



Library Service to Urban University Students (Part-Time, Working, Commuting)

ROBERT L. TALMADGE
AND
ROY L. KIDMAN

A TACIT ASSUMPTION seems to pervade the extensive professional writings which for many years have reflected the deep concern of university librarians with high quality service to their readers; *viz.*, on his own campus, the university librarian has a quite clearly-defined clientele; it is comprised of a full-time, resident faculty which is engaged in research and in the instruction of undergraduate and graduate students who are also resident and full-time. ("Off-campus" is something else again. If his institution undertakes an extension program, an "extra" obligation is imposed on him. His worries about how to provide library service to the extension classes¹ or, indeed, to efforts in adult education² which may have been undertaken by his university have prompted him to write about them for publication.) While an assumption of a full-time, resident—indeed, secluded—community of scholars is largely valid for the nonurban university, it is far from true, as the title assigned for this article rightly suggests, for the majority of urban universities. Just how far will be outlined shortly. The title also suggests that there may be special problems for the urban university library in trying to serve those in its community who are not full-time and resident, or for the students when it comes to using the library. The matter was given close attention on the local level (and excellently stated) in at least one case—the New York University self-survey³ in the early 1950's—but the lack of attention given it in library literature per se is curious. The present study has revealed numerous instances of a library's having taken special steps—or half-steps, at any rate—to alleviate the

Mr. Talmadge is Director, and Mr. Kidman is Assistant Director, Tulane University Library, New Orleans.

vicissitudes of library use faced by part-time, working, commuting students. However, difficulties for both library and student seem persistent is not inherent. Beyond these problems, the findings also appear to justify a serious question as to the quality of the education these particular people are receiving.

Perhaps the writers' experience will explain why others have not previously published general treatments of the matter. Finding little in the literature, they decided to query 38 urban university librarians. The replies—32 in number—were generally thoughtful and helpful concerning each local picture, but collectively they were so extremely lacking in uniformity that few generalizations seem safe to make; virtually a case-study treatment of each campus situation seems required. Variation is pronounced as to the percentage of the total student body classifiable as "part-time, working, commuting"; as to the composition of this group (here data are often incomplete); as to the existence (or lack) of special provision for such students on the part of the universities; as to the composition of the faculty; and as to virtually all aspects of student use of the university library. Clear patterns refuse to emerge, and the caveat needs to be entered that such generalizations as are risked are more likely than not to be dead wrong in the case of one urban university or another. This effort has thus devolved to the status of a preliminary, exploratory survey, far from definitive. It is thought, however, that it has produced evidence of a real need for more careful scrutiny of the library (and possibly other) problems of part-time, nonresident students, both generally and on many a local campus.

While any one or any combination of the terms "part-time," "working," or "commuting" may apply to a given student, the individual with whom one is centrally concerned here is usually in one of two situations. He attends a regular university class, say in the morning, and must then immediately dash across the city to get to his job on time; he may work until late evening, and then begin studying toward his next class. Alternatively, he comes to an evening class, after having already put in a full day's work. The latter seems the more typical case. More than two-thirds of the universities replying to our inquiry have separate divisions (variously entitled University College, School of General Studies, Evening College, and the like) for their evening and special students.

The evening student may have driven miles. Miss Garloch, editor of this issue of *Library Trends*, writes: "many of them commute from

Library Service to Urban University Students

places as far as fifty miles . . . from Pittsburgh,"⁴ and the writers recently met a young Tulane alumnus who mentioned having driven eighty miles to New Orleans to attend a class meeting one night per week. While these undoubtedly constitute the more extreme cases, they are illustrative of a principal point: many a student comes to the campus *only for class*, and then with little time to spare. Consequently, he has problems in use of the university library quite outside the experience of the student who lives on campus, and for the library in turn he represents a special problem. He sprints into the building minutes before his 6 p.m. class is to begin, or perhaps he has an hour in which to study before class convenes. He may rush over again during a mid-evening intermission, this time to check out the books that have just been assigned as his reading for the following week. His chief identifying feature is that he is in a great hurry: "soon the people in the public service departments learn that they must produce for him at once or else." (The Tulane alumnus mentioned here spoke feelingly of waiting twenty to thirty minutes for a book to be delivered from the bookstack, only to be informed that it could not be located.) Another common characteristic, however, makes him worth "producing" for: he is perhaps five or six years older than the average undergraduate; he is in dead earnest; he is going to unusual effort to gain his education. In the questionnaire it was asked whether or not he caused unusual problems of discipline in reading rooms or otherwise. One library replied in the affirmative, but several respondents did not stop at a simple "no" answer; typical are the comments of J. P. McDonald at Washington University (St. Louis): "evening school students require far less discipline than do day students. The adult student is more mature, better motivated toward his educational goals, and much more serious in his attitude towards his studies." Despite the frequent efforts of the library to give him special consideration, the lot of such a student is too often *ad astra per aspera*.

The question of numbers deserves attention. So heterogeneous are urban university libraries as a genre that it cannot even be stated that all necessarily *have* a significant proportion of commuting students. Several have retained an almost wholly residential character, their librarians removing themselves from the scope of this study by such comments as "oriented entirely towards regular, full-time students" or "such a small proportion of our total student body . . . as to be negligible." Included were Brown, California (Berkeley), Emory, McGill, and M.I.T. In effect Harvard also may be classified here, with only

6.6 per cent commuters, all full-time, plus a larger but unspecified percentage of part-time people among graduate students. (Interestingly, Harvard's Dudley House, a "commuters' center coördinate with the eight residential houses," has its own library of 4,500 volumes and is open 1-5:30 p.m., Monday-Friday.)

As noted earlier, a breakdown of enrollments according to the separate categories of part-time, working, and commuting is not available in most of the universities, and strictly comparable data are thus lacking. However, from estimates, couched in varying terms, which were provided by most respondent librarians it was possible to derive approximate percentages of enrollments *other than* full-time resident.

In several cases a university's entire enrollment comes within the category. At Brooklyn College, all students commute; about 54 per cent are part-time. At Drexel, 93 per cent commute; 19 per cent of all students are counted as part-time, graduate, or special. U.C.L.A. is now building dormitory housing to supplement fraternities, sororities, and two cooperative residence halls, but Assistant Librarian Page Ackerman reports that as of 1959, when a survey⁵ was made of library use, "U.C.L.A. was almost completely a non-resident institution." Wayne State's report resembles that of Brooklyn College: virtually all students commute, and 53 per cent (11,501 of 21,534) are part-time; 70 per cent work full- or part-time. All students at the University of Illinois Undergraduate Division at Chicago (Navy Pier) are commuters, but all are full-time; about 60 per cent have jobs, most of them near their homes. Here all classes are daytime, and the library is closed evenings, weekends, and holidays—a striking example of the effect a singular local configuration can have on the library. Minnesota reports a high though unspecified proportion of commuters, but a relatively small number of students enrolled part-time; Director of Libraries E. B. Stanford estimates that of some 27,000 students more than half hold part-time jobs in the Twin City area. Columbia reports 90 per cent commuting and 50 per cent part-time.

By contrast, part-time students constitute only 10 per cent of Ohio State's enrollment, only 11 per cent of Northwestern's at Evanston. (On Northwestern's Chicago campus, however, the figure is 82 per cent.) Somewhat higher percentages appear at Temple (22), Tulane (24), and Miami (29).

Extending across the middle of the scene, and completing the case

Library Service to Urban University Students

for heterogeneity, are 9 universities estimating from roughly one-half to three-fourths of their respective enrollments as being other than full-time resident: Boston University (50), Houston (60), Johns Hopkins (66), Pennsylvania (48), Pittsburgh (68), St. Louis (61 per cent commuting, 25 per cent part-time), Syracuse (44), and Washington University at St. Louis (50). New York University noted in 1956 that three-fourths of its nearly 40,000 students did not attend on a full-time basis.⁶

Widely varying as are these figures, certainly the overall picture is clear: thousands upon thousands of urban university students are unable, by reasons of time limitations imposed by employment or travel, to make use of their respective central university libraries on the same basis as their colleagues who live on campus. In many instances the residents constitute a distinct minority.

The trend—large as part-time commuting students already loom on the urban campus—seems clearly upward. Amid predictions of soaring university enrollments nationally through 1970 and beyond, most of the librarians expect the percentage of such students in their total enrollments either to remain constant or to become still higher than at present. Although a few librarians expect a declining percentage—some of them mentioning dormitory construction—it seems questionable whether new student housing is likely to keep pace with enrollment. If not, even these universities will experience increases in absolute numbers of nonresident students. Commenting upon the trend is Librarian H. G. Bousfield of Brooklyn College:

In the last ten years there has been a steady increase in the number of students registered in the School of General Studies . . . as well as in other divisions of the College. According to Professor Edwin H. Spengler, Director of the School of General Studies, who is also Executive Secretary of the Association of University Evening Colleges which has a membership of 140 evening colleges throughout the country, this is consistent with the national trend of an increase in enrollment of part-time students who are fully occupied in some other pursuit.

Earlier in this paper is an attempt to create a word-picture of the part-time, working, commuting student and his difficulties in using the university library. The presence of only a few such students is unlikely to be felt by the library; if they are frustrated and take the trouble to announce the fact, exceptions to rules can usually be made for their benefit. When they are multiplied by the thousands, how-

ever, their impact upon the library can be severe indeed, calling for special measures and revisions of policies and procedures virtually throughout the library. Again, there is a lack of uniformity in the reports of the various libraries, but certain problems seem to press first and hardest.

Lending Policies. Commuting students coming to the campus only for class on a Monday-Wednesday-Friday, Tuesday-Thursday, or once weekly schedule obviously cannot deal with an overnight reserve system. Accordingly, most libraries have adjusted. Often it is done simply by making special exceptions for individual students on an *ad hoc* basis. In other cases this has been made systematic, and one or two libraries have worked out quite elaborate arrangements. These measures may include clear distinctions between day and evening students, as at Brooklyn College: "For the Reserve Collection, day students are required to return books by 10 a.m. next morning, for overnight loans. For evening students, however, who generally attend classes only twice a week, Monday and Wednesday, or Tuesday and Thursday, the Reserve Room makes the following concession. The student with a class on Monday may bring back his books on Wednesday at 7 p.m. . . . [etc.]."

Differentiation between categories of students may carry over into fines. Again, Brooklyn College, among all libraries reporting, has generally gone furthest in custom tailoring: "The Reserve Room also distinguishes between day and evening students in regard to fines. Day students pay 25¢ the first hour the book is overdue, and 5¢ for each additional hour. Evening and graduate students are fined 25¢ per school day for overdue books."

Inquiry was made about any special troubles with commuting students concerning the collection of fines or of payments for lost books. Replies indicated that they seldom occur; such charges may often be deducted from a deposit. A small number of libraries noted occasional difficulty on this score because the usual sanctions—denial of re-registration, withholding of transcripts—are ineffective if a student is transient and has dropped out with no intention of resuming course work. A deposit appears to be the solution if such defaults are numerous.

Obviously, if both commuting and resident students are on hand in quantity there may be a collision of interests. Columbia comments: "As a good proportion of the student body is part-time and/or commuting, the reserve book loan regulations attempt to meet the con-

Library Service to Urban University Students

flicting demands of those who wish to use the books in the library and those who wish to take them home. Usually, all but the last copy of a reserve title may circulate at 3 p.m. for overnight. . . ." A number of libraries have moved the reserve check-out hour from the evening up into the afternoon. Pennsylvania points up the quandary: "The time for releasing overnight books for outside use is geared to the commuting student and therefore benefits the part-time student. The same is not true of the time for returning such books however. The resident student must not be penalized by the commuter." Interestingly, things worked the other way in one case, at Washington (St. Louis): "Formerly such [reserve] books could be borrowed at 3 p.m., but now do not leave the building until 8 p.m., thus enabling evening students to read assignments before class, or in some cases to procure copies for home use after class."

The typical two-to-four-week loan period for regular books is of course sufficiently long to cover the needs of all students. Ordinarily, however, *serials do not circulate*, at least to undergraduates, and no exemption is granted the commuter. This is (or should be) a serious handicap for the commuter, much more disadvantageous for him than it is for the resident student. There are, to be sure, exceptions. Brooklyn will occasionally make a special dispensation in an emergency. Drexel lends serials other than periodicals, proceedings, or transactions. Johns Hopkins is prepared to place serials on two- or three-day or even longer reserve. At Pennsylvania, "serials are handled in the same manner as monographs." Easing the situation in some of the libraries are quick-copying facilities; several others expressed the hope of acquiring them soon. Finally, willingness to meet a student's emergency need extends so far at St. Louis University as to be startling: "serials, reference books, and all materials which normally do not circulate may be borrowed in an emergency on a reserve loan (2 hour, 1, 3, or 7 days)—this is to be determined by the department responsible. . . ."

Purchases and Technical Services. Given large numbers of part-time, commuting students combined with extra-long reserve loan periods for their benefit, the need to purchase reserve books in greater than normal quantities is to be expected. This was affirmed by several libraries, these for the most part being the ones indicating the higher percentages of commuting students. There is extremely little duplication, however, of other kinds of materials—monographs, sets, or serials. With very rare "bare minimum" exceptions, policies of

not buying textbooks are firmly observed. Wayne, in addition to purchasing reserve books in greater than normal quantities, has set up a system of buying "extra" rental copies of both reserve titles and heavily used journals.

While use by urban university students of libraries other than their own is being dealt with by others contributing to this issue of *Library Trends*, this may be the appropriate point to interpolate that in responding to our inquiry both Johns Hopkins and Maryland spontaneously commented upon the availability to their students of other libraries, both of them specifically mentioning (not without real appreciation) Enoch Pratt. The 1959 survey of student library use at U.C.L.A. similarly referred to quite heavy student use of other libraries.⁷ It should be added, however, that these instances were outnumbered by the libraries which recounted considerable problems in serving their own students owing to heavy use by nonuniversity patrons.

Technical service departments are little affected by the presence of part-time, working, commuting students. Four libraries reported occasional rush placement of book orders, or rush cataloging, attributable to their special needs, but none indicated a significant problem.

Reader Services. While no library of any type is likely to be immune from peak periods of reader service load, the problem is exceptionally severe in the urban university having a large part-time, nonresident student population; indeed, for the library it is probably the most serious and pervasive implication of working, commuting students. No two libraries have quite the same experience. In some instances the load may tend to be spread evenly through the library's scheduled hours because the day students have departed before the evening students arrive on the scene. On the other hand, if peak periods of resident and commuting or day and evening students happen to coincide or overlap, the situation is compounded and things may become "particularly frantic." Fortunately, in most libraries the patterns of peak load over the day and the week are at least regular and predictable; staff is of course scheduled accordingly, if possible. This provision may be awkward if the peak periods are frequent but last only 15 minutes. Financial difficulties may arise: "More staff should be scheduled at peak periods but it is impossible to do this within our budget . . . there are many many disgruntled part-time students."

Any hours of day or evening may bring peak loads to one library or another. In addition to the surge just before or after an evening

Library Service to Urban University Students

class, there is an understandable coincidence of reported times of peak load with the local release hour for reserve books. Mention of the 5-7 p.m. period on week days and of Saturday mornings is ubiquitous in connection with commuting students; this is in sharp contrast to the residential university where these are characteristically the quietest moments of the entire week for the library. The uncommon prevalence of daytime commuters at Minnesota illustrates what a singularity in local conditions can do to the library: "There is a serious parking problem here that results from the tremendous influx of commuters in the morning. This means that people who come early to get a parking place arrive at the libraries somewhat earlier than was the case several years ago. We open at 7:45 and there are always students in the library fifteen to thirty minutes before our service areas are opened. We have set up a basement lobby study area where they congregate until our major departments are able to offer service."

Peak loads may affect any reader service department: Reserve Book Room, Circulation, Reference, Periodicals. They may come at different times for different departmental libraries or subject reading rooms on the same campus according to the school (Education, Business) served. Open stacks are of tremendous benefit to students and library staff alike. Brooklyn College comments: "Since our collection is on open shelves, the urgent desire of the student to get his books is simply reflected in the rapidity of the student's own progress from the card catalog to the book shelves. Once the student has made his selection, the use of IBM cards at the central Circulation Charging Desk enables him to charge his books out in a very few minutes." Weekend loans at Brooklyn require manning of three checkout points at noon on Friday in the Reserve Room. At Drexel the pasting and labeling area is adjacent to the Reserve Book Desk, permitting staff to be drawn off to help charge out books at rush periods.

The reserve collection may be larger than usual, as noted by Pittsburgh: "Many instructors, sensitive to the part-time student's time schedule, place books on reserve where they are directly accessible. In normal circumstances, these same books would not be placed on reserve."

While in recent years a number of the libraries have extended their hours of service later into the night or over more of the weekend and others feel constrained to do so, relatively little of this is attributed by the librarians to the part-time, commuting students. The

pressure has instead come largely from graduate students and faculty. Some part-time students may naturally be benefiting from the changes.

To the general picture of library problems confronting the evening student there must be added three distinctly depressing facets. At several of the universities he finds some, if not all, departmental libraries, along with Special Collections and perhaps Government Documents, closed to him. The reason may be budgetary: "their main handicap, it seems, arises from the fact that some of our 'one man' departmental libraries do not offer evening service, for lack of funds to hire the necessary additional staff hours." Or it may be decentralization, physical and administrative: "Some departmental libraries . . . remain inaccessible to most students at night. . . . These specialized departments seem to feel that it is sufficient for graduate students and faculty to have keys to these libraries and for undergraduates to use them only during daytime hours. Occasionally a persevering evening student will arrange for the central library to borrow needed books from a library not offering evening service and to make these books available in the central library, but it is an unusual student who will go to this trouble."

Secondly, the evening student may well have a definitely lower quality of library staff service than do resident or daytime commuting students: "There is no doubt that evening students have less staff assistance . . . than day students enjoy. An evening student who comes to the library one night a week may never even see the Chief Reference Librarian, much less receive help from her. Further, many service points (including departmental libraries) are manned by student assistants during the evening hours, so that the night school students seldom receive the benefit of professional attention."

In both of the above respects, it need hardly be added, some libraries shine forth as prominent exceptions.

The third gloomy note to be added to this growing picture of underprivileged or neglected status for the evening student is that he is far less likely than his daytime colleagues to know his way around the library, this for lack of the tour or other instruction they have received. In a clear majority of the universities this is a problem acknowledged as unsatisfactorily solved or completely unsolved; comments upon orientation ranged from a blunt "they get none" to "sporadic" or "haphazard." It is typically tied to freshmen English classes, or it may be voluntary, and seldom are orientation tours offered at night. The few

Library Service to Urban University Students

librarians who judged their situation satisfactory all indicated the same solution: library orientation is *required* at their respective universities.

This report, focused as it is on the urban university's central library and on commuting students making use of it, must nevertheless verge briefly over into the area of extension, taking due note of the lack in some instances of clear delineation—administratively, geographically, functionally—as to where the university proper leaves off and university extension begins. The two may overlap considerably. A case in point is establishment now and again of a "University College Library" to serve a separate extension campus downtown. An example is the University of Chicago's University College, located at the edge of the Loop and offering evening classes (some of them for credit) where S. E. Gwynn, Assistant Director for Readers' Services, reports a separate one-man library "of about 6,000 volumes intended primarily to serve the reserve book needs of the evening classes but having also a modest general reference collection." It is nine miles from the main library. A similar service appears to exist at Syracuse and to be developing at U.C.L.A.'s Hill Street Building.^{8, 9} Such libraries, although essentially extension in nature, may often resemble an extra departmental library or reserve book room and thus need to be taken into account as part of the added (and perhaps more convenient) resources and services available to the part-time, working, commuting students who may routinely use the main campus library. Unique among the reporting libraries is Maryland, which has a University College Librarian who not only maintains contact with University College faculty of both the on-campus evening division and off-campus centers throughout the state, but also provides library service through the use of a bookmobile to off-campus courses.

Study Facilities. A local pattern of extreme peak loads may require far greater library seating capacity in relation to enrollment than formulae normally call for. On the other hand, if resident and commuting students regularly use the library at different times—or if, as often reported, part-time students do their studying at home—seating requirements may actually be less than normal. Again, Minnesota's many daytime commuters make a difference: "Another implication . . . is the need for larger seating capacity during daytime peak periods than are needed in institutions where the majority of the students live right on the campus. . . . This is because thousands of students are on campus without any particular headquarters throughout each day and

therefore flock to the libraries during the periods between their . . . classes."

It is obviously essential that any urban university library engaged in building planning take such factors into account. Only a careful study of local patterns and trends of library use will produce the correct answer; formulae which have been employed either by residential university libraries or by any other urban university library may well be far off the mark. As for equipment, except for quick-copying facilities, commuting students seem to have little effect upon needs. The problem of discipline referred to by one librarian lay chiefly in the lack of conversation rooms for students. Wayne mentioned a demand for drive-up book deposit chutes to accommodate car-driving commuters.

Summary

The Library's Problem: Summary. After one has pondered the returns, it is possible to risk the following hypothesis. Derived from a wealth of conflicting data, it is strictly tentative, admittedly subjective. It seems that for the urban university library, part-time, working, commuting students are *least* likely to be a source of distress if they constitute either a very high or a very low percentage of total enrollment; they are *most* likely to represent a dilemma if in numbers they happen to equal or moderately exceed the residential enrollment. If this is valid, the reason may be fairly clear. Library administrators will attempt in all conscience and earnestness to aim for the greatest service to the greatest number. If commuters make up, say, 90 per cent or more of the student population, the library is likely to be geared accordingly. If, on the other hand, some 75 per cent or more of the students live on campus, the remainder who commute on a part-time schedule tend to be submerged and largely out of sight. At the break-even or higher point, however, the quandary of conflicting interests to be served is rather clearly at its worst.

Traditionally the university library's orientation is toward a residential, full-time population; conceivably the librarian may be slow to discern a gradual shift. Still, he may recognize it clearly and promptly but be unable to adjust owing to limited staff, limited budget. For that matter, if choices must be made, the equities involved may be difficult to weigh. If a university has 20,000 students, the total number of courses taken by 5,000 enrolled full-time may equal or exceed those taken by the remaining 15,000 who are attending part-time. To take one obvious puzzle: provided with only a minimum of profes-

Library Service to Urban University Students

sional staff in reader service departments, should daytime professional staffing be sharply curtailed and rescheduled for the benefit of evening students? If a coin really needs to be tossed on such a question, it may be worth pointing out that full-time resident students are in a position to adjust to this kind of change, coming to the library in the evening to gain first-rate staff assistance, whereas the evening commuting student has no option. True, if the residents thus "adjusted" en masse, the effect could be to compound existing evening problems of peak periods or inadequate seating capacity. It seems in any event that such questions, and the equities, deserve re-examination on more than one campus. Obviously best served are those evening students using a library which is geared fully as much to their needs as to the needs of resident or daytime students. There seems good reason to worry, however, about the fate of the students who are "submerged" unless one is prepared to argue that full access to library resources and full service by professionally-trained and specialist library staff are unimportant in higher education. The writers are, rather, prepared to argue the opposite.

The Student's Problems. It will already have become apparent that there is cause for concern, not only about the special difficulties faced by urban university libraries, but also about the plight of the part-time, working, commuting students attempting to make effective use of library resources. However, that concern has come to extend beyond the library-student relationship alone; as noted early in this article, a basic question of quality of higher education presents itself.

Inquiry was made about the faculty: the extent to which the universities employed for their evening and special courses the services of part-time faculty recruited from industry and the professions locally; any special library problems of maintaining appropriate contact with such faculty, as for example in getting reserve lists on time; and the access of such faculty to book funds. The replies were characteristically lacking in uniformity except in two respects: equal access to book funds is the rule, and part-time faculty seldom submit purchase recommendations, much less participate significantly in collection development.

In some universities nearly all evening college faculty are regular faculty members who accept evening assignments for additional pay, and there is obviously no unusual problem of liaison for the library. In others, as many as 84 per cent of evening college faculty may be part-time, drawn from industry or from other local educational insti-

tutions. Here questions of liaison may be serious: "There is certainly not a close co-ordination between the library and the faculty"; "The problem in maintaining contact with part-time faculty seems to be not so much getting reserve lists on time as getting them at all." These problems, however, are not insoluble. Persistent use of telephone or of first-class mail by the library staff should answer most of them. Moreover, transgressions regarding reserve lists are likely to be brought to the attention of faculty relatively quickly by the students.

The basic concern about the quality of evening college education does not spring from such essentially mechanical problems. (Neither, let it be said, is there reason to question the qualifications of the faculty who teach evening college courses.) However, it is unsettling to read such comments as: "Few of them use reserve books"; and "These men . . . are very busy, and only come to the campus in the evening."

A warning of more than local pertinence is contained in New York University's 1956 final report of its self-survey: "In a university with so many commuting and part-time students, there is a great temptation on the part of the faculty to limit the course reading to that which is available in textbooks rather than to make assignments in the library. The temptation finds justification if reasonable library assignments cannot be performed by students for lack of sufficient copies of books or library study space. But the University must resist the temptation with every device it can summon."¹⁰

This admonition gathers force in the face of the following quite unsolicited but blunt comments which appeared in the replies to the inquiry. They are stated here without indication of their five different sources; none, however, is from N.Y.U.:

We suspect that faculty members, aware of the handicaps inherent in evening classes for part-time students, modify or even alter the out-of-class assignments that depend upon library sources chiefly. For example, we are aware that classroom instruction is occasionally skipped with the time given over to library usage. We believe there is also more reliance upon textbooks and class discussion.

As the faculty points out, students simply do not have time to read extensively. . . . As a result, perhaps instructors tend to tailor assignments and teaching methods so that less outside reading is required.

Library Service to Urban University Students

. . . Instructors do not require the same amount of work or the use of varied materials in the off-campus and evening programs.

. . . Part-time evening courses are not at par with full-time day courses. They rely heavily on textbooks, rather than library materials.

We are aware that evening faculty and students make far less use of library facilities and services than do their day school counterparts.

If the smoke-means-fire cliché is valid, there seems evidence here of a possible conflagration. An underprivileged status in terms of use of his library appears *not* to be the most serious problem confronting the part-time, working, commuting—particularly the evening commuting—student, widespread as this situation may be. His much more ominous problem in too many universities, whether he knows it or not, is that in an evening course he is receiving education of considerably lower quality than he would have if he had enrolled in the same course in the same university in the daytime. It seems clear that the evening standards are not as high as day standards. When one is reminded of the thousands of students who are enrolled at night for credit and are working on degrees, reminded again that these thousands are typically more mature and more highly motivated than the average daytime student, this seems to warrant serious reflection and reappraisal by urban university faculties and administrative officers, and perhaps by accrediting agencies as well. The evening commuting student in the urban university may be in the position of the gambler and the roulette wheel: he knows that it is rigged, but it is the only one in town. It may be assumed, however, that neither the students nor the authorities in charge of other urban universities are any more desirous of dilution of the quality of the higher education provided than is N.Y.U. A number of their librarians, obviously, firmly believe that such dilution of quality prevails in their universities.

It was suggested earlier that all facets of the problem—urban university library service to part-time, working, commuting students—should receive more extensive and intensive examination than it has been possible to provide in this study. It bears repeating. More than one librarian has grave doubts about the adequacy of the service he is now providing. It is interesting to realize that a number of the urban university librarians, hard-pressed as they now are, would be

under still greater pressure were the quality of education the same, day and night.

References

1. Littleton, I. T.: The Off-Campus Library Services of Universities. *College and Research Libraries*, 20:300-306, July 1959.
2. Hamlin, A. T.: College and Research Library Contributions to Adult Education. *Library Trends*, 8:51-61, July 1959.
3. New York University: *The New York University Self-Study; Final Report*. New York, New York University Press, 1956, pp. 240-245.
4. Personal communication dated May 18, 1961. Quotations throughout the paper which are not otherwise identified have been taken from questionnaire replies or from covering letters and other enclosures accompanying them.
5. Jones, N. E.: *Books Are Being Read; Summary of a Questionnaire on the Use of the Library*. . . . (U.C.L.A. Library Occasional Paper Number 8) Los Angeles, University of California Library, 1959, 46 l.
6. New York University. *op. cit.*, p. 242.
7. Jones, N. E. *op. cit.*, p. 17.
8. Ackerman, P., and Graham, G. C.: *Library Services for Students and Faculty of University Extension, Southern Area. Working Paper Number 1*. (Mimeographed) [Los Angeles, U.C.L.A. Library, August 1959, 23 l.]
9. [Ackerman, P., and Graham, G. C.]: *Library Services for Students and Faculty of University Extension, Southern Area. Working Paper Number Two*. (Mimeographed) [Los Angeles, U.C.L.A. Library, n.d.] 8 l.
10. New York University. *op. cit.*, p. 241.