

copies from laboriously hand-produced tracings to mechanized routines. By the mid-century, it had become possible to marry the two, and photolithography began to make more or less faithful copies of old books accessible to a wider and wider public. While fastidious readers will disdain such copies, McKitterick correctly notes how the availability of old books in facsimile form helped increase their value and regard as cultural objects.

Which leads to the final section of this excellent monograph: public exhibitions. If you have a copy, if you value the copy, would you not prize seeing the original even more? Before the rise of public museums in the 19th century, it would have been hard for anyone other than scholars, collectors, and booksellers to actually see old books. That began to change with regular displays at the great national museums and libraries in Paris and London in the 19th century, and then more broadly. The prestige of old books soared as culturally esteemed objects, an observation that culminates in McKitterick's book in two happy outcomes: the huge and important Caxton exhibition of 1877 in South Kensington and the parallel creation of what essentially became the modern bibliography that continues to inform praxis and scholarship today. The Caxton exhibition brought into one location some 5,000 books and manuscripts, and it did so in a way that reflected a new, historically and technically grounded appreciation of the relationship between the processes of making books and the books themselves. The exhibition thus both enshrined Caxton and printing in the national British epic of freedom, commerce, and Protestantism, while also giving birth to modern study of antiquarian books. Fittingly, the dust jacket of McKitterick's book is an 1877 engraving of "Caxton shewing the first specimen of his printing to King Edward IV & the royal family in the abbey of Westminster, 1477." But this happy ending is not, of course, the end.

The books in our special collections bear the marks of their own, individual

histories—even where all evidence of "historicity" has been deliberately erased, effaced, or otherwise eliminated. They have been and will be valued differently at different times by different groups of people. The old books in McKitterick's narrative are often as much the victims of love and care as they are of neglect, indifference, or—worse—of mischief. While technological inventions play a major role in McKitterick's story, technology only provides tools; it is not a driver. That said, the dark cloud that hovers silently over this book is the arrival of a thoroughly digital world, completely satisfied with and by digital surrogates, that cease to value (to any meaningful extent) the material legacies represented in our collections. McKitterick's is not an elegy for the old book; it is too smart for that. It may be that the proliferation of easily accessible digital surrogates of rare books will make the physical originals of greater cultural value in the eyes of an expanding constituency for them. But the balance of this fine book does not encourage an easy optimism. —
Michael Ryan, Columbia University.

Library Assessment Workgroup (Lesley University). *Faculty Information and Research Needs: A Qualitative Study of Lesley University and Episcopal Divinity School Faculty.* Cambridge, Mass.: Lesley University Library, 2013. 126p. Available online at <http://ir.flo.org/lesley/fileDownloadForInstitutionalItem.action?itemId=2096&itemFileId=2101>.

This qualitative study examines information needs and the research and instructional behavior of faculty, as well as faculty perceptions of information use by students. Participants include faculty from the Art Institute of Boston, Episcopal Divinity School, Lesley College of Liberal Arts and Professional Studies, and the Graduate Schools of Education and of Arts and Social Sciences. Methods are modeled on an ethnographic approach outlined by the Ethnographic Research in Illinois Academic Libraries Project (ERIAL). Findings are based on

responses from three focus groups, and 25 individual interviews of faculty.

The study is composed of eight parts, which include an abstract, executive summary, introduction, methodology, findings, key issues and implications, bibliography, and appendices. Appendix I includes source material used for the study which includes the information resource standards outlined by the Association of Theological Schools, and the Lesley University Library Mission Statement. Appendix II presents the questions used for the focus groups and faculty interviews.

Results highlight four primary areas where the library can improve. These areas include the process for purchasing and accessing library resources, marketing of library services for and collaborations with faculty, training opportunities for faculty, and scholarly communication in the digital age. Some respondents noted that there are some specific discipline areas that lack adequate coverage in the library's collection, and that additional funding is necessary to purchase these materials and meet this need. Another area of note involves alumni access to library electronic resources, especially databases. However, while this request is popular for many academic libraries, it is usually cost-prohibitive. Faculty also expressed confusion about how items are selected for purchase and how faculty can request library resource purchases. This suggests that the library needs to do a better job of marketing this service and educating faculty about the library's collection development policy. Finally, faculty report high usage of Google Scholar in their own research and in that of their students, as well. This suggests that a library discovery tool that offers improved federated searching might improve faculty and student usage of library owned digital content.

Another general topic of concern involves services of the library and collaborations with faculty. Findings showed that faculty members with the highest

reported levels of satisfaction were also those who have established relationships with librarians and library liaisons. In addition, participants suggested that librarians need to create a more customizable service menu for faculty, and improve visibility of the liaison program. Responders also proposed the need to be more collaborative with faculty to improve collection development and library instruction. Collection development could be enhanced when librarians who lack specific subject expertise collaborate with faculty so that appropriate materials are purchased. Further collaboration between librarians and faculty could improve student learning in the areas of information literacy and research training of students. One participant suggested that librarians investigate faculty use of rubrics in evaluating student research projects as a way to gather more information about a department's collection development needs. "Working with faculty members to identify the library element in these rubrics would help the library create the collections and services that will support student learning" (109). Additional comments suggested that the library market itself as a "point-of-need" and to increase involvement with curriculum committees to receive and disseminate information.

Comments also touched on potential training opportunities for faculty. Some participants expressed that library orientation should be more fully developed and administered by each library liaison. Other participants expressed interest in more frequent and more advanced library instruction sessions for faculty. Such sessions could ameliorate database usage issues for some faculty. Suggested training methods include regularly scheduled programs, webinars, and streaming tutorials. Some faculty said they were often confused about whom to call for help with technology and software issues and suggested that the library create partnerships with technology support providers.

Additional feedback discussed the many challenges involving scholarly com-

munication in the digital age. Some faculty complained about the continuing flood of information and the difficulty of sharing information among faculty members with common interests. Some suggested that the library help faculty improve use of information alerts and e-mail filtering capabilities. Conversations with faculty members also mentioned some topics that overlap with those discussed in the library science scholarly literature, including open access publishing, copyright law, use of Wikipedia, and the nature of research.

The authors also mentioned that further study could focus on a more comprehensive analysis of student behaviors including writing and research. Additional analysis could focus on assignments completed by students to analyze how technology is used to study, research, create, store, and share information. Seeking to enhance partnerships and collaborations with faculty could also provide an opportunity to evaluate how students seek information for class assignments. This would enable the library to evaluate its role in providing appropriate resources and services.

This study provides a plethora of anecdotal evidence of the many user behavioral trends observed in academic libraries. Indeed, academic libraries have reported over the years that faculty and students' information-seeking behaviors have changed. For example, faculty and students are using more digital resources over paper materials, as well as using Google Scholar more than library electronic resources. This study also provides a useful model for implementing an

ethnographic research approach across institutions containing different schools, campuses, and programs.

However, this study also highlights some of the many limitations of qualitative and ethnographic research methodology when performing a library needs assessment. In general, ethnographic research can easily create biased findings due to prior established relationships between any researcher and participant. In addition, qualitative research by nature offers subjective answers from each participant, which unfortunately limits the conclusions drawn from the study. There are practical concerns when doing ethnographic research as well. As noted by the authors, this study required an extensive amount of labor and time to complete all phases of the needs assessment. Extensive time and labor was required to organize and survey participants, as well as to transcribe the recorded responses of focus group and interview participants. Additional labor and time was also necessary to collect, organize, and code the survey data. Such labor demands and the long timetable for project completion make this type of research study impractical for many institutions.

In addition, there are challenges with similar studies when it comes to data analysis. Since this type of study is based on highly open-ended survey questions, the broad diversity of possible responses makes analysis of the findings a challenge. It is difficult to not only find patterns in such diffuse data but also to draw clear and focused conclusions from the data. Unfortunately, findings from this sort of study also offer a paucity of generally applicable conclusions, which means that, while the institutions involved in the study will benefit from the results, most academic libraries will not.

Given the study's limitations, it is still a helpful model for academic libraries interested in implementing an ethnographic research approach for a needs assessment. One hopes that future studies will overcome some of this model's limitations by

Index to advertisers

AAAS	535
ACRL Awards	628
ACRL Workshops	573
ACRL Publications	604
Amer. Psychiatric Assoc.	cover 2
Amer. Psychological	529
Bowker/RCL	530
Choice Reviews Online	619
MIT Press Journals	cover 3
NRC Research Press	cover 4

incorporating additional research trials using quantitative methods and include more narrowly focused survey questions of the faculty—which would not only provide findings more applicable to other institutions but would also provide a needs assessment model that more institutions could implement.—*Anders Selhorst, Guilford Technical Community College.*

Gail Munde. *Everyday HR: A Human Resources Handbook for Academic Library Staff.* Chicago: Neil-Schuman, 2013. 182p. paper, \$65.00 (ISBN 978-1-55570-798-9). LCCN: 2012-18146.

There are many human resources handbooks available for all types of employees, and this one is uniquely focused on academic library staff. The author, Gail Munde, explains that she wrote the book to “help demystify HR by providing basic explanations and rationales for the most common and practical applications of HR management in colleges and universities and, consequently, in their academic libraries” (xiii). Broken into six chapters, references at the end of each chapter, a summary, and an index, this handbook also includes helpful tables that summarize often confusing status categories, laws, and performance evaluation criteria.

From the very first line of chapter 1, Munde identifies the most basic HR principle—the “position” is the basic unit of all human resource (HR) transactions. She goes on to describe how the position (“box”) is separate from the individual, and how both are never static. Also included in the first chapter are thorough explanations of positions and position management, including FLSA status (the terms and definitions that outline nonexempt/exempt determination), librarian status, and the principles of position description analysis. In describing the tenure-track or tenured library faculty, Munde clarifies that the common assumption of tenure as a promise of lifetime employment has no basis in law. A helpful table (1.1) summarizes the typical position status categories in academic libraries.

Understanding the basic principles of position analysis can increase employee awareness of the point at which the position (box) they inhabit requires a review for various reasons. Munde explains that position analysts are experts in understanding the various comparisons and classification levels that indicate the need for a position reclassification. She adds that when analyzing positions it is important to remember that position histories are records of the position (that is, the contents of the “box”), not of the employee.

Chapter 2 outlines basic employment laws, including a table (2.1) that describes relevant federal law and its purpose, and gives a URL for more information. Again, Munde writes not just for the human resource practitioner, but the employee as well. By describing the basic employment laws without using professional jargon, she gives the employee insight into “employment at will,” wage and hour laws, health and safety laws, and she even includes information that applies to student workers.

Next, the handbook describes the importance of the work group and of interpersonal relationships. Using early research on work groups as well as more recent research, Munde describes the influence of coworkers on work attitude, levels of engagement, effectiveness, and job satisfaction. Collegiality, and managing conflict, harassment, and bullying are all addressed in chapter 3.

In chapter 4, Munde makes the point that every supervisor has the power to either motivate, coach, mentor, or develop the individuals who report to him or her; supervisors can also contribute to poor performance, low productivity, high turnover, and the individual’s feelings of value to the organization. Starting with the foundation and philosophy behind the management function of supervision, this chapter defines the expert knowledge, skills, and abilities that are hallmarks of supervision. Supervisors spend most of their time communicating something; thus,