%, while average person hours decreased 14% between 1978 and 1988. When analyzing a specific library’s person hours, it is important to evaluate in terms of reference transactions and gate count and also to consider the goals and mission of the library.

Individual workload of reference desk staff is another important factor in assessing staffing adequacy, as well as the quality of reference service. Workload is obtained by dividing the number of reference questions by the number of person-hours during the same typical week. Table 7 illustrates the new norms for individual workload with the 1978 norms sized by their gate counts.

Four of the five groups, excluding group III, in table 7 increased their average individual workloads at the reference desk. The overall average workload increased 8% between 1978 and 1988. While groups I and II (the smallest by gate count) have increased their average workloads the most, 26% and 14% respectively, these libraries may be better able to handle moderate increases because of their smaller sizes. Groups IV and V, increasing their workloads by 3% and 8% respectively, may have some libraries extending themselves beyond...
TABLE 7

INDIVIDUAL WORKLOAD NORMS

| Group | 1978 | 1988 |
|-------|------|------|
| Group I | 3.49 | 4.41 |
| Group II | 6.36 | 7.28 |
| Group III | 8.20 | 7.48 |
| Group IV | 7.88 | 8.15 |
| Group V | 7.55 | 8.16 |

TABLE 8

POTENTIAL WORKLOAD NORMS BASED ON GATE COUNT

| Group | 1978 | 1988 |
|-------|------|------|
| Group I | 65.5 | 70.4 |
| Group II | 106.2 | 116.4 |
| Group III | 147.8 | 144.5 |
| Group IV | 235.2 | 262.2 |
| Group V | 251.5 | 265.9 |

what is desirable for quality service because of their increasing gate counts/enrollments and reference transactions and their declining average person-hours.

Potential workload attempts to measure the adequacy of staffing based on potential patron use and to assess what impact this might have on the workload of reference desk staff. Potential workload is calculated by dividing the number of users (gate count) in the library by the number of person hours staffing the desk during the same week. Gate count is preferred over enrollment data; however, studies have shown both to be good predictors of library usage. Table 8 shows the norms for potential workload based on gate count in 1978 and 1988.

Potential workload norms have increased an average of 10% overall between 1978 and 1988, as illustrated in table 8. While enrollments and gate counts have increased in recent years, many libraries have reduced person-hours in staffing due to budgetary constraints. As has been stated previously, the number of reference questions is closely correlated to the number of person-hours. As gate count increases and person-hours decrease the percentage of users reached will most likely also decline. If reference librarians increase their workloads well above the norm to assist the increasing volume of patrons, quality of service may suffer. Potential workload may be helpful in examining reasons why a library is reaching a lower percentage of its users than is desired. Murfin showed that potential patron workloads of more than 300 have a strong and dire effect on the number of patrons able to receive service. Libraries with potential patron workloads exceeding 200 have shown a tendency to fall short of a "good" level of reference success in the Wisconsin-Ohio Reference Evaluation Program, a project of Marjorie Murfin (Ohio State University Libraries) and Charles Bunge (University of Wisconsin-Madison). Nineteen of the surveyed libraries in the present study exceeded 200 libraries with potential patron workloads exceeding 200 have shown a tendency to fall short of a "good" level of success.

SUMMARY

At present the fluctuation of norms for reference desk staffing is not yet alarming. However, evidence suggests a decline of person-hours in reference staffing and in the ability of staff to accommodate an increased volume of users. This deterioration has not yet reached a crisis stage, but does warrant continued study to prevent further decline. Certain libraries, based on their survey data, have already reached what for them may be a crisis stage in staffing. Only careful study by these individual libraries will determine if indeed this is the case.

With the economic crisis in higher education becoming more severe in recent years, it is essential for libraries to use their staff efficiently and effectively. By
assessing the adequacy of desk staffing and comparing it with similar institutions, it may be possible to gain some insight for the future.

How are reference departments adjusting to increased service demands and queuing at the desk? Some libraries have reduced the number of reference service points or cut hours, eliminated or restricted phone reference, and/or reduced the provision of tours and individualized bibliographic instruction classes. Other libraries have made changes in public service desk staffing. One of these changes is the initiation of the information desk or catalog assistance desk, often staffed by students or support staff. More than forty of the responding libraries in the present data study have an information desk, many initiated in the past ten years. Another staffing change reported by surveyed reference departments was the increased use of paraprofessional and student assistants at reference service points. Future studies of reference staffing might examine any subsequent effect these changes may have on reference service.
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he literature of librarian status, faculty status in particular, has a long history of continuous publication that shows no sign of abating. In 1984, Patricia Ohl Rice recorded that "the literature of librarianship now contains hundreds of articles and several books on [this] subject... One conservative estimate, based on searches of Library Literature, ERIC, DAI, and Huling's (1973) [comprehensive] bibliography, places the figure well in excess of three hundred items." Karl E. Johnson's 1992 comprehensive bibliography, which supplements Huling, contains more than three hundred entries. He records a high of 219 faculty status titles published in the 1970s and more than one hundred in the 1980s. Although this voluminous literature has been mapped by bibliographies and reviews, it remains time-consuming to master for either practical applications in libraries or further research. First of all, faculty status literature contains a variety of data and views. Fred Batt has identified nine categories (bibliographies, surveys, position papers, etc.) into which it can be divided. No matter how it is analyzed, this literature includes at least four kinds of information:

- A record of the Association of College and Research Libraries' long-term effort to establish a strong role for academic librarians;
- The experiences of librarians who seek appropriate status in their institutions;
- Survey reports which quantify academic librarians' working conditions and views and record traditional faculty members' and others' assessments of librarians' contributions to academe;
- The views of those who support or oppose faculty status, advice to librarians, and other expressions of opinion.

In addition, faculty status is difficult to limit by subject. It is, in fact, not possible to determine the total number of faculty status publications because this topic is inseparable from related subjects: research, salary, and other contents of the nine standards, as well as academic status and wider issues regarding libraries, career development, women's professions, etc. While this characteristic may enrich and keep librarian faculty status in the wider contexts of academe and professionalism, it also precludes its containment as a subject.

Despite this diversity and the breadth of approaches which have been applied to status problems, these issues persistently defy resolution; and statements of frustration over librarians' undefined and under-recognized role also are common in the literature. Faculty status, as defined by the

---
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nine standards, has not been realized fully; neither have writers who decry librarians’ interest in faculty status proposed alternatives that attract much support.

In sum, faculty status literature is vast and diverse; its subject boundaries are indeterminate; and the issues it addresses remain unresolved. It is, nevertheless, the record of academic librarians’ efforts to secure the authority their responsibilities require. Research and thought on status must continue and must be fortified by awareness of this history if librarians’ right to make decisions about library programs is to be asserted successfully. The purpose of this bibliography is to help users of faculty status literature confidently apply its recorded experience to librarian status questions.

**COVERAGE**

This bibliography covers faculty status and, more selectively, its related subjects. It lists:
- Bibliographies and review articles, current and retrospective;
- Titles recommended as worth examining on the basis of the following criteria:
  1. Have historical value; aid understanding of the background of status issues;
  2. Are frequently cited;
  3. Present unique topics or innovative views or approaches;
  4. Contain substantial references to publications of significance as described in criteria 1 to 3.

Related subjects are represented in the bibliography, primarily by titles that are cited often or contain references equal to a basic bibliography of the subject. Geographic coverage, generally, is limited to North America.

**ARRANGEMENT**

The bibliography has three sections:
- A bibliography of bibliographies and reviews. The literature of faculty status is well-covered by bibliographies and review articles from its beginnings in the nineteenth century to the present, and bibliographers have taken reasonable care to assure full coverage. The large, general bibliographies that substantially cover faculty status literature are Huling (No. 4), coverage through 1973; Johnson (No. 5), 1974-1991; and Werrell and Sullivan (No. 8), selective coverage, 1974-1985. Annotations of titles in this bibliography also cited by any of these large bibliographies are followed by H, J, or W.
- Selective recent publications, 1985–1992. Titles in this section aid understanding of status issues (criterion 1), introduce new perspectives (criterion 3), or contain useful references (criterion 4). In addition, this section includes recent notable faculty status titles that do not appear in other bibliographies.
- Early, frequently cited titles, published through 1985. Titles that have historical value or are frequently cited (criteria 1 and 2) appear in this final section.

**SOURCES**

This bibliography grew from the interest of the Academic Status Committee, Association of College and Research Libraries, in facilitating association members’ use of faculty status literature. The committee has a “consulting role in working with individuals or groups in addressing faculty status issues in individual institutions,” and is mindful of the need, sometimes urgent, for academic librarians to be aware of librarian status documents and other materials.

The basic sources examined in the preparation of the bibliography are those traditionally consulted by researchers and bibliographers in librarianship and information science: Dissertation Abstracts International, ERIC, LISA, and Library Literature. In addition, browsing in the Information and Library Studies Library, University of Michigan, revealed useful unindexed items. Familiarity with faculty status literature developed during an examination of faculty status surveys and making and remaking the case for full faculty status for librarians at Oakland University also supported this project.
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ABBREVIATIONS

ACRL Standards—Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians, 1971 (No. 51) and 1992 (No. 12)

H—Cited in N. Huling’s bibliography (No. 4)
J—Cited in K. Johnson’s bibliography (No. 5)
W—Cited in E. Werrell and L. Sullivan’s bibliography (No. 8)

DEFINITIONS

Academic Status—"An official recognition by an institution of postsecondary education that librarians are part of the instructional and research staff, but normally without entitlement to ranks and titles identical to those of faculty, and frequently without commensurate benefits, privileges, rights, and responsibilities.” (ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science. ALA, 1983, p.1.)

Faculty Status—"An official recognition by an institution of postsecondary education that librarians are part of the instructional and research staff by conferment of ranks and titles identical to those of faculty, and commensurate benefits, privileges, rights, and responsibilities.” (ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science. ALA, 1983, p.9.)

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND REVIEWS

1. Batt, Fred. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: Justified or Just a Farce?" Issues in Academic Librarianship: Views and Case Studies for the 1980s and 1990s Ed. by Peter Spyers-Duran and Thomas W. Mann, Jr. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1985. 115–28. 
Reviews faculty status literature dividing the topic into nine categories that include bibliographies, surveys, and policies; analyses by geography, institution, etc.; broader topics in academe; subtopics of faculty status; and position papers. "Optional faculty status" for individual librarians is an alternative to "force-fitting" librarians into the faculty mold. 40 notes. J.

2. DeBoer, Kee, and Wendy Culotta. "The Academic Librarian and Faculty Status in the 1980s: A Survey of the Literature." College & Research Libraries 48 (May 1987): 215–23. Reprinted in Academic Status: Statements and Resources (No. 9).
A "composite profile of the current academic librarian" as reflected in the literature. Topics covered include faculty versus academic status, tenure and other provisions of the ACRL Standards, publishing pressure and productivity. 97 notes. J.
3. Harring, Mark Y. “A Race between Education and Catastrophe: The MLS and Beyond: Tenure and Faculty Status.” *Controversial Issues in Librarianship: An Annotated Bibliography, 1960–1984.* New York: Garland, 1987. 282–86.  
A selective list of 20 journal articles on various aspects of faculty status. Nine of these articles, mostly dating from the late 1970s, make forceful arguments pro and con.

4. Huling, Nancy. “Faculty Status: A Comprehensive Bibliography.” *College & Research Libraries* 34 (Nov. 1973): 440–62.

The basic annotated bibliography of librarian faculty status, 1878–1973. Lists 218 titles. Supplemented by Werrell (No. 8) and by Johnson (No. 5).

5. Johnson, Karl E. *An Annotated Bibliography of Faculty Status in Library and Information Science.* University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library and Information Science. Occasional Papers 193. Champaign, Ill.: Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Publications Office, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1992. 66 pp.

A supplement to Huling (No. 4). This comprehensive bibliography cites over three hundred English-language items published 1973–1991, including a few pre-1973 titles not listed by Huling. Each citation is followed by the original abstract or a brief annotation.

6. Krompart, Janet, and Clara DiFelice. “A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971–1984.” *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 13 (Mar. 1987): 14–18. Reprinted in *Academic Status: Statements and Resources* (No. 9).

A review of thirty-six surveys published since adoption of the ACRL Standards 1971. The surveys document disparity and confusion between stated goals of the profession and actual circumstances of librarians. 20 notes. J.

7. Werrell, Emily, and Laura Sullivan. “Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature.” *College & Research Libraries* 48 (Mar. 1987): 95–103. Reprinted in *Academic Status: Statements and Resources* (No. 9).

Summarizes trends in opinions about faculty status in the literature, 1974–1987. Also reviews writings on publication/scholarship, governance and collegiality, librarians as teachers, and collective bargaining. 56 notes. J.

8. ———. “Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: An Annotated Bibliography.” 1985. ERIC, ED 274 364. 57 pp.

A selective list of 121 titles, 1974–1985. “General or view pieces on faculty status or an aspect of it.” Supplements Huling (No. 4) and is supplemented by Johnson (No. 5). J.

**SELECTIVE RECENT PUBLICATIONS, 1985–1992**

9. American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Academic Status Committee. *Academic Status: Statements and Resources.* Chicago: ACRL, 1988. 58 pp.

A collection that contains the ACRL Standards 1971 (No. 51), other standards and guidelines related to faculty status, reprints of review articles on faculty status (Nos. 2, 6, and 7), and a select bibliography of 44 titles. J.

10. ———. “ACRL Guidelines for Academic Status for College and University Libraries.” *College & Research Libraries News* 51 (Mar. 1990): 245–46.

Nine guidelines for “institutions which have not yet achieved faculty rank, status, and tenure for academic librarians.” Approved by the ACRL Board at the Midwinter Meeting 1990. J.

11. ———. “ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians: A Draft Revision.” *College & Research Libraries News* 51 (May 1990): 402–04.

 Discusses Academic Status Committee plans for revision of the ACRL Standards 1971 and invites those interested in influencing the reformulation of this draft revision of the ACRL Standards to attend a 1990 (ALA, Chicago) hearing or contact the ASC directly.

12. ———. “Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians.” *College & Research Libraries News* 53 (May 1992): 317–18.

The revised version of the ACRL Standards 1971 passed by the ACRL Board of Directors, July 3, 1991 and approved by the ALA Standards Committee, January 1992. Prefatory material presents rationale and history of this revision. Compare No. 51, ACRL Standards 1971.

13. Arlen, Shelley, and Nedria Santizo. “Administrative Support for Research: A Survey of Library Faculty.” *Library Administration and Management* 4 (Fall 1990): 208–12.

A report on 56 surveys on release time and other support for research received by librarians with faculty status in 37 ARL libraries. Librarian scholarship is poorly supported, but there is a trend to repair this lack. This support is especially important for untenured librarians whose hire and training represent a considerable cost to the institution. 20 notes.
14. Atkins, Stephen E. "Academic Librarians and the University." The Academic Library in the American University. Chicago: ALA, 1991. 159–88. Discusses problems facing academic librarians (technological change, difficult clientele, teaching and research demands, etc.). The major adjustment librarians must make is to increase their understanding of academe and the politics of working with traditional faculty and other elements of their university. 142 notes.

15. Benedict, Marjorie A. "Librarians' Satisfaction with Faculty Status." College & Research Libraries 52 (Nov. 1991): 538–48. Results of two surveys of opinion (1982 and 1989) on faculty status conducted among librarians in eight institutions of the State University of New York system. Academic faculty status was preferred, but sentiment for equitable faculty status was also strong. Satisfaction was greater where conditions conformed to the ACRL Standards. 8 notes. J.

16. Blake, Fay M. "In the Eye of the Storm: Academic Librarianship in the Sixties." Activism in American Librarianship, 1962-1973. Ed. by Mary Lee Bundy and Frederick J. Stielow. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1987. 61–72. Describes librarians' traditional "handmaiden's" role, the recognition of the need for change which flourished with the social unrest of the 1960s, and improvements made in librarians' status at the University of California at Los Angeles. 17 notes.

17. Boice, Robert, Jordan M. Scepanski, and Wayne Wilson. "Librarians and Faculty Members: Coping with Pressures to Publish." College & Research Libraries 48 (Nov. 1987): 494–503. A study of librarians and traditional faculty, done by a professor of psychology. The two groups' competence and approaches to research and publication are similar. Both need to improve effectiveness of their use of time. 18 notes. J.

18. Brody, Catherine T. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: The Dream and the Reality." Bookmark 45 (Fall 1986): 42–47. ERIC, ED 287 479. 5 pp. The perspective of a library director (New York City Technical College, City University of New York). Reports CUNY's experience with faculty status and calls for librarians to increase activity in their profession and to improve communication with university administrators and others in their institutions. J.

19. Cain, Mark E. "Academic and Research Librarians: Who Are We?" Journal of Librarianship 14 (Nov. 1988): 292–96. A demographic report: age, year of library degree, sex, geographic location, education, and language and professional skills of a 1986 sampling of 1,771 academic and research librarians in North America. Included here as useful information for faculty status research projects. 2 notes.

20. Clinefelter, Ruth W., and Jack E. Hibbs. "The Neglected Information Specialist." Academe 75 (July–Aug. 1989): 26–30. Discusses barriers to salary equity between academic librarians and traditional faculty in terms of the uneven progress in realization of the ACRL Standards. 6 notes.

21. D'Amicantonio, John. Evaluating Library Faculty. 1989. ERIC, ED 311 787. 9 pp. Describes modifications made by librarians to the California State University at Long Beach faculty retention, tenure, and promotion document. These changes included adding descriptions of librarian skills criteria. Peer review and other sections appropriate to librarians were not changed. 8 notes.

22. DeVinney, Gemma. "Academic Librarians and Academic Freedom in the United States: A History and Analysis." Libri 36 (1986): 24–39. Traces the history of academic freedom and compares its application to traditional faculty and librarians. Academic freedom for librarians largely has had an intellectual freedom model, which focuses on library users' right to information, while the professional model for other faculty is centered on professional status. 74 notes. J.

23. ———. "The 1965–1974 Faculty Status Movement as a Professionalization Effort with Social Movement Characteristics: A Case Study of the State University of New York." Diss., State University of New York at Buffalo, 1987. 332 p. State University of New York librarians made intense efforts to achieve full faculty status during the period 1965–1974. Their activities during these years included lobbying for academic ranks, establishing the SUNY Library Association, and participating in collective bargaining. Not seen: annotation based on Dissertation Abstracts International 48 (1988): 2481A.

24. DeVinney, Gemma, and Mary L. Reichel. "Faculty Status: Lessons from the Past." Building on the First Century. Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Cincinnati, April 5–6, 1989. Ed. by Janice C. Fennell. Chicago: ACRL, 1989. 12–14.
Expresses concern that librarians may forget the history of faculty status and become willing to relinquish gains, such as, access to academic promotions. Proposes an oral history project of interviews with pioneers of faculty status and a faculty status think tank to identify a future agenda. 11 notes.

25. Gamble, Lynne E. “University Service: New Implications for Academic Librarians.” Journal of Academic Librarianship 14 (Jan. 1989): 344-47.

Emphasizes the critical importance of university service for academic libraries and librarians, using the California State University system as an example. Faculty status has opened the door to a librarian role in governance. 15 notes. J.

26. Gatten, Jeffrey N. “Professionalism Revisited: Faculty Status and Academic Librarians.” Ohio Library Association Bulletin 57 (Apr. 1987): 30-35.

Opposes faculty status. Librarians should ally themselves with librarians in a unified profession instead of “declaring allegiance to the teaching faculty.” 9 notes. J.

27. Germann, Malcolm P., Michael Kelly, and Rebecca Schreiner-Robles. “Faculty Status or Academic Status: Must We Choose?” Building on the First Century. Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Cincinnati, Apr. 5-8, 1989. Ed. by Janice C. Fennell. Chicago: ACRL, 1989. 15-18

Librarians at Wichita State University have kept faculty status but revised their tenure and promotion document to incorporate features of academic status. 2 notes. Copy of rev. document appended. J.

28. Hall, H. Palmer, and Caroline Byrd, eds. The Librarian in the University: Essays on Membership in the Academic Community. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1990. 199 p.

A collection of 18 essays under the categories “The Librarian in University Governance”, “The Librarian as Teacher”, “Research, Publication and Networking…”, and “The Librarian and the Student…”, and a bibliographical essay which offers a starting point for librarians and other faculty to inform themselves about university participation beyond their libraries and academic units.

29. Herubel, Jean-Pierre V. M. “To ‘Degree’ or not to ‘Degree’: Academic Librarians and Subject Expertise.” College & Research Libraries News 52 (July/Aug. 1991): 437.

A brief position paper that explores the pros and cons of additional graduate degrees for librarians. “Librarians should undergo this rite of passage” which enlarges their skills and contribution to academic. 2 notes.

30. Hill, Fred E., and Robert Hauptman. “A New Perspective on Faculty Status.” College & Research Libraries 47 (Mar. 1986): 156-59.

A study of whether librarians deserve faculty status, done following a random survey of librarians which showed faculty status continues as an important issue. Similarities between librarians and medical school faculty are worth investigating to determine the most appropriate model for librarians. Only librarians who teach, perform research, and publish should have faculty status. 9 notes. J.

31. Jackson, Joseph A., and R. Wilburn Clouse. “Academic Library Status: A Review of Employment Opportunities.” Behavioral and Social Sciences Librarian 6.3-4 (1988): 139-66.

A study of 527 Chronicle of Higher Education advertisements for librarian positions that covers some of the ACRL Standards: ranks, calendar, research, etc. Academic rank and tenure, research and publication requirements, and the 12-month calendar are among the common features of these advertisements. 13 notes. J.

32. Kellogg, Rebecca. “Faculty Members and Academic Librarians: Distinctive Differences.” College & Research Libraries News 48 (Nov. 1987): 602-06.

Observations of an administrator (associate dean, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Arizona), who is also a librarian, regarding administrators’ views of librarians and traditional faculty. Librarians should set aside the status question and focus on communicating librarians’ unique knowledge and their contributions to institutional goals. J.

33. Kirkland, Janice J. “Equity and Entitlement: Internal Barriers to Improving the Pay of Academic Librarians.” College & Research Libraries 52 (July 1991): 375-80.

Social and psychological research data are appropriate for an understanding of librarians’ psychological barriers to attaining the rewards they deserve and for identifying the skills they need to gain equitable salaries. 16 notes.

34. Lawson, V. Lonnie. “Faculty Status of Academic Librarians in Missouri.” Show-Me Libraries 38 (June 1987): 3-8.

A survey of ten public university library directors in Missouri which asks about the status of librarians at these schools and the directors’ opinions of faculty status. Whether faculty...
status is "contrived status" for librarians remains a debated question. 4 notes; bibliography of 8 items.

35. Leonard, W. Patrick. "More Librarians Should Consider Periodic Classroom Assignments." Journal of Academic Librarianship 15 (Mar. 1989): 28, 33.

Leonard, vice chancellor for academic services at Purdue University, Westville, Indiana, feels that, local conditions permitting, librarians should engage in classroom teaching. The benefits include ameliorating librarian isolation from mainstream teaching and learning. J.

36. Meyer, Richard W. "Earnings Gains through the Institutionalized Standard of Faculty Status." Library Administration and Management 4 (Fall 1990): 184–93.

An application of economic theory and methodology to salary and other data for librarians and faculty at Clemson and fifteen other universities. Faculty status raises librarian salaries collectively, but institutional productivity (i.e., doctoral degrees to total degrees granted, used here as a simple proxy) is lower where librarian publication rates are high. 23 notes.

37. Mitchell, Wilfrid Bede. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: Compliance with Standards, Opinions of University Administrators, and a Comparison of Tenure-Success Records of Librarians and Instructional Faculty." Diss., Montana State University, 1989. 173 p.

Reports a mail/telephone survey of academic administrators, library directors, and librarians active in the faculty status movement "to determine whether certain concerns about librarian faculty status are justified." Among the findings: there is no trend to or from application of the ACRL Standards; librarian and other faculty tenure rates are similar; most administrators favor an alternative to the Standards. Not seen: annotation based on Dissertation Abstracts International 50 (1990): 1827A.

38. Mullins, James L. "Faculty Status of Librarians: A Comparative Study of Two Universities in the United Kingdom and How They Compare to the Association of College and Research Libraries Standards." Academic Librarianship Past, Present, and Future: A Festschrift in Honor of David Kaser. Ed. by John Richardson, Jr., and Jinnie Y. Davis. Englewood, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, 1989. 67–78.

Case studies of Oxford University and the University of Bristol conducted to determine to what extent their librarians' status fits criteria that parallel the ACRL Standards. Status for British librarians is less well defined, but their circumstances are similar to those of U.S. librarians. 29 notes.

39. Oberg, Larry R., Mary Kay Schleiter, and Michael Van Houten. "Faculty Perceptions of Librarians at Albion College: Status, Role, Contribution, and Contacts." College & Research Libraries 50 (Mar. 1989): 215–30.

A survey of Albion faculty asked for views of librarians' status, role, and contribution. Among the findings: faculty often do not distinguish librarians from support staff but the greater faculty contact with librarians is, the greater is their support for librarians' tenure, faculty rank, etc. 30 notes. Copy of survey questionnaire included. J.

40. Olevnik, Peter P. A Study of the Organizational Implications of Faculty Status for Librarians in the College Library. 1986. ERIC, ED 270 121. 24 pp.

A report on 235 responses to a random survey of directors in public and independent institutions with centralized and decentralized libraries and varying sizes of librarian staffs. Neither faculty status nor lack of it showed strong relation to organization structures, and faculty status was not more common in either bureaucratic or collegial organizations. 7 notes. J.

41. Page, Jacqueline Marie. "The Pursuit of Professional Identity for Librarianship within American Higher Education: A Study of Educational Programs and Work Requirements in Socialization for Academic Identity in the 1980s." Diss., Saint Louis University, 1990. 485 pp.

Exploration of the hypothesis that librarians are insufficiently enculturated to being faculty. A literature review and content analyses of library school catalogs and position advertisements demonstrated the lack of systematic preparation for this role. Not seen: annotation based on Dissertation Abstracts International 52 (1991): 10A.

42. Park, Betsy, and Robert Riggs. "Status of the Profession: A 1989 National Survey of Tenure and Promotion Policies for Academic Librarians." College & Research Libraries 52 (May 1991): 275–89.

A 1989 survey which yielded 304 responses from randomly selected academic libraries. The continued primacy of job performance as an evaluation factor and widespread emphasis on service in comparison with research are among the findings. Includes a review of the literature. 40 notes. J.
43. Parker, Diane C. "Librarians: An Element of Diversity within the Faculty." College & Research Libraries News 50 (Sept. 1989): 675-77.
A succinct answer to the question "Why are librarians faculty?" presented by a library director (Western Washington University). Lists fundamental similarities and differences of the two groups and concludes that they collaborate closely and are equally important to the academic enterprise. J.

44. St. Clair, Gloriana, and Irene Hoadley. "The Challenge to Faculty Status: A Call to Militancy." Wilson Library Bulletin 63 (Dec. 1985): 23-24, 26.
Describes challenge to faculty status at Texas A&M University when a new provost was installed in 1986, how that crisis was met by librarians, and some positive results from the experience. J.

45. Schwartz, Charles A. "Research Productivity and Publication Output: An Interdisciplinary Analysis." College & Research Libraries 52 (Sept. 1991): 414-24.
An examination of library science research productivity. Several factors (e.g., available time) are less significant than often assumed. Suggests new perspectives on the study of librarian productivity. 54 notes.

46. Simon, Matthew J. "The Library Director's Role in Colleges and Universities Where Librarians Are Faculty." Urban Academic Librarian 5 (Fall 1987): 20-30.
Faculty status for librarians places library directors in the position of balancing librarians' expectations with those of the university administration. Among the ways directors can maximize faculty benefits are commissioning in-house research projects and redefining assignments to exclude clerical tasks. 15 notes. J.

47. Smith, John Brewster. "Faculty Status of Librarians in Three ARL Member Research Libraries in New York State: A Case Study." Diss., Columbia University, 1991. 369 p.
A multifaceted study of faculty status at three New York State ARL libraries which includes surveys of governance leaders and administrators, an examination of governance documents, and on-site visits by the investigator. Among the findings: librarians prefer faculty status but are ambivalent about some aspects of it, e.g., practical problems in the application of personnel review criteria. Not seen: annotation based on Dissertation Abstracts International 52 (1992): 2743A.

48. Turner, Bonnie L., and Ellen I. Watson. Promotion and Tenure for Library Faculty. 1989. ERIC, ED 331 504. 7 pp.
An example of an internal document (Bradley University) that makes a case for faculty status for academic librarians on the basis of the ACRL Standards and establishes criteria for tenure and promotion of library faculty.

49. Walden, Winston Allen. "Academic Status of Librarians in State-Supported Nondoctorate-Granting, Four-Year Colleges and Universities (Faculty)." Diss., Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1985. 471 p.
A report of a survey of 284 libraries' compliance with the ACRL Standards which presents the percentage of libraries in full compliance with each standard. Few libraries met all nine fully, but librarians' rights and responsibilities were found similar to those of other faculty, and library faculty are more likely to work under Standards conditions than librarians not considered faculty. Not seen: annotation based on Dissertation Abstracts International 47 (1986): 698A.

50. Winter, Michael F. The Culture and Control of Expertise: Toward a Sociological Understanding of Librarianship. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood, 1988. 154 p.
Application of particular sociological theories to the question of whether librarianship as a profession is too limited. Wider exploration of sociological research (studies of professions and occupations, issues of autonomy and control, etc.) can lead librarians to think about their work in new ways.

EARLY, FREQUENTLY CITED TITLES
PUBLISHED THROUGH 1985

51. American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians." College & Research Libraries News 33 (Sept. 1972): 210-12 and 35 (May 1974): 112-13. Reprinted in Academic Status: Statements and Resources (No. 9). Compare No. 12, ACRL Standards 1992.
The nine standards that "recognize formally the college or university librarian's academic status," adopted by the ACRL membership in Dallas, Texas, on June 26, 1971. H.

52. —. Academic Status Committee. Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements. Chicago: ALA, 1975. 55 pp.
A compilation of basic faculty status documents and a reprint of a key article on the historical development of faculty status (No. 66). J W.

53. Association of Research Libraries. Office of Management Services. SPEC Kit, 61. The Status of Librarians: An Overview. Washington, D.C.: ARL, OMS, Feb. 1980. 105 p.

A 1979 survey of ARL libraries: type of status, promotion, tenure, and other benefits equivalent to those of traditional faculty. Results are reported on a copy of the questionnaire. Documents on appointment, promotion and tenure, ranking structure, etc., of eleven universities are included. J W.

Axford, H. William. See No. 77.

54. Bailey, Martha J. "Some Effects of Faculty Status on Supervision in Academic Libraries." College & Research Libraries 37 (Jan. 1976): 48-52.

Faculty status makes the competition among librarians' major commitments (expertise, administration, and professional status) so acute that these conflicting responsibilities become detrimental to academic library management. 12 notes. J W.

55. Bechtel, Joan M. "Academic Professional Status: An Alternative for Librarians." Journal of Academic Librarianship 11 (Nov. 1985): 289-92.

Since 1981 Dickinson College librarians and other academic support personnel have had the title "academic professional." For Dickinson librarians, formerly out of contact with faculty and "horrorfied at the notion of service on committees" or teaching, academic professional status has provided clear responsibilities and improved rewards. 2 notes. J W.

56. Bentley, Stella. "Collective Bargaining and Faculty Status." Journal of Academic Librarianship 4 (1978): 75-81.

Reports on a survey of librarians at six libraries, three with collective bargaining. Librarians without a bargaining agent are more likely to have to meet scholarship criteria without the necessary time and money to do so; and those with collective bargaining tend to be less satisfied with their economic status. 8 notes. J W.

57. Branscomb, Lewis C., ed. The Case for Faculty Status for Academic Librarians. ACRL Monograph, No. 33. Chicago: ALA, 1970. 122 p.

Fourteen papers in support of faculty status by Robert B. Downs, Arthur M. McAnally, David C. Weber, and others associated with the ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Status, 1958-1969. Historic statements of the views that led to adoption of the ACRL Standards. H.

58. Cook, M. Kathy. "Rank, Status, and Contribution of Academic Librarians as Perceived by the Teaching Faculty at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale." College & Research Libraries 42 (May 1981): 214-23.

A survey of teaching faculty views on librarians' contribution to teaching and research. More than half the respondents favored faculty status for librarians. Many saw professorial ranks as inseparable from research, but many also felt librarians should resolve the research issue themselves. Copy of survey questionnaire included. 8 notes. J W.

59. DePew, John N. "The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status: Panacea or Placebo." College & Research Libraries 44 (Nov. 1983): 407-13.

A proposal to achieve an appropriate and attainable standard for librarians by modifying ACRL Standards five and six (tenure and faculty rank). Librarian, not faculty, status would help librarians to their goal of providing better library service. 23 notes. J W.

60. DePriest, Raleigh. "That Inordinate Passion for Status." College & Research Libraries 34 (Mar. 1973): 150-58.

Analyzes the antifaculty status arguments of Kenneth Kister, Daniel Gore, Lawrence Clark Powell, and others. Librarians' desire for status is serious and not "inordinate" because of their professional responsibility to maintain the library and resist detrimental political pressures. 21 notes. H.

61. Divay, Gaby, and Carol Steer. "Academic Librarians Can Be Caught by the Pressure to Do Research." Canadian Library Journal 40 (Apr. 1983): 91-95.

A research requirement is not apt for librarians. Some reasons: librarians are not employed to teach or do research and they have less need to keep up with research trends in their field, which is technical rather than subject-oriented. If research is required, institutions must allow librarians to meet this requirement in realistic terms. 18 notes; bibliography of 32 items. J W.

62. Downs, Robert B., ed. The Status of American College and University Librarians. ACRL Monograph, No. 22. Chicago: ALA, 1958. 176 p.

A collection of papers by Downs, Patricia B. Knapp, Arthur M. McAnally, and others published to provide "practical assistance to librarians and institutions struggling with
matters of status.” Includes studies of librarians’ circumstances and views on faculty status, discussions of librarians’ role, descriptions of personnel programs at specific institutions, etc. H.

63. English, Thomas G. “Librarian Status in the Eighty-Nine U.S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries: 1982.” College & Research Libraries 44 (May 1983): 199–211.

A detailed presentation of the results of a 1982 faculty status survey of the eighty-nine ARL libraries. Over 60 percent of state-supported institutions grant faculty status to librarians, but the trend to faculty status seems to have slowed and, to some extent, reversed. 11 notes. J W.

64. Josey, E. J. “Full Faculty Status This Century: The Report of a Survey of New York State Academic Libraries.” Library Journal 97 (Mar. 15, 1972): 984–89.

A survey of New York State academic librarians’ attitudes to faculty status and the ACRL Standards. Ninety percent saw themselves as faculty, but librarians must struggle for status and institutions of higher education must respond positively to make it a reality by the twenty-first century. 8 notes. H.

65. Keys, Marshall. “Faculty Status: An Heretical View.” Mississippi Libraries 43 (Summer 1979): 76–77.

Librarians’ affinity is to other administrators. It is librarians’ unique ability to deliver information that is worthy of respect. Emulation of faculty is a futile search for “false gods” and “illusory ends.” J W.

66. McAnally, Arthur M. “Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community.” Ed. by Jerrold Orne. Research Librarianship: Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs. New York: Bowker, 1971. 19-50. Reprinted in Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements (No. 52).

A brief history of academic librarianship from the late nineteenth century to 1970. The prognosis for acceptance of faculty status is good; and projections of how librarians’ educational role, changes in library organization, application of academic freedom and tenure to librarians, etc. might work out indicate that faculty status is feasible for librarians. 60 notes. H.

67. Mason, Ellsworth. “A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty.” College & Research Libraries 33 (Nov. 1972): 445–46.

Opposes faculty status on the ground that librarians have more to lose (e.g., freedom from “publish-or-perish”) than to gain. The most important goals (high regard for the library and attraction and retention of excellent librarians) can be achieved without faculty status. H.

68. Massman, Virgil F. Faculty Status for Librarians. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1972. 229 p.

A review of faculty status literature and a report on surveys of librarians and traditional faculty at nineteen state institutions of higher education in three midwestern states. The surveys compared education, professional activities, working conditions, etc., of librarians and faculty. Faculty status is essential for full librarian participation in academe. H.

69. Mitchell, W. Bede, and L. Stanislava Swieszkowski. “Publication Requirements and Tenure Approval Rates: An Issue for Academic Librarians.” College & Research Libraries 46 (May 1985): 249–55.

A report of a survey of 189 Center for Research Libraries academic library members (94.5 percent return) on research and publication requirements for librarian tenure. The most frequent cause of denial of librarian tenure is insufficient research, but the librarian tenure rate (81.5 percent) is higher than that of traditional faculty (58 percent). Copy of survey questionnaire included. 10 notes. J W.

70. Powell, Lawrence Clark. “Shoe on the Other Foot: From Library Administrator to User.” Wilson Library Bulletin 45 (Dec. 1970): 384–89.

A postretirement personal and experiential view of librarianship by the former dean of the University of California at Los Angeles Graduate School of Library Service. Higher status for librarians must come from what librarians do; if they do what faculty do they are faculty, not librarians. Librarians gain status by hard work and study of their own field.

71. Query, Lance. “Librarians and Teaching Faculty: Disparity within the System.” Academe 71 (July–Aug. 1985): 13–16.

Reviews salary inequity and the failure of faculty and administrators to recognize librarians’ unique role. No matter what type of formal status librarians have, they have second-class faculty status in terms of salary. J W.

72. Rayman, Ronald, and Frank Wm. Goudy. “Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries.” College & Research Libraries 41 (Jan. 1980): 43–48.

A report on a survey of ninety-four ARL libraries regarding academic librarian research and publication. Fifteen percent of these libraries require librarian research and publication
for favorable reviews. Whatever the requirement, however, librarian research is not well supported. 11 notes. J.

73. Rice, Patricia Ohl. Academic Freedom and Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Bibliographical Essay. 1984. ERIC, ED 246 917. 18 p.
A review of thirteen publications (1956–1975) which gives academic freedom as a rationale for librarian faculty status. The infrequent use of this argument by librarians probably is due to the ambiguity of the term academic freedom and to librarians’ confusing it with intellectual freedom. 4 notes; 9 added references. J W.

74. Sewell, Robert G. “Faculty Status and Librarians: The Rationale and the Case of Illinois.” College & Research Libraries 44 (May 1983): 212–22. The rationale for faculty status is embodied in three key principles: (1) academic freedom and tenure, (2) collegial governance, (3) evaluation criteria that match faculty ranks. The University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana has been among the institutions most committed to faculty status for librarians and most successful in its implementation. 11 notes. J W.

75. Smith, Eldred. “Academic Status for College and University Librarians: Problems and Prospects.” College & Research Libraries 31 (Jan. 1970): 7–13.
Predicts that trends in higher education, the information explosion, etc., will urge recognition of librarians’ key role in teaching and research. Changes in the organization of libraries, recruiting of librarians, library education, and librarian professional activities must be pursued actively for librarians’ best contribution to academe to be realized. 28 notes. H.

76. Sparks, David C. E. “Academic Librarianship: Professional Strivings and Political Realities.” College & Research Libraries 41 (Sept. 1980): 408–21.
Summarizes the history of the ACRL Standards and the arguments that have been pro pounded pro and con, especially regarding tenure and collegiality. Faculty status still requires evaluation in terms of (1) professionalization, (2) power relationships in higher education, and (3) academic collective bargaining. 72 notes. J W.

77. “The Three Faces of Eve: Or, the Identity of Academic Librarianship, a Symposium.” Journal of Academic Librarianship 2 (Jan. 1977): 276–85.
Ten short articles and letters advocating or opposing faculty status. Writers include H. William Axford, R. Dean Galloway, Virgil F. Massman, Robert M. Pierson, and others. Most of these pieces respond to Axford’s lead article, which expresses reservations regarding faculty status for librarians. J W.

78. Wells, Mary Baier. “Requirements and Benefits for Academic Librarians: 1959–1979” College & Research Libraries 43 (Nov. 1982) 450–58.
A study of advertisements for librarian positions in three librarianship journals for the period 1959–1979. This study tested whether expectations of librarians’ qualifications rose, the nature of librarian work changed, and whether salaries increased. In these two decades, educational expectations, in particular, increased, as did responsibilities; salaries, in general, followed fiscal trends in academe. J W.

79. Wilson, Pauline. “Librarians As Teachers: The Study of an Organization Fiction.” Library Quarterly 49 (Apr. 1979): 146–62.
The assertion that librarians are teachers is an “organization fiction,” i.e., an inaccurate view unquestioningly accepted by a group to serve a particular purpose, such as improving the group’s self-image. This fiction about librarians impedes development of correct professional image and causes contention among librarians. 58 notes. W.
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Letter

To the editor:

I read with great interest Ann Beaubien's guest editorial "Image Counts" in the latest issue of *College & Research Libraries*. Many of us can only agree with her regarding the misunderstanding of our profession as well as the erroneous perception that the public has of any library employee, and her suggestions are well taken. However, I believe that in the case of academic libraries, another audience needs to be targeted very strongly: accreditation teams.

These teams should include at least one librarian (although two or three would obviously carry more weight), so that a thorough evaluation of library holdings and services can be done. From my personal observation, accreditation teams, which are composed of faculty members in one specific area, too often base their judgment on a cursory look at title counts (at our university, faculty members select books and journals). Just because a library has a number of journals in nursing, for example, does not necessarily imply that it is sufficiently equipped for research, including basic research, for a nursing program, as some teams tend to believe. This attitude reinforces the inherent dichotomy that exists between the faculty's knowledge of their respective field and the librarians' methods of teaching research. As teaching faculty members have already acquired an acceptable depth of knowledge (although they seem to have forgotten how), they rely on a few specialized journals to keep abreast of new developments in their fields. If they conduct research, they can use the various automated indexes offered to them or can ask the services of a librarian for convenience sake. However, students are taught a more systematic approach of using specialized indexes to gain access to a wide array of articles published in specialized or more esoteric journals. Hence, librarians on an accreditation team can be more attuned to gaps within their area of expertise. Likewise, they will be more likely to evaluate the quality of services by asking probing questions regarding the hours of services, the staffing of the library, adequate reference assistance including evenings and weekends (mainly when courses are offered at those times), bibliographic instruction programs, volume of interlibrary loan, etc. Not only are many libraries regularly understaffed, but in times of economic recessions, administrators will often begin by targeting the library budget, thus cutting the acquisition of materials as well as the recruiting of adequate staff. ALA and ACRL for academic libraries need to promote minimum standards of service more aggressively than has been done in recent years. Administrators are not always willing to listen to requests from within, but they will bow to the recommendations of accreditation teams, mainly if the accreditation of their programs depends on them. For that reason, our organization needs to lobby for the automatic inclusion of librarians on accreditation teams. Then may we harvest the recognition we are long overdue.

CHRISTINE GUYONNEAU
Reference Librarian
Krannert Memorial Library
University of Indianapolis
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Book Reviews

Recycling Ideas

Horowitz, Irving Louis. *Communicating Ideas: The Politics of Scholarly Publishing*. 2d exp. ed. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1991. 311p. $19.95 (ISBN 0-88738-898-1). LC 91-647.

*Communicating Ideas* is the “second expanded edition,” released in paperback by Transaction Publishers, of a book first issued by Oxford University Press in 1986 under the alternate subtitle *The Crisis of Publishing in a Post-Industrial Society*. Although the subject, scholarly communication, is of interest to academic librarians, the way in which the book has been assembled exemplifies some of the more troublesome aspects of academic publishing today. The 1986 volume is poorly written, carelessly edited, and of questionable scholarship, yet it was produced by an established and prolific author, working in concert with a reputable scholarly publisher. Now, five years later, a second edition is published that not only leaves the basic errors of the first uncorrected, but also compounds them. Moreover, because Horowitz is not forthright or accurate about the origins of his essays, librarians are misled into thinking that much of the material is new, when a lot of it is quite dated.

Irving Louis Horowitz, the Hannah Arendt Professor of Political Science and Sociology at Rutgers University, is the author of numerous articles, reviews, and books on socioeconomic development, public policy, political sociology, and the sociology of knowledge. Identifying himself as “essentially an essayist rather than a writer of lengthy tomes,” Horowitz has published a number of anthologies of his writings. Oxford University Press is scheduled to publish his next book, tentatively titled *The Decomposition of Sociology*, in 1993.

Horowitz also enjoys considerable influence in the field of scholarly publishing. He is the president of Transaction Publishers, a social science press that publishes over one hundred titles a year and includes almost fifty periodical and serial titles in its consortium. His spouse, Mary E. Curtis, serves as publisher and senior vice-president of Transaction and has coauthored several influential essays with him. Horowitz is editor-in-chief of and a frequent contributor to *Society*, Transaction’s flagship journal, which enjoys a circulation of 10,000 and prides itself on reaching out beyond the academy to decision makers and the informed public by presenting social science research findings in a “readable and useful manner.” Horowitz also serves on the editorial board of and contributes articles to several other Transaction journals, including *Publishing Research Quarterly* and *Academic Questions*. Given the breadth of Horowitz’s experience, it should come as no surprise that he is an active speaker on the conference circuit, appearing before such audiences as the Modern Language Association, the Society for Scholarly Publishing, and the National Information Standards Organization.

*Communicating Ideas* is a compilation of Horowitz’s papers and speeches about scholarly communication. The book consists of twenty-four chapters, eight of which are “new” to the second edition. Horowitz considers how technology has
transformed scholarly publishing, including its impact on copyright legislation. He is concerned about the interplay between the consumer's right to information ("fair use") versus the author's and publisher's proprietary right to economic recognition for their product ("fair return"). He also describes the major categories of publishing (trade, textbook, and professional) as well as some of the characteristics of scholarly publishing, in general, and social science publishing, in particular. He comments on the "gatekeeping functions" of academic publishers and outlines the safeguards in place "to reduce the probability of issuing fraudulent or plagiarized materials." Other chapters, particularly those added to the second edition, are narrow in focus and thin in content, and will, therefore, interest only a limited audience. They address issues such as the growth of specialist journals, publishing about philanthropy, the role of the Festschrift, and the proliferation of publishing prizes. The book closes with a startling essay about Horowitz's early publishing venture, Paine-Whitman Publishers.

Horowitz's approach to the material is at times theoretical and philosophical, and at others, particularly in the second edition, pragmatic and "nuts-and-bolts" in orientation. Because of the diversity of subjects and variation in approach, the book lacks internal coherence and does not progressively develop a thesis about scholarly communication. Moreover, serious problems arise when one attempts to reconcile Horowitz's ideas about scholarly communication with his practice, and as a result, some of his opinions seem disingenuous.

In Communicating Ideas, Horowitz promotes the "calibrating-effect" of social science research findings through "mediating publications." According to his ideal, social science research, originally conveyed in a scholarly form to a relatively elite audience, would reach an ever-widening circle in society as it is retransmitted via different media. Horowitz favors a "fluid notion of social science delivery systems" so that various media can be exploited. He explains: "What first appears as a magazine article may filter into the network of social science users differentially. For example, the same article may be delivered in preliminary form to a professional society, then published as a scholarly essay, then be transformed into a popular magazine, finally to be made part of an anthology." This pattern describes the progression of much of Horowitz's own work, including Communicating Ideas, and he is quick to point out the positive aspects of this "calibrating-effect." His philosophy is essentially linked to democratic principles that aim to disperse information, and beneficial social research findings in particular, as widely as possible. Arguing that new technologies add value to traditional forms of scholarly publishing rather than replace them, Horowitz refers to a "multi-tiered system" in which various formats (ranging from books to interactive video) coexist. He points with considerable pride to an article on the Philadelphia prison system that appeared in Society and subsequently formed the basis for a CBS-TV report watched "by approximately 25 million people." As a result of this exposure, a number of prison reforms were instituted. Although Horowitz acknowledges that this level of impact is rare, it is, nonetheless, the goal to which he and Society aspire.

Horowitz, however, seems oblivious to some of the disadvantages of "calibration." Much of his work makes more sense in its original form than it does republished in Communicating Ideas. For example, chapter 1, which has the opaque title, "Valuational Presuppositions of the New Technology," was more persuasive in its original form, namely, as three distinct book reviews, than it is in Communicating Ideas, where these reviews are pasted together with a few interpolated paragraphs. Likewise, chapter 13, "Gatekeeping Functions and Publishing Truths," is more compelling when read in its original context, with Horowitz and Curtis as a pair of respondents to a symposium essay by Richard Kluger, "On Truth in Publishing: The
Cost of Integrity,” that appeared in The Nation in 1978. Chapter 16, “Experts, Audiences, and Publics,” in which Horowitz articulates his notion of “calibration,” is much more interesting as a 1974 report, “Mediating Journals: Reaching Out to a Public beyond the Scientific Community,” where readers can benefit from the full give-and-take among symposium participants, than it is in Communicating Ideas where Horowitz simply strings together his remarks, as if they were a continuous train of thought, with no indication that he has deleted the intervening dialogue. In Horowitz’s case, the “fluid delivery system” rapidly becomes—to the unsuspecting librarian—a flood of virtually identical copies of his work located in different publications. As more and more academic librarians become mindful of the costs exacted by duplication within their collections, they may be distressed to discover that because of Horowitz’s practice of republishing without informing them, or of changing titles without changing content, their institutions have naively purchased five barely distinguishable versions of the second chapter of Communicating Ideas, “New Technologies, Scientific Information, and Democratic Choice.”

Although Horowitz identifies ten previously published chapters, according to my estimation another ten acknowledgments are missing entirely. In other words, at least twenty of the twenty-four chapters appear in print elsewhere, as outlined in the accompanying table. Republishing and repackaging material in new forms has become an accepted practice in academic publishing and has long been part of Horowitz’s repertoire, but with it comes the obligation of forthright documentation. This is not only a matter of professional courtesy and consumer respect but also of copyright compliance. In making decisions about whether or not to add a book to their collections, librarians rely on authors and publishers to inform them honestly about its prior publication history.

Horowitz’s penchant for unacknowledged republishing leaves him open to the criticism of “self-plagiarism.” In a recent contribution to the electronic discussion group, HUMANIST: Humanities Computing, Irving Hexham distinguishes self-plagiarism from the legitimate recycling of a scholar’s work in the following way: “Self-plagiarism occurs when no indication is given that the work is being recycled and where a clear effort has been made, through changing the paragraph breaks, capitalization, and the substitution of English with foreign terms, to cause the reader to believe they are reading something completely new.” Hexham also distinguishes between academic and other types of writing, arguing that “if a book contains academic footnotes, is written in academic style, and is presented as a work of scholarship then it must be judged as such and measured against the accepted rules for citation . . . .” It seems fair to expect Communicating Ideas to meet minimal academic standards.

Horowitz confuses not only where he has previously published his material, but also where the ideas originated. In Communicating Ideas, his pattern of inaccuracy seems to run well beyond inadvertent carelessness. Horowitz is very casual about accurately attributing coauthorship of certain chapters to his wife, Mary E. Curtis. He neglects to mention her contribution to the original article on which chapter 3, “Technological Impacts on Scholarly Publishing,” is based, despite the fact that the earlier version appeared under both their names three separate times. In the case of chapter 8, “Scholarly Communication and Academic Publishing,” Horowitz tells us that he “jointly authored” the original article with Curtis, when in fact it was first issued under her name alone. These seem clear-cut examples of expropriation, but since Curtis was “instrumental” in bringing Communicating Ideas to “fruition,” she evidently has no objection to this misrepresentation of her work.

In addition to reprinting material without acknowledgment, Horowitz alleges that previously published material has been “substantially rewritten, revised and expanded.” This claim proves false. A comparison of original
journal articles and chapters in *Communicating Ideas* reveals that Horowitz has typically "rewritten" chapters by eliminating any clue that they have been published before; "revised" them by haphazardly or speciously updating figures, merging paragraphs, or interchanging synonyms; and "expanded" them by tacking on a couple of introductory paragraphs and a paragraph at the end.

Chapter 15, "Social Science as Scholarly Communication," serves as an example of Horowitz's procedure. Although there is no indication that this chapter has been previously published, it appeared under the title "Marketing Social Science" in 1979 in *Society*. The version in *Communicating Ideas* has two new introductory paragraphs. Most of the other changes either camouflage the article's origin, ("in the previous section" becomes "earlier in this chapter"), or make the data seem current when it appears not to have been updated. Despite a discussion of "several recent trends," a glance at the footnotes reveals that most of the information dates from the mid- to late-1970s. In the original *Society* article Horowitz states, without a footnote, that "overall library sales are expected to drop 28 percent between 1974 and 1981."14 In *Communicating Ideas*, Horowitz revises the statement to read, "overall library sales dropped 28 percent between 1974 and 1981."15 In support of this statement, he footnotes John Dessauer's *Library Acquisitions: A Look into the Future*—published in 1976.16 The attentive reader can only wonder if Dessauer's predictions proved perfectly accurate or if Horowitz is merely "confirming" them ten years later by editorial fiat. He then uses these data to buttress his argument that impoverished libraries rely increasingly on networks to obtain copies of needed material, rather than purchasing a journal outright. Again, Horowitz uses the same statements in both articles, but without footnotes in the *Society* version. In *Communicating Ideas* he notes: "For the entire state of Ohio, only one copy of a periodical is needed. Within twenty-four hours, any article can be rotated to 258 participating libraries." He concludes:

"This means that of 258 potential subscriber units 257 do not require a subscription."7 In my own perusal of Susan K. Martin's *Library Networks, 1976-1977*, which Horowitz cites in *Communicating Ideas* as the source for his statistics, I was unable to locate any such data, although my search was impeded by Horowitz's habitual citation to the entire work rather than to specific pages.18

When he "rewrites," Horowitz demonstrates the pitfalls of sloppy editorial practices. In a discussion about "intellectual property," he drops an entire paragraph from his direct quotation of Dorothy Nelkin without indicating the deletion and then continues to make use of her exact words after he has closed the quotation and provided the footnote. Nelkin's original text (minus the dropped paragraph) appears below, followed by the misappropriation of her words in Horowitz's earlier work, and the cosmetically revised version that appears in *Communicating Ideas*. (Changes from the original text are highlighted in bold print.)

**Original text:** "Intellectual Property: The Control of Scientific Information," by Dorothy Nelkin, *Science* 216:708 (May 14, 1982): 'The ambivalence so apparent in the disputes over the control of research suggests that there have been significant changes in the social role of science and in the importance of research. Indeed, these disputes are part of a larger struggle to renegotiate relationships between science and the public that were established at a time when science was a very different social enterprise."

**Horowitz's text from Information Age** 5:72 (Apr. 1983): "The ambivalence so apparent in the disputes over the control of research suggests that there have been significant changes in the social role of science and in the importance of research. Indeed, these disputes are part of a larger struggle to renegotiate relationships between science and the public that were established at a time when science was a very different social enterprise."

**Horowitz's text from Communicating Ideas** (2d ed.), p. 26: "The am-
bivalence so apparent in the disputes over the control of research suggests that there have been significant changes in the social role of science and in the importance of research." (Nelkin)

These disputes are part of a larger struggle to renegotiate relations between scientist and citizen that were established at a time when science was a very different, more confined, social enterprise.

The contradictions between Horowitz's subject matter and his methods undermine his authority and make it extremely difficult to ascertain where his ideas end and someone else's begin. Paradoxically, copyright regulation, specifically the protection of intellectual property rights through enforcement of the "fair return" concept, is a subject on which Horowitz is considered an authority. For example, Horowitz is cited in the May 1992 editorial of College & Research Libraries for his views on copyright. He devotes four chapters in Communicating Ideas primarily to the discussion of copyright issues, including "The Reproduction of Knowledge and Maintenance of Property." It is a considerable irony that Horowitz gives no acknowledgment of prior publication for this chapter despite the fact that it formed the basis of a presentation at a public hearing before the Copyright Office at the Library of Congress in 1981, was adapted to an article in Scholarly Publishing, "Corporate Ghosts in the Photocopying Machine," and reprinted by permission of the author and publisher (copyright 1981 by the University of Toronto Press) in Library Lit. 12 - The Best of 1981. The article was then expanded for presentation at a 1986 conference at the Center for Book Research, before its publication in Book Research Quarterly under the title, "The Protection and Dissemination of Intellectual Property." This latter article acknowledges that Horowitz "is the author of Communicating Ideas, to be published in September 1986 by Oxford University Press." It does not state, however, that this article will appear as a chapter in the book.

While cavalier in his own practice of disclosing copyright, Horowitz argues that the 1976 copyright legislation allows for too generous an interpretation of the "fair use" doctrine, and he is especially critical of academic librarians who have been its champions. He contends that technology has made it increasingly possible to violate copyright by permitting extensive photo duplication without adequate reimbursement to the author or publisher. Horowitz proposes that advanced technology could also be used to remedy these infractions through the installation of monitoring and reporting mechanisms. If authors and publishers are not compensated for their products, Horowitz believes, the wellsprings of creativity will dry up, and scholarly publishing will decline.

Our enthusiasm for Horowitz's proposals might diminish, were we to conclude that he has been overly concerned with the privileges of copyright, while neglecting its responsibilities. Because of the confluence of publication dates, he has certainly set himself a difficult task in obtaining copyright clearances. For example, chapter 2, which is not acknowledged as previously published, bears a copyright by Butterworth & Co. for the article in Information Age in April 1983; a copyright by Virginia Quarterly Review, The University of Virginia, for the article published in Autumn 1983; and a copyright by Elsevier Science for the article in Representation and Exchange of Knowledge published in 1984. Horowitz then retains copyright in 1986 for its appearance (and all other material) in the first edition of Communicating Ideas, while Transaction holds the copyright for all new material in the second edition.

Horowitz argues against more controls in the scholarly publishing industry to prevent deceptive work. He believes that "the best safeguard against fraud is a free and untrammeled publishing network. Fail-safe systems urged by those who would make the publisher a Guardian of Truth represent a cure far worse than the disease." If authors, editors, and publishers let us down, we can rely on the review process. According to Horowitz, "it should be remembered that one of the chief functions of making a work public is exactly to separate sense
from nonsense." Yet Horowitz's own work has slipped through this safety net. The first edition of Communicating Ideas emerged from the review process relatively unscathed. One reviewer commented that "the book is more a collection of individual essays than a comprehensive statement" (Altbach); another referred to "several wordy chapters" (Virginia Quarterly Review); a third noted the irony that a book on scholarly publishing was "riddled with typos" (Boyer); and a fourth observed that "some of it is the heavy-footed dance around the obvious" (Garrett). Each of these criticisms, however, was counterbalanced by acclamations of a "stimulating book" (Altbach) with "provocative observations" (Boyer), and an "informed and intelligent volume" (Gusfield).  

In the reviewer's opinion, were Horowitz not a major presence in the field, enjoying considerable influence, we might dismiss this book as an ill-conceived and poorly managed project. But because he is such a powerful figure—professor, writer, editor, reviewer, and publisher—what he says carries a great deal of weight. One is almost tempted to see his book as an elaborate hoax—a kind of intellectual game in which Horowitz deliberately contradicts his own tenets. However, it is not Horowitz alone who is remiss, but also the publishers and a legion of forgiving reviewers. Horowitz exhorts readers to rely on the established safeguards of author reputation, editor scrutiny, publisher validation, and reviewer legitimization to discourage, if not prohibit, marginal products—and indeed we do. However, when these "controls" prove inadequate, where do we turn? For academic librarians, our collection budgets, if not integrity, hang in the balance. If the need for the first edition of Communicating Ideas was uncertain, then the second edition is even more problematic. Should we choose to ignore the many questions raised by this book, perhaps in 1996 we will deserve to add a third expanded edition to our collections: Communicating Ideas: The Ethics of Scholarly Publishing in the Twenty-First Century.—Martha L. Brogan, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

I gratefully acknowledge the assistance of the following people in either tracking down material for this review or discussing their opinions with me: Christine Boyland, James Brogan, Irving Hexham, John Kaiser, Jeffry Larson, Susanne Roberts, Cesar Rodriguez, Patricia Sabosik, Edward Shreeves, Meneca Turconi, and the good offices of Yale University Library Interlibrary Loan.
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*Distinguished Classics of Reference Publishing,* Ed. by James Rettig. Phoenix: Oryx Pr., 1992. 356 p. alk. paper, $55 (ISBN 0-89774-640-6). LC 91-33629.

Romans erected heroic statues and triumphal arches so that future generations would remember their glory. But for compilers of reference works, even those who labor long years in the bibliographic vineyard, immortality usually takes the form of a modestly signed foreword. Sometimes, like Roget, Brewer, and Bartlett, they have the semblance of widespread fame through their eponymous reference works. But who actually gives a thought to Edith Granger when tracking down a line of poetry?

Like their unsung editors, most reference works generate little critical comment aside from reviews in the library literature. A very few have figured in the history of their publishing firms or in the biographies of exceptionally well-known compilers, like Leslie Stephen and James A. H. Murray. Occasional articles about major reference works do appear in *Reference Services Review,* most notably in the "Landmarks of Reference" series that began in 1980.

Editor James Rettig has set out to remedy this long-standing neglect by collecting profiles of thirty-one major reference works and their compilers. He has chosen the titles carefully to represent a variety of subject areas as well as a range of genres, from atlases and guidebooks to dictionaries and encyclopedias. Each chapter consists of four parts: an analytical, historical essay, the title's publishing history, a selective bibliography of secondary sources, and the chapter footnotes. Most of the analytical essays concentrate on describing and explain-
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ing the conditions surrounding the history and reception of the reference works. Some, like Emily Post's *Etiquette*, are obvious candidates for social analysis. However, Charles Bunge, in his essay on *Brewer's Dictionary*, perceptively identifies a number of Victorian values that contributed to the dictionary's unique mixture. These values included self-improvement, the sanctioning of controlled forms of popular entertainment, and the scholarly respect accorded philology and folk beliefs.

The essays in this collection should interest not only reference librarians but also all those concerned with publishing, scholarship, or information management. The publishing business in both Great Britain and the United States figures in the background of many of the essays, not simply in the histories of individual firms but also in the changes brought about by improved technology down to the current impact of computerized typesetting and CD-ROM. For librarians, these essays should prompt reflections on the beginnings of reference service as well as the role that librarians played in the development of such standard sources as the *Readers' Guide* and the *Encyclopedia of Associations*. At a more speculative level, the descriptions of editorial decisions and compiling methods should stimulate thinking about the organization of knowledge. For example, the intellectual distance between hypertext and Murray's working method for the *Oxford English Dictionary*, thousands of paper slips in cubbyholes, may not be as great as we imagine.

Although there is a great deal of interesting material in the essays, much of it has to be teased out of overly detailed accounts of editorial policies and publishing histories. Most of the authors do not relate their titles to the broader context of the organization of knowledge, the professionalization of scholarship, and the formation of a high culture. The collection would have profited from a concluding essay that drew on examples from the various chapters to present an informed overview of the changing role of reference works and their relationship to scholarship and official culture. A good example of this approach to the theories, assumptions, and goals behind the compilation of dictionaries and encyclopedias may be found in Tom McArthur's *Worlds of Reference* (Cambridge Univ. Pr., 1986).

Readers opening *Distinguished Classics of Reference* may be disappointed that their particular favorite is missing. I would have liked chapters on Benjamin Spock's *Baby and Child Care* and the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. The absence of any titles dealing with people of color and women, however, is a serious oversight. In the current climate of racism and the backlash against feminism, it is important to profile editors and titles that have attempted to set the historical record straight, sometimes without benefit of academic sponsorship or lavish financial support from publishers and foundations. For example, the noted black scholar Monroe Work compiled, virtually single-handedly, a series of bibliographies culminating in 1928 with *A Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America*, which retains its great historic value, especially since no comparable bibliography has subsequently appeared. Another reference title that comes to mind in this regard is *Notable American Women*, which set out in part to profile those important individuals omitted from the *Dictionary of American Biography*. Several of the essays in *Distinguished Classics* suffer from careless proofreading. This seems especially disheartening in a book devoted to reference sources that prize accuracy and clarity of expression. In most cases the errors are immediately obvious and simply disrupt momentarily the reader's train of thought.

In his introduction, editor Rettig emphasizes the pleasure that reference works afford readers. These essays, through their descriptions, analyses, and judicious use of quotations, serve to remind us of that pleasure as well as the value and influence of the works themselves. The chief virtue of *Distinguished Classics* lies in the fact that it will prompt readers to rediscover or explore for the first time these reference treasures, from Fowler's witty prohibitions to Emily Post's sensi-
Dillon, George L. Contending Rhetorics: Writing in Academic Disciplines. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Pr., 1991. 175 p. acid-free paper, $27.50 (ISBN 0-253-31743-6). LC 90-25572.

Many branches of scholarship have in the past decade become increasingly preoccupied with their own discourse. While this is certainly a healthy preoccupation, it can also be distracting and perhaps even hazardous—rather like trying to drive while looking at one’s windshield instead of through it. Contending Rhetorics is an attempt by George L. Dillon, a professor of English at the University of Washington, to sort out and evaluate some of the main recent contributions to the study of how different academic disciplines use written language to create and regulate themselves.

The book begins with an examination of the relationship between rhetoric and rationality, and of the extent to which rationality can be defined as a (or as the) fundamental attribute of academic discourse. This is followed by a discussion of the norms of formal academic communication, principally those of “impersonality/autonomy/universalism.” The author then identifies two “aspects” of academic communication: there is a technical aspect that aims to contribute to a body of public knowledge in the discipline, is based on specific (but normally unexamined) assumptions, and conventionally ignores the personal or political background of the contributor; but there is also a critical aspect that seeks to study and evaluate those assumptions that underlie the production and acceptance of knowledge—the technical aspect—of the discipline. The latter activity is often undertaken by an outsider, someone who is not a practitioner of the discipline. Dillon then discusses three instances of this critical activity in the form of social studies of science; all three of the works he examines are examples of social constructionism, a per-
perspective or method that approaches social phenomena as ultimately discursive constructs. Considerable attention is devoted in this section to the perennial question of whether or how the social scientist observer fundamentally influences (or, in a sense, even creates) the phenomena observed. The concern here, therefore, is not simply about the extent to which scientists can communicate about the natural world, but also about the extent to which social scientists can communicate about communication among scientists.

The next section of the book reviews three efforts by social scientist practitioners—in the fields of economics, sociology, and ethnography—to study and evaluate the scholarly discourse and rhetorical conventions of their own disciplines. This is followed by a review of three works by historians on the problems of defining historical discourse, especially its differences from scientific discourse and its relationship to literature and literary studies. Dillon then considers theories of academic discussion and argument—or, as he prefers to call it, dialectic. In this section, he concentrates principally on Michael Billig’s work on social psychology and Richard Rorty’s theory of philosophy as conversation. The final section of the book considers the teaching of the techniques of scholarly communication, in which Dillon reviews three essays that “regard the academic world as a discourse community . . . and view the writing course . . . as a means of initiation into that community.”

This book expects a great deal from the reader. It assumes that the reader is already somewhat familiar with current trends and discussions in the social sciences and humanities. The intent of the book, however, is neither to redirect those trends, nor to single out or endorse any particular group of the perspectives it considers—a point Dillon makes clear at the outset: “Our account, or account of accounts, will therefore be more academic than polemical, more oriented toward drawing distinctions and pursuing implications than kicking butts, tipping the boat to the other side, or making a clean and thorough break with the past.” The book also leaves to the reader much of the work of evaluating and comparing the different “accounts” discussed. To be sure, by choosing to examine these particular works, Dillon is making a value judgment about the special utility and contribution of those particular studies, and certainly he provides an erudite and considered commentary, but the book remains for the most part a relatively unconnected series of critical summaries, a kind of extended literature review. The purpose and intended audience of the book are, therefore, somewhat obscure, as if the author were unable to make up his mind as to whether he was writing an introduction or a scholarly contribution to the subject. There is also no real justification as to why these particular works were selected for analysis, and the author makes very little effort to cumulate, synthesize, or even to contrast in any depth or detail the different perspectives presented. Useful and insightful comments are certainly made along the way, but one misses any effort to pull all of these varied ideas into any kind of meaningful whole or vision that would provide some overview of the current state of the study of academic discourse. The book ends with a three-page conclusion which certainly makes a few good points (e.g., the “rhetoric of impersonal objectivity” is “being challenged by the rhetoric of reflexive self-awareness”). These same points, however, could have been made (and, for the most part, were made) in the Introduction and the body of the book.

The legibility of the book is somewhat hampered by its style, which ranges from breezy, hip slang to very intricate and occasionally obtuse compound sentences: “The books we have examined . . . are both apologies for their disciplines (as they conceive them) and challenges to their opponents to answer specific criticisms of their own work and to field alternative accounts both of the knowledge to be gained from the discipline and the appropriate rhetoric for developing it.” Tracking down the antecedents of all the “theys,” “thems,” and “theirs” (not to
mention the final "it") in such a sentence requires considerable time and ingenuity. Surely a professor of rhetoric and composition can write better sentences than this. Difficult texts are warranted and expected, if the authors have difficult things to say—if they need to stretch the language, to express the inexpressible. That is not the case here. This book should aim to elucidate the complex and relevant ideas it examines, but instead it sometimes needlessly obfuscates them.

Although a difficult and problematic book, it has nevertheless the potential to be quite useful for a few very specialized audiences, including especially academic librarians. Since it is the ultimate function of academic libraries to support and promote scholarly communication across space and time, academic librarians need to learn as much as possible about the methods, conventions, and limitations of academic discourse—starting with some insight into just what academic discourse is and why it is an issue of such current interest in the social sciences and humanities. *Contending Rhetorics* is a very up-to-date starting point for such study. Individual chapters can be read relatively independently. The documentation in the notes is helpful and selective, so that readers less than fully familiar with current trends in the fields treated can—and will probably need to—locate and read some of the sources cited in order to make better sense of the text.

The book can also be approached as a kind of manual on how all types of scholarly communication can be critically examined. Academic librarians should be prepared to apply such methods to the study of the discourse that composes those disciplines for which they are responsible. The critical concerns and methods described in the book should also be applied to our own discipline of library and information science. We need to decide for ourselves (certainly no one else will do it for us) how the writings that populate our professional journals create our discipline and relate to reality.

Finally, *Contending Rhetorics* should also be of interest to academic librarians.
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because it offers some valuable insights into the role and responsibility of the outsider inside the academy. Several of the writers discussed in the book, especially those who undertake the "critical" approach to academic discourse, are necessarily observers of, rather than participants in, the disciplines they seek to examine—a situation analogous to that of the academic librarian. The whole book, in fact, consisting as it does primarily of an "account of accounts," is itself fundamentally bibliographical, in the extended sense of a conscious (and, in this case, critical) restatement of what has already been written. For that reason alone, the book is well worth perusing.—Ross Atkinson, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

The Evolution of Library Automation: Management Issues and Future Perspectives. Ed. by Gary M. Pitkin. Westport, Conn.: Meckler, 1991. 189p. (ISBN 0-88736-811-5). LC 91-4988.

For those with literal minds or long memories, the term automation is likely to conjure up images of robot assembly lines or other machines replacing human workers. As the term undergoes its own evolution, however, automation has become nearly synonymous with the use of computers, and that newer sense is the one used in this collection. The essays in this volume are the papers from a seminar conducted during the Sixth Annual Computers in Libraries Conference. The authors represent a cross-section of management roles (library director, university administrator, automation vendor, etc.), and each covers the broad topic from the perspective of his or her position.

While some attention is given to past developments, the emphasis here is very much on the evolution yet to come. As seen by these contributors, the major theme of that future will be access: access that offers more varied sources of information, that is more widely distributed, and that makes use of more sophisticated searching capabilities. The same topics recur in almost every chapter—proliferation of information in electronic form; emphasis on access over acquisition; increasing demands for direct end-user access and document delivery; pressure for seamless interfaces and greater interconnectivity. Even in cataloging, the current interest in relations between local systems and utilities, intersystem searching, and record transfer is largely related to access. These are, of course, all familiar subjects to academic librarians, and they give promise of exciting developments to come.

Still, one might have hoped for both longer and broader views of library automation. The future depicted here is a well-mapped extrapolation of trends and forces that are already clear, but there is not much speculation about what lies beyond. Forecasting is a risky business, but it might have been well to ask at least one contributor to take the long-term perspective.

Asking each author to write from a particular role must have seemed a clever approach for a seminar, with its opportunities for discussion and debate. Unfortunately, the perspectives turn out to be not all that different. The same major themes are repeated at some length, while other important aspects are hardly covered. For instance, there is little discussion of the impact that electronic texts may have on the way research is done or on the library's role in the research process. Nor is there much mention of the potential for further automation of actual library operations, for example, through use of catalogers' work stations or expert systems for reference work. There are tantalizing glimpses here and there that show that these authors have more to say, if only they had the space and freedom to expand. Ronald F. Miller offers two paragraphs on the global village that could well serve as the basis for a separate chapter. Donald Riggs devotes half of his chapter to expert systems, but only after feeling obliged to fill the other half with a rather prosaic discussion of OPACs.

For all of that, there are rewards to be gained here with a bit of selective reading and judicious skimming. Clifford A. Lynch's chapter gives one of the most cogent, concise, and readable summaries in print of library automation from the
systems perspective. The reaction papers grouped at the end offer more personal views and in their references to the main text provide useful entries to interesting points in the earlier chapters. On the whole, the emphasis on management issues keeps the volume refreshingly free of the sort of location-specific writing for which library literature has been so often criticized. (It is worth noting, though, that four of the eleven contributors as well as the editor have some connection with the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries or the CARL system.) For those who have kept up with OPACS, NREN, e-mail, and Internet, this is hardly an essential text, but one could do worse than to browse here while waiting for the wild visionary who will show us what lies beyond the horizon.—Robert Wolven, Columbia University, New York.

Library Communication: The Language of Leadership. Ed. by Donald E. Riggs. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1991. 188 p. $30 (ISBN 0-8389-0581-1). LC 91-34565.

The sixteen essays in this volume address two obvious themes: libraries need leadership, and leadership requires communication. Regrettably, the essays work better separately than as a book. Together they do not define the topic systematically, nor do they move toward any particular end. This book neither persuades us nor demonstrates its point. The words “language of leadership” and their permutations appear repeatedly in titles and section headings: “Language, Leadership, and Librarians,” “Leadership Language,” “The Language of Library Leadership.” But the reader expecting to learn about language, written or spoken, will be disappointed. Most often the essays consider communication as the transmission of information; some refer to body language, gestures, and speech; some to the organization of libraries.

Repetition serves as the collection’s primary rhetorical device. The writers reiterate the sender-message-receiver model of communication, or repeat popular
saying ("Managers do things right; leaders do the right things"), or draw on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Not surprisingly, the bibliographies often cite the same sources.

Characteristically, many of the essays begin with easy, self-evident, or unsubstantiated generalizations: "Perhaps no area of library leadership receives so much criticism as the area of communication"; "Communication is one of the most discussed topics in libraries"; "Conflict is one of our most difficult areas for communication because we generally feel strongly about the issues involved in the situation." Similarly, many conclude vaguely: "In short, growing to greatness as a library communicator is a never-ending process"; "Through the preceding steps and the use of positive communication skills, we can take our position of leadership"; "An appropriate response, then, to those who urge greater leadership from librarians, and for those who desire to exert more leadership in the world outside the profession, is attention to increasing our communication skills."

The writers often admonish us: "Being a good listener is the other essential part of communication and should not be forgotten." Urging us to believe that communication is important, the essays exhort us to communicate well, but after reading several, one cries, "Communicate what?" A few give practical tips or examples. These range from reorganizing the library to using body language carefully: "If standing, place your feet as parallel as possible (inward indicates subordination)."

Five noteworthy contributions provide substance. Eugene S. Mitchell’s concise "Review of Leadership Research" directs readers through the literatures of management and librarianship. Peggy Johnson writes clearly about openness, trust, and intuition in personal communication in "The Role of Empathy in Managerial Communication." John M. Budd’s "Leading through Meaning: Elements of a Communication Process" distinguishes between information and meaning. Rosemary Huff Arneson’s "Mediation: A Language of Leaders" describes the potential of the formal process of mediation as a management tool. Richard H. Moul’s "Discourses of Vision and Necessity: The Information Age, the Library, and the Language of Leadership" offers concepts with which to perceive and criticize our professional discourse.

Unfortunately, this book does not succeed on its own terms and falls short of its potential. It probably will not make better leaders. Had the editor articulated a deeper vision and had the writers reflected on one another’s work, they might have worked together toward one common end and produced a book that added up to more than the sum of its parts.

Rather shamefully, the book lacks an index. Of all people, librarians and the editors of ALA publishing should know the value an index adds to the book.

This book exhibits the problem with leadership everywhere in our country today: hollow words and generalities instead of deeds and substance. Like bad politicians, we aspiring library leaders stand here mouthing platitudes with our feet carefully parallel, claiming a position of leadership and hoping no one will notice we are doing nothing.—Marcia Pankake, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

From Memex to Hypertext: Vannevar Bush and the Mind’s Machine. Ed. by James M. Nyce and Paul Kahn. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press, 1991. 367 p. $40 (ISBN 0-12-523270-5).

Vannevar Bush could well be to electronic information theory what Panini is to the study of language or Melvil Dewey to library science. As director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, Bush oversaw the massive scientific bureaucracy created for weapons research during World War II. An engineer by trade and a pre-war pioneer in the development of electromechanical analog computing devices, Bush grew concerned as the war came to a close about the future of scientific research. In a 1945 essay, Bush explained it this way:

"There is a growing mountain of research. But there is increased evidence..."
that we are being bogged down today as specialization extends. The investigator is staggered by the findings and conclusions of thousands of other workers—conclusions which he cannot find time to grasp, much less to remember, as they appear. Yet specialization becomes increasingly necessary for progress, and the effort to bridge between disciplines is correspondingly superficial. Professionally our methods of transmitting and reviewing the results of research are generations old and by now are totally inadequate for their purpose.

That essay, "As We May Think," proposed a device called a Memex as a solution to what is perhaps still a disturbingly familiar problem. The Memex was to be "a device in which an individual stores all his books, records, and communications, and which is mechanized so that it may be consulted with exceeding speed and flexibility. It is an enlarged supplement to his memory." Bush's original thumbnail sketch of the Memex included a vast store of information on microfiche cached in a personalized retrieval device hidden in a desk. Among other items, "As We May Think" predicted the desktop computer, computer databases, the laserdisk, optical scanning, artificial intelligence, multimedia technology, and online searching—technologies essential to the contemporary library. Thus while Bush's original writings are fascinating in their prescience and their close understanding of the history of the relationship between information retrieval technology and intellectual progress, the contemporary reader may find the last section—concerning the extension of Bush's theoretical constructs into the practical reality of a working electronic university—of more interest.

Hypertext is the intellectual descendant of the Memex, an attempt to put Bush's "natural" indexing system into practical use through modern computing technology. Included in the last section are pieces by hypertext pioneers Doug Engelbart and Ted Nelson; an excellent explanation of the relationship between Bush's ideas, hypertext, and current multimedia technologies by Norman Meyrowitz; and a contemporary scholar's experience with trying to implement the Memex concept in classical studies (Gregory Crane's Perseus Project at Harvard).

From Memex to Hypertext is an important contribution to the emerging field of electronic information theory, both for the critical links it establishes between the early work in the field and current technologies and as an anthology of the theoretical essays of its most cited pioneer, Vannevar Bush. While individual essays may be overly technical or specific in detail for many readers, the collection as a whole is a solid integration of the historical,
theoretical, and practical problems of accessing electronic information. It is recommended reading for those grappling with planning and philosophical issues concerning the use of electronic resources and for library school courses in information retrieval theory, information systems design, reference, and collection management. Librarians and their technical partners would surely profit from, or at least be reassured by, this half-century of material that addresses our contemporary concerns.—Matthew Wall, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania.
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