when it's good, it is not enough.—William A. Moffett, Oberlin College Library.


This slim volume reports on research sponsored by the British Library Research and Development Division (BLRDD) to discover the: "extent of awareness of ongoing research amongst practitioners; their attitudes towards research (and reasons for holding them); assessment of the utility and relevance of research to their day to day work; the kind of research that ideally they would like to see in progress." It builds on two earlier and related BLRDD-supported studies—one on the dissemination of research to library educators and one on the dissemination practices of researchers. Marketing concepts and terminology are used throughout.

The report describes responses to a questionnaire mailed to 1,950 library-information workers selected from three sampling frames: the membership of Aslib (the Association of Special Libraries and Information Bureaux), the membership of the Institute of Information Scientists, and the Library Association (Great Britain). Chapter 2 summarizes results succinctly in one or two paragraphs devoted to each of the remaining chapters of the report which are: the potential audience for research; participation in professional groups and activities; reading habits: use of the professional literature; the practitioner as researcher and author; how practitioners hear about research; awareness and evaluation of research. A final chapter called "Let Them Speak for Themselves" provides verbatim comments.

The potential audience for research was segmented in three different ways: by current employment (industry, commerce; central government; societies, associations; local government; education), by extent of experience (six categories beginning with "under 3 years" and ending with "over 20 years"), and by qualifications (none, Library-information only, other (subject) only, dual (library-information and other). These variables were correlated with responses on all other topics. Current employer is the one which revealed the greatest number of significant differences among respondents.

Many of the results provide an interesting perspective on the field although they do not relate directly to the dissemination of research. Of those that do so relate, none are surprising but a few seem worthy of mention. Only 27 percent of the practitioners had been involved in research and the involvement usually meant in-house studies rather than generalizable ones. Only 23 percent felt that they were well informed about research and only 32 percent claimed to be "fairly" or "greatly" interested in it.

Although talks at meetings might seem to be a good way to disseminate research findings, learning about research is not one of the reasons why respondents attend meetings. In view of reasons why they do not attend, the authors suspect many would cease to come if research were featured. When the various media where one might read about research were considered (secondary services, newsletters, primary journals, research reports, theses) the journal article was easily the most popular. This remained true even when informal means of learning about research were also considered (i.e., various forms of personal contact). Research reports were not heavily used partly because they are hard to locate. The authors found this a "perturbing finding" since many researchers believe dissemination is completed once they have produced a research report.

The United States has no agency like the BLRDD to exert leadership in matters related to research. If it did, and a similar study were conducted, the results would probably be very similar in the U.S. Researchers interested in disseminating their results and library educators interested in helping practitioners to appreciate research should take heed.—Mary Jo Lynch, ALA Office for Research.