

baries and archives are listed under the original name with address, the name of the chief officer, and library hours. The information about photocopying is given where such facilities exist. The method of individual library description is historical with the current status of holdings. A pertinent bibliography is also supplied.

This work will be useful to the student of international and comparative librarianship as well as to visiting librarians and scholars in Yugoslavia. Those users not familiar with the Yugoslav languages may find this work difficult to use because of the retention of the original terms. Thus, it would have been better to use: Zagreb. National and University Library; or, Beograd. Serbian Patriarchate. I. Library. II. Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church. These English equivalents could have been inserted parenthetically, both in the titles and in the text. The glossary without this suggestion, however useful, is inadequate. Here and there one encounters ordinary misspellings and other inconsistencies: e.g., Pravoslavna akademija, p.43; cf. esnaf, p.x and esnaf, p.84. The indiscriminate use of the word "fonds" for the English "holdings or stock" is inexcusable. It must be pointed out that these shortcomings in no way detract from the value of this addition to the library science collections.—*Ray R. Suput, Department of Library Service, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.*

Durey, Peter. *Staff Management in Universities and College Libraries*. (International Series in Library and Information Science, 16). Oxford: Pergamon, 1976. 170p. \$8.50. (LC 75-31515) (ISBN 0-08-019718-3)

This book, by the librarian of the University of Auckland, New Zealand, is a short but perceptive review of some of the problems and issues of contemporary library management. The author did not, I think, undertake to write a "how to do it" book, although his opinions and recommendations on the matters he discusses are illuminated with great good sense and, obviously, wide knowledge. The book will be only of limited help in the warfare endemic among academic administrators, faculty, and librarians, but it should be of consid-

erable value to those new to library administration, to those new to participative management, and to students. It could be of value to those scores of ignorant critics of libraries, librarians, and librarianship found on every campus if they would but read it.

In a simple, direct style, a style enhanced by the author's comments based on his own varied experience and on extensive reading in the literature of the field (citations are to "References" listed after each chapter), and further enhanced by a kind of sly wit, we are reminded that we have a whole set of problems to live with largely unknown to our predecessors. The book is not to librarianship what Blau, Simon, Drucker, and others, are to management generally, but its descriptions of current problems and practices, presented with consummate sense and dispassion, might well serve to encourage more investigation of them.

In comparative examples drawn from practices in the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the U.S., Durey presents in Part I the organizational framework of libraries and in Part II the human aspects affected by the subjects addressed.

In the former, and by far the better, he devotes chapters one through five to administrative structure, style of management, planning and budgeting, communication, and unionization. In Part II, in chapters six through ten, he writes on recruitment, conditions of service, training, promotion and performance appraisal, and, a welcome chapter, the problem staff member. These latter chapters do have a bit of the "how to do it" quality about them, but they may be of use to the inexperienced and will be to students.

Durey nowhere states for whom the book is written, but it is essentially a primer. It might also, however, be seen as an introduction to a more intensive examination of some of the problems the profession will ultimately have to resolve. To an American reviewer, the comparisons among the countries represented suggest that in the U.S. we may be closer to a realization of what these problems are and may become than our colleagues "down under" and in the United Kingdom.

The author's comments, almost "throw-away" lines on occasion (e.g., "The criteria

applied to faculty, which include research, publication, and teaching, are not necessarily suitable for librarians. Indeed there have been some distressing cases of professionally competent librarians being refused tenure because they could not meet criteria which included teaching and scholarly publications.”), suggest he recognizes that current serious management problems exist within the framework of some facts which are not fully perceived by the profession, and are unpalatable as well.

Durey is clearly aware, as many of his readers may not be, of the fact that the academic department or collegiate model may not work in libraries; that quality libraries do not really have a very high priority in academia; that unionization may well lead to lower standards; that insisting that library science is an academic discipline is pretentious if not fraudulent; and that as the opportunities for academic appointments constrict, both faculty and librarians have, not surprisingly, become self-serving to a degree which makes laughable our claims of professionalism. Durey does not address himself to these things as such, save by indirection, and the readers for whom I believe he wrote may not perceive them. Experienced librarians will, and administrators must.

If Mr. Durey has no solutions to the problems current management practices are trying to solve, he has at least described the various efforts being made to react to them and done so with commendable candor and objectivity. Now, if he will just write volume two. . . —*Stuart Forth, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.*

Markuson, Barbara Evans. “The Ohio College Library Center: A Study of the Factors Affecting the Adaptation of Libraries to On-Line Networks,” *Library Technology Reports* 12:11-132 (Jan. 1976). (\$40.00 for single issue, available from American Library Assn., 50 East Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.)

Nitecki, Joseph Z. *OCLC in Retrospect: A Review of the Impact of the OCLC System on the Administration of a Large University Technical Services Operations*. University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science. Occasional Papers, no.

123, May 1976. 35p. \$2.00 (prepaid). (Available from Publications Office, 249 Armory Bldg., University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science, Champaign, IL 61820.)

Librarians using OCLC's on-line cataloging system seem to have an insatiable thirst for information about the experience of others with the system. Until now, there has been little systematic research to supplement the ever-present user discussion groups, on-site visits, and exchange of internal reports. Barbara Markuson's report takes a big step towards filling this information gap.

The Markuson report begins by presenting a well organized and clearly written description of OCLC's services. Beyond that, the principal questions addressed by the study are: “Why do libraries join networks? How have on-line operations affected costs, staffing, production, workflow? How has the transition to on-line operations been handled? Do staff like or dislike use of the cathode ray tube terminal for file access?”

The data for the study were gathered by use of an exhaustive questionnaire covering a wide range of issues related to the utilization and evaluation of OCLC. The questionnaire was mailed to 151 OCLC user libraries; responses were sought from three levels of library staff—top administrators, middle management, and terminal operators.

For the most part, the report is a compendium of responses to the items in the questionnaire. A sampling of the titles of statistical tables illustrates the many useful and interesting areas covered: “Importance of Factors Related to the Decision to Participate in OCLC,” “Assessment of Factors Relating to Successful Transition to OCLC,” “Budget Effects Due to OCLC,” “Value of Training Sources Reported by Respondents,” “Assessment of Operational Impact of OCLC,” “Difficulty of Learning Specific Terminal Related Tasks.”

The raw data included in these tables are provocative, although the report itself suffers from a lack of analysis and interpretation. The impression is very strong that the massiveness of the data is out of proportion to the yield of useful insights. Perhaps a more serious concern is the low response