

mistic. The Bureau of Labor Statistics did try to cover itself by adding a caveat at the end of the *Bulletin* stating: "If, as seems increasingly likely, 1985 population and enrollment levels are lower than those assumed at the time this analysis was carried out, fewer librarians may be required."

The organization of the material is excellent, and the prose is clear, making a wealth of data intelligible and interesting for the layman. This work is well documented and is augmented by numerous tables and readable charts.

Even if the projections for employment are too high, this book should still be on every librarian's, student's, and library educator's priority reading list. Many false assumptions are dispelled, and many suspicions are confirmed by reading this document. There are serious implications for all of us based on their findings which document current trends in librarianship. A few random quotations may serve as examples of the above:

Nearly half of all librarians in the United States were employed in school libraries in 1970. Probably no more than 40-50 percent of all librarians employed in the United States have a master's degree in librarianship. Employment of library attendants and assistants is expected to grow much more rapidly, through 1985, than employment of professional librarians.

—Janice J. Powell, Assistant to the University Librarian, University of California, Berkeley.

Guyton, Theodore Lewis. *Unionization: The Viewpoint of Librarians*. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1975. 204p. \$10.00. (LC 74-19164) (ISBN 0-8389-0187-5)

Treating southern California as a microcosm of the United States, Mr. Guyton has gathered and analyzed the views of 460 local public librarians toward collective bargaining for their profession. The statistical method employed can occasionally lend oracular solemnity to the obvious. Thus a UCLA computer reveals to us that librarians who are generally against unionism are unlikely to join a library union; and that there is a high positive relationship be-

tween the formation of public librarians' unions and the presence of legislation permitting public employees to bargain collectively. These exuberances of computational power do not, after all, interfere much with the author's other points.

His main point is, of course, what makes these people join or reject unions. Merely economic motives are overshadowed by a complex of interrelated events: The growth of a library turns it into a bureaucracy, in which communications between librarians and administrators are reduced, and a gap grows between their respective roles. Because the librarians perceive their profession to have fitted them to perform at all levels of the bureaucracy, this gap also represents a discrepancy between their desired professional status and what it actually is. Thwarted as individuals, they turn to collective effort, a union.

The author suggests that librarians consider themselves holding a "status ideology," whereby workers seek to share administrative authority without destroying it (as opposed to a "class ideology" of conflict with authority). The questionnaire did not get at this point. Shared authority is such a pawn of rhetoric, like social justice or law and order, that it may not matter.

The author found that employment security had not been important in fostering library unionism. It seems likely that events since 1971-72, when the manuscript appears to have been submitted for publication, have given employment security a greater importance; but that is merely a new chapter in history. Probably nobody is more frustrated than the author by the slow pace of the publisher, for in collective bargaining a delay of three years in publication is serious.

Not every useful point can be cited here, but the study shows that the slowness of public librarians to unionize is not attributable to shyness or any such personality traits with which folklore has vested them.

Mr. Guyton's statistical analyses do tell us important things, but he is at his best when he walks without the aid of the UCLA computer. The book includes a short history of public library unionism in the United States since its beginning in 1917. Inseparable from this history are the roles of ALA and other professional associations,

which the author feels might deter unionization if they performed some of a union's functions. He adds, however, "ALA is encouraging other organizations to assume its role as spokesman for the nation's librarians." This pithy statement demands a challenge—if any ALA champion is awake to make it.

This book deserves special recognition on several scores. It pioneers an approach to collective bargaining among librarians—not the only approach, but a useful one which will probably now be repeated from library school to library school. Moreover, it has drawn on fields of knowledge outside of traditional library science to a degree that presages future effects of collective bargaining on the isolation of the profession.—*John W. Weatherford, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant.*

Thomson, Sarah Katharine. **Interlibrary Loan Policies Directory.** Chicago: American Library Assn., 1975. 486p. \$7.95. (LC 74-32182) (ISBN 0-8389-0197-2)

If there is any one person to whom the current generation of interlibrary loan librarians has reason to be grateful, it is Sally Thomson. Her Columbia dissertation (later published as an ACRL monograph) was the first substantial study of interlibrary loan transactions in this country. The *Interlibrary Loan Procedure Manual*, which she published in 1970, makes it possible for the least experienced librarian to properly execute interlibrary loan requests. Her most recent contribution, the *Interlibrary Loan Policies Directory*, will in the future save numerous individual librarians the work of compiling the same data.

The *Directory*, arranged by NUC code, contains information on the lending policies and practices of 276 American academic, public, government, and special libraries. The libraries selected generally lend 250 or more volumes a year to out-of-state libraries. Information given for each institution includes addresses of interlibrary loan and photoduplication services, photocopy practices and charges, and lending policies for periodicals and other serials, microforms, government documents, dissertations and theses, genealogies, and technical reports. The information was supplied by interlibrary loan librarians following a de-

tailed form provided by Dr. Thomson.

The only similar work is the *Directory of Reprographic Services*, issued by the Reproduction of Library Materials Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA, which contains information on lending policies for dissertations and periodicals as well as information on photoduplication services. But the RLMS directory, because of its lack of standards for inclusion, its inconvenient format, and its lack of detail, has not been very useful to interlibrary loan librarians.

As long as libraries fail to agree on lending policies and practices, a directory such as Dr. Thomson's will be a necessity. The individual interlibrary loan librarian will still need to collect and compile some data since not all libraries could be included in this new directory. It does provide, however, a very substantial common core to which each library can add its own supplementary list.

In order to make it easier to add other entries and also to insert changes as they occur, it would be helpful if the next edition were issued in a more flexible format. It is undoubtedly too much to hope that this public display of their failure to agree will motivate librarians to reexamine their policies and make the publication of future editions unnecessary!—*Marjorie Karlson, Head, Reference Department, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.*

Daily, Jay E. **Cataloging Phonorecordings: Problems and Possibilities.** (Practical Library and Information Science, vol. 1) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1975. 172p. \$13.75. (LC 73-90723) (ISBN 0-8247-6196-0)

When the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)* were published in 1967, Jay Daily evaluated Part III, "Non-Book Materials" (see his "Selection, Processing, Storage of Non-Print Materials," *Library Trends* 16:283-99 (Oct. 1967)). He was not at all pleased with the new code and subsequently issued his own code for dealing with nonprint materials. Some of his ideas can quite properly be described as radical and controversial. On the other hand, his criticisms of AACR represent something more than a personal idiosyncrasy. If Part III of the code were satisfactory, it is not