shaped by a class of intellectuals that mistrusts and fears "the people."

The Cold War & the University is an important book that hopefully will be used to open up debate about the role of the university as a social institution in the post–Cold War era. Two copies belong in every academic library in the nation.—Elaine Harger, New Jersey Historical Society.


American academic librarians are familiar with The ACLS Survey of Scholars: Final Report of Views on Publications, Computers, and Libraries, published in 1989 by the American Council of Learned Societies. In that survey, book and journal collections received poor marks from respondents, especially among younger faculty members. However, scholars expressed widespread satisfaction with library services, including computerized resources. In that same year, the British Library Research and Innovation Center (BLRIC) conducted a similar study on scholars in the United Kingdom. The results appeared in Research Libraries in Transition (1989) and The Research Process: The Library’s Contribution (1990). BLRIC repeated this survey in 1995. The result is an interesting picture of current academic library use in Britain and a chance to make comparisons with American institutions.

The study was conducted for the BLRIC by Social and Community Planning Research in autumn 1995. Postal questionnaires were sent to 4,496 scholars in medicine, natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities from seventy-six universities throughout Britain and Northern Ireland. The respondents were asked for opinions on access to book and journal collections, if the collections were up to date, status of library services, use of electronic resources, and how changes in library collections and services affected research.

Not surprisingly, three of four respondents named their own main university or department library as the primary collection for research. Access to high-quality monograph and journal collections ranked first among library services. Three of four respondents said that their home university libraries met their needs for British books and journals, but less than half were happy with holdings of non-British published materials. Scholars from Oxbridge universities were the most satisfied with their collections, whereas respondents from polytechnics expressed the lowest satisfaction. These findings echo results from the 1989 survey.

Overall satisfaction with home university collections dropped from 76 percent favorable responses in the 1989 survey to 67 percent in the 1995 survey. This change was due to the cancellation of important journals and a decline in acquisition of current monograph collections due to funding cuts. Natural scientists were more likely and social scientists least likely to report collection deterioration. Access to electronic services, quality of photocopying services, library operating hours, and the quality of assistance provided by librarians received positive marks. Respondents also cited e-mail and bibliographic databases as the most important electronic resources. Areas cited as problems included limited library space, lack of staff time for reference assistance, slow ordering of new materials, and time spent to reshelve materials. Interestingly, respondents were evenly divided on the quality of ILL services.

As was noted in the 1989 survey, scholars relied less on browsing library shelves for materials and were more careful in recommending materials for library purchases. About half said they
worked more from photocopied materials, a quarter responded they used other libraries, and a third made less use of their own library at this time. The respondents also said that research was neither less rigorous nor did it take more time due to the lack of materials at their home libraries. Areas in which scholars wanted to see improvement included journal, monograph, and research report collections, access to external databases, and improved ILL services.

In total, the results from the two British and the ACLS studies mirror one another. Although faculty have embraced electronic tools and resources, the monograph and the journal remain the key tools for scholarship. Scholars value assistance from librarians, as well as high-quality library services, but collections remain their first priority for libraries. The quality of, and time needed for, scholarship did not suffer due to these changes.

This updated survey, along with its 1989 version and the ACLS survey, stands as required reading for all academic librarians. Perhaps it is time for ACLS or ACRL to conduct a new survey of North American scholars. The widespread use of the Internet and adoption of full-text resources since 1989 is seen as changing how libraries and researchers do their work. Now it is time to test this perception.—Stephen L. Hupp, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown.


This cogent analysis of the role and influence of advertising in middle-class American women’s magazines at the turn of the century apparently represents a shortened and sharpened version of Garvey’s 1992 University of Pennsylvania dissertation. Enlivened with forty-four well-chosen illustrations, it exemplifies current scholarly trends that offer academic librarians considerable food for thought.

Chapter topics include the trade card scrapbook (“readers read advertising into their lives”), advertising contests (“training the reader’s attention”), the overlappings between fiction and advertising, women and the bicycle, women as gendered consumers, and men as ad writers. Recent scholarly works the author draws upon range widely: shopping and shoplifting, magazine readers, the socialization of children, changing roles for women, material culture, the trademark law (passed in 1881), and bicycling.

The author compares magazines to department stores, argues that courtship stories are allegories of shopping, notes the perceived value of advertisements (“news of modernity”) and where they were placed in the magazine, and marshals convincing detail to prove the interaction between fiction, advertising, and the molding of consumers. Her insights into the use, promotion, and slippery boundaries of advertising can heighten awareness of our own responses to it—whether in television, radio, films, the Web, or the library press.

The book’s interdisciplinary nature is made obvious by the assignment of ten LC subject headings, as well as by its perplexing classification as a history of the American short story. Potential readers will more likely locate it through keyword searching, citation indexes, or American Studies bibliographies. Librarians might prefer its thirty-four pages of documentation to be complemented by a separate bibliography and a discussion of sources and repositories.

Garvey’s many and rich sources suggest material for collections that academic libraries might be building, pre-