



# Departments in University Libraries

ARTHUR M. McANALLY

THIS STUDY OF DEPARTMENTS in university libraries covers both the units of operation and the system by which they are controlled and coordinated. In management terms, the former represents division of work, the latter organization. It is not practicable to study departments without at the same time considering how the units will work together. The term department also should be defined: it is applied in libraries to a major unit of a certain size, although this varies widely according to size of the library. Both line and staff units are included. The term section normally refers to a subdivision of a department, and the term division to a combination of two or more departments, subject to some diversity in practice.

In order to discover trends in organization, the literature of management, both theoretical and institutional, was explored first in the belief that this would prove more fruitful than the study of university library organization alone. Although the literature of library management is respectable in both quantity and in quality, greater progress in the study of organization has been achieved in other fields, for several reasons.

First of all, when compared to organizations in business or industry or government, a university library is a small operation. Only three such libraries in the United States have as many as three hundred full-time employees, and none more than four hundred. Only three others have between two hundred and three hundred, and the median number of staff members in the 112 libraries which are listed in the annual statistics in *College and Research Libraries* is 55.<sup>1</sup> Qualifying these figures are the facts that several library collections now total over two million volumes, and that a library's immediate customers may total in the twenty and thirty thousands.

Again, the results of library operations cannot be measured readily nor in terms of dollars and cents; a library does not have profit to drive it on nor to use for measurement. Business, moreover, has a

Mr. McAnally is Director of Libraries, University of Oklahoma.

### *Departments in University Libraries*

great deal more money and manpower to spend in analysis and study of itself than institutions possess; and more practicing management consultants, as well as faculty members within universities, are interested in the theoretical exploration of management in government, business, and industry than in comparable investigation affecting other agencies.

Also, a university library is a very complex organization, and one difficult to study. It deals with symbolic materials which are not and cannot be standardized; it serves two clienteles, one of which is highly professionalized and individualistic; and it is a captive agency within an institution which is itself somewhat unusual in terms of its management. For these reasons, and because the problems of administration increase with institutional growth, it would appear logical to assume that libraries may profit for some time yet from the study of management in other fields.

Most off-campus developments which may influence library organization are transmitted through the university itself, but a few exert influence directly on the library. For example, continuing expansion of knowledge and the increase in specialization as reflected in an upward spiral of publication cannot but accentuate the problem of storage, if a library maintains its proportionate rate of acquisition. Some technological developments that may bear on libraries include machines for translating, a cheap method of reproducing text without reduction in size, and machines for the storage and retrieval of information. Studies in the theory of documentation and communication also may be important. Television has come into prominence since 1950, and teletransmission text is now available, if only in a crude form. Regional and national approaches to the provision of information also are being explored.

Within universities, the impending tidal wave of students will have tremendous impact upon libraries. Predictions are that enrollment will enlarge more than 100 per cent within twelve years, partly because of the growth in the population of college age people, and partly because of an increase in the proportion who attend college.<sup>2</sup> Expanding numbers may be expected to focus attention on service to undergraduates and off-campus storage of some library materials, and lead to continued dispersal of resources for research.<sup>3</sup> Physical facilities certainly will influence library organization, since "in a time of rising enrollment, building space becomes the most important single determinant of a university library's organization."<sup>4</sup> Many states may add branches to

existing universities, with attendant problems of coordination, as well as extend existing campuses. New subjects, new schools, and larger instructional and research units may be expected, as well as experiments with larger classes, audio-visual aids, and other methods of coping with greater numbers.

The popularization of opportunities for higher education will bring an emphasis in the curriculum on content of contemporary significance. Universities also will have to make students more responsible for their own education. Along with this trend toward social goals there will be increased emphasis on utilitarian subjects and upon professional schools. Sputniks and utilitarianism together will tend to build up interest in science and technology. Universities also are giving more attention to the "whole" student by providing housing and specialized services, as well as by bringing extracurricular activities into their field of interest.<sup>5</sup>

Many of the changes in university educational policies expected during the next few years will affect libraries. "One of the abiding problems of library planners is to find out where the enterprises of which their libraries are a part are going."<sup>6</sup> Long range planning will require renewed effort to discover institutional plans and to forecast educational developments, which the decentralization of authority in academic affairs may render difficult.

One major problem of an institution undoubtedly will be shared by its library—the financial pinch. Finances never rise as fast as enrollments. As a matter of fact, the compensation of professors barely has held its own since 1900 in terms of purchasing power, while salaries in many other fields have doubled and more.<sup>7</sup> Ever-tightening finances during the next twelve years, coupled with rising costs, undoubtedly will compel the library to examine its operations more and more closely.

Finally, expansion of faculty personnel and consequent increase in the number of administrative officers and non-academic personnel will accelerate. As suggested below in connection with schools, with the increasing size of a faculty, a greater proportion of the total staff probably must be given over to administration. And the multiplication of academic personnel in administration is as nothing compared to that of the non-academic.<sup>8</sup> One effect of such growth has been the development of personnel schemes for everyone, including library staffs. Also, in many institutions the professional librarians have been granted faculty status, which affects organization.

## *Departments in University Libraries*

Departmentation appears to be a neglected word in the literature of management. In connection with libraries, P. S. Howard has considered the idea it connotes as a part of the organizing function, and used it to designate "the arrangement of an organization into units having a definite personnel and performing a definite portion of the work."<sup>9</sup> Donald Coney has viewed departmentation instead as a part of the planning function.<sup>10</sup> The term is a convenient one, though perhaps inexact, and will be used in the present paper to designate the grouping of work into operating units, including the placement of both personnel and materials.

The term organization in the technical sense is applied to the establishing of coordinating activities, resulting in an administrative structure through which authority is delegated and control is exercised. It often is used loosely to include both division of work for production and the erection of a mechanism for control, and will be so used here for lack of a more suitable term. Organization has been used similarly as applied to libraries by both Howard and E. A. Wright.<sup>11</sup>

A standard definition of the bases for division of work is that of L. H. Gulick, who identified four fundamental characteristics: (1) major purpose or function, (2) process or method used, (3) persons or things dealt with, and (4) place, or geography.<sup>12</sup> These were adapted to library terminology by both Coney and Howard. The most recent statement for the library profession is that of Wight, who lists the bases for departmentation as (1) function (acquisition, circulation, etc.), (2) activity or process (order, repair, etc.), (3) clientele, (4) geography, (5) subject (fine arts, chemistry, etc.), and (6) form of materials. Libraries are peculiar in having to take into account their collections, while the only base used in industry which the library list does not contain is that of time, as represented in the shifts in a factory.

Librarians have done little in analyzing or breaking down these bases into subdivisions. Coney in 1938 divided library materials according to physical characteristics into eight groups, which in the main are still acceptable.<sup>13</sup> To these eight would need to be added now a new category, namely, such alternatives to or substitutes for books as slips or cards, as exemplified in Human Relations Area Files. An analysis according to content, while difficult, would be particularly useful for departmentation in the future, since there seems to be a trend towards subjects as the base for organization. Changes in the methods of storing and furnishing information, especially in small

discrete subject fields, ultimately may work a revolution in this area, but at present university libraries cannot afford them. As bearing upon such matters, very little is known about the learning process and not much about the qualitative aspects of reading. Further analyses of library processes also would be helpful.

Sometimes these bases for division coincide in determining an organization, but often they do not. Gulick stated in 1936 that, "There is apparently no one most effective system of departmentalism. . . . If an organization is erected about any of these four characteristics of work, it becomes immediately necessary to recognize the other characteristics in constructing the secondary and tertiary divisions of the work."<sup>14</sup>

Judgment has to be exercised in making divisions, and the advantage of a particular method of grouping as contrasted with others is seldom obvious. Unfortunately, administrative science has not progressed far since 1936 in providing criteria upon which a choice among alternative means may be based.<sup>15</sup> Reference may be made to one such attempt, in terms of economic criteria, by Ernest Dale, a management engineer.<sup>16</sup>

The ideal or logical does not always prevail, however. Other factors may affect the departmentation of a library, which does not operate in a vacuum and seldom can start from scratch. Coney, improving upon Mary Parker Follett's terminology, refers to these as "the climate of administration." Some of them are quite influential and may override theoretical or ideal considerations. Putting together Coney's and Howard's lists, the following factors result: financial ability, size, variety of material, capacity of existing staff (as well as availability of other personnel), history of a library, accident, conditions in other libraries, the governmental structure, tools, and quarters. For the most part these are supplementary. Other factors, such as the existence of cooperative plans and coordination in higher education, could be added.

Bases of organization or departmentation must be distinguished from forms of organization, which establish lines of authority for supervision and coordination. Forms of organization are of three types: line, line-and-staff, and those completely functionalized. To these three some authorities would add a fourth, viz., group (multiple, committee) organization, which however seems a variant of the line-and-staff variety.

Line organization is taken from the military and now tends to be used only for small operations. The line-and-staff type is adopted

### *Departments in University Libraries*

widely in business and elsewhere. The strictly functional organization form, as developed by F. W. Taylor, is falling into disuse, partly because it is based largely upon technical efficiency and does not take into account certain personal factors. Group management is utilized by some of the largest corporations, such as DuPont and General Motors, and has proved highly effective with them. Academic administration in universities has some similarities to the group plan. All of these forms are discussed further in the next section.

It was concluded that the best way to conduct this study would be to discover trends in departmentation and organization in areas other than librarianship, then attempt to relate them to changes or thought in the library field. Some of the developments in administrative science generally relate to group size, span of control, informal organization, centralization-decentralization, divisionalization, flexibility, democracy in management, advisory services, committees, and reorganization. They have a bearing upon organization, and are treated below.

Basic research of the first importance to management is being done on the dynamics of groups, and on the effectiveness of groups of varying sizes. This investigation is being performed in connection with social psychology, sociology, and cultural anthropology. A good summary of developments to date is that by Theodore Caplow.<sup>17</sup>

It has been known for some time that the relational complexity of small groups grows rapidly with small increases in numbers.<sup>18</sup> The subject has been developed further by W. M. Kephart.<sup>19</sup> Thus, a group of three persons has six interpersonal relationships, a group of four has 25, a group of five 90, a group of six 301, and a group of ten 29,268. Obviously this progression should have some bearing on the competency of groups.

Another approach has been to study the actual groups. It has been found that size may affect both the quality of performance and the amount of activity, influencing such factors as consensus, satisfaction, amount of dissension, and the number of ideas produced. Regarding participation by members of a task group it has been discovered that "if the volume of activity of each member is carefully measured and the members are ranked with the most active member first, the next most active member second, and so on, the volume of activity will be found to diminish at a predictable rate."<sup>20</sup> From the organizational standpoint, however, it has been stated that this diminishing of returns with increases in group size may not hold for all organizational types, since upper limits have not been proved to exist for all. Concerning

size, it has been ascertained that organizational stability apparently correlates directly with it. The common belief that the proportion of non-productive labor grows with increasing size has not been substantiated fully, though one study has proved the affirmative.<sup>21</sup> Caplow concludes with a note of caution, however, saying: "We know just enough . . . about the effects of size on organizational structure to perceive that size is an important element in determining the way any human organization adapts to its environment and that the whole subject deserves closer study."<sup>22</sup>

C. I. Barnard set the effective optimum size of a group as not over fifteen, stating: "In practice a limit of usually less than fifteen persons for a working group obtains, and for many types of cooperation five or six persons is the practicable limit."<sup>23</sup> His conclusions were based upon the bounds of effective leadership, which he believed to depend upon the complexity of purpose and technological conditions, the difficulty of the communication process, the extent to which communication is necessary, and the involvements of personal relationships. Any organization larger than fifteen he would call complex, and thus needs to be broken into two or more units.

It might not be amiss at this point to mention the theory of the ubiquitous "Colonel Parkinson," who states that work expands to fill the time available for its completion; and that due to the ambitions of supervisors a staff gains in size at a fixed annual rate regardless of the amount of work to be done.<sup>24</sup> He seems to favor a group of seven, as indicated by the title of his *Fortune* article, "How Seven Men Can Do the Work of One." The magic number for top size is 19, 20, or 21; beyond that lies disaster. His book is a good introduction to management in reverse and to bureaucracy, and provides a bit of spoofing that has been overdue.

From the beginnings of the study of management theory under Taylor and Henri Fayol there has been considerable uncertainty about the number of persons that one administrator could supervise effectively. Then V. A. Graicunas around 1933 developed his theory of the geometric progression of interpersonal relations as group size increased arithmetically. This formula was taken by some as a means of establishing the maximum size of the span of control of an executive. One of those who was most positive was L. F. Urwick, who stated that "No superior can supervise directly the work of more than five or, at the most, six subordinates whose work interlocks."<sup>25</sup> Others disagreed, some setting the maximum as high as twelve.

### *Departments in University Libraries*

On this point a study in 1952 under the American Management Association of the extent of the span of control in one hundred large companies and forty-seven smaller companies, all known to have good organization practices, revealed that the median number of subordinates "supervised" by the president was between eight and nine in the larger cases and between six and seven in the smaller. In some the span of control was over twenty. Speculating on these findings, Dale concluded in his report that perhaps the theoretical limits on span of control had been set too low, or that possibly the number who had access to the president was high but the number actually supervised less.<sup>26</sup>

Dale's discovery precipitated a lively argument, which has helped to throw additional light on the subject. The two chief papers in the controversy are by W. D. Suojanen<sup>27</sup> and Urwick.<sup>28</sup> Suojanen said that "the span of control is no longer a valid principle of organization in view of the advances that have occurred in those social sciences that relate directly to administrative theory." According to him, the chief executive now only coordinates instead of supervises; business has become institutionalized; and informal primary groups now provide a high degree of control. Suojanen cited a recent study on executive time in Sweden, which had reached similar conclusions. Interestingly, as far back as 1938, both Coney and K. D. Metcalf had agreed that the librarian should only coordinate and not supervise,<sup>29, 30</sup> and Metcalf had stated that the chief librarian had only about three hours a day to deal with the work of his immediate subordinates.<sup>31</sup>

Urwick countered Suojanen by saying that the survey was not precise, that Suojanen did not cite the so-called social developments, that "access" is not supervision, that general staff assistance did allow the chief executive to cope with a wider span of control, and that the principle had not been invalidated. The debate clarified definitions and gave an excellent review of the literature of the subject, but without settling the question.

In large university libraries, the administrative-divisional plan with its small span of control still predominates. However, the reorganization at Harvard in 1956 apparently increased the librarian's span from nine to twelve,<sup>32</sup> and the Columbia reorganization of 1953 increased it there, partly "to strive for a maximum of direct communication—that is a relatively horizontal as opposed to a vertical organization."<sup>33</sup>

The span of control probably should be extended to the point at which the advantages of delegation, in freeing the executive, are out-

weighed by costs of additional staff, supervision, and difficulties in communication. An increase is likely to mean further delegation of responsibility. For libraries, factors in determining the span have been identified speculatively by Wight as stability of the organization, ability of the officer, complexity of activities, the size of the operating units, the level in the hierarchy, and the geographic scatter of units.<sup>34</sup> To these should be added capacities of the staff and perhaps other factors.

Most library staffs presumably have not yet reached a size where the length of the chain of command becomes a critical element. The reductions effected by increasing the span of control at Harvard and Columbia are exceptional. They are two of the three university libraries with more than three hundred staff members.

Formal organization is deliberately impersonal, is based on ideal relationships, and has in the past been based on the "herd" or "rabble" hypothesis, especially in industry. Even there, however, the "rabble" hypothesis has given way to person-to-person concepts, and then has taken account of group relations.

It is recognized generally, however, that without the help of the informal organization the formal organization often would be ineffective. Recent years have seen the recognition of the existence and importance of informal organization and study of its characteristics. The study began with the Hawthorne experiments in the 1920's by Elton Mayo and others, and is being carried on very actively now. Informal organization may be defined as "the aggregate of the personal contacts and interactions and the associated groupings of people."<sup>35</sup> Its membership may be based on ethnic, religious, and other associations.

There is considerable discussion in the current literature of management on decentralization, due to the great expansion of business and industry. The larger the company, the more urgent the problem. Some confusions in terminology exist—decentralization is often taken to mean separation of facilities, a type of organization, or the delegation of decision-making. In the pure administrative sense, decentralization is the delegation of authority to the level where action takes place. The virtues and defects of centralization and decentralization are summarized well by H. A. Simon, and the reader is referred to that source for a good brief statement.<sup>36</sup>

Most university librarians now have administrative control over all library units on their campuses, and the libraries may be said to be centralized administratively. The most frequent exceptions are those

### *Departments in University Libraries*

in which medical and law libraries are not included. Complete administrative centralization was achieved at the University of California at Berkeley in 1956, but examples in which it still does not exist are the libraries at Harvard and Cornell.

Decentralization of university libraries is not made necessary by size of library staffs, for even the largest are comparatively small. However, the question is being brought to the forefront in the large libraries by several factors, viz., the enormous size of some collections, a large and highly specialized clientele, a spread-out campus, and educational considerations. Perhaps the basic factor leading to the decentralization of monolithic library services and collections is the theory that the amount of use tends to be governed by the readiness of access to books.<sup>37</sup> The only exceptions to this tendency toward decentralization appear where the adoption of the subject-divisional approach coincides with a move into a new and spacious central building.

Librarians of many of the larger libraries, even those already having a number of branch or departmental libraries, have anticipated or are experiencing this pressure for decentralization. The reasons seem to be educational more than administrative, as proved at California at Berkeley, Michigan, and Stanford. The problem is stated well by R. C. Swank: "Decentralization along broad subject lines (as contrasted with narrow departmental lines) is desirable both administratively and educationally. There may be an optimum size of a library unit beyond which the service becomes too complex, impersonal, and mechanized. The optimum is, perhaps, a unit large enough to be efficient but small enough to retain some of the informality, accessibility, and special services of the good departmental library. The desired result is a compromise between an overgrown main library and an over-fragmented system of departmental libraries."<sup>38</sup> F. H. Wagman at Michigan states that "Ideally, combinations of the various divisional and departmental libraries should be made according to the relationships of their materials in the classification of knowledge. . . . It is more likely, however, that the geographic dispersal of the University's units will result in demands for more fragmentation. . . ." <sup>39</sup>

Historically, university library operations were first divided into the four basic procedures of acquisition, integration, circulation, and reference. Compared to the earlier simple library in which everyone did some of everything, these were major specializations. As libraries became large and increasingly difficult to use, further specialization was introduced in terms of forms of material, entailing departments

for documents, serials, maps, and manuscripts, for example. Next librarians were compelled, partly by their faculties, to recognize that perhaps they had been preoccupied with internal problems, and ought to give more attention to needs of their clientele. This faculty pressure had existed for a long time as a demand for branch libraries. Consequently subject- or reader-centered departments were created to serve various groups, instances being branch libraries, undergraduate libraries, and browsing rooms. Sometimes branch libraries had been developed independently of main libraries or with the grudging consent of librarians ultimately rendering it hard to gain administrative control of such units.

It may be observed that whereas the first basis for departmentation was functional, and the second was forms of material, the last has been that of subject. This seems to indicate a shift from preoccupation with internal problems to an emphasis upon fields of instruction, and may indicate that the library will be more intimately concerned in the future with educational requirements. In one sense the focus has shifted from technical matters to reader problems, a vast and largely uncharted area filled with uncertainties. Technical responsibilities remain important in the modern university library, however.

The extensive proliferation of departments has created major problems in control and coordination. In addition to the large number and wide variety of units, it must be recognized that coordination in university library management is complicated and hampered by two other factors: first, libraries are low in mechanization and high in professionalization, and second, authority in academic affairs is decentralized. Incidentally, the trend toward academic status for professional librarians is symbolic, and can have major implications for librarianship.

In coping with coordination, two solutions have been tried. These are divisionalization, and the development of staff participation and especially the committee system. The divisional concept is discussed here, and the committee system in a subsequent section.

Divisionalization apparently was adopted first, beginning in the 1930's. It is the grouping of two or more related departments under one head responsible to the chief librarian. It is a means of dividing a large and monolithic organization into small and flexible units, with a view to recapturing some of the advantages of the small organization and at the same time minimizing the drawbacks that come with increasing size, diversity, and dispersion.

## *Departments in University Libraries*

Divisionalization can be according to function, such as technical processes; forms of material; geographical location; subject; or clientele. More than one base may be used, and often is. The adoption of functional and form-of-material bases obviously places major emphasis on procedures or materials, and divisionalization by subject, geography, or clientele on the customer. The first may be thought of as organization mainly for administrative purposes, the latter more in response to the needs of the clientele. Coney's 1938 statement of the administrative values and disadvantages in divisional organization are still pertinent,<sup>40</sup> and will not be reviewed here.

Although divisionalization for administrative purposes came first, divisionalization with reference to instructional purposes followed shortly thereafter. The idea was taken from the public library, where it had been in use for a long time. The subject-divisional plan according to Frank Lundy is "a way of organizing library materials and services around the broadest concepts of subject matter."<sup>41</sup> Carl Hintz carries the definition further, saying: "Library service should be organized on a broad subject basis reflecting the major divisions of knowledge, the principal methods of instruction, and the needs of students and faculty."<sup>42</sup>

The plan seems to be most applicable to university libraries of medium size, perhaps partly because it usually includes physical centralization in a main library building. However, the reference departments of some of the largest libraries have adopted the divisional approach. When geographic centralization is not involved, the plan may be suitable for even the largest library, though building costs may prevent its adoption. The literature of the subject is voluminous. A selection of informative articles are the early ones by Ralph Ellsworth, and recently those of Lundy, Hintz, G. D. Smith, P. D. Morrison, and Clarence Gorchels.

The subject-divisional plan of organization when carried to the ultimate extent constitutes a revolution in library organization. Subjects are substituted for functions as the chief base for specialization. Plans vary, however. Sometimes reference function is absorbed complete in the topical division, as at the University of Georgia; sometimes circulation is absorbed into the subject divisions, as at Nebraska at various times; and almost always some aspects of acquisition are withdrawn, especially a portion of the selection activity. The type is not standardized.

An especially interesting phase of some of the geographically cen-

tralized subject-divisional plans is the consolidation of both reference and cataloging operations into the divisional units, and the reduction or elimination of these common functional departments. Such action follows earlier proposals of Swank. The administrative reasons and problems in taking cataloging into the subject division as at Washington State and Nebraska are given by Hanna C. Krueger<sup>43</sup> and Kathryn R. Renfro.<sup>44</sup> The librarian at Nebraska also has stated that one of the purposes in incorporating cataloging there was to relieve the cataloging department, catalogers being hard to secure. Sometimes the divisional librarian also supervises branch libraries in his field.

Administratively, the library organized along subject-divisional lines usually has a span of control which extends to all division and department heads, and frequent meetings of this group with the librarian are characteristic. For this reason its organization may be effective in the training of junior executives.

Another method of organizing along topical lines may be identified as the loose or interspersed plan as used at Princeton, Iowa, Oklahoma, and Louisiana State. In that, all library materials are arranged in a logical subject order on open shelves with small reading areas scattered about. The number and size of service units as well as their location varies according to need. Reference functions also may be split, with apparently satisfactory results, as is the case at Oklahoma; and cataloging could be included, although that is not the case in any of the libraries using the plan. The arrangement also facilitates the separation of clerical and sub-professional processes from the professional by the use of centralized auxiliary services. It is much less formal and more flexible than the usual subject-divisional scheme, with its large formal reading areas and collections separated on the basis of use as well as of topic. Greater subject specialization also is possible. It can be speculated that in its geographically centralized form it may be effective for larger libraries than the geographically centralized subject-divisional plan.

A radical proposal which bears upon divisional arrangements would organize the clerical and sub-professional staff along functional lines in the operational part of a library, and the professional staff and collections along subject lines. Its author objects to the operational-subject schism which he says exists in some subject-divisional libraries, with the professional librarians left in the operational part. This accusation should not be justified in a properly organized subject plan, but he could not figure out how to supervise the professional half.<sup>45</sup> Per-

### *Departments in University Libraries*

haps the librarians could be assigned to instructional units. The proposal recalls the experiments with bibliographical assistants at Cornell and Pennsylvania, and brings to mind again faculty status of librarians in various universities. Barnard's *tour de force* demonstration that the methods of eliciting services from employees are also applicable to customers might be noted.<sup>46</sup>

Incidentally, a great many of the large libraries recently have established divisions of special collections, to coordinate a variety of separate collections. A few examples are found at Columbia, Oregon, U.C.L.A., Stanford, Kansas, and New Mexico. Sometimes the manuscripts unit is left out of the fold, especially if it includes archives, as at Duke.

Flexibility or adaptability is now being stressed in business and industry, to make adaptation easier in a period of rapid social and technological change. Rigidly fixed departments tend to force activities into artificial channels without allowing the organization to adapt itself to its natural course. Departmentation might be right at the moment it was made, but the boundaries might be different the next minute. University libraries, like their parent institutions, tend to be quite conservative, but nevertheless changes in organization are becoming far more frequent than they used to be. Flexibility has been held as a keynote in handling responsibility in the library director's office at Columbia, and the three assistant librarians at California at Berkeley constitute a kind of staff group, with subordinates having the right to approach any one of them whether in the line function or not. The organizational flexibility of the loose or interspersed plan also should be mentioned.

It is now generally recognized that the nature of the American citizen affects organization and that one of his essential needs is for self-determination. The day of the aristocrat is waning, and that of the cooperative team is taking its place. "Participation, consultation, and information should be encouraged, even demanded, to the extent that they are possible within the framework of a reasonable amount of time."<sup>47</sup> Increasing recognition of the importance of the personal and informal activity has tended to reduce somewhat the emphasis upon the formal organization. In administrative science, "the study of how to divide our common tasks into parts suitable for private practice, rather than of how to divide them for purposes of central and hierarchic control, confronts and challenges us."<sup>48</sup>

The most remarkable development of the last fifteen years has been

the growth of the advisory staff concept, as expressed in committees. Sixteen organized committees, not all of them advisory of course, were identified in the library structure of California at Berkeley as of 1956,<sup>49</sup> and other libraries may have even more. Committees were established to achieve coordination, to promote cooperation, to provide advice and service and help, and for the training of junior executives. However, they also were set up in line with the personnel and group factors discussed above. Thus their purpose differs in some respects from that of the traditional staff function as developed in the Catholic church embodying "the right to be heard," and in the military.

The proper size for efficient committees has been discussed, as well as some other aspects of their operation, in connection with the size of groups. While the number of its members is an important factor in determining the usefulness of an advisory committee, one can hardly be precise as to optimum size. K. C. Wheare, who has made the most thorough study of the matter, says that if a committee is so large that its members have to stand up to address each other, it is unlikely to be effective,<sup>50</sup> and sets this number at twenty to thirty. Barnard, as has been mentioned, believes fifteen to be the upper limit. In actual practice committees that meet frequently tend to be much smaller than this. Libraries often have two councils, one larger than and including the membership of the other. Group management as practiced by DuPont and General Electric places the advisory function as a part of the policy making and governing boards.<sup>51</sup>

Other aspects of staff participation are the use of consultants, who provide an intermittent service, and of staff executives or assistants, who are found to an increasing extent in the large libraries. Auxiliary or specialized aid, dealing with financial and personnel requirements, is the subject of another paper in this issue of *Library Trends*.

Little attention has been given in the library profession to the dynamics of change. The literature of management contains a good deal on this matter, however; and it is worthy of study, for libraries are becoming more receptive to revisions, and could well consider what is known affecting it. Good treatments are those by Dale<sup>52</sup> and L. A. Allen,<sup>53</sup> both practicing management engineers.

### *References*

1. Bentz, D. M.: College and University Library Statistics, 1956-57. *College and Research Libraries*, 19:55-59, Jan. 1958.
2. Thompson, R. B.: *The Impending Tidal Wave of Students, a Report of the*

## Departments in University Libraries

*Committee on Special Projects.* (Fourth Printing with Additions and Revisions, January 1955) The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1955.

3. Coney, Donald: The Flooding Tide, or: Where Did You Go? To the Library. What Did You Get? Nothing. *College and Research Libraries*, 19:179-184, May 1958.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 184.

5. Brubacher, J. S., and Rudy, S. W.: *Higher Education in Transition: An American History: 1636-1956.* New York, Harper, 1958, pp. 373-390.

6. Milczewski, M. A.: Cloak and Dagger in University Library Administration. *College and Research Libraries*, 13:117-121, April 1952.

7. Ruml, Beardsley, and Tickton, S. G.: *Teaching Salaries Then and Now.* (Bulletin no. 1) New York, Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1955.

8. Brubacher and Rudy, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

9. Howard, P. S.: Functions of Library Management. *Library Quarterly*, 10: 338, July 1940.

10. Coney, Donald: The Administration of Technical Processes. In: Joeckel, C. B., ed.: *Current Issues in Library Administration.* (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science) Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1939, pp. 163-180.

11. Wight, E. A.: Research in Organization and Administration. *Library Trends*, 6:141-146, Oct. 1957.

12. Gulick, L. H.: Notes on the Theory of Organization, with Special Reference to the Government of the United States. In: Gulick, L. H., and Urwick, L. F., eds.: *Papers on the Science of Administration.* New York, Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937, p. 15.

13. Coney, *op. cit.*, ref. 10, pp. 167-168.

14. Gulick, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

15. Simon, H. A.: *Administrative Behavior.* 2d ed. New York, Macmillan, 1957, p. 33.

16. Dale, E.: *Planning and Developing the Company Organization Structure.* (General Research Report no. 20) New York, American Management Association, 1952, pp. 25-34.

17. Caplow, T.: Organizational Size. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1:484-505, Mar. 1957.

18. Graicunas, V. A.: Relationship in Organization. In: Gulick, L. H., ed.: *op. cit.*, pp. 181-187.

19. Kephart, W. M.: A Quantitative Analysis of Intragroup Relationships. *American Journal of Sociology*, 55:544-549, May 1950.

20. Caplow, *op. cit.*, p. 497.

21. Terrien, F. W., and Mills, D. L.: The Effect of Changing Size upon the Internal Structure of Organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 20:11-13, Feb. 1955.

22. Caplow, *op. cit.*, p. 505.

23. Barnard, C. I.: *The Functions of the Executive.* Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1957, p. 106.

24. Parkinson, C. N.: *Parkinson's Law, and Other Studies in Administration.* Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1957.

ARTHUR M. MC ANALLY

25. Urwick, L. F.: *The Elements of Administration*. New York, Harper, 1943, p. 53.
26. Dale, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-60.
27. Suojanen, W. D.: The Span of Control—Fact or Fable. *Advanced Management*, 20:5-13, Nov. 1955.
28. Urwick, L. F.: The Span of Control—Some Facts About the Fables. *Advanced Management*, 21:5-15, Nov. 1956.
29. Coney, *op. cit.*, ref. 10.
30. Metcalf, K. D.: Departmental Organization in Libraries. In: Joeckel, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-97.
31. Metcalf, *ibid.*, p. 95.
32. Harvard University. *University Library*. (Reprinted from the Report of the President of Harvard College and Reports of Departments, 1955-56), pp. 2-3.
33. Logsdon, R. H.: Memorandum to the Library Staff from the Director of Libraries. *Columbia Library World*, new series, 2:1-3, June-July 1953.
34. Wight, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
35. Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
36. Simon, *op. cit.*, pp. 234-240.
37. Shaw, R. R.: Implications for Library Services. *Library Quarterly*, 25:353, Oct. 1955.
38. Swank, R. C.: *The Over-all Library Plans in a Nutshell*. (Mimeographed). Oct. 1957, p. 2.
39. Michigan University Library. *Report of the University Library, 1956-1957*. Ann Arbor, Mich., University of Michigan, 1957, p. 5.
40. Coney, *op. cit.*, ref. 10, pp. 176-177.
41. Lundy, Frank: The University of Nebraska Plan. *PMLA Quarterly*, 22: 40-41, Oct. 1957, p. 40.
42. Hintz, C. W.: Some Management Aspects of the University of Oregon Library's Subject Divisional Plan. *Call Number*, 14:4-5, Dec. 1952.
43. Krueger, Hanna E.: Acquisition and Cataloging, An Integral Part of Reader Services. *PMLA Quarterly*, 22:38-39, Oct. 1957.
44. Renfro, Kathryn R.: Cataloging in the Divisional Library. *College and Research Libraries*, 15:154-157, April 1954.
45. Pickering, J. H.: Non-Librarian Administrators in Libraries. *Library Journal*, 81:4-6, Jan. 1, 1956.
46. Barnard, *op. cit.*, pp. 114-123.
47. Smith, S. B.: A Co-operative Team. *Library Journal*, 79:2044, Nov. 1, 1954.
48. Smith, E. A.: Bureaucratic Organization: Selective or Saturative. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2:373, Dec. 1957.
49. University of California, General Library, Berkeley: *Organization Chart*. (General Order no. 34) Rev. Jan. 13, 1956.
50. Wheare, K. C.: *Government by Committee; An Essay on the British Constitution*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, pp. 7, 63.
51. Dale, Ernest: DuPont: Pioneer in Systematic Management. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2:25-29, June 1957.
52. Dale, *op. cit.*, ref. 16, pp. 123-161.
53. Allen, L. A.: *Management and Organization*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1958, pp. 273-331.