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The question of librarianship as a profession is considered here in terms of the three key relationships of a professional—client, organizational and professional. Professional practice in this field is thus cast against accepted norms and standards of professional behavior. This critical assessment suggests that librarianship falls far short of the professional model. Major shifts in the nature of the services performed by librarians and in their bureaucratic relationships will be required if librarianship is to advance. The contributions of the professional associations and of library schools to the advancement of the process of professionalization is also analyzed. Progress in the field is viewed to be inextricably tied to the success or failure which librarianship achieves in its quest for true professional attainment.

Librarians, like many in other marginal or maturing professions often spend considerable time being concerned about whether or not they are truly professional; much effort sometimes goes into reassuring themselves that they are indeed professional and that they should therefore enjoy the recognition and rewards of professional status. Such preoccupation manifests itself in a wide range of activities common to all such upward-mobile and self-conscious aspiring groups. They conduct public relations programs designed to create a favorable image of their craft. Being much concerned about status differences, they discuss endlessly means of differentiating the professional worker from the lesser educated. They establish and seek vigorously to strengthen their occupational associations; they promulgate a code of ethics and establish internal means of controlling members who violate it. They frequently turn to legislation to control entry into practice. Concomitantly, there is a striving toward the identification of a philosophical and intellectual base for practice. Ultimately their educational efforts find a place in the universities where they come eventually to seek academic parity for their instructional programs by meeting university standards of scholarship.

Many early claims of professionalism and early activities to attain it tend to be suspect since they are often a mélange of the real and the fanciful, in which pious longings are often confused with reality. A field's recruitment publicity is thus often based upon ill-conceived sloganeering or myths which sometimes turn out to be nearer to what the discipline and those who practice in it would like to be than what they really are. The ethic presented by the group can be so vague as to defy relation to the realities of practice. The educational preparation, or training as it is more frequently termed, conducted by the professional

1 Hence the term "professional librarian." One might question parenthetically whether there could be such a thing as a nonprofessional librarian. And would it be comparable to such a thing as a nonprofessional lawyer, nonprofessional doctor, nonprofessional dentist, etc.?
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2 Or, as in the case of the library code of ethics, grows from a lack of understanding of what the nature of a professional ethic really is, emphasizing as it does the "employees" obligation.
school, is sometimes offered by instructors who are displaced, or perhaps misplaced, from practice, and it tends heavily to the practical, the mechanical, and the ritual. Only very gradually and very subtly does the university influence manifest itself in reorienting course content, so that a grudging tolerance for conceptual and theoretical issues comes to find its place alongside the pragmatic.

Even within firmly established professions the ethic may be more pious hope than reality. Carlin's findings in a study of the legal profession suggest that a group may so frequently and flagrantly overlook malpractice that it in effect condones it. The widespread abuses of the Hippocratic oath by the medical fraternity in such instances as fee splitting and the proprietorship of pharmacies and optometry houses, attest to its hypocritical abuse. It is doubtless, true that professions discourage their members from making public disclosures of undesirable practice, acting only after there has been a public scandal. Certainly, much of the effort of professional groups seems to stem more from self-interest than from a true regard for their responsibilities. Many groups which claim to be professional have never had a sense of community responsibility. Intra-group rivalry goes on within professions, while at the same time fields strenuously resist encroachments from other occupational groups through the use of political and economic mechanisms, and they strive to reassign less glamorous tasks to others. Conditions of actual practice in virtually every profession depart in important measure from the professional ideal.

These disparities, however, do not mean that the professions do not have well-established traditions of service or commitments to standards, nor does it mean that they are not committed to the advancement of knowledge and the practical art of their fields. It is to these ends that the attempt to achieve professional status for librarianship appropriately addresses itself. All established professions have an awareness of the conditions of practice required for a professional to grow and develop. They have frequently struggled to protect practice from political or other influences which would corrupt or misuse or downgrade, and on balance they must be viewed as a force for orderly progress within the democratic tradition. The more advanced professions, although their practice may remain imperfect, provide traditions, ideals, models, and directions for emerging professions.

Librarianship appears to be in the midst of a serious shortage of personnel. In order to attract from the limited reservoir of talented people who are sought and competed for by each of the professions, it must be possible to offer potential recruits rewarding and satisfying careers. To do so implies a speed-up in the process of professionalization. In order to fulfill their original mandate of serving as guardian of society's information needs and in order to influence positively the forward motion of progressive information development in a time of competition with other emergent information-oriented disciplines, librarianship must more fully take on the responsibilities and substance as well as the forms of a profession. Without such com-
mitment, librarians may ultimately find themselves left only with custodial tasks while the intellectual aspects, as well as the more active forms of information service, are yielded to other groups.

Some in library education place all their hope in the next generation of librarians. In effect, they would write off most of those now in practice as essentially and permanently semi-professional. This attitude is unrealistic. It ignores the fact that during the next two decades, which may well prove to be most critical for determining whither (or whether) librarianship, the major decisions influencing variations and adaptations in information services will be made by those who are already in practice. Furthermore, such a view tends to be over-sanguine about the real advances of present educational programs over those of the past. Viewed in historical perspective, the library schools may be seen to have been a decisive influence in whatever degree of professionalization has been achieved thus far. They have succeeded in placing their programs, at least in a formal sense, at the graduate level. Nevertheless, one may remain skeptical of the capacity of library education, and of library educators (except for certain isolated institutions and, regrettfully, isolated individuals) to be fully transformed along the drastically variant lines which contemporary technological, societal, and behavioral advances clearly require.

Many librarians are without doubt best suited, either by temperament or through the remorseless habituation of long experience, to performing superclerical tasks. In some instances they may even be hostile to or suspicious of efforts to upgrade the intellectual demands put upon them in their practice, but it is not necessarily because they are uninterested or opposed to intellectual effort. Frequently they are highly literate, intelligent people who remain satis-

fied with or resigned to spending major portions of their working lives performing at a nonintellectual level. It is simply that the acculturation process in library education or in practice, or both, have been so devoid of genuine intellectual content that they have come to identify their roles, and the role of librarianship generally, as pedestrian and uninspiring. For them, as for many similar types in other humdrum fields which do not call forth the breadth of their imagination or the finest quality of their minds, there is sublimation in the form of home pursuits, hobbies, and travel. For them the battle is over. Library work is a nine-to-five routine—the best comes only on long weekends, extended holidays, travel, and early retirement.

The field also has many competent and thoughtful people (mostly in the earlier years of service and not yet ground down by the weight of experience and bureaucratic indoctrination) who are deeply disturbed by the disparity between what they believe constitutes professional practice and what most librarians now do. Many were and remain deeply disgruntled about the calibre and content of their educational preparation and are strongly motivated to improve practice in the field. It is to this group, uneasy and unfulfilled by their present roles, to whom this article is primarily directed, in the hope that it may contribute somewhat to enlarged understanding of what professional practice in librarianship involves and what needs to be done to advance this field toward such a goal.

Professionalism will be viewed here not in abstract academic terms but rather in the real world in which librarians practice, through a comparison of the behavior of librarians with what is customarily considered to constitute professional behavior. The central thesis is that it is in terms of three major relationships—with clients, with the institu-
tion where he performs, and with the professional group—that the decision as to whether one is or is not a professional is decided.

**The Librarian-Client Relationship**

The client relationship is the central role of any professional whether the client be an individual or, as is frequently the case in the practice of law, a company or other institution. It is his *raison d’être*, his justification for the claims he places on individual institutions and on the society generally, even though not every professional works directly with the client. For even with the increasing institutionalization and bureaucratization of professional activities and the consequent lessening in the degree and frequency of client relations, the ultimate purpose remains service to the client. In an ideal and unambiguous relationship, the client relies upon the professional for the expertise which his problem or situation requires. The professional, by virtue of his training, experience, and specialized knowledge, offers the client the counsel, service, or prescription which he views to be appropriate *whether or not* this is precisely what the client wants or thinks he wants. The professional’s guidance may not always be followed, but the judgment and recommendation of the professional are not open to question or debate by the layman. The professional *knows*.

When cast in this context, how does the librarian-patron relationship measure up? Generalizations are always fraught with risk, particularly when they attempt to characterize a practice stretched across a continuum as wide as that of librarianship. Yet, in spite of the hazards, perhaps some broadly relevant observations can be advanced here. In general library situations, that which is requested by or offered to the patron is ordinarily just not complex enough to be considered a professional service. The service provided would not overtax the capacity of any reasonably intelligent college graduate after a minimum period of on-the-job training.

This is not necessarily because librarians do not wish to serve (although some do not and have developed a practiced *hauteur* which quickly suggests to all but the doggedly persevering client that they are thought to be intruders or ignoramuses). Yet, in spite of this element and despite allegations that the collecting function takes high precedence over the service function, American librarianship has for the most part enjoyed a proud tradition of service. Perhaps in the past however, and even into the present, library work has had a decidedly feminine cast. That is to say, librarians achieve intrinsic satisfaction from the very act of serving and are content to perform in minor and inconsequential capacities. This can also manifest itself in other ways. Like the doting mother shoveling spoonfuls of food into the mouth of the child and joyful at the sight of consumption, the librarian may be too sensitive to the limits of the information user’s appetite, to the preciseness of his need or to the particularity of his taste. The willingness to play an inexpert role may well have been reinforced by the fact that the librarian has had some little knowledge about many things but not very much genuine understanding of anything. This portrait is not drawn to suggest that it is only the very most complex problems with which a librarian must concern himself, nor, to use a medical analogy, that the general reference librarian is any less consequential than the general practitioner. It is to suggest only that the druggist should not be confused with the doctor.

An apparently related phenomenon is the essential timidity of practitioners, clearly reflected in the widespread, deep-
seated, and trained incapacity or high degree of reluctance to assume responsibility for solving informational problems and providing unequivocal answers. The problem may be viewed at two levels of service, each interrelated. At the general level, it is reflected in the extinction of the reader's advisor, that breed of librarian who could, would, and did actively channel readers along rational and productive lines by making concrete recommendations and introducing taste and discrimination into such choices. The reluctance to be assertive may be as much a function of insecurity born out of fears engendered by the limits of the modern librarian's mind to cope with the complexities of an ever broadening spectrum of knowledge, or awe of the growing sophistication of middle class readers among whom higher educational preparation is now widely characteristic, or because of the confusion which attends a set of objectives for library service which tolerates light diversion with intellectual development as equally viable missions: It is the client then who always determines his wants, and it is only the most iconoclastic librarian who suggests alternatives either by making precise recommendations or by skewing client choices through close control of the content of collections to reflect excellence. Perhaps, in this sense, it is the children's librarians who are the most professional. Not only are they experts in their literature who share commitment and high purpose, but they also presume to advise and direct their clients readily and to influence the client's independent choices by maintaining careful quality control over the composition of their collections. (It is of course easier to assume this posture with the child than with the adult.)

This problem is also seen at the general level in the conduct of reference librarians who balk at offering judgments about the quality of material or, at times, even at making comments upon the relevancy of material to particular informational problems. Rather than straightforwardly and self-assuredly advising a patron which is the singular or which the most promising sources, reference librarians appear to be most comfortable when providing numerous works or voluminous bibliographies. Moreover, it seems characteristic of the librarian's psyche to recoil from giving out straight answers. Instead, it is invariably the printed source in which the information is to be found that is offered. What may have been an appropriate rationale for such an approach in an earlier period seems less relevant in 1967. Whether a service which relies solely upon a book stock as the only true source of information is congruent with contemporary realities (except for such isolated cases as law or medicine) is subject to serious doubt. In a time of abundant and oftentimes more realistic alternatives to searching on printed pages, it is anachronistic for librarianship to remain so heavily committed to and dependent upon published sources to the exclusion of other possibilities. Viewed in solely economic terms, hours spent searching the literature for potential data which may no longer be current seems far less rational than employing alternative approaches, as for example, telephoning and asking someone who knows, even if the knower is five hundred miles away. While training and temperament have geared librarians to fact finding from published sources, by setting such a limit on the approach they circumscribe their role, and in the process, their professional value.

For the most part librarians remain medium- rather than client-oriented. In clinging tenaciously to the information container of another age, and as they continue only to acquire and stock and shelve books, they resist the idea that
the more fundamental commodity of modern times is information and that it takes myriad forms. They will meet the client's requirements if it can be done with a book and only with a book. For the clientele the vehicle is beside the point, the point is the information sought. By concentrating exclusively on the book and by resisting alternatives, the librarian remains comfortable and unpressured, while the client finds other avenues of access to information because of the librarian's default.

As part of this same syndrome, we find large-scale collection building seen as the expression of the librarian's expertise rather than rapid uncomplicated access to intelligence. Yet, the most effective client service may well be enhanced when the librarian concentrates his efforts upon careful discrimination in choice of acquisitions rather than in fiercely competitive and feverish collection building. Ultimately, means become ends; libraries are measured in terms of the size of their collections while the more significant measure, the quality and nature of the service they render, is ignored.

Viewed from another angle, catalog conventions, codes, policies, and procedures are also divorced from their ultimate purpose—service to the client. Detachment from clientele permits cataloging personnel to remain dedicated exclusively to the book literature, while ignoring or avoiding less conventional forms and media. As a consequence, these remain outside the control of the library and the patron dismisses the library as a source for any but the traditional published forms. The full potential of a very powerful tool to support clientele service is unrealized.

At another level of service, the library and the librarian functioning within the framework of a specific subject discipline, many of these built-in constraints are absent. Librarians here are typically more prone to deal with and give specialized treatment to unconventional sources, and they are prepared to go further in pursuing information requests. Where there is lack of assurance on the part of the librarian or limits on the reliance which the client places on his expertise, it will most frequently stem from the inadequacy of the librarian's educational preparation in the substantive field. To function in a science setting without the requisite orientation in the science disciplines or in a financial environment without understanding a balance sheet or the working of the financial markets serves only to reinforce the tenacity of the librarian to cling to card catalogs and book titles rather than to venture forth upon the precarious ground of substantive information; it re-affirms in the client's view the belief that the level of sophistication to be expected as an aid in problem-solving from library personnel is minimal. In either case, the effect is far from the most efficacious ideal for the professional-client relationship.

The remedy here may be to close the chapter on that phase of library history which tolerates, as one example, the well-meaning English major who gravitates into medical librarianship. Granted the need for organizational skill, the service ideal, and technical grounding in information handling, it will only be when the client can respect the subject competence of the librarian that he will accept him and respect him for his professional competence in the meaning employed here. Now this is not to say that the subject librarian need be a highly trained and advanced student of a narrow and specialized discipline to perform effectively, but rather that there must come to be a better match than has yet existed in typical cases between his

---

* This point is elaborated in Paul Wasserman, The Librarian and the Machine (Detroit: Gale Research Co., [1965]), p.50 ff.
preparation and his field of practice. Under such terms, someone without rudimentary grounding in the biological and chemical sciences would be discouraged from medical library service and someone without economics and financial study from business librarianship. Of course, this would call for a reorientation in recruitment patterns away from the more traditional and disproportionately heavy reliance upon those trained in the humanistic disciplines and toward the sciences and the social sciences. With the increasing role of the federal government in the support of graduate study, as reflected in such programs as those of the Office of Education and the National Library of Medicine, such a prospect is less remote than when there were no incentives to offer library students and at earlier stages when library work was less related to information services and more to a predominantly custodial function.

Two prototypes of this professional ideal suggest themselves. One is the subject-expert special librarian. He is epitomized in the law librarian with a law degree, the fine arts librarian trained in fine arts, or the music librarian with substantive preparation in music. In the university setting, some but not all departmental and college librarians fall into this category. More recently the subject bibliographer has come to be found increasingly in the universities. Such an individual plays the role of subject collection builder and librarian. Sometimes drawn from the particular field of scholarship, sometimes from librarianship, he enjoys the respect of his clientele for his subject competence. It may well be that the next stage in the educational preparation of librarians will call for a fundamental modification, to build into the educational preparation of librarians a planned and programed sequence of enhancing the subject competence of its students, for there can be little doubt that when the librarian is comfortable, both in the subject matter of the field in which he serves and in the substance of librarianship, he is far more strongly equipped and so more likely to achieve fuller acceptance as a professional in his role relations with clients.

Pushed one stage farther, under these terms the librarian can move from a fundamentally passive to a more aggressive role in information prescription. At home in the subject field, he will be less reliant upon published bibliographic sources, and he will far more readily generate for himself the bibliographic and reference aids for his clientele, for they will grow naturally and logically out of his work in a subject area in which he is not alien. Because bibliographic organization and imaginative informational approaches to subject matter in burgeoning fields are so much sought by clientele, here is an obvious path to improved clientele esteem.

The responsibility for a lack of aggressive professional service in problem-solving terms must be laid at the door of professional education for librarianship. For the schools, with only rare exceptions, have failed to breed an appreciation for the subtleties or the potentialities of the professional role. Where individual librarians have assumed significant information responsibilities for their constituencies, it has resulted from a combination of their own inherent and intuitive perception of their clientele commitments with imaginative application of bibliographic expertise and subject competence.

What the schools have produced is several generations of librarians committed zealously to the pattern of general service. While the library school student may have been exposed to a smattering of philosophy, and berated with and perhaps inspired by librarianship's service commitments and yearnings, nowhere was this likely to have
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been translated beyond the bounds of a vague service concept and on into the terms which might correspond with truly professional practice. Reference instructors (typically generalists themselves who rely on the descriptive terms of bibliography, simplistic isolated fact-finding exercises, or vague problems of reference administration) might seek to rationalize their offerings by suggesting that general, mechanistic, totally book-slanted orientations are intended for only the beginning stages of practice. This indoctrination, however, appears to have conditioned most librarians to perform throughout their careers at no higher level of attainment than that of this beginning practice. In learning a set repertoire of responses to meet only narrowly defined client requirements, librarians have not been provoked to consider the alternative of undertaking more demanding or new and differing responsibilities for their clienteles.

It would be naive for any occupational group to believe it could establish its professional role independently, for the ability of any professional to perform and the capacities in which he functions are in many respects circumscribed and influenced by external factors. This may be particularly true for librarianship, which has been a relatively passive pursuit. Since this has been so, it is not surprising to find that the librarian’s role has come to be influenced by the expectations of the library’s clientele and community which, in many instances, correspond to the minimal attainment level which he has set for himself.

A professional certainly cannot assume a professional role with a client without the client’s acceptance of him in the role of expert. Varying factors have tended to prohibit such acceptance of librarians. One has been the conditioning of clienteles to view the librarian in negative stereotyped terms with a consequent reluctance to enlist him as an active ally in the information seeking process. On non-literary matters, the average person simply does not expect—and his experience reinforces this view—that the librarian would be able to help him. The unlettered may hesitate to seek help for fear of revealing their presumed ignorance to someone who appears so all-knowing and bookish and who would tend only to reinforce their feelings of inadequacy in an alien environment. The research scholar, reluctant to relinquish to another the tasks which he has performed unaided (except in the university, to graduate assistants who function under his guidance, and who as a consequence have the subject background to understand fully the nature of the work upon which he is engaged), requests only minor assistance from librarians.

These barriers do not appear to present insurmountable obstacles to professional performance. If the librarian succeeds in developing skill and finesse in reducing the hesitancies of those not accustomed to use libraries, larger numbers who genuinely require information may be expected to turn to them. And as career preparation for librarianship came to comprise substantive preparation beyond the solely bibliographic, so would the disposition of the client change to place heavier reliance upon him for assistance of a more professional calibre. No ultimate wresting of control from the client is involved, for as in every other instance in which a professional is employed, the choice of whether or not to use the service, and then to accept or reject its guidance if it is found to be unreliable or inexpert, is retained by the client.

Although, at least in the public library, a fundamental modification of objectives is required for this to be the case. The alternative is to have the information responsibility assumed by others. A recent monograph suggests the establishment of a national information system at the community level. See Alfred J. Kahn, et al. Neighborhood Information Centers: A Study and Some Proposals (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1966).
The immediate institution in which the librarian performs may also have decided and frequently dysfunctional influences upon the client relationship. These institutional constraints will occupy us in further detail hereafter. Just as the wider environment influences the library, it also determines to a considerable degree the professional role of the librarian. The clientele group, in the aggregate, exerts its influence, for libraries, like other service institutions, tend to accommodate to those who use them. And such external forces have characteristically tended to perpetuate traditional roles for the institution and in the process for the professional role. Several examples shall be cited.

At a time when the population composition has shifted radically in virtually every older core city, the public library essentially retains its cultural orientation to the middle class, and this results in an institutional role and a concept of client service which corresponds with the strivings, literary tastes, and values of a middle class clientele which often is no longer present. The community typically is indifferent to this incongruity. In a university during the period when it seeks to develop its graduate and research programs (and this is the present state of a large proportion of American institutions of higher learning), the undergraduate service requirements continue to preoccupy the library as the influence of a longer history of undergraduate programs continues to hold sway, while the graduate and faculty constituencies are neglected. This situation often persists until the research faculty succeeds in exerting its influence upon the university and upon the library’s administration. Not only are the libraries inclined to be biased in favor of one constituency over another, but in each instance the community expects only minimal forms of service. Public library patrons tend to settle for recreational fare. In the university a classroom appendage, the reserve reading room, is too often confusedly equated with the entire library by administrators who do not understand the nature of a library and by librarians who do not understand the nature of either.

In the school library, client service is often a victim of the conflict between the ideal of service to support the individual student’s intellectual growth and development, and to the curricular requirements of the school. Moreover, many school libraries carry out functions which bear no relation to either objective, as reflected in such activities as librarians substituting for teachers, or in the use of the library as a study hall or for class disciplinary purposes. There may be some fundamental question and ambiguity about who the client really is—the school, the teacher, or the student—and this only further compounds the conflict inherent in the situation.

In each of these instances, accommodation is to requirements which are not reinforcing of professional-client relationships, but are rather the contrary. Where service expectations are minimal from the community, and as these are furthered through the institutional orientation of the library, whatever the aspirations of the librarian, he is restricted from enhancing his professional role. The point is that this role is of course, to a considerable extent, conditioned by the public image of the library and the function of the librarian which is in need of drastic modification, if the professional ideal is to be furthered.

The client relationship has been dealt with thus far as a primarily individual matter, but it seems relevant also to consider it in its community context, and in comparison with other similar fields. To take two illustrations, let us consider public health and social welfare. Energetic clientele effort conceives of its role as embracing more than only the
existing consumer, but also reaching out and functioning as a professional service in improving the community as regards such affairs. For public health, this would include preventive measures in a program designed to reduce the incidence of disease, and in social service, the organization of activities committed to a reduction in the frequency of need for welfare assistance. The counterpart for library service could be found only through commitment to constituencies not now viewed as the library’s responsibility—for the public library, the marginally literate and other non-users of traditional services; for the academic library—the devising of new forms and methods of information service beyond the passive collection function; for the school-library—a commitment to building collections and services to influence the teacher in his continuing education and his effectiveness to perform. Such a perspective of the revised professional commitments for library service is not in conflict with the views of progressive elements in the library profession. Yet, far more persistent and far more pervasive is the widely shared consensus that libraries basically are for those who use them and that it is no part of the library’s or the librarian’s responsibility to shift in the direction of those who do not. The implementation of far-reaching, innovative, or imaginative approaches to professional/clientele services seems only remotely possible, or likely to develop in only isolated instances, when viewed against the general level of current commitments and current practice.

INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Client relationships are importantly conditioned by the bureaucratic setting within which librarians function. As is equally true of other types of professionals who practice in formal organizations, librarians are faced with conflicts inherent in the incongruence between professional commitments on the one hand, and employee requirements on the other. Professionals view the freedom to function independently, the exercise of discretion, and the formulation of independent judgments in client relations based upon their own standards and ethical views, as essential to professional performance. The professional represents institutional authority which attempts to influence his behavior and performance norms, preferring control by colleagues. These requirements for independence are met to varying degrees in the institutionalized professions, and in librarianship, scarcely at all.

Librarians do perform in their direct client relationship with remarkably limited review or supervision, and stated conversely, with perhaps equally limited direction or training. The reference librarian is typically free to set his own limits on how or whether to deal with patron inquiries. He will, in fact, often spend more time on those questions which interest him or upon which he feels confident. Or, he will perhaps determine the relevance of an inquirer’s need based upon his assessment of the prestige, the authority, the personality, the appearance, or the presumed social, economic, or intellectual stratum which the patron represents. Despite the democratic ethic upon which library service is founded, the human tendency to choose to deal with individuals or situations which do not threaten, or to cater to those presumed to be most important, remains unbridled.

It is not so much that the institution tolerates such personalized judgments of the relative merits of a quest by the reference librarian out of deference to his expertise or evaluative acumen, as much as that the encounter does not appear to be viewed as critical or crucial enough to warrant inspection (as compared, for example, with preparing cards for a
catalog which can be assessed as a permanent record of the success or failure of performance). If administrative pressure is exerted, it will most typically be directed toward expediting or handling of more requests so that larger numbers of patrons can be accommodated. In some large systems there may even be a deliberate striving for anonymity, with new staff members cautioned against trying to build a personal following.

While the institution may not directly interfere in the client encounter, in addressing himself principally to satisfying immediate client needs the professional inevitably runs counter to the system which is designed not to maximize client service, but for the over-all good of the largest number, even if this is only a most modest good. And since rigid adherence to bureaucratic ritual (rules and regulations) permits of practices which may be efficient in terms of the organization’s requirements, in any given instance professional service to clientele may be sacrificed. Ultimately, the bureaucratic routine imposes procedures which may be in conflict with the very goals of the organization—the dialectic is complete, means have become ends, and the intellectual and professional design is sacrificed upon the altar of economic and efficient work procedures.

This is not to suggest that there is not a need for order and control in organizations which traffic as heavily in stock and records as do libraries. With the growth in size and scale of activity, the need for procedural consistency is accentuated. Nevertheless, such regularization means that perhaps ironically in the very largest libraries with the greatest resources and thus the greatest potential for professional service, the tolerance for individual needs will be most sharply curtailed, the client service minimized, and the professional values most seriously threatened. The role of the library, as Walton has so concisely put it, is to find that precise balance which introduces only enough routine to keep order and record-keeping integrity, but not so much as to impair the opportunity to afford clientele convenient and unhindered access to resources. Finding this balance may be seen as the task of the creative administrator. It is clearly not to be found in imposing burdensome ritual which may serve to stultify the opportunity for professional behavior and practice.

It is for this reason and to act as a countervailing force to the pressures for economy which would reduce standards of service that it is essential for professionals in organizations to assume decision-making responsibilities in relation to goals and standards of service. Yet, with only rare exceptions, libraries fall into that class of organizations in which goal decisions are tightly controlled by the administrative hierarchy. They are consequently often at the mercy of other tendencies of bureaucracy which run counter to professional aspirations and responsibilities. While professional spirit and zeal thrive most in an atmosphere which tolerates, even furthers, freedom of inquiry and pronounced license for unrestricted thought and action, the hierarchical system by its nature protects and perpetuates itself through its demands for submission, obedience, and acceptance. Since the hierarchical structure is reinforced when it withstands any pressure for rapid change, it tends to be
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8 As for example, in following such a policy as that in a number of university libraries which specifies that a librarian will not carry out extensive literature searches for any faculty member since the library could not be expected to provide such service for all who sought it.


10 For a fuller consideration of authority structure in libraries as an influence upon decision processes, see Mary Lee Bundy, "Conflict in Libraries," CRL XXVII (September 1966), 253-62.
organized in such a way as to inhibit the stream of ideas within the organization which might ultimately culminate in variations in organizational arrangements or practices. One consequence is that libraries tend not to advance beyond the levels of minimal service, for the organizational structure strives to reinforce the status quo. While there may be tolerance for procedural improvement, particularly when there is a universal climate provoking such modification (automation of circulation procedures may be a case in point) resistance to any more fundamental change such as goal modification remains as staunch as ever.

Compliance of professionals is achieved through a reward system which distributes benefits and higher incentives for loyalty to the institution. While the professional presumably addresses his fundamental loyalty to the societal responsibilities of his calling and therefore to the commitments and responsibilities to the clientele which this engenders, the institution recognizes only organizational loyalty. As the professional seeks institutional rewards, security, and status, he pays for them with compliance and conformity at the expense of his professional obligations. The professional who retains a fundamental identification with clientele commitment is inevitably forced into a position of conflict with organizational requirements.

Bureaucratic structure clearly imposes restraints, yet these tendencies which are contrary to professional requirements are not necessarily irreversible processes or insurmountable barriers. Even so, librarians continue to tolerate and perpetuate conditions of practice which fall short of the professional ideal. Perhaps this stems from the lack of understanding on the part of many librarians as well as administrators of what the issues are. In many library situations, a librarian viewing his primary commitment as essentially to client service, rather than to institution, would be considered disloyal, uncooperative, or otherwise suspect, even among his peer group—fellow librarians. May this not perhaps be the case of the new breed of subject bibliographer being spawned in the academic library, forced to choose between allegiance to library or to subject discipline, and gravitating away from the rigid bind of bureaucracy and toward the more free flowing current of his scholarly company? By many librarians he is seen as a prima donna, impatient with necessary work routines, unwilling to help out in emergencies, a waster of time spent in idle conversation with his clientele about their work—renegade and spoiled.

Administrators in other comparable fields (particularly when they are drawn from the professional ranks as is true of most library administrators), are sensitive to professional needs, values, and aspirations, and as a consequence, strive to bend bureaucratic limitations in order to accommodate to the working requirements of professional and other specialists in their organizations. Library administrators sometimes view operational constraints to be of such overbearing importance that they are exaggerated through their administration. Too often the administrator (not infrequently one who blows the horn of professionalism loudest), has not a minimum understanding of the proper climate within which professionalism is cultivated. He will view professional standards from the standpoint of internalized organizational standards, see the products of graduate study as so many replacements for the firing line without regard for their needs or their immediate or ultimate aspirations. Under these terms, librarians are treated like inter-
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11. In many instances concentration upon automation may be viewed as an administrative strategy for diverting attention from more basic problems and thereby forestalling the necessary fundamental reassessment of goals and services.
changeable parts serving where and when needed. Librarians man desks and meet schedule commitments, and in the process, deny and are denied the opportunity to care, to grow and to act professionally.

Nor is the library administrator always sensitive to the changing requirements of the external environment within which his organization functions. In the academic milieu, the storm warnings have long been out to alert the administrator to the fact that for important elements of his clientele their information requirements are simply not being met effectively and that only dramatic modification of the library's role will alter things. Where the problem is economic, and this will typically be only a minor symptom of a more fundamental disorder, the library administrator does both his library and the larger institution a disservice when he accepts only the crumbs from the organizational table. Indeed, library administrators sometimes make a virtue of such martyrdom when they might better recognize that there are times and issues for which one must stand up and be counted, even if this implies putting one's job on the line. In the public library, the central issue relates to the basic role of the library during a period when social needs, modern technology, and other dramatic factors should be influencing a re-evaluation of the conventional middle-class and book orientation which was seen as appropriate for another time and under different circumstances.

People and institutions ultimately get the form of administration which they seek. If so, why during a period of drastic personnel shortages, have librarians tolerated forms of administration which deny them the opportunity for full expression? As the administrators do not often understand the nature of professional commitment—or are short-sighted enough to sacrifice it—so librarians come to assume that professionalism may simply be a slogan, or that administration may be the only professional practice. Since there is no basic commitment to clientele, or awareness of what is being sacrificed, they succumb easily to an authoritarian structure. In doing so, they need no longer assume more responsibility or undertake differing tasks, carry the burden of professional commitment, or take risks which put them in conflict with the organizational status quo. In the process, their submissiveness lends further credence to the bureaucratic ethos which holds that people need to be led for they are not mature enough to lead themselves. It is not simply that some librarians do not resist bureaucratic entrapment, nor that library leadership sometimes diabolically exploits the very individuals who must be inspired to adapt and to innovate rather than to be smothered in stale ritual, but that the environment created by library administrators and closing in the practicing librarian is diametrically at odds with the independence of action and freedom from restriction which most characterizes truly professional service.

Part of the difficulty in libraries is undoubtedly related to improper utilization of personnel. In recent years, a greater number of individuals who carry out so-called professional library functions have benefited from formal academic preparation for librarianship. Yet it is undoubtedly true that libraries have not tended to analyze systematically their position structures and requirements, and as a consequence disproportionate numbers of librarians are employed in capacities which do not call for their full range of preparation and expertise. Too many librarians are under-utilized in roles which call for lesser skill or training, with the result that there is much zealous guarding of the few cherished intellectual tasks from those with less formal preparation, if equivalent
competence to perform. It is true that if a professional were to continue to perform at a concentrated peak level of strenuous intellectual effort all through the day, the strain would be intolerable. This is one reason why professors do not lecture forty hours a week, or social workers spend a full work day in case interviews. But, the problem in librarianship appears rather one of a need to attempt to reach equilibrium closer to the other end of this scale.

At precisely the same time when administrators bewail an abundance of unfilled positions, accurate analysis of working environments for members of these very staffs would all too frequently identify the sharp limits on opportunities for the expression of imagination and creativity—the burdens and ritual of desk covering, the routine and menial tasks more economically delegated to lesser paid employees. Imbalance in the proportion of time spent by professionals on chores which may be tiring, energy sapping, but professionally shallow and devoid of importance, may be quite widespread in libraries. The dignity and respect which might be accorded to professional, rather than to administrative pursuits, is too often denied. Exuberant professional spirit, high ideals, zeal, and commitment to innovation and experimentation are so often suspect and misunderstood that enthusiasm is ultimately thwarted by the bureaucracy until even the idealists succumb to the nine-to-five mentality or find other outlets for their creative aspirations.

Librarians are alert to and much concerned with the need to re-allocate certain routine chores to others less qualified; this is laudatory. But they do not as often recognize the fact that time spent in administrative work is also time spent in non-professional practice. And in this they have much in common with those in other disciplines who look schizophrenically toward the twin goals of administrative aspirations and professional satisfaction. Perhaps because the utility of administrative accomplishment is more clearly understood, and is so often attributed a higher value in a bureaucracy and in the culture, and because the goals of professional practice in librarianship are so confused and ambiguous, librarians more readily assume such administrative responsibility without remorse. And it may be for this reason that the assumption of an administrative role is so often equated with success. It naturally follows that the highest professional performance is seen as administrative activity, and that service to clientele through direct or indirect performance, comes to be viewed merely as a way station on the high road to the assumption of administrative responsibility.

It would be misleading to convey the impression that problems would be solved if only work assignments were to be better distributed, or if more dignity and stature were accorded to professional performance in libraries. Given the organizational propensities of librarians, personnel reclassification might lead only to more tightly circumscribing the librarian’s role, if albeit at a higher level. What appears to be required is a more fundamental administrative reorientation toward an institutional climate which advances the professional spirit and yields organizational responsibilities to the professional group. Nor is this to propose democratic administration or a human relations approach as an end in itself, but rather that the decisions about the future of libraries and of librarianship itself may well hinge upon the extent to which professionalization is furthered.

As long as professionalism remains so weak and so ill-understood, libraries will remain unable to solve not only their immediate and pressing problems, but they will be unprepared and so unable to make the radical adaptations necessary
to meet the rapidly shifting and growing requirements put upon them. Under these conditions outside intervention will come to influence the changes required, either by direct action upon the library or by fashioning new alternative forms of information service.

This may be what has happened in a number of university libraries where top library administrators have been relieved of their responsibilities or where outside insistence has resulted in the addition of more expert personnel to the staffs of the libraries. Perhaps administrators have served as the whipping boy for the limited level of professional attainment, when all who would aspire to professional standing should stand in the dock together. It may be that as some administrators charge, the majority of librarians are simply unprepared to assume mature responsibilities, although perhaps this is more a consequence of the bankruptcy of administrative leadership than of inadequacies among librarians. Nevertheless, to the degree that administrators countenance, if not foster, a set of organizational conditions less than appropriate for even minimal professional practice, it is they who are in greatest jeopardy and it is they who must beware.

THE PROFESSIONAL GROUP

Why is the record for professionalism in individual libraries so weak, and why has librarianship failed to move more rapidly toward maturity as a profession? In order to answer this question and thus better to understand the nature of the professional commitment, it is necessary to consider the wider grouping of which the librarian is a part as well as the nature of his professional relationships. In these terms, the professional group—the associations and societies—as well as the less formal personal identifications and group affiliations, are seen to be relevant. Through these relations are derived many of the patterns of the librarian's behavior and his continued professional growth. The process of acculturation into the group is begun during the educational sequence when the initiate is not only inducted into the field and affairs and is introduced to its intellectual substance, but is also indoctrinated in its commitments, its value orientation, and the standards which ultimately guide his practice.

Although the library-school tie may be securely attached, and while the bond may grow stronger as the nostalgia of each passing year adds further romance to old associations, the indoctrination process of the schools in feeding fuel to professionalism has been remarkably weak. The mystique, the induction rites, the salute to service concepts, the glorification of its heroes, the reinforcement of the field's sense of its own importance and accomplishments, all these have been present as long as one remembers. But, the substantive content, the body of significant professional knowledge, the theory, the philosophy and the ethic, these have evaded the field's grasp except in rare and isolated instances. Why should this have been so?

Perhaps the answer may in part be found in the role which library education has assumed in orienting its program so markedly to the requirements of those who come either while heavily engaged, or during the brief respite from practice after a period of past involvement. Many such students view library education grudgingly, as only a necessary intrusion, to be managed dextrously and conveniently, and to be related as much and as directly as possible toward reinforcing the operational skills which they have already gained on the job. The schools, perhaps seeing their role in much the same manner, conscious of the need to placate their clients, and having no firm philosophical orientation and commitments either, have provided insti-
tutionalized accommodation to precisely such requirements.

What is more, because the professional schools have tended toward weakness and have followed the more active vanguard in the field of practice, they have allowed the special interest groups—public, school, special libraries—to influence them in orienting their course sequences toward the presumed needs of particular areas of practice. In the course of pursuing such a fragmented approach, librarianship has been divided rather than unified around a common theme, philosophy, or professional commitment. By offering technical courses for specific types of libraries, it is as if to suggest that the process of administration or organization of materials or informational problem-solving is fundamentally variable by type of library. Cross-fertilization is thereby reduced; school librarians see themselves as something apart from public librarians, and academic from special librarians. To suggest only one serious dysfunction, the ultimate end of this process is to reinforce the institutional barriers to cooperative and imaginative planning, and seriously to impede the logical next step in the evolution of library service—the invention and organization of regional and interinstitutional information systems.

Perhaps the most searing indictment of all, however, is that while library education has evolved to the graduate level in the university, when its content is measured against the honest yardstick of its intellectual contribution there is room to doubt whether its claim to professionalism has not been a ploy by those in library education who simply seek to rationalize their own roles as professionals. For if library education is not truly professional education, what then is the self image of the field's educational and administrative leadership? This is not to say that library education is incapable of advancing to the stage where it is more centrally concerned with ideas, issues, theory, concept, and less with routine, description, procedure, and method, more with why and less with how, more with what for and less how to. But, the transition from description and homily and routine has only grudgingly given way to scholarship. There are still hundreds of students in graduate library programs memorizing names of famous modern librarians, committing to memory large sections of classification schedules, cluttering their minds with details of whether certain books have an index and table of contents or not, and taking superficial cultural romps through the various fields of knowledge to learn such things as the fact that Margaret Mead is an anthropologist, instead of studying the reasons for contemporary trends in societal information developments, the logic of comparative systems of classification, the structure of bibliography and information agencies as resources for problem solving, or the personal, organizational, and social group determinants of information need. To the extent that the details have overshadowed the more fundamental issues, so has education been routinized and stripped of its potential for embodying a content that is intellectually viable.

Part of the problem is one of the certification of mediocrity. At a time when the accreditation process in library education (jealously and zealously guarded as the prerogative of one national organ-

12 One manifestation which illustrates such influence may be seen in the meeting on library education for special librarianship convened each year by the SLA Education Committee during the annual conference. While the subject matter of the discussion varies from year to year, the common theme is the attempt to arrange for a dialogue between special librarians and library educators about the educational requirements for practice in the special library. See for example, Special Libraries, LVII (January 1967), for a report of the Second Forum on Education for Special Librarianship.

23 This issue is elaborated in Bernard Barber, "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," Daedalus, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, XCII (1963),
ization) should be strengthening the fiber of the educational product, it is accrediting and reaccrediting programs of doubtful merit thereby giving its imprimatur to schools very distant from any ideal or even advanced attainment. A truer service to professionalism would be to submit each program to ever more critical test, to encourage experimentation. The perspective of other organizations might well be sought (representation from SLA and ADI as illustrations), if only to encourage library education programs to foster timeliness and consideration of alternatives to their conventional fare. Present accreditation of graduate library education is in danger of fostering a negative standard—like the way in which a hack writer is encouraged when he watches an inferior television program and is sure he can do that well himself. Of course, the prescription of an absolute standard would be absurd, but it must certainly be time for graduate level programs to aim higher. In a period so crucial for librarianship's future, when excellent students present themselves in abundance, to tolerate and certificate mediocrity and worse is a disservice to professionalism and to the students who are being prepared.

The relatively painless acquisition of the association's seal of approval may, however, be only symptomatic of a more fundamental ailment. Education for librarianship may simply not have succeeded in attracting to the scholarly dimension of librarianship the theorists and researchers competent to build the concepts and the knowledge base upon which to construct an intellectual basis for professional practice. Drawn predominantly from, and committed almost overwhelmingly to, humanistic disciplines (when not to educational methodology), faculties in librarianship have failed or refused to see in library service a scholarly pursuit. Analytic insight is uncommon. Descriptive and historical orientations abound. Doctoral study has remained predominantly an academic exercise, serving either as the springboard to administrative advance or as the terminal research effort, short on methodological rigor and long on detail and bibliography.

Like the practicing librarian who bemoans the overload of clerical demands and busily perpetuates a role which tolerates the condition, academics accede to excessive course loads, teaching commitments in subject matters alien to their background and preparation, and wistfully lament the lack of time for genuine research and scholarship. But, the fact of the matter may simply be that they have not had the imagination or the conceptual orientation, the scholarly and intellectual footing to do more than remain a lap or two behind practice in their classrooms. For they seem to have almost universally failed to identify the basic problems or even to ask the most interesting questions, and so ultimately what they have taught proves to be irrelevant to contemporary requirements.

Lacking a conceptual base, typically barren of the analytical skills of the social or hard sciences, what scholarly effort is carried on by library faculties tends most frequently to center upon historical study or the applied survey. Where research has been fostered it has remained largely irrelevant to the educational offering, and even doctoral study has been characterized by a sterility and detachment from the fundamental issues in a way that is remarkable for a field so much at the center of societal concern. The link-up first forged with the social sciences at Chicago in the 1930's and 1940's has slipped away, and now information science seems the only serious intellectual issue to be engaging the attention of more than a handful of library scholars. Yet, there is danger in this that the technological issues and applications will so overwhelm the scholar-
ly company in librarianship that alternative issues, with all of their behavioral, political, and organizational ramifications, will be swept aside and once more pragmatic means rather than philosophical ends will engage the attention of the field's most inquiring minds.\textsuperscript{14}

Just as the schools provide or fail to provide the basic intellectual orientation and the body of knowledge fundamental to the claims of professionalism, the wider professional grouping acts to support professionalism in practice purely because it is a vehicle for wider personal recognition and reward. Within the scholarly disciplines, the source of recognition and prestige tends to be the peer group of colleagues rather than the local institution. Success and the achievement of career satisfactions are most often accorded only following distinctive attainment among the scholarly fraternity, even while there may be some degree of ambiguity and conflict between local and cosmopolitan orientations.\textsuperscript{15} In the professions, career advancement proceeds differently. Except for the relatively small number of individuals engaged in research, writing, or other scholarly pursuits, the path to wider recognition through the channel of publication tends to be closed.\textsuperscript{16} Perhaps for this reason librarians sense that they must concentrate so energetically upon purely local demands and requirements, since without having achieved profession-wide visibility, the route to advancement locally or laterally into other organizations is equated with recognition within one's own organization of the effectiveness of his performance. But, in a time of almost unlimited opportunity, the truer barrier to advancement may be the restriction upon mobility which handicaps the individual. While it is uncertain whether career advancement within libraries is promoted by profession-wide contribution (except in the case of academic libraries where such recognition is more common), the process of professionalization might be furthered if this were to be the case more generally. This is not to suggest that the goals of librarianship would necessarily be enhanced by a spate of ill-conceived and poorly executed articles, but rather that an institutional tone which honors such external commitment becomes a stimulus to professionalism, just as the converse may be equally true.

Librarians can and frequently do achieve visibility. It is also clear that professional involvement is often prelude to career advancement. While it is unquestionably true that some few in librarianship have adroitly identified the political utility of organizational engagement as a device leading to career opportunity, it is equally true that for many, many more, professional affiliations and participation serve as the tool of improved practice. This may be best illustrated by the special librarian's reliance upon professional colleagues in other institutions to expand the scope of his expertise, for as he draws upon his fellow librarians as external access points to information, he in the process expands the confines of his limited collections. In so doing, he reinforces immeasurably the professional contribution which he can make to his own organization.

We suspect that a significant hallmark
of the librarian who functions as a true professional is reflected in the nature of his relationships. The professional constantly expands upon his circle of contacts and reinforces and strengthens existing colleague relations, pursuing an active role by continuing his growth through self-study and associating himself with the local and regional and national activities in librarianship and in other special disciplines with which his work puts him in contact. For him, keeping up with professional trends and advances through the journals and monographs is a matter of fact. To lose touch with current affairs would make him feel as uncomfortable and ill-equipped professionally as to remain out of touch with broader societal affairs would render him uneasy as a generally aware person in his culture. This is in contrast to the librarian who confines his relationships to those which are merely comforting, reassuring, and reinforcing of his prejudices and limitations.

Nor is this to suggest that all so-called professional activity is desirable. Those who have participated in groups in which meetings consist of members explaining why they have failed to complete assignments or committees which deliberate weightily the means for perpetuating themselves instead of considering their purpose or program, or still others which consume hour after hour preoccupied with minutia, need no reminder of this. It is likely that many energetic and imaginative librarians have been repulsed and disenchanted from professional engagement by participating in precisely such exercises in frustration. The associational excesses of the ritual, the routine, and the social do not characterize only the local groups; as a consequence the participation of some of the most thoughtful and committed of librarians has been shunted off.

It is interesting to speculate whether identification with professional norms and values may be impeded, enhanced, or otherwise affected by practicing in large libraries, compared to the situation of the librarian in the special library or the school, where he is functioning apart, and associating more with a distinct clientele or discipline. In theory, professional ties should be reinforced through daily interaction with professional colleagues. Yet, close colleague associations with other librarians seem also to foster undesirable aspects of professionalism. Professional values may be more strongly reinforced through interaction and identification with clientele. This would clearly be the case in those instances where such undesirable or negative manifestations as a strong alliance in defense of the status quo or a tendency to band together in common disregard if not active resentment of the clientele, were to be found.17 While librarians working in concert may be better able to impose their standards and values on the institution, frequently they tend rather to reinforce and tolerate minimal service expectation.

If recent events in New York City libraries are a harbinger, more militant group solidarity when it takes shape may more likely be found in efforts to organize as collective bargaining agents rather than as professionally goal-oriented groups. While proponents of unionization reason that unions are fully compatible with professional goals and objectives,18 in view of the emphasis in organized labor on such matters as

17 Whether such characteristics tend to be more pronounced in academic libraries because of their unique status problems when compared with other types of libraries, would serve as the basis for an interesting line of inquiry.

18 "... It is true that a union of professional people, whether they are researchers in an industrial laboratory or college professors, will be substantially different from that which you would find in an industrial organization of plant workers. But, the fact that they have joined a union doesn't change the fact that they still have professional standing, professional competence," in "How to Negotiate with a Professor's Union" (an interview with Dr. John McConnell) in College Management, II (January 1967), 25.
seniority rights and employee benefits it remains to be seen whether the effect may not be a reinforcement of the very rigid authority structure of libraries which serves now as an impediment to innovation and furtherance of service commitments.

There are certain issues which require of professionalism that their proponents stand up and be counted. While the library profession supports an ethic with regard to intellectual freedom that calls for librarians to resist censorship pressure, the Fiske study documents the ways in which many librarians practice forms of self-censorship. It is equally true that librarians do not always resist or are not always successful in resisting external censorship pressures. Whether or not the practice varies from the ideal, the ethic is viable. More librarians will stand up for it than if it did not exist and unless it were to be so flagrantly disregarded as to become a mockery, society will ultimately come to know and respect it and the group which supports it. But, censorship is the most dramatic issue, not necessarily the one most central to professionalism. Librarians need equally to be militantly vocal about meeting minimum standards of excellence in such terms as the conditions, the support for, and the resources necessary for them to perform by acceptable standards.

In theory, if a professional cannot win minimum conditions for practice, he leaves. In actuality, he usually does nothing of the sort, for a variety of reasons good and bad. Many librarians are married women and hence immobile. Librarians frequently rationalize that it is better to remain and so offer some level of service while seeking to influence change for the better, much in the same manner as the optimistic woman whose life mission is to reshape some undeserving and unsuspecting male. There is perennial hope that conditions will improve. In these matters, librarians do no worse than faculty members of academic programs in which all who seek admission enter and everyone who enters ultimately graduates. No pat formula is at hand to describe whether in a given situation at a given time the conditions are irremediable, or must remain intolerable. It is only to be hoped that decisions may come to be made more frequently in terms of the professional commitment and the zeal for improved conditions, rather than the naive wish or the longing, and that aggressive professionalism will become a more widespread standard than patience and hope.

It will never cease to be an embarrassment to those who aspire to professionalism to find library situations in which the fiercest partisans for improvement are not the librarians themselves, but rather some outside or community group such as faculty members or teachers who struggle tenaciously for improved resources and conditions of operation. It is precisely here, in the passiveness or aggression of its commitment to the ideals and goals of library service, that those who practice it are assessed. Librarianship has not yet reached the stage in its development where it exerts the type of influence over its members which requires them to stand up and be counted on important issues or to refuse to practice in situations where resources are inadequate to do a minimal job. It therefore continues to countenance
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10 See for example, the "Freedom to Read" statement prepared by the Westchester Conference of the American Library Association and the American Book Council in 1953 ALA Bulletin, XLVII (November 1953), 481-83. It is important to recall that at this very time other prestigious national societies assumed a position of studied silence. This was the case of the American Political Science Association, to cite only one of a number of such bodies, which might be viewed as having an important concern with the issues of censorship and political freedom.
forms and levels of service which fall short of adequate standards. It has been conditioned by a national and educational leadership attuned to the acceptance of the modest and unassuming prospects of the past when resources were scarce or unattainable. In these more affluent times, librarians have still not been aroused to demand the conditions for effective performance which are typically far more readily within their reach now if only they will aspire to them.

For much of the history of American librarianship, the professional associations remained forward of practice. But, in many ways the one primary national organization now no longer speaks with authority for all the elements in librarianship. Information activity under various names is shifting dramatically and incorporating new forms and new paths to entry into practice. Libraries as they have traditionally functioned must either respond to contemporary requirements, or lose to competitive agencies and technologies. While the principal national association has been influential in many ways, its primary focus has been and remains political rather than professional. It has identified predominantly with the public library, and in the process lost touch with many of the most significant developments which should be influencing the library profession. Through its overly modest position on accreditation standards for graduate education, its non-existing role in the accreditation or certification of libraries, and by concentrating its zeal most strenuously upon aggrandizing the scale of its size, its political influence, and its economic power, it has contributed little to professionalization and tended, by default, to perpetuate inadequacy.

Like the libraries which it reflects, the American Library Association is a bureaucracy with the same built-in vested interests. To the extent that its key posts are held by those in administrative positions in librarianship, and that power in the organization is wielded by a relatively small coterie, it is less a professional association than an administrative conferederation. Like other oligarchical organizations of large size and wide geographical dispersion, it proves less capable than it should be of attracting younger, innovating elements into its higher councils. By concentrating its efforts on improving only the most underdeveloped situations in librarianship, it frequently misses being in the vanguard of new or imaginative directions for librarianship. By assuming unto itself a wide range of national, international, research, and societal responsibilities, for which it is less than ideally equipped, it purports to do more than attain the political ends at which it is most successful. Conventions and meetings which appear designed in greatest measure to reassure the rank and file that problems are under control by reinforcing outmoded traditional approaches, are of only limited service to a profession in a rapidly changing world posing new demands.

Viewed against the perspective of history, librarianship can be seen to have made only slow and gradual evolution as a profession and exists now as only a marginal entry in the competitive race for professional status. The conditions of modern times, however, are such that if librarianship does not move much more rapidly forward toward enhanced professionalism, the field will not only decline rapidly, but ultimately face obsolescence. Already, traditional and conventional libraries are being replaced as new agencies and new practitioners respond more appropriately to changing requirements for information and professional service.

Progress in librarianship is made by only a relatively small number. Innovation remains on trial when it should be encouraged. The field stands conserva-
tively and deeply rooted in the past at a time when such a stance exposes it to danger. Fundamental to advancement is the need to forge a new professional identity founded upon some of the characteristic elements which have been treated here.
Shared Mobile Library Collections

The use of bookmobiles is proposed for sharing special book collections among cooperating libraries. The advantages of such an arrangement over freighting joint-use collections from institution to institution include: (1) effort involved in packing, shipping, and receiving can be saved; (2) wear and tear on the books resulting from shipment can be reduced; and (3) mobile units can be considered supplemental library floor space.

It is well known that one of the most pressing problems in almost every college is library acquisitions. Compounding this problem is the fact that the need for additional acquisitions has been made more compelling due to increased publication, new dimensions of research and the need to add even more courses to college programs dealing with new areas of study such as the Far East and Latin America.

Colleges have responded to this critical situation by developing various methods for the cooperative acquisition and use of library materials. One additional type of academic cooperation which seems to be both apparent and desirable is the use of mobile library units which could be transported between two or more institutions.

Standard mobile units, such as those currently in use in many public library systems, are as large as 10' x 35'; the cost of these units, including shelving, lighting, air-conditioning, and heating, is approximately $7,500 to $8,000. It is possible, of course, to employ custom trailer construction which would allow for even larger units. For example, expandable units which have a maximum size of 20' x 35' are available. Also, two of them can be joined together on a location providing a total space of 20' x 70'. Additional custom features can provide space for such items as microfilm readers and storage.

It would not be advisable, it seems, to attempt to utilize such mobile holdings for introductory level courses, or courses which are offered at cooperating institutions each semester of each year. Great economy and utility for cooperating institutions could result, however, in using them for courses offered in alternate semesters or alternate years. In order to illustrate in what way these mobile units could be used by cooperating colleges let us assume that colleges A and B decide to offer Chinese history. This would be a two-semester sequence course offered in alternate years. The two institutions would agree to offer them in different years; thus, College A would offer it in the academic year 1967-1968, and College B in 1968-1969. In order to provide the maximum holdings to support and supplement the teaching of the faculty and the learning of the student, the jointly held collection would be placed in a mobile unit, which would be housed on the campus where the course was being offered for both semesters. The
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collection, housed in this unit would be cataloged in the mobile unit, as well as in the catalogs of both institutions. These mobile units, when they are resident on a campus could be used in a variety of ways as a supplement for that college's existing library facilities. The following four methods of use are suggested.

First, the mobile unit could be placed adjacent to the main library. This collection could be made available for a limited number of hours each day, since it would be unlikely that the materials would be used by any student or faculty other than those involved in the course. Thus, limited availability, for purposes of checking out and returning materials would seem acceptable. Also, this would not involve extensive demands on use of library personnel to staff this mobile unit, for only one library assistant would be needed for the hours this unit was open.

Second, in order to assure access to this collection on the same basis as other library holdings and in order not to require additional library personnel to staff the mobile unit on such a basis, the cooperating schools could arrange to have this unit joined physically to their existing libraries. Minor alterations could be made on one of the exterior walls of the stack which would allow the door of the mobile unit to be opened into the stack area. The provision of such a point of access would seem to involve very little construction. If there were at least two continually rotating collections so that each campus would have one of them resident on its campus every year, such an arrangement would be very desirable. Consequently access to the collection would be on the same basis as access to other stack holdings, and all checking in and out of materials would be done at the main desk of the library.

Third, the shelving on which the collection was housed in the mobile unit, could itself be movable so that the collection could be wheeled into the main library's regular stack section. In this instance, it would seem quite practical for the college involved to use this vacated unit as an additional room for classes or seminars, or for additional study space lost to the library by virtue of their needing space in which to locate this unit's collection. This seems less desirable, since it seems eminently more practical to use the collection in the mobile unit.

Fourth, the collection in the mobile unit could be considered a branch library and could be housed adjacent to the buildings in which the appropriate department was located. The department or division could, therefore, share the costs with the main library for staffing the unit and paying the overhead costs involved.

Some of the benefits proposed in this suggestion duplicate the benefits involved for colleges with shared bloc holdings which can be transported by simple freight transfers, mainly in terms of reduced cost of acquisition. It seems that there are three major additional benefits, however, which accrue from this suggestion which make it more desirable than freight transfers.

First, library staffs would not be faced with the necessity of packing, invoicing, and shipping a bloc collection at the end of any term, or for receiving, inventorying, and shelving such a collection. This seems to be an inordinate demand of time, energy, and involvement on already overworked library staffs.

Second, the collection would not be subjected to the wear and tear resulting from the continual packing and repacking involved in transporting bloc collections by freight. Indeed, in this mobile unit, these collections would be very similar to parts of the permanent collection of the library.

Third, the use of the mobile unit would be economical for the cooperating
colleges not only in terms of the cost of the collections, but it would also reduce considerably the cost involved for constructing space in which to house this collection. Further, the space constructed to house a collection which is to be moved by freight is vacant when this collection is moved, and, even though it might be utilized for study areas, it is a costly way to provide such an area.

These then are the additional benefits that would seem to result from the use of mobile units. Most important, however is the fact that it provides colleges with a cheaper method of acquiring and housing collections which are needed in areas of study.
An Investigation of Classroom-Library Relationships on a College Campus as Seen in Recorded Circulation and GPA’s

The study is an analysis of the library habits of the students of a small liberal arts college with emphasis on library-classroom relationships as revealed through comparison of library use and grade point averages. Expanded circulation records were kept on individual students in relation to the particular courses being taught at the time, in order to get per-capita circulation figures by both individuals and the courses for which the books were used. These figures were correlated with individual student grades and with instructor grading patterns by courses. Motivations for library use were also checked. Correlation between library use and GPA proved to be very low, since grading criteria and teaching methods did not take account of the sort of values that are normally achieved through library use.

This study was conducted at Grand Canyon College, Phoenix, Arizona, during the 1963/64 academic year. Grand Canyon is a church-related four-year college of arts and sciences with a fall enrollment in September 1963 of 479 students. The college was young and had not as yet been able to exercise much selectivity in its admissions procedures, attracting therefore a student body of average academic aptitude. Neither had it yet been able to achieve full regional accreditation by the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges. However, its teacher education program was approved by the Arizona State Board of Education, and therefore more students majored in education than in any other department and upon graduation, if qualified, were granted elementary or secondary credentials. Although students of all faiths were freely admitted, the program was strongly promoted among and geared to the needs of college-age young people of its own denomination. The college’s dormitories were always filled to capacity, but being located in a metropolitan area of several hundred thousand people, many students also commuted. At the time of this study 24 per cent of the student body were living in college housing.

Problem and Method

The study grew out of the desire of the college to bring its work to the highest possible point academically in order to achieve its goal of making possible a top-level liberal arts education for those who elect to come there, and as a byproduct, to attain the regional accreditation necessary to serve best the needs of its students and constituency.
It is generally conceded that a college library can occupy a key place in any academic program if it is properly integrated into that program. It is also recognized that there can be a sizeable gap between this ideal and actual practice. Moreover, the existence of such a gap can sometimes go unrecognized by the faculty in its preoccupation with the other activities of the classroom. It was the purpose of this study therefore to develop and apply a technique for assessing the extent to which the library was actually attaining its full potential in the college's academic program.

The need was made even more apparent when the librarian (since moved to another college) in early 1964 conducted a survey of recorded library use for all the small accredited four-year liberal arts colleges in the United States. This survey revealed a national average of 46.1 loans per capita for 1962/63, while the local college library had a recorded circulation figure (including both reserve and two week loans) of only 27 per capita. This ranked the college library fourteenth from the bottom of the list of ninety-two colleges, i.e., there were only thirteen accredited colleges which occupied a lower position.

Hypothesis. Through numerous studies of library use made in liberal arts colleges, it has generally come to be agreed that the key to extensive use of the library on the part of students is the manner in which the instructors organize and teach their respective courses. Whatever other factors may have a part, the crux of the matter lies in the classroom rather than in the library itself. The testing of this hypothesis (with an isolation and evaluation of factors causing the gap between classroom and library) lies at the heart of the present investigation. It is conceivable that in an isolated college situation, this hypothesis, although arrived at through numerous studies of liberal arts college library situations, might nevertheless be inapplicable in some particular case due to special or unusual circumstances.

Other Studies of Library Use. The problem of method remained to be solved. There have been several significant and very useful techniques developed by various investigators beginning with Harvie Branscomb's notable work in 1937-39 up to the most recent at the University of Delaware as reported by Gorham Lane. Quoting from the introductory paragraph of the latter study:

Although the University Library is regarded consensually as a potent educational force, its strength is more often than not described in terms of its physical facilities, the extent of its collections, or even its budget... These do not provide a measure of the library's effectiveness as an instrument of education. Such measures can be obtained only by assessing the extent to which students use the library and the extent to which such use relates to academic growth. These assessments are not easy.

The present study is an attempt to use the techniques of other investigators but with three significant additions: (1) The correlation of book use with faculty evaluations of course work as represented by grades, and this computed both individually and by courses; (2) By means of a questionnaire arrive at some estimate of off campus library use; (3) Also by means of a questionnaire, to arrive at

---

2 Gorham Lane, "Assessing the Undergraduates' Use of the University Library," CRL, XXVII (July 1966), 277-82.
3 Lane evidently did figure his statistics for this, but made nothing of it except to note the lack of clear correlation. Ibid., p.280-81. Perhaps this lack of correlation is itself significant!
some estimate of the relative importance of various motives for library use or lack of use.

The nine weeks (exactly half of the semester) just before Christmas vacation in the school year 1963/64 were chosen as a representative and easily handled period for study. The first step was to expand circulation records so as to get more highly individualized data than normal procedures provided. A record was kept of the number of books checked out by each student, as well as a record of the courses for which they were to be used.

The student totals were ranked in order of the number of books used and both median and average figures determined from the list. Grade point averages for each student were secured from the registrar’s office and used to ascertain whether or not there was any correlation between grades and number of books used. This was supplemented by taking a mean of the grade point averages for those making no use of the library and another mean for those at the top of the list who made heaviest use of the library.

The instructors’ semester grade reports were used to determine the number of students enrolled in the courses. Net enrollment was figured by subtracting all withdrawals. This net figure was used to get average per-student circulation in each course. The same grade reports provided figures for computing the grade point average for each course. This gave another opportunity for comparing grades and books used, this time in relation to each instructor’s course.

To supplement the data collected and to aid in its interpretation, a questionnaire was developed and mailed out which would bring to light the extent of the use of off-campus library resources. The latter was especially important in view of the large proportion of the students who commuted. The questionnaire also sought to determine motives either for heavy or light book use. It was sent to the seventy-five heaviest users of the library (the fifteen top users in each class: freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and special). Also it was sent to the 150 students who showed no recorded use of the library for the whole nine weeks.

The last step in the investigation involved the tabulation and interpretation of the results.

It is recognized that a completely controlled situation cannot be created for such a study as this, and that some room must be left for a margin of error resulting from the intrusion of incommensurable or unrecognized factors that may to some extent skew the results. However, certain safeguards were set up. The fact that the study was in progress was not revealed to either students or faculty lest conscious or unconscious deviations from typical patterns of action should creep in. Questions from borrowers as to the reason for the extra information about the identification of courses for which books were being used were parried with a stereotyped noncommittal answer: “We are making a special study of the library for accreditation purposes.” The questionnaires which were returned unsigned were sent out after all other statistics were gathered.

**Results**

**Distribution of Book Use by Students.**

The total student circulation for the semester was 5,491; the total for the nine-week test period (October 19 to December 20) was 3,182, or 58 per cent of the whole. If there is any skewing of the picture, therefore, it would be in the

---

5 Grand Canyon College uses a 3 point rather than a 4 point system in computing its grade point averages. The valuations are as follows: A = 3.0; B = 2.0; C = 1.0; D = 0.0; F = -1.0.
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direction of making the situation look better than it really is.
Elimination of all auditors and those who withdrew from school without completing the full semester’s work reduced the number on whom computations were made from the initial 479 to 468. Table 1 gives the circulation statistics for these 468 students.
Summarizing Table 1—
468 students checked out a total of 3,181 books.
Median per capita, 3 books.
Mean per capita, 6.7 books.
The lowest 50 per cent of the students checked out 157 books or 4.9 per cent of the total.
The highest 50 per cent of the students checked out 3,024 or 95.1 per cent of the total.
The top 13 per cent of the students were responsible for 50 per cent of the loans.
The top 5 per cent of the students were responsible for 24.3 per cent of the loans.
It will be noted that the average per capita figure is considerably larger than the median. In statistics of this sort the median is usually considered to be the more significant figure. The average is much higher as a result of a few students checking out a large number of books and so distorting the over-all picture. With the lowest 50 per cent of the students checking out only 4.9 per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. Books Checked Out by Each</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2. RECORDED CIRCULATION IN RELATION TO GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Grouped by Library Use</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>No recorded use of library</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Lowest use below median (1-3 vol. each)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Lowest use below median (3-7 vol. each)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Highest use (7-55 vol. each)</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Whole Student Body</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the total the college could justifiably conclude that the library is making no significant contributions, so far as recorded circulation is concerned, to at least half of the student body.

Noting again the figures above—that the lowest 50 per cent of the students checked out only 157 books or 4.9 per cent of the whole, and the highest 50 per cent checked out 3,025 books or 95.1 per cent of the whole; it is rather surprising to discover that this very great difference is not paralleled by a comparable difference in GPA as revealed in Table 2.

This is the first indication of the fact that there may be a very low correlation between use of the library and the grades given. If true, it can only be concluded that in the judgment of the instructors as shown in the grades given, it is possible for a large portion of the students to do average work with no use of the library whatsoever.

If the students are grouped by classes, the circulation and GPA statistics come out as shown in Table 3.

The figures for both circulation and GPA show a steady and expected increase from the sophomore through the senior years. It is when we note the statistics for the freshmen and special students that we turn up the unexpected. These unusual results may be explained by the admissions policies in force.

As to special students:
1) they constitute an unusually large proportion of the student body: 16.3 per cent;
2) they are non-degree, part-time students taking only a few units each;
3) many already have college degrees, and are engaged in public education and taking a course or two at the college either from special interests or to enhance their professional standing;
4) they almost all live off campus.

These special factors probably account at least in part for both the low book use and the above-average GPA’s.

The low GPA for the freshman class in spite of a fairly high record of circulation (it is above the sophomore level) probably results from an open admissions policy that allows the matriculation of a rather large percentage who are not capable of college level work in spite of evident effort as gauged by use of library materials. The resultant .98 GPA is .02 below the minimum level necessary to remain in school. The big difference between the size of the freshman and sophomore classes would suggest a high attrition rate resulting from a similar situation the previous year.

To get at the question of whether there was a causal relationship between the steady increase in GPA’s from class to class as seen in Table 3 and the likewise steady increase in recorded per capita circulation, further analysis is attempted in Table 4. Average GPA’s were computed for those in each class who made no use of the library and checked against the GPA’s for an equal number in each class who made the heaviest use of the library.

In four out of five of the above groups a positive correlation does exist between book use and GPA. It is important to note though that with the exception of the sophomore class, it takes a major in-

| Table 3. Recorded Per Capita Circulation by Classes in Relation to GPA |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| No. in Class    | Class           | Median Books    | Average Books   | Average GPA    |
| 76              | Special         | 0.00            | 2.25            | 1.84           |
| 72              | Senior          | 5.00            | 9.29            | 1.69           |
| 96              | Junior          | 5.00            | 8.26            | 1.55           |
| 83              | Sophomore       | 3.00            | 5.55            | 1.36           |
| 141             | Freshman        | 5.00            | 7.72            | .98            |
crease in book use to bring only a slight increase in GPA, and in the junior class the opposite is true. These two facts would seem to be particularly important in interpreting book use and GPA correlations. It would suggest other factors as being more significant than library use in causing increased GPA's when one moves from the freshman to senior year, e.g., the weeding out of poorer students as one moves up the academic ladder. Moreover, in three out of five of the groups those who made use of the library were able to get GPA's above the 1.43 average for the school as a whole. The instructors have in effect been saying by their grading standards: "The student can do above average work in large segments of the curriculum without recorded use of the library."

However, it could be that since this is an open stack library, students were making heavy use of materials in library reading areas which would never show in recorded circulation statistics. Various faculty members felt sure that this was actually happening. To get at the facts of the matter a survey of library activities was made on two separate occasions, the sixteenth week of the fall semester and the sixth week of the spring semester. During these two weeks a total of ninety-four hourly counts were made of the number of students studying in the library, including a record of whether or not they were using any library materials. The number present at one time averaged eighteen (3.1 per cent of the student body) for all counts; the highest at any one time was forty-four and on twenty occasions the number ranged from zero to nine. Even more revealing was the small proportion of this low number present who were actually using library materials—an average of 34.9 per cent; the other 65.1 per cent were using the library only as a study hall for reading their own books. Left, therefore, with an average figure of only six or seven students out of the total student body of 468 using library materials on the premises at any one time, it could hardly be claimed that the open stack facilities were significantly skewing the recorded circulation as a valid gauge of classroom-library relationships. This is especially true if it is remembered that the other colleges with which circulation statistics were being compared were nearly all open stack libraries.

There is one more loophole that could possibly invalidate the picture that is becoming increasingly clear. To what extent does use of outside library facilities modify the situation, especially for those who made no use of the college library? Do the large number of students who live off campus actually make extensive use of other libraries? To

---

Details of this study are found in: R. Vernon Ritter, "An Evaluation of Fleming Library, Grand Canyon College," p.24-25 (Dittoed and distributed to Administration and Faculty, May 1, 1964).

**TABLE 4. AVERAGE GPA'S FOR THOSE MAKING NO USE OF LIBRARY AND THOSE MAKING HIGHEST USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>No-Use Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>GPA Increase Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>No. Bks. Circulated</td>
<td>Average GPA</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>No. Bks. Circulated</td>
<td>Average GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15-37 ea.</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6-32 ea.</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11-55 ea.</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16-53 ea.</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0 each</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1-25 ea.</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class No.</td>
<td>No. Students</td>
<td>Books Used</td>
<td>Average Books per Student</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Course Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
check this a questionnaire was sent to all 150 students making no use of the college library requesting information on the use actually made of other libraries. Forty-two out of the one hundred fifty were returned.

Of the forty-two responding:
6 made "much" (average 22 vol.) use of public libraries.
2 made "much" (average 15 vol.) use of college libraries (other than home college).
4 made "much" use of their own private collections.

The size of the home libraries ranged from five to fifteen hundred volumes with one hundred as the median size—hardly an adequate substitute for a public or college collection.

We have no way of knowing whether the 108 others making no use of Grand Canyon College library made extensive use of other libraries. However, it is probably safe to suppose that a large proportion of them did not return the questionnaires (return stamped envelopes had been enclosed) for the simple reason that they had nothing of other library use to report. Since only eight indicated "much" use of other college or public libraries, it seems fair to conclude also that the low use of this college library had not been replaced by significant use of other library collections.

**DISTRIBUTION OF BOOK USE BY COURSES**

It is generally agreed that there is very little virtue in library book use for certain types of courses. For that reason any increase in total library circulation would have to be developed within those courses where library use could conceivably be valuable (or in general interest circulation). For this reason the courses in elementary languages, music, mathematics, physical education activities, and such were excluded from the main group of courses.
TABLE 6. BOOK USE AND GPA COMPARED WHEN COURSES ARE GROUPED AT VARIOUS COURSE LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>No. of Courses</th>
<th>Aver. Bks. per capita</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 series</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 series</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 series</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 series</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since among the courses listed in Table 5 there is variation in the value of library book use even in an ideal situation, it would be inappropriate to make too much of individual applications. However the following comparisons may be made:

1. Comparing the two extremes of per capita book use in the various courses, fifteen courses that made no use of the library achieved an average GPA of 1.40, only .03 less than the school average; at the other extreme the fifteen highest users ranging from 3.41 to 17.09 volumes per capita achieved an average GPA of 1.56, only .13 above the school average of 1.43.

2. When all the classes are compared—the lowest per capita book users with the highest—the lowest half achieved an average GPA of 1.45 as against a 1.42 for the highest!

Table 6 gives the statistics from Table 5 redistributed by course level. The results are in harmony with what would be expected from the analysis of book use and GPA's by classes (supra), and introduce no new variants.

The analysis of book use by courses confirms the previously tentative conclusion: for large areas of the curriculum it is possible to get above average grades with little or no use of the library. Or to put it in other terms: in the opinion of the instructors, judged by the grades given, good work can be done in a sizeable portion of the curriculum with only negligible use of the library.

STUDENT MOTIVATION

Question 2 of each of the two questionnaires, one sent to the 150 nonlibrary users, and the second sent to the 75 heaviest users of the library, was an attempt to rate motives for library use, or lack of use. The results are tabulated in Table 7 with an indication of the number of students who considered each motive as being of first, second, third, or fourth place importance in prompting to library use.

As might be expected, the classroom stands out as of supreme importance for motivating the use of the library whether by way of formal requirements or by way of subject interest. However, there is considerable indication that those who used the library most went beyond classroom requirements or on the basis of special subject interest, or on the basis of previously established study habits. Seventeen rated this as of first or second place importance. In effect these would be saying: “Whatever course requirements may have been, whether great or small, we study and use libraries this way in any case.”

The importance of this point in this particular academic situation stands out in Table 8, which shows the results of

TABLE 7. STUDENT MOTIVES FOR LIBRARY USE AMONG HEAVY USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>First Place</th>
<th>Second Place</th>
<th>Third Place</th>
<th>Fourth Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously established study habits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course organization and requirements</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than average interest in particular courses taken at time of survey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8. STUDENT MOTIVES FOR LIBRARY USE AMONG LOW USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>First Place</th>
<th>Second Place</th>
<th>Third Place</th>
<th>Fourth Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No need for much use because of nature of course requirements</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much use of library materials elsewhere</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy of college library</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procrastination</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the other questionnaire sent to those who made no recorded use of the library; there it becomes clear that those who do not have such study habits and whose particular courses do not require extensive use of the library, end up with no recorded library use. By far, the greatest portion of those who show no recorded library use claim that their courses did not require it. This could be an idle rationalization, but a check of their GPA's confirmed this claim in 75 per cent of the cases (Table 9). None were below 1.00; all but five were above the 1.43 average for the student body as a whole. The five who rated this lack of need as of second importance had GPA's as follows: 1.20; 1.33; 2.00; 2.00; 2.00.

It can only be concluded therefore that, in the opinion of their instructors, these students were able to do above average work in spite of their lack of library withdrawals.

In regard to the reason getting the second largest number of votes: “much” use of libraries elsewhere (including their own private collections), the following should be noted:

1. Out of the 42 responses, the proportion of those not using their own college library, but who claim “much use of other libraries” harmonizes with the facts already discovered from the analysis of the first half of the questionnaire: 12 out of 42—they would both be approximately 30 per cent.

2. A check of use made of other libraries by those who also made heaviest use of their college library reveals that 50 per cent in this group claim “much use” of other libraries.

The comparison of these two groups suggests a rather strong tendency for other library use to follow the pattern of local college library use. If they use the local college library more, they use other libraries more; if they use the local college library less, they use other libraries less. The one is a replacement for the other only to a very small degree.

CONCLUSION

Although it was not possible to set up laboratory-like controls or use a scientifically accurate statistical procedure, it has been possible to isolate factors relevant to the problem of an admittedly low circulation figure, and to point out certain tendencies, as well as strengths and weaknesses inherent in the classroom-library relationships of this particular college campus. Even though the statistics assembled derive from only one college, they do have implications for other institutions as well, and might merit careful consideration by the administration and faculty of other schools. Although this particular college is unaccredited, its circulation statistics were being compared with those of fully accredited institutions only, and there were thirteen others that were lower! If we arbitrarily add to those the figures for the thirteen immediately above (who did not really do much better, ranging from 27.6 to 31.7 per capita) it can be readily seen that the campus surveyed is hardly altogether atypical!
After approaching the questions investigated both through individual students and courses of study, it is clear that all lines converge upon the classroom as the main determinant. The gap between library and student can be bridged only by bridging the gap between classroom and library. The extent to which the instructor can generate a thirst for learning, can communicate something of the excitement of ideas, and can share with inquiring minds his own very genuine enthusiasm in his search for truth—these very personal factors are crucial. It is the contagion of such enthusiasm that catches on—there is no known substitute. It must be humbly admitted that this investigation has served only to point up the greatness of the problem by underlining the formal and the commensurable. The real solutions can only come by way of the intangible and interpersonal. It is the glory of the small college that it still has room, and time, and concern for such values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individu als</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00-1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43-1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00-2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50-3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information—An Innovation in Education

Information systems are now a reality in the field of education. The ERIC system is the first major attempt, based upon public funds, to establish a nationwide network of information centers dealing with several disciplines in education. At the present time the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information is the first center to represent a particular level of education. By concentrating first upon the acquisition and dissemination of locally-produced reports of institutional research in junior colleges, this clearinghouse seeks to fulfill its function as an agency designed to classify and distribute information to a specialized field.

In recent years American education has been the beneficiary of widespread public interest and substantial financial support from both private and public sources. As a result, research efforts and programs of institutional development have mushroomed on all levels of education. Concurrently, the size of the body of research information being developed has expanded into seemingly limitless proportions. The problem of disseminating research methodologies and findings in order to avoid costly duplication and wasted effort and in order to translate research into practice has become crucial. In response to this need, the Educational Research Information Center has been developed by the United States Office of Education.

The background of the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) is found in the funding of the Cooperative Research Programs of the United States Office of Education in 1956. With this act, the scope of educational research programs based upon legislation enacted by Congress increased rapidly. As the body of reports grew, leaders in the federal government realized that the sponsorship of research was only a part of the responsibility of the U.S. Office of Education. Some way of sharing the results of these efforts had also to be developed. The first large-scale attempt to do so was made in 1965 when the Educational Research Information Center was established. The initial project undertaken by ERIC was in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. At that time 1750 documents on the special educational needs of the disadvantaged were collected, indexed, ab-
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stracted, and sent to state and local education departments.

The general plan for the development of ERIC called for the establishment of a headquarters office in Washington, D.C., the organization of a decentralized network of clearinghouses designed to serve separate segments of education, and the development of a document reproduction service. At the present time thirteen clearinghouses have been established at various universities and research centers throughout the country. They cover such general areas as reading, which is located at Indiana University; educational administration, at the University of Oregon; vocational and technical education, at the Ohio State University; and junior colleges, at the University of California, Los Angeles. Five new clearinghouses have been funded recently, including one on libraries which will be located at the University of Minnesota. The location of these centers is in keeping with the ERIC policy of utilizing established collections and specialists at the site of their concentration.

The ERIC program is designed to become a nationwide information service for teachers, administrators, librarians, and researchers. Therefore ERIC is concerned with the acquisition of reports of basic and applied research as well as fugitive documents which report innovative ideas and emerging knowledge in each field. The location and dissemination of current unpublished research and research-related materials which have a low distribution is the essence of the ERIC project.

ERIC clearinghouses acquire, select, index, and abstract documents in their fields of interest. At each clearinghouse, a paper-tape typewriter is used to record document data uniformly on ERIC résumé report forms and punched paper tapes. Copies of the résumé forms, the paper tapes, and the documents are sent to Central ERIC where they become the principal devices for information storage and retrieval.

The Autonetics Division of North American Aviation at Anaheim, California, is the contracting agency with the responsibility for converting the data from paper tapes into a central computer system designed for rapid storage and retrieval. The résumé forms, which include abstracts, and the actual documents are photographed and made available to the consumer either on hard copy (paper) or microfiche form through the Educational Document Reproduction Service—a unit of the Bell and Howell Corporation in Cleveland, Ohio.

Research in Education, a monthly publication of the U.S. Office of Education, includes announcements of new projects funded by the Office of Education and reports of recently completed studies. Abstracts of documents processed by the clearinghouses appeared for the first time in the July 1967 issue. In addition to bibliographic information and abstracts, each issue provides prices and procedures for ordering copies of reports.

The ultimate goal of ERIC is to develop a network that will link universities, professional organizations, school systems, and boards of education so that research results may speedily be sent to places where and when they are needed. The Clearinghouse for Junior College Information is one unit of this network.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

The development of two year colleges from eight institutions with a total of 100 students at the beginning of the century to 837 junior colleges enrolling nearly 1.5 million students in 1966 is phenomenal.1 Reports in 1966 show that fifty-two

newly established junior colleges enrolled 53,234 students in their first semester of operation.2 "It has been estimated that by 1970 there will be 1,000 junior colleges enrolling nearly two million students."3

The tremendous impact of these institutions and their students upon the structure of American education is obvious. More than that, the commitment of junior college educators to give quality education while maintaining the "open door" policy means that each institution must bear close examination and evaluation—if it is to continue to render such services. As do institutions of other kinds, junior colleges have their deficiencies and problems.

Much of this examination must come from within each institution. When it is formalized, such efforts are known as "institutional research." Institutional research is defined in many ways. A particularly appropriate definition is that designated by Hendrix as "any study, formal or informal, made on the campus of any part of the college, its program, or its operation by any group or individual."4 Brumbaugh emphasized the importance of institutional research in the following statement:

The key to effective administration is the ability of the president and those who work with him to ask the right questions and then to find the right answers. But the right answers to the right questions, whether they are specific in relation to a given institution or whether they are more comprehensive, must take into account all the relevant, factual data—the kind of data that only institutional research can provide.5

In March 1966, a proposal for funds to establish a clearinghouse on community colleges at UCLA was submitted to the Bureau of Research of the U.S. Office of Education. This center would be one of twelve decentralized units in a network of information centers which were being organized throughout the nation in association with the Educational Research Information Center in Washington, D.C. At UCLA this new concept of information handling in education is of mutual interest to the graduate school of education, the school of library service, the institute of library research, and the university libraries. Much of the groundwork for this project was laid in the Junior College Leadership Program sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation, and in the Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System (MEDLARS), and the Brain Information Service projects of the university biomedical library. These facts, coupled with national leadership in the field at the university and the strong concentration of junior colleges in California, made the university an appropriate site for this clearinghouse. Late in May the proposal was funded at $108,731 for the contract year—June 1, 1966 through May 31, 1967.

The Clearinghouse for Junior College Information was established at UCLA as a joint project of the graduate school of education and the education and psychology library. The principal investigator and the co-investigator of the proposal assumed the roles of director and associate director respectively. Located in the Powell library building, professional staffing appointments include an associate director, an information specialist, a junior college specialist, a systems specialist, and a librarian (III) who acts as head of the indexing-abstracting section, as well as appropriate supporting personnel.

In accordance with a requirement of the ERIC program, an advisory board

2 Junior College Directory, loc. cit.
has been formed which is composed of eminent leaders in the junior college field, both statewide and nationally; the university librarian; and the director of the institute of library research. The principal functions of the Advisory Board are to approve criteria for controlling the quality of input to the clearinghouse collection, to determine ways of improving user service on a demand retrieval basis, and to give guidance to the over-all direction of the clearinghouse operations.

The clearinghouse performs several distinct functions. It acquires, abstracts, indexes, stores, retrieves, and disseminates the most significant and timely research and research-related documents relevant to public and private community and junior colleges. This includes studies concerned with junior college students, staff, curricula, programs, libraries, community services, and any other subject specifically related to the development and evaluation of junior college operations.

The clearinghouse has, for the most part to date, collected fugitive research studies. "Fugitive" indicates that the study has not yet been published or widely disseminated. Reports of institutional research are the most common types of fugitive material. Surveys, conference proceedings, and certain committee reports are also representative of such materials. Certain monographic publications and journal articles will also be included in the clearinghouse collections. Dissertations and theses relating to junior colleges and their programs are another valuable source of clearinghouse information.

Input quality is also a significant aspect of the ERIC program. Such factors as format, originality, relevance, and technical quality are essential qualifications. Limitations in the size and scope of Research in Education make it necessary for clearinghouses to devise other ways of reporting their collections to the field. Junior College Research Review, the initial publication of this clearinghouse, reports state-of-the-art papers and bibliographies based upon documents in the clearinghouse collection. Abstracts or copies of documents in this collection are available upon request.

All documents worthy of retention are indexed and abstracted according to specifications received from Central ERIC. A system of coordinate indexing is used for analyzing the subject content of the materials. Basically, this system depends upon the assignment of a number of terms or concepts to each document entered into the system. These terms, called descriptors in the ERIC system, are technically meaningful terms or subject headings which, when taken together, describe a document and may be used as index entries. Descriptors provide a dual function. They permit the indexer to describe the subject elements of the document so that it may be stored in a system and later searched for retrieval. They also provide the material from which a question may be constructed for the system to answer. The descriptors then comprise the indexing vocabulary. The size of the vocabulary and its range of specificity have a marked effect upon the form of the index and upon its bulk.

The control of terminology in the ERIC project is maintained by the use of a Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors. The first edition of the Thesaurus was a product derived from the processing of 1750 documents relating to the disadvantaged children at preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels. The fact that the original thesaurus reflected a specific subject area at specific levels of interest was recognized as a limitation in its general usefulness. A revised edition has been developed, and procedures for frequent up-dating of the Thesaurus have been established.
When the cataloging, indexing, and abstracting have been completed, the document citation, abstract, and index terms are recorded on a standard ERIC résumé form via a paper-tape typewriter. The documents, résumé forms, and punched paper tapes are sent to Central ERIC where they become the principal vehicles for storage, retrieval, and dissemination.

Reference and retrieval services are the newest aspects of the clearinghouse operation at this time. Inquiries include requests for searches on such specific topics as the evaluation of particular programs, data on transfer students, studies of teacher load in junior colleges, reports on vocational and technical curricula, studies of attrition rates, and requests concerning architectural designs and master plans.

Since most requests are received by mail, the procedure is to translate the requests into the language of the index system and thus formulate the initial search strategy. The index or inverted file provides access to each document in the collection through the clearinghouse accession number. A complete citation can be obtained from the shelflist and direct access to the document will also provide an abstract of the report. Abstracts of documents or full copies on microfiche are furnished to users on request.

Various types of services are anticipated for the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. Immediate access to the collection now results in reference and retrieval services which provide bibliographies, abstracts, and periodic state-of-the-art reports produced in a periodical. Extended efforts may result in the preparation of “packages” of bibliographies or special interpretive reports. This would be done in anticipation of the requirements of users who wish to be alerted to new developments and also to accommodate a number of potentially repetitive requests. The operation of a program or workshop for users of an information retrieval system would also be appropriate.

As a unit of the ERIC system, the Clearinghouse for Junior College Information seeks to meet the information needs of all junior college educators—librarians, administrators, teachers, counselors, and others. In a large measure, its success will depend upon the development of relationships with all junior college personnel. Communication and cooperation are the essence of this activity.
Comparative Classification for Administrators: A Short Sermon

It appears that in too many instances the administrators who must decide what classification schemes libraries should use lack understanding of comparative classification. As a result, these decisions are frequently based upon irrelevant considerations. The author points to the several weighty reasons for claiming that such systems as Bliss, the Colon Scheme, and the UDC are superior to those in common use in the United States today, and invites reconsideration of their merits.

American libraries are growing more rapidly than was expected; perhaps even more rapidly than the libraries around the world. Among libraries that are not growing in absolute size, there is a more rapid rate of inclusion and exclusion, thus requiring an even faster means of making use of the material held there for so short a time.

Librarians managing such pressurized institutions are aware of increasing needs for rapid and efficient access to their monumental and/or rapidly changing collections. There can be no sympathy for processing departments and their traditional (but growing) backlogs: the material must get out on the shelves and into the catalogs so it can be used! From all these pressures have come the movement toward automation, the use of simple computer-produced catalogs such as KWIC, size-storage, and centralized cataloging and classification.

Such devices have their uses, when their limitations are understood. And their usefulness can be increased if ways can be found to overstep these limitations while retaining the speed-advantage of each basic technique. This paper (and two longer ones1 upon which it is based) is primarily concerned with the devices of automation and centralization. It is the headlong rush to reclassification with LC, as a supposedly invariable corollary of acceptance of centralized Library of Congress cataloging, that represents to many the great danger today, particularly to libraries also in process of automation. What is needed, as preliminaries to that decision (or to alternatives to it), is the development of a body of insights into comparative classification.

Such a title may suggest an austere and erudite discipline, and one cannot deny that, in its most developed forms, it is such. But it can perhaps be shown in a few fairly easy examples how it can be utilized, and what sort of conclusions can be drawn from it.

The two longer papers aforementioned have been concerned to develop, as

1 "On Bibliography and Automation; or, How to Reinv ent the Catalog" (Libri, XV (No. 4 1965), 287-339); and "Re-Classification: Some Warnings and a Proposal" (Illinois University, Graduate School of Library Science, Occasional Papers, no. 87—in press).
the over-archingly guiding principle of all library service—whether conventional or automated, public or university/research, in a single institution or in a network, in public service per se or in “non-public” service such as acquisitions searching—the principle of search strategy, which can best (or most economically) be phrased “What, then, next?”—that is, what steps can be taken after the failure of the first attempt to provide that which will meet the patron’s need.

These two key concepts, comparative classification and search strategy, are not often found among the armory of administrators, to whom falls the decision which can be based only upon them; administrators have their own species of reasons, which need not be recited here, all presupposing a state of “everything else being equal . . . .” Comparative classification and the need for a search strategy together, though, can eliminate that only apparent state, and thus leave the administrator faced with issues other than “purely” administrative ones. Indeed, for administrators to have so long allowed themselves to be so little aware of the developing theory of library service as search strategy, even in such diverse thinkers as Metcalfe and Ranganathan, bespeaks a need for a new invigoration of the profession—probably possible only through the library schools.

Why do we sometimes become biased against a particular classification? If we have only one document on twentieth-century Magyar lyrical poetry, and it is all we have on Magyar literature we may well rebel at Dewey, 17th edition, which yields a code like 894.5110409003. If the document just prior is coded 894.3 (Turkic literature), and that just posterior is 894.6 (Paleosiberian literature), we may well say that the middle number is over-developed, and unnecessarily so. Yet in our subject headings, where adjacent entries are not necessarily conceptually related, we do not object to one entry with a couple of subdivisions coming between two unsubdivided entries, alphabetically prior and posterior. Nor, in a classification where the notation is non-structural and does not attempt to represent lower classificatory orders by extensions of the code, but simply numbers each node in the tree consecutively, would it be resent if a document bearing a simple code for a complex idea were preceded and succeeded by documents bearing simple codes for simple ideas?

DC is under serious attack, especially the 17th edition, and for serious reasons. Yet these reasons are not truly fundamental; nor are they leading toward solutions which are fundamentally ameliorative of a sticky situation. Since the first need in library service is for search strategy (an answer to “What, then, next?”), a structure must be provided to help patrons and reference personnel discover the next most relevant documents. The two major types of such structure are syndesis (characteristic of subject headings) and juxtaposition (characteristic of notational classification).

Syndesis, and subject headings along with it, might be perfectable, but surely a great effort would be required, and the present structure would need to be replaced at one blow by its successor. It seems better then to recommend a shift to a wholly new mode of search strategy, than to be dominated by juxtaposition: in a word, the classified catalog.

For instance, as chosen from Sears: ‘Hungary’/‘Hungary—History—Revolution, 1956—Addresses and essays—Bibliography’/‘Hunting.’
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2 For instance, as chosen from Sears: ‘Hungary’/‘Hungary—History—Revolution, 1956—Addresses and essays—Bibliography’/‘Hunting.’
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What is classification? Most American librarians can think only of shelf arrangement as the answer, but this is far from all. And the resistance to classification as search strategy is based on dissatisfaction with currently available “models,” primarily DC and LC. Thus by a strange dialectic the majority of American library administrators have come to distrust all classification and to place their whole search-strategic trust in subject-headings—which, however, are neither perfect for conventional libraries nor even remotely sensible for automated searching.

Why is classification as search strategy resisted? What is one to think of a system that arranges but does not reveal its mode of arrangement? What of a system where the same concept can be predicted to be in a large number of different places, depending on relatively minor connotational differences as interpreted by catalogers? What of a system which gives only one available search-strategic pathway, even from an initial point of attack that is complex, and thus must require several such pathways?

What we do with such a system is to cease to expect such a function from it; we call it a “shelf arrangement,” and thus effectively cease to need to think about it seriously.

But classification so characterized is not much of a representative of the family; where shall we find a better? In fact, several better ones are available: BC (Bliss’ Bibliographic Classification), CC (Ranganathan’s Colon Classification), and UDC (the Universal Decimal Classification) would all do what is needed. A few reasons are given in the afore-mentioned paper on “Re-Classification” for possible option for the last of these—primarily in terms of its strong family resemblance to DC, and hence its greater familiarity—but they will not be repeated here at any length. The one thing to be absolutely clear about, however, is that the above-mentioned defects of DC and LC are not characteristic of UDC. It is nearly ideal as a search strategy in that it orders concepts hierarchically (but only after having separated out the elements of complex ones), its notation is structural (so that it can be ritually manipulated) and general-categoric (following, that is, the separation of the elements of complex concepts). In other words, with it you do know what to try next, the first point of attack having proved unsuccessful; and you know so from the code itself, not from your grasp of its semantic contents. In the cited example, “twentieth-century Magyar lyrical poetry,” the UDC code 894.511-14 “19” uses a sub-code for “lyrical poetry” that is uniform in all uses under class 8 (literature); thus if the best available document is on “twentieth-century Finno-Ugrian lyrical poetry” the code is still recognizably relevant: 894.5-14 “19.” Similarly with “twentieth-century Magyar poetry [of all types]”: 894.511-1 “19,” or “Magyar lyrical poetry [of all periods]”: 894.511-14; or, varying more than one facet at a time, 894.5-1 “19”; or, adding in additional facets, 894.511-2-14 “19” (-2 means “drama”); or, both adding in and

---

4. It is generally assumed that this objection cannot touch alphabetically arranged catalogs; but I will show in a subsequent work (The Idea of Order: an Essay in Bibliographical Systematics) that this is not a really nonproblematical area at all.

5. In our earlier example, the next most relevant document is not necessarily that on twentieth century Magyar poetry in general, since we may have no such; it may instead be twentieth century Finno-Ugrian lyric poetry, but what do we have available in the given code to allow an economical and rapid transfer of our attention thence?

6. I cannot claim, in fairness, that any available general classification of subject-heading system is really perfect; all that it is fair to do is to make a comparison in which we choose the best of the candidates in terms of the criteria recognized. It has been suggested that a thoroughly presuppositionless attempt to establish goals and criteria of performance would be advisable, and I must admit to a certain sympathy for such an undertaking; but there is a more immediate need, for which more immediate solutions are required.
Comparative Classification for Administrators

varying, 894.5-2-14/15. In each such code, simple program recognition would indicate the degree of distance of the examined document-surrogate from the initial search-specification. What more do we expect from a classification, whether it be for shelf-arrangement, as the basis for a classified catalog, or as the basis for electronic searching?

LC cannot do any of these things for us; it has, as mentioned, probably been a large factor in the general disaffection with classification in the minds of American librarians and documentalists. Why then change to it? Why indeed!

For the sake of monetary advantage, that's why! What other service offers us as large a proportion of classificatory work ready-done? None. What other service offers us descriptive cataloging along with this ready-made shelflist and shelf arrangement information? What other offers us a catalog-arranging and search-strategic device in addition to these other advantages? None!

But what good are these advantages in light of what we want to accomplish? None, if we can see significance differences between available classifications, some better and some worse (in terms of purpose and its achievement); a great deal, it would seem, if we cannot see such differences, since in that case we should look for a way to save money for purposes which can be effected by excellence.

This paper argues that there are such significant differences, and that our primary purpose is the provision of documentary relevances; hence we must choose the means for the achievement of this purpose, doing as well as we can within the financial constraints that such a choice imposes. And library administrators must do so too; they must be, in the fullest sense, librarians. This does not just mean possessors of library degrees, but rather persons oriented to the true purpose of libraries. As administrators in the narrow sense they may need to take refuge with the wise counsel of their technical personnel, but they must not rest content if these are unable to outline to them the relations between input and output, cataloging (and classification) and reference, information storage and information retrieval. If they cannot find reference librarians who know the details of classification theory nor catalogers who know the details and needs of reference work, they must become librarians on their own and find out for themselves.

The classified catalog, then, arranged by UDC, is in the thinking of some people a far better solution than would be reclassification to LC, which does not really attack the central problem at all. But even if none can be persuaded to adopt the classified catalog, a search strategy such as UDC can be extremely helpful in the search of electronically stored catalogs which are the by-products of library automation. Only, however, if libraries either do their own tape-stored cataloging by UDC (which many would feel is not such a terrible problem), or if they can get such information externally (and centrally) ready-made. Therefore, a widespread agitation appears warranted that such a centralization of service comes about by the establishment (at the Library of Congress perhaps, or cooperatively by the Library of Congress and the British National Bibliography) of an agency to do what is now being done in terms of LC and DC codes—the assignment of UDC codes to a large proportion of the monographic literature. Indeed, this could be made an even more helpful project if such companies as Bowker and Wilson were to index by UDC, so that the card-

---

1 Even though small enough for a really large and/or rapidly growing library. Also see P. A. Richmond, "Switch Without Deliberation," Library Journal, XCI (October 15, 1966), 4870.
or page-catalog, as well as external bibliographies contributing to the same searches, were to utilize the same rather than a pointless variety of strategies. The shelves, then, could continue to be arranged by DC or by partial UDC codes, or even by LC (though the essential browsing function would be lost thereby).

The Library of Congress has always said that its classification was a private system; let's let them have it back.
Library administrators could adjudge their likely fortunes in the academic tug-of-war for funds if they understood more clearly the attitudes of institutional administrators toward libraries. Some view the library as "a bottomless pit"; all recognize that the library is unlikely to generate much political pressure for its own aggrandizement. Many young institutional administrators are coming to apply more sophisticated measures to their funding formulas than have been utilized in the past. Librarians therefore would be well advised to become more proficient in modern management techniques and program budgeting concepts.

Academic librarians worry a lot. One need only attend a convention or leaf through the library journals to be impressed by the range and intensity of their concerns. Some worry about recruitment, others about automation, and still others about interlibrary loans. There are even those who worry about the institutionalization of these ever-proliferating worries in the form of standing committees and round tables. There remain a few unifying themes, however, matters about which almost all academic librarians worry. Among the most important of these is "The Administration."1

1 "The Administration," as all academics will know, consists of the institution's president, vice-presidents, provost, and their entourage of executive assistants, plus perhaps a few of the more powerful deans. On some campuses the Administration is referred to as "it"; on others as "they."

Directors of academic libraries are especially prone to worry about the Administration, and understandably so. For it is the Administration which establishes the salaries and official status of the director and his staff, which sets at least the total library budget, which decides if and when a new library building shall be constructed and at what cost. In short, it is the Administration—not the faculty and still less the students—which determines the fate of the library and those who toil therein.

While many academic librarians worry endlessly about the Administration, they usually know very little about it. Librarians are not normally part of either the administrative inner circle itself or the select group of faculty oligarchs and entrepreneurs whose views carry great weight. They are thus excluded from the real decision-making process of the institution. Indeed, librarians are often horrified and/or en-
raged to discover that decisions of crucial importance to the library have been made without their advice or even prior knowledge.

Much, though certainly not all, of this frustration might be avoided if librarians had a better understanding of how academic administrators view the library. It is the purpose of this article to offer a few modest insights.

The most accurate answer to the question, "what do academic administrators think about the library," is that they don't think very much about it at all. There are amazingly few references to libraries in the vast and repetitive literature of higher education. Libraries are almost never discussed at the national meetings of presidents, provosts, deans, and other academic luminaries. This rather deafening silence cannot be attributed entirely to the faculty club view that all administrators are illiterate. There are other reasons, several of the most important of which are noted below.

It has often been observed that administrators devote most of their attention to matters at either end of the spectrum and have little time for those in the middle. In the academic world, the library is definitely in the middle. It is unlikely to be the cause of either a crisis or a coup. It will not, on the one hand, trigger a riot nor on the other hand will it bring in a multi-million dollar grant. In short, the library is one of those academic sleeping dogs which the harassed administrator is quite content to let lie.

Administrators also devote much time and attention to those units which consume a large portion of the institution's total budget. The library is not one of these. Most universities allocate perhaps 4 or 5 per cent of the operating budget to the library. This is not only a relatively small percentage but is also a remarkably consistent one, varying little from year to year. As a result, many academic administrators tend to view the library budget as a fairly modest fixed cost and let it go at that. It is certainly the case that librarians worry vastly more about the high cost of libraries than do administrators. (A study of why this is so might reveal much about personalities of academic librarians).

Of course, academic administrators do give some thought to the library. After all, it is they who determine the library's budget. It may be instructive to note some of the factors which the Administration is likely to consider in determining how much of the institution's resources should be devoted to the library.

One important consideration is the fact that many academic administrators view the library as a bottomless pit. They have observed that increased appropriations one year invariably result in still larger requests the next. More important, there do not appear to be even any theoretical limits to the library's needs. Certainly the library profession has been unable to define them. This the Administration finds most disquieting. The science chairmen may request staggering sums for equipment, but at least they have a definite and perhaps even attainable goal in mind. It is possible to imagine that, with an assist or two from the National Science Foundation, the physics department might reach the point where it has all the equipment it wants; another reactor or accelerator would actually be in the way. Even the athletic director will admit, if pressed, that it would be absurd to build a field house above a certain size.

Only the librarian is unable to place any limits on his needs. Research libraries are, after all, infinitely expandable. This being so, the Administration is understandably reluctant to de-
vote a very great per cent of its resources to the pursuit of an undefined and presumably unattainable goal.

The allocation of an academic institution's resources is influenced by many factors: truth, justice, wisdom—and pressure. While the library is the institution's official repository for the first three, it has never managed to accumulate much in the way of pressure. Almost everyone is in favor of more money for the library, but always at someone else's expense. Dean A and Chairman B will cheerfully support an increase in the library budget as a general proposition or even at the expense of some other unit. However, any suggestion that the funds should come from their budgets produces a reaction rather like that of a mother grizzly guarding its young.

In most institutions, a significant increase in the library budget is third or fourth on the priority list of most of the deans and chairmen—falling well below more money for salary increases and more money for new staff. Depending on local circumstances, it tends to rank just above or just below more money for parking facilities. Indeed, only the librarian is likely to be intensely concerned about the library, and, as has been noted, he does not often carry great weight in the academic power structure. Thus the administrator who consistently favors the library does so largely because he happens to think it a Good Thing and somehow self-justifying is questioned. The young men are contemptuous of articles of faith. Even the fact that the prestige universities tend to have the largest libraries leaves them unmoved. They point out that this is simply a result of wealth, and that the prestige universities also have the best student psychiatric services.

In short, the conventional wisdom is simply no longer useful in the area of resource allocation. It does not, for example, help the Administration determine whether an additional $100,000 a year would be better spent on books or on the addition of new staff in the department of civil engineering. At the moment, neither do the analytical techniques developed by institutional research. The young men are hard at work, however, and their mere presence has forced administrators to think in terms of cost-benefit. Since nobody yet appears to have the slightest idea how to make a cost-benefit analysis of the contribution of the library, few administrators feel justified in straying far from the traditional percentage.

In summary, academic administrators devote little real thought to the library. Tradition, what other institutions are doing, academic politics, and the personal predilections of the officials involved tend to determine budget support. Such criteria may not seem very impressive, but at the moment they are about the only ones available.
The current pressure to introduce modern management practices into the universities will not leave libraries unaffected. Such techniques as program budgeting require a much more rigorous analysis of the balance of return against investment than has ever been applied to libraries. Just why should the library receive 3 or 6 or 1 or 10 per cent of the institution's total budget? How should the claims of the library, the computer center, and educational television for budget support be evaluated? These and similar questions are certain to be asked. It might be prudent for academic librarians to have some answers.
Faculty Studies: A Survey of Their Use in Selected Libraries

A mail survey was made of faculty study use in selected academic libraries. An examination of reported faculty to faculty study ratio suggests that no single mathematical formula can be employed when determining local needs. Other factors influencing the demand for faculty studies are examined. The management of faculty studies through a properly administered policy statement can help to control space shortages and reduce irregularities common to most libraries providing faculty studies.

University and college libraries are seldom planned and built without faculty studies. Faculty studies absorb considerable library space and are the cause of housekeeping difficulties in all libraries. Library literature lacks adequate information; there is no accepted doctrine on the subject.

The purpose of this survey is to review the current trend of faculty use of library studies as well as to probe selected institutional policies, problems, and attitudes on this matter. The thirty-two libraries selected for the survey are relatively new, having been built within the past few years. The institutions employ an average of 898 faculty members and have an average of fourteen hundred student seats available in the libraries. The smallest institution reports three hundred full-time faculty members; the largest, twenty-seven hundred.

All institutions participating in the survey are basically urban universities. The only feasible way to conduct the survey economically was through mail. A self-administered questionnaire was developed and mailed to thirty-two institutions. There were thirty-two respondents, of which twenty-four provided complete information. The remaining eight supplied partial information or none at all beyond the fact that their libraries possess no faculty studies.

The questionnaire defined the faculty study as "a small enclosed area for individual study; not an open study station." The definition seemed necessary in view of the fact that there is no standard definition agreed upon in this matter. In one institution a faculty carrel may mean an open study desk, in another institution it may mean an enclosed cubicle or study room. Library building planning guides are of little help in clarifying the issue. Burchard distinguishes between studies and carrels by saying that as a rule a "carrel" is smaller than a "study" and that "carrels" are for graduate students while faculty use "studies." 1 Wilson and Tauber 2 and Met-

I use the word "carrel" for enclosed faculty studies in their respective works. The definition of the faculty study or carrel on the survey questionnaire kept the confusion to a minimum. The answers which some institutions related to open-study stations have been omitted here.

**How Many Studies Should a Library Have for Faculty Use?**

The questionnaires returned reveal that 65 percent of the libraries have faculty studies. An additional 6 percent indicate plans to add such faculty studies as building expansion permits.

Just how many studies a library should provide to satisfy demand is not an easy question to answer.

Eighty-two per cent of the libraries with faculty studies indicate that the demand, at least on the surface, is greater than the supply (see Table 1). Eighteen per cent of the libraries which indicate an "adequate" number of faculty study facilities are listed in Table 2.

The faculty-to-study ratio in Table 2 ranges from 1.6:1 to 31:1. Since one group reports these ratios to be adequate, one may wonder why sixty per cent of the libraries in Table 1 do not consider their facilities adequate. It will be noted that Table 1 shows ratios ranging from 4:1 to a low of 337:1.

An examination of these facts suggests that no single mathematical formula will provide the answer to every library need. Let us examine some of the factors which could influence the demand for faculty studies in an institution.

1. It appears to the surveyor that in institutions where teaching is emphasized rather than research there is less demand for faculty studies.
2. Libraries with extremely attractive facilities attract a greater percentage of faculty who want facilities separate from students.

3. Universities with full-scale Ph.D. programs demand more faculty study facilities than those institutions which level off at Masters programs or have a limited number of Ph.D. programs. Additional factors, minor as they may seem, may also increase the shortage of faculty studies in certain situations.

1. The shortage of faculty studies is sometimes because professors obtain the privilege of using the facility, then do not make proper use of it. At times faculty stop using the facility altogether and do not inform the library. For instance, faculty assigned a study leave for an extensive trip, or terminate employment without reporting to the library. Shortage of faculty studies may result when a number of professors obtain faculty studies, then sublet them to their students. This may happen in institutions where graduate students actually have their own study facilities.

2. In spite of the claimed shortage of
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2. In spite of the claimed shortage of

---

**Table 1. Ratio of Faculty to Faculty Studies in Institutions Where the Number of Faculty Studies Are Reported "Inadequate"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Available Faculty Studies</th>
<th>Ratio Faculty: Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10.4:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>8.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>15.5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>769</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>337.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>105.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 2. RATIO OF FACULTY TO FACULTY STUDIES IN INSTITUTIONS WHERE THE NUMBER OF FACULTY STUDIES ARE REPORTED "ADEQUATE"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Number of Available Faculty Studies</th>
<th>Ratio Faculty: Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.0:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1.6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty studies, libraries assign them to other than faculty. Twenty per cent of the libraries indicate it is their policy to include visiting scholars for study privileges. Thirty-three per cent of the libraries consider graduate students if they show an adequate cause. Fifteen per cent of the libraries indicate they give consideration to ministers, state officials, and other dignitaries if the occasion arises.

3. Most libraries consider faculty members uncooperative in observing regulations in respect to faculty studies. Yet only fifty per cent of the libraries indicate they have a written policy statement available for use and distribution to faculty. The obvious lack of instructions to faculty may be an important factor contributing to study shortage in some institutions.

4. Libraries tend to assign faculty studies to coincide with a semester, quarter, academic year, or even with a calendar year. While these may seem convenient target dates to set, they are actually irrelevant to the actual needs of a scholar. Libraries assigning studies on an academic calendar basis may tie up facilities after the faculty members are through with their use. Libraries aiming at a better use of such facilities might attempt to determine the approximate length of intended use through an interview with the faculty member. Logical as this method may seem, only 10 per cent of the institutions report they practice such control.

The shortage of faculty studies is not the only problem they pose. There are other housekeeping matters which are sometimes delicate issues in academic circles.

One of the major problems reported is the search for uncharged material kept in studies. All libraries report they check faculty studies regularly and remove uncharged material. This may be irritating to some faculty members. Recognizing the public relations value of not removing uncharged material from faculty studies, one institution uses stack pages to prepare the charge records when necessary. The frequency of faculty study checks varies a great deal from institution to institution. The most popular practice is to check irregularly but at least once a week. Only 15 per cent of the libraries report daily or every-other-day checks.

Few libraries have established special lending rules for faculty studies. Sixty-six per cent do not use separate circulation policies. Those which do indicate a greater flexibility by granting liberal loan periods or by circulating material which would normally not be allowed to be taken outside the building.

Noise must be considered when establishing policies concerning use of typewriters in studies. Ninety per cent of the libraries indicate typing is permitted in faculty studies. Ten per cent restrict typing to certain studies designed to absorb typewriter noise.

None of the libraries permit the use of studies as office space. This may be one of the reasons no faculty study is equipped with a telephone. The lack of telephones is also a feature preferred by researchers who want to get away from interruptions when using the library. Sixty per cent of the libraries will not "page" a faculty member out of re-
spect to his sanctuary and for other practical reasons.

Smoking is permitted in faculty studies by 71 per cent of the libraries. Others indicate that while they have smoking restrictions faculty smoke as long as they have the privacy of an enclosed study. None of the libraries permit eating or drinking in faculty studies. Yet 80 per cent report housekeeping problems along these lines.

Nobody seems to have the magic solution to all the housekeeping problems. Regular inspection of studies and personal contact between faculty and library staffs can help to control irregularities. Personal contact is maintained conveniently when keys to the individual faculty studies must be picked up and deposited at a central location such as the circulation or reserve desk each time the faculty member uses the facility. A few libraries use such times of personal contact to point out a few “do’s” and “don’ts.” The system might also be used to measure the extent of use of the studies and will help identify those who have signed up for a study but are not using it. Further, this system may create controllable conditions to detect whether or not the study is used for the purpose for which it was originally assigned.

All libraries indicate that they cope with the problem of faculty studies by enlisting the aid and advice of their respective library committees. However convenient this method may seem, it does not eliminate the total problem.

Would librarians eliminate faculty studies from their buildings if possible? Surprisingly, only 20 per cent said yes. The minority group prefers unreserved open carrels instead of enclosed studies for faculty for the following reasons:
1. It is impossible in most libraries to provide an enclosed study for each faculty member.
2. Proprietary sense develops by holder, resulting in abuse and unhappiness if privilege is rescinded.
3. Other faculty is often dissatisfied when no space is available.
4. Where building budgets are limited, a choice must be made between faculty studies and other essential functions.

The surveyor constructed a model policy statement regarding faculty studies, based on the answers and material provided by cooperating libraries. This model policy may be useful in full or in part to those needing to establish new policies or practices as well as for revising or adjusting existing ones. The statement covers the following areas:
2. Regulations for use.
3. Procedure for charging material used.
4. Loan period.

**POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE USE AND ASSIGNMENT OF FACULTY STUDIES**

A. **Policy for the Assignment of Faculty Studies**

1. All members of the University faculty and instructors who are not candidates for advanced degrees are eligible for Faculty Studies.
2. Studies will be assigned for specific research projects that require library materials which cannot, or can only with difficulty, be used away from the library; and for projects requiring facilities for uninterrupted study or writing.
3. Applications for Studies will be made in writing to the Director of Libraries to members of the faculty who are engaged in:
   a) Writing a book or research paper.
   b) Preparation of course syllabus.
   c) Performance of a committee function requiring extended use of library materials.
4. Applications for Studies will be made in writing to the Director of Libraries. Application forms will be made available at the office of the Director. In case of over-subscription of Studies, the Faculty Library Committee will determine priority.
5. Studies will be assigned for specific projects, but not to exceed one semester. Applications for shorter periods, a summer, or even a period of a few weeks will be in order.

6. A Study holder may apply for renewal at the end of his assigned period, but he will have no priority over other applicants.

7. Studies will be for research and scholarship only and will not provide office or conference space as such. Visiting will be discouraged.

8. Insofar as possible, faculty members will be assigned Studies near the books they intend to use.

9. Faculty members may not sublease Studies assigned to them.

10. If agreeable to all parties concerned, double or multiple assignments to a single Study may be made.

11. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to notify the Librarian's office when the Study assigned to him is no longer needed.

B. Regulations for the Use of Faculty Studies

1. Studies have been furnished and equipped for faculty use. No furniture is to be moved from or introduced into them, except by arrangement with the Director's office.

2. Faculty Study keys may be picked up from the Circulation Desk. Keys should be returned there before leaving the library building.

3. Walls and doors must be kept free of nails, tape or any other methods of affixing objects.

4. Occupants are urged, out of deference to colleagues, to avoid disturbances caused by visiting in the individual Studies.

5. Faculty Studies should be kept neat and orderly. Smoking, food, and beverages are prohibited.

6. Damage to any furniture or equipment and necessary repairs or replacements should be reported immediately to the Director's office.

7. Study holders are responsible for the observance of all regulations. The library reserves the right to revoke assignments or stack privileges at its discretion.

C. Charging Procedures for Faculty with Assigned Study Areas

1. Library materials may be charged out for: a) Home or office use, or b) Faculty Study use.

2. Any faculty member planning to use an item in a Faculty Study for over two hours must charge it out at the Circulation Desk.

3. Materials charged to “Faculty Study” are not to be removed from the building.

4. Circulation Desk attendants will insert a specific checkout slip in books to be used in the Faculty Study. This slip should be kept in place so that the words “In Use” show clearly above the top of the book; on termination of use, the card must be inverted to show “To Be Discharged” and returned to the Circulation Desk for discharging.

5. All materials charged out to the Faculty Studies must be returned to the Circulation Desk for discharging.

6. When signing for materials for Faculty Studies, assigned room numbers must be included as follows:
   
   John Doe
   Lib 404

7. All library materials which are not charged out and do not have the “In Use” slip inserted in the manner described above, will be picked up by library personnel daily.

D. Loan Periods for Faculty Studies

1. To provide equal access and balanced distribution of materials available in the library to all University personnel, the Faculty library committee establishes the following loan periods for material used in Faculty Studies.

   a) Books: One month. When a book is directly related to a research project, a faculty member may request a semester loan.

   b) Periodicals: Three days. Exceptions are current periodicals in great demand which do not circulate.

   c) Reference Books, Bibliographies, Indexes: These items do not cir-
It seems that in most academic libraries some problems are encountered in the management of faculty studies. In general, library staffs consider them a nuisance, in a sense wishing they did not exist. Recognizing the useful aspects of the facility, few administrators would eliminate faculty studies from their buildings. It appears that the majority of problems in faculty study room management cited by librarians are actually minor in a broad sense of total library operations. The fact that minor problems can be irritating to some inflates the actual size of the issues. It has been suggested that better communications between users of faculty studies and library staff is needed to improve conditions of working relationship.

The reported shortage of faculty studies may be helped in some situations through establishing firm, realistic policy statements. It is equally important that library staff responsible for implementation of policy statements recognize the need for sound management practices.

The model policy and procedure was designed as a reflection of what the surveyor considers the best features in current faculty study management in leading academic institutions. This statement should be looked at as a blueprint for ideas which is to be examined and evaluated from a local point of view. If properly applied, it can be helpful in solving many of the needs of all concerned.

**APPENDIX I**

12-6-66

**Faculty Carrel Use Study**

1. Does the main library of your campus provide individual faculty carrels? YES NO

* A small enclosed area for individual study; not an open study station.

2. If yes, please state their number: .........

3. Are the number of carrels available adequate for this group? YES NO

4. Approximately how many faculty are served by your library? .........

5. How many student seats do you have in your library? .........

6. Do you have a written policy statement on the distribution and use of these faculty carrels? YES NO (If yes, please attach a copy to reply).

7. Do you have a library faculty advisory committee? YES NO

8. Did this committee help you to establish a carrel use policy? YES NO

9. Do you have written instructions to the occupants of these carrels? YES NO (If yes, please attach a copy to reply).

10. Do you permit the use of faculty carrels for office use? YES NO

11. Do you permit smoking in the carrel? YES NO

12. Do you permit eating and drinking in the carrel? YES NO

13. Do you permit typing in the carrel? YES NO

14. Have you installed telephones in any of your carrels? YES NO

15. Will you "page" a carrel using faculty member if an outside call comes in? YES NO

16. What are the typical housekeeping problems you consider most serious? .........

17. What measures have you taken to ease those problems? .........

18. What is the typical length of time a carrel is assigned to an individual? .........

19. If you would redesign your library would you eliminate individual carrels for faculty? YES NO

20. If yes, please present a brief argument.

21. Do you have a separate set of circulation policies for carrel users? YES NO (If yes, please attach).

22. Do you charge out to carrels:

   A. Current periodicals YES NO

   B. Reference books YES NO
C. Books from stacks YES ... NO

24. Does your staff check these carrels for material which was not charged out? YES ... NO

25. If yes, how frequently: Weekly .... Monthly .... Irregularly ....

26. Do you assign carrels to non-faculty? YES .... NO ....

27. If yes, to whom?

28. If you feel that I have overlooked any pertinent information please add:

29. □ Please send me a copy of the survey when completed:

   Name .........................................

   Title ...........................................

   Address ........................................

30. Please complete and return questionnaire at your earliest convenience but not later than January 4, 1967. Thank you.

The detailed analysis of the libraries of fourteen universities of Australia in 1966, as reflected in the charts and statistical data presented in this report, shows a striking growth since 1961, when it was the reviewer's privilege to work with the librarians of that country. Mr. Fielding, librarian at the University of Queensland, has done a meticulous job in identifying various aspects of the organizations and operations of university libraries of the country, including such matters as library committees, personnel, selection and acquisition activities, cataloging and classification, housing and loan of materials, departmental libraries, size of collections, and other aspects of the individual institutions. Organization charts of each library are included.

The usefulness of such a compilation to librarians of the country, as well as to students and others interested in library development, is quite apparent. The editor is modest about the likely helpfulness of the report, and suggests that "it may prove possible to revise this booklet from time to time." This should certainly be done. American librarians and students in library schools might find this document most illuminating in respect to the various aspects of Australian university libraries. The cooperation in completion of the extensive questionnaires distributed by Mr. Fielding is in itself an indication of the excellent spirit of the librarians of the country to improve library service to students, faculty members, and researchers generally.—Maurice F. Tauber, Columbia University.


Reviewing the new code as an isolated document might, in one sense, result in a fairer review. The new code is after all a marked improvement over its predecessor. The basic differences between the two are well known in the profession and have been widely discussed. It is useful to have the rules for descriptive cataloging included in the same volume as those for main entry, even though these rules are substantially unchanged. There are some problems in treating rules for choice of entry separately from those for form of entry, but the approach is basically sound. The index is not as good as it might be (Festschriften, for example, are not indexed adequately, and technical reports appear not at all), but the work is physically attractive.

Inevitably, however, reviewing the new code as an isolated document would be less useful than a consideration of that code in the context in which it appears.

To begin with, it seems a pity that we have such an anomalous title page: this is the "North American Text" of an Anglo-American code. Abstractly, it would seem better to have a real Anglo-American code even if this had been at the cost of North American acceptance of the British version in its entirety.

It seems a further pity that these new cataloging rules deviate from the principles accepted nearly unanimously at the international level at the Paris Conference. This is particularly true since those principles were largely an American product, and since the Americans voted for their acceptance. It is perhaps exceptionally true in that their acceptance involved basic changes for some other countries and relatively minor ones for us. Shades of the League of Nations!

But then what have we done? Having embraced in printed form a code in which the deviations from the Paris principles seem almost completely intended to minimize problems occasioned in large research
libraries because of their historical accumulations under older rules (please note: not necessarily under the older ALA rules), we then discover that our national library is not going to follow even what we have finally come up with. Instead, it will follow a policy of keeping to the old rules for any entry already established, and applying the new only for entries new to its particular catalogs; a policy for which it has coined the term "superimposition."

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, that same national library which, together with the Association of Research Libraries, exerted the major influence to make the new really the old, has courageously embarked upon a truly noteworthy and trailblazing effort to provide cataloging on a national scale in machine readable form. The preface to the new code tells us explicitly, however, that, while the code makers did not ignore machine (i.e., computer) considerations, they did nothing about them. A similar statement is to be found in the new filing rules of the ALA, and is certainly implicit in the new edition of the Library of Congress subject headings.

Lubetzky's original effort toward clarity of principle has vanished, leaving behind significant traces of his mighty intellect in particular rules, but shattering the grand conception. Perhaps we should have accepted Lubetzky's original and then exiled him, as the Athenians did Solon, for ten years during which we could make no changes.

We have managed, then, after our thirty-five years of effort, to put together a new code which is better than what we had by a considerable factor. So much for achievement. But...

We have muffed our chance for a code based clearly on principle, we have missed the boat on international cooperation (significantly, just as the Library of Congress begins a magnificent program of international cooperation in shared cataloging), we have allowed the problems of a relatively few large existing libraries to take precedence over the emerging needs of many more libraries which will be the large existing libraries of the future, and we have ignored the new technology which we know represents what we must use in the future. But we discharged our responsibility to those existing large collections (many of which did not follow the old rules anyway); we did not upset too many applecarts; we have kept faith, not with Cutter and the giants, but with the catalog embroiderers of the twenties and thirties.

And so, with a crash, to earth. We can live with the new code and even with the way in which the Library of Congress is applying it. We have to. But, inevitably, we will have to change—perhaps back toward Lubetzky and forward to the computer simultaneously. It might be a good idea to start the work now. It has taken since 1941 to get to this point. Perhaps if we begin again right away we may finish our next code by 1983.

And yet—one is tempted to soften the harshness of the above by asking if anything more was really politically possible at this time. In any case, it is just as certain that if we have not done quite what we should, it is not something we can blame on the Library of Congress, or the committees, or the Association of Research Libraries, or ALA, or any other organization—but only on all of us, the profession as a whole. We have to live with it. Unfortunately, so does our public—and our and their successors.—Theodore C. Hines, Columbia University.


Eileen R. Cunningham produced the first edition of her classification system shortly after 1929 when she became librarian of the Vanderbilt University medical school library, now the medical division of the Joint University Libraries in Nashville. The system was designed to conform to the sequence of the medical curriculum, and was divided into four main parts: biologic sciences, organic systems of the body, pathologic and clinical subjects, and paramedical works of interest in medical collections. The system's major features are its close relationships between complementary subjects,
its easy expansibility, its simple symbolic notation, and its adaptability to collections of any size.

The first edition was produced in visible file form in 1929. The second and third editions, both in paperback, were published in 1937 and 1946 respectively. The fourth edition appeared in 1955, with Eleanor Steinke listed on the title page as a collaborator for the first time; Mrs. Cunningham had acknowledged Miss Steinke’s earlier assistance in the preface to the third edition. The major changes from the third to the fourth edition were in the sections for psychology and psychiatry, where related material was brought closer together, and in the section for radiation and atomic medicine which was considerably enlarged.

Mrs. Cunningham had completed the revision of six sections in preparation for the fifth edition before she died in 1965; Miss Steinke then took over. The fifth edition, the first in hard covers, has a text of two hundred pages and an index of sixty pages (two columns). While the same basic structure has been retained, the necessary inclusion of new material has led to some major changes (intensified by the twelve-year gap between the fourth and fifth editions) which will require substantial recategorization by those libraries desiring to keep up with the new edition.

Mrs. Cunningham’s classification provided medical libraries with an easily used system designed specifically for their own needs, both medical and nonmedical. Although the Boston system and several more parochial systems had been developed before 1929, the Cunningham system gradually earned a solid place for itself. It has now become the only system other than that of the National Library of Medicine specifically designed for medical libraries and in use among more than a few such libraries.

Letters were written to the forty-six libraries listed in the 1959 Directory of the Medical Library Association as users of the Cunningham system to see how they were reacting to the many changes in the medical literature. Replies from thirty-two (70 per cent) showed that seventeen were still using Cunningham, eight were currently changing to NLM and three had already done so; one was currently changing to LC, and one had already done so; one had never used Cunningham; and one library had been absorbed. Size and type of library meant little since large and small libraries of various types either changed systems or retained the Cunningham classification.

Because of the growing standardization of medical classification being brought about by the rapidly growing number of new medical libraries, the Cunningham and other privately originated medical systems will probably die out except in some of the large research collections (where the cost of recategorization would be prohibitive). Even if this happens medical librarians will remember the development and growth of the Cunningham System as a needed job that was well done.—William K. Beatty, Northwestern University.
INTRODUCTION

This article continues the semi-annual series originally edited by Constance M. Winchell. Though it appears under a byline, the list is actually a project of the reference department of the Columbia University libraries, and notes are signed with the initials of the individual staff members.

Since the purpose of the list is to present a selection of recent scholarly and foreign works of interest to reference workers in university libraries it does not pretend to be either well-balanced or comprehensive. Code numbers (such as AD34, DB79) have been used to refer to titles in the Guide to Reference Books.

PERIODICALS


Emery Koltay, ed.

“A classified guide to current foreign and domestic serials, excepting periodicals issued more frequently than once a year.”—(t.-p.)

Full publication information on more than fourteen thousand five hundred serials issued annually, less frequently than once a year, or irregularly, is offered in this new directory. Planned as a companion to Ulrich’s International Periodicals Directory, the new work follows the general format and classified arrangement (with title and subject index) of Ulrich’s. Similarly, it is international in its coverage, attempting to include material in languages using the Roman alphabet or having abstracts, subtitle, or some information in English.” (Pref.) Only titles whose most recent issue is later than Jan. 1, 1960 are included. Here, then, is a guide to a wide range of current annuals and irregular continuations, whether yearbooks, transactions, proceedings, reports, or the many “advances” and “progress in” volumes. (Surely the seemingly comprehensive listing of these latter series will prove a boon to science librarians.) An added feature is the “Title Grouping of International Meetings' Publications.” This is both a needed and welcome addition to the reference shelf.—E.S.


This volume represents the first successful attempt to establish a union list of periodicals for France, an endeavor which has spanned some thirty years. Though it covers the end of the alphabet, it is the first of the set to appear; volumes 1-3 will be issued in inverse order.

Titles listed date from the early seventeenth century to 1939. The compilers regret the circumstances which forced them to accept so early a cut-off date, but hope to extend coverage by a series of supplements. Emphasis is on French periodicals, but foreign titles held in the seventy-three contributing libraries are included as well. Excluded are daily papers after 1849; almanacs; annual directories; administrative publications; extremely fragmentary holdings; and, generally, publications of limited interest, such as local church bulletins, alun-
ni magazines, etc. Also excluded are Slavic periodicals in the Cyrillic alphabet, as these are listed in the Catalogue collectif des périodiques slaves en caractères cyriliques (Guide AF105). However, if a Slavic periodical title also appears in the Roman alphabet, it will be so listed with a cross-reference to the Cyrillic catalog. Entry is under the first word of the title not an article. Thus, there will be multiple entries under such titles as “bulletin,” “annuaire,” “acta.” These publications will be regrouped under issuing bodies in an index in the proposed fifth volume. Each entry includes a catalog description of the title; dates of publication; brief notes on title changes, other language editions, supplements, cumulative indexes, issuing body, etc.; the holding library or libraries, with call numbers and exact holdings. Title changes are outlined in a single notice de rassemblement for each periodical; separate, full entries for each of the alternate titles provide cross-references to this listing.

The completed work will be an invaluable reference tool in any library which relies heavily on the Union List of Serials and the British Union Catalogue of Periodicals for bibliographic searching.—L.B.

**Government Publications**

DiRoma, Edward, and Rosenthal, Joseph A.

A Numerical Finding List of British Command Papers Published 1833-1961/62.


Research workers in British history and widely related fields should welcome the appearance of this new finding list which makes it possible quickly to "ascertain the volume in the collected series of British Sessional Papers in which any particular Command Paper printed from 1833 through 1962 appears without having to refer to the annual numerical lists." Since, in most libraries, the numerical lists are bound with the yearly alphabetical indexes (see Guide AH58, annotation), the new list should prove a considerable time saver when the Command number is known. Numbers in the five Command series (1-Cmnd. 1843) are here set out three columns to the page, followed by the date of the session, the volume number in Roman numerals, and the page number for the Parliamentary set in Arabic numerals.—E.S.

**Dissertations**

Magnier, Thomas F.


University Park, Pa.: Department of Slavic Languages, Pennsylvania State University, 1966. 100p. $3 ea.

Based on the author's compilations made during a summer's work at the Lenin library, this catalog lists 1,313 dissertations in the field of Balto-Slavic literature and linguistics. Theses are arranged by subject; there is no author index. A detailed table of contents and an index of writers as subjects facilitate use. Since gaining access to the subject matter of Soviet dissertations has always been a problem for Western scholars, this guide will surely be most welcome to the subject specialist.—E.L.

**Biography**

Biographical Dictionary of Republican China.

Howard L. Boorman, ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967- . v.l-

Contents: v.1, ai-Ch'ü. 483p. $20.

Concentrating on outstanding figures of the period between the Wuchang revolt in October 1911 and the inauguration of the Central People's Government at Peking in October 1949, this new work is intended as a supplement to A. W. Hummel's Emincent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (Guide AJ106). Both living and deceased persons are included, with a total of six hundred biographies planned for the completed set. Balanced coverage of significant areas of activity and change in republican China was the aim, but the editor points out that some fields (e.g., medicine) are sparsely represented, and others are omitted altogether. "The basic form of each article is a brief identifying paragraph followed by an account of the person's background, early life, career, writings, and family." (Pref.) Articles vary in length from one to several pages and, for various reasons (such as problems of translation and editing), are unsigned.—E.S.

Citations for more than five hundred published autobiographies and diaries are listed by author in the first part of this volume. Unless a later edition is more complete, the listing is for the first edition only. All entries include brief identification of the author, and indication of the contents of the work cited. Part II is an alphabetical listing of persons mentioned in the autobiographies, thus providing a key to personal relationships and influences often easily overlooked because of the lack of indexes to many publications of this nature. A final section groups the titles under broad headings indicating the areas of activity of the authors (e.g., literature, art, theater). Altogether it is a most useful tool for research concerned with the personalities of German cultural history in the twentieth century.—E.L.


Ed. by Paul A. Theis and Edmund L. Henshaw, Jr.

The purpose of this new book is “to provide a basic reference volume covering important political figures and public servants active today in the U.S.” (Pref.) It contains twelve thousand five hundred biographies, arranged alphabetically, of political personalities ranging from the President to local political figures, including former, living office holders as well as those outside the usual political categories “who nevertheless exert political influence”; this encompasses political party officials. Information was gathered by questionnaire, and includes the expected biographical data. Users should note that a number of omissions not discovered until after printing made it necessary to include an addenda section at the end. Two appendices give state delegations to the 90th Congress, and governors of the states. This addition to the list of specialized “who’s who” volumes has been prompted, undoubtedly, by the increased interest in political activity of recent years, and the data about strictly local or minor office holders and party officials is not easily available anywhere else. A new edition is planned in two years’ time.—F.O.

PHILOSOPHY


Writings by and about Greek philosophers of the past five hundred years are the subject of this bibliography. Philosophers are entered chronologically within century subdivisions, a biographical note on the philosopher being followed by listings of his own works and of works about him. At the end of each century division a brief summary of the era’s philosophical trends and developments is provided. An extensive bibliography of bibliographies is appended, and there is an index of names.—E.S.

RELIGION


Entire runs of certain periodicals in the fields of social science, anthropology, and religion were searched in the initial stages of compilation of this bibliography. Further citations were added from a large number of other periodicals—so large a number that it was decided to concentrate on English language materials and to list no books published prior to 1945 and not subsequently reprinted. Even so, the bibliography runs to six thousand items. Emphasis is on studies which relate religion to other social-behavioral variables, though the compilation intends to cover “as much of religious experience as social scientists can study.” (Intro.) Items are arranged in a classification system of nine major categories (e.g., Religion and social issues; Religion
and social change), with more than one hundred and twenty subdivisions. Numerous cross-references are provided and there is an author index, but the user must rely on the classification outline for the subject approach.—E.S.

LINGUISTICS


Edited at the University of Michigan Center for Research on Language and Learning Behavior (Ann Arbor) in collaboration with the Bureau pour l’Enseignement de la Langue et de la Civilisation Française à l’Etranger (Paris).

This new international abstract journal published simultaneously in Europe and America is designed to provide “comprehensive, rapid, selective” access to scholarly articles “whatever the disciplinary focus” relevant to language and language behavior. More than six hundred journals in twenty-two disciplines and twenty languages are now (July 1967) scanned. This is an increase of a hundred journals since the first issue of the volume. Each number contains close to a thousand entries. The abstracts, averaging about a hundred words, are grouped in four subject areas: linguistics, psychology, communication sciences, and hearing; there are appropriate subdivisions for each discipline. Entry gives author, title (with English translation if in a foreign language), abbreviated journal title, date, volume, and paging. Abbreviations of titles are fully explained and publishers (with addresses) are listed. An author index is appended. Format is of “computer” type, and production is by photo-offset.—R.K.

LITERATURE


Similar to Mrs. Curley’s volume on modern American literature (Guide BD219) and to R. Z. Temple and M. Tucker’s compilation for modern British literature, this work is concerned with the major European writers employing the Romance languages in the twentieth century or at the turn of the century. To a great extent, these are the writers who appear in English translation. For each author excerpts from critical appraisals are given from books as well as from American and foreign periodicals, with exact citations. A selective list of the author’s works is also included. An index of critics completes this volume in the series updating Moulton’s Library of Literary Criticism (Guide BD339).—M.G.


Contents: v.1, 1900-1960.

This long bibliography (5,459 entries) lists Italian books and articles on German literature and Italian translations from the German. Also included are some articles in tangential areas: philosophy, art, religion, politics. Authorship is Italian, except for a short list of the work of foreign scholars in Italian. Arrangement is alphabetic by author, or in the case of translations, by translator. This serves well the purpose of searching otherwise hard-to-find writings of modern Italian scholars, but is no aid in identifying Italian translations of German originals. Presumably this difficulty will be overcome by use of an index which will appear in volume two, together with the writings of 1961-1965.—R.K.


Reflecting both the developing concept of a unified field of Western culture and the growth of comparative literary study, this volume contains 967 biographies of writers of thirty-one different literatures. Major and minor writers of types varying from “schoolmen and mystics, humanists and troubadours, and the precursors and inventors of the national tongues” all find a place here. The chronological criterion
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for inclusion is: birth after 1000 AD and death before 1925. "The sketches have been written and edited with the general reader, rather than the research student, in mind." (Pref.) There are 309 portraits, and short bibliographies are provided. Most articles are signed by the contributors, nearly all of whom are faculty members in departments of literature in various colleges and universities.—F.O.


"The student of stylistics must not be surprised to find himself venturing beyond literary criticism, into aesthetics, linguistic philosophy, logic, epistemology, personality theory, the psychology of perception and learning, linguistic pathology, mathematical linguistics, statistics, computer technology, sociology, and anthropology, not to mention the branches of linguistics itself." (Introd.) This bibliography of more than eight hundred items is, therefore, both wide-ranging and selective, but all items are related to the study of style. Most citations are in English, with some in French, German, or Italian. Items are grouped chronologically within five categories: theoretical, methodological, applied, bibliographies, and omnibus. Rather than ordinary annotations, a system of "descriptors" has been employed, and both author and topical indexes are supplied for maximum usability. The practice of starring items recommended for introductory study, the indication of readily accessible reprints of many items, and the inclusion of a glossary of key terms all add to the work's usefulness for the beginning student, but it will be welcomed by the established scholar as well.—E.S.


Based upon A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400 by John Edwin Wells (New York, 1916), and its supplements 1-9 (1919-51).

This long-awaited revision is both a rewriting and an expansion of Well's Manual (Guide BD317). Not only are the critical bibliographies updated, but the scope has been broadened to include sixteenth-century literature. In addition, the commentary is a fresh evaluation of the literature and the scholarship of its critics. This first fascicle corresponds to Chapter I of Wells, and subsequent parts will cover later chapters in accordance with the original scheme.

Arrangement is that of Wells: in two parts, the first identifying each piece by form, date, manuscripts, source, content, and summarizing scholarly critical views. Part II is the bibliography, listing for each work the manuscripts, printed editions, and critical materials. The bibliographies repeat all Well's entries and are intended to be complete through 1955. They also give all important studies up "to the present (that is, date of going to press)—presumably late 1965—but spot checking shows few imprints later than 1955. A list of journal titles, a "volume-year correspondence chart," and an index of medieval authors and titles make the work easy to use.—R.K.

**Motion Pictures**


The compilers of this highly selective biographical dictionary of the film world here offer 273 biographies as illustrative of all aspects of film art and of all eras of cinematography. In order to achieve geographical and artistic diversity, they were forced to be selective within a productive country or a popular genre. Intended for the film amateur, the dictionary emphasizes the current film, but a concerted effort was made to do justice to the silent screen as well. Four scope articles comprise the first section of the book. Articles of the main section, arranged alphabetically by biography, are of varied length, but share the same basic outline: a brief biographical sketch, a list of credits, a short bibliography, and a critical review of the artist's
achievements. The criticism is generally lengthy and far more detailed than the biography. Thus, the dictionary is, as its title indicates, more a dictionary of the film than of film-makers, with emphasis on one's contribution to the world art of the film. Articles are signed with initials; there is an index of names cited.—L.B.


Many names not likely to be listed in previous directories are contained in this first biographical dictionary devoted entirely to the Spanish film. Artists of all aspects of film-making are included: directors, cameramen, technicians, musicians, actors, producers, critics. Non-Spanish figures are generally included only if they have worked in at least three Spanish films. The dictionary presents articles of varying length; for the productive artist the list of credits is partial. The author laments the factual void in which he had to work, and warns that the birth dates provided, especially for women, should be considered more gallant than precise.—L.B.

EDUCATION


Constituting the first step in a six-part revision and expansion of the 1952 work, Educational Systems of the World (Guide CB41), this volume depicts in chart and outline form the educational patterns of forty-four African nations. It is a noteworthy effort toward providing the American admissions officer with information necessary for evaluating a college applicant's record. Each national study is prefaced by a brief historical statement. Data reported for each educational system revolve around curricular offerings, the examinations required, and the certificates, diplomas, and degrees awarded at the various stages in the educational process. A bibliography at the end of the work includes both general works on Africa and those dealing specifically with education. Appendices provide supplementary treatment of the major secondary examinations. Recommendations on the granting of credit for African credentials, and proposals for academic placement of students in U.S. institutions are among the important aspects of this rather specialized but much needed compilation.—J.K.

SOCIOL OGY


The first international and interdisciplinary bibliography of twentieth-century books and articles on marriage and the family, this work makes use of machine procedures to assemble and classify the 12,850 references included. The volume is divided into five sections: the first analyzes the works according to the Keyword-in-Context system; the second arranges them by subject; and the third offers a complete reference list providing full bibliographic information on each citation arranged by its alphameric reference code. Author and periodical lists make up the last sections of a useful guide to the literature of this field.—M.G.

GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES


Nearly thirty-six hundred items are included in the new edition of this extensive bibliography of United States and Canadian place-name literature. Lists supplementary to the 1948 edition (Guide CK88) appeared in the journal Names beginning in 1955, and these references, together with citations to other new materials, have been incorporated into the present bibliography. Items are numbered in this edition, and there are separate author and subject indexes.—E.S.
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CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES


Originally published in French as Dictionnaire de la civilisation grecque (Paris, 1966), this reference book focuses upon "the civilization that took shape in Greece during the second millennium BC, spread throughout the civilized world, and remained a living force well into the Christian era." (Pref.) Thus it is not simply another classical dictionary. It is chiefly the work of an archaeologist, Pierre Devambez (chief curator of Greek and Roman antiquities at the Louvre), working in collaboration with a literary historian, a philosopher, and a professor of Greek. A principal objective of the work is to emphasize the real, day-to-day or "familiar" aspects of Hellenistic life, giving an adequate background to the more well-known "eminent figures and splendid creations" of the culture. To this end the volume is fully illustrated in black and white. Articles appear in dictionary arrangement, are written in a concise and interesting manner, and all are signed.—F.O.

HISTORY


Contents: v.1, Indledning; Politisk Historie samt Stats- og Kulturforhold til og med Erhvervsliv. 641p. 49.50 Kr.

When complete in six volumes, this new series will offer a comprehensive bibliography of writings on Danish history published 1913-1942. It will thus bridge the gap between Erichsen and Krarp's work of the same title (Guide DC37) covering through 1912 and the previously-published volume edited by Bruun (Guide DC38) covering publications of the period 1943-47. The new series will include some fifty-two thousand items in a classified arrangement similar to that used by Erichsen and Krarp. Volumes 1-2 will cover political, economic, and cultural history; volume 3, topographical and regional history; and volumes 4-5, biographical works. The final volume will be an index to the series.—E.S.


As indicated in the preface, this work has been compiled with the desire to be as objective and accurate as possible in treating a field where conjecture and emotion prevail. In one alphabet we are given a listing of those politicians, parties, journals, and terms of the past whose influences have lasted to our own day, and of those contemporary institutions and people of notable impact. The "nonconformity" of the editorial policy is demonstrated by the fact that many obscure personages are included whereas certain "pontiffs" have been omitted. The main body of the work is supplemented by appendixes listing presidents and cabinet members since 1870 and the distribution of votes for elections and referendums since 1945. In a work that presents itself as a scholarly effort the absence of bibliographic citations is regrettable.—E.L.


At head of title: Commission Internationale pour l'Histoire des Villes.

Third in a series (Guide DC225) devoted to the histories of European cities, this volume is concerned with France and contains selective bibliographies covering 311 cities. Extremely well organized, the basic arrangement is by province, followed by general references; then by city (grouped by d'épartement), with more specific sources given. For each locale references are given in a fixed classified arrangement beginning with bibliographies and guides to archives, and continuing through ecclesiastical, cultural, and intellectual history. Approximately ten thousand titles are listed, including books and periodical articles. There are indexes of authors, cities, and provinces, and a detailed map of France rounds out an extremely useful volume of interest to historians, geographers, archaeologists, and architects.—M.G.

A comprehensive and up-to-date annotated and critical bibliography of the major works of Civil War historical literature, this is the first of a two-volume work intended for the scholar and the general reader. The work will be divided into fifteen subject sections from military aspects to economic and social conditions of the Union, each section headed by a scholar in the field. Titles include accessible primary and secondary sources in book or pamphlet form for which Library of Congress cards exist. Cards are reproduced through the collation, each followed by a critical note, and arranged by author within divisions. The more than twenty-seven hundred titles in the first volume are clearly and concisely treated, and when the second volume appears with an additional three thousand titles and an index to the entire work, a highly valuable contribution to the organization of a wealth of material on the Civil War will have been achieved.—M.G.


Written by fifty correspondents of Reuters News Agency, this guide attempts to present up-to-date information on each of the newly created nations of Africa. Brief, rather journalistic, accounts of the history and recent political events are given for each country, including statistics on industrial and agricultural production and on exports. Brief biographical sketches of leading political figures are included at the end of each section, and there is an index to all the biographies in the work. While the volume is useful for the additional biographical material not found elsewhere, its political coverage is too sketchy to be of lasting value.—J.K.

Science

Pandex. New York: Pandex, 1967-. Quarterly, with annual cumulations. $460 per year; $390 for educational institutions.

This ambitious new reference tool, published as microfiche, analyzing some two thousand journals, is designed to index “the world’s scientific and technical periodicals” and thus provide an interdisciplinary index with both subject and author approaches. Computer technique and traditional indexing methods have been combined to list a considerable amount of technical information in small format. Arrangement is alphabetic by subject word with full article title given in “wrap-around” style and with subject and secondary word in solid caps to aid in scanning. For an article whose title contains six telling subject words, there will be six listings. In addition, an author section permits searching from that point of view. Fiches are numbered and carry headline words to indicate contents; guide words stand at the head of each column of text. Grammatical variations of a word and its foreign equivalents are dealt with as a single subject term. Entry gives full bibliographical information, with journal title abbreviated according to the list distributed to subscribers. The page is crowded, but uses both upper and lower case type and is readily legible.—R.K.
From Mercurius Musicus, 1669, to Esquire, 1967.

Periodicals, periodicals, and more periodicals. Professional, scientific, trade, Early English, American, Chinese, Russian, government, newspapers. Over 5,000 titles. All on 35mm positive microfilm.

With so many periodicals to choose from, it's understandable if you find it difficult to decide what you need. We can help. We're specialists in providing source material. And we understand things like budgets, space and curriculum.

For a beginning library, we might recommend our Basic Collection; Scientific American, Atlantic, Time, Reader's Digest, Newsweek and 30 other periodicals.

For a large library, we might recommend the Comprehensive Collection; all the titles in the Basic Collection plus 64 others.

Every periodical is indexed in Readers' Guide. And when you order either collection, we include our microfilm reader.

Write for University Microfilms' free 170-page catalog of periodicals. Or talk with one of our specialists in your area.

Why should you look for things when we've already found them.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Company
324 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103/313-761-4700
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Interscience journals —
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COMMUNICATIONS ON PURE AND APPLIED
MATHEMATICS
Volume XXI, 1968 Published by-monthly
Subscription: $15.00 Foreign postage: $2.00

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF QUANTUM CHEMISTRY
Volume II, 1968 Published bi-monthly
Subscription: $60.00 Foreign postage: $3.00

JOURNAL OF BIOMEDICAL MATERIALS RESEARCH
Volume II, 1968 Published quarterly
Subscription: $20.00 Foreign postage: $1.00

BIOPOLYMERS
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BIOTECHNOLOGY AND BIOENGINEERING
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RESEARCH MANAGEMENT
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Subscription: $10.00 Foreign postage: $1.00
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Subscription: $15.00 Foreign postage: $1.00
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Resourceful reading from Abingdon's winter list

PREPARING FOR PLATFORM AND PULPIT
John E. Baird. A textbook for people preparing for the ministry. The principles of public discourse are presented in a logical and orderly fashion, making the book ideal for both classroom use and as a self-help tool for the practitioner seeking to improve his speaking. All material is based on sound rhetorical theory and is especially adapted to the requirements of speaking in the setting of the church. In twelve chapters the author deals with selection of speech subjects, organization of material, problems of speech delivery, and much more. Index and bibliography. 224 pages. $4.50

PHILOSOPHICAL RESOURCES FOR CHRISTIAN THOUGHT
Edited by Perry LeFevre. In view of recent developments in theology and philosophy, the question of the relation between philosophy and Christian thought has become increasingly significant. Represented here are four fields of philosophy covered by a leading spokesman sympathetic to its contribution to theology: Process Philosophy by Charles Hartshorne; Phenomenology by Quentin Lauer, S.J.; Language Analysis by Frederick Ferré; and Existentialism by John Macquarrie. An introductory chapter by the editor sets the stage for the discussion. 144 pages. $3

A LITERARY HISTORY OF THE BIBLE
Geddes MacGregor. A marvelous reference volume of the history of the Bible from the Middle Ages to the present. An eminently qualified scholar, philosopher, and theologian shows how advances in biblical scholarship, newly discovered manuscripts, changes in language, and cultural developments made old translations obsolete and prompted efforts to make the Bible available in clear, forceful English. Includes chapters on the Coverdale Bible, Geneva Bible, Bishops' Bible, Douai-Reims version, King James Version, revised versions, and others. Indexed. 400 pages. $7.95

A HUMANIST IN AFRICA
Letters to COLIN MORRIS from KENNETH KAUNDA. This correspondence offers the reader a rare opportunity to share the "thoughts on the march" of the head of state in a newly created country. Kenneth Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia, writes to his good friend Colin Morris, missionary and president of the United Church of Zambia and one of the few white leaders in that church. A warm, personable leader, Kaunda writes from a passionate belief in the worth and possibilities of man. His letters give Western readers remarkable insights into man, the African mind, and the future of Africa. 136 pages. $3.50
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<tbody>
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<td>$1789.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany. Reichstag. VERHANDLUNGEN DES REICHSTAGS. Vols. 1-458. (fiche and opaque—3 x 5)</td>
<td>$3500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanchton, P. OPERA QUAE SUPER SUNT OMNIA. Halis, 1934-60. 28 vols. (fiche and opaque—4 x 6)</td>
<td>$112.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE NEWS. Vols. 8-90 (1926-66). (fiche and opaque—4 x 6)</td>
<td>$210.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME MAGAZINE. Vols. 71-88 (1958-66). (fiche and opaque—4 x 6)</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Civil Aeronautics Board. ORDERS. E1-E25599. (16mm microfilm)</td>
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☐ ITALIAN BOOKS BEFORE 1601
☐ LITERATURE OF FOLKLORE
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☐ TRAVEL LITERATURE: MEXICAN AND LATIN AMERICAN

GENERAL MICROFILM COMPANY
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A selection of available reprints recommended by the American Library Association in

BOOKS FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES

compiled by M. D. Voigt and J. H. Treyz.

ARNDT, KARL J. R. and OLSON, MAY E.
German-American Newspapers and Periodicals, 1732-1955.
history and bibliography. Heidelberg,
1961. cloth $25.00
(Bibliography and Library Science; Z 6940-6962 Periodicals and Newspapers; LC #62-107)

BOAS, FRANZ, ed.
General Anthropology.
Boston, 1938. cloth $9.00
(Geography and Anthropology; GN 20-22 General Works; LC #38-32351)

HATZFELD, HELMUT ANTHONY
A Critical Bibliography of the New Stylistics Applied to the Romance Literatures, 1900-1952.
Chapel Hill, 1953. cloth $12.00
UNC (Bibliography and Library Science; Z 7001-7123 Philology and Linguistics; LC #53-1788. rev.)

KONVITZ, MILTON RIDVAS and ROSSITER, CLINTON LAWRENCE, eds.
Aspects of Liberty;
theses presented to Robert E. Cushman.
Ithaca, N. Y., 1958. cloth $15.00
CCL (Political Science; JC 571 General Works; LC #58-4267)

KROEBER, ALFRED LOUIS, ed.
Source Book in Anthropology.
Rev. ed. New York, 1931. cloth $12.50
(Geography and Anthropology; GN 14-14 Societies. Congresses. Collections: LC #31-26852)

For a comprehensive listing of all Johnson Reprint Corporation titles, available and in preparation, included in Books for College Libraries, write:
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JOHNSON REPRINT COMPANY LTD.

111 FIFTH AVENUE
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Publishers of reprints of scholarly books and journals
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$6,000 set aside $.35 a week
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AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Announcing Bro-Dart’s expanded program for Books and Book Processing for School Libraries.

New Catalog... New Services... New Low Prices!

32,000 Elementary and Secondary School titles plus Cataloging and Processing Kits are listed in a unique “Open-End” Catalog... which is more than just a catalog. It is a complete catalog/ordering system designed to simplify and expedite the acquisition of school library books.

The catalog makes available hardbound school library books published in the United States, subsequent to its distribution, as though they were actually listed in its pages. Titles selected from this listing and/or those newly published are available completely cataloged and processed at the one low price of 60c each (added to the net price of book). Books with Kits, Books only, Kits only, are also available. Additional important features of this program are:

- New Confirmation or Quotation Service Computer-Printed detailed invoice facsimile... as a check list for orders in process... or as aid for those not in a position to place an immediate order.
- New, large catalog format with easy-to-read type.
- All catalog pages perforated for easy removal.
- Self-contained simplified Order/Instruction Form.
- Higher total fulfillment rates.
- Prompt, prepaid deliveries.

This catalog features books appearing in important, prominent lists, such as:

- The Elementary School Library Collection (Bro-Dart Foundation)
- A Basic Book Collection for Elementary Grades (A.L.A.)
- Children’s Catalog (H. W. Wilson Co.)
- The AAAS Science Booklist for Young Adults (American Association for the Advancement of Science)
- A Basic Book Collection for Junior High Schools (A.L.A.)
- Junior High School Library Catalog (H. W. Wilson Co.)
- A Basic Book Collection for High Schools (A.L.A.)
- Standard Catalog for High School Libraries (H. W. Wilson Co.)
- An Invitation to the Performing Arts (A Selected List of Books for Young Adults)

If you have not received your free copy or require additional ones, please write: Dept. CRL-1

P.O. Box 923, Williamsport, Pa. 17701
America’s Complete Library Source
A New Series in the Field of BOTANY

BIBLIOTHECA MYCOLOGIA

This series has been planned to contain facsimile reprints of comparatively modern reference works on fungi now out of print and difficult to obtain.

Now available from stock:

Volume 1: BERKELEY, M. J. and BROOME, C. E., Notices of British Fungi
480 pages, illus. (L. 1837-1885) Reprint 1967 paperbound $40.00

xiii, 732 pages. (1929) Reprint 1967 paperbound $20.00

Volume 3: DE VRIES, G. A., Contribution to the Knowledge of the Genus Cladosporium Link ex Fries (Thesis)
xvi, 122 pages, 22 illus. (Baarn 1952) Reprint 1967 paperbound $10.00

Volume 4: GROVE, W. B., British Stem- and Leaf- Fungi
(Coelomycetes)
2 vols., illus. (1935-1937) Reprint 1967 paperbound $15.00

Volume 6: LUTTRELL, E. S., Taxonomy of the Pyromycetes
(Univ. Mo. Studies 24:3)
120 pages. (1951) Reprint 1967 paperbound $10.00

In preparation:

Volume 7: TUCKER, The Taxonomy of the Pyromycetes (1931)

Stechert-Hafner, Inc.
THE WORLD'S LEADING INTERNATIONAL BOOKSELLERS
offices in LONDON / PARIS / STUTTGART
BOGOTA / RIO DE JANEIRO
31 East 10 Street / New York, N.Y. 10003