To the Editor:

In his C&RL, (Mar. 1985) article "Book Selection Policies in the College Library: A Reappraisal," Charles Gardner makes at least two important claims, one of which is true and the other false. Neither is well documented.

The first is that faculty dominate book selection in small undergraduate institutions. I found this to be true in 1979, when I did a study, "Collection Development in Ten Small Academic Libraries: A Report to the Council on Library Resources" (ERIC ED 190 074). Further, I expect it is still true, though less so than it used to be and not for the same reasons reported by Gardner.

A second claim made by Gardner is that the first claim is the prevailing opinion of college librarians and that there have been few dissenters. Please count me, and a host of other college collection developers, as dissenters. Many of us have argued that material's budgets should be allocated by subject rather than by department precisely in order to make it clear to everyone just who has responsibility for and control of the book budget. I might point out that this has been argued ad nauseam in print and out.

Mr. Gardner may think he is alone in his reappraisal. He is not. Rather he joins a large, established, and distinguished group of college librarians interested in collection development.

WILLIAM E. HANNAFORD, JR.,
College Librarian, Castleton State College, Castleton, Vermont

To the Editor:

The paper of Kohl and Davis, "Ratings of Journals by ARL Library Directors and Deans of Library and Information Science Schools" [C&RL Jan. 1985], is clear with respect to directors, deans and truly general journals. However, its treatment of specialty journals (e.g., excluding Notes and BMLA but including Law Library Journal and School Library Media Quarterly) is confusing. And the claim that it represents a dialogue between educators and practitioners may require an important qualification. There must be—in studies like this and in tenure and promotion decisions—a better distinction made between truly general journals (e.g., Library Quarterly, Library Trends, Library Journal), which deans and directors can judge as well as anyone else, and those journals specialized by librarian function (e.g., RQ, Reference Services Review, and Reference Librarian) or subject area (e.g., Notes, BMLA, Science and Technology Libraries) best judged by instructors and practitioners in those specialties. The authors acknowledge limitations in the scope and nature of this study, but suggest that it might well be extended to school or public librarians. May I suggest that any extension be in a way of perhaps greater interest to readers of C&RL: the consensus of professors and practitioners of public and technical services, and humanities, social science, and scientific literatures, about the journals (both general and within their specialty) that they regard as prestigious.

TONY STANKUS
Science Librarian, Holy Cross
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