the status of women within the library profession, but also, as the researchers state, to "contribute to the positive image of women in librarianship by virtue of the quality of the research." From the preface, where that statement appears, and continuing throughout the work, the reader is constantly reminded of the difficulties facing women in our (numerically) female-dominated profession. This study documents the "how" and "where" of gender-based differences in salary and status. It goes beyond that by anticipating the "why."

Estabrook and Heim succeed admirably in fulfilling both goals set for the study. The research is comprehensive (within the stated limits of the population surveyed) and the methodology sound, but its greatest strength is that it calls into question carefully nurtured assumptions about women and work.

The monograph itself is deceptively simple. It's short, barely 41 pages of text. The language is clear and concise (interpretation of the data doesn't require a tortuous interpretation of the interpretation). Heim and Estabrook clearly want the results of their research to be accessible to the widest possible concerned audience. They do not obscure their findings by adding unnecessary embellishments or, as is so often the case in reports of survey research, by "speaking in tongues," addressing only the initiated.

The first two chapters introduce the study. Chapter One is a detailed literature review; it examines previous studies upon which the researchers drew and notes the areas of possible investigation that have been overlooked. The second chapter, "Methodology of the COSWL Study," describes at length the design of the questionnaire and introduces the population surveyed. The researchers are careful to point out that the population in question consists of members of the American Library Association and is therefore predominately female and predominately white. To its credit, the survey is not presented as a definitive portrait of librarianship.

The final questionnaire (included in the appendix) consisted of 37 questions covering four major areas: overall career pattern, current or most recent job situation, educational background and professional involvement, personal and family data. The rationale for each section of the questionnaire is fully discussed allowing this chapter to be read both as a description of a completed project and as a model for future research. It was particularly gratifying to note that the section on personal and family data offered, along with the standard categories "married, divorced, single," the option "part of a long-term committed relationship."

Chapter 3, "Analysis of Major Findings," provides the heart of the study. Statistical tables accompany the narrative discussion of the findings. These findings, while interesting and important, serve mainly as tangible evidence of the existence of a situation many have long suspected: significant differences in status and salary are found between women and men in the library profession. Even when the researchers controlled for personal, career, or professional variations, sex was found to be an important determinant of salary.

As a member of the Committee on the Status of Women in Librarianship (though not serving on COSWL during this project) and past-coordinator of the SRRT Feminist Task Force, I may appear to some as a less than impartial judge of a study of this nature. On the contrary, I believe that constant involvement in issues affecting women in librarianship has made me read more critically and accept less readily research on these issues. Heim and Estabrook have completed a study that belongs on every library director's bookshelf, and should be required reading in library school management courses. Apart from the information it gives us about ourselves, this study serves as model of conscientious, principled survey research. I recommend it highly for the questions it answers and the issues it raises.—Ellen Broidy, University of California, Irvine.

Michael Tate presents a subject access theme with his paper on American Indian discontent with government reports. It is an interesting account of how government reports have adversely impacted the Indian. He delineates problems connected with official definitions of who is Indian and the effect this has on the census. He also reveals problems with access to Bureau of Indian Affairs files that prove frustrating to researchers.

Two papers are research reports. Peter Hernon and Charles McClure present a preliminary report of a pilot study on quality of reference in academic depositories. On the basis of unobtrusive testing in seventeen libraries, they found that correct answers were provided only 37 percent of the time. The authors argue that such a low rate of accuracy impairs access to depository collections and raises questions about the effectiveness of the depository system in meeting the public's information needs. The authors make several recommendations for further study.

John Richardson looks at the nature of research in government publications by analyzing theses and dissertations completed since 1928. He too recommends further research.

The eighth paper is on the struggle to pass a Freedom of Information Act in Canada. R. Brian Land gives an account of the many bills introduced and a comparison with the U.S. law.

Each paper has references that are consolidated in a bibliography at the end. A summary of papers is provided by Gary Purcell. The theme of access is followed to a greater or lesser degree in all the contributions, except for Richardson's.

The topics are interesting, but diverse. The work is for documents librarians who wish to keep abreast of the literature and for those seeking research topics in the field. It does not serve as a basic text on the topic as does Herron's and McClure's latest publication, *Public Access to Government Information* (Ablex Publishing, 1984).—Michele Strange, Northwestern University.