

at the conference, their preservation in this volume is less valuable.

Of more lasting interest are papers which probe to the underlying issues. Jean L. Connor clearly identifies ten factors of network success, while Michael M. Reynolds explores similar issues, but gets lost in wordiness:

Efforts to promote cooperation should continue because of the social value for libraries, regardless of the operant facts, since the consequences of the idea of cooperation not being present will be detrimental to the library as an institution and as an organization, and will inhibit the possibilities for developing other alternatives to achieve professionally desirable goals—goals which frequently do not lend themselves easily to operational definitions. (p.51)

Wallace Olsen and Hugh Atkinson provide perceptive papers on constraints influencing network development. As Atkinson states: "Constraints are not to be construed as reasons to avoid networks, but really parameters within which networks exist." (p.57)

Paxton Price looks at some state plans relating to networks, and Gordon Williams examines national plans. Williams proceeds beyond descriptions to critically examine the assumptions in network planning.

Finally, Glyn T. Evans, charged with discussing "Networks: The Future," eschews more of the blue-sky and instead focuses on the prime and more difficult question: What do we want to become?

Both publications reflect quick and inadequately edited transcripts from tapes: a reference to "Urbana-Champagne" (p.30) in the CATV volume, and a citation in the "Networks" report to a paper by Donald Urquhart, director of the National Lending Library in Great Britain, "A National Loan Policy for Syrians" (p.80).

Both reports contain some worthwhile and perceptive papers, and provide useful overviews of topics of current interest.—*John W. Aubry, Coordinator of Library Systems, Five Associated University Libraries, Syracuse, New York.*

Wilson, T. D., and Marsterson, W. A. J.  
**Local Library Cooperation: Final Report on a Project Funded by the De-**

**partment of Education & Science.** (Occasional Publications Series No. 4) Sheffield: University of Sheffield, Postgraduate School of Librarianship and Information Science, 1974. 2 vol. (v.1: 223p. [text]; v.2: 3 microfiche [additional tables and exhibits]) £3.50 (ISBN 0-903522-01-2)

Wilson and Marsterson, with a grant from the British government's Department of Education and Science, explored cooperative projects whereby six Sheffield libraries might increase the availability of their library resources to user groups in higher education. The study included libraries of the university, the polytechnic, the city, the University Institute of Education, the City College of Education, and the Totley/Thornbridge College of Education.

The principal report is printed in volume one. Volume two consists of three microfiche inserted in a pocket inside the back cover of volume one. Over 100 statistical tables and charts compare such variants as resources, expenditures, users, services, and staff.

The report is numbered and subnumbered for easy reference, although scarcely for smooth reading. Nevertheless, the authors occasionally included unrelated information in a paragraph; for example, on page 75 in paragraph 5.5 headed "Cataloguing and Classification" the last two sentences deal with charging systems.

The authors found library cooperation in Sheffield rather limited. The study suggested improved communication links both between librarians and between librarians and patrons in regard to the resources available in the Sheffield libraries. The authors recommended a more in-depth study of a cooperative transport system to facilitate interlibrary loan service; a complete union list of periodicals; coordination of nonbook resources; cooperative cataloging and acquisitions systems; and cooperative purchase and use of computer data bases. Two suggestions beg implementation—including patrons of other libraries in the orientation program of each library and providing familiarization training sessions for staff members at other libraries.

This study should be read by librarians interested in either cooperative library proj-

ects or in library surveys. The survey instruments are excellent, have been tested, and could be easily adapted to fit other locales. In courses on library organization patterns, the comparative descriptions of the internal library organization of each library and the relationships between the libraries in Sheffield should prove of interest.

The somewhat pensive recognition by the authors that the impetus for cooperation must come from above will hopefully motivate chief librarians to exercise a leadership role in developing the appropriate *Weltanschauung* among their professional staff for implementing more imaginative programs of service.—*Elizabeth Snapp, Coordinator of Readers' Services, Texas Woman's University Library, Denton.*

Zachert, Martha Jane K. *Simulation Teaching of Library Administration.* (Bowker Series in Problem-Centered Approaches to Librarianship) New York: Bowker, 1975. 297p. \$18.95 (LC 74-32041) (ISBN 0-8352-0612-2)

Professor Zachert has written the first book on simulation learning that is specifically designed for the preparation of library managers. Although this book has been needed because most of us know little about simulation theory, I found Professor Zachert's style at times annoying. I was horrified, for example, by the "Chapter Highlights" at the end of the chapters in the first two parts which summarize the chapter's contents, as if the reader needed catchwordy reinforcement. Then given this method, why did she not continue it beyond chapter 5? I also found annoying Professor Zachert's intrusion on her materials with her personal class experiences and the reprinted comments of her students' reactions to class assignments. I suppose that I was most annoyed because the book was not what I thought it should have been. Perhaps it could not have been written otherwise because most of us, indeed, need to be trained in the language and use of simulation, and thus only a primer needed to be written. I do wish, nonetheless, that Professor Zachert had not depended upon the literature and style of the professional (secondary?) educationist, but had emulated the engineers instead.

Parts I and II (chapters 1-5) are necessary preliminary matters which delineate simulation and teaching. The simulation model is a selection of the central features of reality. As such, the simulation is not only a representation of reality; it is also a reduction of reality to certain basics so that teaching and learning can occur. If the professor is capable of this style of teaching, the use of simulation in the classroom is much more demanding of the professor than the lecture. The professor becomes more detached from the group of learners and acts as a resource person instead of a deliverer of lecture-packaged truths. A poor professor, a charlatan, can use simulation to cover inadequacies both in knowledge and technique. Use of simulation in the classroom is not only comparatively low in risk to the students. If done properly, it is certainly high in student involvement.

Chapters 1-5 preface the heart of the book, namely, the four chapters of Part III on roleplay, in-basket exercises, action mazes, and games. Of these four subclasses of simulation, the more intriguing to many should be the in-basket exercises and the action mazes, although all four have certain advantages for classroom use. The printing of "The Ann Davis Situation" as an example of an action maze should be appreciated by almost all readers.

I was surprised by the paucity of the discussion on games and by the apparent identification of gaming solely with the board games such as Monopoly and its imitators. There is little on computerized management games. To give Professor Zachert credit, perhaps this neglect is due to the fact that there are not many versions of library management games yet. Nevertheless, it is this area which holds the greatest prospect for us because of its possibilities of overcoming temporal spans and because of its capabilities to handle the mathematical possibilities of the consequences of decisions.

It is good that Professor Zachert has given us our needed primer in simulation of library management. We now need someone to take us one step further: to write a sophisticated version.—*G. A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries, University of Nebraska—Lincoln.*