

Recent Publications

BOOK REVIEWS

Dougherty, Richard M., and Maier, Joan M. **Centralized Processing for Academic Libraries.** The Final Report (Phase III, Jan. 1-June 30, 1969) of the Colorado Academic Libraries Book Processing Center: The First Six Months of Operation. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1971. 254 p. \$12.50. ISBN 0-8108-0381-X.

A reader concerned about the future of centralized processing for academic libraries might well ask the question: "What has become of CALBPC? Is it alive and well and still living in Boulder?" The answer is, according to the informal information network always operative in librarianship, "no, CALBPC is not well. It still lives in Boulder, but in tenuous form—a shadow of its former self." Shortly it will process materials primarily for the University of Colorado, if the rumors are to be believed.

Basic to the composition of any review of the Dougherty-Maier volume is the decision as to whether the success or failure of CALBPC has any bearing whatever on the value of the book. For the purposes of this discussion, it has been assumed that the well-being of CALBPC is not necessarily an acceptable measure of the success of the book which serves as its "final report." A factor which may link the two considerations, however, is the discernment of procedures, attitudes, or situations which carry with them the seeds of failure.

The final report does indeed record such procedures, attitudes, and situations. Phases I and II of the project developed conclusions in light of certain presuppositions which were not in fact realized in Phase III, e.g., the percentage of current domestic imprints ordered through CALBPC was considerably lower than expected; the directive to order only in-print items was consciously ignored in the case of the University of Colorado; and the percentage of

budgets directed to the center proved to be less than optimum. Disappointment was also experienced in the areas of vendor discounts, speed of vendor delivery of materials, and ability to coordinate ordering among the thirteen participating libraries.

There is question, however, as to whether these problems could have been foreseen, given the more or less artificial character of Phases I and II of the experiment. What ought, nonetheless, to have been anticipated was the possible development of antagonism among the staff of the member libraries toward a center housed in the largest of those libraries. Throughout the Dougherty-Maier volume runs an undercurrent of disillusionment with the quite normal behavior of cataloging staff who have been operating independently for a good many years. Some of this disillusionment may be unwarranted in that it is based upon a simplistic concept of "library philosophy." An example of such oversimplification is encountered in the following assertion: "A librarian who believes books ought to be made available for use as quickly as possible might be willing to circulate a title before the catalog cards are filed safely in the public catalog. In contrast, a librarian who attaches greater importance to the orderliness of his records may be inclined to hold a book in a work area or in an office until all records have been received, inspected and filed." (p.108) The "good guys" are those, then, who spend extra money to circulate an uncataloged volume, while the "bad guys" are those who insist on avoiding duplication of effort by processing the material once and for all. But this, too, is simplistic. There are no clearcut "good" or "bad" catalogers; there are only people with various personal histories and expectations trying to do a service job the best they know how. To suggest that all cannot be well unless a library circulates uncataloged books as a symbol of its service-orientation is to invite the hostility of those automati-

cally cast, thereby, in the role of "bad guys." If such an attitude was conveyed by CALBPC staff, then the center was probably defeated from the start.

If the Dougherty-Maier volume has a major fault, it is the fact that the center was more management-oriented than people-oriented. In the final recommendations, this deficiency is admitted. The astonishing fact is that the need for the staff's knowing "how cooperation will affect their jobs, their future, or their status" was recognized only after the experiment was concluded. If ever there were a cogent argument for requiring prospective librarians to study personnel administration and psychology, this recorded naivety would provide it. It is incredible that library administrators can, in the 1970s, still claim unawareness of the need for staff to be treated as members of a team, not as chessmen to be manipulated on the board of library efficiency.

Despite the naive personnel relations evident throughout the volume (cf. especially recommendations 4 and 5, p.119), this record of a "grand experiment" is rich in technical data. If anything, the tables are overly abundant and detailed. Every conceivable segment of the operation has been counted, timed, measured, or costed out. If for no other reason than this, every academic library catalog department ought to buy a copy of the book.

There are, as is not uncommon with Scarecrow Press volumes, a plethora of typographical errors. In a work less dependent for its value upon technical details, this problem might be more easily overlooked. The finding of, for example, three alphabetical typos in Figure 2.5 causes the reader to wonder whether some of the numbers might also have been copied incorrectly. It is unfortunate for the impact of the study that a more careful job of proofreading was not done.

In sum, the Dougherty-Maier report is a detailed, data-rich record of an important experiment in library cooperation. From a management standpoint, it will be invaluable to academic library technical services departments. From a human standpoint, however, it leaves much to be desired.—*Doralyn J. Hickey, Associate Professor of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

Massman, Virgil F. *Faculty Status for Librarians*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972.

After hundreds of articles and papers dealing with faculty status for librarians, this is the first regularly published book to appear on the subject. It is worthy of the honor despite certain limitations. The publication is a sociological study of librarians in the nineteen state-supported colleges and universities in a three-state area—Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, excluding the senior state institutions. The author surveys the literature of the subject, examines the sociological bases of academic librarianship as a profession, and then compares representative samples of librarians and classroom faculty members. Although written as a dissertation, completed at Michigan in 1970, it is broad-gauge and readable, soundly conceived and generally well executed.

The literature survey is done well, with no significant sources overlooked. Massman documents the history of the movement and summarizes the sociological factors upon which the movement for faculty status for librarians is based. In this section he shows good understanding and sound judgment in evaluations.

The main body of the work, however, is a very extensive comparison of librarians—92.7 percent of whom hold faculty status—and the classroom faculty in certain subjects. A wealth of information is presented in eighty-eight tables, many of which supplement even the excellent study of librarians by Anita R. Schiller. These tables and the discussion compare librarians and classroom faculty members as to age, sex, education, length of service, publications, Senate and committee memberships, faculty rank by degrees held and by sex, publication, length of academic year, tenure, sabbatical leave, and funds for research and travel.

Some interesting findings are that 92.7 percent of the librarians hold full faculty status, and that two-thirds are on nine or ten months contracts. These librarians are fortunate in this regard especially when one thinks of such states as California and New Jersey, or of some large universities. Regarding rate of publications, those on twelve-month contracts were, quite surpris-