

cally cast, thereby, in the role of "bad guys." If such an attitude was conveyed by CALBPC staff, then the center was probably defeated from the start.

If the Dougherty-Maier volume has a major fault, it is the fact that the center was more management-oriented than people-oriented. In the final recommendations, this deficiency is admitted. The astonishing fact is that the need for the staff's knowing "how cooperation will affect their jobs, their future, or their status" was recognized only after the experiment was concluded. If ever there were a cogent argument for requiring prospective librarians to study personnel administration and psychology, this recorded naivety would provide it. It is incredible that library administrators can, in the 1970s, still claim unawareness of the need for staff to be treated as members of a team, not as chessmen to be manipulated on the board of library efficiency.

Despite the naive personnel relations evident throughout the volume (cf. especially recommendations 4 and 5, p.119), this record of a "grand experiment" is rich in technical data. If anything, the tables are overly abundant and detailed. Every conceivable segment of the operation has been counted, timed, measured, or costed out. If for no other reason than this, every academic library catalog department ought to buy a copy of the book.

There are, as is not uncommon with Scarecrow Press volumes, a plethora of typographical errors. In a work less dependent for its value upon technical details, this problem might be more easily overlooked. The finding of, for example, three alphabetical typos in Figure 2.5 causes the reader to wonder whether some of the numbers might also have been copied incorrectly. It is unfortunate for the impact of the study that a more careful job of proofreading was not done.

In sum, the Dougherty-Maier report is a detailed, data-rich record of an important experiment in library cooperation. From a management standpoint, it will be invaluable to academic library technical services departments. From a human standpoint, however, it leaves much to be desired.—*Doralyn J. Hickey, Associate Professor of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

Massman, Virgil F. *Faculty Status for Librarians*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972.

After hundreds of articles and papers dealing with faculty status for librarians, this is the first regularly published book to appear on the subject. It is worthy of the honor despite certain limitations. The publication is a sociological study of librarians in the nineteen state-supported colleges and universities in a three-state area—Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, excluding the senior state institutions. The author surveys the literature of the subject, examines the sociological bases of academic librarianship as a profession, and then compares representative samples of librarians and classroom faculty members. Although written as a dissertation, completed at Michigan in 1970, it is broad-gauge and readable, soundly conceived and generally well executed.

The literature survey is done well, with no significant sources overlooked. Massman documents the history of the movement and summarizes the sociological factors upon which the movement for faculty status for librarians is based. In this section he shows good understanding and sound judgment in evaluations.

The main body of the work, however, is a very extensive comparison of librarians—92.7 percent of whom hold faculty status—and the classroom faculty in certain subjects. A wealth of information is presented in eighty-eight tables, many of which supplement even the excellent study of librarians by Anita R. Schiller. These tables and the discussion compare librarians and classroom faculty members as to age, sex, education, length of service, publications, Senate and committee memberships, faculty rank by degrees held and by sex, publication, length of academic year, tenure, sabbatical leave, and funds for research and travel.

Some interesting findings are that 92.7 percent of the librarians hold full faculty status, and that two-thirds are on nine or ten months contracts. These librarians are fortunate in this regard especially when one thinks of such states as California and New Jersey, or of some large universities. Regarding rate of publications, those on twelve-month contracts were, quite surpris-

ingly, exactly as productive as those on nine or ten months contracts. Women librarians published one-sixth as much as men. All published less than the classroom faculty. Regarding salaries, the author found librarians' salaries lower than those of classroom faculty at all ranks. However, when education was taken into account the differences were small: librarians with the doctorate averaged \$13,167 compared to \$13,229 for classroom faculty; librarians with two masters' degrees, \$9,980; and librarians with one master's degree \$8,839 versus \$9,605 for a classroom teacher with the master's. The comparative maldistribution of librarians among faculty ranks is documented but not discussed. Substantial discrimination in salary by sex is revealed and commented on, both among the classroom faculty and among librarians.

Sociologists believe that the major determinants of occupational prestige are (1) education, (2) amount of systematic and general knowledge, and (3) amount of individual responsibility. The author concludes that the literature of librarianship is adequate but faults librarians on education and responsibility. He concludes that education being the most critical factor and highly important in academic life, improvements will be necessary. He sees faculty status as a major means for this continued improvement.

The work does have several shortcomings. The senior state universities are omitted; including them unquestionably would have affected the findings. Although the publication date is 1972, the field work was done in 1969 and the literature survey ends early in 1970. Much has happened in the two years since. The classroom disciplines from which the faculty sample was drawn were traditional subjects in which the doctorate usually is the terminal degree; it would have been desirable to include some subjects in which it is not, such as home economics, social work, library science, and the fine arts. Omitted is any information on several important aspects: the work week, role of the supporting staff, effects of faculty status on organization and administration, and the views of those in the profession who oppose faculty status. As to the latter, the separate but equal advocates, and the management-efficiency group, he

does list the leading figures. Also omitted are the principal threats to faculty status in a state—the state civil service boards who would like to extend their domain, and the out-of-state efficiency experts who may propose to save money by operating the library on what Louis R. Wilson once called a stripped-down housekeeping level. Also, as usual with Scarecrow Press books, the format is poor and there are a number of typographical errors.

Despite these shortcomings, the book is a very welcome addition to the literature of faculty status. It provides a great deal of factual information and its conclusions will compel librarians to take stock and make plans for the future.—*Arthur McAnally, Director of Libraries, University of Oklahoma.*

Wynar, Lubomyr R. *Encyclopedic Directory of Ethnic Newspapers and Periodicals in the United States*. Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1972. 260p. \$12.50.

Immigrants are American history. Despite the characteristics of the American society—opportunity, mobility, and integration, and despite the rhetoric of the melting pot, we are still a pluralistic nation. In fact, there is a resurgence of ethnic activities: action programs in ethnic communities, ethnic studies at the college and university levels, etc., many recently supported with the Ford Foundation grants. Increasingly, ethnic consciousness and cultural differences are cultivated, not obliterated as in the past.

For those interested in American social and cultural development, the ethnic press is a topic deserving special attention. By ethnic press we usually mean newspapers and periodicals published in a foreign language or in English but addressing themselves to a national group. (Guidelines of Canada Ethnic Press Federation.)

So far, few studies on the ethnic press exist. One of the first ones and still important from the historical point of view—*The Immigrant Press and Its Control* by Robert E. Park—was published in 1922 and reprinted in 1970. It examines the period following World War I. It is a thorough descriptive study of the characteristics and varieties of one thousand immigrants' publications. In