

edge Industry Publications, 1983. 231p. \$27.50 paper. LC 82-18726. ISBN 0-86729-002-1.

This is an important book. It defines, and provides a context for, preservation as a library function equal to cataloging or reference work. It is for seasoned, senior administrators, who have just realized the need for a coherent preservation program, and for novice preservation administrators, who have just been handed the task of starting one. Library administrators will find all the arguments they need to convince their colleagues and university officials of the necessity for allocating budget dollars for preservation; preservation administrators will find graphically illustrated organization plans, position descriptions, decision-making apparatuses, case studies, and enough technical information to point them in the right direction.

Morrow begins by succinctly describing the organic composition of library materials from books to videotape and why they tear, fade, crumble, warp, break, mold, or spontaneously combust. Enough scientific data is offered to underscore the arguments for the preservation practices offered, but not to impede general understanding by the intelligent reader. Discussions of preservation issues for each type of material focus on special problems, controversial points of view, and trade-offs between treatment options and costs.

The strength of Morrow's work lies in the chapters on how to develop a preservation program and case studies concerning conservation of rare and unique items. Administrators will find useful the budget and cost figures that appear throughout; this kind of data is elusive, and even more cost analysis would have strengthened the work. Morrow concludes with an overview of the latest technological experiments, including optical disk, deacidification, freeze and vacuum drying of water-damaged materials, accelerated aging tests, cold storage, and encapsulation. A final chapter describes the various organizations and funding agencies active in preservation matters.

Gay Walker contributed a chapter on

preserving the intellectual content of printed materials, based on her very successful program at Yale. While she concentrates heavily on the process of preservation microfilming (or "microfiching"), there is a section on in-house photocopying that may be unique in the literature. In her introduction, Pam Darling, author of the profession's most readable preservation lore, gently but firmly explodes yet another myth. "The survival of thoughts beyond the life of the thinker gives significance to the human experience," she writes, "and so we are comfortable in believing that the materials on which we record those thoughts will live on after us. But it has never been true."

As a first step, Morrow's book will help libraries face this reality and engender a commitment to change. Academic libraries may then want to turn to the *Preservation Planning Program, An Assisted Self-Study Manual for Libraries and Resource Notebook* (Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries, 1982) for more in-depth help.

Trained conservators don't need this book. Libraries that have not yet accepted the preservation challenge do.—Nancy E. Gwinn, *Research Libraries Group, Inc.*

Myers, Marcia J. and Jirjees, Jassim M.
The Accuracy of Telephone Reference/Information Services in Academic Libraries: Two Studies. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1983. 270p. LC 82-10785. ISBN 0-8108-1584-2.

If one accepts the fact that Myers and Jirjees have developed a statistically valid research study, and they spend the great majority of this book explaining their methodology in such detail that this reviewer is convinced, then they have some important conclusions that every public service administration should find interesting. According to past studies, which have only been done in-depth for public libraries, telephone reference service is only about 50 percent accurate. These studies done in the Southeast by Myers involving forty academic libraries ranging from two-year colleges through universities and in the Northeast by Jirjees (in five, four-year state colleges with graduate pro-

grams) arrived at very similar percentages, 50 percent and 56.6 percent respectively. Variables, such as, library budget, collection size, service population, number of full-time professional reference librarians, hours the library was open, and physical facilities were considered to see what impact they have on reference service. The size of the library and the hours open had a substantial association with the number of correct answers, most other variables had little or no significant relationship to effective telephone reference.

The method used in both studies was unobtrusive measurement for the evaluation of telephone service to factual reference questions. There are concerns about the ethics of such a study but the authors deal with these issues in a clear manner, and the questions asked seemed fair and certainly comparable to the type asked at academic reference desks in the experience of this reviewer. The conclusions are startling and important for planning the future of telephone reference service in academic libraries. Myers says "if academic libraries can answer fact-type queries correctly only 50 percent of the time, they should be emphasizing other aspects of

reference services that, one hopes, they perform better, such as, readers' advisory service, guidance, and teaching." Perhaps, but reference administrators should look carefully at their operations and make improvements wherever possible. Only 56 percent of the staff in Jirjees' study offered sources of their information to the patron. Staff attitudes can be improved, programs for regular in-house training in new as well as traditional sources should be instituted, and written reference policies are also necessary. Reference staff need to think beyond their own sources to those outside of their own institution and certainly they must use any staff subject expertise available on site before answering negatively. If the staff feel pressured by the immediacy of telephone service then "call backs" should be encouraged. It is not difficult to come to the conclusion, as Jirjees does, that patrons of this information age will not be satisfied with only a 50 to 60 percent success rate for their information needs. The summaries of these two studies should be read by all reference librarians, library administrators, and educators.—*Florence Kell Doksansky, Brown University.*

ABSTRACTS

The following abstracts are based on those prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse of Information Resources, School of Education, Syracuse University.

Documents with an ED number here may be ordered in either microfiche (MF) or paper copy (PC) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P. O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Orders should include ED number, specify format desired, and include payment for document and postage.

Further information on ordering documents and on current postage charges may be obtained from a recent issue of Resources in Education.

Job Characteristics of the "Traditional" University Librarian versus the "Learning Resource" Librarian. By Mary M. Flekke. 1980. 29p. ED 224 487. MF—\$0.83; PC—\$3.32.

This paper, compiled for a class at St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, compares the job characteristics of traditional university library staff, who are most comfortable handling print material, with the job characteristics of university learning resource center staff, who handle all forms of instructional media including such nonprint materials as films, tapes, videotapes, records, videodiscs, and realia. Differences in service functions, education, duties, and competencies for the two types of librarian are discussed, with mention of a progression from one type of librarianship to the other. The development of learning resource center specialists from audiovisual librarianship is noted, and a list of seven competencies for school media specialists is provided. Acceptance or nonacceptance of new technologies in the field of librarianship, including computer technologies, is identified as the major area of contrast between traditional and learning resource center librarians. A thirty-item bibliography concludes this paper.