



Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

MAURICE F. TAUBER

ANY LIBRARIAN WHO EXAMINES *Library Literature* will soon be aware of the number and kinds of library surveys which are conducted annually in the United States, as well as in foreign countries. The June 1963 issue, for example, includes citations to Humphry's *Library Cooperation*; *The Brown University Study of University-School-Community Library Coordination in the State of Rhode Island*; the New York State Education Department's *Reference and Research Library Resources Plan for the Rochester Area*; *An Analysis of the Proposals of the Commissioner's Committee as Applied to a Selected Region*; Wezeman's *Extension of Library Service in the Birmingham-Bloomfield Area of Michigan*; Oehlerts' *Study to Determine the Feasibility of Establishing a Cooperative Technical Processing Program and Direct Transmission of Interlibrary Loans*; Tauber and Kingery's *Central Technical Processing of the Nassau Library System*; *A Report on the Organization, Facilities, Operations, and Problems*; Boaz and Castagna's *Ontario (Calif.) Public Library, A Survey; Recommendations for Future Development and Planning*; Ward's *Plan for the Chico Public Library from 1962 to 1985; A Study with Recommendations*; Taves and others' *Public Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding a Rural Minnesota Library System*; and Gaver and Velazquez' *School Libraries of Puerto Rico; A Survey and Plan for Development*. The same issue of *Library Literature* listed two articles by Phinney: "Community Survey: A Technique for Planning Library Adult Education," *Wisconsin Library Bulletin* for January 1963, and "Recent Trends in Public Library Adult Services, Report of a Survey," in the *ALA Bulletin* for March 1963.

This bibliographical listing indicates that several of the major aspects of library service were involved in these studies, surveys, re-
Maurice F. Tauber is Melvil Dewey Professor, School of Library Service, Columbia University. The author wishes to thank Carlyle J. Frarey, University of North Carolina, for suggestions in developing this paper.

ports, or whatever else they may be called, in addition to total library programs for a community or a larger region. Resources, inter-library loans and other forms of cooperation, technical processing, as well as other matters are considered. All types of libraries are represented. Development of a building program, such as that by W. H. Jesse for the University of Concepción in Chile, is regarded as a special type of survey, and is noted under the entry of Architecture in *Library Literature* for December 1962. But building programs require intensive examination of the functions, service programs, and plans of a library or a library system. It may be noted here, too, that there have been a number of personnel surveys which have been restricted to the problem of staff utilization, although usually general surveys, as well as building programs, have been concerned with analysis of personnel.

In the conduct of surveys, there have been some individuals who have been and still are (in some cases) associated with special types of surveys. The April 1, 1961 issue of the *Library Journal* contains a version of a talk I presented at a meeting of the Hawaii Library Association which dealt with several matters relating to surveys.¹ Among these were the individuals and groups which have used the survey approach to solve library problems. With some minor adjustments, it may be useful to categorize these participants as follows:

1. Surveys by library associations
2. Surveys by non-library associations
3. Institutional surveys: (a) educational, (b) endowed
4. Governmental surveys: (a) Federal, (b) state, (c) regional, (d) local, (e) departmental or agency
5. Commercial organization surveys (surveyors may be employed by associations, governments, or foundations through grants)
6. Personal consultantships or personal surveys (employed by institutions, associations, accrediting agencies, governments, foundations, or commercial organizations)
7. Foundation surveys (direct grant to either a group or individual, or to an institution)
8. Surveys conducted by library schools (sometimes in connection with master's or doctoral studies)
9. Surveys by accrediting agencies
10. Self-surveys (either completely independent, or with the aid of an outside consultant).

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

Librarians now not only have colleagues who have had depth experience in surveying, but library surveys have also attracted the interest of management engineers, operations specialists, psychologists, social scientists, and industrial experts to their problems, particularly in such areas as library personnel, library machinery and equipment, and the general field of information storage and retrieval. Architects and psychologists have long been concerned with matters of buildings and reading, respectively. Whether librarians will have the cumulative knowledge to formulate principles and establish standards from these various studies is something about which one can speculate as library problems become more massive and complex. Problems are already in frustrating stages in respect to systems of service for all types of libraries.

If library service is not different from other callings, in the sense that it should progress as its practitioners become more familiar with its problems and recurrent obstacles, then it would appear that the future has much to offer the field. Undoubtedly, the present emphasis on science and technology has been brought about by the need of researchers in these areas to have immediate access to information and analysis. Any precise improvement of library or informational services in science and technology may well have direct implications for the social sciences and the humanities.

Although there are some librarians and others who regard surveys as interesting exercises without definite implications for the field as a whole, the record shows that this has not been really true. Various textbooks on research methodology in the social sciences usually devote a substantial chapter or section to the survey method. It is not necessary to explore these disciplines in detail. It is the purpose of the remainder of this paper to consider the following aspects of the survey: (1) its nature, (2) its approaches, (3) its limitations, and (4) its results. Reference to particular persons or surveys will be made at appropriate points. The emphasis is on the individual library and library system survey.

Nature of the Survey Method

The survey method is among the oldest efforts in the social sciences to assess a situation, whether it be for the purpose of developing a city plan, a street or road plan, a water system, a school system, a medical program, or a governmental structure. Geodetic, geologic,

cartographic, and other scientific surveys have added knowledge to man's search for understanding the world in which he lives.

In many of the social science surveys, we find an appreciation for the future. Although there are surveys directed toward the formulation of recommendations for the quick solutions of immediate problems, in government, education, transportation, and other fields, many surveys, as may be recalled from the items listed at the outset of this paper, are concerned with a ten- or twenty-year period (or even longer).

The purposes of the surveys also differ in terms of depth. Some surveys are conducted for the purposes of confirming assumptions, others for synthesizing data on a particular area of a library, or a total library system, and others for assessing a situation in terms of correcting inadequacies or removing inefficiencies. The basic goal is improvement, which is the goal for research in other fields, even though in pure research we recognize no necessary relationship between the study and immediate practical application. A survey does not have to be conducted only when a situation has become faulty, but many surveys are introduced at this point.

The sampling of titles provided earlier represents but a few of the many hundreds of surveys which have been prepared for college, university, school, governmental, and special libraries of all kinds. Even though some surveys start with the consideration of specific questions, others are directed at providing a full-scale review of all aspects of a library, including such areas of study as history and background, community analysis and governmental relationships, financial administration, organizational patterns and administrative relationships, technical services, readers' services, personnel, resources, use of the library, quarters and equipment, cooperative arrangements, and in some cases, training for librarianship. Most, if not all, of these areas are included in major surveys of university libraries and the larger public library systems.

A final point may be made on the nature of the survey. In the categorization of surveys, it was observed that they have been conducted by groups or individuals. There are many one-man surveys, and names such as those of Louis R. Wilson, M. L. Raney, A. F. Kuhlman, Joseph L. Wheeler, Keyes D. Metcalf, Ralph Ulveling, Charles Mohrhardt, Ralph E. Ellsworth, William H. Jesse, Frederick Wezeman, Robert B. Downs, Ralph R. Shaw, Leon Carnovsky, Andrew D. Osborn, Lowell Martin, Edwin Castagna, Walter T. Brahm,

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

Edward A. Wight, LeRoy C. Merritt, Raynard C. Swank, Robert E. Kingery, Martha Boaz, Emerson Greenaway, and others have appeared on reports of library systems. These and other librarians have worked also with colleagues on surveys.

It is desirable here to say a word about the team approach to surveys, which is exemplified in the Library Building Consultants, Inc. approach, but was prominent in the Los Angeles Public Library Survey, the Public Library Inquiry, various projects of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., the American Library Association Library Technology Project, and foundation and government sponsored surveys. Unless there is a restricted area of concern, such as a particular department or service of a library, the idea of the team approach should be commended. The use of two or more minds on a particular library problem not only results in a fertile atmosphere of questioning, but also serves as a guard against bias or limited experience. In accrediting surveys, librarians work with colleagues in other fields, and this has been generally fruitful. Gelfand has written in detail on this approach.²

Approaches of the Survey

In its totality, the survey utilizes not only the major methods of research, such as the historical, descriptive, and (on a more limited basis) the experimental methods, but also the common devices of research, such as documentary and statistical analysis, questionnaires, checklists, visits, interviews, observation, and the compilation of specialized data for particular conditions. In essence, all of these approaches are designed to enable the surveyor to gather, synthesize, analyze, and interpret data for the purpose of offering solutions to pressing problems, for improving conditions, for correcting faulty conditions, and for planning. It may be worth while to consider briefly each of the major approaches.

The usefulness of documentary sources in surveys is apparent when one is concerned with such matters as library organization, library government, legislation, finance, personnel, and the operations and routines involved in management and administration. The use of such materials in surveys, particularly in the development of the background for evaluating present conditions, requires the insight and imagination that come from wide experience and the recognition of the variables present in a particular problem. Experience with similar problems, familiarity with sources, and a flexibility of mind are es-

sential to the proper evaluation of such evidence. The surveyor must be careful not to accept the documentary sources as valid without confirmation from other sources. He must not be easily led to draw conclusions on the basis of scanty information found in reports, documents, policy statements, minutes of meetings, previous studies and surveys, annual summaries, manuals, operational outlines, charts, forms, and production records, but he must use these in proper relationships.

The statistical sources and published data which may be available to the consultant will need to be checked with current data. Such data may be concerned with book stock, other collections, personnel, production, and services of various kinds. Various personnel data may be in the records of the library or may be collected through questionnaires. In connection with operations, data may be developed through the keeping of records by staff members or by the recording of data by close observation on the part of the surveyors. In a few surveys, time and motion studies have been carried on in various activities of the technical and readers' services. The usefulness of such data will depend directly upon their validity and reliability, and these should be determined by the surveyors with a strict sense for statistical values. Quantitative comparisons with other libraries, in operation or costs, have been made in a number of cases, but again the question of validity must be raised in connection with this approach.

The standard textbooks on research methodology do such a thorough job on the structure, problems, and limitations of questionnaires and checklists that it is unnecessary to dwell on these at great length. However, they are used frequently in surveys for gathering data, and require the careful analysis that should be given to all such devices. The questionnaire is a complex instrument, and so it is not surprising that one surveyor will use successful questionnaires or checklists that have been devised for other surveys. The battery of questionnaires devised for the survey of the Columbia University Libraries in 1957 has been applied in at least two other university library surveys.³ Although tailoring of questionnaires is essential for a particular library, effective forms might well be used in appropriate situations. Open-end questions have been found useful when extensive comment is wanted.

The use of checklists has been somewhat more limited. In personnel inquiries, as well as in operational and collecting activities, they have been applied with some success. With both questionnaires and check-

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

lists, it is essential that testing be done before they are distributed to large groups of respondents. It is probably needless to suggest that questionnaires and checklists should be considered today within the framework of possible machine analysis.

The approach of the surveyor has usually included spending periods of time at the library that is being studied. If there is a team involved, individual members spend periods together or separately. In some cases, members of a team are assigned specific areas for intensive examination. The visits are essential for checking on questionnaires, for identifying additional matters which have not been presented in documentary or other sources, and for clarifying relationships.

Interviews are essential in following up questionnaires or checklists, in isolating personal comments which individuals are reluctant to put on questionnaires, in providing the surveyor with an opportunity for judging the respondents, in discussing matters with individuals who find it difficult to complete forms easily, and in exchanging information with individuals in such ways that other avenues are opened up for the investigator. The experienced surveyor becomes aware of the truth of facts as he talks with different staff members on the same matters. Staff on all levels usually are interviewed.

Allied to both visits and interviews is the device of observation. In many surveys it has been necessary to have periods of time devoted to close observation of operations, services, and equipment. The absence of data or records on various factors requiring study may be met by careful observation on the part of the surveyors. The persistence in observation may be useful in revealing relationships that are otherwise overlooked. The trained observer in a library survey is similar to a researcher in any field seeking to isolate facts and to separate them from hearsay or conjecture. In any of these approaches involving discussions and observations, it has been found useful to employ cameras and recording devices when applicable and convenient.

Through questionnaire and interview, as well as through on-the-spot examination of conditions, it is possible to gain insight into the various factors that are being studied in a survey. However, it becomes necessary in some instances to require the development of specialized data. One of the astonishing conditions that the surveyor sometimes finds is an absence of a clear understanding of the particular functions of a library or information service. In several instances during the past few years, one of the first tasks in the survey was to

determine just what the library was supposed to do in respect to the work of the parent institution. This may be somewhat removed from research *per se*, but the problem was a basic one of definition and philosophical reflection. Statistical, geographical, and other data which are not usually kept may be developed by staff members who are experienced and equipped to work up such information. This is true also of various types of illustrations.

In any profession which seeks to raise the level of work of its craftsmen, it is essential that guiding principles and standards, so far as they can be derived, be identified and made available to the practitioners. Surveyors, if they are conscious of the existence of principles or standards, should use them when appropriate. A recent survey of the Sioux Falls College Library employed the college library standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries as a basis for appraising the conditions.⁴ Standards represent guides, and must be applied with caution.

Surveys themselves have had a role to play in the development of guiding principles, in that the surveyors have frequently brought to light some activity or operation that might be described as "successful experience." In such works as those by Randall and Goodrich,⁵ and later by Lyle,⁶ on college library principles, and similar compilations for university libraries (Wilson and Tauber),⁷ public libraries (Wheeler and Goldhor),⁸ technical libraries (edited by Lucille Jackson),⁹ and special libraries (edited by W. Ashworth),¹⁰ there has been an obvious reliance upon the findings of surveys to provide guidance in a variety of practices and procedures, and to point up policy development. The statewide survey in California under Wight¹¹ is an example of an exhaustive analysis of factors which are involved in effective library service, and might be adapted to other states.

Limitations of Surveys

A dozen or so years ago, Goldhor wrote a "Critique of the Library Survey."¹² The point that he made was that outsiders called in to survey a library might not be in a position, from the point of view of knowledge, to do as well as staff members in surveying the conditions and making proper recommendations. In the recent volume on *Practical Administration of Public Libraries*, by Wheeler and Goldhor, there is some reservation against the self-survey, even though it may be useful. They write: "Staff members are often inhibited in their approach and findings, hesitating to criticize or make drastic

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

suggestions which might offend their colleagues. They may lack the completely fresh, challenging viewpoint based on wide experience in scrutinizing other libraries.”¹³ There are various problems, however, which are susceptible to objective examination by the staff members themselves. The qualification of surveyors may also be a limiting factor. In some cases, a team approach would be more useful than an individual surveyor.

There have been other criticisms of surveys, particularly in regard to inadequate sampling. The recent access to libraries study, the Public Library Inquiry, and surveys of individual libraries have been subjected to question in regard to this significant factor. This may be a deficiency of a study, and not necessarily of the method. The problem of sampling involves, for example, collections, personnel, cataloging production, and similar variables, and is one that requires special consideration in each study. The nature of the study may determine the extent of sampling required, and the experienced surveyor should be in a position to recognize limitations in sampling if there is an effort to generalize and draw conclusions. In an authoritative survey, supported and encouraged by the administration of an institution, the cooperation and aid essential in obtaining adequate sampling are sometimes sufficient to provide the surveyor with proper data. Even then, it may be difficult for the respondents to provide the data.

An example of a difficult area of exploration is the evaluation of collections of a library. There has been widespread use of checklists of titles—books, serials, or other materials. As is generally known, any list of titles is subject to question. Lists that have been prepared by various academic bodies, organizations, or accrediting agencies have been employed in evaluating collections. Some lists have been prepared by surveyors, with the advice of experts or specialists in the field. The results of checking such lists, however, are generally reported on a quantitative basis, since it is assumed that each item is of equal value. Some further analysis may be gained by categorizing the materials on a subject basis, and by language. The actual listing of holdings by identification of authors and titles, periodical titles, and other specific items helps to clarify the character of the holdings. This is a difficult task, and requires considerable background and knowledge of the different fields. Usually, group evaluation in specialized areas is essential. In the survey of the Columbia University Libraries, the gradation of collections on the levels of (a) basic in-

formation, (b) working, (c) general research, (d) comprehensive, and (e) exhaustive, was designed to guide faculty members in assessing the collections from both quantitative and qualitative standpoints. However, in sampling for some departments, as well as in evaluation, it was pointed out in the report that the results had to be regarded as suggestive and exploratory, rather than as definitive, since the sampling had been spotty. The theory of the approach, however, appears to provide a sounder basis for appraising collections than lists, if a long-term view of collecting programs and policies is wanted. If it is agreed, however, that specific titles do represent strength in particular fields, the use of lists may have some merit. Actually, there are various lists which have been used in surveys, and for a large group of surveys they have been summarized in *The University Library*.¹⁴

In comparisons between libraries on such matters as size and growth of collections, circulation, cataloging production, reference service, and other aspects of service, the measurement is usually done within the framework of available statistics. Librarianship has had some difficulty in such areas as uniform counting, as well as uniform statistics. Such collections of statistics as those compiled by the Association of College and Research Libraries, the U.S. Office of Education, and those that appear in the *Bowker Annual* have been available for use. While these have been useful, they are still subject to question when used in comparative tabulations in surveys.

Undoubtedly, one of the areas of great concern to the surveyor is the availability of statements of standards, mentioned earlier. The efforts of the Library Technology Project of the ALA and the emphasis that the Council on Library Resources and Committee Z39 of the American Standards Association have placed on standards suggest that perhaps some of the rough measures that we now use will soon be replaced by more precise data. The stress on producing valid measuring instruments verified through experimentation, possibly leading to standardization, marks a recent development that should be helpful to all libraries. Experimentation and study of equipment and services at the Library of Congress, the New York Public Library, the National Library of Medicine, the University of Illinois, the University of Missouri, the University of California, the University of Chicago, General Electric, IBM, and other libraries or agencies represent further directions of the survey technique which may overcome some of the gaps in our knowledge at the present time.

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

In the Columbia survey, it was found necessary to devote a section to special problems which could not be examined in a survey of a single institution, since there were implications for other libraries. The entire field of cooperation, if it is to be meaningful, involves libraries which cut across local, regional, and national boundaries. Surveys of state library service, however, may provide a body of data that could be used to explore wider areas of cooperation.

Financial support for a survey may be insufficient and hence make it necessary to curtail examination of aspects which are relevant. The financing of a survey has been one of the less well understood factors. We do know that librarians are likely to underestimate costs of a survey in much the same way as other researchers engaged in intensive projects. With the opportunity for improvement of services as a result of a survey, it would appear that this limitation would be minimal.

Timing of a survey may be an important limiting factor. The period of the survey should be long enough to take into account variables which would appear at different times of the year, as in an academic situation. Moreover, timing is important in relation to staff activity as well as in regard to users. Some surveys have been conducted when the period was atypical in book ordering, cataloging, and other processing. As a result, the findings did not reveal the true situation. Surveys should be stretched over a sufficiently long period to make it possible to include variables, but at the same time they should not be too long in appearing after data have been collected.

The formal presentation of the report is a critical part of the survey process. The provision of proper financial support for the issuance of the report is essential and should be made a part of the contract. The report itself should be organized so effectively that the parties responsible for its implementation will be able to use it easily. Proper classification of the contents, including summaries, attractive format, simplicity in writing, and the use of tables, diagrams, charts, maps, and other illustrations are desirable if the report is to make a full impact. Illustrations, for example, may be more important than many words. Such was the case of the sheet from the abominable shelf-list at Cornell, or the photograph of the hopelessly inadequate reading room at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. It is important that the report omit no important data in order to save on costs of reproduction. Nor should it be reproduced in unnecessarily expensive format just to make an impression.

Prior to final reproduction of the report for general use, it has been found useful in many instances to have appropriate staff members of the library examine it for errors of any kind, omissions, or misinterpretations. This is not to give the staff any prerogative to inject their own impressions or recommendations, but is designed to eliminate any small errors which if they are not caught may prove to be distractions from the significant findings of the report. Misinterpretations, of course, should be corrected.

With the development of more libraries, as well as more library schools, there is a need to issue a large enough edition of copies of surveys which may be available to them for use by students of librarianship. There has been a past history of minimal copies available to the profession for many important surveys.

Results of the Survey Approach

In 1936, writing in the volume of *Library Trends*, edited by Louis R. Wilson, and issued by the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, Edward A. Wight discussed "Methods and Techniques of Library Surveys." He wrote: "The survey is relatively novel and recent in public-library practice. A bibliography compiled at American Library Association headquarters in January, 1936, listed thirty-eight surveys. . . . A total of six surveys are reported before 1920, and twenty-five after 1925."¹⁵

At this time, there were probably but a handful of university and college surveys. In 1958, Peter Jonikas¹⁶ issued his bibliography of public library surveys and cited almost 300 separate items. There have been in the college, university, school, and special library fields probably an equal number during this period. Individual authors, persons engaged in higher education, staffs of research bureaus, special committees, and in some instances, trustees, were responsible for the surveys, as described by Wight in 1936. He also called attention to the fact that reports of surveys sometimes appeared in typed or mimeographed form, or in summary form, or in one instance, in a local newspaper.

The present day survey is likely to be reproduced in multiple copies and made available to library schools, libraries, and others, as well as the persons directly interested in the study. The period from 1936 to 1963 has shown a remarkable movement towards the survey as a method of evaluating a library situation. In the opening paragraph of this paper, mention was made of the June 1963 issue of *Library*

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

Literature. It should be noted that there are many surveys, particularly those made for organizations, business, industry, and government which are regarded as internal administrative reports and are not reproduced for general circulation. It is possible that this restriction has resulted in analyses of library situations which are significant for improvement of general library conditions, or which include data which are not found elsewhere in the professional literature. In general, however, major surveys are published today.

Wight found that public library surveys of 1936 made only a limited contribution to the study of library problems because they were subjective, and because they had limited distribution and frequently appeared only in summary form. There was little or nothing descriptive of methodology, and actual tabular and other data were lacking. It would be difficult to criticize many surveys produced in recent years for the same reasons. That subjectivity appears in surveys is to be admitted. However, there appears to be more attention to gathering facts for purposes of answering specific questions, adherence to objective appraisals of conditions, and providing a workable program for those who have to implement the recommendations.

Wilson prepared a statement on university library surveys in 1947.¹⁷ Although it is clear that improvements in a surveyed library might come from a variety of pressures, it was suggested that surveys have been influential in academic situations in (1) opening up channels of information concerning the library, (2) orientation of the administration in the purposes of the library and its role in education and research, (3) codification of a library policy, (4) development of a program of action, (5) increase in library support, (6) solving of specific problems, and (7) stimulation of the library staff.

In 1961, Erickson¹⁸ prepared a study of the results of twelve college and university library surveys. He examined 775 recommendations made in these surveys, and found that 60 per cent were carried out completely or in large part, and that 10 per cent more were achieved to a small degree. Only in 15 per cent of the recommendations were the surveys regarded as having exerted no influence. Of course, it is important to differentiate between recommendations, since they do not all have the same value. Erickson considers this question and concludes that significant recommendations were given proper attention. Direct or indirect effects of a survey on developments in a library may be difficult to trace. A reviewer of the Erickson work, Marion Milczewski, is critical of the concentration on tabular

presentations, and suggests that they “. . . led the author both to give a misleading appearance of precision in the results so carefully tabulated, and to understate the values of social and political pressures which lead to correction of deficiencies to which surveys are intended to call attention.”¹⁹ Milczewski suggested a further study which would give attention to the “animating spirit which inspired each of the surveys,” and examine the surveys in “the light of objectives of the surveys, methods of persuasion used to effect changes, and of the resulting changes in the library climate of the institutions affected.” Milczewski admits that this is a difficult approach, but believes it would add up to an important sociological document.

Indeed it would, and I would encourage any one who could isolate such evidence to write it up for the profession. Felix Reichmann’s detailed analysis in the September 1962 *College and Research Libraries* of the reclassification at Cornell,²⁰ one of the recommendations made in the Cornell Library survey, is an example of the problems, persistence, personal dedication, and as Milczewski would say, “animation” that resulted in the completion of the project. There is no substitute for the individual in librarianship. It is quite possible that if we had high-powered staffs in libraries, who could anticipate developments so that errors or miscalculations could be avoided or minimized, surveys would not be needed. On the basis of the variety of surveys which have been made, particularly in respect to planning and the movement towards cooperation on several fronts, it does not appear that surveys will meet a quick end.

Mention should be made that a study of the results of public library surveys has been started at Columbia University by William L. Emerson, of the Palos Verdes (Calif.) Library. He expects to examine the outcome of recommendations of sixteen public library surveys in California, made from 1948 through 1959. Perhaps he will be able to gather some insights which go beyond tabulations.

In respect to the outcome of surveys, it would be a serious omission not to comment finally on the activities of the sponsoring agencies. Proper backing by an institution’s administration, proper cooperation by the constituents, proper orientation of potential participants, proper publicity, wide distribution of the findings to all relevant audiences, and publication all aid in making the study a document of importance.

Surveys are not cure-alls. They are also not claimed to be more than the application of knowledgeability to a given situation in order

Survey Method in Approaching Library Problems

to resolve serious and incipient problems, to devise blueprints for the future, and to focus attention on the program of the library. When performed on a high level, and when the library staffs involved have a willingness to experiment and to change, they can be helpful in up-grading library service. In the last analysis, the character of the implementation will determine whether or not surveys are effective, working blueprints.

References

1. Tauber, Maurice F. "A Survey of Library Surveys," *Library Journal*, 86: 1351-1357, April 1961.
2. Gelfand, Morris A. *A Historical Study of the Evaluation of the Libraries in Higher Institutions by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation prepared at New York University, 1960.
3. Tauber, Maurice F., et al. *The Columbia University Libraries*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1958.
4. Gormley, Mark M., and Hopp, Ralph H. *The Sioux Falls College Library: A Survey*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1961.
5. Randall, William M., and Goodrich, Francis L. D. *Principles of College Library Administration*. 2d ed. Chicago, American Library Association and the University of Chicago Press, 1941.
6. Lyle, Guy R. *The Administration of the College Library*. 2d ed. rev. New York, Wilson, 1944.
7. Wilson, Louis R., and Tauber, Maurice F. *The University Library*. 2nd ed. New York, Columbia University Press, 1956.
8. Wheeler, Joseph L., and Goldhor, Herbert. *Practical Administration of Public Libraries*. New York, Harper and Row, 1962.
9. Jackson, Lucille, ed. *Technical Libraries: Their Organization and Management*. New York, Special Libraries Association, 1951.
10. Ashworth, Wilfred, ed. *Handbook of Special Librarianship and Information Work*. 2d ed., completely revised. London, Aslib, 1962.
11. California Public Library Commission. *Reports, Pursuant to 1957 Statutes of California, Chapter 2328*. Berkeley, 1959.
12. Goldhor, Herbert. "A Critique of the Library Survey," *Illinois Libraries*, 32:609-612, Nov. 1950.
13. Wheeler, Joseph L., and Goldhor, Herbert. *op. cit.*, p. 138.
14. Wilson, Louis R., and Tauber, Maurice F. *op. cit.*, pp. 552-585.
15. Wight, Edward A. "Methods and Techniques of Library Surveys." In Louis R. Wilson, ed. *Library Trends: Papers Presented before the Library Institute at the University of Chicago, August 3-15, 1936*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937, p. 344.
16. Jonikas, Peter, comp. *Bibliography of Public Library Surveys Contained in the Collections of the University of Chicago Library and the Headquarters Library of the American Library Association*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1958.

MAURICE F. TAUBER

17. Wilson, Louis R. "The University Library Survey: Its Results," *College and Research Libraries*, 8:368-375, July 1947.
18. Erickson, E. W. *College and University Library Surveys, 1938-1952*. (ACRL Monograph No. 25) Chicago, American Library Association, 1961.
19. Milczewski, Marion. [Review of] *College and University Library Surveys*, by E. W. Erickson, *College and Research Libraries*, 23:357, July 1962.
20. Reichmann, Felix. "Cornell's Reclassification Program," *College and Research Libraries*, 23:369-374+, Sept. 1962.