

portunity" (p.64). He believes his library not only survived the lean years of the early 1970s but actually prospered. Determining the accuracy of that claim has a special interest and importance for the profession at this particular time. Thanks to the now infamous Proposition 13, or one of its many offspring presently in utero, academic librarians at a number of publicly supported institutions now face the prospect of having to cope with the same dismal conditions that earlier challenged Daniel Gore.

A dispassionate analysis of the annual reports argues convincingly that the Macalister Library did indeed survive some extremely rough years, perhaps in even better condition than might have been anticipated. For this, no small achievement, Daniel Gore can rightfully claim credit. However, Gore's confident assertion that his is "a library that has prospered through years of heavy weather" remains very much a matter of opinion. This reviewer remains unconvinced of the superiority of Gore's innovations or their usefulness as a model for other libraries.—Robert L. Burr, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington.

Collection Building: Studies in the Development & Effective Use of Library Resources. Syracuse, N.Y.: Gaylord Professional Publications, in association with Neal-Schuman Publishers, Inc. 1978—. \$55 per vol. Issued three times a year. ISSN 0160-4953.

Collection Management: A Quarterly Journal Devoted to the Management of Library Collections. New York: Haworth Pr., 1976—. \$25 per vol. Issued quarterly. (V.1, nos.1 and 2, published under the title *De-Acquisitions Librarian*.) ISSN 0146-2679.

Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory. Elmsford, N.Y.: Pergamon, 1977—. \$25 per vol. Issued quarterly. ISSN 0364-6408.

The Serials Librarian. New York: Haworth Pr., 1976—. \$25 per vol. Issued quarterly. ISSN 0361-526X.

In these days of tight money and wildly escalating serial costs, new periodicals in any field must justify their existence by providing more and better information on key topics than the existing journals. Enter-

prising editors must offer potential subscribers fresh insights and objective, evaluative studies that will attract and hold their interest.

These four new, or relatively recent, journals cover various aspects of the planning, development, and management of resources in large and small libraries of all types. Their aim is to acquaint library personnel from paraprofessionals to specialist bibliographers with the latest trends, issues, and policies in this relatively neglected field. In relation to the existing periodical literature each of them attempts to fill a perceived long-standing need for more analytical and practical information on the complexity of acquisitions work.

The audience for which these four specialized journals are primarily intended appears to be library workers who are already heavily involved in collection building. As one might expect, the journals differ considerably in their aims, policy, content, and even in their definition of the field they cover.

Predictably, the articles range from technical papers and research reports to interpretive essays and how-to-do-it pieces. A few reading lists on special topics are also included. The varying quality of these journals can to some extent be attributed to each editor's ability, or lack of it, to recruit contributors ranging from well-known names in library literature writing on familiar topics to neophyte scholars just out of graduate school.

As its title indicates, *Collection Building* deals with this important range of professional activities "in libraries of every category and size." Its editors and publishers point out that relatively little attention has been given in the past to collection development in small and medium-size libraries. They further charge that "only in the large university-research library is excellence in resources development [regarded as] a necessary or realizable goal." In his introductory editorial Walter Curley, associate director of the Detroit Public Library, promises not only to publish regularly bibliographic essays and developmental profiles of noteworthy collections but also to sponsor "specific studies on diverse aspects of collection development." An editorial board com-

posed of both library educators and practicing librarians assists Curley in assembling and screening a group of contributors whose youthful enthusiasm is tempered with experience.

Many useful and relevant topics are covered in the first issue, ranging from informative articles on building a community resources file to commentaries on the problems of collection development in college libraries and in school library media centers. There are also three bibliographic essays for selectors on preparing for retirement, urban mass transportation, and free and inexpensive materials. The contributors are all knowledgeable and experienced librarians, apparently well qualified for their assignments. Individually most of the articles are worth reading but none would qualify as a rigorous research study. Perhaps the most interesting article in the first issue is Dan Duran's piece, "Informational Status and the Mass Media: The Case of the Urban Poor," which will undoubtedly provoke more philosophical discussion and debate among outreach librarians than book selectors.

In his introductory editorial in *Collection Management*, Ralph Trueswell, professor of industrial engineering and operations research at the University of Massachusetts, argues that there has long been a need for a periodical which focuses on the "theories, practices, and research findings involved with the modern management of collections." The audience for which this particular journal is intended includes a mixed bag of practitioners, theorists, researchers, and educators who, the editors hope, will interact to help solve existing problems. Among the timely and eminently practical topics to be studied here are weeding, no-growth collections, secondary storage, and budget allocations. Potential contributors are reminded that all articles accepted for publication in *Collection Management* must have "a pragmatic thrust either implicit or explicit in their subject matter."

How successfully is this editorial policy implemented? Most of the articles I examined are readable and sensible enough, although they vary greatly in their conceptual and methodological approaches to measurement and evaluation. Some articles are

based on a rigorous statistical analysis while others reflect personal and professional experience in a particular library. Still others are bibliographic essays written in traditional style.

Perhaps the strongest papers methodologically are William McGrath's formulation of regression models to study the predictability of book selection and Philip Morse's long exercise in probability analysis, though readers not versed in mathematical analysis and model building may find them tough going. In sharp contrast is Peter Durey's brief commentary on his experience in weeding serials subscriptions in a university library in New Zealand. Another troubling note is the editorial decision to reprint a "classic article" in each issue, thus consuming valuable space that might have been better used for more timely information not available elsewhere.

Scott R. Bullard (Acquisitions Department, Duke University Library), the editor-in-chief of *Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory (LAPT)*, proudly points out in his introductory remarks that the broad field of acquisitions work now has a professional "vehicle specifically designed to bring all the disparate subfields and persons together." *LAPT's* modest aim is to provide a forum for the exchange of knowledge, ideas, and experience among library professionals and nonprofessionals in education, research, and practice.

Bullard's editorial approach is based on the broad assumption that every truly scientific regimen must be solidly grounded in both theory and practice. In maturing, each discipline must assemble its own base of research studies as well as develop an increasingly refined methodology.

Yet the emphasis in the early issues of *LAPT* is heavily balanced in favor of practice. The range of articles presented here includes a commentary on new or forthcoming library hardware (apparently to be a continuing feature), a bibliography of recent acquisitions literature, a piece on mailroom sorting, and even the proceedings of a workshop on acquisitions from the Third World that was held in Washington in 1977. As might be expected, there is considerable unevenness in both style and content; many papers show little restraint in the use of jar-

gon, to the point of confusing even experienced librarians.

As its title indicates, *The Serials Librarian* focuses on "all the major aspects of serials librarianship" in academic, public, and special libraries. Edited by Peter Gellatly with the assistance of a distinguished editorial board, it features full-length research and review articles as well as brief notes on such topics as automation, bibliographical control, and collection development. The contributors to the initial issues include such well-known names in library literature as Bill Katz, David Kronick, Joe Morehead, and Herbert Goldhor as well as other equally talented writers from outside of librarianship.

There is much solid information here, and even some original insights, notably Elizabeth Snowden's essay on "Collecting Women's Serials" and Tom Montag's sprightly piece on "Stalking the Little Magazines," which are presented in a clear, readable style. To the editor's credit there is something for everyone, a mix of historical and bibliographical articles along with more practical pieces for the working and overworked serials librarian. Beginning with volume two a regular feature, "New Serials," provides in advance of publication an annotated listing of new titles with prices, frequency, and ordering information.

The almost simultaneous appearance of these four journals leads one to wonder when (or if) a saturation point will be reached—if it has not been reached already. The overlapping scope of these particular journals will inevitably result in needless duplication of effort and content. Moreover, one suspects that there are not enough talented and willing librarian/writers or editors to fill the pages of the existing literature well, not to mention four new periodicals.

Ironically, as the budgetary noose tightens, painful choices must be made and these four very specialized publications (at a combined cost of \$130) will be prime candidates for the very procedures they advocate—careful evaluation and weeding. Viewing them in the light of the widespread current fiscal stringencies, we must sadly conclude that the unbridled free enterprise in periodical publishing that was characteristic of the 1960s and '70s must come to an

end.—*Jack A. Clarke, University of Wisconsin-Madison.*

California Postsecondary Education Commission. *Librarians' Compensation at the University of California and the California State University and Colleges: The Search for Equity.* Commission Report 78-2. Revised May 8, 1978. Sacramento: California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1978. 1v. (various pagings)

Though many librarians nationwide are envious of the salaries paid to California librarians in institutions of higher education, we could not agree with the findings of this extremely uninformed report that they are paid an equitable wage for the services that they provide.

The charge to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) was to "analyze the comparable wages and parity of CSUC [California State University and Colleges] and the UC [University of California] librarians with librarians in other institutions of higher education, both nationally and in California." The objective was to determine whether CSUC and UC libraries are able to compete effectively for the best-qualified librarians.

The study that was done was obviously prepared by people with little to no knowledge of academic librarianship, as the descriptions offered regarding the nature of librarianship were either pathetically historical or written by some of the profession's more irresponsible critics. Worse yet, many of the conclusions in the report are based on these misconceptions; and the CPEC patronizingly states that librarianship is undergoing some changes, and as soon as librarians really become active disseminators of information we will qualify for higher salaries. Inasmuch as they focused on providing information, the preparers of this report might have realized the complexity of the task had they spent even an hour at a reference desk. Providing access to information requires not only an extensive formal education but also a great deal of experience.

The data-gathering techniques were questionable. A hasty, incomplete survey was made, and no examination was made of the many salary surveys that have already been