evaluating and weeding reference collections. —J. Christina Smith, Boston University.


The image of practicing librarians, from all types of libraries in the United States, has frequently been the focus of research in the library and information science (LIS) literature. Who were the authors of these research papers? What topics have been studied? What will be possible future research agendas? Readers should expect to have these questions answered by this occasional paper published by the Center for the Study of Information Professionals, Inc. (CSIP).

The mission of the center is to enlarge the body of knowledge that describes and defines those individuals whose work is focused on generating, selecting, organizing, preserving, evaluating, disseminating, and using information in service to others. In this publication, the first of the CSIP Occasional Papers, Watson-Boone presents interesting insights on how the LIS literature describes librarians. It synthesizes some of the research on this topic, as published in fourteen LIS research journals between 1985 and 1995. This paper is a rather small publication—only thirty-three pages, including a fourteen-page bibliography.

To qualify for inclusion in this study, journal articles had to: (1) be full length or in a column devoted to research, (2) focus on librarians as the major participants with regard to the study topic, and (3) contain findings of a research study. Of the 4,476 articles in the fourteen journals, systematic review of each article identified 343 (7.66%) as appropriate for inclusion in this study. However, this paper drew on a sample of only 165 (48.1%) of the 343 qualified studies. Among the selected journals, College & Research Libraries had the largest number of qualified studies.

Watson-Boone concentrates on the types of research methods used, authorship, and topics studied. She discovered that the authors of the studies/articles used mail surveys with questionnaires more than any other research method. Practitioners were authors of 41 percent of the studies, LIS faculty of 41 percent, other researchers of 9 percent, and practitioners and LIS faculty were coauthors of 9 percent. Librarian studies by practitioners appear most frequently in ALA divisional journals and in Special Libraries, the official publication of the Special Libraries Association, while LIS faculty articles were more likely to appear in their own professional association journal, the Journal of Education for Library and Information Science.

Topics studied clustered into four broad categories: demographics, employment–positions–jobs, attitudes and behaviors, and institutions. “Demographics” treats librarians as a population in terms of age, family background, and educational attainment. The current average age of librarians would appear to be 41. The majority of female librarians do marry and most raise children. Academic librarians and school media specialists are most apt to have second graduate degrees. Increasingly, academic librarians who become directors of major re-
search libraries have earned the Ph.D.

Under “employment–positions–jobs,” the studies revealed that catalogers have been studied more than other LIS specialties. Various changes (e.g., new cataloging rules and the implementation of online catalogs) are obvious reasons why catalogers have received so much attention. Generally, these studies found that positive changes in the profession include heightened job interest, better use of individual abilities, increased understanding between technical and public service areas, and the development of a greater flexibility among librarians when coping with emergencies. Negative trends include fragmentation of time, lack of consistency in cataloging, problems with training, and difficulties in developing expertise in multiple areas.

Under “attitudes and behaviors,” librarians are described as having very positive attitudes toward the technology they use in searching. Special librarians appear most interested in studying their image. The results of some studies found special librarians to be risk-taking, introspective, and judgment oriented. Academic librarians focus mostly on faculty status issues whereas public librarians concentrate on personalities, programs, and the professional skills of children’s librarians. Unquestionably, librarians are concerned about the lack of effective communication between librarians and technologists. The author is to be commended for the historical sketch of the changing role of the librarian from late 1800s to the current time.

Under “institutions,” the author included viewpoints (extracted from the studies) about the different types of librarians (principally, academic, school, special, and public).

There are essentially no data on how librarians in one type of library perceive their counterparts in other types of libraries. This is an area that warrants additional research. Three areas were not touched on at all in the journal studies, yet they illustrate interesting research questions. They are: (1) What are the information-seeking habits of librarians? (2) How frequently do librarians use libraries for nonjob needs? and (3) How different or similar are librarian library users from other library users?

This work contains 165 carefully selected resources on the description of librarians. If one is interested in conducting research on librarians, the bibliography would be an excellent starting point.

Notwithstanding the fact that this publication includes findings on librarians from all types of libraries, there are several good reasons why academic librarians should consult this well-organized, easy-to-read work. Not least among them is that academic librarians will learn basic concepts that will enable them to better understand themselves. Moreover, this occasional paper is essential reading for anyone planning to conduct research on the image and roles of librarians. —Sha Li Zhang, Wichita State University.


As South Africa moved from apartheid to liberation, it was fashionable to say that the past should be forgotten and a line drawn across the nation’s history. Now that the inevitable and predictable continuities have reasserted themselves, such comments are rarely heard. They are made to look all the more unrealistic in the light of writing, such as Willinsky’s, that traces the extent to which the imperial way of knowing the world has survived within educational systems following the demise of empire.

Imperialists subscribed to the doctrine, familiar to librarians, that knowledge represents power. Indeed, their desire to know, coupled with economic and political interests (labeled tellingly by the author as “intellectual mercantilism”), caused them to behave in ways characteristic of librarianship—cataloguing, classifying, ordering, and creating what