

ing but he never examined the library technician training programs, which exist for just that purpose. Conant advocates a two-year program but ignored the experience of the Canadian library schools (accredited by the COA), which have been giving a two-year MLS program for about a decade now. Library schools are professional schools, but Conant never investigated the degree to which the criticisms he heard made of library schools paralleled or differed from those leveled at other professional schools.

Last, I complain strongly about the ineptness or carelessness of the presentation itself. The book is badly misproportioned, with the key first chapter being far too brief to make its point and the interview reports given three times the space they warrant. There are no bibliographical citations whatsoever. The bibliography is so lamentably incomplete (e.g., it does not include Danton's major study on sixth-year programs) as to suggest that Conant was not well informed about previous studies on his subject. The index is simply laughable; for example, there are entries under "graduate library schools" and "gatekeepers of the profession" but none under "library schools" or "librarianship." There are typos aplenty and some outright unintelligibilities. Why, for example, would Conant's model curriculum include—as required courses, no less—such topics as "serial files maintenance" and "reproduction" (p.179)? Even the printer has nodded over this book—there are at least seven instances of text being badly misaligned on the page!

I spoke at the outset of the hopes and fears that attended the publication of the *Conant Report*. My judgment is that neither emotion is warranted by this disappointing study. The Williamson report for the 1980s remains to be written.—*Samuel Rothstein, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver.*

Slater, Margaret. *Career Patterns and the Occupational Image: A Study of the Library/Information Field*. Occasional Publication no.23. London: Aslib, 1979. 334p. UK £18 (£15 Aslib members); overseas £22.50 (£18.75 Aslib members). ISBN 0-85142-122-9.

Margaret Slater has gathered a

tremendous amount of statistical data for this study of the library/information profession in Great Britain. Her goal was to describe career patterns set in the context of the professional image as perceived by employer, librarian, and the general public. To do this she analyzed 307 organization charts and surveyed 1,770 unit heads and 303 members of the profession as well as 100 members of the general public. A less formal evaluation of the public image was gleaned from the media as mirrored in books, films, advertising, and pornography.

A profile of the librarian/information officer in Great Britain emerges from this study. Women predominate in the profession (63 percent were women). The average age was 37.6 and the average length of time in their current job was 5.5 years. Job satisfaction was surprisingly low. Asked if they would choose the same career if they were given a hypothetical second chance, only 47 percent said yes.

The patterns of mobility delineated in the study were representative of the year 1977. Slater found that mobility in the profession was sluggish, with only a 16 percent turnover rate. Curiously, only 45 percent of the libraries surveyed had any turnover at all. Unit heads, asked to conjecture about the reasons for staff departures, identified domestic commitments, the desire for better jobs, and return to school as the primary factors.

Although the image of librarians is a recurring topic for research, Slater fails to compare her findings with many earlier studies on the subject. However stale the topic, her approach is novel and the study reveals some interesting facts. She asked members of the library profession and the general public to place about twenty occupations in rank order from the most important to the least important. Librarians were ranked similarly by the profession and the general public, about twelfth out of the twenty.

Despite this apparent agreement, Slater concludes from her survey and her impressionistic appraisal of the image of librarians in the media that there is a divergence between the profession's self-image and the public's perception of librarians. Librarians view themselves as a people-directed com-

munication and education profession. Their patrons, on the other hand, regard them as aloof, pedantic document shufflers. She believes this negative image has changed little in eighty years despite major changes in the profession during that time.

Although the study was creatively designed, the analysis of the statistical findings lacks depth. The scope of the topic is so broad that some aspects are treated superficially. Sampling techniques are inadequately described, and there is not enough comparison from chapter to chapter. The writing style is conversational ("Tough luck for ex-librarian Mum who fears she may be turning into a cabbage"), which adds some zest to the dry statistics, but the author uses too much jargon to suit this reviewer (e.g., "negative feedback loop mode of operation" and "terminological scatter"). Quotes from punk rock singers and a bizarre restyling of Shakespeare's life are examples of some of the incongruous interjections in this study. Numerous typographical errors contribute to the impression that the study was published too quickly in an effort to keep it timely. Despite these criticisms, the book does contain much to fascinate those interested in the topic.—*Janet L. Ashley, State University of New York, College at Oneonta.*

Johnson, Edward R., and Mann, Stuart H. *Organization Development for Academic Libraries: An Evaluation of the Management Review and Analysis Program.* Contributions in Librarianship and Information Science, no.28. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Pr., 1980. 199p. \$19.95. LC 79-8289. ISBN 0-313-21373-9. ISSN 0084-0243.

"Know thy library" and make it better is the basic premise of the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP). A program that is now nearing the end of a decade of almost constant evolution, MRAP is sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries and assisted principally by grants from the Council of Library Resources, Inc. (CLR). Since little about the program has appeared in the literature, MRAP, a freely chosen, self-evaluation process, and its participants have acquired an unnecessary mystique. This compact and

judicious volume at last takes the "wraps" off MRAP.

The research core of the book was supported by a grant from CLR. One of its two authors, Edward Johnson, served as chairperson of the Pennsylvania State University Libraries MRAP Study Team, and after "several thousand man-hours of intense and sometimes frustrating work" in using MRAP thought its overall impact worth examining. His co-investigator was Stuart Mann, a professor of operations research at Penn State with an interest in library operations. Their statistical analyses and careful, almost understated assessments add definite credence to the study.

A brief but helpful explanation of planning and organization development (OD), itself a growing influence on libraries, constitutes chapters 2 and 3, including a useful outline of earlier self-studies at Columbia, Cornell, and Chicago. Duane Webster, indefatigable director of ARL's Office of Management Studies (OMS) and responsible for MRAP's development, describes it in chapter 4. Chapters 5 and 6 provide the methods and quantitative summaries analyzing MRAP's impact on libraries and staff. Chapter 7 presents conclusions and recommendations. Appendixes include examples of questionnaires used.

By the beginning date of the study (May 1976), twenty-two research and university libraries had undergone MRAP. Three—Iowa State, Purdue, and Tennessee—participated in the pilot operation designed to test the program starting in August 1972. From this and later groups Johnson and Mann selected ten libraries for the most intensive phase of the study, a decision based on finances and time. They note some directors declined to participate or did not respond; they also recognize this may have had a biasing effect on the results. Questionnaires (with remarkable return rates), face-to-face interviews, and Delphi panels of participants were all part of the techniques utilized.

Self-assessment is an appealing, if easily criticized process and promises to continue as a standard for libraries. Nevertheless, as the authors point out, it is time consuming and requires a conscious, clear appraisal—and no small dash of courage—before in-