

of *Catalogues of Libraries* includes all thirty-nine of the rules and a substantial portion of the preliminary essay. The omissions from the latter are mainly lengthy quotations supporting Jewett's arguments in addition to the seven opening pages repeating (from other sources included) his plan for stereotyping the catalog entries. The omission of the two pages on the "Preparation of Titles so as to Serve for both General and Particular Catalogues" is to be regretted, however, as important to later cataloging codes on such matters as editions, copies, and size.

The book is a valuable source for those not having access to the complete works. Nevertheless this reviewer was somewhat disappointed, especially by the quality of Harris' essay. It is more a biographical than a "substantive critical" essay and its tone is more panegyric than critical. Furthermore, a more sophisticated style might be expected from a writer of Harris' experience.—*Edith Scott, The Library of Congress.*

Goodell, John S. *Libraries and Work Sampling*. (Challenge to Change: Library Applications of New Concepts, no.1) Littleton, Colo.: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1975. 60p. \$5.00 pa. (LC 74-79026) (ISBN 0-87287-087-1)

Goodell's book is an auspicious beginning for this new series, giving an easy-to-understand presentation of a technical subject. For those unfamiliar with the topic, an example of work sampling is the use of statistical methods to determine the percentages of the total time circulation clerks spend on their various duties. The information obtained can then be used to establish a better work schedule. Properly performed, work sampling can be a valuable management tool for making more effective use of limited resources.

The author does a commendable job of presenting a library-oriented introduction to work sampling. He first reviews the theory of sampling and then explains the five steps of a typical study. There are numerous examples, tables of statistical information, clear instructions for using the tables, and finally there is a review of the literature of sampling as applied to li-

braries. Statistical terminology and mathematics have been kept to a minimum, and few people will have trouble understanding the material.

This compact book must be read with great care: Its brevity leaves too little room for discussion of areas where the beginner may encounter problems. One can obtain poor results through the use of a biased sample, or through failure to define the problem properly, or through a lack of approval and cooperation by the people concerned. Goodell touches on these areas, but his warnings are not strong enough. Inaccurate work sampling studies can have harmful effects that may be difficult to overcome.

With proper regard for the techniques of work sampling, almost anyone can produce useful studies with only a little experience. Goodell's book is an excellent one for the librarian or graduate student interested in learning the basics, but further information will be necessary. Detailed guidance on making and using work sampling studies will have to come from experienced practitioners and through studying the publications the author lists in his bibliography.—*Edward Gibson, Assistant Librarian, Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland.*

Davies, D. W. *Public Libraries as Culture and Social Centers: The Origin of the Concept*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1974. 167p. \$6.00. (LC 74-8420) (ISBN 0-8108-0738-6)

David W. Davies, long an academic librarian and a historian and typophile as well, here turns a critical, somewhat ironical eye on the relationship between goals and programs of public libraries in Great Britain and North America. On the basis of both his particular point of view and his research—which is stronger for the early nineteenth century than for later years, especially our own time—he sees public libraries as having been diverted from their legitimate function, the provision of books and a place to read, by a faulty conception of their social role. Though he promises to follow the progress of scholarly along with popular libraries, the entire book, except for a few paragraphs, is devoted to the latter; there is no attention given to the re-

search collections and scholarly work of large public libraries as they may relate to his major theme.

Davies argues that public libraries, founded by nineteenth-century upper- and middle-class philanthropists convinced of the perfectibility of humankind, eager to uplift the masses, and persuaded that reading was intrinsically virtuous and refining, were, like other educational and cultural institutions, started by similar people and for similar reasons (lyceums, athenaeums, literary and scientific societies, mechanics' institutes), paternalistic and elitist. Being neither initiated by the people they were endeavoring to improve nor, as it turned out, heavily patronized by them, libraries suffered from the contradiction between the high aims of their founders and the low level of their use. Most people simply did not read, and even fewer would read serious books. So public libraries, unlike scholarly libraries with their ready-made and motivated clientele, resorted to "nonbook" activities to attract the populace: classes, festivals, exhibitions, lectures, contests, excursions, slide shows, performances of plays, film showings, concerts, even karate demonstrations. The object was thus to stimulate somehow the reading of books, and failing that, to make libraries "centers of culture" or "social and entertainment centers"—all without evidence of success and in face of a perpetually small reading public and competition from more powerful and more efficient purveyors of culture, social services, and entertainment. Unable or unwilling to confront these realities, public libraries remain anachronistic institutions on the nineteenth-century uplift model, mindlessly emulating the long gone lyceums, et al. They would do well instead to confine themselves to a perfectly respectable and useful role as specialized agencies dealing with books and with information gleaned from books.

This is an awfully simple solution to a not-so-simple set of problems, and therein is the basic limitation of Davies' book. The subject is bigger and more complex than his slender treatment of it, so that the strength of his views makes the book thesis-ridden. As a work of history, it is a sketchy survey, mildly provocative, slightly idiosyncratic,

and highly opinionated. This is too bad, as Davies does have something to say.—*Phyllis Dain, Associate Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University.*

**Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A History and Policy Statements.** Compiled by the Committee on Academic Status of the Association of College and Research Libraries. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1975. 55p. \$3.50. (LC 75-29403) (ISBN 0-8389-5455-8)

The object of this booklet, compiled by the Committee on Academic Status of ACRL, is to make available basic documents related to faculty status for academic librarians. It includes the "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians" (adopted by ACRL in June 1971); the 1974 "Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians" as drafted by a committee of the ACRL, AAC, and AAUP; and a "Model Statement of Criteria and Procedures for Appointment, Promotion in Academic Rank, and Tenure for College and University Librarians" (approved by the ACRL in 1974).

It is good to have all of this material now available in one place. A special addition to this volume is the essay by the late Arthur M. McAnally, "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community," reprinted from the 1971 volume, *Research Librarianship: Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs* (Bowker). As a review of the literature, it is excellent; and what he says is eminently sensible, especially about the evolution of librarian faculty status. As a brief summary of future developments, it is particularly interesting since four years have passed; and the budget situations at many schools now make some of his possibilities seem more elusive than ever, particularly the nine-month year. What he does emphasize is that the whole question of faculty status is complex and interrelated with many factors.

All library faculties or departments should reread the June 1971 ACRL "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians" and apply the criteria to themselves. How many can say "We do!" to all nine standards? Finally,