types of libraries, with subdivisions, is sensible and fairly convenient, and there are author and subject indexes. Bibliographical information for each entry seems sufficient for retrieval of the item, though there are some errors and it would have been preferable (albeit more expensive) to have supplied authors’ given names rather than only their initials.

With this publication, together with the appearance also in 1978 of the Dictionary of American Library Biography and the coverage of current publications and other news in the Journal of Library History, we now have for American librarianship essential tools for historical research and writing that we have long needed. Now wouldn’t it be nice to have, as a companion, a guide to manuscript, archival, and other unpublished sources relevant to American library history? But that wish by no means diminishes the achievement of Harris and Davis in compiling this exceedingly useful and most welcome volume.—Phyllis Dain, Columbia University, New York.


These two works explore the use of slide/tapes or tape-slides for library instruction in academic libraries from American and British viewpoints. Hardesty’s book is a survey that looks at the question in order to provide particular information about the condition of slide/tapes as an overview, while Hills’ evaluation tries to ascertain the value or worth of tape-slides used in library instruction.

In his well-organized survey of the use of slide/tape presentations in academic libraries, Larry Hardesty, of DePauw University, tackled a problem common to instruction librarians in academic libraries: how to develop a media program that is economical to produce and effective to use and well received by librarians and users, “in the search for more effective methods to orient and instruct large numbers of students in the proper use of the academic library.”

He surveyed libraries through Project LOEX (Library Orientation Instruction Exchange), identifying 104 libraries in 1975 and 193 in 1976 that used slide/tape presentations. Lack of money, time, and expertise were the major problems identified by librarians for developing slide/tape programs. Hardesty lists the particulars for some seventy-five instruction slide/tapes and an even greater number of orientation slide/tapes. He gives the background of his two surveys and provides useful appendixes, including his survey letter and a list of information sources for library instruction.

As in any survey of this nature dependent on a clearinghouse, there are some gaps. (SUNY Albany for instance has five slide/tapes used for library instruction: library services, government documents, information retrieval, the card catalog, and a search strategy for library research, but is not included.)

Murphy’s appendix lists “six typical faults which can doom any presentation.” He cites these as being: vague purpose, too long, no interaction, ineffective visuals, improper use, and wrong equipment. Murphy’s section is followed by a selected bibliography and a brief description of the British SCONUL (Standing Conference on National and University Libraries) program, including reference to the Evaluation of Tape-Slide Guides for Library Instruction report.

P. J. Hills, director of the SCONUL Tape/Slide Evaluation Project at the University of Surrey, England, in his report “sets out to describe a study on the introduction of an innovatory method in library user education in a number of universities and colleges throughout the United Kingdom.” The project was “to investigate the preparation and use of tape-slide guides for user instruction in the context of the SCONUL scheme” (which is a cooperative, systematic approach using a steering committee of librarians from different institutions to coordinate the production of tape-
slide guides for library instruction and small working parties to actually produce them).

According to Hills, the aim of library instruction is to serve the training needs of the students: to collect evidence for oneself, to form a balanced judgment about it, to fortify the ability to think independently. In this context the report describes in practical, concrete details how one would go about using tape-slides to accomplish these aims. Worthwhile objectives, user instruction methods, evaluation, a testing procedure, dissemination of information, and conclusions and recommendations are topics covered in this thoughtful, well-written report. Useful appendices are included (tape-slide guides produced by SCONUL; typical features of a printed guide; examples of pictures for a tape-slide), and an excellent bibliography, subdivided by topics, is given.

The British system of preparing tape-slides via the SCONUL scheme is impressive as reflected in this report. High standards and careful attention to details are evident in the material presented. Instruction librarians would do well to read this study as they ponder how to instruct users in the ways of libraries.—Anne F. Roberts, State University of New York at Albany.


This guide lists 420 collections of materials in the “humanities” in the six states from Louisiana to Arizona; it also lists 340 “scholars in the humanities” resident therein. The publication was funded, at least in part, by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Collections are arranged alphabetically by state and by locality within the state; scholars in the humanities, alphabetically within the state. There are indexes to collections by names of institutions and names of individual collections, and by subjects, and to scholars in one alphabet and by subject specialties. The book is decently and legibly produced from typewritten copy and is reasonably free of typographical errors; the cover is tasteless.

The definition of humanities, according to the preface, is that of the National Endowment for the Humanities: “Language (modern and classical); linguistics; literature; history, philosophy; jurisprudence; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; history, theory and criticism of the arts; social sciences (those aspects having humanistic content and employing humanistic methods); the study and application of the humanities to the human environment, with particular attention to the relevance of the humanities to current conditions of national life.”

This grandiose definition is reduced, in most of the collections listed, to history of the most parochial character and to archaeology. Outside the few major universities in the region, humanities collections in this broad definition are nonexistent. Among the 420 collections are those of The Plantation Museum, Scott, Arkansas, containing only “household and farm equipment used on southern plantations during the period of the 1870s to the 1920s,” and the Maricopa County Historical Society, Wickenburg, Arizona, with a library of fifty volumes of “historical and Indian materials.”

The listing of these historical societies, public libraries with local history collections, and National Park Service agencies accounts for the bulk of the list of collections. This list of institutions is of limited usefulness and value. One looks in the subject index in vain for “music,” “dance,” “Renaissance”; but an entry for “Yugoslavia” turns up “12 books and several pamphlets presented by the city of Skopje” to the Public Library of Tempe, Arizona.

In summary, humanities collections in major southwestern libraries are adequately listed in Ash’s Subject Collections and the historical societies in McDonald’s Directory of Historical Societies and Agencies. Special collections in public libraries are almost entirely confined to local history; listing them is comparable in fatuity to listing law libraries in county seats.

“A limited number of scholars in the humanities are listed in the directory. These humanists were selected by the state-based