

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."

The *Guidelines* do not, however, resolve other important issues. Surprisingly they say nothing about measures of library effectiveness and productivity and little about nonprint material and interlibrary cooperation.

Thus, even though they have taken "Standards for College Libraries" a step further in some respects, the *Guidelines* leave gaps that future sets of standards must address.—*Jasper G. Chad, Wichita State University, Kansas.*

The Marketing of Library and Information Service. Ed. by Blaise Cronin. London: Aslib, 1982, 359p. ISBN 0-85142-153-9.

Marketing library and information services seems to be on everyone's current agenda. "Techniques for . . ." appear on the Library and Information Science Research Agenda for the 1980s developed by Cuadra Associates for the Department of Education Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies. Special Libraries Association's "Highest Priority Issues" list refers to the need for developing strong public relations programs, and every recession-conscious public, special, and academic librarian has begun ruminating about, if not embracing wholeheartedly, the marketing concept.

Whether you agree with John Berry that "a library is a necessary public service" and shouldn't have to be "sold" like toothpaste, or with Fred Glazer that "pap" (persuasion, agitation, participation) is called for more than "quiet dignity," this volume of reprints brings it all together and lets you decide for yourself what marketing is, or can be, and how important it is to the future of libraries.

Blaise Cronin has selected, organized, and intelligently introduced many of the important articles on the subject. He begins with Theodore Levitt's classic 1960 article from the *Harvard Business Review*, which introduced the oft-paraphrased anecdotes detailing the demise of the railroads and the buggy whip industries owing to a lack of the understanding that industry is involved in "customer-satisfying" not "goods producing" processes. Definitions of the library user, nonuser, and information consumer, the variety of library products, marketing

tools, and techniques, the measures of effectiveness, target groups, and community analyses are recurrent topics for discussion in this collection.

In this fourth volume of the Aslib Reader series, the editor has limited selection to articles pertaining to the marketing of library services (as distinct from the marketing of scientific and technical information). Each essay approaches the subject differently and thus justifies its inclusion. There's general theory here as well as discussions of applied marketing principles and practices, and results of research on marketing methodology. The book's only drawback is the reduced print of many of the articles reproduced from larger-format journals.

Although published by Aslib, the majority of articles are by Americans—Robert Wedgeworth, Fay Blake and Edith Perlmutter, Shirley Echelman, Douglas Ferguson, Martha Boaz—these people will be instrumental in whether there is a future market for libraries and will play a major role in how library service is marketed.

Whether your interest is in "selling" the necessity for support of the public library as a free institution to the taxpayer, or you want to focus on the needs of your academic patrons for a computer searching service or review various pricing techniques for commercial information services, this book is highly recommended as a useful and important source. The reviewer believes with the authors that the survival of library services is a real concern, and, as Levitt points out, survival of any service organization always entails market response and change. Knowing your user, knowing your product potential, and knowing how to communicate and what to change are the basic tenets of successful marketing—and survival.—*Shelley Phipps, University of Arizona, Tucson.*

Marketing the Library. Ed. by Philip M. Judd. Newcastle upon Tyne, England: Association of Assistant Librarians, 1981. 124p. \$11 paper.

This slim, edited transcription of a "weekend school" leaves much to be desired, even though there are some highly