



Future of Library Administration

EUGENE H. WILSON

ASSUMING THAT OTHER SECTIONS in the present issue of *Library Trends* portray a current overview of library administration, it may remain to venture a glance at the future. Such an effort seems appropriate since library administration is concerned broadly with the man power and materials required to attain institutional objectives, even though it might not be expected in a context dealing with conditions and movements.

The twenty-six issues of *Library Trends* which have preceded this number have covered the most important aspects of organization, man power, and materials involved in library administration. Issues have been devoted to types of libraries; to the acquisition, conservation, and servicing of general, special, and research resources; and to such particular aspects of man power as personnel administration, scientific management, and mechanization. A review of these, and of related matter as mentioned below, furnishes a reasonably sound foundation for predicting developments.

The most recent material along these lines appeared as this article was being written. Paul Wasserman¹ "attempts to assess the point to which management of libraries has progressed, to draw parallels with related fields, and to point out avenues which appear most promising for furthering development of management theory and practice in the library field." He reviews the literature, considers current orientation to administration, training for library administration, parallels between library and public administration, achievements in educational administration, and suggests avenues for advancing library administration. His article might well be at hand as the reader goes through this number of *Library Trends*.

In the public library field, C. B. Joeckel's *Government of the American Public Library*, Arnold Miles and Lowell Martin's *Public Administration and the Library*, and the publications which resulted from the

Mr. Wilson is Dean of Faculties, University of Colorado.

Future of Library Administration

Public Library Inquiry constitute benchmarks in the literature of this area. Supplementing them, the papers presented before the twenty-second Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in 1957, dealing with new directions in public library development, provide a sound basis for certain predictions.²

The summary of the Chicago conference by Lester Asheim emphasizes that the American public library is in an era of exciting social change. R. D. Leigh points out the changing concepts of the library's role, with emphasis on the idea that library service is a responsibility of the state as well as of the local community. Loleta D. Fyan cites implications for the future as raised by the Library Services Act. The outlook for support for public agencies, with particular reference to libraries, is presented by C. H. Chatters. P. M. Hauser demonstrates that library planning over the next several decades must take into account shifts in the population growth, distribution, and composition of population, and in the physical structure of metropolitan areas. The question of what relation professional decisions, or lack of them, bear to the needs and interests of the public the librarians are trying to serve is raised by J. W. Getzels, particularly as related to children; and Dan Lacy offers nine inferences for the public library in summarizing his consideration of the adult in a changing society.

Considering new approaches to the collection and services, R. R. Munn concludes that the consolidation or federation of small libraries into county or regional systems is the only means by which the country as a whole can secure adequate public library service. The implications for personnel caused by these changing concepts of the public library's place in our dynamic society are considered by E. A. Wight in terms of numbers, recruiting, regrouping of work and job enlargement, in-service training, and certification. He concludes that the development of state-wide cooperatively sponsored programs for training and developing competent middle administrators is needed, and a program on a national basis to train and certify qualified specialists and top administrators is imperative if the library profession is to embody a mature and responsible group.

Academic libraries face administrative problems similar to those confronting public libraries, and for much the same reasons—growth and changing nature of the population to be served, growth in size of institutions, and increasing competition for funds from public as well as private sources. It is clear that libraries will not progress unless library administrators are successful in gaining public approval and

support in competition with the other demands on bodies controlling tax proceeds.

The literature on the rising tide of students and the problems they will present to colleges and universities is voluminous and should be familiar to librarians. Federal and state governments, foundations, associations and organizations, institutions, and individuals are busily engaged in research on this problem.

Examples of activity by the federal government are reports of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, and the various publications of the United States Office of Education. Among those by state agencies, outstanding examples are to be found in Michigan and California. The Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education issued between June 1957 and June 1958 ten staff studies in *The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan*. The Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education published in 1955 a 473-page report entitled, *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education*. In this, libraries receive some three pages of attention, most of which is devoted to central library storage and space standards. These state agencies have made detailed analyses of institutional programs, including teaching loads and instructional productivity; physical plant needs, including space utilization; the state's ability to support higher education; and the organization and administration of higher education.

The Committee on Utilization of College Teaching Resources, established by the Fund for the Advancement of Education, has made grants to assist experimentation on a wide scale.³ Such experimentation in four major areas has been supported: (1) the placing of greater responsibility on students for their education; (2) rearrangement of course structure; (3) the discovery of new resources, both in teaching and in performance of duties ordinarily expected of teachers, which will be in addition to the usual graduate supply of new full-time teachers; and (4) increasing the institutional reach of colleges and universities.

The Monticello Conference of the Association of Research Libraries in 1954 discussed problems of research libraries, particularly those relating to finances and to cooperative activities, and raised questions that should be investigated.⁴

Looking to the advancement of library service generally, the Folger Library Conferences held in 1955 led to recommendations to the Ford

Future of Library Administration

Foundation which resulted the following year in the incorporation of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. This was set up as an independent, nonprofit body having as its principal objective "to aid in the solution of library problems; to conduct research in, develop and demonstrate new techniques and methods and to disseminate through any means the results thereof." Underwriting it, the Foundation made a grant of \$5 million to be expended over a five-year period.

The first annual report of the Council⁵ marked out three areas within which it expected to find opportunities for fruitful work: (1) basic research in the processes of distribution, organization, storage and communication of knowledge as these affect libraries; (2) technological development looking to the physical-mechanical apparatus of library work (including the collections themselves) and to the applications of mechanisms not yet utilized, and (3) methodological development and coordination of effort looking to over-all development. One of the early moves by the Council was a grant to the Graduate School of Library Service at Rutgers University for a study, "Targets for Research in Library Work," to be directed by R. R. Shaw. That undertaking will summarize the state of the art and the lacunae of understanding in various aspects of librarianship.

The three promotional programs which probably have been of most significance to libraries are the Andrew Carnegie gifts, the Library Services Act, and the establishing of the Council on Library Resources. The gifts of Carnegie led to the construction of nearly three thousand buildings, and the Library Services Act will, it is hoped, bring a great extension of public library services. However, they will have created and increased administrative questions, rather than helped to meet them. The Council program should be of much significance through the contributions it may make toward solving the administrative problems of libraries.

In the area of organization, administration, and functions of academic libraries, the most comprehensive single source of information is L. R. Wilson and M. F. Tauber's *The University Library*. The 1956 edition concludes with a chapter which enumerates and discusses briefly ten categories of problems facing university libraries today. The categories are: (1) history of university libraries, (2) organization and administration, (3) finance, (4) personnel, (5) technical services, (6) services to readers, (7) bibliography and documentation, (8) book and other collections, (9) cooperation and specialization, and (10) buildings and equipment. The authors emphasize the meager

support of research on library matters, and the fact that fewer persons are being trained in research in library schools with the changes in the master's programs which have eliminated courses in the methodology of research and a thesis. The Council on Library Resources may be an adequate source of research support, but it will not provide the personnel which the present programs of the library schools fail to supply.

A recent reappraisal of the place and function of the library in the four-year college was made at the nineteenth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago in 1954.⁶ The program was divided into three major parts: (1) an attempt to ascertain the major current educational objectives and their actual relationships to the library, (2) an analysis of the major resources that the college library must have to meet its obligations, and (3) financial problems of the college library and a summary of some of the major questions and issues mentioned by the various speakers.

In pointing to a few of the major problems, trends, and observations mentioned by the speakers in their separate analyses of various aspects of the college library, H. H. Fussler cites evidence that librarians may be failing to communicate well with faculty members and college administrators, and raises the question as to whether librarians talk about the right things when they do communicate. He suggests that the librarian's position is difficult, being unique in the academic structure because nominally he takes his orders from the president but must determine his actions principally according to faculty needs and directions.⁷

Donald Coney at the Monticello Conference suggested that the isolation of librarians from the sources of high administrative policy has encouraged their exclusiveness, and that librarians have found it easier to work with each other than with scholars. In his opinion the librarian must seek better information on his university's educational plans than he usually has; but he agrees with Fussler that this is not an easy task, since the librarian has no counterpart in the educational economy of the university. Consequently, he must rely on fragmentary information, often obtained by accident from a variety of sources. Also, according to Coney, university librarians are usually bad reporters of what they do, and he suggests use of a "performance budget" to demonstrate the relation of the many operations of the university library to the appropriate university activity.⁸

In demonstrating where the librarian stands in the hierarchy of the

Future of Library Administration

college, Wilson offers a comparison of salaries received in 1952-53 by librarians in colleges with those of administrative personnel and faculty. These figures indicate that the librarian, at least in terms of salary, ranks well toward the bottom of the administrative group, and only at the top of the instructor rank in the academic group.⁹

Fussler finds "the library salary structure as reported by Wilson is disturbing, not so much because of the low salaries themselves as because of the implications of the adverse differentials between the librarians' salaries and the other administrative and teaching salaries. We see ourselves as major academic, administrative officers, charged with the responsibility for building, maintaining, and operating the single most complex, most expensive, and most widely used instrument of learning and research within any academic institution—cyclotrons and ion accelerators not excepted—the library."¹⁰

More recent studies by the U. S. Office of Education and by the Research Division of the National Education Association indicate that the librarian in all types of colleges and universities, public and private, holds approximately the same hierarchical position, in terms of salary, as in the college library figures for 1952-53. A survey by the U. S. Office of Education, based on returns from 429 public and 717 private institutions, included salaries paid to administrative personnel. Its report embraces a section as follows:

The 10 of the 24 administrative positions in 1957-58 paid the highest mean salaries for public and private colleges and universities combined . . . are shown below. The highest mean salary is in the first position and the other positions are in a descending order.

1. President
2. Dean of the graduate school
3. Executive dean or academic vice president
4. Director of planning (physical plant)
5. Director of development (fund-raising)
6. Chief business officer
7. Dean of students
8. Administrative assistant to the president
9. Director of student health
10. Director of non-academic personnel.¹¹

When institutions were divided into categories by type and according to method of control, the data revealed the remuneration of the director of the library ranking among salaries for administrative posi-

tions in the several classes as follows: 9th, 11th, 13th, 7th, 13th, 12th, 13th, 17th, 10th, and 15th. They put it above those of such officers as alumni secretary, registrar, director of food services, chief accounting officer, and manager of residence halls.

A study made by the Research Division of the National Education Association in 1957 disclosed that among the salaries paid to administrative officers in 723 degree-granting institutions in 1957-58, the median compensation of the head librarians ranked 20th in the list of 23 such officers, being higher than the salaries of the deans of women and the registrars.¹² This same study indicated that in 181 junior colleges the librarian tied with the director of public relations for last place salary-wise among nine administrative officers. In 72 private junior colleges the librarians ranked 8th in salary, ahead of the dean of women.¹³ The median remuneration for the head librarians in 723 degree-granting institutions in 1957-58 was \$6,134 for twelve months of service; that paid to full-time instruction personnel of all ranks in 772 degree-granting institutions for the same period was \$6,015 for nine months of service.¹⁴

Jerrold Orne¹⁵ and L. C. Powell¹⁶ have expressed their concern over excessive appointments of non-librarians to the librarianship of major educational institutions. Powell suggests that these are made by executives who do not like what they see passing for librarians, and his solution is to provide librarians who are readers of books and servants of those in need of help, instead of "cynical and unbelieving technicians, ambitious for a quick climb to the top of the ladder."

Orne points out "serious and distinctive differences both in character and demand between academic librarians and those who are selected to serve in large public or important special libraries." He proposes a new educational pattern, which will bring superior candidates into the library field to be trained for top-level academic positions.

Powell comments on "a trend toward taking top library administrators out of their posts and making them some other kind of administrator—which seems to me an admission that the person had been in the wrong work all his life." In this instance he would appear to disagree with David Riesman, who, in considering the movement from craft skill to manipulative skill suggests the emergence of a new pattern in American business and professional life, according to which "if one is successful in one's craft, one is forced to leave it."¹⁷ Riesman cites as examples the newspaperman who becomes a deskman, the doctor who becomes the head of a clinic or hospital, the professor who

Future of Library Administration

becomes a dean, president, or foundation official. He points out that when the size of enterprises was small, the head could remain a colleague among other colleagues, not cutting connections entirely to enter a new milieu. The older generation of college presidents was composed largely of men who continued to think of themselves as scholars.

Riesman adds that, "The executive who has moved up from a professional position can hardly help feeling that his work is air-conditioned: fine only so long as the machinery below runs smoothly. Those colleagues whom he has left behind will not be slow, in their envy, to remind him that he can no longer consider himself a competent craftsman among his fellow craftsmen, that he does not fool them if, as an editor or by-line columnist, he occasionally attends a presidential press conference; or, as a college administrator, an occasional scholarly convention. . . ." ¹⁸ He comments also that a society increasingly dependent on manipulation of people is almost as destructive of the craft-oriented professional man as a society in the earlier stages of industrialization is destructive of the handicraft-oriented peasant and artisan. The professional worker of today is pushed upstairs into the managerial class; but in a profession such as librarianship most positions will continue to offer comfortable places to inner-directed types. Powell's "readers of books and servants of those in need of help" must be available in staffing libraries, but the top administrators must be those who can build into smooth-flowing organizations the skills that were once built into men by a long apprenticeship process.

In summary, the present writer suggests the following trends which appear likely to affect library administration in the future:

1. Growth in size of library service units, institutional and geographical, with an attendant requirement of real managerial skill to assure maximum utilization of total resources.
2. Altered demands for library service, reflecting population and social changes and calling for administrative capacities to meet them.
3. Increasing competition for funds, from public and private sources, which will make much more important the ability of the chief library administrator to communicate with his superiors in presenting library programs and needs.
4. Increasing attention to basic research in the three areas defined by the Council on Library Resources, with the possible result of major modifications in the whole field of library administration.
5. Changes in education for librarianship, to assist in producing

liberally prepared executives who, as recruits from the profession can move up from the ranks to the level of managerial responsibility needed.

If these trends do develop, as it now appears they may, an appreciation of the uses of books still will be the major factor in the successful administration of libraries.

References

1. Wasserman, Paul: Development of Administration in Library Service: Current Status and Future Prospects. *College and Research Libraries*, 19:283-294, July 1958.
2. Asheim, Lester, ed.: *New Directions in Public Library Development*. (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1957.
3. Committee on Utilization of College Teaching Resources: *Better Utilization of College Teaching Resources . . . A Second Year's Experiments*. New York, Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957.
4. Association of Research Libraries: *Problems and Prospects of the Research Library*. New Brunswick, N. J., Scarecrow Press, 1955.
5. Council on Library Resources, Inc.: *First Annual Report*. Washington, D. C., The Council, 1957, p. 12.
6. Fussler, H. H., ed.: *The Function of the Library in the Modern College*. (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1954.
7. Fussler, H. H.: Some Problems in College Librarianship. In: *Ibid.*, pp. 113-117.
8. Coney, Donald: A Librarian's view of Library Finance. In: Association of Research Libraries, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-134.
9. Wilson, E. H.: Government and Control of the College Library. In: Fussler, *op. cit.*, ref. 6, pp. 34-35.
10. Fussler, *op. cit.*, ref. 7, pp. 113-114.
11. Bokelman, W. R.: *Higher Education Planning and Management Data, 1957-58*. (Circular No. 517) Washington, D. C., U. S. Office of Education, 1958, pp. 6-7.
12. National Education Association. Research Division: *Salaries Paid and Salary Practices in Universities, Colleges and Junior Colleges, 1957-58*. (Higher Education Series, Research Report 1958-R 1) The Association, 1958, pp. 30-31.
13. *Ibid.*, pp. 51-52
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 10.
15. Orne, Jerrold: Wanted: A Million Dollars. *Library Journal*, 83:798-801, Mar. 15, 1958.
16. Powell, L. C.: Books Will be Read. *Library Journal*, 83:346-351, Feb. 1, 1958.
17. Riesman, David, *et al.*: *The Lonely Crowd*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1950, pp. 133-136.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 134.