

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

conducted by ARL and ACRL. The analysts settled on one method of gathering data, by position level, and then could not use existing data.

Throughout the report, data are dismissed as being irrelevant for one reason or another. Again and again, the key issues were dismissed, such as sexual discrimination, because of the difficulties the analysts had in dealing with the issues. The technical advisory committee, which did include librarians, met for the first time four months prior to the deadline for the report, and drafts of the report were issued to them just four days before the committee's final meeting. Therefore, one assumes that the librarians were unable to enlighten the authors.

The report concludes that even though California community college librarians earn 20 percent more than librarians in the four-year institutions, the salaries are adequate to draw qualified candidates, and, after all, there is a surplus of librarians in California. A major oversight in the report was in not addressing the effect UC's and CSUC's low salaries have had on affirmative action. These institutions have not been able to draw minority candidates the way the community colleges have.

The problem with a report such as this, which was prepared by those who do not understand librarianship, is that it is read by others who do not understand it but who are reading the report ostensibly to gain understanding. The report's damage is already done. One could spend hours pointing out the errors, inconsistencies, and prejudices in this report, but all this defensiveness will not lead to greater understanding. It is important for California librarians, and indeed all librarians in higher education, to prepare reports that clearly and factually address the issue of adequate compensation for the responsibilities we assume and the services we provide.—*Janice J. Powell, University of Maryland at College Park.*

New, Peter G. *Education for Librarianship: Decisions in Organising a System of Professional Education.* With specialist contributions from D. W. Langridge, C. D. Needham, B. L. Redfern. London: Clive Bingley; Hamden, Conn.: Linnet Books,

1978. 174p. \$10. LC 77-19198. ISBN 0-85157-250-2 [Bingley]; 0-208-01548-5 [Linnet].

This rather brief introduction to library education, presented from a distinctly British perspective, makes no pretense of offering a balanced review of the field. Its 174 pages include primarily the personal advice and comments of Peter New (cited on the dust jacket as "senior member of the staff of the Polytechnic of North London School of Librarianship"), along with three specialized chapters on the organization of knowledge, bibliography, and management submitted, respectively, by D. W. Langridge, C. D. Needham, and B. L. Redfern.

New provides relatively little in the way of historical review of the growth of library education. His approach is mainly didactic and anecdotal, thereby lending the work a certain charm as the expression of a clearly dedicated teacher, albeit one who might seem to American students just a bit old-fashioned. No documentation, other than personal experience and logical argument, appears in any of New's writing. The only bibliographic citations in the book are those provided by Needham. (It does seem appropriate that someone writing on bibliography as a "core subject" should include a bibliography, but Needham's full documentation also serves to highlight the absence of such material from the rest of the contributions.)

The book begins with a fairly detailed section about the advantages and disadvantages of taking one's library education at home versus going abroad for it. While this chapter might initially seem of little value to Americans, it contains useful insights into the problems of the foreign student that may be more easily overlooked in the United States, where students from other countries are in the distinct minority on most campuses.

New also attempts to treat some of the basic questions in library education such as the level at which it should be begun, whether the same institutions should offer training for library technical assistants along with the education of professionals, and the degree of reliance upon part-time faculty fresh from practice versus use of full-time academicians.