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Participative Management

Participative management is a live subject in librarianship. It has been discussed frequently in the pages of this journal, and many academic librarians are directly involved in committees and projects of all sorts, communicating, setting goals, evaluating themselves and their peers, raising standards and productivity. Participation has heightened awareness. In the process, aspirations have been raised for librarianship and for librarians. For these reasons, the draft proposal of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science should spur widespread interest from the library community. The report's recommendation for streamlining the bibliographic apparatus, integrating a disparate collection of libraries and information centers into a national system is long overdue. Yet because their expectations have been raised, librarians will also want to know more than the document now tells them, and how they fit into the proposed scheme.

Ironically, the word "librarians" doesn't even appear in this 18 page proposal called "A New National Program of Library and Information Service." True, the document does devote two brief paragraphs and a stray sentence or two to human resources. But the gist of these references is simply that human resource needs have not been assessed and that nobody knows just what they are (p. 3); and that new educational approaches to manpower development will be required (p. 11). Although this may imply that the proposed system will come to grips with the very real probability of technological unemployment, this matter remains ill-defined. And because technology is a sweeping current which may be redirected but cannot be reversed, this is only one aspect of a more overriding question. This concerns decision-making power and the nature and effects of library/information science work.

What role will the cataloger, administrator, reference librarian, academic librarian/specialist, etc. (or their future counterparts) have in the proposed national system of library and information centers? Will they participate in such decisions as what kinds of data bases or information and abstracting services will be included; how information will be analyzed; whom it will serve, and how the costs will be distributed when the system is operational? Will there be any assurances that critical viewpoints will be represented; that searches won't be made on who's requesting what data; that government information will be more accessible rather than less so as a result of the new system?

The Commission may have considered some of these questions, and its support for studies of user needs reflects an essential perspective. At the same time, the draft document itself is based on economic arguments, with a few social benefits thrown in. Persuasive as these may be, the document ignores any discussion of social costs.

In other areas of our existence, we have learned at our peril that these so-called "externalities" cannot be ignored. Least of all can we afford to ignore them in the knowledge industry. The NCLIS should examine how the recommended national library and information system will affect the knowledge workers who will operate it, and whether its social benefits to society will outweigh its social costs.

ANITA R. SCHILLER
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The Impact of Automation
On the Content of Libraries
And Information Centers

Information needs are growing more rapidly than the abilities of research libraries and information centers to meet them. Two reasons and their influence on information systems are discussed: a shift in scientific endeavor from basic science to applied, leading to the emergence of programmatic research; and the technology of science itself.

INTRODUCTION

It has been generally agreed in recent years that information needs are growing more rapidly than the abilities of research libraries and information centers to meet them. Most often, the reason given for this phenomenon has been the growth in the amount of published literature. Two additional reasons, which are little noted though perhaps more important, will be discussed here, along with their consequences for information centers: a shift in scientific endeavor from basic science to applied, leading to the emergence of programmatic research; and the technology of science itself. These sources of difficulty will be discussed briefly before considering their influence on information systems.

BASIC TO APPLIED
To Programmatic Research

Scientific research is traditionally divided into basic and applied, where the former is described as an activity directed toward "a fuller knowledge or understanding of the subject under study, rather than a practical application thereof," and the latter is "directed toward practical application of knowledge." No great insight is necessary to see that stock in knowledge for its own sake has taken a tumble in recent years. A more business-oriented federal government, a greater consciousness of the ill effects of socially undisciplined research (the Vietnam war), and a heightened awareness of short-term social needs compared with long-term benefits from basic research—all of these contribute to the disenchantment with basic research and a consequent shift in emphasis toward practical application in the ways we use knowledge and generate new knowledge.

In particular, a new form of applied science is emerging: programmatic research, the marshalling of technology and men to the achievement of some change in the world. As it is used here a program specifies a sequence of actions organized and directed toward solving a specific problem, or system of related problems in our physical environment, as contrasted with efforts which attempt
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Urban redevelopment, environmental protection, population control—the pursuit of goals such as these circumscribe action-oriented disciplines with relatively specific, even short-lived goals. As organizations of technological and scientific effort, these efforts contrast with knowledge-oriented academic disciplines where goals are diffuse.

Since it is possible that these new disciplines are transitory, that as the problems which prodded them into existence disappear, they will also, it may be asked why we should consider developing approaches and techniques to cope with their special needs. There are two reasons. Such problem-focused disciplines are important enough on our current horizon, both in size and import, to elicit special attention from information scientists. Moreover, even if today’s distinct forms disappear, the generic activity is likely to persist: other special forms will arise to take their place, organized around other large problems but with similar information needs.

How do the information needs of such activities differ from normal science? This question is hard to answer, and a complete answer will not be attempted here. On the one hand, the information needs—both in sheer bulk and in management tools—are usually greater: normal science can often advance fragmentarily, through the efforts of individual scientists and without integrative paradigms. Spaceships or antiballistic missile systems cannot, generally, be built that way. Usually the new sciences are conducted by large multidisciplinary teams organized in an explicit way. There are delineated lines of authority and responsibility, with subgoals and divisions of labor clearly specified. Increased organization increases the burden of communication. The increase and demand for communication often lead to informal channels, and an overall drop in system efficiency. So far, little is understood about how best to organize information for such efforts.

**The Technology of Science**

A second source of trouble for libraries and information centers, contributing to the gap mentioned above, and one which in the long run may be more significant, comes from the product of science: technological development. The advent of the computer and the subsequent growth in its use is rapidly redesigning most human efforts, and science is no exception. The degree of complexity which can be meaningfully managed either for practical ends or in basic science has grown enormously in the last decades.

One can appreciate the extent of the change by considering application areas where the techniques of operations research are suitable tools of analysis. Changes of degree—in terms of the size problem which can be meaningfully tackled, and amounts of data which can be represented or analyzed—are so great as to produce changes in kind. Linear programming models can employ thousands of constraints to model problems where fifty were excessive before computers were available to solve the resulting system of equations. Simulation models accounting for thousands of relationships likewise are beginning to be commonplace. In statistical modeling, to mention only one change, factor analysis of hundreds of variables is possible where twenty was arduous labor for the analyst using a hand calculator.

In similar ways, the computer is revolutionizing the technology of science, necessarily leading to changes in the conduct and conceptual structure of science. The paramount change to date has been in the role of data: the amount which can be easily manipulated has increased by orders of magnitude. Though often altering little more than the bookkeeping, this radically enlarged empirical basis will no doubt
soon lead to qualitative changes beyond bookkeeping and affect the very nature of science.

Each of the above points has serious implications for the organization and operation of libraries and information centers. The discussion which follows attempts to highlight the more serious, organized around three central artifacts of science: (1) documentation: the detailed public exposition of research results, whether basic or applied; (2) theories and models: the construction of formal representations of research results which synthesize, integrate, or explain them; (3) data: the organized groups of symbols or numbers which are the results of scientific observations of the world and serve as the empirical roots of theory.

Though it will not be argued here, it is likely that all these artifacts are poorly understood—both in what they contain and in how they do or should function. Automatic information retrieval systems have had very limited success in explicating documents and their use; philosophies of science have made little progress since Newton; and both macro and micro physics have their trouble with data (in giving exact meaning to very small or very large measurements).

These fundamental difficulties at the root of scientific activity are a major source of uncertainty in designing information systems which function as faithful adjuncts to scientific research. The implicit emphasis here is not on science itself, but on systematic program planning where the same uncertainties are ameliorated somewhat by explicit program goals. The systems design can be evaluated for such programs in ways unavailable in basic science.

**DOCUMENTATION AS SYSTEMS DESCRIPTION: THE ORGANIZATION GAP**

In research undertaken to support some facet of program planning, the achievement of program goals is paramount and serves as a focus to the research. Such an obvious observation seems barely worth making were it not that the organization of its documentation rarely clarifies the role of such research in the overall planning effort. Access to research documentation is usually determined by channels and methods within the discipline in which the research was carried out, not through program-determined organizations of knowledge. Very rarely are attempts made to show relationships among interdisciplinary materials or to model document collections on program needs.

Some examples will help here. In the field of population activities, a fairly single-minded short-term goal can be cited: control of population. Related research and its documentation is growing at a remarkable rate, but as yet no substantial subject indexing system is available, much less one specifically organized to aid in the development of population programs. Moreover, the research effort itself, which is presumably geared to aid specific aspects of program design or implementation, cannot by any reasonable method be connected to programming concepts. And the related research is being carried out all over the globe and by workers in many disciplines. This research area, due to its easily expressed global goals, is more or less organized than some which might be cited. Urban redevelopment has barely started on such efforts and as a consequence information organization is solely along specialty divisions, or *ad hoc* constructions of local libraries.

Such defects in documentation control are not to be blamed necessarily on the libraries. At least part of the responsibility lies with current problem-solving techniques as they are embodied in science: they are fragmentary, rarely explicit, and probably incoherent. Even the health sciences, presumably guided by expressible goals, pursue them unsystematically, in an order and with an em-
phasis determined by the puffs of perfidious politics. As a consequence, organizations of knowledge specific to a discipline are inferred from existing literature; documentation of research undertaken to support programming sporadically borrows from these existing structures and attempts, in a makeshift manner at best, to relate them to program goals. For the multidisciplinary research teams which participate in program planning on a large scale, communication through a centralized document collection is as essential as the rarity of such systems in practice. The nature of the tasks currently under attack (waging war, exploring space, remaking cities) usually involves natural, social, and engineering scientists, where differences of viewpoint are almost cultural.

A slight alleviation of the organization gap is available through automated systems which allow some degree of user organization through formulation of specific queries. Such systems in conjunction with vocabularies developed in cognizance of these problems go some way toward facilitating use of interdisciplinary document collections. When two or more disciplines have a common object for analysis or similar goals, their vocabularies usually express this intersection, though not systematically. Exactly how this occurs has not been investigated as yet, but since the practitioners of each discipline share a common world and a common natural language, it is easy to see why. Since the overlap is only rough, the individual scientist must interpret the details according to his own light and in conjunction with his own goals. Though such techniques are still primitive at best, their principles of operation shed some light on the defects of organization in science and its documentation.

**Computer Programs as Theory**

A further problem, and one whose implications and consequences have been even less well perceived and attacked, is the growing tendency of computer programs to embody the essential properties of theory. The reasons for this development are fairly straightforward: programming languages possess many of the communicative advantages of formal languages used in mathematics: they say what they mean in a sense so literal that to translate their logic into other languages is not attractive. Second, the computer program is always a strictly formal entity: it is well defined and its parts have a clear meaning (to the initiated). Third, the program itself is available (the complete theory) and can always be used by someone wishing to explore the consequences of a particular formulation, or to trace the effects of specific assumptions.

This development is particularly noticeable in applied fields where large models are the vehicle for exploring system interactions. The model can either have an explicit mathematical formulation, as do linear programming models, or, there may be no alternative representation, as is so often the case with simulation models ("A simulation model is a theory describing the structure and interrelationships of a system.") Both techniques are of increasing importance in program planning due to the complexity of the problems which must be solved. In either case, the computer model serves as a theory for the system which is being modeled.

A good example of this tendency is available in Jay W. Forrester's *Urban Dynamics* where a simulation model of urban areas is described. Indeed, Appendix A is entitled, "The Model—A Theory of Urban Interactions," and the language used to express system functions and equations is exactly the language accepted by a computer system for constructing and executing simulation models. The dependence on the computer formulation is understand-
able when one considers that the model contains some 150 equations which interact to describe the urban areas in complex ways, and involving hundreds of parameters and variables. Equally interesting is the “world model” described in *World Dynamics* and developed in *The Limits to Growth*. The technical problems are similar: great complexity and detail; the solution the same: formulate the theory in terms of a computer simulation model.

How these developments affect the underlying assumptions and formal apparatus of science cannot be determined as yet, but sure to be altered is the shape and function of theory. Part of the reason for this is the speed with which developments are occurring. There was a time when today’s theory was tomorrow’s computer program. Increasingly, today’s program is today’s theory. For program planning especially, computer models replace theories, both as organizations of knowledge and predictors or determiners of the future. It is likely that we are at the periphery of such use, and that the future will see more and more of it.

Whether this development is to be lauded or regretted may be debatable. Second class theories or not, computer models cannot easily be dismissed: their numbers are growing. In this context, the point to be made is that the computer program represents something essential about the theory, and the theory is often approached and understood by researchers through its computer representation. Libraries and information centers which support research, if they are to satisfy the information needs of their users, must get into the business of providing access to such programs. Exactly how this need should be met remains a mystery, though some ideas follow.

**The Changing Role of Data**

It is obvious that as computer programs like those cited become the standard means of communicating results of research, the role of data in libraries and information centers will grow apace.

In many ways, scientific documentation is primarily processed data. The contents of research articles are often formed from samples of the data and fragmentary evidence in support of the author’s conclusions; when the conclusions are questioned or, more often, when different questions need to be asked, the data is more valuable than the documentation. As a form of knowledge, the article becomes less attractive as the ways of processing data increase. As the variety of analytic techniques increases, the likelihood that an analyst will be satisfied with this or that particular analysis decreases. We now have automated procedures for data analysis: everyone becomes his own analyst and can perform his own analysis tailored to his own needs.

The same point can be made in relation to the simulation models cited: they are ways of processing data; they are a means for digesting pasts. Both developments increase the importance of raw data. Libraries of data are becoming commonplace and, as a national asset, it can be argued that the Bureau of Standards with its data collections is more valuable than the Library of Congress. Certainly for science and technology this is true. As evidence of this changing role of raw data, two important examples can be cited, each of which incorporates extensive data bases and a means for selectively processing them. At the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, a system has been developed to provide analyses of a growing body of U.S. economic data (described in “The Computer and Economic Analysis at the Bureau of Labor Statistics”). At the Bureau of the Census, a more elaborate system has been under development to handle demo-
graphic data, primarily the 1970 census data.  

Do these developments have implications for research libraries? It is after all an accident of technology that books and journals are the vehicles for storing and communicating research results. As data becomes a more dynamic part of an information system, continually reanalyzed from varying points of view, representations of the data in printed form are reduced in value, and the corresponding computer representation has increased value. If libraries and information centers are to continue as vital adjuncts to science, they must accommodate themselves to this shift from product to process.

INTEGRATED INFORMATION SYSTEMS

From the foregoing it would appear that scientific research efforts would be best supported by an information system of three major components: (1) A documentation component, which included interactive text editing facilities as well as retrieval capabilities. Question-answering systems as they are currently understood would derive from this component, insofar as they are based on natural languages such as English. (2) The second component would include data bases, especially those which contributed to the technical papers in the document section. They would normally contain far more, even data which had not been documented, though unanalyzed data would require sufficient definition to be used by the community. (3) The third component would be the techniques for analysis, especially those which were actually used in the reported literature. The term "techniques" as used here is merely a euphemism for computer program or technique available through one.

It is likely that the long-term solution to these problems will be through integrated systems such as Project INTREX where data, analytical procedures and documentation each will have a place. In such systems, users will communicate with one another and to their programs and data through terminals in an interactive environment. With common file definitions and the facilities for working with them, the frame exists for an on-line community of scholars or research specialists: instant publication.

Unfortunately, such systems are far in the future. What can be done in the interim? For information centers already employing automated components the hardware and software technology exists to eliminate or minimize some of the deficiencies noted above. Each of the three facets of scientific research—documentation, programs, and data—has been dealt with separately and fragmentarily by different approaches and procedures. Though no system exists which incorporates all three suitably, they can be had individually with less effort than might be supposed.

The first major task is to tie the production of research documentation more closely to the automated system. This can best be done within the constraints of current technology, through available text editing systems. Text-editing systems allow alterations and corrections to be made to manuscript material through its computer representation. The advantage is that only a small portion usually need be changed, the fitting of the text to pages, including altered pagination, spacing, paragraphing, etc. being done automatically in a subsequent reprinting of the text. Since no new errors are introduced, such systems usually reduce the overall labor and improve the product at the same time. In theory at least, text-editing systems can interface directly with computer driven printers, removing the need for additional proofreading (especially valuable for texts heavy with formulas). Why they are not in more widespread use is a mystery, but one which will not persist for long: their advantages will soon
make them commonplace.

In this context such systems are cited for making available machine-readable versions of documentation at their origin, increasing the amount of text so available as well as doing it more speedily. Thus eventual use of such text for retrieval or question-answering is assured.

The second problem—availability of analytical techniques or models in the form of computer programs—requires for its solution better management of research efforts, and more cooperation (legislated or otherwise) among libraries and information systems. For example, we have not yet reached the stage where research designs contain, or in the case of federal funding, are required to contain, explicit means for communicating, in addition to the conclusions of the research, the analytical techniques which were used and the data they were applied to. To get some idea how this approach works out in a book medium, consult Cooley and Lohnes, *Multivariate Data Analysis* where a national survey is referenced throughout as a source of examples. The book itself contains copies of the computer programs necessary to duplicate most of the analyses which were carried out on the data, and the data can be obtained through the authors.

Such an exemplary practice will more and more be copied as its value to the research community becomes more obvious. A concomitant responsibility falls on the information center to make such corroborative or subsidiary tools as computer programs and data available as well as the documentation: they will soon become as essential, if not more essential than the documentation. As analytical techniques become more standardized, it will become easier for information centers to provide them to users. Programming systems which include global file definition and a broad selection of statistical procedures have been commonplace for some time. The Biomedical Package (BMD) series and the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* are two of the more generally available examples.

A more critical example, apt since it deals with information retrieval, is in the SMART efforts carried out at Cornell University over the last few years. Part of the burden of the research was the development of specialized files and procedures and their organization into a single system capable of achieving the research goals of the participants. The system itself is available from Cornell and interested researchers are able to carry out duplicate tests, either on the original or their own data, as well as inventing their own experiments.

**CONCLUSION**

The final solution, like all final solutions, is far in the future. What can be done immediately? Some action is required on the federal level: the specification of data interchange codes, the standardization of analysis techniques; the requirement that all federally funded research specify fully and in advance the form and ultimate end of any data; standardization of bibliographic records, publication standards, and far more.

On another level what is needed is a more thorough analysis of the relationships among the sciences, and the development of common tools of analysis and common languages. At the same time, more attention needs to be paid to the development of scientific planning methods: too often seat-of-the-pants decisions are based on seat-of-the-pants reasoning. From such studies should emerge better techniques for controlling the access to documentation for the purposes of improved planning, both in the use of scientific resources and in the development of social programs.
Even in the absence of these obviously worthwhile endeavors, information centers must develop ways of managing more than documents; they must develop a means of controlling data and programs as well, and understanding the use to which their users would have them put. As more information centers automate their services, they will more easily be able to extend them to include making available computer programs and data in electronic form.
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Organizational Patterns Of Scientific and Technical Libraries: An Examination Of Three Issues

Three aspects of the problem of library reorganization are considered with specific reference to scientific and technological libraries: the politics of centralization; the concept of accessibility; and the interaction of science and technology. Although these aspects are central to library reorganization, their impact on the structure of university scientific and technical libraries has yet to be understood in order to provide a rational basis of decision making by university administrators, librarians, and library users.

INTRODUCTION

The divergent patterns of organization which university libraries have assumed over the years, ostensibly to meet the information needs of their users in the most efficient and effective manner possible within resource limitations, represent a topic of continuing interest to university administrators, librarians, and library users. The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) sponsored study, Problems in University Library Management, summarized some of the basic issues related to the organizational structure of university libraries as follows:

Librarians are caught between conflicting pressures for centralization and decentralization of collections and, consequently, facilities. University administrators desire to hold duplication of collections and dispersal of services to a minimum. Faculty and graduate students press for decentralized departmental libraries. There appears to be a growing trend toward the establishment of large, decentralized libraries covering several major academic fields, such as the life sciences. The more established trend of constructing separate facilities for undergraduate and graduate students continues.

The issue of centralized versus decentralized facilities poses major management problems for university librarians. In planning new construction and considering changes in existing space utilization, the library must decide whether it is more efficient and effective to decentralize or to centralize operations. Librarians indicate that little data are available to assist them in making such decisions.1

Whether librarians, university administrators, or library users are "caught between conflicting pressures for centralization and decentralization" depends
upon their individual perspectives. Although these groups should participate in decisions relating to the organizational structure of university library systems, they are not equally involved in the making of decisions. In most cases, as university administrators control the resources necessary to accomplish major modifications in library systems, they play the major role in decision making. McAnally and Downs noted the apparently declining influence of university librarians and libraries in terms of their ability to participate in high level decisions.\(^2\) In actuality, the extent to which university librarians can influence major library or university decisions depends largely on the historical background and present conditions at a given university. If the university librarian has the respect and confidence of the administration and faculty he can be expected to have considerable influence and may even provide leadership. If he lacks this respect and confidence or if major decisions related to the library system have traditionally been made by the faculty and/or the administration, authority and responsibility for decision making may shift from the library environment, with the university librarian primarily engaging in matters of implementation.

Although not explicitly stated in the ARL study, much pressure for decentralization of university library systems originates with the faculties and students of scientific and technical fields, thus, the organizational structure of scientific and technical libraries provides the focus for the following discussion. The commonly assumed advantages and disadvantages of centralized or decentralized scientific and technical libraries in university environments have been repeatedly discussed in the literature of librarianship.\(^3\) Suffice it to say that most university library administrators, and students of librarianship in general, oppose forms of subject decentralization which extend to the departmental level. They argue that such an organizational pattern: (1) generates numerous problems of communication, control, and coordination; (2) results in rising cost through the duplication of library services, materials, personnel, and records; and (3) encourages, wherever materials are not duplicated, the fragmentation of knowledge and the isolation of scientific and technical fields. The trend at many universities to organize scientific and technical libraries around a number of closely related academic fields (e.g., life sciences, physical sciences, engineering sciences, etc.), may result from: (1) an attempt by university administrators and librarians to realize economies of scale (i.e., cost savings in physical plant and operating expenses due to increased size); (2) recognition of the potential benefits of increased accessibility to users; (3) a compromise between factions favoring greater centralization (e.g., a single scientific and technical library) and those favoring greater decentralization (e.g., departmental libraries); (4) a desire to serve more adequately the information needs of interdisciplinary instructional programs and research; or (5) a combination of the above.

Faculty members of academic departments, in contrast to library administrators, often argue for subject decentralization to the departmental level. They contend that their work (primarily their research activities) requires unlimited access to library materials over time, and in addition that library materials should be physically situated in close proximity to the greatest number of potential users. Particularly with respect to scientific and technical libraries, they maintain these factors should supersede what they view to be the essentially economic arguments of library administrators. Caught between the persuasive arguments of library administrators on the one hand and those of faculty on the
other are university administrators, who must allocate university resources among competing demands. As a reorganization of a university library system represents a long-term commitment, decisions made today may severely limit future options. Centralization of library systems almost certainly entails the initial expenditure of substantial sums of money in developing the physical plant to house the consolidated collection and the staff to provide services. Change in general is costly, and in a time of short money lack of adequate financial resources has a strong tendency to reinforce the status quo. Thus, unless university administrators are provided evidence of substantial savings in operating expense or improvement in service, it is unlikely that proposals for major reorganization will receive enthusiastic administrative support.

Although any long-range planning must be partially based on "soft" information (e.g., subjective judgments, projections of student enrollment and university growth, changeable building priorities) decision makers would like to have as much accurate or "hard" information as possible regarding the future consequences of alternative courses of action. Unfortunately, most arguments are based exclusively upon the subjective judgment of individuals possessing a strong bias either for or against centralization.

The profession's inability to accumulate this objective information results from a combination of factors. First, any attempt to evaluate the efficiency, effectiveness, and/or benefits derived from a particular pattern of library organization is at best a costly, time-consuming, and in the end, somewhat subjective process. For instance, Evans and Borko identified a range of criteria which seem to hold some potential for accessing the performance of libraries; included are library coverage, response time, accessibility, cost, use, user satisfaction, and a number of combinations of each. The selection of evaluative criteria represents a complex process. Although some are relatively easy to use (e.g., library coverage or response time), others are extremely difficult to operationalize (e.g., cost-benefits or user satisfaction). Reducing the performance of an entire library system to a limited number of criteria runs the additional danger of underestimating the complexity of most library systems. The selection of cost, for example, as the major performance criterion would probably be unacceptable to the majority of library users, particularly if the study emphasized system cost over user cost or benefits.

Second, although levels of performance could conceivably be determined for a given pattern of organization, it is unlikely that most library systems could examine the performance of alternative patterns of organization. Such an approach would require either the restructuring of the library system for experimental purposes, or perhaps the development of a complex model for simulating the alternative systems. In either case, excessive cost tends to reduce the viability of such an approach.

Finally, where it is possible to generate reliable information which may support decision making, wide variations in local circumstances restrict its use to a given library system at a particular point in time. Some dangers inherent in evaluating the performance of varying patterns of library organization by comparing different library systems, for instance a centralized system at university X with a decentralized system at university Y, have already been discussed in detail by Richmond.

For the immediate future there appears to be little likelihood that university administrators, librarians, or library users will possess the ability to predict accurately the level of benefits to be derived from given patterns of library or-
ganization; too little is known about the relationship between library organization and system performance. Yet without this knowledge individuals are reduced to relying exclusively on intuition or an appeal to authority to serve as a basis for decision making.

Because of their potential impact, three aspects of the problem of library reorganization which have received little attention will be considered: the politics of centralization; the concept of accessibility; and the interaction of science and technology. These topics will be examined to illustrate their importance to the subject at hand and to indicate specific aspects of the problem which seem to deserve additional study.

**Politics of Centralization**

It has been observed that “university professors know more about everything else than they know about themselves and their habitat.” Although knowledge of the academic system has increased appreciably over the last five years, information related to the role of the university library in that system—particularly the role of the university librarian in the social structure of the university—remains fragmentary. Two recent exceptions to this generalization are a paper by McAnally and Downs, and an interview with Robert A. Miller, reported by Lyle. Both provide insight into the complex social system of which the university library is an integral part and illustrate the importance of the political realities which directors of university libraries must deal with on a continuing basis. Although the economic aspects of centralization receive emphasis in the literature of librarianship, the political aspects of centralization may really determine negotiations for changing library systems.

In universities with traditional departmental decentralization of scientific and technical libraries, faculties have tended to be reluctant to give up “their” libraries. They cite the need for immediate physical accessibility to library materials. Yet, a more compelling, although unstated, reason may be human resistance to change, and the possible consequent loss of administrative control.

Where departmental libraries exist, faculties tend to retain considerable control over matters of library policy and procedures: library hours, availability of library keys, duplication and selection policies, selection of the departmental librarian, establishment of library services, etc. As expected, preferential treatment is often accorded faculty members and graduate students of the department; library users from other departments on campus frequently find these libraries, and their services, considerably less accessible. With centralization, departmental faculties might lose this control over the operation of the library as well as their preferential treatment.

Centralization confers most responsibility and authority for decision making to the office of the director of the centralized facility, rather than upon the faculties of the individual departments. The librarian, rather than focusing on one department, must balance the needs of several departments; he must balance the needs of undergraduates against those of graduate students and faculty; the needs of research against those of instruction. Specifically, the librarian of a centralized facility must consider the scientific and technical information needs of the total academic community subject to limited resources.

Although general improvement in service to the overall academic community might reduce service to specific departments, centralization has considerable potential for improving library service to individuals throughout the academic community. The availability of increased resources (physical, financial, and human) to centralized systems provides an opportunity to develop library
services which are generally not available in highly decentralized systems—selective dissemination of information, systematic collection development by subject specialists, increased access to subjects of peripheral interest, improved facilities for study and research, exploitation of nonprint media, and document delivery services. In addition, it provides improved access to library materials for the rapidly growing number of educational and research programs which are inter-, multi-, or transdisciplinary in nature.

Too often, however, promises of improved library service made by librarians are not matched by performance, and most scientists and technologists in university environments are aware of this painful fact. Many faculty members have had an opportunity to make use of the university’s central library (which represents, in their minds, an example of centralization). They have observed that the library was often overcrowded, extremely large, difficult to get to and once there, difficult to use, impersonal, possessed of loan policies which were restrictive, and stated by individuals having little appreciation of their particular informational needs. The difference between promised and observed performance sometimes generates a credibility gap of monumental proportions.

The ability of the library administrator, usually the university librarian, to bridge this gap will mainly determine the extent of departmental faculty support, which seems necessary to be effective. Nicholson observed:

Centralization will be successful . . . only if complete agreement is reached by faculty, university and library administration that it is the best way in which the greatest number can be effectively served . . . under reasonable financial expenditures.¹⁰

Most scientists and technologists are less concerned with how the “greatest number can be effectively served” than they are with how they can be more effectively served. If a library administrator cannot secure the active support of the faculty in such a venture, he must do everything possible to reduce active opposition. One way of measuring faculty reaction to centralization is through faculty response to questions of the following nature:

1. Does the library administrator have an understanding and appreciation of the information needs of scientists and technologists? Has this appreciation been demonstrated by his past interest in, and support of, the development of the scientific and technical libraries on campus?

2. What is his record with regard to library matters of primary concern to the scientific and technical community within the university?

3. Will centralization mean a reduction in library service to me? Can the library administrator be trusted to provide the kinds of services that he promises? Does he have the “power” within the university to deliver on such promises?

4. As the system grows in size and complexity can assurances be given that we will continue to be treated as individuals with individual information needs?

Without a perceived record of sensitivity to departmental needs, the university library administrator will have to provide sufficient guarantees that centralization will, in fact, result in improved library services for scientists and technologists.

Little objective data exists on the role of the university librarian in the social structure of the university. Available information primarily considers the relationship of the director of libraries to the library committee (which may or may not be representative of the facul-
ty of the university as a whole), library staff, students, and sometimes the university administration. Little is known about the attitudes of departmental faculties, particularly in the sciences and technology, toward the university librarian.

In negotiations on the restructuring of the university library system, the degree of empathy displayed by the participants can be critical in determining a program's success or failure. A brief survey of the backgrounds of the directors of the twenty-five largest university libraries in the United States (and thus those thought most likely to be facing the question of centralization or decentralization) revealed that none possessed a Ph.D. degree in either the physical sciences, engineering, or the life sciences. In addition, twenty-two of the twenty-five directors possessed backgrounds in the humanities or social sciences. This considerable divergence in backgrounds might have a substantial impact on these negotiations.

Sound sociological research is essential before an adequate understanding of the role of the university library in the academic community can be realized. This understanding is not only important for decision making, but would also contribute greatly to the establishment of realistic library goals, and expectations of library service, in the academic community.

**CONCEPT OF ACCESSIBILITY**

Library administrators tend to be less than sympathetic toward demands of science and technology graduate students and faculty for maximum accessibility (both physical and intellectual), because to increase the user's accessibility almost certainly will result in an increase of operating costs. Library administrators do not have to defend user costs (i.e., the physical, psychological, and economic cost which users incur in interaction with the system) at budgetary meetings, but they do have to defend library operating costs. An interesting example of the conflict between user cost and system cost is described by Dougherty in an evaluation of a document delivery system at the University of Colorado. Until university and library administrators recognize that reducing library costs often increases user costs (and indirectly university costs), most university library systems will continue to shift the cost burden to the user.

Nevertheless, university library administrators have the obligation to provide the most effective and efficient library service possible within existing budgetary constraints. No matter how efficient a centralized library may be on the basis of library costs, it cannot be effective unless it is used by those for whom the system was designed. The extent to which a library, or any information system is used, depends in large part upon the extent to which potential users perceive the system as being accessible.

Scientists and technologists frequently have emphasized the importance of having documents immediately accessible throughout the course of their teaching and research. Nevertheless, little is known when a library or information service becomes so inaccessible as to be not used.

Defining accessibility in terms of the economic, psychological, and physical cost associated with using a given communication channel, Allen found that, for the groups of engineers studied, accessibility was a critical variable related to the extent to which a communication channel was used. Further, he concluded that:

Improving the quality of performance of a particular information service (or system) will not in and of itself, lead to increased use of the service. Before the improved information service can lead to increased performance, it must
be used: And the only way to increase use is through increased accessibility.

At least three dimensions of accessibility are clearly identifiable: distance, time, and familiarity. With distance, for instance, is a library in a building next door inaccessible? Is one down the block inaccessible? How about one across campus? Although Raffel and Shishko provide a methodology, based on location theory, which may provide library administrators with some guidance in the location of centralized or decentralized library systems, the method provides little hope of resolving the essentially psychological problem related to the point at which distance makes a library inaccessible to the point of nonuse.

Similarly, the amount of time required to retrieve a document may influence a user’s perception of accessibility. Are documents located in storage, and which require two days to retrieve, considered inaccessible? Are materials acquired through interlibrary loan, and requiring at least two weeks to retrieve, inaccessible in the eyes of the user? Are materials housed in a centralized library, which require twenty minutes walking time from an individual’s office inaccessible?

Allen found that the engineer’s perception of accessibility was influenced by past experience. The more familiar an engineer was with a given communication channel the more accessible he perceived it to be. Thus, if an individual makes use of the university’s central library once or twice a year he may perceive that library to be relatively inaccessible as compared with, for instance, a departmental library which he uses twice a day. Many individuals who have used centralized scientific and technical libraries have reported that their experiences have been somewhat unsatisfactory. Whether this lack of satisfaction is a result of low performance on the part of the library or the user’s lack of familiarity with the system is unknown. Obviously, the extent to which time, distance, and familiarity affect an individual’s perception of accessibility depend on various conditions: ease of use; motivation of the user; his particular information needs; climatic conditions; the physical condition of the user; and many other factors which are difficult or impossible to anticipate.

Although the concept of accessibility is central to most arguments for the decentralization of university scientific and technical libraries, and is recognized by library administrators as an essential to effective library service, it remains a poorly understood aspect of the communication process. As such, it should be used with caution as a measure of system performance for basing decisions on library organization until a systematic examination can be made.

**Interaction of Science and Technology**

The extent to which departmental decentralization represents an effective and efficient form of university library organization partially depends on the amount of crossover (i.e., “the degree to which those at one market or point of origin [e.g., academic department] use libraries at more than one location”) which exists within the library system. If crossover is negligible, a strong argument can be made for situating the libraries close to the primary market (e.g., the academic department); if crossover is substantial, libraries should be placed so that they are most convenient to the total user population. The extent of users with multidisciplinary interests, therefore, is important in the determination of organizational structure.

In terms of centralizing scientific and technical libraries, the extent to which these disciplines interact, particularly through the literature, should be examined. Existing knowledge relating to the
interaction of science and technology is equivocal. Storer observed that "it has been increasingly the case that scientific advances are directly responsible for technological advances (and) it is only because of the increasing dependence of technology on scientific progress and the closer ties between science and the common universe of discourse, that we now speak of the 'practical' importance of science." In contrast, Price, following an analysis of citation patterns in scientific and technical literature, observed that the "interaction between science and technology seems to proceed only slightly and with great difficulty through the literature." 19

In an analysis of the communication patterns of engineers in industrial environments, Allen presents an appealing, and apparently valid, explanation of why the average engineer makes little use of research-oriented literature. He stated that "most of the professional engineering literature is too mathematically sophisticated for the average engineer to comprehend. It is therefore inaccessible to him." 20 If the average engineer lacks the mathematical sophistication to interpret the professional engineering literature, in all probability he likewise lacks the ability to interpret the research-oriented literature of science. If this argument were valid for engineers in academic as well as industrial environments, establishing a centralized library would not seem justified.

To study the relationship between the citation of scientific literature and the institutional affiliation of engineers, Waldhart performed a citation analysis of a selected sample of articles written by engineers. 22 Results of this analysis clearly indicated that, contrary to popular opinion, engineers who publish tend to make extensive use of scientific literature. 23 The major exception to this generalization was those source articles published in trade journals. These source articles generally lacked references, and were authored by individuals who lacked the Ph.D. degree and possessed industrial affiliations. Trade journals were not generally employed by engineers with academic affiliations either as a citation source or as a publication outlet.

In addition, engineers with academic affiliations were found to be more scientific in orientation (they cited a significantly higher proportion of references from science), and more literature conscious or dependent (they cited a significantly higher number of references per source article), than engineers with nonacademic affiliations. 24

Although Waldhart studied only the engineer's use of scientific literature, the extent to which scientists cross over and make use of technological literature is generally felt to be considerably less, although no recent study of this subject exists. 25 More likely, crossover by scientists occurs primarily within the structure of science itself, rather than between science and technology. Some changes in the scientist's use of technological literature can be expected with the recent modification of funding policies of the federal government which tend to emphasize applied as contrasted with basic research, and the growth of multidisciplinary research institutes devoted to the study of environmental problems. 26

Thus from the point of view of the engineer in academic environments, it would appear that engineers could benefit from the improved accessibility to scientific literature which would result from a centralization of scientific and technical libraries. However, it should be emphasized that the reorganization of university library systems should not be based solely upon such evidence. It represents only a "bit" of information which may be useful for understanding the complexity of any decision to centralize or decentralize scientific and technical libraries.

Organizational Patterns / 433
CONCLUSIONS

The Association of Research Libraries stated that "librarians indicate that little data are available to assist them in making such decisions (centralization or decentralization)." In this light, two basic conclusions seem inescapable: first, because of the uniqueness of local circumstances it is unlikely that a "general theory" of library organization, which can guide the decision-making process, will be formulated in the near future; second, if librarians need data to support the decision-making process, it will fall to them to generate such data.

Decisions relative to the organizational patterns which university library systems will assume in the future can be made on a "crisis" basis, where decisions are forced, often prematurely, by immediate problems which require solution; or, they may be made on the basis of careful, long-range planning which attempts to deal "systematically with future opportunities, problems and alternative courses of action." It seems patently apparent that the second course of action is preferable. Implicit in this course is the need for more intensive and extensive research related to the relationship between organizational patterns of libraries and their performance. This paper identified three areas felt to be particularly deserving of attention—many more could be detailed. The library community, both practitioners and those primarily concerned with research, must take the initiative in conducting such studies. Failure to accept this challenge can only lead to a further degrading of the role of librarians as active participants in university decision making.
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Applying “Management by Objectives”
To the University Library

Many methods of library management are no longer sufficient to meet the more sophisticated demands of today. A promising management technique for librarians is “management by objectives,” which helps to establish library goals, measure performance objectively, and to identify factors affecting an operation’s final results.

The problems facing the university library administrator are becoming increasingly complex. As budgets grow tighter and the demands for library service continue to increase, the allocation of resources and the utilization of professional and nonprofessional manpower become more complex. University budget officers are demanding better justification of library expenditures with statistical analyses and facts to back up budget requests. Most academic library administrators have to plan for future needs under uncertain economic conditions and unpredictable university growth.

Librarians, like managers of other large enterprises, have come to recognize that past techniques of library management are no longer sufficient to meet the more sophisticated demands of today. Several methods of modern management have been borrowed and adapted by librarians, including a technique called “management by objectives.” This concept has been defined as “a clear and precise identification of objectives or desired results, the establishment of a realistic program for their achievement, and an evaluation of performance in terms of measured results in attaining them.”

The Pennsylvania State University libraries have been faced with these management problems, solutions to which have been constantly sought. Recently the question arose of whether or not to continue the reclassification project in the face of dwindling monetary and manpower resources. Since the LC classification system was adopted at Penn State almost seven years ago, most of the important periodicals and serials in the collection were reclassified from Dewey in “blocks” rather than title-by-title. The Technical Operations section was hard-pressed to maintain current activities and could no longer take on the burden of redoing large numbers of periodical and serial titles at one time. However, as the time approached for moving into a new addition to the library, it became obvious that certain remaining current periodicals and serials would have to be reclassified if the logical unity of the new building were to be maintained. Further complications developed with vacancies and the need to transfer the professional librarian and library assistant from the project to other departments.

The decision was made to continue the reclassification project, but only on
OBJECTIVE: To reclassify on a title-by-title basis, 7,186 "open" serial and periodical titles remaining in the Dewey classification and currently listed in the Serial Record within a period of two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Short-Term Goals</th>
<th>Long-Term Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Goals</td>
<td>Completion of current &quot;block&quot; reclassification of 3,100 titles in 010-019 classification; 194 titles in selected 500-600 classification; 237 titles of selected law materials (340s).</td>
<td>Completion of the reclassification, title-by-title, of 7,187 titles, or 117,968 volumes, of all open serial titles, including 600 analyzed titles, at an average rate of 6 titles per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Goals</td>
<td>Completion of all cataloging, classification, card and label production, remarking, and card exchange by nonprofessional reclassification staff relatively independently and efficiently with a minimum of &quot;snags&quot; remaining after Miss ______'s transfer.</td>
<td>Completion of the reclassification project with a minimum of professional direction and supervision, using only available staff, and producing no unusual strains on the Typing and Marketing section of the Catalog Department so that they can handle reclassification as a part of the daily routine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time Period

- By January 1973
- By January 1975

Example 1.
Penn State's Reclassification Project

a title-by-title basis, at least until the remaining periodicals and serials could be transferred from the overcrowded old stacks into their new locations. As a different approach to the problem of reclassification was needed, it was decided to develop a working plan by applying the techniques of management by objectives. Before selecting the objective of the project, a careful analysis was made of the amount of material remaining to be reclassified, and past reclassification statistics were studied to determine performance standards. The next step was to write the objective and to chart it in terms of quantitative and qualitative goals for a given period of time (see Example 1). During this at first deceptively simple process, several objectives or variations of objectives had to be considered. Penn State's objective was checked against the following criteria developed by Morrisey:

1. It should start with the word "to," followed by an action verb.
2. It should specify a single key result to be accomplished.
3. It should specify a target date for its accomplishment.
4. It should specify maximum cost factors.
5. It should be as specific and quantitative (and hence measurable and verifiable) as possible.
6. It should specify only the "what" and "when"; it should avoid venturing into the "why" and "how."
7. It should relate directly to the accountable manager's roles and missions and to higher-level roles, missions, and objectives.
8. It should be readily understandable by those who will be contributing to its attainment.
9. It should be realistic and attainable, but still represent a significant challenge.
10. It should provide maximum payoff on the required investment in time and resources, as compared with other objectives being considered.
11. It should be consistent with the resources available or anticipated.
12. It should avoid or minimize dual accountability for achievement when joint effort is required.
13. It should be consistent with basic
company and organizational policies and practices.

14. It should be willingly agreed to by both superior and subordinate, without undue pressure or coercion.

15. It should be recorded in writing, with a copy kept and periodically referred to by both superior and subordinate.

16. It should be communicated not only in writing, but also in face-to-face discussions between the accountable manager and those subordinates who will be contributing to its attainment.2

The next step in the management by objectives approach was to “program” the objective, by setting up the steps by which the objective was to be reached. This

---

### Example 2.

#### Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Required</th>
<th>Target Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Maintain reclassification as a unit in the serials department and continue current “block” reclassification plans which are closely related to the physical move soon to be undertaken.</td>
<td>now (September 1972)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transfer Mrs. ——— to the monograph catalog section of the catalog department to continue her duties in transferring and withdrawing monograph snags.</td>
<td>as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fill the existing professional vacancy in the serial cataloging section of the serial department so that this person can become thoroughly acquainted with the necessary procedures and routines before any personnel changes are made.</td>
<td>as soon as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Establish a detailed list of priorities in close consultation with the Circulation Department so that the most needed serials are reclassified first, taking into account the problems of space availability and circulation’s capacity for changes.</td>
<td>November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Complete the reclassification of 3,100 titles in 010-019.</td>
<td>Mid-October 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Complete the reclassification of 194 titles in 500-600.</td>
<td>Mid-November 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Complete the reclassification of 237 titles in law (340s).</td>
<td>End of December 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Complete all remaining miscellaneous physical reclassification tasks and follow-up on “snags.” Cease formal “block” reclassification.</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Complete the remarking of all reclassified titles.</td>
<td>As soon as space becomes available in Pattee stacks January 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Upon the transfer of Miss ——— place the direction of the Reclassification Project under one of the other experienced serial catalogers.</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Begin the reclassification of the remaining serial titles on a title-by-title basis, setting up a routine so that three junior catalogers can handle approximately two titles a piece per day for a total of six a day.</td>
<td>January 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The handling of each serial will involve:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the volumes from the stacks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulling the old cards, including SAF’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparing copy with serial run, updating as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigning LC classification number and filing LC shelf list.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing instruction slip for typists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remarkign volumes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When analytics are involved, collating all analytic cards and preparing instruction slips for each. If analytics are not available for all volumes, doing them either from LC copy or original copy. When partial analytic situations are encountered a serial cataloger will review to decide whether to pull the old analytics or do full analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Upon completion of the remaining current serials, make a decision whether or not to bring the reclassification project, as a separate unit of the serials department, to an end.</td>
<td>January 1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was the "how" and was as deceptively easy to write as the "why," or the objective. The "Action Plan" for Penn State was based on careful study of the situation and in consultation with the appropriate personnel. Every attempt was made to consider all possibilities and to foresee all potential problems. It was determined that the current projects had to be finished first. Then, it was recommended that a set of priorities be established for the current periodicals and serials remaining to be reclassified. Past statistics indicated that a performance standard for each junior cataloger of reclassifying two titles per day was a realistic one. The plan was implemented in late September 1972. (See Example 2.)

The final step, after programming and implementation, was to assess the results. The reclassification project was almost on schedule. A significant delay in moving into the new building resulted in a lack of available space, in either the old or the new areas, for the processing and shifting of materials; only the titles in law, however, remained to be reclassified. Also, the detailed list of priorities needed completion. With the move started, the personnel in the reclassification project were in a better position to plan for the next two years, although further experience will be needed to refine the techniques and to better learn to anticipate possible problems and delays in programming and implementing objectives.

Any academic library will benefit from experimenting with the process of establishing goals. The library administration will find it useful to break down the job of management into understandable units and to place them in a logical sequence leading to a specified, and agreed upon, result. Management by objectives will facilitate the evaluation of performance as it is based on specific accomplishments within a given period of time. An "Action Plan," such as the one at Penn State, if made available for regular consultation and discussion to all levels of staff, will provide an objective, rather than a subjective, measurement of the success of a selected goal. The attainment of a specific goal might prove less important than the capacity to measure, quantitatively and qualitatively, the factors contributing to the success or failure of an operation through management by objectives.
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Faculty Status—
A Comprehensive Bibliography

This bibliography represents the results of a thorough literature search through Library Literature, Dissertation Abstracts, Library and Information Science Abstracts, and ERIC. I attempted to include all articles, books, letters, and news items directly pertaining to the topic of faculty status.

A perusal of the literature reveals a broad spectrum of opinion concerning faculty status. Although it would be somewhat difficult to detect a general consensus concerning the subject, most authors agree that the major problem confronting the instigation of faculty status exists in the lack of a precise definition of all that the term implies. The majority of librarians who have addressed the topic advocate some sort of improved status, whether it be toward identification with the teaching faculty or merely a recognition of librarianship as a worthwhile profession in itself. The individual institutions must dictate the type of status given to their librarians, since most operate under different administrative policies and pressures. Often librarians may possess the same educational level and responsibilities as the teaching faculty, while in other institutions they fall far short of the faculty's qualifications. It becomes obvious that librarians must devise a single and descriptive definition of the term "faculty status" before administration will classify librarians in such a bracket.

The subject of faculty status for academic librarians continues to command a great deal of attention; thus, this bibliography will be outdated in a matter of months. However, it is hoped that it will serve as a guide to the literature concerned with the foundations of faculty status and the major issues involved.


AAUP has defined eligibility requirements for membership which allow any professional librarian who holds at least a half-time appointment at a college or university library to belong to the organization.


Reports that the Faculty Council Committee on Library Affairs at the University of Idaho approved academic rank for librarians. The librarians must be judged by the same criteria as other faculty members.


News note relating that librarians at Pennsylvania State University received academic status.


News note stating that Penn State librarians received full academic status. When evaluation is made for promotion, competence as librarian is a criterion in addition.
to general characteristics expected of faculty.


News note reporting the outcome of a survey conducted among eighty-two academic libraries in the East to discover the prevalence of faculty status.


News note reporting the granting of academic status to librarians at Pennsylvania State University. Librarians receive the same rights and privileges as the teaching faculty.

"Alfred University Librarians Gain Faculty Status," Library Journal 93:4086 (1 Nov. 1968).

News note stating that on September 8, 1968, full faculty status was achieved by professional librarians at Alfred University in New York. Benefits included the nine-month appointment period, comparable salaries, review by a promotion and tenure committee, and titles.

"All That Rumbling and Only a—Mouse?" The UPC Advocate 3:16 (April 1973).

Briefly reviews the attempt by California State University and Colleges librarians to attain full faculty status. States that in March 1973, the chancellor's office announced its decision pertaining to the status of librarians. Discusses changes to be made by the chancellor's decision. Faculty status was not granted; alterations were made only in titles assigned to librarians; salaries remained the same and benefits were not added.

Allen, P. S. "In the Liberal Arts College—The Reference Librarian, a Professor?" School and Society 39:231-36 (24 Feb. 1934).

Proposal for subject specialists in the field of library science, and for closer contact with professors and their duties.


Presents a list of standards pertaining to faculty status.


Presents the revisions in the October 1970, ACRL standards for faculty status.


Emphasizes the importance of librarians to the academic community and strongly recommends academic status with corresponding faculty privileges. Lists the reasons why faculty status should be granted to librarians.


The report states that since all professional library staff members contribute to the educational program of the institution, they should possess academic rank commensurate with deans, teaching staff, and departmental assistants. Librarians should enjoy academic privileges; salaries should therefore be equal to teaching staff with the same education and background. The report concludes by outlining the duties required for each library position.

This report presents the qualifications of professional librarians, relating the positions to the corresponding grades of the faculty.


Joseph H. Reason discusses the approved resolution suggesting that personal members of ACRL be assessed $5 and institutional members be assessed $10 above their regular dues for the support of the proposed Office for Academic Status.


Allan Dyson spoke against the concept of “faculty status” and opposed the joint statement as twisting definitions to make librarians the teaching faculty they are not. Dyson proposes that the librarian should instead be seeking his rightful place on the campus by working toward a meaningful academic status, rather than by attempting to ape the faculty.


Report on the proceedings of the annual ALA conference of 1969. Contains the report of the Academic Status Committee, which proposed a list of standards to be approved by ACRL concerning faculty status. ACRL adopted the standards for faculty status, led by David Kaser, despite the vote of the membership to defeat it.


Discusses the threat of removal of faculty status for librarians in New Jersey colleges and universities.


Bergen discusses the chasm between librarians and professors, and states that the initiative for convergence of the two groups must come from the librarian.


News note concerning union bargaining terms. States that most of the demands are for increased status and pay; librarians want vacations equal to the faculty.


Blackburn identifies the sources of conflict between the teaching faculty and the academic librarian. One of the problems stems from the ambiguous status of academic librarians.


Blake states that although faculty status is in a state of confusion, librarians seem to be moving actively toward it. Because the librarian’s work has changed, he needs the same conditions, protection, and responsibilities which the teaching faculty needs. The author gives reasons for the librarian’s need for faculty title and rank, tenure, academic work year, and career and promotion structure.


Blake attacks the program of the convocation, which she states “failed utterly in a number of vital areas of concern for American education.” She concludes that the “academic world does not recognize the librarian as a colleague.”

Blake disagrees with the observations on faculty status put forth by Ellsworth Mason in the November 1972, issue of *College and Research Libraries*. Mason inveighs against faculty status for librarians, while Blake believes that academic librarians without it suffer great disadvantages, which she enumerates.


Reviews the struggle of California State College librarians in the attempt to attain faculty status. Deprecates ALA for suggesting that California State College librarians accept all facets of faculty status except salary, which could be arranged when the conditions of the state's budget improve. Blake states that librarians must fight for the salary now or they will never receive it.


Blake outlines the purposes and history of academic freedom and tenure for teaching faculty and observes these values to the academic enterprise. She further points out the similar and growing need for such freedom and tenure for college and university librarians and cites examples of how the absence of these items can be detrimental to an institution.


Survey conducted to determine salaries, work week, vacations, and benefits and privileges of the academic librarian. Concluded that library salaries are not comparable to faculty, but status is improving with improving qualifications of academic librarians.


Since 1938, the libraries of each of New York City's five municipal colleges have been legally recognized as academic departments. Members of these staffs have been granted a status unique in academic library practice.


Author discusses the terms of the National Educational Defense Act and how its tenets relate to librarians once they are accorded academic status.


Results of a survey indicate that most medical schools grant a degree of academic status to their professional librarians. Faculty appointments and benefits are not always granted. To upgrade effectiveness and stature of medical school librarians, faculty status is desirable. The librarian must merit faculty rank on the same basis as the other teaching faculty.


The paper reviews the discussions and processes involved in the transferring of professional members of the library staff of the University of Illinois from the nonacademic university civil service to academic status. Author discusses the scheme devised by the University of Illinois to accomplish this task.


Most of this chapter deals with the college president's responsibility toward the librarian in bringing the librarian into the college educational program. States that the librarian should be a regular faculty member serving on regular faculty committees, with a voice in the organization of the curriculum.

Presents a number of essays discussing various facets of faculty status. Includes articles by such authorities as Arthur McAnally, Robert Downs, Carl Hintz, David Weber, and Anita Schiller.


Because professional librarians are involved in intellectual tasks, they need an atmosphere of freedom. Branscomb outlines the librarian’s tasks, and states that they should have tenure to ensure free performance. He promotes faculty status, and outlines a tenure procedure for librarians.


Author promotes professional status rather than faculty status.


News note reporting the issuance of the 1968 California Library Association Position Paper on status and benefits for California academic librarians.


Paper purports that academic librarians are essential to the development of college and university libraries, and in order to fulfill their responsibilities and objectives, librarians must attain full faculty status.


Presents the sanctions against the California State College system for failing to implement faculty status for librarians.


News note announcing the adoption by the California Library Association of sanctions against the California State Colleges for failure to grant faculty status by July 1, 1969.


Sanctions against the California State Colleges were invoked by the California Library Association on July 1, 1969, because full faculty status and benefits were not granted to librarians in the system.


Presents recommendations pertaining to the classification and status of professional librarians. Outlines the duties of each position.


Author reviews the evolution of the trend toward recognition of the academic contributions of college librarians. Feels that the attendant assignment of faculty status and rank is important. Academic librarians are finally moving toward full acceptance as members of the academic faculty.


Based on the results of a survey addressed to 65 two-year colleges in California, the author urges that head librarians in these institutions be classed as all other college administrators or as instructors with a bonus.


To meet the responsibilities of faculty
status, librarians can become involved in the formal instructional programs of their own or other institutions. Author surveyed academic libraries in the Association of Research Libraries in the winter of 1968-1969 to determine how many librarians were actively involved in formal teaching programs. She discovered that only 2.75 percent participated.


This study aims to examine the type of employment agreements, tenure of appointment, salary and promotion schedules, participation by librarians in retirement and pension plans, sabbatical leaves, and other factors influencing the status of librarians.


Cottam comments on a letter by Richard Thompson, who deprecates faculty status. Whereas Thompson states that librarians have no teaching function, Cottam believes that he is involved in a personal kind of teaching.


States the important role of the university librarian. For the author, it is not a matter of academic status, but a question of recognition of equality with faculty, which is necessary to render the greatest service to institutions. States that academic librarians must be scholars and possess a degree recognized as the equivalent of the Ph.D. The education of the librarian must be commensurate with that of the professor.


Not available for review.


Author comments on the positions taken by those librarians opposing faculty status, and he believes that these librarians are overly concerned with status. He discusses reasons for this concern, and presents arguments in favor of faculty status; he feels that status should depend upon the direct contribution by the librarian to the academic program.


In an exploratory study, the author tested specific hypotheses concerning the relationship between status concerns and professionalization of individual university librarians. Status concerns were found to be an important socio-psychological determinant of professionalism. To improve status, the librarian must gain faculty status at both an explicit and an implicit level.


Author discusses the role of the librarian as a member of the faculty. However, the major portion of the article is devoted to a superficial discussion of the librarian’s role in society. The author briefly states the major duties of a university librarian, and feels that if librarians want faculty status, they must act the part.


Improvement of professional education, subject specialization, professional research, and the development of the Association of College and Research Libraries are suggested methods for improving the status of academic librarians.


Dorsey bemoans the fact that academic librarians are neither faculty nor office help. Promotes equality in pay with faculty members who have commensurate education
and experience. Must change status from "unclassified" to "classified."


In 1946, the librarians at the University of Illinois were accorded faculty status. The article discusses the staff classification, stating that the salaries of librarians correspond to the teaching staff salaries. Librarians worked to attain faculty status due to the fact that they discovered that they were the only university group engaged in academic activities that did not have academic recognition.


Downs believes that librarians must be recognized as an integral part of the academic ranks and enjoy all of the rights and privileges of the faculty in order for the library to remain an effective institution. Privileges should correspond to responsibilities.


In this article, Downs reviews the present status of university library staffs (professionals only) and concludes with a summary of current opinion among library administrators as to the most desirable type of personnel organization.


Discussion of where the librarian belongs in the academic community, mostly in relation to the question of faculty status. Must define what is meant by an academic professional librarian, for on this hinges whatever claim librarians may have to faculty status.


In considering the status of librarians, Downs surveyed conditions of librarians in 115 American universities. Discusses three discernable patterns of how universities rank librarians. Argues for faculty status, stating that this will improve the quality of librarians. The librarian must offer commensurate qualifications. Downs states the reasons for awarding librarians faculty status, and urges librarians to obtain more degrees.


A century ago, few if any American academic librarians held faculty rank by virtue of their library work. Slowly some came to be recognized as responsible academic officers, usually at first without rank, and then in more recent years increasing numbers of them have been accorded full faculty status and rank. The struggle continues, but with more promise for acceptance.


Presents a series of essays concerning the status of the academic librarian.


National trend toward academic recognition of university librarians continues. Forms of recognition achieved differ. Article reviews break-throughs and describes current situation, based on the correspondence of the author. Librarians must accept responsibilities as well as privileges.


Article deals with sabbatical leaves for all types of libraries. Author says that the granting of sabbaticals is not correlated to faculty status in universities. Feels that a sabbatical program would encourage an attitude of professionalism.

Estes, R. S. "Challenge to College Librari-
Faculty Status / 447


Author states that it is difficult to determine the status of college librarians. This is chiefly the fault of the librarian. A need exists to become involved and lead the academic community. The librarian must attain definite status as a librarian rather than as faculty.

Estes, R. S. "Faculty Status in the City College Libraries," College and Research Libraries 3:43-45 (Dec. 1941).

A history of the change of the status of college librarians from clerical to instructional. Board of higher education in New York gave librarians faculty status.

“Faculty Status,” Library Journal 65:497 (1 June 1940); Wilson Library Bulletin 14:735 (June 1940).

Faculty status granted to all professional librarians at the municipal colleges of New York City, announced on April 16, 1940, by the Library Association of the City Colleges of New York.


The New York Library Association passed a resolution backing academic status and rank for college and university librarians.


A news note relating the granting of faculty status to librarians at the University of Kansas. Outlines tenure policies.

“Faculty Status Granted to Librarians at the University of Kentucky,” Library Journal 91:3160 (15 June 1966).

News note pointing out that the librarians at the University of Kentucky received faculty status. Assures librarians of membership in the senate, access to research funds, sabbatical leaves, tenure, and other privileges accorded to the teaching faculty.


News note announcing the attainment of full faculty status by the City University of New York librarians.


Academic librarians need the same benefits as the teaching faculty to further their education, which will eventually improve the status of the librarian.


Defines status as the “position an individual occupies with relation to a social group or organization.” Also assigns rights, duties, and value. States that librarians are not granted social acceptance commensurate to faculty; rather, their positions are often nebulous. She promotes any satisfactory status rather than as faculty members. Author foresees the time when librarians will be accorded equal rights as faculty.


Discusses the ranking of the librarian.

“Full Faculty Status for Librarians?” The UPC Advocate 1:2-3 (12 April 1971).

In this news note, former San Jose State College library systems analyst Robert J. Duman comments on status discrepancies between the teaching faculty and librarians. He believes that full faculty status for librarians would help eliminate inequities between the two groups. Also states that collective bargaining could provide the needed advantage to attain full faculty status.


Author reports findings of a survey made to discern the status of academic librarians in thirty-five colleges of education.

Galloway, Louise. “Academic Librarians

On May 18, 1966, librarians at the University of Louisville were granted faculty status with the accompanying professorial rank. Article discusses the formulation of a separate library faculty and the election of a Library Faculty Selection Committee to search for and select a director of libraries to recommend to the university administration.


The quality of educational institutions is threatened unless librarians are accorded faculty status and benefits. Author believes that the work of the academic librarian is instructional in nature. Attempts to show that the granting of faculty status will benefit students, faculty, and the institution as a whole.


Letter discussing the California Library Association's plan to invoke sanctions against California State Colleges for failure to grant full faculty status and benefits to librarians after the academic senate voted to grant such status.


Discusses the struggle of California State College librarians to obtain faculty status.


Librarians must examine the responsibilities of academic status. The nine-month contract is a necessity, as research cannot be carried on without it. Presents a plan to gradually implement the nine-month contract.


Article presents results of questionnaire survey in which seventy college librarians participated. Librarians and faculty members offered their conceptions of the place of the library in the college. Where faculty rank is accorded it is usually granted only to the chief librarian and one or two assistants. Most librarians received lower salaries than teaching personnel of similar academic rank.


Goode, a sociologist, describes the characteristics which identify a "profession." He then examines how a librarian fits this description, and concludes that librarians fail to meet the qualifications. Contains a brief discussion of how professionalism is directly related to the question of faculty status.


Not available for review.


Subtitled “A Farce in One Scene.” Through a satirical and riotous play, Gore presents his main contention with faculty status: that librarians are not ordinarily teachers and are not likely ever to be regarded as faculty by anyone but themselves. Gore states that the librarian should be considered an academic administrator, and should receive increased benefits in this way.

In this essay, the author contends that because librarians contribute to academic study and receive special training, they should receive all of the rights and privileges of faculty status.


The author states that librarians themselves regard the library as a detached unit of the academic whole, and until this image changes, the status of the librarian will remain the same. Halverson suggests ways to achieve staff unity and cooperation, and methods by which to improve relations with the faculty. To attain faculty status, the librarian must aim for a higher goal and produce qualitative research. The article concludes with a discussion by other librarians on the topic of faculty rank and status.


Author states that the librarian should have the doctorate for the door to faculty status to open.


Article describes the classification and pay plan of the Louisiana State University library. Librarians have equivalent academic rank and are associated with the teaching faculty.


States that the librarian is central to the role of education. Therefore, the library staff must rank with the faculty. Suggests that librarians be termed “Professors of Books and Reading.” Discusses the failure of the Carnegie Foundation to accord benefits to librarians.


To determine the status of librarians in the university community, what it means, and how it is decided, questionnaires were sent to 100 major American academic institutions. There is a need for clarification and standardization of practice. Criteria used for determining promotions are discussed, and a draft statement of policy concerning the matter is proposed.


Author discusses the image of the academic librarian from the point of view of faculty members whom she surveyed. The final section of the study deals with the question of faculty status for librarians. Holbrook concludes that there exists a need for librarians to accept not only the privileges, but the responsibilities, and to realize exactly what status implies.


Discusses the need for a philosophy of librarianship, stating that there is too much emphasis on minutiae. He outlines a plan to form a philosophy and what to stress in a library school curriculum. Concludes by instructing librarians to cease worrying about faculty rank, since recognition will arrive unsought by concentrating on making librarianship a humane and live profession.


Horn suggests that there is little motivation for academic librarians fighting for faculty status. Librarians should form a faculty entrusted with the government of and instruction in the library. Academic titles should be used. If faculty status is to be achieved, many librarians need a Magna Carta declaring that the director is not the king, but the foremost baron.

Horn, Steven. “The Professional Ladder,”
Horn examines the report on "Position Classification and Principles of Academic Status in Canadian University Libraries." He deprecates it, wondering if the "professional ladder" is a risky step in the academic library organization.


Author states that the efficiency of a library is judged by its performance. Believes that India's academic librarians must achieve a higher status for service to be effective. He compares the situation of academic librarians in India to the situation of those in the United States and the western world.


James examines the difficulties confronting the professional librarian seeking faculty or academic status. This is actually a brief survey of the important literature in the field and includes a brief bibliography.


Members of the teaching faculty are expected to spend part of their working time in study and research. This paper examines the extent of comparable opportunities available to academic librarians, as revealed by questionnaires returned from fifty-two research libraries and fifteen college libraries. Presents a discussion of desirable library policies in regard to this topic. Dominating idea is that librarians should have commensurate privileges with the teaching faculty.


Comments on the proposed standards for academic librarians as they appeared in the October 1970, issue of College and Research Libraries News. Presents revised standards because of confusion in wording of the previous standards, especially in the section concerning education.


Presents a comment on an article by David Weber and disagrees with some of his specific points. States that the librarian must work for faculty status and insists upon a consideration of the problem.


Discusses various methods of rating librarians, based on results of a questionnaire returned by 138 university libraries. Asks whether the appraisal method for librarians is the same as for the teaching faculty. Discusses faculty status as it relates to appraisal methods.


Presents the text of the joint statement concerning faculty status for academic librarians formulated by the Association of American Colleges, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association of College and Research Libraries. Text states that the function of the library in the academic world is central and indispensable, and that librarians should therefore be granted faculty status.


Discusses the attainment of faculty status by the City University of New York Library Association. Describes formula for achieving status and discusses the structure of the university. Outlines the sequence of events which led to the new status and states current actions and plans.
States that the City University of New York librarians received faculty rank and that, as of 1968, salaries rose considerably.

States in a letter that the Library Association of the City University of New York is seeking to obtain more of the typical faculty privileges and responsibilities.

New Jersey State College librarians hold faculty status, but the governor still demands the twelve-month year. To solve the faculty status problem, librarians must not be passive, they must avoid clerical routines, and they must not resist change. Most of all, the librarian should feel that he deserves faculty status.

A report of a survey of New York State academic librarians concerning their views of the propriety and probability of achieving full faculty status. Librarians do see themselves as educators, and must retain a definite status within the academic community.

Discusses the need for faculty status, the dangers and pitfalls on the road to obtaining it, and urges support of the ACRL standards for faculty status.

A questionnaire was distributed to the directors of all members of the Association of Research Libraries and to all other state university libraries inquiring about their attitudes and practices regarding library staff participation in professional and community activities. Seventy-two respondents showed preponderantly favorable attitudes to such activities, research and publication, consulting, and participating in the work of professional groups. Although there appear to be explainable differences between such activities by librarians and by teaching faculty members, it is clear that more university librarians have reasonable opportunity to engage fully in the educational enterprise.

Points out the diversity between the rank of teachers and that of librarians. Urges that librarians be placed on par with teachers in schools, colleges, and universities.

Kirkpatrick first reviews the status of librarians at the University of Utah from 1917 to 1947. He concludes that librarians should receive the same privileges and benefits as the teaching faculty with commensurate training. The librarian must work for these privileges.

Includes a lengthy discussion of interviews which the author conducted with various faculty members to determine their concepts of the academic librarian's role. Discovered that most faculty members felt that librarians deserved faculty status.

The author served as the head of a committee to study the problem of faculty status. The article presents the results of their survey, which encompassed all types and sizes of academic institutions. Discovered that the question of faculty status seldom
has a clear policy at the official level.


Discusses the status of the librarian in general, and the attempt to improve it. College librarians work the hardest to ameliorate their status. The author believes that academic librarians should improve their own profession rather than becoming professors.


News note discussing issues of the first state-wide meeting of the United Professors of California Librarian’s Advisory Committee in San Francisco on March 11, 1972. The primary topic of concern was faculty status; members discussed problems in its attainment.


Author promotes faculty status. Outlines conditions in California State College libraries. Believes that librarians can attain faculty status only through membership in the United Professors of California, which would act as the bargaining agent.


Based on September 1968, article in College and Research Libraries. Out of 183 libraries answering a questionnaire, only 26 libraries reported having equal status with the faculty.


Presents a list of college and university libraries which attained full faculty status by 1969.


This is basically an advertisement urging California academic librarians to join the United Professors of California. However, it lists the duties of academic librarians, states their qualifications and other pertinent activities, and enumerates the provisions of a UPC sample contract agreement which includes the following points: abolition of second class status, full academic rank, establishment of a new academic department, professional ranks, equal compensation, nine-month schedule, and full academic employee benefits.


News note stating that librarians at the City University of New York were promoted to full faculty status, including titles and salaries. Article provides salary figures according to rank. Librarians were not accorded equal annual vacation.


Librarians at Delhi University were granted faculty status, including equal pay, but they protested the fact that junior librarians, many with twenty years of experience, were informed that they must get an MLS to receive the privileges. They were not told of this decision until after faculty status had been instigated.


Article reports a study of the current status of professional librarians in the twenty-six university libraries of the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries. Relates the status patterns of the ASERL librarians to the criteria used for appointment and promotion. Argues for faculty status with salaries, benefits, and responsibilities commensurate with those of the faculty at the same level of academic contribution. Based on the study, ASERL presents recommendations for faculty status.

Lundy, F. A. “Faculty Rank for Professional Librarians.” Unpublished Master’s the-
Reports the findings of a questionnaire concerning faculty rank of librarians sent to thirty-five large colleges and universities.


Part I outlines the reasons for librarians’ attainment of faculty status. Points out the important role the librarian plays in the educational function of the university. States that faculty status would bring the faculty and the librarian closer. Rank should correspond to teaching faculty with the same education. Part II discusses faculty status in several institutions which associate the professional librarian with the teaching and research staff.


This book is primarily a discussion of the relationships between the three groups mentioned in the title and their responsibilities to each other. Lyle wants librarians to place less emphasis on status. Although he expresses belief in academic status, he feels that status should be a byproduct of the librarian’s work.


An analysis of factors and processes in decision-making at the university level as it relates to the acquiring of faculty status by staff librarians.


A discussion of the components of faculty status and what it means to the librarian.


McAnally discusses faculty status and the obstacles confronting its adoption. Espouses a favorable opinion of faculty status.


The authors discuss the ways in which the role of the library director has changed and the different sources of pressure acting upon him, one of which is the push for faculty status.


Paper presented at the 1941 annual meeting of the Minnesota Library Association. Discusses what status college librarians want and how they can achieve it. McEwen is more concerned with the college rather than the university librarian. To attain faculty status, librarians must prove that they share the faculty’s interest in teaching and research. This would bring librarians a sense of belonging in the academic world and lend significance to their work.


Presents the results of a survey conducted among thirty-five institutions to ascertain regulations and rules concerning the status of librarians. Found that few universities had regulations regarding status. Librarians must be accorded a status of some sort in order to recognize their places in the institutions and to give proper dignity to their work.


A study which developed from the efforts of librarians at the four-year campuses and university centers of the State University of New York to gain complete faculty status. Paper based on replies from a question-
naire sent to 321 four-year state colleges and university centers across the United States. The compilation of statistics is based on a 57 percent return. Status of librarians was equated with that of the academic faculty in regard to rank and titles, promotion criteria, tenure, sabbatical leave, rates of pay, holidays and vacations, participation in faculty government, and fringe benefits. Reports that conditions of the librarian have not changed significantly over the past decade. Authors promote faculty status.


Results of a study conducted to determine the status of librarians and how many have faculty status. States that faculty status is desirable, but librarians must also raise their own standards.


Suggests that librarians be given faculty status to improve communications with the faculty.


A letter responding to Eli Oboler's letter concerning faculty status, which appeared in the January 1973, issue of College and Research Libraries. Mason again stresses his belief that the library profession is in better condition than the teaching profession. Mason states that all librarians are not teachers, and that librarians should work to better their own profession.


In this editorial, Mason deprecates the wish of some librarians to be associated with the teaching faculty. Librarians should be recognized as librarians. Derides the teaching profession for becoming "obscenely competitive." However, librarians can improve their status by gaining the respect of the faculty and by recruiting and retaining a staff of librarians possessing academic worth.


Massman, who promotes faculty status, addresses himself to the following questions: 1. How and why does academic freedom affect librarians? 2. Might it not be harmful to the cause of librarians to equate them with faculty members, because librarians do not have as much formal education as is expected of the teaching staff? 3. How does faculty status affect recruiting? 4. Should or should not faculty status be granted only to teachers?


Presents the results of a questionnaire sent to nineteen state colleges and universities in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Purpose of the study is to review the history of the struggle for faculty status for librarians and some of the arguments advanced in support of that objective; a second purpose is to gather information on the similarities and differences between librarians and faculty members in broad areas of preparation, contributions, and rewards. Author defines faculty status according to ACRL standards. This is the most comprehensive work available concerning faculty status, and contains an extensive bibliography.


The professor can assist the librarian and help to improve the library by supporting faculty status. This would bring professors and librarians closer together.

Massman, Virgil F. "Responsibilities and Benefits of Faculty Status for Librarians: A Review of Related Literature and a Survey of Librarians and Faculty Members in Nineteen State Colleges and Universities in Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin." Unpublished Doctoral dis-
sertation, Univ. of Michigan, 1970.
Massman’s recent book, Faculty Status for Librarians, is based on this work. Refer to the previous abstract for further information.

Discussion of the ACRL standards for faculty status and their implications for librarians.

Reports that ACRL members gave overwhelming endorsement to the “Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians.”

Board approved the adoption of the April 26, 1972, “Joint Statement on Faculty Status of the College and University Librarian” presented by the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors.

News note stating that the Missouri Association of College and Research Libraries has detailed specifications for academic status in a position paper. Paper states that librarians should be commensurate with the faculty.

Report presented at the 1937 Pacific Northwest Library Association Conference. Suggested that college and university librarians work collectively and individually for: appropriate rank and recognition, improvement of the salary scale, tenure, pension allowance, adequate vacations, special privileges to continue study and opportunity to travel, and time for preparation.

When professional librarians achieve full academic status, they must accept all of the responsibilities. This includes all of the responsibilities of the faculty, including publication. Must have firm lines of communication to ensure benefits for the entire staff.

Presents the results of a questionnaire survey covering forty-nine medium-sized universities and colleges in the United States in April 1953. Many charts and tables are included.

Supports faculty status, stating that the librarian is involved in indirect teaching. Discusses what faculty status means to librarians. When faculty status is obtained, the librarian should use the privileges to the fullest.

The author states that librarians are vastly underrated. Need advancement of status to faculty rank; all librarians need advanced status.

News note stating that New Jersey academic librarians are appealing to ALA for financial aid in mounting a court fight against their demotion from faculty status.

News note reporting that Governor Cahill is attempting to strip academic librarians of faculty status and reclassify them in civil service positions.


Supports premise that all New Mexico academic librarians have faculty status commensurate with that of the teaching faculty.


News note reporting State University of New York Library Association’s gains toward improved status, and its problems in attaining full faculty status.


States that the university recognized and awarded academic status to those members of the library staff who hold positions which are chiefly of a teaching or research nature.


Presents the results of a questionnaire dealing with staff conditions at Catholic academic libraries, including questions concerning faculty status. States that there are differing conceptions of faculty status.


Evaluates and points out weaknesses of Ellsworth Mason’s editorial, “A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty,” in which Mason deplores faculty status. Oboler believes that Mason’s facts are consistently in error, and disputes his contention that the only faculty benefit denied librarians is a longer vacation. Oboler supports the “Joint Statement on Academic Status.” Mason responded to this letter in the May 1973, issue of College and Research Libraries.


Outlines the history of the struggle for faculty status by California State College librarians from 1951 when the Brakebill Committee was appointed until June 24, 1971.


Parker, a librarian at Stanislaus State College, discusses the results of a study conducted in the summer of 1970 to determine the status of librarians in 179 state-supported academic libraries of institutions comparable in size and structure to the California State Colleges and University system. The article includes many statistics, and Parker concludes that the academic work year stands as the most important benefit of full faculty status.


News note stating that full academic status was granted to librarians at Pennsylvania State University, completing a process started in 1967 by the Board of Trustees.


States that much discussion of academic status has proceeded from an emotional rather than a rational base. Attempts to
analyze the "formal environment" of academic status. Concludes that the librarian "is in a sense the academic environment himself, and is accordingly pre-eminently academic."


Disagrees with article by R. Dean Galloway, "Academic Benefits for Academic Librarians," which supports faculty status. Pierson questions whether faculty status is really what librarians want; they may not want to meet the responsibilities. Need definition and recognition of the special character of librarianship.


Reaction to the 1970 ACRL standards for faculty status. Sets forth specific objections to ACRL proposal and offers general comments.


Presents results of a questionnaire concerning the status of library school librarians sent to library schools in the United States and Canada. Conclusions, based on twenty-seven replies, given under the following divisions: faculty benefits, role of faculty library committee, salaries. Library school librarians do not enjoy the same status as librarians in the classroom in terms of responsibilities and privileges.

Posey, Edwin D. "The Librarian and the Faculty," *Southeastern Librarian* 18:152-61 (Fall 1968).

Outlines problems between librarian and faculty, the attempt to define professionalism in librarianship, and the obstacles to faculty status.


Author basically discusses the changing role of the librarian from preserver of the collection to the fulfillment of educational needs. Mentions that the librarian must be an important member of the faculty.


Discusses the relationship between the college administration and the college library. Author suggests that the college librarian's fight for recognition be taken up by all library organizations.

"Professional Library Staff Acceded Faculty Rank," *Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly* 33:40 (Summer 1969).

Reports the promotion of librarians at the University of Idaho to equivalent faculty rank on July 1, 1969.


Forty-nine responses to a questionnaire sent to 108 community college libraries showed great disparity between the salary of the college librarian and that of the faculty. Privileges desired were fringe benefits and faculty government participation, and academic status and tenure. The apathetic response to the questionnaire indicates that librarians are responsible for their low positions.


Author discusses the continual problem of the librarian's status and classification within the academic structure. Librarians must broaden knowledge and gain respect as a profession.


ACRL membership meeting instructed the board of directors to establish the Office for Academic Status. Outlines the functions of the office. The ALA Council reject-
ed the plan, but plan remains to establish office, if it can go in the ACRL budget.


Discusses the fact that although librarians at Brooklyn College have full faculty status, the president attempted to change working conditions and tenure policy arbitrarily. Librarians filed grievances and won.


News note stating that sanctions would be applied against the California State Colleges by the California Library Association unless faculty status is awarded. They demanded the same salary schedule for librarians and teaching faculty.


Discusses the status of librarians and the obstacles blocking attainment of faculty status. As a result of survey of fifty Catholic and fifty non-Catholic college libraries, the author concludes that there should be definite policies of tenure for librarians.


The good librarian must guide students in the use of library materials, a function which requires much skill. Author concludes, therefore, that librarianship itself should be a professorship.


In his study of 367 colleges, the author found that relations between the library and faculty members were good, and that librarians were generally accepted as faculty members.


Schiller includes a discussion of faculty rank. States that the status of librarians is too often ill-defined. Concludes that the question of full faculty status for librarians deserves wider and more affirmative institutional response.

Scrivener, J. E. “What’s in a Name?” Australian Academic and Research Libraries 2:30-32 (March 1971).

Not available for review.


To attain faculty status, librarians must be willing to meet the same qualitative standards, or their equivalents, as are expected of the faculty at large. Author outlines these standards—educational, professional, and institutional.


Letter reacting to the article in Lewis Branscomb’s ACRL monograph on faculty status concerning the status of California State College Librarians. States that the struggle is one of power. She was involved in the City University of New York’s struggle for faculty status for librarians. Urges the California Library Association to ignore the copout by ALA, and help librarians to achieve their goal.


Discusses librarians’ status at the City College of New York. States that faculty status is only nominal and does not extend to benefits. States that the statistics serve only to retain librarian in low status and poor pay.

Author looks upon the librarian as an educator and faculty member.


Academic librarians will achieve and deserve full academic status only after they cause changes in the bureaucratic structure of libraries and in library education, and when they provide professional service on a scholarly level.


Author states that there are three ways of grouping academic librarians. He answers some self-imposed questions concerning academic status. Believes that librarians must be concerned with the business of being librarians, and work for status in that light.


Investigation of status of librarians in 108 colleges and universities. Found that librarians enjoyed privileges comparable to those of teaching members in matters of meetings and committee work and discussions of tenure, but there are large discrepancies in salary, vacation, and leaves.


Members of ACRL voted to accept the standards. Item four, concerning education, was deleted.


Presents and explains the nine standards for faculty status which were adopted by the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries in Dallas, Texas, on June 26, 1971.


Faculty status at Minnesota does not include all professional librarians, but only administrative positions. Librarians can be promoted as they are able to meet the qualifications expected of other faculty members for such appointments.

“State University of New York Librarians Association Seeks Faculty Status With Class Grievance Motion,” Library Journal 97:1230 (1 April 1972).

News note reporting demands of SUNY-LA for faculty status and the filing of a “class” action grievance asking SUNY to show cause why all librarians have not received the nine-month year appointment.


News note reporting that the State University of New York librarians attained faculty status.


Position paper on status and benefits of academic librarians in California. Outlines the privileges and responsibilities of faculty status.


Discusses the position paper on faculty status of the California Library Association’s College, University, and Research Library Section. Considers the points enumerated in the paper and their validity. Recommends that librarians in the State College System be granted full faculty status. Also makes recommendations concerning benefits.

States the ACRL reasons for the granting of academic status to librarians.


States that professional philosophy would improve with the granting of faculty status. Present status of academic librarians is ambiguous. Promotes faculty status and outlines the tenets of status.


News note stating that sanctions will be applied against the California State Colleges unless full faculty status is granted to librarians in the system by July 1, 1969.


Presents a statement on the work week of the librarian. Librarian must realize responsibility and contribute if faculty status is attained. Librarian should contribute more to the growth of the library if it is adopted.


Letter in response to Ellsworth Mason’s editorial “A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty.” Stevens agrees with Mason about the disadvantages of faculty status for librarians, and that adequate leadership can obtain full benefits specifically adapted to the librarian’s position and requirements.


This paper summarizes the results of a survey conducted in Texas to compare the academic status of librarians and teaching faculty at Texas institutions of higher education. Respondents were fifty-seven junior colleges, forty-one private senior colleges, and twenty-five public senior colleges. Faculty rank was defined as complete equality with the academic faculty in regard to rank and titles, promotion criteria, tenure, sabbatical leave, rates of pay, holidays and vacations, representation and participation in faculty government, and fringe benefits.


Presents a statement on faculty status adopted by the College Libraries Division of the Texas Library Association on April 15, 1950. States that the present status of college librarians is ambiguous, and proposes a solution promoting faculty status.


Presents the statement concerning faculty status, and reports the results of the meetings of the committee.


Discusses the evolution and general trends in the history of library education. Although there appears to be a movement toward the granting of academic rank to professional librarians, for the most part the general position of librarians remains ambiguous.


Author inveighs against faculty rank and status for librarians; supports professional status instead. Feels that librarians should rank with other college professionals, such as nurses, architects, and doctors.


Author sent questionnaire to eighty-five predominantly black institutions to determine the extent to which librarians partici-
pated in a formal teaching program. Also attempted to discover actual status and benefits of librarians. Found the status of librarians to be ambiguous.

Reply to letter by Rose Sellers, "Statistics; The Earthy Approach." Trent says that faculty status for librarians rarely means much, and never will until librarians stop recruiting and admitting to library schools the misfits, the failures, and the incompetents.

News note stating that University of Idaho librarians were granted faculty status. Criteria for faculty rank included contribution to overall teaching and research, research productivity within the individual's area of competence, academic background, and administrative level and competence. Recommended that faculty status be related to individual's scholarly contribution rather than an administrative position.

Reviews the status of the librarian in each regional library association. Discovered that standards of all but one of the regional accrediting associations specify faculty status for the head librarian.

Discusses why relations between faculty and professors are strained. Attributed in part to the low status of the librarian.

Letter discussing the faculty status situation in New Jersey.

Author believes that academic status would do much to make library positions attractive, and would go a long way to enriching the intellectual content of the profession.

Reply to letter by Rose Sellers. Wallace states that administrators cannot understand what faculty status involves because librarians have not yet decided upon a definition.

In an attempt to answer some questions about faculty status, the article deals with naming personal qualities required for success in academic librarianship, professional training, and collegiate conditions. Librarians, to deserve increased status, must be educators of students in thought and action. Weber is at variance with the California Library Association's position on faculty status.

The justification for and the special nature of tenure for librarians is discussed. Reasonable grounds and procedures for dismissal are delineated. Although the formalities of faculty tenure work well for some libraries, a different program based on a sound pattern of appointments is described and considered preferable in other institutions. Tenure is not necessarily a component of faculty status, but can be attained on its own.

An anonymous reaction to R. Dean Galloway's article "The Quiet Revolution." Believes that the single factor against granting faculty status is the nonprofessional attitude of many librarians.

Not available for review.


By 1968, librarians at fifteen Canadian universities had been granted academic status. The desirability of this is outlined. There exists no evidence that academic status increases production of articles. For most university librarians, status represents a less than honest link with teachers and researchers.


Presents the results of a study to determine the extent to which Texas librarians have achieved academic status.


Wilkinson attacks Ellsworth Mason's editorial "A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty." States that Mason's contentions are misleading. Defends tenure and longer vacation periods as necessary elements of scholarly development. Believes that librarians who are truly professional do want not only the privileges of faculty status, they also desire the responsibilities.


Paper reports the results of a survey on fringe benefits provided by college and university libraries. Benefits treated are vacations, sick leave, faculty rank, salaries, sabbaticals, yearly increments, raises on merit, time off for funerals, voting, and jury duty.


Author promotes faculty status for librarians. Discusses the functions of both the teacher and the librarian. Librarian should have scholarly interests and tastes.


Author expresses the need for librarians to attain faculty status. States that salaries are far below those of professors, even though librarians often teach formally. Librarians should be granted professorial rank and corresponding salary. Wyer supports his arguments by stating that academic librarians must have much more educational training than was required in previous years. Faculty status would be a benefit for all concerned with the university.
LAURENCE MILLER

The Role of Circulation Services
In the Major University Library

A survey of 103 major academic libraries examined the professional/nonprofessional functions, staffing patterns, changes, and management attitudes towards circulation departments. Five tables present numerical data, and an extended summary discusses questions raised by conclusions from the data.

AUTOMATION WITHIN THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT of the major university library has received wide attention in recent years, as has the application of systems analysis to circulation routines. Yet concurrently, rationale governing the allocation of functions and staff to this area has received virtually no published attention. The library administrator looking for a body of accepted practice as a theoretical framework for planning finds that none exists. Although assumptions are commonly made about the role of circulation services and its changes over the past few decades, these assumptions often bear little relationship with current practice. The issue is a major one in view of the importance of circulation to the logistics of library operation, and because of the substantial staff commitment involved.

The present study was initiated to discover (1) the role of the circulation department in the major university library and the extent to which it has changed; (2) current staffing patterns and their relation to function; (3) the validity of some assumed factors as causal influences; and (4) management attitudes toward the role of this area.

Dr. Miller is director of library services, California State College, California, Pennsylvania.

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

An exhaustive survey of library literature since 1900 was first conducted to discover past and present attitudes toward circulation services. This was extended to the literature of library management and then to classical management theory, from which much library management theory is derived. In addition, a survey was conducted of circulation department function and staffing patterns in 126 university libraries, which ultimately led to an examination of the relationship between current function and staffing patterns with management attitudes toward these factors.

The professional literature during the past half century reveals no consensus on the role of the circulation department. The 1926 ALA Survey of Libraries in the United States reported a close relationship between the circulation and reference departments and noted that much circulation work concerned study and research functions. The 1933 Circulation Work in College and University Libraries by Brown and Bousfield, the classic and most comprehensive work to date on the circulation department, defined its role to include the technical function of collection control and circulation, as well as the location of information and material by individual
readers, library instruction, use of the card catalog, reader's advisory service, and instructional development. Donald Coney, however, in his review of this comprehensive view of the circulation department, stated that it was "founded on a definition that extends college circulation work beyond the limits usually understood," and noted the disparate skills required for book delivery as compared to instructional functions. Successive editions of standard library administration texts by Lyle and Wilson and Tauber reflect a narrowing of the circulation function, but do not indicate evolution to a completely technical status. The July 1957 issue of Library Trends served to emphasize the lack of consensus on the circulation function, whereas Wasserman and Bundy indicated that technical assistants frequently serve as library department heads, primarily in circulation.

Many detailed library position classifications have been developed. Although those preceding and including the 1947 statement of the ALA Board on Salaries, Staff, and Tenure did not embrace the comprehensive Brown and Bousfield concept of circulation work, they did recommend widespread employment of professionals in head and subordinate positions. Yet the 1948 ALA Descriptive List of Professional Duties in Libraries, concluded that "... registration and circulation is non-professional in nature, requiring first of all, familiarity with good clerical procedures"; the work would be conducted by clerical staffs in larger libraries with intermittent professional supervision. Current statements, although shifting substantially from the pre-1948 era, are not as detailed nor as influential as earlier pronouncements, nor do they relate function to staff.

In general, the library literature has reflected the classic management school (with early appreciation for the writings of Fayol). Such literature, together with general management publications, has emphasized the separation and rationalization of unrelated functions calling for different skills, and the grouping within departments and positions of functions homogeneous in nature and consistent in staff requirements. Writers such as Coney and Howard within librarianship, and within management, Fayol, Mooney and Reiley, and Ralph C. Davis, by implication argue for a department specializing in technical functions as a single-purpose organization.

The literature survey left unanswered the following questions: (1) What functions are most commonly allocated to the circulation department? (2) What is the level of staff commonly assigned? (3) Specifically, to what extent are professionals employed? (4) Do staffing patterns appear to be appropriately related to functions? (5) What is management's conception of the circulation department role? (6) What, if any, patterns emerge in comparing present functions in individual libraries and the use of computerized routines and/or systems analysis in the circulation department?

**Survey Methods**

To help answer these questions, a survey was made of 126 major university libraries, selected from those institutions in Earned Degrees Conferred graduating more than thirty Ph.D.'s per year. These libraries had an average of 1,173,203 volumes and served institutions with a mean of 15,903 students. Thus these libraries were presumably affording reasonably sophisticated information service combined with high circulation.

The questionnaire was highly structured, but with major provision for atypical responses. Of the 126 libraries included in the survey, replies were received from 114, a return of 91 percent. Of these, 11 were received from libraries with decentralized circulation ser-
TABLE 1
QUICK INFORMATION SERVICE AS A CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service rendered.</th>
<th>Group 1*</th>
<th>Group 2*</th>
<th>Group 3*</th>
<th>Group 4*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not provided from within the circulation department.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Service Provided:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queries requiring professional knowledge for solution referred elsewhere.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions requiring extended time referred elsewhere.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only directional and incidental queries handled.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Group 1—libraries of less than 500,000 volumes; Group 2—500,000-999,999 volumes; Group 3—1,000,000-1,999,999; Group 4—2,000,000 volumes and over.

Service, which were eliminated from the study. Returns were analyzed in four distinct categories in order to examine the effect of size on selected variables. The four categories were the following:

Group 1. Libraries of less than 500,000 volumes ............... N = 25.
Group 2. Over 500,000 but less than one million ............... N = 42.
Group 3. One million but less than two million ............... N = 30.
Group 4. Over two million volumes .......................... N = 17.
The choice was an arbitrary one, but provided sufficient 'N's in each category to yield meaningful tabulations.

FUNCTION

The presence or absence of various functions was studied, and, at the same time, the depth of departmental participation and responsibility was examined.

1. Reserve Books. The majority of libraries allocated some degree of responsibility for the reserve function to circulation, particularly in Group 1 libraries. Only in the largest libraries were reserves generally administered separately. If the department were accorded some role, it was usually given primary responsibility.

Most reader service functions were formerly offered directly from the circulation desk. The present study shows that half of the Group 1 libraries offered reserve service from the circulation desk. This percentage uniformly decreased as the size of the library increased.

2. In-depth and/or Quick Information Service. As expected, only four libraries offered in-depth information service from circulation. On the other hand, ninety-one respondents (89 percent) indicated that they provided one of three categories of "quick information service" from the circulation desk. (See Table 1.)

Of ninety-one circulation departments offering in-depth information, or quick information service, 88 percent indicated that directional and incidental queries were the only ones handled. It is evident that although the circulation desk is still a source of information service in most libraries, it is limited to handling largely ephemeral requests.

3. Interlibrary Loan. Many libraries (61 percent) have allocated the interlibrary loan function outside the circulation department. However, no clear pattern exists by size of library. Of those exercising some responsibility in this area, almost half provided this service from the circulation desk and 62 percent made the department administra-
tively responsible for this function.

4. Library Instruction. Only about a third of the libraries entrusted to the circulation department some responsibility for library instruction or orientation. When such responsibility was present, with two exceptions it was in a supportive rather than in a primary role.

5. Reader Assistance. Forty of the 103 libraries considered the assistance to readers in the use of the card catalog to be a function of the circulation department. In three cases the role was a primary one, and in the case of an additional three, the function was shared equally with the reference department. In all but four cases, this activity was performed from the circulation desk.

6. Inventory. Many circulation departments (61 percent) were entrusted with some degree of responsibility for inventory.

7. Book Selection. A traditional role of the comprehensive circulation department was book selection. The rationale was that circulation personnel had the most direct contacts with the user community and therefore were in the best position to judge requirements. Some degree of activity in this area was retained by just over half of the libraries. Of these, roughly two-thirds shared this responsibility with all or virtually all departments.

8. Shelving. Shelving and stack maintenance was a function of 85 percent of the circulation departments: 78 of 85 libraries indicated that circulation superintended this activity.

9. Policy Formation. To determine the degree of responsibility for formulation of circulation policy, a range of four responses was provided. In 81 libraries (79 percent), one, or a combination of both of the following statements describes the heavy responsibility that the department bears in policy formation: “Chief of circulation services recommends policies to immediate superior for review and adoption; Chief of Circulation Department participates in committee with representatives of other departments et al in policy formation.” This role might either reflect the widespread presence of professionals, or explain their placement in the circulation department.

To summarize, the average circulation department included in this study would have primary responsibility for reserve books, although they would be circulated from a location separate from the circulation desk; would handle directional and incidental information queries but give no in-depth reference service; and would have primary responsibility for inventory of the book collection, shelving, and stack maintenance. It would play a major role in the development of circulation policy. On the other hand, it would have no responsibility for interlibrary loan, library instruction/orientation, assistance to readers at the card catalog, or in book selection other than that granted to other departments.

Professional and Nonprofessional Functions

Not only is it important to determine what functions still rest with the circulation department, but also to establish the degree to which they are professional. The following functions are assumed to be essentially professional: in-depth reference service; quick information service where the only questions referred elsewhere are those requiring extended time to answer; primary responsibility for interlibrary loan; a primary role in instruction and/or orientation in the use of the library; assisting readers in the use of the card catalog where the department has a major role or shares this equally with reference; book selection; and participation in policy formation.

Subprofessional or clerical functions include:
TABLE 2
PATTERNS IN TWO TYPES OF PROFESSIONAL FUNCTIONS IN CIRCULATION SERVICES:
AN ANALYSIS BY SIZE OF LIBRARY (N = 100*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Professional Functions Present</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Library Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requiring Special Assignment of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Personnel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Professional Functions Present</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Including Above)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three respondents did not provide sufficient information to be included in this analysis.

1. Reserve books (any degree of involvement)
2. Quick information service where queries requiring professional knowledge are referred elsewhere, or where directional and incidental queries (such as those involving library rules) are the only ones handled
3. Supportive work with interlibrary loans
4. Supportive work in library instruction where primary responsibility lies elsewhere and other professional personnel are available to work with subprofessionals within the department
5. Inventory work
6. Shelving and stack maintenance

Professional functions were further distinguished between (a) those that would probably be performed within the circulation department primarily because a professional was already available there, and (b) those that would justify the special assignment of professional staff to this department.

In the first category were placed:
1. Quick information service where only questions requiring extended time to answer are referred elsewhere.
2. Book selection where professionals of all departments participate equally (except for greater participation by acquisitions and reference).
3. Policy formation.

In the second category were placed:
1. In-depth information service.
2. Primary responsibility for interlibrary loans.
3. Primary responsibility for library instruction and/or orientation.

Where professional functions required specific professional staff assignment, only thirty (30 percent) of the circulation departments undertook even one of the prescribed services. Of this number, twenty-seven undertook only one service. A significant aspect of this functional pattern is that the average circulation department in the major university library undertakes no functions requiring the specific assignment of professional personnel. (See Table 2.)

Considering all functions requiring professional personnel, 48 percent of the departments embraced only one such activity—that of policy formation. In addition, 30 percent of the departments embraced two, and 18 percent undertook three. As Mooney and Reiley imply in their Principle of Functionalism,
policy-making is easily separable from other aspects of circulation work and need not be performed within the department.\(^9\)

**STAFFING PATTERNS**

The purpose of the staff section of this study was to determine (1) the number and level of staff assigned to circulation services, and (2) the relationship of staff assignments to functions allocated in this area.

1. **General Staff Levels.** Of the 75 libraries providing complete responses, 58 had circulation departments headed by individuals with the master's degree or higher. Of these, 47 possessed the master's degree in library science. Supportive staff ranged from those possessing the doctorate (one case) to those with no formal preparation. The over-all percentage of professionals with either a master's degree in library science or a higher degree in relation to all circulation staff averaged about 13 percent with only slight variations by library size.

2. **Specialized Subordinate Levels.** With regard to specialized subordinate positions within the department, of the 103 libraries with centralized circulation departments, 61 had the specialized position of assistant or associate director of circulation services. Most frequently, the position was occupied by a technical assistant, as in 27 of the libraries with this position. In addition, one incumbent held the doctorate and 25 held the master's in library science.

The circulation departments of 27 libraries maintained the position of interlibrary loan librarian. In 59 percent of these libraries, the occupant held the master's degree in library science. Other staff consisted of four subject-field master's holders, nineteen technical assistants, and thirty-two clerks.

Forty libraries reported a subdepartment for reserves within circulation services. The 37 libraries reporting staff composition employed 11 professional librarians (master's in library science), supplemented by a total of 49 technical assistants and 87 clerks.

3. **Staffing and Function.** One of the most significant aspects of the study was the extent to which the presence of high-level staff coincided with high-level professional functions. Of 17 circulation departments employing four or more professionals in their staff, seven have no professional function requiring assignment of professionals; six embrace only one professional function of any kind—that of policy formation. Of 43 departments employing two or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SF**</th>
<th>GF***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Professional in Department</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Professionals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Professionals</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or More Professionals</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Professionals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Seventeen responses insufficiently complete for inclusion.
* **Special Function**—according to the criteria described above, these are the functions that specifically would in themselves justify and require the special assignment of professionals to the department.
* ***General professional function. Although professional in nature, they are more incidental then integral to the department function and would often be assigned to the department only because professionals were available there. They would not in themselves normally justify the special assignment of professional personnel to the circulation department.
more professionals, 19 have been allocated only a single professional function of any description, and 25 have no functions specifically requiring the assignment of professionals. (See Table 3.)

Apparently, a substantial number of professional staff are being employed in less than professional work, particularly where multiple professionals are employed in the absence of any professional functions justifying their assignment.

CAUSES FOR CHANGE

Many casual assumptions are made for the evolution of circulation services. Undoubtedly, increases in the volume of circulation and greater sophistication in the information service rendered by libraries in this group are major factors. Such pressures have made rationalization of functions formerly grouped around the circulation desk essential. At the same time, these pressures are said to have prompted other phenomena: the introduction of automation and systems analysis, larger and more functional buildings, open stacks—thus giving the reader the opportunity of bypassing the circulation desk in his search for information, and the rise of the reader service division, which collectively embraces the functions originally grouped around the circulation desk.

Systems analysis in particular, preceding automation in this area, is said to have prompted review of departmental objectives and reallocation of functions. Sixty-four libraries had undertaken some form of computerization and 31 had extended this to the circulation department. Forty-one libraries had undertaken some form of systems analysis, 8 had extended this to reader services as a whole, and 40 had included circulation. Yet surprisingly, 13 libraries reported that “as a result of computerization of routines, and/or systems analysis . . . the range of functions allocated to the circulation department has been broadened.” Two indicated that their scope had been narrowed, whereas in 43 libraries, the range had remained the same. Four libraries reported increases in the number of professionals, 6 reported reductions, and 47 institutions reported that the number of professionals had remained the same.

Architectural influences impose little or no restraint in the rationalization of circulation functions. Asked whether the scope of functions embraced in circulation would be diminished, increased, or remain the same were it not for architectural limitations, 2 reported the range would be diminished, 12 indicated that the scope would be increased, whereas the majority (87 percent) reported that the scope would be substantially the same. This may be partially explained by the fact that 83 libraries have either occupied new buildings or have undergone refurbishing with repositioning of the circulation department.

There is no substantial difference in the number of professional functions assigned to closed and open stack libraries. The same may be said of departments within and outside of reader service divisions.

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES

The final section of the study surveyed management attitudes toward the role of circulation services for which there exists a substantial community of thought. Fifty-seven percent indicated that although the circulation department is service-oriented, it is primarily concerned with technical functions; and that virtually all information service queries, other than those involving directional and other information of similar complexity, should be referred elsewhere. A more detailed breakdown is given in Table 4, and an analysis of at-
TABLE 4

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD INFORMATION SERVICE PROVIDED IN THE CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT (N = 102)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A A service department in which the principal objectives embrace both technical functions and information service.

B A service department in which the technical functions are of primary importance. It also, however, has a significant information service role although in-depth queries are usually referred elsewhere.

C The same as above, only the information service function although recognized is more incidental than described in the preceding option.

D Although service oriented, this department is primarily concerned with technical functions. Virtually all queries, other than those involving directional and other information of similar complexity, are referred elsewhere.

Attitudes toward specific functions is given in Table 5. Administrators responding to this study were generally opposed to including interlibrary loan, library instruction/orientation, assistance to readers at the card catalog, and any special role in book selection within the circulation department. They favored including the reserve function and inventory. There was no major difference in attitude between libraries in which the circulation department had or had not been subjected to systems analysis. Thus, library administrators at the present time are clearly in favor of a restricted and largely technical role for the circulation department. In general their preference is parallel to and often stronger than the organizational reality in the libraries they administer.

SUMMARY

This study confirms that the circulation department has evolved into a unit primarily concerned with the technical functions of physical dissemination and control of library collections. Despite the lack of functions requiring the specific assignment of professional librarians, such personnel are still widely employed in this area.

The widespread use of professional librarians in circulation work poses questions for the profession as well as for the individual library. The results of the study appear to leave only the following open as possible justification for such assignment: (1) the departmental role in policy-making, (2) the planning of routines and automation, and (3) supervisory reasons. Regarding the first, the importance of circulation policy far transcends both the department and often the library itself, and it is arguable that the formulation of such policy ought also to transcend the

TABLE 5

MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE APPROPRIATENESS OF INCLUDING VARIOUS FUNCTIONS WITHIN CIRCULATION SERVICES (N = 103)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve books</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library instruction/orientation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance of readers at the</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>card catalog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking of inventory</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special role in book selection</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
department and its myriad technical considerations. There is, in fact, no reason why such policy should originate within the circulation department. The planning of routines constitutes at best a temporary need and, once again, can be separated from the department with appropriate communication and consultation. Supervisory reasons, however, give rise to the most debate.

Some intermittent supervision is required for nonprofessionals engaged in circulation work. Yet these questions can still be raised: Can this just as readily be provided from outside the department through direct relationship with the director of reader services, assistant/associate director, or other general supervisory position? If a professional is assigned to this department on a full-time basis, will most of the work engaged in be professional in nature? If this is initially the case, will the individual continue to function on a professional level over a period of years? In the absence of professional functions requiring specific assignment, is professional supportive staff ever justified? Given well-codified circulation policy and written manuals of procedure, are the supervisory skills required more likely to be found in a professional librarian than in an intelligent subprofessional with organizational ability? These decisions must rest with the individual library, but they demand consideration.

No longer, of course, is there a question of professionals being unavailable. Williams, writing in 1945, expressed fear that the use of professionals far less than professional work, quite aside from availability, tarnished the concept of librarians as professionals. It created a "vicious circle or descending spiral" in which low grade work discouraged the recruitment of quality manpower which, in turn, helped to insure continued low-grade work and low wages. Librarianship as a profession is probably better off today in most respects than in 1945, but the concern is still a highly legitimate one, particularly when employment in highly visible positions is involved.
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Academic Status: Who Wants It?

A survey conducted among academic librarians to determine their reaction to the concept of faculty status as expressed by the ACRL Standards showed a general endorsement of these standards by those librarians with advanced educational training, with ALA/ACRL membership, and with experience in public or administrative service.

Academic Status for College and University Librarians has been and continues to be an issue of great concern. This concern was expressed recently by the membership of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) at the 1971 annual convention of the American Library Association. At that meeting the set of Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians, which had been proposed in 1969 by the Committee on Academic Status of ACRL, was modified and approved by the membership of the national association.

To implement these Standards, ACRL has pledged to

Investigate all violations of these standards which are reported by members of the Association of College and Research Libraries [and to] invoke the following sanctions against institutions of higher education which are found, after such investigation, to be in violation of any or all of these standards:

a. Publicize the violation and the institution concerned in CRL News and other appropriate publications.

b. Refuse to accept advertisements in any ALA publication for positions at that institution.

c. Discourage its members from accepting employment at that institution, through notices in its publication and other means.

Since ACRL is proposing to represent academic librarians, it should be determined whether academic librarians not only support the concept of faculty status but agree on the rights, privileges, and responsibilities which should accompany such status. Prior to the June convention, the Proposed Standards for Faculty Status, as drawn up by the ad hoc Committee on Academic Status, were published in College and Research Libraries News and opinions were solicited from the membership. Although arguments pro and con were received and published in subsequent issues of the journal, most represented the views of library or department heads. Similarly, E. J. Josey's study of New York academic librarians' reactions to the Proposed Standards was restricted to administrators of public contact departments. It cannot be assumed that library heads are speaking for their staff members in urging extension of academic status. Rank-and-file as well as administrative librarians in all departments of the library would be affected by changes in university policies resulting from implementation of the Stan-
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standards, their attitudes should also be known and considered.

In order to determine the reaction of all types of academic librarians to the specific provisions of the adopted Standards, a questionnaire was sent in March 1972 to a sample of full-time professional librarians working in private and public institutions of higher learning in southern California. For the purposes of the study “academic” and “faculty” status were used as synonymous terms and both were defined in terms of the Standards adopted by the ACRL.

**Population and Sample**

The population for the study consisted of the full-time professional members of the library staffs of all private and public junior colleges, colleges, and universities in the ten counties of southern California, as listed in the 1969–70 edition of the Accredited Institutions of Higher Education. All types of professional positions and all ranks of the library hierarchy were represented. Professional librarians were defined as:

... employees doing work that requires training and skill in the theoretical or scientific aspects of library work, as distinct from its mechanical aspect.

From this population a stratified random sample of professional librarians employed in various types of academic institutions was selected. All 100 libraries were stratified according to the highest degree granted by their institution (A.A., B.A., M.A., and Ph.D.) and a random sample of 30 academic institutions was chosen. The names of all full-time professional librarians were then requested from the directors of their respective libraries. Twenty-eight academic libraries responded and 216 full-time professional librarians in these libraries were sent a survey questionnaire. A follow-up letter and another copy of the questionnaire were mailed two weeks later to those individuals who did not respond to the initial letter. Approximately 81 percent (174 librarians) returned usable questionnaires.

**Questionnaire**

The first part of the questionnaire measured the librarians’ attitudes toward academic status. Respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point rating scale (ranging from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”) their reactions to twelve statements taken from the adopted Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (nos. 1–12) and to four statements (nos. 13–16) designed to identify the librarians’ opinions on academic status in general (see Table 2).

The second part of the questionnaire identified personal, educational, occupational, and associational characteristics of the sample librarians to be used in analyzing their attitudinal responses (see Table 1).

**Findings**

**Demographic data.** It was found that, in general, the respondents were female (57 percent), nearing middle age (the median was just over forty years), married (57 percent), and had earned as their highest degree the first professional degree in librarianship (56 percent). Most were currently employed in public service positions (50 percent), had some formal administrative rank (nearly 70 percent), and had worked in that position less than five years (58 percent). Although over half of the southern California librarians belonged to their state professional association, only one-third were members of ACRL or ALA.

**Interest in academic status.** Overall, a high level of support was found both for the concept of academic status for librarians and for the specific rights, privileges, and responsibilities spelled
TABLE 1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA PARTICIPANTS
N = 174

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic data</th>
<th>So. Calif. librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 or older</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (widowed/divorced/separated)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree received</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a master's</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject master's only</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's or Master's in L.S.</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject master's + Master's or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's in L.S.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/6th year Master's/Ph.D.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCCUPATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of library work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in library hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief librarian or director</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/assistant librarian</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department or division head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including head of college, school, or departmental library)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional assistant</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in present job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSOCIATIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association membership*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State professional society</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association/ Association of College and Research Libraries</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of University Professors</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not total 100 percent because respondents could belong to more than one professional association.

out in the Standards. The range of agreement for the sixteen statements representing these ideas was from 62 to 97 percent, as shown in Table 2. Great-
## TABLE 2

**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS’ ATTITUDE TOWARD ACADEMIC STATUS**

*N = 174*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Each librarian should be assigned general responsibilities within his particular area of competence. He should have maximum possible latitude in fulfilling these responsibilities.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The salary scale for librarians should be the same as that for other academic categories with equivalent education and experience.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Librarians should have access to funding for research projects on the same basis as other faculty.</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Librarians in colleges and universities must have the protection of academic freedom. Library resources and the professional judgment of librarians must not be subject to censorship.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians on the same basis, and with the same requirements as they are available to other faculty.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Librarians should be covered by tenure provisions the same as those of other faculty. In the pretenure period, librarians should be covered by written contracts or agreements the same as those of other faculty.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Librarians should be eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent body at their college or university on the same basis as other faculty.</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Librarians should be promoted through ranks and steps on the basis of their academic proficiency and professional effectiveness, by means of a peer review system similar to that used by other faculty.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Librarians should normally be appointed for the academic year. If a librarian is expected to work through the summer session, his salary scale should be adjusted similarly to the summer session of other faculty at this college or university.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Complete equality with faculty is a desirable goal for all professional librarians working in college and university libraries.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There are significant disadvantages to librarians who work in universities or colleges that do not grant faculty status to their professional librarians.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. College and university libraries should adopt an academic form of governance. The librarians should form as a library faculty whose role and authority is similar to that of the faculties of a college, or of a school or department.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The degree to which he has fulfilled his responsibilities should be regularly and rigorously reviewed by appraisal by a committee of peers who have access to all available evidence.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A major portion of your work time and energy is devoted to activities that should be considered as teaching through either direct or indirect contact with students.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The prestige of professional librarians would not be especially enhanced if college and university librarians were accepted in all respects as co-equal with faculty members.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The librarian’s promotion ladder should have the same title, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
variable), a step-wise multiple regression analysis was run on the four statements (nos. 9, 14, 16, 2) which showed the least agreement (see Table 3).

At the .05 level two factors, age and professional association membership, entered as significant variates in the regression equation for equal titles and ranks for faculty and librarians (no. 9). Younger respondents were more likely to reject the concept of equal titles for librarians and faculty than were older participants. Also, respondents who did not belong to the ALA/ACRL were less likely to agree that "the librarian's promotion ladder should have the same titles, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty" than were members of the organizations.

Several variates (age, educational level, and type of library job held) correlated significantly with the librarians' reaction to the idea that "the prestige of professional librarians would not be especially enhanced if . . . librarians were accepted in all respects as coequals with faculty members (no. 14)." Younger librarians were more likely than older respondents to agree with the above statement. In addition, the less educated the respondents, the less likely they were to feel that faculty status could enhance the prestige of academic librarians. The same view was shared by technical services librarians, who were more likely than public services or administrative librarians to feel that faculty status would not result in a better image of academic librarians.

The type of job the surveyed librarians held and the number of years they had worked in that position significantly related to their view of the way academic librarians function. When all other factors were held constant, technical services librarians were less likely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #2**</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>4.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Level</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Assoc. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #16</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>4.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>6.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Assoc. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #14</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>8.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>3.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Assoc. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement #9</th>
<th>Multiple Correlation Coefficient</th>
<th>F-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression coefficient</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>2.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>7.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ. Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Assoc. Membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at the $\alpha = .05$ level or better.
** See Table 2 for specific wording of statements.
to support the view that academic librarians function as teachers (no. 16) than were public services or administrative library employees. In addition, the less time librarians had held their present jobs, the less they supported the idea that librarians operate as teachers.

Age, sex, and educational level proved to be significant predictors of those librarians who opposed the use of peer groups to appraise librarians' performance (no. 2). Females were more likely to oppose peer appraisal than were younger librarians. Those librarians who did not support peer evaluation of work performance could also be identified by educational level. The more advanced the degree earned, the more likely the librarian was to oppose evaluation by a peer group.

**SUMMARY**

Southern California academic librarians generally support both the concept of academic status and the Standards which have been adopted by the ACRL to achieve such status. Statements dealing with specific rights and privileges, however, were more enthusiastically approved than those presenting the philosophy and concepts of academic status. Even the controversial proposal of peer evaluation received greater support from the surveyed librarians than the view that librarians operate as teachers.

Certain factors related significantly to the librarians' views on selected aspects of academic status.

**Age:** While older librarians were more likely than their younger colleagues to advocate faculty titles for librarians and to claim that faculty status would enhance their prestige, they were more likely to oppose the idea of peer appraisal of their work performance.

**Sex:** Females were more likely to oppose the idea of peer evaluation than were male librarians.

**Educational level:** The more advanced the librarians' educational background, the more likely they were to support the importance of acceptance as equals with faculty members and the less likely they were to agree to the idea of peer appraisal.

**Library position:** Public services and administrative librarians were more likely than technical services librarians to feel that faculty status would enhance the librarians' prestige and to agree that librarians function as teachers.

**Years in position:** The longer librarians had held their present jobs, the more likely they were to support the view of librarians as teachers.

**Professional association membership:** Members of ALA/ACRL were more likely than nonmembers to agree that librarians should have the same rank and titles as faculty.

Thus, sampled librarians who were older, had advanced educational training, worked for an extended period of time in public service or administrative capacities and belonged to ALA/ACRL were more likely to support faculty status than those who did not share these characteristics. Interestingly, however, many of these same librarians did not support one practice of the Standards: peer evaluation of work performance. In particular, older female librarians with advanced educational training were less likely to support this practice than librarians who did not share these characteristics.

In general, however, the support the ACRL would need to continue its push for faculty status is definitely present among southern California librarians. Since these librarians are demographically similar to librarians located in other areas, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the findings in this study would hold true not only for southern California librarians, but for academic librarians in other geographical locations throughout the country.8
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To the Editor:

In letters to the editors of Library Journal and several other library periodicals over the past few years, I have expressed considerable scepticism about the advisability of recruiting unemployed college teachers for library work. W. A. Moffett's "Academic Job Crisis" (CRL, May 1973), offers a much more viable approach than the proposals that drew my criticism.

There are grave dangers, as Moffett perceives. People may enter the field with a view to exploiting their positions, i.e., using work time for their research. Even worse is the prospect of seeing many male Ph.D.'s obtaining excellent positions at the expense of women who have been in the library field for years. If subject specialists are willing to remain specialists, well and good. However, if Ph.D.'s with a year or two of library experience successfully demand preference for administrative positions solely on the basis of their advanced degrees, grave inequities can occur.

Moffett is surely right when he suggests a recruiting program would be necessary to attract Ph.D.'s to the library field. I am at the dissertation stage of a doctorate in political science. Colleagues in political science assume, until I tell them otherwise, that I shall seek a teaching position immediately upon finishing my degree. I suspect my experience can be projected upon people in other academic fields.

It is not altogether clear from Moffett's article whether he feels the subject specialist must always get an M.L.S. or not. I gather that he does. I concur with this. I strongly oppose any effort to make entrance into the library field too easy for subject specialists. Many Ph.D.'s take post doctoral studies anyway. Therefore, those who wish to become librarians can hardly object to fulfilling some additional requirements (another degree).

There are some disturbing statements in Moffett's essay. He seems to be saying there will have to be changes in the library school curriculum to accommodate subject Ph.D.'s. I do not follow this reasoning. The M.L.S. is designed to train students to be librarians. Why would it be necessary to modify programs for the benefit of a certain group of people who wish to enter the profession? Moffett also mentions the "availability of loans and scholarships." While I think recruiting a few former or would-be college teachers for specialized positions would be desirable, provided certain safeguards are established, I am less happy about the prospects for special financial support. If a particular graduate school of library service has lavish funds for minority or other group programs, it might consider making available a few scholarships to Ph.D.'s.

In summation, I believe Moffett's proposals are on the whole well taken. Great caution will be needed to ensure that people already in library work are not disadvantaged by the recruitment of Ph.D.'s. An alternative approach, that of providing financial assistance and time off to librarians who have long wanted to pursue graduate studies in subject fields, should not be ignored. Finally, librarians should not compromise on the matter of the library degree. If anyone is to be a librarian, he or she should have an M.L.S. Moffett makes much of using subject specialists to bridge gaps between librarians and professors. While academic librarians all wish to eliminate these gaps, we must ensure that the subject specialist has had a background at least partly in common with his or her colleagues in other departments of the library such as serials, government documents, and reference. In other words, the specialist should have had the full course of library instruction.

Benjamin R. Beede
Assistant Law Librarian
School of Law Library, Camden
Rutgers—The State University
Camden, New Jersey

To the Editor:

Although I have always subscribed to CRL, I have never joined ALA simply because as an academic librarian I felt that ALA simply did not provide anything for
us. I am happy to see that your editorial backs up my feelings.
I agree completely that it is time for an alternative and the AAL sounds like a great idea.

Richard J. M. Parker
Librarian, Chemistry Library
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

To the Editor:

Professor Jack A. Clarke in the May 1973 issue of CRL discussed the problems involved in preserving popular culture sources in libraries. He touched upon special archival collections, colleges, and universities which offer courses in popular culture, the complexity of the subject and the need for adequate organization of ephemeral material. For the purpose of the article he defined popular culture "as that part of culture abstracted from the total body of intellectual and imaginative work which each generation receives, which is not narrowly elitist or aimed at special audiences, and which is generally (but not necessarily) disseminated via the mass media." 1 He continued to say that it includes the subdivisions of popular, mass, and folk culture.

As the authors of this letter are respectively a folklorist and a librarian, we thought it necessary to present folk culture as a discipline in itself and not merely as a "subdivision" of popular culture. "... folk culture and popular culture are mutually influential, although certainly two different levels of culture. ..." 2 Defining the term folk culture for years has been a point of contention among folklorists. Folklore is usually thought of in terms of oral tradition, whereas customs and material culture may also be included under the rubric of folk culture. The sources needed for the study of this discipline are as varied as those necessary for studying popular culture. Photographs, maps, diaries, recipes, cookbooks, dress patterns, song books, autograph albums, and technical journals are just a sampling of the material used by the folklorist.

The lack of adequate bibliographical references are again a problem. Charles Haywood's Bibliography of North American Folklore is the only cumulative bibliography on the subject. The American Folklore Society publishes Abstracts of Folklore Studies which attempts to keep abreast of the latest studies, and Southern Folklore Quarterly publishes a bibliography annually.

There are archives located around the country which serve as repositories for material pertaining to folk culture. Among these there are the Georgia Folklore Archives, the Institute of Ethnomusicology and the Center for the Study of Comparative Folklore and Mythology located at the University of California—Los Angeles, the University of Pennsylvania, and Indiana University. Especially strong in traditional material culture is the Cooperstown Archive at the New York State Historical Association.

During the last few years there has been an increase of interest in the study of folklore, and colleges and universities throughout the country responded by offering related courses in their curricula. According to a survey conducted in 1968, 170 institutions offer folklore courses. 3 Indiana University, UCLA, the University of North Carolina, and the University of Pennsylvania grant M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in folklore. In 1964 the New York State Historical Association and the State University College at Oneonta began an M.A. program leading to a degree in American Folk Culture. The resources of Cooperstown—the Farmer's Museum, and the Fenimore House—provide an excellent training ground for the study of material culture.

The Journal of American Folklore is the primary scholarly periodical in the field of American folklore. However the Journal of the Folklore Institute published by Indiana University, Keystone Folklore Quarterly, and Western Folklore also exemplify a more scholarly approach. In contrast to these journals there are local periodicals which emphasize folk culture peculiar to their region. New York Folklore Quarterly, Pennsylvania Folklife, and the Journal of the Ohio Folklore Society are examples of periodicals in this category.

We believe that folk culture is an autonomous discipline and that there is a need for greater recognition of this discipline in our libraries. If college and university librarians are cognizant of the types of sources needed for preservation, our folk
culture can be studied more completely by present and future folklorists.
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Kenneth and Sandra Roff
Brooklyn, New York

To the Editor:

I was interested in Mr. Goyal’s article on the allocation of library funds in your May issue. Unfortunately I feel that he has missed the main criteria by which library funds ought to be allocated, and one doubts the practicality in these interdisciplinary days of allocating funds to departments at all.

The important things which Mr. Goyal has ignored are the library intensiveness of different subjects, the number of books published in each subject field, the state of the stock on the library shelves, the various problems of keeping material up to date, the development of new modules within courses, and revision of course structures. It is things like this which are relevant to library expenditure as opposed to Mr. Goyal’s conceptions of the importance that society or universities attach to the work of a department.

I feel that his article would have been more useful if it had tackled realistic library problems rather than sociological imponderables.

K. G. E. Harris, Librarian
Newcastle upon Tyne Polytechnic
Newcastle upon Tyne, England

To the Editor:

Upon re-reading the McAnally and Downs piece in the March 1973 issue of CRL, I am compelled to offer the following observations as an addition to the commentaries already made with respect to that article:

The paper was apparently written on the premise that a “stable” directorship is somehow a good or desirable phenomenon. The authors commence by observing that “traditionally the directorship of a major university library has been a life-time post,” then lament that in the 1960s “all was not well in the library directors’ world” with the “seriousness of the situation” becoming pointed in 1971-72 when seven directors of Big Ten university libraries left their positions, “only one a normal retirement for age.” I submit that there is little, if any, evidence to suggest that longevity in office is prima facie beneficial to anyone except, perhaps, the incumbent; and, in fact there is evidence to suggest that it is not.

Among the “solutions” aired in this rather lengthy apology for librarians’ failure to compete and adapt on the campuses, is that of somehow elevating the status of the director. Among the suggestions for “restoring confidence and credibility in the director” are “establishing an effective working relationship with the administrative officers . . . , providing a framework in which the director can operate effectively within the university’s power structure” (Buckman), or that the director “be made a vice-president” (Booz, Allen, & Hamilton). The big question that remains, of course, is: who is going to do the establishing, the providing, and the making? I venture to say that it will be neither those librarians who have thus far failed to compete and adapt nor university administrators who have succeeded in competing and adapting. My bets go with those without a prime concern for longevity and who are adept at negotiating in what have become very unstable milieus.

Edward S. Warner
Director of Libraries
The University of North Dakota
Grand Forks, North Dakota

To the Editor:

Ms. Terwilliger, the reviewer of my book
"Information and Library Science Source Book" (CRL, July 1973) states: "Both the author's preface and the publisher's releases stipulate that the items summarized range from mid-1964 through 1969, which of necessity restricts information in the items themselves to early in the year of 1969, allowing for preparation and publication." This is not "necessarily" so. Her statement is an assumption—not a fact. The word "through" means "from beginning to end." And that is exactly what my research covered. The standard indexing and abstracting journals in the library and information field and in other disciplines were searched by me through 1970 for the specific purpose of locating 1969 articles, books, and reports that were not included in the indexing and abstracting services for 1969. Had Ms. Terwilliger carefully examined the references in my book, she would have found a large percentage of items published in 1969 covering the entire year.

But, the statement that disqualifies Ms. Terwilliger as a reliable reviewer is found in the second paragraph of her review. She states that I failed to include a significant article on the Colorado Academic Libraries Book Processing Center which appeared in the Winter 1969 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services. I refer Ms. Terwilliger to page 125 of my book where the article is listed under R. M. Dougherty who was the editor of that 3-part study. The full study which was published in book form by Scarecrow Press in 1969 is also included in my book on p.167 where it is listed under the senior author, L. E. Leonard.

Gertrude Schutze
Woodhaven, New York

Mr. Carpenter was a fine student, and I am pleased to have it become known that his school is Wisconsin-Madison. However, one point he makes is not grounded in fact, in my opinion. I do not think that many library school administrators are deceived by vacancy listings in the library press or elsewhere. All the library school educators that I know are very aware of the tight job market for beginning librarians. And yet, few of them think that educational opportunity (or the supply of new professional talent) should be (or indeed can be) turned off and on like a spigot. While I am not certain of the wisdom of our approach of holding the line on enrollment size while seeking to educate librarians that can respond to both continuing and developing needs of the profession, I take comfort in one fact. Had our school imposed some of the limitations that Mr. Carpenter advises, he might still be an English Ph.D. student facing unemployment and Lockwood Memorial Library might have been denied a fine librarian.

Charles A. Bunge
Director, Library School
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

I have finally got to reading through the July issue of CRL, noting the editorial exhorting us to more research and thinking to myself, "What kind of research, on what, what for? can it be that research exists as a thing unto itself which should be done for its own sake?" I read on and came to what I take to be a piece of research, "Search Versus Experiment—The Role of the Research Librarian," by Albert H. Rubenstein, David J. Werner, Gustave Rath, John A. Kernaghan, and Robert D. O'Keefe. And I thought to myself that we do not need more research at all, not if it is to be trivial and repetitious research of this kind. If Mrs. A. could have found Dr. B.'s answer in 11 minutes she or her ilk could have told Rubenstein, Werner, Rath, Kernaghan, and O'Keefe what their answer would be in as short a time without calling anyone up. That is nothing I intuited or suppose that medical librarians intuit, it is one of the things you find out soon enough.

To the Editor:

While Eric J. Carpenter did not identify the school of which he wrote in his letter in the July issue, an error of fact should be corrected. He writes, "Enrollment at my own library school rose 30 percent the year that I began my studies there." This is not correct. Aside from relatively small fluctuations, caused by the difficulty of predicting how many admitted students will actually show up, the Library School here at Madison has had a quite stable enrollment for the past few years.

To the Editor:
working in academic and, I suppose, medical libraries. It has a good bit more to do with the personal doubts, fears, insecurities, and even shame of potential clients and librarians as well. Some years ago when I was working in a large university library I noticed that it was not the older and thoroughly scholarly teachers who hesitated to ask questions—indeed some of them did ask questions and they were terribly difficult ones. When a real scholar has exhausted his or her resources then one has a problem at hand. It was the younger ones, from middle age on down who seemed to be less and less competent as they were younger and younger who were reluctant to approach a reference librarian (I have toyed from time to time with the idea of changing my title to research librarian, but it seems such proud foolishness). From time to time they do and find out that someone like Mrs. A. can find the answer in 11 minutes and they are embarrassed and ashamed and all the less likely to ever ask Mrs. A. anything again except something that will degrade her as she degraded them. Supposed researchers and professors are often proud and not particularly bright. As Pierre van den Berghe noted in Academic Gamesmanship (London, New York, Toronto, Abelard-Schuman) academics do not tend to be much more or less intelligent than the general populace (nor do librarians). But they do tend to be more anxious about their status than much of the general population, as I hope to show more fully in something I intend to use scholarship as a profession completely out of touch with its own traditions and for that and other reasons in the last stages of degeneration. In any event we have a good many putative scholars and researchers and practitioners within various professions who cannot, indeed, find anything. In addition we have a good many "trained" and "qualified" librarians who can't find much either and whom the doubtful researchers have little cause to trust (what true scholar does let anyone else do his or her research anyway)?

It makes one's stomach churn to see a supposedly well-trained and qualified librarian stopped dead by a question, to see him or her waver, blither and dither, and begin running around in circles making excuses all the while and far too busily engaged in that to find anything, and yet the sight is not uncommon. Thomas Yen-Ran Yeh, in "Library Peer Evaluation for Promotion and Merit Increase: How It Works" (i.e., where he is) in the same issue of CRL assumes that the women in the library are "less prepared than the male faculty" because they, "held fewer advanced degrees beyond M.A.L.S. and listed fewer scholarly activities." Better prepared for what? does preparation, like research exist in a vacuum? Do advanced degrees and scholarly activities prepare one not to fold or blither and dither when presented with a hard question? Michael H. Harris, in the editorial, wishes that the library schools had the time and facilities to prepare research librarians but hopes at least they will be "able to train adequately a generation of scholars to fill research positions elsewhere." Where elsewhere? are they not hard enough pressed to prepare librarians to do the sort of work that is available? and which, indeed, needs to be done? We need more well-educated librarians who have a far greater knowledge of personal and social interaction who can cope with day to day problems in libraries. Such people could, after gaining the smattering of knowledge available in library school as well become well trained by practicing with and under the supervision of master librarians, just as a Ph.D. candidate, one hopes, learns to become a scholar by working with scholars—the degree should connote what has happened already. It should be a recognition of being, and what one possessing such a degree should be, presumably, is a scholar. In what way does preparation as a scholar prepare one to work as a librarian? I do not think that enough thought has been given to that within our, er, profession and doubt that further research like "Search Versus Experiment—the Role of the Research Librarian" will turn up the answer.

Let me comment on the conclusions of "Search Versus Experiment." In the ordinary library it is almost impossible to implement any of their suggestions. The people best able to do it are all too often pinned to stations such as reference desks, to get
out and around sufficiently to establish colleague relationships with researchers or anyone else. Most reference or research librarians lack the authority within the para-military organizations they operate within (as best they can) to insure that they are always deployed on work which is commensurate with their abilities. In addition, it is easy enough to establish and advertise one's expertise in information retrieval, which is the easiest part of my work. Building client confidence in one's ability to discover knowledge or at least informed opinion is much more difficult and difficult to advertise except by word of mouth. Ellsworth Mason has already commented, I thought definitively, on the phoney subject specialties of librarians. No real scholar can respect someone who claims to be a specialist in generalities, and yet here Rubenstein et al. are back with it again. I do not know of any library that has enough reference or research librarians or information officers that there can be one for each subject even during the daytime. At night and on weekends all are back to the hardy little band of necessary generalists and none of those generalists can afford the solipsistic view that when one goes home at five on Friday the library disappears. (I knew of one director who used to work on Saturday mornings to show his awareness that the library was open on the weekend, but he always worked in his office and might as well have not been there at all.)

Finally, it is true that, "If researchers could be trained in the efficient use of information systems and services, existing systems and services could function more effectively." It is also true that a stitch in time saves nine and that truth will, in the end, out, and that if all librarians were really well trained and qualified for their work they would be better trained and qualified than most everyone else in the academic world and... so?

Roger Horn
Clarion, Pennsylvania

To the Editor:

Rejoinder to a review of What Black Librarians Are Saying, ed. by E. J. Josey, reviewed by Norman Lederer.

Book reviewing in America is, indeed, a dying art. Nonetheless, in its waning years some of its practitioners do, at least, attempt to write a few creditable reviews. Unfortunately, Norman Lederer is not one of the more successful practitioners of the art. His review of What Black Librarians Are Saying, ed. by E. J. Josey, CRL, vol. 34, no. 4, July 1973) is a rather pathetic attempt at book reviewing.

Upon reading Mr. Lederer's review one wonders whether he really read with any understanding What Black Librarians Are Saying or just skimmed through its pages in search of spurious evidence to support his preconceived notions about the book and black people. Mr. Lederer's review is factually inaccurate, filled with inept statements, and pompous and paternalistic in tone.

Mr. Lederer's review opens with an inaccurate statement.

"Following by several years his compilation The Black Librarian in America, E. J. Josey, chief of the Bureau of Academic and Research Libraries for the New York State Education Department, has submitted another collection..."

The Black Librarian in America was published in 1970. What Black Librarians Are Saying was published in 1972. The time span between the two books is not several years. It is just two years.

Throughout Mr. Lederer's review are scattered several inept statements. Many of these statements give false impressions of the nature of the work.

Mr. Lederer, for instance, refers to the book as a compilation. The book is a work of solicited essays. The title page, introduction, and general format of the book indicate this fact. Wouldn't it be more appropriate, especially for a professional librarian, to refer to the work as a collection and not a compilation?

In another instance Mr. Lederer refers to What Black Librarians Are Saying and The Black Librarian in America as: "[a] collection of statements and remarks from black librarians throughout the nation." This phraseology is unsuitable in view of the fact that none of the essays in the book were originally presented as speeches or extemporaneous remarks.

Aside from the aforementioned criticisms,
perhaps the most glaring flaw in Mr. Lederer’s review is its lack of vision. Mr. Lederer does not seem to want to understand or grapple with the basic and underlying issue of the book: the dilemma of being a black librarian in America.

An essay entitled “The Black Librarian’s Dilemma,” by Walter J. Fraser, explores in its broadest aspects the plight of the black librarian in America caught between racial loyalties and professional commitments. Mr. Lederer pompously dismisses this essay as:

“... a long garbled and almost impenetrable essay by Walter J. Fraser concerning the dilemma faced by the black librarian....”

Did Mr. Lederer understand this essay? Or was he unwilling to deal with its content?

Alex Ladenson
Chief Librarian
Chicago Public Library
Chicago, Illinois

To the Editor:
Norman Lederer’s comments on E. J. Josey’s What Black Librarians Are Saying (CRL, July 1973) appear to disqualify him as an objective reviewer of anything written by a black person. If he finds it noteworthy that the writings of these highly respected professionals are “remarkably sober and rational in tone,” one wonders if he would also find sobriety and rationality “remarkable” in all librarians regardless of race. With the admirable credentials of these black librarians at his disposal in “Notes on Contributors,” Mr. Lederer still thinks it necessary to compliment these blacks who do not “engage in polemical attack for its own sake.” Obviously the color of their skins has more effect on Mr. Lederer’s conclusions than the fact that, at the very least, these librarians are his intellectual equals.

Perhaps the various articles which Mr. Lederer finds so repetitive stem from the frustrations of his black colleagues who find communication with other Norman Lederers an exasperating experience.

Dorothy B. Simon
Assistant Professor
Library Instruction Librarian
New York City Community College
Brooklyn, New York
BOOK REVIEWS


That "no library is an island" is forcefully brought to everyone's attention by The Metropolitan Library. While the emphasis of this publication is on the social, political, and economic problems of the large library located in the major urban centers of the United States, the effect of the suburban library, school libraries, community college libraries, and college and university libraries on the urban library make this volume broader in scope than the title would indicate.

The volume is divided into four parts: I—Introduction, II—The Function of the Public Library, III—The Public Library in the Metropolis, and IV—Critical Issues. The eighteen chapters are authored by five librarians and twelve specialists in other disciplines. (Ms. Molz presents two chapters.) In addition to Ms. Molz, such stalwarts in the library field as Dr. Jesse Shera, Dr. Lowell Martin, Mr. Lester L. Stoffel and the British librarian D. J. Foskett present challenging documents. Contributors of other chapters include urban planners, publishers, and professors in sociology, journalism, speech communications, political science and an administrator in the U.S. Department of Labor. Eight of the chapters have appeared in other versions in other publications. Included in the eight, five appeared in The Public Library and the City (ed. R. W. Conant, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1965). Parts of one chapter—that written by Dr. Conant—have appeared in at least five other publications.

In spite of the reprinting of updated articles, the volume is a valuable contribution not only to librarians but also to all those people—legislators, library board members, and state, county, and municipal officials—who must make decisions concerning the future of the large library in a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Particularly significant are the chapters by Dr. Shera ("The Public Library in Perspective"), Dr. Martin ("The Role and Structure of the Metropolitan Library"), Dan Lacy ("The Dissemination of Print"), and Claire K. Lipsman ("Public Library Service to the Urban Disadvantaged"). Ms. Lipsman reports a study of more than 3,000 individuals in fifteen cities, all residents of low-income urban areas living within half a mile of a branch library. The findings of this study are highly significant to any librarian planning or operating a program for disadvantaged users or nonusers. Of particular importance is the model presented for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of such programs. This article is a summary of the book, The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness by Claire K. Lipsman (Chicago: ALA, 1972).

To have authorities from other disciplines examine the large public library brings insight and suggestions vital to the advancement of the urban library. Robert H. Salisbury focuses attention on "Trends in Urban Politics and Government" while William H. Hellmuth examines "Trends in Urban Fiscal Policies." Both chapters show the political and financial changes which have occurred in the last two decades, their effect on urban libraries, and identified future problems.

One cannot help wondering how this book would have been written in late 1973. Almost every author not only recognizes the importance of federal funding but also anticipates an increase in federal as well as state financial support. With the change of federal funding from categorical appropriations to revenue sharing, and with most states refusing to pick up the cost of federally funded programs, the conclusions and recommendations of most of the authors would have had to be different. The possibility of such a shift in federal funding was not even identified as a "critical issue."

The major thrust, however, of this volume is that public libraries are part of the social and political structure of society. They cannot exist in a vacuum. The metropolitan library must move into the main-
stream of the information and communication network locally, regionally, and nationally. If it fails to overcome its isolation and provincialism, it will disappear and will be replaced by more viable and dynamic institutions. That thrust is achieved.—John T. Eastlick, Graduate School of Librarianship, University of Denver, Colorado.


The introduction states that **Subject Guide to Government Reference Books** is essentially a general orientation guide to the most important reference books published by the Government Printing Office and government agencies. Ms. Wynkoop has done an admirable job in choosing, listing, and annotating some 1,016 books and serials with reference value. The resulting compilation is a good introduction for the occasional user and provides an insight into the variety and scope of subjects covered in official publications.

The very qualities which go into making a good orientation guide limit the usefulness of such a guide for reference and research purposes. Obviously, the high degree of selectivity necessary to provide coverage for many subjects prevents comprehensive coverage of any particular subject. In order to list the most important government reference books, many of the most common also had to be included. The practicing reference or document librarian hardly needs another description of the **Statistical Abstract** or the **Yearbook of Agriculture.**

Each entry gives all essential bibliographic information and a descriptive annotation. The annotations are well done, particularly in giving data about previous editions, related volumes, etc. On the whole, the information is accurate, with a few minor errors which really do not affect the usability of the information.

The index in the back of the book is also geared for general purposes. It is made up of the subjects which appear in the table of contents, a title entry for each book or series included, and personal authors when mentioned. The use of several descriptors for each entry would have done much to increase the value of the guide for reference purposes.

**Government Reference Books 70/71** is the second in a biennial series which forms a record of the most important reference books published by the government during 1970 and 1971. Unlike the **Subject Guide** this listing is intended to be comprehensive. The format is essentially the same as in the **Subject Guide** and the 68/69 edition with the books arranged by subject. The arrangement of the subject headings has been somewhat changed, and while the new arrangement is useful in this volume, it is disconcerting if the three publications are being used as a set.

A great deal of repetition of titles is included in the one thousand-plus entries in this edition. In my opinion this is detrimental rather than helpful. In a biennial survey it is wasteful at best to include two entries for books published annually, four entries for books published semiannually, and in some cases five and six entries for the same title. There are also forty separate entries and annotations for Army Area Handbooks, each entry repeating essentially the same information with slight variations from country to country. One entry describing the series, plus a list of those handbooks published in 1970 and 1971 would have been sufficient.

For people having limited contact with documents, these biennial compilations will be a reminder of the on-going and tremendously worthwhile contribution of the government in the field of reference materials. For purposes of research, or as a helpful aid to documents librarians, this series has the same drawbacks as does the **Subject Guide** —an unsophisticated index, general rather than in-depth coverage, and a great deal of space devoted to what every documents librarian should know already or be able to find easily.—Joyce Ball, Head, Reference Department, University of Nevada, Reno.

This concise, informative volume should be the media cataloger’s *vademecum* until final decisions concerning Anglo-American rules have been accomplished. This is a manual supplying clear and highly definitive principles for entry and descriptive cataloging of nonbook materials. This is a guidebook, providing guidelines for the care, handling and storage of nonbook materials. It is also a sourcebook, with a selected bibliography. The volume does not deal with the practical aspects of labeling and identifying materials; Hicks and Tillin’s *Developing Multimedia Libraries* continues to be a valuable companion manual for those and other important related matters.

*Nonbook Materials* has a prestigious background, prepared in consultation with the CLA/ALA/AECT/EMAC/CAML Advisory Committee on the Cataloging of Nonbook Materials.* The Joint Advisory Committee, chaired by Dr. Margaret Chisholm, dean of the School of Library and Information Sciences, University of Maryland, has performed a valuable service in international cooperation. The committee members, who are listed prominently in the introductory pages, represent the Library of Congress, public schools, universities, faculties, public libraries, and commercial producers of materials.

The authors are highly qualified to deal with the subject matter, having handled audiovisual materials as catalogers and as administrators. The thoroughness with which the authors have applied is apparent, even to the inclusion of techniques for cataloging machine-readable data files. The immediacy of the authors’ knowledge of developments and techniques in the field of audiovisual materials is evident through their detailed statements recommending treatment of the endogenous items of description that identify each piece of material.

The experience of the authors with the materials themselves is evidenced by detailed descriptive cataloging which references the need for special equipment, as in the case of a double-frame filmstrip, or the make and model of a videorecording machine. Such information is an absolute requirement for the user, and might be carried even further in notes on the catalog card which would specify the type of support equipment necessary for utilization of all nonprint items.

The authors have struggled to achieve consistency in the terminology employed for cataloging purposes. The Glossary provided is a practical one, reached by cooperative agreement, but beset with some problems in identifying the various forms of audio and video materials. One solution, patterned by analogy after the term *microform*, would seem to be to employ *audioform* as a generic term including cylinders, discs, rolls, magnetic tape, and wire. *Videoform* would encompass videotape, videocassettes, videodiscs, and any other future developments. (Specific physical descriptions are required in the collation for each item, identifying reel tapes and ips, phonodiscs and ips, number of frames, size of maps, etc.)

Librarians who have been resisting the inclusion of nonbook materials to their collections of monographs in buckram bindings will be well advised to study this slim volume. The policies of information retrieval for media, or nonprint materials, are developed by extending existing cataloging policies to the new forms. Examples are presented in standard 3 x 5 inch format and are indeed, traditional catalog cards, with impeccable use of descriptive cataloging techniques applied to nonbook materials.

One tends to ponder the reason for resistance to both the inclusion of nonbook materials into the collection and to the development of nonbook cataloging techniques. Surely the fact that an intermediary device is required cannot be a primary deterrent; have not microforms, with their viewers, been accepted almost universally? Collections of phonodiscs are solidly planted in both public and academic libraries. This author recalls with nostalgia the splendid collection of 78’s which was on open shelves for home loan in the early forties in Springfield, Massachusetts. That library also loaned framed prints, ready for hanging. Why then, more than a generation...
later, are we as a profession still hesitant to declare ourselves unilaterally as open storehouses and dispensers of the recorded resources of knowledge and information, regardless of format?

The intuitive answer may be that information in form other than print is suspect as being less than intellectual. Let us look a little more closely at some of the monographs on our shelves, where in the name of thoroughness and academic freedom we have collected biased, poorly written, out of date and occasionally unreadable works. And let us compare these with some of the nonprint media which vividly capture in sight and sound, history, skill techniques, procedures, beauty and ugliness, and engaging entertainment. Our shelves should proudly contain the totality of the human experience, in all the forms devised by mind and technology, providing total access for that vitally-concerned segment of society which is our clientele.

Nonbook Materials, The Organization of Integrated Collections is a guide and a precept for those who have accepted this challenge.—Gloria Terwilliger, Director of Learning Resources, Alexandria Campus, Northern Virginia Community College.


There have been few serious biographical studies done on the major figures in Revolutionary journalism. Edes and Gill, Rivington, John Holt, James Parker, and others still await biographers. Fortunately, Hugh Gaine, one of the most controversial and enigmatic of the Revolutionary editors, has now been given the careful and unbiased treatment he has so long deserved.

Professor Lorenz has written an important book. For he has revealed, better perhaps than anyone else, the tremendous obstacles encountered by an editor who wished to remain independent of "special interest" in a time when emotions ran high and neutrality was viewed as a traitorous act. In doing so he shows clearly the reasons for Gaine's erratic editorial course from 1752 to 1776.

In Professor Lorenz's biography Hugh Gaine emerges as a talented and dedicated editor who only wanted to print the news and make money. However, in those days an editor had to ally himself and his paper with a special interest group if he intended to stay in business, and thus Gaine was forced to change sides frequently in the tumultuous years preceding the Revolution in order to ensure his livelihood.

Gaine made a fateful decision when he decided to abandon the patriot cause in 1776, and return to New York to resume the publication of his New York Mercury in that occupied city. Once he had made his choice there was no turning back and he soon became one of the most hated and maligned Tory editors in Revolutionary America. His notoriety was further enhanced when he became the subject of Phillip Freneau's long and cutting poem, "Hugh Gaines Life." Freneau maintained that Gaine would:

Always adhere to the Sword that is longest and stick to the party thats like to be strongest. . . .

Unfortunately, Gaine underestimated the patriots, and chose to support the wrong "party." Nevertheless, he remains a major figure in the annals of American publishing, and Professor Lorenz's balanced, well-written, and timely study should be acquired by every library with an interest in the history of the American Revolution.—Michael H. Harris, Associate Professor, College of Library Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington.


This seventh in a series of Readers in Library and Information Science is a compilation of articles covering the whole field of technical services. In one small sense the title is misleading for in actuality descriptive cataloging and classification have been excluded from this volume and covered in another of the series.

The collection brings together materials of a historical nature, some state-of-the-art articles, and some attempts at predicting the future. One big disadvantage is a "de-
liberate attempt to exclude materials that have appeared in recently published collections." For a teacher or student of technical services to use a reader of this nature effectively, it must contain all outstanding pertinent materials no matter where else they have appeared nor how recently. This approach, then, makes the volume less useful as a text but important as a supplementary resource.

Mr. Applebaum has done an admirable job in presenting the historical perspective to the basic problems which are facing us in technical services today. The discussions on cooperative cataloging and Dewey's classification system, at the first Conference of the American Library Association in 1876 and the presentation and discussion of cataloging at the London Conference of Librarians in 1877, are classics. The remainder of the volume covers the areas of acquisitions; bibliographic control; cooperative and centralized processing endeavors; and future prospects.

Who would be better than Mr. Applebaum to select outstanding articles in the area of acquisitions, from policies to blanket-order plans, from administration to future trends? Articles by Metcalf, Downs, Veaner, and the excellent symposium chaired by Perry Morrison are good examples.

The section on bibliographic control is less cohesive. Certainly all articles included are important ones but perhaps not all should be included here. For instance the Introduction to the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules must have been read at least once, if not a dozen times, by all students of cataloging—probably all have their own copies—and the articles on serials by Clara Brown, delightful as it is, doesn’t really seem to fit into the sequence. Otherwise it contains a good representation of articles on bibliographic control of monographs and serials. One previously unpublished article on “Book Catalogs” by Scott Allison, is a very good state-of-the-art paper. Classic pieces such as the one by W. W. Bishop, as well as current deliberations such as the ones on the National Serials Data Program, are valuable items for discussion.

Cooperative and centralized processing is an area with which Mr. Applebaum has been very intimately involved for several years and has used his expertise in bringing together a chronology of developments on this subject.

The final section deals almost exclusively with MARC and its national and international implications—those being the solving of some important problems in technical services.

Particular criticism could be leveled at the volume for the exclusion of any discussion on nonprint materials, their acquisition, storage, and accessibility.—Robert D. Stu­e­art, Graduate School of Librarianship, Uni­versity of Denver, Colorado.


This book is the result of the author’s doctoral dissertation at the University of Pittsburgh. It is primarily concerned with the attempts made by the Library of Congress and American publishers over a long period of time to bring books and catalog copy together quickly. These efforts culminated finally in the Cataloging-in-Source program (1958-59) and its reincarnation in the Cataloging-in-Publication program (1971).

The aims of the study were (1) to discover whether the various programs at the Library of Congress were sufficient to decrease the time-lag in cataloging, and (2) whether it is possible for the Library of Congress to accept bibliographical data as provided by publisher’s catalogs.

To answer the first question, a statistical sample of 5 percent of American trade publications in 1969 was taken from the Na­tional Union Catalog. The selected entries were checked against the time of their appearance in Copyright Office records, Library of Congress cards, MARC tape input, and Publisher’s Weekly. Programs were designed and data fed to a computer. The results were compared to an earlier study done by Roger Greer in 1961, and it was found that, in spite of the various attempts which had been made by the Library of Congress to expedite the cataloging of books, the time needed to get cataloging information had in fact increased. The full details of the Greer study, an unpublished doctoral dissertation, are not given, so it is difficult to assess the validity of the com-

This slender, impeccably printed volume contains, in addition to the essays by the three authors mentioned in the title, a preface and introduction by Thomas F. O'Connell, and brief biographical sketches of the three authors who were recipients of honorary degrees at the colloquy.

Dedication of a new library building is a highly important affair in an institution of learning, and perhaps even more so at York University, because of its comparative youthfulness and rapidity of growth—both in student enrollment and in library resources.

The three chief participants in the dedication represented different but allied professions. They addressed themselves to the topic: “The University—The Library.” Samuel Rothstein, library educator, sketched briefly some of the academic and curricular changes of the last century in higher education, which have led to the rise of a trained, service-directed class of professionals in modern libraries. Richard Blackwell spoke of the close dependence existing between librarian and bookseller, drawing with charm and discernment upon his experiences with the firm of B. H. Blackwell.

Archibald MacLeish, poet, was concerned with the importance of a book collection as more than a mere institutional statistic. One paragraph quoted from his remarks may suffice to indicate his affirmations in the essay, “The Premise of Meaning”:

For the existence of a library, the fact of its existence, is, in itself and of itself, an assertion—a proposition nailed like Luther's to the door of time. By standing where it does at the centre of the university—which is to say at the centre of our intellectual lives—with its books in a certain order on its shelves and its cards in a certain structure in their cases, the true library asserts that there is indeed a “mystery of things.” Or, more precisely, it asserts that the reason why the “things” compose a mystery is that they seem to mean: that they fall, when gathered together, into a kind of relationship, a kind of wholeness, as though all these different and dissimilar reports, these bits and pieces of experience, manuscripts in bottles, messages from long before, from deep within from miles beyond, belonged together and might, if understood together,
spell out the meaning which the mystery implies. (p. 53)

The final two pages of the book contain a brief account of the Shakespeare Head Press, written by Basil Blackwell, the sole survivor of the original company. It should also be recorded that the end-sheets and a centerfold contain reproduced interior and exterior views of Scott Library.—Cecil K. Byrd, Indiana University, Lilly Library, Bloomington, Indiana.


Carol Kronus and Linda Crowe compiled the various papers presented at the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science devoted to library-based neighborhood information centers to form this monographic, but decidedly weak, synthesis. Unquestionably, the conference itself must have been a far more exciting and rewarding experience than the simple gathering of the papers presented. There are too many questions asked by the authors and papers presented, too many issues raised, too many simplistic answers to enormously complex problems, and too little interactive research to allow this work a more successful place on people's reading lists. Even though the conference was held at the University of Illinois on October 24-27, 1971, the results are now outdated, some conditions significantly changed in the library world, and other projects quiet yet nonetheless failures. Why?

I will not attempt at this point in time to relate the significance of this work to the world of academic libraries, but will leave that issue for the end of this review. It seems more appropriate first to discuss the shortcomings of this publication. To begin with, the articles are repetitious and disjointed. There needs to be an interwelding of research, theory, experimentation, library operational modification based on circumstances at hand, and reworking of previously held concepts or theories about the inner city residents, labeled the urban poor. Information provided by each of the papers related to a specific subject or project, with occasional mention of similar situations. As such, each paper could stand on its own merits, but would add very little to the cohesiveness of the whole.

What was missing in the monograph was the give and take that must have existed between the participants, the audience, and the editors. The exchanges that might have congealed these library and information vagaries with the dispassionate research findings presented by nonlibrary experts could have materially improved the development of a polemic on the role of libraries with regard to information services. Instead, the reader is left to fend for himself. The necessary amalgam to make these papers a valuable interwelding of theory and practice is missing. Furthermore, the success of many of these neighborhood information centers is now in question, particularly with the decline or absence of federal supporting funds. The question never asked in this work is whether such services are the province of the public library. Is this where public libraries should concentrate their efforts?

As an academic librarian, I am disappointed by the inability of researchers and librarians alike to distill the crucial issues in one setting and project their significance into another. Urban academic libraries already are feeling the impact of a need for more assistance in providing information and services to their respective academic and urban communities. How should they cope with this problem? For those librarians with great imagination and dedication, this publication may generate some projects or goals. Unfortunately, for most librarians it will remain a closed book.—Robert P. Haro, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
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Statement on Appraisal of Gifts, (developed by the committee on manuscripts collection of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section), s49
Statement on Legal Title, (developed by the committee on manuscripts collections of the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section), s49-50
Stevens, Benjamin H., Coughlin and Taieb, Urban Analysis for Branch L. System Planning, rev. of, 239-48
Stevens, Charles H., Marie P. Canfield, Jeffrey J. Gardner, "Library mergers, new possibility for cooperative reference service," 40-46
Stevens, Roland E., letter to the ed., 159
Stierwalt, Ralph E., rev. (Computerizing the Card Catalog in the Unl.), s79-79
Stimpson, Catherine, ed., Women and the Equal Rights Amendment, rev. of, 74-75; comment, 308
Stokes, Katharine M., "From inside the DLP," s13-34
Stout, Lucille J., ret., s210
Stroh, L. S., letter to the ed., 381-84
Stuckjaer, Myrtle, ret., s279
Stuert, Robert D., "Change Any­ one?" editorial, (Sept.) 233-34; appt. to CRL editorial board, s224; rev. (Reader in Technical Services), 490-91
Sullivan, Robert C., "Microform developments related to acquisitions," 223-24; comment, 306-7
Suzuki, Yukihisa, Tsunesei and Buckman, Japanese Reference and Research Ls. in Japan and the United States, rev. of, 161-62
T
Taieb, Françoise, Coughlin and Stevens, Urban Analysis for Branch L. System Planning, rev. of, 320-31
Tagli, Kent D., letter to the ed., 223
Tanis, Norman, "ACRL Officers for 1973/74," port., s189
"Controversy over Personnel Policy," (California State Univ. Davis Colleges Ins. vs. Chancellor's office of the system), s187
"Task Force on the Status of Women in Librarianship," s50
Tell Me to The Times, s287-88
Terwilliger, Gloria, rev. (Information and L. Service Book), 318; comment, 481-82
"The Time-Lag in Cataloging, Pop., rev. of, 490-97
Title II A Grant Funds, s27-28
"To the Readers of CRL News," Heribson, s27
Trevorrow, Mildred L., ret., s90
Truelson, Judith, rev. (Planning the Special L.), 319-20
Tsunesei, Warren M., Buckman and Suzuki, eds., University and Research Ls. in Japan and the United States, rev. of, 161-62
U
United States Government Publications Monthly Catalog, (Sept.) 287-89
United States Government Publications Monthly Catalog, (Sept.) 287-89
United States Government Publications Monthly Catalog, (Sept.) 287-89
United States Government Publications Monthly Catalog, (Nov. 1972); comment, 482-84
The University—The Library, Papers presented by Samuel Rothstein, Richard Blackwell, Archibald MacLeish at York University, Toronto, on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Scott Library, 30 October 1971, rev. of, 491-92
"Use of a ln./consultant team to study l operations," Rouse and Rouse, (Sept.) 242-48
V
Van Note, Roy Nelson, letter to the ed., 306
Van Zanten, Frank, letter to the ed., 69
Veit, Fritz, ret., s312
Vocabulary Control for Information Retrieval, Lancaster, rev. of, 162
Voit, Irene and Auld, "Library
group practice,” 54-58; comment, 223

W

Waldhart, Thomas J. and LeRoy G. Zweifel, “Organizational patterns of scientific and technical is.: an examination of three issues, 426-35

Walker, Katherine, ret., s312

Warner, Edward S., letter to the ed., 481

Wasserman, Paul, The New Librarianship; A Challenge for Change, rev. of, (Sept.) 284-85

Watson, Peter G., rev. (Current Awareness and the Chemist), 320-21; rev. (Out of the Dinosaurs), (Sept.) 285-86

Watt, Georgene, dec., s91


Werner, David J., et al, “Search versus experiment—the role of the research ln.,” (July) 280-86; comment, 482-84

West, Stanley I., rev. (Current National Bibliogs. of Latin America), 76-77

What Black Lns. are Saying, Jo­sey, rev. of, 315-16; comment, 484-85

Whitbeck, George W., The Influence of Lns. in Liberal Arts Colleges in Selected Decision Making Areas, rev. of, (May) 233

“Whither interlibrary loan?” Kas­er, (Sept. 1972), comment, 69

Whitten, Benjamin, ret., s117

Wilkinson, J. F., letter to the ed., 225

Woman and the Equal Rights Amendment: Senate Subcom­mittee Hearings on the Consti­
when seen through MasterLens

Cataloging, research or the ordinary read requirements of day-to-day work around your library often call for prolonged study of small print, fine details—conditions that can cause strain in even the sharpest eyes. EdnaLite MasterLens with its powerful magnifier and bright glare-free light source takes the strain out of close work—increases accuracy and efficiency. And if MasterLens is a help to those with ordinary good vision, think what a life-saver it is to library employees and patrons who have visual handicaps.

MasterLens. Just plug it in. Complete, self-contained...useful and effective.

The best way to look at thin...

Lightweight portable model
Magnifies type to double size.
Same superb optical qualities as model. With its own carry case. $1-

MasterLens RL, on its own base, with an articulated arm that allows a close, clear, comfortable look at any part of the page without shifting the book. Enlarges to twice size.

Regularly $207. Now, for a limited time $17
Source materials relating woman’s march toward equality are now available on 4x6 microfiche. A total of 79 titles (including The Woman’s Journal) cover topics as wide-ranging as suffrage, marriage, education, employment, and social status. Authors include such well-known names as: Helen Blackburn, Elizabeth Blackwell, E. Sylvia Pankhurst, Ida Tarbell, John Stuart Mill, and Mary Wollstonecraft. $550.00

Microcard Editions
An Indian Head Company
A Division of Information Handling Services

Microcard Editions 901 26 Street, N.W.  Washington, D.C. 20037

☐ I wish to order the source materials Women’s Rights (79 titles) on 4x6 microfiche  ☐ positive  ☐ negative at $550.00
☐ Please send me a list of titles for Women’s Rights
☐ I wish to order the following titles on microfiche  ☐ positive  ☐ negative

☐ Please send me your current catalog.  ☐ Please put me on your mailing list.

NAME
TITLE
INSTITUTION
ADDRESS
NOW! FROM BAKER & TAYLOR—LIBRARY OF CONGRESS MARC TAPE CATALOGING AND PROCESSING

At Baker & Taylor all titles on MARC tape as supplied by the Library of Congress are now available cataloged and processed—and there is no extra charge if LC numbers are not included on your order.

Catalog cards using Library of Congress classification and subject headings and Unabridged Dewey classification with Library of Congress subject headings (LC/LC and Dewey/LC) provide descriptive cataloging, subject analysis and classification exactly as on MARC tape. Processing materials are computer produced and supplied with your books.

Cataloging and processing from MARC tape offers you a wide variety of call number formats at no extra cost. Here are a few examples of Baker & Taylor's low cost LC/LC and Dewey/LC processing options:

- Fully cataloged and processed book, including cards, label, book pocket and book card ................. 89¢
- Fully cataloged and processed book without Mylar jacket .................. 65¢
- *Unattached processing kit .................. 35¢
- *Catalog cards only .................. 25¢

(*Available with book orders only)

Additionally, at your option, titles not accessible from MARC tape are often available from Baker & Taylor's computer file of Dewey/LC and Abridged Dewey/Sears cataloging, prepared by our own professional library staff.

Each order for processed books must be accompanied by a specification sheet. Request the specification sheet for the type of cataloging you prefer. Write to your nearest Baker & Taylor Library Service Center.

The Baker & Taylor Co.
when you bought that microform reader did you?

consider consult

THE MANUFACTURER'S CLAIMS:

The [reader] has no complicated controls or touchy adjustments; maximum ease of operation is built into the reader. Just insert the fiche in the precision holding and transporting mechanism, flip the switch, adjust focus, and scan.

LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS:

The design of the reader does not provide for a page indicator grid. The platen moves awkwardly and binds, especially when moving from side to side.

The user must reach to the left side of the reader and move a short arm back and forth to focus the image.

None of the controls are labeled. The user must experiment with the various levers and handles to learn how to use the reader.

The bracket holding the platen handle allows the film to catch between the bracket and glass, which can tear the film if the user is not careful.

Quoted from the manufacturer's literature.

From an evaluation of the same machine in the July, 1972 LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS.

library technology reports
A Product Testing and Evaluation Service

American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611
Play up your periodicals...dress up your library

Present your periodicals where they can be seen, appreciated, read and enjoyed...in these smart, efficient new Gaylord units...made especially to display periodicals...designed especially for library use. All have metal shelves and are finished in rich walnut grain vinyl. Contemporary design...sturdy construction. And economical, too.

For further details about these and other forthcoming new displayers, designed for libraries by library specialists, please write today.

GAYLORD
GAYLORD BROS., INC. LIBRARY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT • SYRACUSE, NY 13201 • STOCKTON, CA 95204
"The publication of this superb new edition of the CODEX ATLANTICUS is an historical event of great importance. At long last this primary document is being made generally available to scholars and artists in a form worthy of its great author."

I. BERNARD COHEN,
Professor of the History of Science, Harvard University

are proud to announce that
Volume I of the facsimile edition of
LEONARDO DA VINCI'S
CODEX ATLANTICUS
as restored by the Grottaferrata Monks
is now published
and available for immediate delivery

Limited edition of 998 numbered sets for the entire world
A set consists of twelve volumes of 360 pages each, with 178 true-color plates per volume; hence, a total of 4,320 pages with 2,136 true-color plates. The plates have been interleaved with blank pages for protection, exactly as in the restored CODEX. Size (as the original) 61 x 44.5 cm., or 12 x 24". Handbound in full leather.

Price
$6,900.00 the set (payable at $575.00 per volume as published) until December 31, 1973, subject only to changes in worldwide currencies. Thereafter the price will be increased. The Publishers will protect subscriptions accepted at $6,900.00 per set against any future price increase.

Publication Schedule
Volume I: October 1973
Volume II: January 1974
Subsequent volumes will be published at regular intervals, with the last two volumes appearing early in 1977.

Please write for a descriptive brochure.
ARE THE PEOPLE WHO USE YOUR PERIODICALS COLLECTION MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO KEEP A PERIODICALS COLLECTION?

Since periodicals are almost always printed on paper, and paper is almost always vulnerable, we've developed probably the only sure method of safeguarding them.

We've dispensed with the paper.

By ordering your periodicals on microfilm from us, you get everything on the printed page but the page. This not only discourages people from taking part of your periodicals home; it makes it virtually impossible for them to do it.

A page the size of the one on the left reduces to less than a square inch on microfilm. Anyone ingenious enough to tear out an article from a page that size would probably be smart enough not to try.

This isn't to say that an entire roll of microfilm couldn't turn up "missing." (It's unlikely, since the film is useless without a reader.) But if it ever should, you could replace it for far less than it would cost to replace the original periodicals—which are sometimes irreplaceable at any price.

So if you're starting a periodicals collection, or expanding the one you have, you might consider microfilm.

Not just because of the space you save.

Because of the periodicals you save.

For more information, write: Xerox University Microfilms, Dept. P3, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48103.
How much can a subscription agency save your library?

In the long run, depending on the size of your library, you can end up with worthwhile savings. Just consider how long it takes to order one subscription, how much it costs to process one invoice for payment and send one check. Estimates run from $10.00 to $18.00 for each order. Multiply by the number of subscriptions your library orders, and see how much you’ll save by sending one order and one check for all your periodicals to F. W. Faxon Co.

Send for our free descriptive brochure and annual Librarians’ Guide listing more than 50,000 domestic and foreign periodicals.

Library business is our only business – since 1886.

F.W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
Telephone: (800) 225-7894 (Toll Free)
SEARCH THE N.U.C. IN 20 SECONDS

All you do is look up the L.C. number, listed in numerical order, and refer to the corresponding issue, page and column in the N.U.C. If you can't find the L.C. number in our index in 20 seconds, it means the Library of Congress hasn't prepared a card yet, and you can end your search.

With the Lisco L.C. card number index library technicians can perform the searching functions now done by catalogers, resulting in more efficient use of your library personnel.

The Lisco system enables you to decrease the time per search up to 90%, thereby increasing the overall performance of all other library operations (departments).

Cost of a twelve month subscription is only $300. Order yours today and capitalize on this valuable time saving device.

We are interested in the Lisco system for searching the N.U.C. Please send catalog and full details.

LISCO

2464 Massachusetts Ave.
Cambridge, Mass. 02140
Tel. (617) 868-0500
Providing monthly guides to all English language and French language monographs and new serial titles acquired by The Library of Congress in the following subject areas:

- **BUSINESS & ECONOMICS**
- **CONFERENCE PUBLICATIONS**
- **GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS**
- **LAW**
- **MEDICINE**
- **TECHNOLOGY**

**Current Access**

Librarians, academicians and professional people with interests in any or all of these fields will now have current access to all books and serials cataloged by The Library of Congress as they are provided via the LC MARC (MAchine Readable Cataloging) computer tape distribution system.

**Bibliographic Information**

Complete Library of Congress bibliographic information is provided for each title in a main entry arrangement. Further access is provided, in additional listings, by Area Studies, CIP (Cataloging In Publication) and Series entries. Furthermore, a Subject Index and cumulating Title Index to all entries are provided.

**Monthly Publication**

The Guides will be published separately for each subject area, in 12 monthly issues plus in annual cumulations. Publication of each of the Guides will commence with January 1974 issues, except for the Law Book Guide which commenced publication in January 1973. Monographs in languages other than French and English, as well as new serial title entries, will be provided as they become integral parts of the MARC data base.

Please write now for descriptive material and pricing information. You will find this to be a unique monthly periodical service offering a comprehensive and current bibliography and index for all publications cataloged by The Library of Congress in these areas of specialization.
COMPLETE TRANSCRIPTS OF CONGRESSIONAL PUBLIC HEARINGS
TELEVISED MAY THROUGH SEPTEMBER, 1973; WATERGATE INVESTIGATION
IN 8 VOLUMES.

Special Subscription Offer in both
Clothbound and Paperbound editions

TO:

THE LESLIE PRESS
Dept. CR • 111 Leslie St. • Dallas, Texas 75207

Please send:
CLOTHBOUND
Unabridged

☐ $37.20 net for all 8 vols.
   @ $4.65 net per vol.
   (retail $49.60 set)

check one of the following:
   _ Ship ea. vol. as issued,
     order direct Leslie Press
     only. (Immediate shipment
     vol. 1.)
   _ Hold and ship full set when
     available

Please send:
PAPERBOUND
Unabridged

☐ $24.00 net for all 8 vols.
   @ $3.00 net per vol.
   (retail $32.00 set)

check one of the following:
   _ Ship ea. vol. as issued,
     order direct Leslie Press
     only. (Immediate shipment
     vol. 1.)
   _ Hold and ship full set when
     available

Name of organization _______________________ ______________________________________
Title ______________________ Address ____________________________________________
City ______________________ State ____ Zip ________
Total amount enclosed $ ________ Total amount to be billed $ ___________

(postpaid if payment enclosed.
$2 added for postage and handling for each set on charge orders.)
The story of John James Audubon is well known and extensively documented. Yet surprisingly little has been written about his struggle to prepare, print and sell the great work which made him immortal, the "double elephant folio" produced at a cost of $1,000.00 each and sold, most recently, for $216,000.00 at a London auction. This is the story of the creation and sale of the double elephant folio with a census and survey on extant complete sets.

Much of author Fries' information has never before been recorded. The Double Elephant Folio is a magnificent gathering of vital facts related with warmth and talent. Exquisitely and amply illustrated.

Cloth ISBN 0-8389-0103-4
Pre-publication price $35.00
After February 1, 1974 $45.00

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 East Huron Street • Chicago, Illinois 60611
The most recent book on library acquisition, *Stephen Ford's The Acquisition of Library Materials*, 1973, makes some specific statements about what should be expected from jobbers or wholesalers. Here are some of the key points he makes:

- wholesalers/jobbers should be able to supply any book in print including trade, text and technical titles.
- they should be expected to supply recent books within 60 days and other in print books in 90 days to 120 days for older titles.
- timely, accurate status reports and special invoicing requirements should be met.
- book acquisition for libraries should be his primary business.
- he should have a stock of new books appropriate to libraries he serves.

We agree. In fact, the Book House exceeds these expectations consistently.

We do better because we try harder. We call it "Concerned Service" — a dedication by our entire trained and competent staff to see that every customer gets personal service and that every effort to serve quickly and accurately is made.

Why not see what "Concerned Service" can do for you with a trial order right now!

ANY QUESTIONS? CALL 517-849-9361
Let us know if you want to receive our newsletter.

The House of Superior Library Service
208 West Chicago Jonesville, Mich. 49250
Rise above the paperwork.

Richard Abel Company has a plan.

Richard Abel Company has a proven approval plan that has freed hundreds of libraries from the massive detail it takes to select books. And we’d like to do the same for you. We’ll free you from checking dozens of lists, catalogs and reviews, cross checking, verifying, corresponding, arguing, re-verifying, processing hundreds of individual orders, invoices and writing a multitude of payment checks to a multitude of book sellers. Here’s what you get with the free Richard Abel Approval Program (RAAP):

1. The Abel Company works with you. You tell us the subjects, publishers, and non-subject parameters such as the academic level, language, format, type of publishers, etc. We do the gathering. You do the selecting.

2. More options than any service offered on the market today.

3. A greater range of subjects and non-subject parameters to choose from, which gives you greater control of the collection completeness you desire.

4. We tailor approval plans to fit the needs of large or small libraries.

5. Service that covers more publishers faster than any other approval plan available.

6. The only approval plan with world-wide coverage.

7. The services of many experienced subject and language specialists.

8. Approval books 6 to 12 months ahead of reviews.

9. There are no orders to write and you only pay for the books you decide to keep.

10. The approval plan is compatible with the Richard Abel Standing Order Plan and eliminates duplication.

If you would like to eliminate most of your paperwork, take advantage of a fully integrated standing order service for over 35,000 series, and have time for more effective decision making, just mail the coupon or call your nearest Abel rep about the Richard Abel Approval Plan and let's RAAP.

Phone: 800-547-3551 Toll Free.

Let's RAAP
☐ Please have your representative see me.
☐ Please send more information.

Name__________________________

Library________________________

Address________________________

City/State/Zip____________________

Richard Abel & Company, Inc.
P.O. Box 4245/Portland, Oregon 97208
(503) 645-3511/Telex 36-0458
OFFICES IN: Arlington, Tex. • Atlanta, Ga. • Blackwood, N.J. • Denver, Colo. • Glendale, Calif. • Marion, Ohio • Zion, Ill. • Waltham, Mass. • Mill Valley, Calif. • Toronto, Canada • Amsterdam • London • Sydney • Sao Paulo.
The Power and Form of Emerson’s Thought

By JEFFREY L. DUNCAN. 144 pp., app., index. $6.75

This volume describes and analyzes Emerson’s philosophical conceptions of nature, society, and the individual in terms of his basic polarity. In doing so, the author uncovers a coherence in Emerson’s thought that clarifies the changes, shortcomings, and contradictions that occur in the philosopher’s prose. The author supports the argument that, while Emerson’s basic organic principle is one of polarity, his ideas have a fundamental relatedness and his thoughts an underlying unity. Duncan takes Emerson at face value. He believes that only by taking Emerson’s ideas literally, can the reader understand their structure and relation.

Shakespeare’s Pagan World

The Roman Tragedies

By J. L. SIMMONS, Tulane University. 204 pp. (tnt.), index. $8.75

Shakespeare’s Pagan World maintains that the poet’s conception of the Roman world and its place in history inspired a distinctive kind of tragedy in Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra, and Coriolanus. The three plays have a common Roman setting. Each is derived from Plutarch, and each presents a tragic conflict between the individual and the state. More important, however, is the pagan environment out of which each tragedy arises. Seeing Rome in the light of Christian historiography, Shakespeare represents the empire as a pagan world in which protagonists heroically aspire to realize a vision of perfection in an imperfect world. The tragedies occur when the hero tries and fails to translate his idealistic vision into reality. Simmons convincingly concludes that the antedating of Christian revelation is the most significant historical factor in the Roman plays and that Shakespeare conceived the ironies and the tragedies of his pagan world in this larger comic perspective.

An Annotated Bibliography of Jane Austen Studies, 1952-1972

By BARRY ROTH, Ohio University and JOEL WEINSHEIMER, Texas Technological University. ix, 272 pp., indexes. (Bibliographical Society) $7.50

This bibliography includes all publications first issued during this time along with other material published before 1952 but considered valuable enough to be reprinted. So much Austen criticism has been written in the last twenty years that this bibliography meets the need for a convenient, usable tool for locating and summarizing the wealth of scholarship available. The bibliography includes all books, essays, articles, and doctoral dissertations on Austen and all critical matter appended to every edition of her works in English and in selected translations, as well as significant mentions of Austen and her work elsewhere. All entries are annotated. This comprehensive work is an indispensable one for all Austen students.

University Press of Virginia
Box 3608 University Station
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
"Dozens of data bases! Millions of bibliographic records! Billions of characters of storage! On-line! Immediate! Cheap! Effortless!"

How many times have you heard this? And, how many times have you been suspicious of the claims? They sound too good to be true. And, unfortunately they usually are.

We at System Development Corporation don't put much stock in promises. We just tell the facts as they are.

LIKE: We've been providing on-line access to large bibliographic data bases since 1965.

LIKE: Every day we offer 1,100,000 chemical literature records, 450,000 medical literature records, 430,000 agricultural literature records, 150,000 education literature records, and 10,000 business/finance literature records.

LIKE: We have customers throughout the U.S., many of them using local telephone numbers to access the SDC Computer Center.

LIKE: We have served more on-line users than any other commercial organization in the world.

Contact one of our Search Service specialists for more information. You won't get promises—just facts.

System Development Corporation

Ms. Judy Wanger
2500 Colorado Avenue
Santa Monica, California 90406
(213) 393-9411

Ms. Linda Rubens
5827 Columbia Pike
Falls Church, Va. 22041
(703) 820-2220
Immediate access to our collections of Early English Books is better than a sabbatical in Great Britain—although perhaps not as much fun. Students and faculty alike will enjoy the benefits of doing research from primary sources when they are in your library.

Our collections include almost all the titles listed by Pollard and Redgrave in their “Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1475-1640” (STC I), and by Donald Wing in his “Short-Title Catalogue . . . 1641-1700” (STC II).

Through the cooperation of libraries in Great Britain and the United States, we are photographing the titles from these two authoritative bibliographies, and making them available to the academic community on 35mm roll microfilm and as bound, xerographic copies. Included with the microfilm are guides listing the collections’ contents by reels, and cumulative cross indexes by STC number.

These primary sources for the study of Tudor and Stuart times are issued serially as additional titles are photographed. They are a very economical way for your library to increase its holdings dramatically—without the need for elaborate storage facilities or an increased budget.

Further information about these collections can be obtained from the Series Product Manager, Xerox University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Xerox University Microfilms
The Encyclopedia of Associations has traditionally been consulted first by librarians and researchers looking for sources of current, authoritative information, which associations are uniquely equipped to provide on thousands of subjects. The new, Eighth Edition includes some 25,000 changes and 1,224 new listings. Nearly 12,000 of the 17,886 entries are full descriptions of active associations; others are listings for inactive or defunct groups, pseudo-organizations, etc.

*In the Spring, 1973 issue of RQ, the previous edition of the Encyclopedia of Associations was described and appraised:

"During the sixteen years since its introduction in 1956, the Encyclopedia of Associations has earned its reputation as a cornerstone of any sound general reference collection . . . "Volume 1, the basic volume and the one which all libraries should have if the cost of all three is overwhelming, is a classified listing of, primarily, nonprofit membership organizations of the United States. But included as well are selected nonmembership groups, commercial groups, foreign organizations of interest in this country, international associations with large U.S. memberships, local American organizations of national interest and importance, and numerous ad hoc citizen groups and projects. The information about each association is expressed, usually, in seventeen categories. Included are name, address, number of members, purposes, publications, chief executive, and phone number if supplied by the association. In each of the classified sections, such as Educational and Cultural Organizations, the associations appear in alphabetical order by the principal keyword (underlined) in the title. Section 19—Inactive, Defunct or Foreign Names—is the exception to this convenience. However, quick access is provided to any organization through the general alphabetical/keyword index.

"Volume 2 provides two additional points of access to the associations comprising Volume 1. The Geographic section lists by state and city the names, addresses, phone numbers (if supplied), and executives of the organizations. The Executive section lists by surname the executives cited in Volume 1, together with appropriate association, title, and address . . . "Volume 3 . . . is especially important in an age of proliferating ideas, problems, and grievances, around which people cluster in organizations to decide upon courses of action and methods of redress. 'New Associations and Projects,' or NAP, thus supplements information in Volume 1 by listing in the same format and with the same detail all new associations called to the attention of the publisher between editions of the basic volume . . . "In a word, the Encyclopedia of Associations is a basic reference tool. All libraries should have it. It can be very useful, too, in the area of technical services, giving acquisitions departments current information on publications and mailing addresses of associations. Cataloging departments may find both the existence and the form of a particular association helpful in determining the form of entry of corporate bodies . . .”

THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF ASSOCIATIONS IS AVAILABLE ON 30-DAY APPROVAL

Vol. 1, National Organizations of the United States (1546pp.), $48.00
Vol. 2, Geographic-Executive Index (512pp.), $28.50
Vol. 3, New Associations and Projects. Inter-edition subscription, $48.00

GALE RESEARCH COMPANY
BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICH. 48226