

professionals. However the manpower shortage is now forcing administrators to give more than lip service to performance of professional tasks by librarians and to the employment of supporting personnel for the remaining library work. As Harlow predicts,³ the full staffing of our libraries in the future will require radically overhauling the organization and responsibility of positions and people.

It has been estimated that the work force below the professional level will require over 145,000 additional personnel in the next ten years. Since in-service training on this scale would be wasteful and burdensome to individual libraries, some standardized pre-employment training is regarded as desirable. An Interdivision Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Education Division and the Library Administration Division, of the American Library Association, charged with the responsibility for preparing a statement of definitions of the subprofessional or technician class of library employees and developing classification specifications, has submitted a pioneering report.⁴ The report recommends recognition of two levels of service between clerical and professional staff, library clerk and library technical assistant, and proposes classification standards and typical duties. College librarians may have some reservations about this report since they may prefer to employ in certain positions assistants with more liberal education than that represented by high school graduation, which is the basic general education specified for both subprofessional levels.

This possible objection is met in the important Asheim proposal "Education and Manpower for Librarianship, First Steps toward a Statement of Policy."⁵ Asheim states as his thesis that the professional segment of the library occupation is responsible for the definition and supervision of the training and education required by all levels of personnel within the occupation. He suggests a modification of the definition of the subprofessional recommended by the Interdivisional Ad Hoc Committee. In addition to the library clerk and technical assistant categories, Asheim would create another level with the title "library assistant" to designate personnel whose duties would be essentially preprofessional and of whom the bachelor's degree would be required. The proposal, if accepted by ALA and implemented, would do much to solve the manpower shortage although this benefit would be peripheral to its real purpose which is to upgrade the responsibility and education of the professional. If the introductory material and basic technical training which now clutter our graduate library school programs could be covered in training programs for

Personnel and Manpower Needs

supporting personnel, it should be possible to redesign the professional master's programs. They could be less vocational and much more professional and would provide a continuing educational experience for persons qualified to assume greater responsibilities. According to Asheim, the college librarian of the future should possess an undergraduate education in the liberal arts; a grounding in a professional core of basic principles, theories and their practical application relevant to the ordering of knowledge and its dissemination to and interpretation by users; a knowledge of human relations, psychology and principles of administration; and additional concentrated study in some of the academic disciplines and knowledge of scholarly and research materials.

The control of entrance into the occupation through the setting of standards for education and training is a characteristic of a mature profession. However, librarians should probably heed Jencks and Riesman's⁶ warning against overstating the degree of professionalism to be found in any occupation. Like the engineers in these authors' example, librarians are usually employed in institutions, are almost wholly at the disposal of their employers, and so far have not moved collectively to set the terms of the relationship. One can conjecture hopefully that ALA will follow AAUP in this respect, thus moving further along the line of professionalization.

A second major trend which will affect college library staffs in the future is the increasing democratization of the policy-making function. Warren Bennis offers the theory that democracy becomes a functional necessity to a social system competing for survival under conditions of chronic change. Certainly American industry is adopting widely a new style of management which stresses full and free communication throughout the organization, the concept of influence as based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on position in the administrative hierarchy, acceptance of the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual and a reliance on consensus to manage this conflict.⁷

Although Bennis asserts that universities have been slower to accept democratization than most other institutions, the 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, formulated jointly by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education and the Association of Governing Boards has remarkable implications for institutional reform.⁸ Bertram Davis, General Secretary of the AAUP, notes the import of the provisions that the

president should have the confidence of the board and the faculty; that adequate communications should be established among board, administration and faculty; and that there should be restraints upon the exercise of arbitrary authority when there is conflict between faculty and administration. He points out for special comment the provision that the president's leadership role is supported by delegated authority from the board and faculty. "The faculty's authority, it is clear, rests not upon presidential understanding or largesse, but upon the faculty's right, as the institution's foremost professional body, to exercise the preeminent authority in all matters directly related to the institution's professional work. The president, in short, is not the faculty's master. He is as much the faculty's administrator as he is the board's, and the institution which accords him any other role has failed to appreciate the principles on which a successful academic community must be built."⁹

The Carnegie Corporation has initiated and supported a study of the future liberal arts colleges, for which twelve "profile" colleges were selected as models of "how a college can be what it ought to be." Keeton and Hilberry, reporting on one phase of the study, predict that the dominant styles of leadership will change radically within the next twenty years in the direction of bringing new and more autonomous roles for the faculty, students and administrative officers. This is already happening in the profile colleges, fully two-thirds of which are becoming engaged in associations, unions, centers or collaborative enterprises which are undercutting conventional, hierarchic patterns of government. In almost every one of the profile colleges, students are seeking—and getting—greater influence in college policy decisions.¹⁰

These signs would indicate that in libraries, too, the policy making function will tend to become decentralized. There have already been examples of staff demands for influence in policy decisions in large public and university libraries.

Bundy and Wasserman¹¹ maintain that it is essential for professionals in libraries to assume decision-making responsibilities in relation to goals and standards of service. They urge the centrality of the client relationship in the work of the professional and point out that the professional's commitment to satisfying immediate client needs frequently runs counter to institutional requirements for economy and service on the principle of the over-all good of the largest number. The authors' strictures on the institution-oriented library administrator

Personnel and Manpower Needs

are severe and they suggest that what is needed is a "fundamental administrative reorientation toward an institutional climate which advances the professional spirit and yields organizational responsibilities to the professional group."¹² While Bundy and Wasserman seem to be thinking in terms of university or large public libraries, their discerning analysis is equally applicable to the college libraries.

A third force to be considered in planning for the future development of our college library staffs is the rapid advance of technology and its successful application to solving problems of libraries. The computer already has the capability of freeing libraries from the drudgery of catalog searching, preparation and filing of catalog cards, and the maintenance of circulation files. These benefits, in all or part, have already accrued to some fortunate libraries, especially to libraries in universities, in large public library networks and in new, publicly supported colleges. It is doubtful that totally automated systems will soon be available to established college libraries because of the very high cost of computerizing their existing collections. Those who speak airily of the future college library having no need for technical services have simply not thought through the special problems of the college library with its need for selective acquisition, for older material, and for speed in meeting faculty and student needs.

Benefit from automation, however, is more feasible with respect to current acquisitions, either with home-based equipment, through participation in cooperative projects or through use of commercial services. When MARC tapes become available, and especially when the program includes works published in languages other than English, the tapes will be purchased and access to computer time will be sought by college librarians.

At the present time, college librarians are offered commercial services of various kinds, such as the Books-Coming-Into-Print, the computer-based program of Bro-Dart. The program covers English language publications and in essence assumes the book selection function for the individual college library according to a "profile" submitted by the library. Full cataloging and processing services are offered for firm orders. Other commercial services will prepare complete sets of cards from copy supplied by the college library.

College library administrators will need to be alert for the point at which a computerized operation could profitably (from the standpoint of service as well as economy) replace personnel on their technical services staff. Similarly, the precisely right time for the automa-

tion of a circulation system will depend upon local factors such as the size of the library's clientele and the efficiency of the existing manual or data processing system.

Another force of consequence to the personnel needs of college libraries is the involvement of the federal government in support to libraries, especially through the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title IIC which authorizes appropriations to the Library of Congress for the purpose of insuring that the Library acquire all library materials of value to scholarship and of providing and distributing catalog and bibliographic information, has had very great effect on academic libraries of all sizes.

At the San Francisco Conference of ALA on June 29, 1967 a program to discuss the impact of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging was held under the auspices of the Association of College and Research Libraries and the Resources Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the ALA. A version of the program edited by Norman D. Stevens has been published.¹³ While the participants in the shared cataloging program are primarily research libraries, some large college libraries are included. In any case the substantial impact felt on the technical processes in the participating libraries has certainly begun to be felt also in other academic libraries that use Library of Congress cataloging copy. Among specific points made were these: the Library of Congress is providing a successively greater proportion of the current catalog copy needed by libraries; the program makes possible the accomplishment of a greater work load without increase in personnel; the "pre-cataloging" function can be reliably performed in the order department with a resulting elimination of duplicate effort; cataloging with Library of Congress copy can be accomplished entirely by clerical personnel.

John Dawson¹⁴ agrees that much work traditionally considered professional can be done well by non-professionals. He considers suitable for assignment to non-professional personnel such functions as, cataloging with Library of Congress cards, original cataloging under the supervision of a librarian, verification of entry and checking to prevent duplication. Dawson does not minimize the difficulty, especially for small academic libraries with small staffs, in distinguishing between professional and non-professional activities. However he maintains that this is essential and his advice, that we must persuade our colleagues to abandon the comfortable prejudices of the past and to learn to trust in the abilities of others working under professional

Personnel and Manpower Needs

tutelage and supervision, is particularly cogent in the area of technical services work which has benefited from the Title IIC program.

A fifth force which will influence the college library staff of the future is the growing urgency for granting academic status to college and university librarians. Trends in this area are closely watched by the Academic Status Committee of ACRL's University Libraries Section and a recent paper by Carl Hintz, published as a committee report, states that "the move to grant academic status to librarians has been the prevailing trend for a number of years and is now generally accepted, although the exact definition of academic status remains uncertain."¹⁵ Of eighty-seven respondents to a questionnaire sent to one hundred major American academic institutions, seventy indicated that their librarians held academic status in some measure. Of the seventy, twenty-six reported that librarians held full faculty rank and title; thirteen reported patterns of equivalent rank; seven reported patterns of assimilated rank and a fourth group reported an array of diverse patterns impossible to classify.¹⁶

On the other hand, Madan, Hetler and Strong, who recently conducted a nation-wide survey of four-year state colleges and universities to determine the present status of librarians, concluded that the conditions of librarians have not changed significantly in the past ten years.¹⁷ The discrepancy obviously stems from the strict definition of "full faculty status" which the latter survey applied. "Faculty status" entails complete equality with the academic faculty in regard to rank and titles, promotion criteria, tenure, sabbatical leave, rates of pay, holidays and vacations, representation and participation in faculty government and fringe benefits."¹⁸ According to this definition, only 14.2 percent of the reporting libraries grant full faculty status to librarians, although almost two-thirds of the respondents consider themselves as having full faculty status. It is apparent that academic status is badly in need of definition.

The ALA Ad Hoc Committee on Manpower Problems urges the development of a position paper on faculty status for academic librarians on the basis of which ACRL could adopt an official position and plan for its implementation. The committee points out that such a paper must consider the obligations and responsibilities of librarians holding faculty status, as well as the privileges.¹⁹

There is not unanimity among librarians with respect to academic status. Another viewpoint is expressed by Daniel Bergen who argues that librarians and teachers belong to different subcultures within

the collegiate setting. He holds that the borrowing of faculty status symbols will in no way solve the problem of developing collegueship with the teachers. He attributes this borrowing to the library profession's failure functionally to differentiate the work of the librarian from that of the non-professional. Bergen believes there is little opportunity for the academic librarian who is neither subject competent nor skilled in research to be more than ancillary to the discipline-oriented status system of the teaching faculty.²⁰ The sentiment for considering librarians a separate professional group in the college hierarchy is seemingly a minority one. As the emerging pattern of education for academic librarianship, together with the sharper definition of the work of the professional, gradually becomes effective in individual academic institutions, the traditional resistance of college administrators and faculties toward the granting of academic status to librarians seems likely to disappear.

These five prevailing forces tend to interact and reinforce one another. Their total effect will be to produce a revolution in the organization and staffing of college libraries. They should also heighten the attraction of the library profession to the well-qualified young people who will be needed to serve the innovating college library programs of the future.

The current state of change in the profession presents an enormous challenge to practicing librarians. During the library manpower program held within the 1967 ALA conference in San Francisco, some 3,000 persons addressed themselves to these problems in 130 discussion groups. Numerous helpful suggestions for action came out of the discussions and the most useful of these were summarized in the report of the ALA Ad Hoc Committee on Manpower Problems.²¹ College library administrators may profitably adopt the suggestions for the redefinition of library goals, for the continuing education of library personnel, for task analysis and job classification, and for measures to overcome resistance to the new ideas of library organization and employment of staff.

The restatement of goals, and along with this, the identification of new kinds of positions needed to achieve these goals, is particularly urged since librarians may be so busy with their daily concerns that they fail to see the need for change. A recent, outstanding example of such a statement is the Swarthmore report²² with which college librarians will want to become familiar.

Continuing education opportunities for the professional staff must

Personnel and Manpower Needs

be a concern of college library administrators, and librarians must take the time and effort to avail themselves of these opportunities if they are to fulfill their new responsibilities. Study may be in a subject field, in management and human relations, in information systems or in an advanced field of librarianship. A study by Jesse and Mitchell of professional staff opportunities for study and research, based on information from fifty-two research libraries and fifteen college libraries, disclosed that there is one means of improving the librarian's education which is almost universal, and that is the policy of permitting him to interrupt his working schedule to enroll for course work in the institution in which he is employed. Administrators should further encourage such study by granting the time and by negotiating for the remission of tuition. Where sabbatical leave opportunities are not available to librarians, the administrator should consider alternate plans for providing librarians with the necessary time for further study and research, such as the practice of granting periodically scheduled summer leaves.²³

A unique aspect of the academic library's personnel is the pool of students available who bring high intelligence and competence in language or subject to their work. In 1961-62, 14 million hours of student help supplemented the work load of non-professional staff members.²⁴ A college library's task analysis and job classification should be extended to cover this group, especially in view of current student demands that work assigned under scholarship programs be relevant to their interests.

It is inevitable that some experienced college librarians will resist the changing definition of their role because of feelings of inadequacy. The generalist reference librarian will feel insecure because of his lack of special subject ability. The technical services librarian may feel personally unsuited to the training, supervision and revision of the non-professional and student assistants who will be assuming many duties formerly performed by the librarian himself. It will be the part of the college library administrator to provide for these people, to the extent possible, the means of overcoming their deficiencies and, by example, to lead them to welcome the challenge of higher professional responsibility.

References

1. ALA Ad Hoc Committee on Manpower Problems. "Library Manpower Problems," *ALA Bulletin*, 62:995-1000, Sept. 1968.

HELEN M. BROWN

2. Wasserman, Paul, and Bundy, Mary Lee. "Maryland's Manpower Project, a Progress Report," *Library Journal*, 93:1409-1414, April 1, 1968.
3. Harlow, Neal. "The Present Is Not What It Was," *Library Journal*, 89: 2527-32, June 15, 1964.
4. Interdivisional Ad Hoc Committee of the Library Education Division and the Library Administration Division. "The Subprofessional or Technical Assistant, a Statement of Definition," *ALA Bulletin*, 62:387-397, Apr. 1968.
5. Asheim, Lester E. "Education and Manpower for Librarianship, First Steps Toward a Statement of Policy," *ALA Bulletin*, 62:1096-1106, Oct. 1968.
6. Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.
7. Bennis, Warren G. *Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization*. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.
8. "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," *AAUP Bulletin*, 52:375-379, Winter 1966.
9. Davis, Bertram H. "Unions and Higher Education: Another View," *AAUP Bulletin*, 54:320, Autumn 1968.
10. Keeton, Morris T. and Hilberry, Conrad. "Liberal Arts Colleges: A Call to Leadership," *Journal of Higher Education*, 39:361-375, Oct. 1968.
11. Bundy, Mary Lee and Wasserman, Paul. "Professionalism Reconsidered," *College & Research Libraries*, 29:5-26, Jan. 1968.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
13. Stevens, Norman D., ed. "The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging: A Progress Report on Developments under the Title IIC of the Higher Education Act of 1965," *Library Resources & Technical Services*, 12:17-29, Winter 1968.
14. Dawson, John M. "Not Too Academic," *College & Research Libraries*, 27:37-39, Jan. 1966.
15. Hintz, Carl. "Criteria for Appointment to and Promotion in Academic Rank," *College & Research Libraries*, 29:341, Sept. 1968.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 341-346.
17. Madan, *et al.* "The Status of Librarians in Four-Year State Colleges and Universities," *College & Research Libraries*, 29:381-386, Sept. 1968.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 382.
19. ALA Ad Hoc Committee on Manpower Problems, *op. cit.*, p. 999.
20. Bergen, Daniel P. "Librarians and the Bipolarization of the Academic Enterprise," *College & Research Libraries*, 24:467-480, Nov. 1963.
21. ALA Ad Hoc Committee on Manpower Problems, *op. cit.*, p. 996.
22. "Report of the Special Committee on Library Policy." In Swarthmore College, *Critique of a College*. Swarthmore, Pa., Swarthmore College, 1967, pp. 333-397.
23. Jesse, William H. and Mitchell, Ann E. "Professional Staff Opportunities for Study and Research," *College & Research Libraries*, 29:87-100, March 1968.
24. Drennan, H. T. and Reed, S. R. "Library Manpower," *ALA Bulletin*, 61: 957, Sept. 1967.