



Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

ERNEST J. REECE

IN VIEWING LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION today, care may be needed to include all its aspects. Even librarians may fall into acting as if a person responsible for a library, having been attracted by his calling and fitted for it, is occupied solely in acquiring and organizing library materials and making them useful to people—this although they know the realities are otherwise.

It also is relevant to distinguish the place the several parts of library administration deserve. That may be especially true because so far there seems to have been only limited critical examination of the duties in libraries. Existing descriptions of positions appear to be reportorial, rather than preceptive or even aimed at designating what might be correct.

In any case, it must be recognized that frequently there are lumped with a librarian's essential tasks some which are not intrinsic or peculiar to library work, which he may not have anticipated undertaking, and for which he could not be expected to possess particular capacities. Prominent are those connected with housing, staffing, the conduct of business affairs and public relations, and possibly photographic processing. Among them, also, are statistical and editorial duties, the protection of clientele, staff and property, and attention to management problems. Still others may claim a place, now or in the future.

Such responsibilities seem to merit scrutiny because generally they are inescapable, because they entail considerable outlay in time, effort and money, and because they may not have been provided for in the most suitable or efficient manner. Observation indicates that, in small libraries at least, often no one of them is enough to constitute a job in itself, and that such a job could not be budgeted in any case. Conse-

The author is Melvil Dewey Professor *Emeritus* of Library Service, Columbia University.

quently they become lodged with regular staff members as time permits, or with the head librarian.

To handle auxiliary functions in such a way may have seemed expedient, but is it sensible? The individuals taking them on presumably have ample loads as librarians—at least one seldom hears that libraries are overstaffed. What time and attention are required for them must be drawn from library duties, perhaps at the cost of some distraction. Again, the knowledge and skills those persons are apt to lack are important—facility, for example, in saying what should be done about a leaking window or window-frame, in approving a job of gutter-mending or termite extermination, or in speaking the final word about a new floor surfacing or heating installation, after experts have proffered alternative and perhaps conflicting recommendations. Comparable handicaps may show in the testing of applicants for staff positions, in the procedures of financial bookkeeping, and in the several arts involved in public relations, to say nothing of the remaining range of incidental activities.

The prospect that library service may suffer when unprepared librarians attempt unaccustomed duties of course is the clinching reason for examining how far the ancillary responsibilities are in proper hands. If libraries were conspicuous for meeting the demands upon them and measuring up to their opportunities, flaws here and there in their structure might be overlooked. As it is they hardly can afford to ignore such defects and any conditions causing them.

The facts pertinent in considering the auxiliary responsibilities are what and how much has been done to regularize their management and render it effective, and how that has been accomplished. Specifically this means what amounts of time and attention are accorded them, what the status is of the persons in charge of them, and the qualifications for their work such persons possess. The place to look is the libraries which have sought and attained in some degree a systematic assignment of the duties. Such information can represent only a limited number of libraries, as explained in the addendum to the present paper. It does illustrate the conditions, however, and is set forth in the ensuing paragraphs with as much generalizing and as little minutiae as has seemed possible. In assembling it and in interpreting it the libraries were thought of as in two classes—those conducted autonomously and those associated operatively with institutions or governmental units—this because the latter customarily differ from others in being relieved more or less of the extrinsic activities by out-

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

side offices. The groups are referred to in the paper as "unattached" and "attached" respectively.

Naturally the practices of large libraries in managing the secondary duties vary widely and are not readily classifiable. As a rule a given responsibility is cared for in one of three ways. Where the provision is most nearly complete—in about one-fourth of the total libraries considered—there are full-time officers bearing distinctive titles, sometimes prepared for their assignments through study and/or experience in relevant fields, recognized by salaries which range up to \$10,500, and generally furnished with assistance amounting to one or more workers and in a few instances to nine or above. In a comparable number of cases officers giving less than full time to the special activities exist, designated by titles related either to their particular tasks or to librarianship, occasionally with preparation suited to their jobs, receiving compensation usually beyond the \$6,000 level, and provided with aid, although frequently not as much as one assistant. Finally, there remain even in large libraries fairly numerous examples suggesting unplanned disposition of the ancillary functions, the methods being either to distribute them among one or more staff members or to leave them in the hands of the head librarian to manage as he can. In such cases the persons responsible have the appearance of casuals as far as their special tasks are concerned. Here and there they have enjoyed some study or experience fitting them for their work; their salaries as a rule seem what they would receive as librarians and without reference to extraneous duties; and they apparently have the benefit of such help as is necessary from associates or subordinates, although the amount of this is indefinite and probably often minor.

Within this pattern a few circumstances are notable. Auxiliary duties may be substantial even in attached libraries; the persons in charge of them frequently are well prepared as librarians, whether or not they are so in ancillary fields; assistance for the directors of incidental activities appears most liberal where the directors themselves have firmly established major-time status, and the reverse; and compensation lower than might be anticipated occurs here and there, despite a generally favorable remuneration level.

The deviations, however, are numerous and widespread. They seem coupled with diverse views about the several functions and the consequent sense of obligation regarding them; with the stage reached in dealing with those functions, generally and locally; and most of all

with the contrasting conditions in attached and unattached libraries.

For personnel administration about a fourth of the libraries maintain full-time officers with distinguishing titles, according to the general pattern; but about the same proportion depends upon appointees describable as casuals as respects the work in question, and a larger number has part-time officers. To be sure, in attached libraries the full-time ratio runs much lower than this and the part-time higher. Yet evidently in such situations an impressive measure of direction and control continues to be exercised by the libraries—in one instance it is reported that a university personnel authority “only establishes basic policy.” The number of casuals too may suggest a common disinclination on the part of administrators to relinquish a matter as intimate to effective service as personnel administration is, and possibly even to concede how much attention it requires.

Personnel officers on the whole receive only moderate amounts of help, perhaps because what assistants can contribute is thought limited, except in the largest organizations. A sprinkling of them have pursued substantial study, and somewhat more have accumulated experience in their field, although in neither case to any such extent as in librarianship.

Conforming to type again, business managers are on full time in approximately one-fourth of the libraries. Such officers giving part of their time appear in well toward one-half of the cases, however, and not many casuals are found. The relatively full provision here—more abundant all told than in any other of the auxiliary areas—possibly can be laid to the facts that financial procedures are involved in book-buying, regardless of the need for them otherwise; that they must have begun to claim attention early in library history; and that they may comprehend the total fiscal activities. Assistance to finance officers is generous, commensurate with the circumstance that much of the work can be handled by clerical persons and that this reduces the time demanded from those in charge. Help is fairly plentiful even in attached libraries, this resulting probably from the need for records which a central institutional or municipal office might not maintain and which in any case must be at hand.

The record for special preparatory study and experience shown by business officers is the strongest in the ancillary fields, this being particularly true of their experience. An explanation may be a tendency in libraries to look for such qualifications, plus the availability of school and college courses in relevant subjects and the opportunities

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

for pertinent work outside libraries. The conversance of such officers with library science is modest. Their salaries include more below the \$6,000 mark than occur elsewhere, perhaps in line with the nature of some of the duties and the brevity of the schooling required for them.

Building supervisors are retained in well over half of the libraries, those on full and part time being about equally numerous, and officers giving all their time being more prominent than for any other of the auxiliary duties. There are very few who carry the tasks only incidentally. Such ratios very likely are attributable to long-standing pressures of housekeeping duties felt directly by administrators. It is of interest that only one of the full-time officers is in an attached library, and that more commonly than in any other of the ancillary fields libraries report that they bear no responsibility. Despite this there are enough part-time men and casuals in attached libraries to show that the necessity often remains there for persons to follow up on needs and to maintain general liaison in relation to cleaning, repairs, and alterations. Also, so far as casuals are present they could imply, at least where the work is limited, a tendency to tolerate the survival of traditional practice or of assignments once lodged with individuals for momentary reasons.

Whatever arrangements obtain for plant supervision may be supplemented when construction projects are in train. One large city library states that contemporarily the attention to building oversight is stepped up because of a "branch expansion program and physical changes at Central"; another at present has a full time "new buildings officer," as is known to have happened in at least one metropolitan situation in the past. Except in attached libraries the help furnished to plan superintendents is extensive, although some of that reported doubtless is only custodial.

Practical experience has contributed more to the equipment of buildings supervisors than study in their special field, which has been scant. Not that appropriate schooling is infeasible or unknown, for in some cases courses in maintenance have been pursued or engineering degrees have been attained; but these are exceptional. Acquaintance with library work has only a small place. Salaries seem to reflect the kind and standard of preparation since, as in the case of business managers, there is a marked number in the low brackets.

Public relations, taken at its widest, claims the services of designated full-time officers in less than one-fourth of the libraries—this being the arrangement almost invariably in metropolitan instances—and of

part-timers in somewhat fewer. The total for the two groups is smaller than for any of the other auxiliary functions. In attached libraries full-time persons are rare—none at all are reported from universities. Of the others, two-thirds give less than half time. Casual management is frequent, notably in universities, where a common plan presumably is for a staff member to keep a central publicity agency *en rapport* with library affairs and to maintain appropriate contacts with clientele, "Friends of the Library," and potential benefactors. However, one university librarian allots a major portion of his time to public relations; and a recent respondent, supposedly thinking in the main of such situations, judges "that at least fifty per cent, probably more, of the time and attention of the country's top library directors is devoted to activities falling under the head of 'public relations'." Help amounting to at least one full-time worker is usually at the call of full-time officers, running in one instance to as many as eleven, with less available for part-time heads and casuals.

The cases in which public relations officers have prepared themselves by study in their subject and on the other hand by experience in the same field are about equally numerous, and together they are not impressive. Further, about as many have acquired conversance with librarianship as with their specialty, which may suggest that the incumbents often are librarians who have turned to the auxiliary branch of work. Their salaries generally are at or above the \$6,000 mark; although some are below that and may imply the utilization of subordinates who because of youth or other factors have not progressed far in the service.

In gauging the provision for public relations, several conditions need to be kept in mind. In the absence of agreed definition the subject must be taken broadly—embracing simple publicity, measures for spreading comprehension and use of facilities, and services aimed partially at promotion. So interpreted, the relatively small number of special officers tells only part of the story, since most members of most library staffs may be engaged in the enterprise. Among the reasons for such ramifying participation may be that it is closely bound with many kinds of service to the public; that it is too pervasive to be readily isolated as an activity; and that it calls for varied gifts, from those of assistants versed in feature-writing, editing, and display, to the talents of high-level staff members facile in individual and community contacts and in innovations, conveniences, allurements, and sheer hospitality.

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

Furthermore, the task entailed in public relations evidently is seen to be as sizable and pressing as its demands are varied. Library staffs accordingly appear sensitive to it, even though it could be slighted without immediately troublesome consequences, much less official or public criticism. They also must be aware that no one will bother about it if they do not. The spread and urgency of public relations thus combine to elicit contributions which augment materially those of both special and casual officers. They probably mount up to more aid to administrators than might be guessed.

Photographic processing seems to rank as an auxiliary service; for although it is a means of making informational resources available and therefore might be treated as intrinsic to library work, its techniques are peculiar to itself and it can be assigned largely to persons whose skills are limited to those techniques. Provision for it appears almost solely where reference and research work are extensive, which means relatively few even of the large libraries, and those mainly at universities.

At several libraries there is an expert "head of photographic services," or a similarly designated person, on full time. Again, the work is in charge of a librarian, with or without distinctive status, who with some staff manages photographic operations along with other duties—perhaps oversight of technical processes generally, or of printing, binding, duplicating, supplies, or even business affairs or physical plant. Three libraries scatter the responsibility among several individuals, in one case pending concentration when it becomes possible to reorganize. One library depends wholly upon a part-time student assistant, and another upon a clerk. Only one case is known in which a central agency takes care of photographic processing for an attached library. The assistance available to full-time men runs to as many as nine helpers, and in one exceptional case far beyond that; and it is by no means niggardly in general—this in line with the routine nature of much of the work.

Not a great deal of special study or experience is represented in the records of photographic officers, and of the two experience is the more marked. Preparation in librarianship has a larger place, implying that librarians may often have taken on the duties in question. With the examples small in number and diverse, little can be concluded about the compensation of the heads of photographic services, some appearing above the \$6,000 level and some below.

While the arrangements for photographic processing are new, few,

and not closely in line with those for auxiliary responsibilities generally, they may be settling into a scheme of their own. They seem at least to represent a measure of evolution. Some readers will recall that in years past head librarians here and there devoted a good deal of attention to them. This may have been inevitable in the pioneering stage, since the processes take unlike forms and differ in their advantages and disadvantages, and often entail substantial investment, so that policy decisions have necessitated study of their features. They also may have pricked the normal interest of executives in scientific aids to efficiency. Present conditions can well be viewed against this background.

Other ancillary responsibilities might be listed at length, for they appear to be growing in prominence. Only those mentioned in the introduction to this paper seem to occupy any considerable place, however, namely statistical control, the editing of publications, the policing of services and quarters, and the study of management conditions and practices. At that, the provisions existing for them have little relation to the general pattern. In a few libraries where their volume has mounted there are special officers or even departments, sometimes mingling auxiliary duties with others. Ordinarily, however, the activities so far as they are developed would seem to be carried by head librarians incidentally, by other staff members as expediency and schedules permit, by clerks, or in combinations of these ways. All told the arrangements for them offer little fresh or significant illustration.

What estimate can be placed upon the conditions as portrayed? How far do they indicate advance in shifting the auxiliary responsibilities from librarians to persons possessing time and qualifications for them?

In a general way there undoubtedly has been progress. Long-time observers know that the existence of special officers is a modern development; and indeed it would have been unthinkable when all libraries were small. Many will recall that as late as the mid-thirties personnel directors, for instance, were rare, although the need for them was becoming manifest. Their contemporary presence and that of their companion officers therefore represents a gain, whatever their numbers and equipment. Furthermore, it supplies examples and perhaps incentives for libraries which are lagging.

Looking at the picture more concretely, a standard for evaluating the conditions may be hypothesized, beginning with the view advanced by the Public Libraries Division of the American Library Asso-

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

ciation in 1956 and used in discovering the libraries to be covered in the present study, that a library having a staff of seventy-five or more should be served by a special personnel officer. The proposal did not specify that the one in charge of personnel administration should devote all his time to that work, but since otherwise the statement would lack meaning as a guide it may be supposed that this was intended. It seems fair to infer also that he was to be thought of as having expert status, prepared by a year or more of formal study and/or by five years or better of experience in his field, compensated to correspond with his duties and qualifications, and furnished with the help of one or more assistants. The standard can be completed by assuming that a library with a staff of the size indicated would need comparable officers, similarly equipped, for each of the other major ancillary functions. Implicit too is an adequate comprehension of the several areas, with intent to discharge the responsibilities on the scale they demand. In using the criterion leeway obviously is necessary where libraries are parts of other units and consequently do not bear the full burden of auxiliary duties.

The summaries suggest how far short of any such norm the libraries fall. Taking into account the numbers of special officers, the time they and their assistants can give, and the qualifications and status they embody, only about one-fourth of the libraries supposedly large enough to meet the standard are doing so. Even allowing for the indeterminate needs in attached libraries, such a proportion hardly can be made to look favorable. What the conditions must be in the hundreds of libraries of less size and resources can be imagined. Clearly all too much remains on the shoulders of staff members whose main obligation is service to the public, including head librarians. True, the norm is a theoretical one; but the committee that ventured it knew well the situation in public libraries at least. True again, some public libraries whose position seems to call for staffs of seventy-five or more were found to have fewer than this; yet failure to maintain the force a service area would require hardly can excuse disregard of still another standard.

The shortcomings are confirmed by various remarks and observations of respondents. Examples from unattached libraries are sundry statements of chiefs—in one case that the proportion of his day consigned to incidental duties amounts to “about one hundred and fifty per cent”; in one that “far too much time of the librarian . . . is spent on matters that should be delegated to properly trained assistants”;

in a third that for the want of help on such tasks "the struggle to expand our facilities and stretch our financial resources takes me farther and farther from the real work of the library," so that "any time I spend on real library work . . . is a treat"; and in still another that "for two years budget requests have included funds for a full-time personnel director and a publicity director, but . . . have been cut so deeply as to eliminate these two positions," and that "we are not through requesting."

Such laments are repeated for the specific fields—for instance, that a "full-time personnel director is an outstanding need"; that "it at times seems desirable to have one position for the business operations and one for buildings, etc.," instead of a combination, "budgetary problems" being "largely responsible for this not having been accomplished"; and that "for the public relations and publications program," "more time is needed and a higher level of training and experience." The limited help available often where ancillary responsibilities are carried incidentally lends double force to such complaints, and underlines the degree to which bricks are having to be made with little straw.

In attached libraries dissatisfactions are less marked, and the arrangements with outside offices sometimes are described as working well; yet aid from such agencies does not necessarily render everything simple and serene. Apart from the fact that a library may be billed for services received—which supposedly can be adjusted fairly enough—the liaison and the communication back and forth may be cumbersome, and the action of a central office upon accumulating requests from cued-up claimants may seem dilatory. And apparently the anticipated help may be uncertain. One comment regarding a group of university libraries—in this instance, it is true, libraries presumably not large enough for inclusion in the inquiry—stated that "the university librarian is expected to be a man of all work," and that "the scholarly interests are usually sacrificed to the performance of quite menial tasks: carpentry; helping the janitor move books or cases, etc."

As implied in the testimony, complaints are likely to be most sharp from "in-between size" libraries, where the engaging of specialists would be within reason and perhaps is seen to be so, but must await growth and amplified means. One such case appears in a city of almost 400,000 population. More or less often such libraries may not have reached the dimensions suited to their potential clientele, their basic trouble therefore being that they remain small libraries in large situations.

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

Not that all the reactions have been critical. Some libraries enjoying adequate provision for the auxiliary duties noted their satisfaction with conditions. Probably this could have been assumed, since they hardly would have persisted in the retention of special officers and staffs unless convinced that the device was working to advantage. Further, one metropolitan library recently has had a survey of the operations here considered made by a firm of management consultants, presumably with a view to improving the existent practice since there is no intimation of relinquishing it.

Contentment with things as they are was indicated also in a number of libraries where regulations for the ancillary responsibilities plainly fall short, qualified sometimes by such expressions as "present arrangements seem satisfactory for this library." If the standard is in any wise valid, however, such reports scarcely can prove success in disregard of it. Commendable effort against odds there may have been; but the likelihood would seem that the libraries either are suffering from want of the facilities suited to their supposed class, or that they have not attained that class. Exceptions of course are to be allowed for in the cases of attached libraries.

The attitude of those failing to disclose a judgment on conditions naturally can only be guessed—whether they relish their lot, or are too unhappy to dwell upon it, or are unconcerned. Perhaps a fair surmise is that a majority would welcome improvement, but either do not see it as urgent, or indulge faint hopes of getting it and therefore think the less said the better.

The picture as revealed might be dismissed as one of normal transition, yet a glance at some of its causes may help in judging whether librarians can afford to let the matter rest. The budget limitations deplored by respondents undoubtedly are common, and are of particular moment because auxiliary officers and staffs must be charged to administration. With the item for book purchases often a regrettably small part of total expenditures, additions to operating costs may seem hard to defend, yet they may be in the long-range interest. Again, prevailing ways of handling the secondary duties, warranted at the time of their introduction but not advantageous permanently, may have become unduly fixed. Especially where coupled with a lag in modern organization generally, they may have retarded progress. Finally, the several functions may not have been seen as calling for more than minor concern.

Present returns, apart from the definite practices reported from

major libraries, are not barren of hints for overborne head librarians. The handicaps inherent in service units of scant size themselves imply that creation of larger agencies could bring better management of extraneous responsibilities. Again, persons may be appointed to subordinate library positions who have conversance with the auxiliary tasks, or flair for them; and some already on the payroll may be encouraged to fit themselves for such duties.

The responses to the inquiry tempt a reader to imagine still other avenues of relief. Just as an attorney on a board of trustees may furnish his library legal advice, for example, help along other lines might be securable from comparable sources, or even from "Friends of the Library" or from officials of sister institutions. Such a solution hardly could be recommended as a permanency; and the assistance might be largely on a staff rather than a line basis while it lasted. Often it would deserve compensation, of course; but at that it supposedly would represent a saving, and could be worth-while as a stop-gap if it lightened administrative burdens and improved results.

Beside the matters so far discussed there are some in the background which deserve to influence future thinking about the handling of the auxiliary responsibilities.

One of these is the conditions in attached libraries, which are bound to render it difficult for such libraries to invoke any settled formula for managing the duties. Whether associated with educational institutions, with political units, or with private foundations, the burdens such libraries carry and the methods they follow are determined largely by their individual situations. Probably it is correct to say that no two are alike—some have considerable ranges of the auxiliary tasks carried by central offices and others only small amounts; some are relieved quite definitely of one or more branches of work and less so of the rest. Also, events and decisions outside the libraries' control may govern or change their share of the load. While such circumstances may becloud judgments as to the practice to be preferred in a given place, however, they may be the best reasons for studying whatever problems are at issue and for having a policy, subject to local factors and to forecasts of institutional and governmental courses.

If there are to be auxiliary officers, question arises whether they should be primarily specialists or essentially librarians. Some avoid this, asserting that "the quality of the personnel" and its work are

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

more important than "organization," or "who does what," or even "standards of education." But the issue is there.

As heretofore shown, a great number of the specialists are librarians, sometimes equipped by study or seasoned experience in their particular fields, but more often not. This arrangement probably rests mainly upon expediency, if not necessity; yet one respondent avers that "library training and experience are desirable for the auxiliary positions." Another says regarding personnel management that since it "is of major importance to the development of good library service," it "can not be left in the hands of those who are not directly responsible for that service." And an able expositor, himself in charge of some of the ancillary duties, writes that "without a thorough knowledge of library practices and problems, including those in the areas of bibliography and service to readers, we cannot do effective work."

Some emphasize this viewpoint by advocating concentration of more than one function in a single librarian. Such an arrangement is reported from a university library as "exceedingly satisfactory," since "by having one administrator responsible for these varying phases of administration, there is a coordination of activities and a continuity which would not exist if responsibility was invested in several individuals." A colleague elsewhere approves it as "placing in responsible hands the administration of areas very important to the library's successful operation," and has plans to add a high-level staff member to help the director and associate director in the several auxiliary tasks. It is to be noted that both of these comments come from universities, where such work does not fall wholly upon the libraries. In any event, if they mean asking special officers to be expert in more than one field, that apparently is not regarded as too much.

Convictions to the contrary, based equally on experience, are no less firm. In one case it has been the "goal to utilize the skills and knowledges of other professions . . . whenever possible," and in another the use of "specialists in their subject fields" has been found very acceptable. In a third the intention is to add such persons when the tasks calling for them have grown sufficiently. Even more positive are the statement that most of the positions dealing with the auxiliary duties "are not in [the] professional librarian series"; the belief "that non-librarians as personnel supervisor and building manager can bring to the library special qualifications and experience which are better than what could be gained by converting a librarian"; and the opinion that "inasmuch as possible it seems desirable . . . to remove from

professional functions those activities not directly related to library service."

Possibly resolution of the opposing positions is not to be pressed. Those favoring auxiliary officers who are first of all librarians have a strong argument in the value of intimate internal knowledge of the institutions to be served. On the other hand, the basic assets of such an officer are knowledge and skill in his specialty. If he possesses those he should be able to apply them effectively in a department store, a steel mill, a school system, or a library. He will need familiarity with library practice; but that should be acquirable through attentiveness to the conditions and procedures in libraries, and not indispensably by formal study of library science or by being a librarian. The ultimate choice between the two courses may hinge upon the importance ascribed to the division of labor, of which more later.

The use of the term "professional" in one of the quotations above might seem to pose a distinction between the dignity and prestige of one calling and those of another. Probably nothing of the kind was intended; and in any event it need not be entertained. If the status of librarians is professional, so also is that, for example, of a personnel or public relations director; and indeed in today's scene it might be the more widely recognized. But it is professional in its own right. The qualified practitioner in the management of personnel or public relations possesses it, whatever the enterprise to which he contributes his capacities. The librarian who goes to the pains of equipping himself for such an auxiliary field acquires it, although without dependence on his role as a librarian. He has become doubly professional.

There remains the problem of dealing with the auxiliary responsibilities on a sufficiently broad front. This is three-fold, involving the ideas about the duties themselves, the administrative principle particularly applying to them, and the science of administration in general.

It has been suggested that the manner of providing for the ancillary activities is likely to depend upon the notions held regarding their scope. It naturally makes a difference whether personnel administration, for example, is thought of simply as hiring, placing, and keeping time and payroll records, or as embracing the formulation of classification and compensation schemes, the setting up and supervising of retirement plans, arrangements for transfer, promotion and discipline, staff training and improvement, attention to the varied aspects of welfare, and the conduct of needed studies. It makes a corresponding difference whether the work of a business office is seen only as routine

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

purchasing and financial processes, or as joining with these the general planning of fiscal procedures, the development of systems and techniques, the coordinating of operations with those of other departments, the drafting of budgets, the preparing of formal reports, and the prosecution of pertinent investigations.

As between such views of course a library may feel that it can do little to effectuate a choice. What it vests in an auxiliary office may be ordained by deep-rooted peculiarities in its organization or, in the case of attached libraries, by what remains to be done beyond the tasks carried by outside agencies. But if efficiency is worth an ancillary officer, it seems worth an endeavor wherever feasible to take into account all that he could be controlling advantageously. The evidence suggests that libraries sometimes scrape through with scant concern for secondary duties because they have not considered what is being left undone. Does building supervision, for instance, mean merely taking care of day-to-day necessities, and of emergencies as they arise; or is there a program for maintenance, and effort at enlisting the brains and ability to carry it out? There would appear little doubt as to what sound and provident administration dictates.

Given an adequate appraisal of the ancillary functions and their demands, it may be time to apply more fully the division of labor. If that principle is valid in the world at large, and even in forming departments for processing and service in libraries, why not in distributing the auxiliary responsibilities.

It is not alone that the load of these responsibilities can be heavy, but that it is specialized, and specialized in several directions. Rarely can a librarian be expert and free to ply an expertness in a field other than his own, let alone in more than one such area. Even if he succeeded, he almost surely would end up as a less effective librarian than he was capable of being. Crowded by his schedule, diverted incessantly from his chief concern, and perhaps harassed personally, he would be put to it to keep his vision and perspective and to direct his energies most productively, granted that he managed to plow through mountains of work each day. It is relevant here that where an administrator feels any extraneous burden at all it is likely to include the several kinds of ancillary duties, since in a given library all tend to be treated alike. Logic indeed seems on the side of establishing the librarian first of all as a librarian; and in the case of the director as a generalist and coordinator—this in relation to auxiliary activities as well as to library procedures proper. Surely one step toward this

is for him to share his secondary responsibilities with persons proficient in them.

There are those, it is true, for whom the manipulating of a complicated instrument, and playing upon many keys and stops and controls, holds high interest. The contributions of such persons in the upbuilding and managing of libraries have been distinguished, and fortunately so in some situations. Perhaps what they have done, however, has been accomplished under handicaps that need not remain. And if to any the delegating of auxiliary responsibilities seems to leave librarianship with too little content, they may care to ponder the remark of a respondent in the inquiry who characterized the professional task as "primarily involved in continual evaluation and selection of book stock and those public services requiring an evaluative knowledge of library resources."

It is assumed of course that any librarian's central anxiety is the sufficiency of his institution. As regards secondary duties he may have been forced into an inconsistent role, and even be acquiescent in it. He is not warranted in complacency, however, nor in reluctance to question his efficacy, nor in neglect to discriminate between proper and alien elements in his work. Nor is he blameless if he fails to push his governing body and his clientele into dissatisfaction with the quality of library service they are apt to be getting.

If full acceptance of the division of labor is desirable, so may be further regard for the science of administration generally. A lay observer might well judge that this has lagged.

It may appear puzzling that as librarians have acquired and handled the literature of administration for patrons, so little has rubbed off and been applied in libraries. Apart from faults in allocating auxiliary duties, there are the cases in which the organization as a whole looks improvised. Again, there have been some in which personal direction has become entrenched, with action and even policies dependent upon the nod of the executive. There have been still others in which the views of management experts, and their studied and systematic approach to administration, have been suspected and spurned.

Perhaps the most plausible warrant in such instances, aside from the lack of resources for innovations, is the feeling that administration rests so heavily upon common sense and moment-to-moment adjustment that it holds little place for planning and programming. There is some ground for this in that the executive, although appearing to be in a position of command, still must take account of the preroga-

Auxiliary Administrative Tasks

tives and preconceptions of his governing body, see that the things are done which his subordinates may omit, and pick up the pieces when designs fall apart. He may drift into thinking that the more fluid things are kept the better.

However, accumulated knowledge can help in applying common sense. Systematic organization can routinize some matters and reduce improvising. Most of all, the study and experience of experts hardly can fail to throw light upon the administrative task and its problems. It would seem thus as though administrative science could contribute to a comprehensive understanding of ancillary functions, and encourage the handling of them through a sane division of labor. It conceivably could help toward defining the role of a head librarian, or even library administration.

ADDENDUM

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY OF AUXILIARY RESPONSIBILITIES IN LARGE LIBRARIES

As indicated in the paper, the aim of the study was to examine the management of certain auxiliary administrative duties in libraries supposedly of sufficient size to be handling them with some adequacy. The libraries considered constituted only a fraction of the total in the United States and Canada. Of the two categories embracing them the "unattached" group consisted almost wholly of city public libraries. The "attached" class comprised chiefly university libraries, but with a sprinkling of others; and it was included because of common knowledge that the libraries in it have to devote some attention to the ancillary activities even though they receive more or less help on the matter from associated agencies.

The libraries to be examined were selected on the thesis that a library system whose staff numbers seventy-five or more should have a special personnel officer. (See American Library Association. Public Libraries Division. Co-ordinating Committee on Revision of Public Library Standards. *Public Library Service*, 1956, p. 41.) Since some of the other ancillary responsibilities were believed to become pressing at least as early in a library's development as personnel management, this floor figure was taken as showing the cases apt to yield significant information for all.

In applying the criterion, the list of university libraries having full-time staffs of seventy-five or more was drawn from the American Library Association compilation "College and University Library Statistics, 1956-57" (see *College and Research Libraries*, 19:[55-58], Jan.

1958.) No school or college libraries, so far as known, maintain staffs of such numbers. For public libraries, including some in the attached group, the judgment that there may well be one staff member for each 2,500 residents in a service area suggests that the libraries having staffs of seventy-five or above, and which therefore should be considered, are those serving populations of 187,500 or better. (See *Public Library Service, supra*, p. 43, for the recommendation on this, and the sources cited in the footnote below* for the populations of service areas in the United States and Canada.) While there might be question whether this norm should be utilized uniformly for all public libraries (notably for county as well as for city libraries), it has been employed for want of anything more authoritative and because the variations among libraries hardly could render it fatally at fault. The few large reference libraries studied were included on the strength of knowledge of their size.

The count of libraries supposedly qualifying was 122. After they had been listed the data available in printed sources about their handling of auxiliary responsibilities were gathered, and an inquiry was sent to them asking, where the facts were not already in hand, for the titles of the officers charged with the main ancillary duties, the amount of time devoted to the activities by such persons, the quantity of help supplied to them by assistants, the relevant preparatory study and experience of the officers, their salary brackets, and comments by the reporters. Response or information was received from 113 libraries—fifty-nine unattached and fifty-four attached. In a dozen cases significant data remained lacking, whether because the libraries were small, or had little or no concern with the ancillary duties, or were so organized as not to be able to answer the questions, or for combinations of such reasons.

* United States. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *Statistics of Public Libraries in Cities with Populations of 100,000 or more*. Fiscal year 1956. (Circular 502) Mar. 1957.

United States. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. *Statistics of County and Regional Libraries Serving Populations of 50,000 or more*. Fiscal year 1956. (Circular 506) July 1957.

Canadian Almanac and Directory for 1958. pp. 441-446.