

Each chapter holds interest for a specific audience. Unfortunately they are all lost in a collection of this sort. They would have been better placed as journal articles where their content could have reached the specific audiences for which they were written.

Unless a library has a standing order for the series, this individual volume will add little to its professional collection.—*Robert D. Stueart, Simmons College, Boston, Massachusetts.*

ALA Survey of Librarian Salaries. Office for Research and Office for Personnel Resources with assistance from the University of Illinois Library Research Center. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1982. 108p. \$40 paper. LC 82-11537. ISBN 0-8389-3275-4.

In using any survey it is important to distinguish between what it is and what it is not. Because of the pressure of economics and the availability of other data, this survey covers only two types of libraries: "public libraries serving populations of at least 25,000 and academic libraries which are not part of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL)." Those who seek salary information on other types of libraries must seek elsewhere, but they can be aided in doing so by a bibliography of salary surveys, which is included in an appendix.

The survey was sent to fourteen hundred randomly selected libraries in January of 1982. Five types of library categories were stratified by four regions in the United States. Response rates by type varied from 54 percent for two-year colleges and universities to 82 percent for large public libraries. Small public libraries had a response rate of 73 percent, and four-year colleges, 57 percent. A copy of the survey instrument and a note on the technical considerations in the sampling are contained in an appendix.

The survey attempted to elicit information about thirteen job titles ranging from director, and associate or assistant director, to coordinator of children's services. Some of the titles were unique to public libraries, but the rest could also exist in academic libraries.

There are obvious difficulties in any sur-

vey in communicating with the respondent. The surveyor cannot know and cannot really take into account all of the particulars in every case; summary decisions must be made. In this case decisions were made on issues such as the meaning of "full-time," "professional," job level, position title, and contributed salary. Users of this survey should be careful to read what the compilers say about how these issues were handled. Decisions are reasonable, but individual users may confront a different situation than those summarized by the compilers.

The actual data of the survey are arranged by position, scheduled and actual salaries for each position, the four geographic regions plus an "all" category, and finally, within each cell by low, mean, and high salary together with the number in the cell.

The surveyors present, in supplementary tables, data on beginning professional salaries and on employee benefits—a notoriously difficult type of data to elicit and analyze. There are also useful appen-

Heritage on Microfilm

Rare and out-of-print titles and documents on 35mm silver halide microfilm.

- French Books before 1601
- Scandinavian Culture
- 18th Century English Literature
- Victorian Fiction
- Literature of Folklore
- Hispanic Culture

Send for catalog and title information today.



GENERAL
MICROFILM
COMPANY

70 Coolidge Hill Road
Watertown, MA 02172
(617) 926-5557

dixes on employee compensation programs, ALA salary issue policies, and a selected bibliography on compensation and employee benefits.

The survey is a useful work, professionally done. It will be a valuable tool for library managers and anyone else who is interested in librarian compensation issues. But it does not answer critical issues on equity and appropriateness of salaries, something of constant concern, and no one should expect it to do so. Survey instruments covering such a broad scale cannot be precise enough to answer local questions. For this, the interested librarian must conduct a narrower analysis that compares institutions more nearly like one another than the survey was able to do. In addition, other factors such as experience, training, education, sex, and race must be considered. None of these are included in the survey, but analysis of them in any given situation is critical for an equitable and effective compensation plan. Consequently, the survey is useful in a general way, because it provides a context within which to view salary issues in the libraries, but it cannot be relied upon to provide a basis for specific decisions.—Richard J. Talbot, *University of Massachusetts, Amherst*.

College Libraries: Guidelines for Professional Service and Resources Provision.

3d ed. London: The Library Association, 1982. 63p. (Distributed in the U.S. by the Oryx Press) \$12. ISBN 0-85365-635-5.

Because of many changes in libraries, higher education, and in support of higher education, the Executive Committee of the Colleges of Further and Higher Education Group of the Library Association undertook, in 1980, revision of its 1971 standards. The result was a generally well presented and up-to-date set of standards.

These British standards immediately invite comparison with their American counterpart: "Standards for College Libraries" (*College & Research Libraries News*, October 1975). At first glance, both documents appear to cover about the same points and say much the same thing. Yet there are differences, some of which stem

from the way the British *Guidelines* were conceived and prepared. Noting that "too often . . . [standards] are simply a demand for resources, reflecting only theoretical opinions, and offering little in return," the *Guidelines* describe not only what is needed to provide a reasonable level of service, but promise to spell out what the institution can expect in return. Despite that promise, the *Guidelines* are no more specific than the American "Standards," except for the "User Education" section. Another conceptual difference is in the way the two standards specify levels of necessary support. While both employ quantitative formulas to determine collection size and staffing, the American approach relies largely on statistical norms, whereas the British use expert judgment and experience of the "better institutions."

The true measure of any new set of standards, however, is the degree to which it successfully addresses matters not covered or inadequately covered previously. The *Guidelines* do address some of these gaps. They place greater stress than the American "Standards" on achieving a close and integral relationship between the library and the academic program: college librarians must "see themselves as educators in the fullest sense." The entire "User Education" section elaborates on this concern, a matter accorded a single paragraph in the "Standards for College Libraries." The *Guidelines* stress the need "to involve the library in the early stages of all course planning," including changes in content or teaching methods. Involvement in curriculum planning is not dealt with in the "Standards."

Because they were published seven years after the "Standards," in a period of financial stringency, the *Guidelines* argue for not cutting back on library support: "There is a danger of entering a downward economic spiral in which a poorly funded library becomes less valuable to staff and students, use drops off, with the result that funding is further reduced, and so on." The *Guidelines* also discuss the increasing dependence of libraries on technology and the budgetary implications of that dependence, matters not touched on in the "Standards."