



Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

LEON CARNOVSKY

RESEARCH IN LIBRARIANSHIP, apart from its historical and bibliographical aspects, is fairly recent. And since research and publication of its results go hand in hand, it follows that facilities for publication were largely non-existent, as they were unnecessary, until there was something to publish. Before 1930 we had not a single journal in this country which catered primarily or specifically to the publication of library investigations; since then we have witnessed a significant increase in the number of such journals. I have selected 1930 as the dividing line because in that year the *Library Quarterly* was established "to fill the need for a journal of investigation and discussion in the field of librarianship." Later it was joined by *College and Research Libraries* (1939), *Libri* (1950), *American Documentation* (1950), *Library Trends* (1955), *Library Resources and Technical Services* (1957)—an outgrowth of the *Journal of Cataloging and Classification* (1943), and the *Journal of Education for Librarianship* (1960); all of them receptive to scholarly articles and reports of investigation. Today there is no shortage of outlets, and if any piece of investigation fails to find a means of becoming known, it probably was not worth publishing in the first place.

Research, of course, logically precedes the establishment of journals for reporting its results. Once the journals are established they require a steady flow of manuscripts; if the flow is sluggish the journals may have to suspend publication or change their character to become hospitable to articles of a descriptive or speculative sort, and this, in fact, is what has happened in the library field. It is doubtful if we can point to a single periodical whose major articles are devoted exclusively to research reports; once established, the journals go on,

Leon Carnovsky is Professor, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago.

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

broadening their scope, and in the process compromising their emphasis on studies that qualify as original investigation. If the research interest dries up entirely, some journals may go out of existence, and those that remain will obviously lose the characteristic that led to their original creation.

But the present offers no signs that research in librarianship is on the wane—quite the contrary. If the master's thesis has diminished in quantitative importance, it has been compensated for by attention to the doctoral dissertation. Thirty-five years ago only one library school offered the doctorate; today seven offer it. Not only this, but a library research center is operating at the University of Illinois and another will soon get under way at California. Funds are being provided by the Council on Library Resources, the foundations, and the Federal Government to underwrite big and small studies of all kinds. The possibilities of research are limited only by our own imagination, abilities, and energy.

Though my assignment is to discuss the process of bringing the results of research to public attention rather than research itself, it will help to begin with an overview of investigations since 1950. In that year the *Library Quarterly* began its listing of graduate theses accepted by library schools in the United States, and it has continued the record up to the present time. About 3,000 titles have been listed, an impressive number even when we grant that many entries qualify for inclusion only by courtesy and a very liberal interpretation of "research." Many, probably most, are undoubtedly valuable student exercises, not intended for a wider audience; in any event, once listed, they may be obtained on inter-library loan or by photographic reproduction by the rare person who might wish them for consultation or permanent ownership. Many theses deserve a wider audience and could get it if their authors were willing to condense or rewrite them appropriately for publication in a periodical. This, however, rarely happens; instead, the author who wishes wider distribution for his manuscript all too frequently sends it to the editor and expects him to do the necessary selection and rewriting. Alternatively, the thesis, like Thomas Gray's rose, is born to blush unseen, to no one's particular consternation. This is the fate that befalls the thesis in every field of graduate study.

But I want to say a word about the exceptions—the reports of investigations that do come to a journal, and here I should like to draw on my own experience of 18 years as managing editor of the *Library*

Quarterly. During this long period it fell to my lot to read hundreds of manuscripts. Some I remember with pleasure, those whose authors had something to say and wrote it down with literary grace. Others I prefer to forget; the words tumbling out like a waterfall but without its compensating beauty, the ideas expressed trivial or half-baked or shrouded in murky rhetoric. Some were inappropriate to the purpose of the *Library Quarterly* but worth publishing somewhere; still others, in my opinion, were undeserving of print anywhere (but undeserving or not, many of them achieved it).

Librarianship is essentially a discipline of action; its job is to collect and organize materials and to facilitate their use. It is a profession that does not depend upon the writing of its own practitioners, but on the writing of everyone else. This may explain why its "classics" cannot compare in number with those of the conventional intellectual disciplines; perhaps, also, this may account for the limited acceptance of librarianship as a discipline worth a place in an intellectual climate. Yet this need not be so. The library as an institution—public, academic, or special—commands universal respect; its place in civilization is assured, and it deserves a body of professional literature commensurate with its stature.

The obligation for creating such a literature obviously rests with all of us—not only the graduate students in library schools, but their teachers and their future colleagues. No editor can tell them how to write, but if they observed a few simple ground rules, the editor's life would be easier and the chance of achieving publication would be measurably enhanced. Out of my experience as editor, then, I should lay down six ground rules, all of them obvious but, alas, all of them continually violated.

(1) Every manuscript submitted should be typewritten, double spaced on sturdy paper, and with wide margins. Believe it or not, and every editor should be spared this, I have received hand-written manuscripts and, more often, manuscripts typed single-spaced on flimsy paper. The hard-boiled editor will throw up his hands on receiving such a document, the manuscript with them. Do not load the dice against yourself.

(2) Get a footnote *right*; a faulty citation leads to exasperation, frustration, and lessened respect for the author. Footnotes are not a bore, and they may be indispensable; the editor cannot and should not be expected to correct careless errors.

(3) If quotations are used, they should be exact. To tamper with

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

another person's published prose is dishonest, and the editor may not be able to check the original.

(4) Follow a manual of style, either the University of Chicago Press *Manual* or the one published by the Government Printing Office. If neither is at hand, examine in detail previous issues of the periodical being courted for a guide to tabular presentation, footnote style, bibliographical references, center, sub- or marginal headings, and the like.

(5) Be sure you have selected an appropriate periodical to which to send the manuscript. The periodicals themselves suggest the type of article preferred, and if they were examined before a manuscript were submitted, a good deal of time and disappointment might be avoided.

(6) Above all, respect the English language. Write simply and clearly, cut out excess verbiage, avoid fine writing, eliminate repetition. The author is seldom his own best critic, and a friendly colleague or relative can frequently spot passages crying aloud for revision or elimination. Almost any manuscript is strengthened by being cut.

These rules, of course, apply to any piece of prose, whether intended for periodical, book, or other medium. Although he was not speaking specifically of theses, but of research reports in general—and by professors at that—Roger Shugg, director of the University of Chicago Press, characterizes them as “. . . too often gracelessly written in the jargon of their subjects, wastefully full of repetition, intolerably dull if not wholly unintelligible to anyone not in the inner circle of initiates. Even the humanists have made a cult of obscurity and carry their *explication de texte* so absurdly far that all but captive readers are lost through boredom early on the way.”¹

Over and above form, however, is content; implicit always is the assumption that what is written is worthy, but given intellectual substance and literary form, no manuscript will lack a publisher.

When we consider the more extensive research report, we naturally think of the conventional book, and here too there is no shortage of publishers. Most fortunate is the author who achieves publication in a dignified letter-press format, such as might be given by a university press, the American Library Association, or a trade publisher. Since the audience is almost invariably limited, this type of publishing is expensive and chancy, difficult to achieve unless some form of subsidy is available. We can, of course, point to many books that have reached

letter-press format, and all of us would applaud more like them. But since the conventional university and other presses tend to be discouragingly conservative, there has developed something of a gap between many research reports and their publication; to close the gap, publication in near-print has been widely adopted. Capitalizing on near-print techniques and aiming at the specific if limited professional library market, such presses as Scarecrow and Shoestring have provided the means of bringing us many books which otherwise might never have reached publication. We all have groaned at one time or another over their publications, but we owe them a debt for making them available. The books are anything but inexpensive, and they certainly are not candidates for the Fifty Best Books of the Year exhibit; still, they have performed a useful service. Whether they need to be as expensive as they are is a question of economics. The market is bound to be limited in any case, and it is doubtful if a book priced at \$10 would sell appreciably better if its price were cut in half. As I write, I have before me Margaret Monroe's comprehensive study *Library Adult Education*, published by Scarecrow and priced at \$12.50. This 550 page book is printed in photo-offset from typewritten copy, the lines separated by 1½ spacing, and it is altogether readable. It will undoubtedly command a sale to the larger libraries and to library schools, probably also to colleges and universities interested in adult education—in short, an institutional sale. At \$12.50 its sales to individuals must be small indeed, but if it were priced at \$5 or \$6, the chances are that individual sales would still be small and institutional sales not substantially increased. If this is correct, then the higher price is probably justified, to permit the publisher to come out with a fair profit. In the Winter 1963, issue of *Daedalus* Roger Shugg writes: "As matters stand, the publisher of a scholarly book can count at the start of no more than two or three hundred orders from educational libraries. For a scientific or technical book he can expect nearly an equal number of orders from libraries overseas."² Lower prices undoubtedly would improve the situation, but not appreciably.

To what extent will the newer developments in communication affect the publication of library research? To some extent they already have, but the results are too small to make more than a ripple. Take paperbacks. Typically, the paperback is a republication—the rebirth of a classic or best-seller or reasonably popular book, and few library publications would qualify. I know of only one or two—e.g., Butler's

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

Introduction to Library Science,³ and this was not a research report but an interesting contemplation of the nature of librarianship and its possibilities for objective study. The mass market on which the paperback depends simply does not exist for library literature.

A more promising development is the microcard, and here the microcard series of the Association of College and Research Libraries provides us with real evidence of accomplishment. Initiated in 1953, the series is under the control of an editorial committee which is responsible for the selection of manuscripts to be preserved on microcards. A statement concerning the ACRL publications program indicates that the series "includes works in all fields of librarianship and bibliography which, for technical reasons, are not suitable for publication as an article in a periodical, a letterpress book, or an ACRL monograph. These reasons may be limited appeal as to contents, length, or organization of material. ACRL microcards represent material which should be generally available by reason of quality, but for which there is no other channel of publication. Qualitative standards of style, factual content and intelligent organization of material are the same as those applied to *College and Research Libraries* and the ACRL Monographs. Manuscripts will be considered in all fields of librarianship and bibliography, not necessarily those which relate to college and reference libraries. . . ."

As of July 1963, 138 titles had been issued and are available. As new titles appear, they are abstracted in *College and Research Libraries*. There are only 83 subscribers to the series, but, of course, individual cards are also sold. Distribution is, however, certainly not widespread, and the editor reports that though a few titles have sold 150 to 175 copies, the average is 100 to 125. The price of the first 100 cards issued is \$1.00 each; the remaining 38 range from 75¢ to \$2.25.

The titles that have thus far appeared vary widely; a large number are historical studies, frequently of specialized or limited interest; others seem of more general interest and applicability. Many of them began as master's theses in library schools. Granted that ACRL Microcards are not the ideal vehicle for transmitting the results of research, they are certainly better than nothing. If they are not widely read, well, the same is true in all academic fields, and for that matter the same may be said of most books and periodical articles that achieve conventional publication.

The microcard series serves its function when the research report is considered unsuitable for the other forms of publication, and the

ACRL Monograph series has been mentioned as one possible means of publication. This series, begun in 1952, includes 25 titles, ranging in size from 16 to 208 pages, and in price from 25¢ to \$4.25; many of the titles are now out of print. As with the microcard series, many titles, highly useful and informative, are not research reports; but the important point is that the series furnishes an opportunity for research publication. Distribution is handled through the Publishing Department of the American Library Association, and there are about 700 standing orders. Clearly, in spite of microforms and lower prices, we are still more comfortable with the conventional form of presentation; I doubt if, qualitatively, there is any superiority in the monograph over the microcard series. Each manuscript is read by at least two persons, and if acceptable to them it must be further screened by the ALA Publishing Department. The present editor of the series writes that the only real problem is one of obtaining manuscripts for consideration. However, he does cite other difficulties, such as excessive wordiness in the manuscripts submitted, bad writing and organization, faulty citations, and similar grievances that seem endemic.

Hardly in the field of publication, but certainly related to it, is the microfilm. It is now fairly general practice for all doctoral dissertations to be made available on microfilm, one copy deposited in the Library of Congress, another in the degree-conferring university. The negative is subsequently used for Xerox copies for any individual or institution wishing to purchase them. The price at the University of Chicago is 5¢ a page. Thus far this method of reproduction and distribution has not been very important, quantitatively, in library research, since the total number of library school doctoral dissertations is relatively small, and most of them manage to achieve publication in some other form. In any event, the microfilm contains within it certain defects which tend to militate against its wide use except as a substitute for conventional presentation. As Rush Welter points out in his monograph *Problems of Scholarly Publication in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, micropublication creates eyestrain, defies easy handling and contemplative reading or re-reading, and precludes useful marginal notes and memoranda.⁴ Nevertheless, I shall return to further consideration of microreproduction later.

One of the complaints repeatedly heard is that the results of library research, though eventually published, are so long delayed as to militate seriously against their utility. The complaint really is twofold: not only are the investigations late in getting published, but the raw

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

data used in research are themselves frequently out of date by the time they are made available. This is particularly serious in a period, like the present, when changes take place so rapidly that the figures reflecting 1960 are obsolete two or three years later. Of course this situation is not unique to library data; after all, census data are not exactly up to date either. But if the problem cannot be solved to everyone's satisfaction, at least the situation is being rapidly improved, thanks to the energy and expansion of the Library Services Branch in its data-collecting and publishing programs. I need not review the complete program of the Library Services Branch, but I should point out that its periodic complete reports for libraries of different kinds provide a useful basis for comparison, not only on a geographical but on a temporal basis. We are in an ever better position to see how one library or one state or region compares with others, and also how individual institutions and states grow or diminish in their library programs from one year or decade to another. The Library Services Branch is now engaged in cooperating with state library agencies to make its data speedily available, in the expectation that the national figures will be supplemented by statistics collected in each state. This development is extremely promising, and should open the way to fruitful investigations.

There still remains the problem of quickly making available the results of research. I do not know how serious this problem is; but I suspect that once we know about a study we can gain access to it long before it is published. Here, too, the Library Services Branch is helpful, particularly through its publication *Library Research in Progress*. Anyone who is interested in current investigation can keep up with it through this publication, and frequently the study itself—methods and results—can be consulted long before it reaches publication, if it ever does. This is not a substitute for speedy publication—I see no prospects for much relief here—but a means of getting access to the study itself, which, after all, is the basic consideration. I should draw attention also to the publication by the Library Services Branch of *Library Science Dissertations, 1925-60*, containing titles and abstracts of doctoral dissertations written in library schools and also of dissertations that deal with library matters regardless of their provenance.⁵ And here it might be appropriate to refer once more to the annual listings in the *Library Quarterly* of master's and doctoral dissertations accepted by library schools, as well as the listings in *Library Literature*, usually accompanied by abstracts.

Still another source of knowledge about research is the Palfrey and Coleman *Guide to Bibliographies of Theses, United States and Canada*, the second edition of which was published by ALA in 1940 but is now out of date and out of print. However, a new comparable publication, prepared by Dorothy Black of the University of Illinois, will be issued in 1964 by ALA. This will list theses by subject and by institution, and will include theses in library science as well as theses in other fields. With this in hand, supplemented by the contemporary listings already noted, no one should have cause to complain that he is unable to find out what library research has been undertaken or is currently in process.

Other avenues for research publication are provided by library schools. Much of the research that takes place in the schools reaches publication through the media already described, especially when the school itself serves as the publishing spur behind a periodical or series. But we should note the "Occasional Papers" of the University of Illinois Library School as well as the "Research Report" series by that school's Library Research Center and the Illinois State Library. Many of the papers deserve much better than the mimeographed format usually employed; the use of photo-offset from typewritten copy is a considerable improvement, especially if the typing is double-spaced and a firm binding is provided. The library school at Rutgers has been unusually active as a publisher; one immediately recalls the "State of the Library Art" series and Metcalf's *Studies in Library Administrative Problems*, the latter an outgrowth of a seminar conducted for eight experienced librarians.⁶ The library schools frequently issue the studies conducted by their faculty members, usually in mimeographed form.

We hear a great deal these days about the possibilities of using electronic and technological devices for the storage and retrieval of information, and enough progress has been made to remove the prospects from the realm of the theoretical. I do not contemplate such a rich flowering of library research as to require its preservation in such esoteric forms; still, the development is important enough to warrant some attention to it in our present deliberations. I recently received a catalog entitled "Basic Collections in Microeditions: Slavonics" issued by the International Documentation Centre in Tumba, Sweden. The introduction pointed out certain problems with which we are familiar, such as scarcity of the extant literature, deterioration of poor paper, high prices, etc., and then noted the organization of a project for com-

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

piling a systematic microfiche and opaque-microcard collection of all basic literature in the field. A systematic bibliography in Slavonics is to be compiled, and the works listed are to be microrecorded and made available along with a portable reader (priced at about \$100). Of course, at first only a handful of libraries will find it necessary to take advantage of these microforms, but in time, as other subject areas become represented, all scholarly libraries will have to deal with them. Some people have become so enamored of this development that they contemplate the disappearance of the conventional library altogether. One group in Park Forest, Illinois, has already announced the creation of a "bookless college library" as a feature of a contemplated liberal arts college, utilizing 3" x 5" slides similar to microfiche, each containing 64 pages of text, and providing each student with a projector for his "slide reading." One of my colleagues has suggested that the first addition to this college will be a School for the Blind; anyone who has spent much time with microfilm or microcards will sympathize.

Carried to such extremes, the idea seems preposterous, but I do not anticipate such extremes either in Park Forest or in any other library. Still, we cannot close our eyes to what lies on the horizon, and, appropriately, I refer to a recent article in the magazine *Horizon* by John R. Platt, a physicist.⁷ Platt reminds us that every new form of preservation, from the cuneiform inscription on the clay tablet to the papyrus roll to vellum and paper books to printing with movable type, must have been regarded with suspicion and met with resistance. In our own day we can certainly recall the quizzical look we formerly cast on microfilm (many of us still do). Yet all of these changes have marked a stage in progress, and the end is not yet in sight. The microfilm gives us a reduction of 40 to 60 times in page area; the microcard, a reduction of 500 to 1,000 times. But, Platt, asks, why stop here? He envisions the application of the "microdot" system in which a page is photographed down ". . . to the smallest size at which the individual letters can still be read through a high-powered optical microscope"⁸ so that each page is reduced in area by as much as one million times! Even this is not the limit; he sees the possibility of an electron microscope reduction, shrinking each page to one micron by two microns in area. A micron is the thousandth part of one millimeter, or the millionth of a meter. Translating this into understandable if inconceivable terms, 1,000 books of 500 pages each could be inscribed on the head of a pin!

So speaks the physicist, and the picture is a forbidding one. But forbidding because it seems to obliterate the act of reading as we have always experienced it, and Platt, who is a very civilized person, recognizes its limitations. Let me quote him once more: "The trouble is that the advantages of microstorage are institutional, while its disadvantages are personal. We have come to enjoy the sensory pleasures we have associated for the past few hundred years with the life of the intellect—the pleasures of browsing among the shelves, of handling real books and smelling the print, of flipping through the pages to look at the pictures or the endings. . . . Some of us may fear that if we now have to read microbooks only on projection screens, the literate pleasures will vanish completely. It may be research, but it is not *reading*." ⁹

Fortunately for our eyes and comfort, we may still contemplate the publishing of library investigations in conventional form. Certainly there exist plentiful opportunities for achieving publication; the real problem is not here, but rather, as the editor of the ACRL Monograph series points out, in the production of research worth preservation. It may not be amiss, therefore, to suggest a few areas in which investigations might fruitfully be pursued, preferably in library schools but not limited to them.

Public library structure and organization offers a good field for study, provided we or our students are willing to collect original data, or even to use the data being made available by the Library Services Branch. We ought to have state by state studies showing how library service has developed in time, how it has been affected by population movements and by the vicissitudes of economic pressures and by developments in educational facilities. Do we have a good library history for a single state comparable, say, to Gwladys Spencer's history of the Chicago Public Library? Shera, Ditzion, Thompson, and others have given us good general histories on a national or regional basis. We should all welcome intensive and incisive state library history, not in the sense of chronicle or antiquarianism, but rather in the sense of relating library developments to social forces. This suggestion has been made many times, but in our zeal for contemporary description we all but ignore our true history. The more we know about how we got where we are, the clearer we may plan our future course, and the better we may understand why achievements in, say, New York, are not possible in the Dakotas or even in Illinois.

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

Even in contemporary terms the field is wide open for studying library structure in relation to use. Consider the familiar large-unit concept. What actually happens in a community when its library, formerly completely independent, becomes part of a system? How, if at all, is the pattern of reading, of book use, affected by the change? Does the availability of a larger and more diversified book stock affect the character of reader demand? We have some relevant data from the New York systems,¹⁰ but much more intensive analysis is clearly desirable. In city systems one may ask if the establishment of an elementary school library in a neighborhood formerly served only by a branch of the municipal library affects the use of the branch. Has reading as a whole increased; has dependence shifted from the branch to the school library; has the character of children's use of the branch changed, and if so, how? To mention another significant area, there is the metropolitan problem, the dependence on the central city library by nonresidents. A student in the Graduate Library School at the University of Chicago has found that in one metropolitan area nonresident withdrawals from the main library alone constituted nearly a third of all loans in a single week. Is this figure higher or lower than would be found elsewhere, and what are the implications for cost, personnel, book stock, and, even more, for a shift in the concept of library support? And finally, can we get more precise information on the use of state library agencies—to what extent do they supplement local services, for what kinds of books, for what classes of people, and for what types of community? These are not idle academic questions; they have implications for libraries everywhere, and especially for those in the profession who are seeking a sound basis for expansion of library facilities and for the intelligent use of available and potential funds. Library schools should be in the forefront of such investigations, and the profession in time should look to them not only to solve personnel problems but for the facts and solutions that administrators have neither the time nor the responsibility to collect.

This leads me to another area of study—education for librarianship itself. We are all aware of the somewhat chaotic proliferation of library education programs, and of the present hopes for formulating a national plan which would lend some coherence to library education nationally. It is anyone's guess as to whether anything will come of this, but whether or not it does, the problem is worth tackling. Merely to toss out a few questions which seem relevant to me: Is

there a substantive difference between undergraduate and graduate library education, and what is the difference, if any? What do we mean by a *good* library school, and how does it differ from one less good? Do such differences show up in the product—and should we even look to the product as the criterion? What characteristics in their faculties seem important? How do the faculties compare in their scholarly productivity, their contributions to the profession, their impact on society? Is there a real difference in education for librarianship of different types, and are there some areas of librarianship where conventional library training is altogether irrelevant, or where a different type of training is called for? Here too it is possible to suggest numerous other questions where inquiry should be encouraged.

The question of library censorship is one that continually intrigues library school students; after Fiske's study,¹¹ there seems to be little to investigate except the presence or amelioration of book-banning beyond California (or even *in* California, five years after Fiske). When we move outside of library censorship to censorship in general, we run into matters of law, religion, and sociology, requiring somewhat specialized techniques and sophistication of a kind our students rarely possess. The present literature is of course extensive, heavily repetitious but rarely dull. As far as library research in censorship is concerned, I doubt if we can do much beyond identifying its prevalence and pin-pointing the conditions that bring it about. It might be a matter of curiosity, if no more, to study censorship against a library's official statement of its book selection policy. We have often said that every library should have such a policy in writing, without stressing that the policy is more important than its codification; but given a written policy, what is its relation to the facts of book provision? The answer to this question might not affect library practice, but at least it would enable us to ask, if discrepancies between the two exist, the reasons for them. I do not mean to imply that the answer is easy, since so many factors are involved in book provision, among them money, board members, the librarian's predilections and prejudices, the character of the community. Still, it is an interesting field for study, and it might be worth identifying the specific factors that interfere with a library's decision to buy or not to buy.

Censorship, however, is only one aspect of book provision, and is by definition negative. The positive side is much more important, and here I should like to know much more than we do now about the

Publishing the Results of Research in Librarianship

books available through libraries in neighborhoods and communities of different size and type, as well as more incisive information on book use beyond the demands of school assignment. We take it as a matter of faith that the library stands four-square for open access where anyone may encounter ideas of whatever novelty, peculiarity, or conventionality incorporated in print. We know, in fact, that there is often a vast gulf between what the library stands for, what it would like to do, and what it actually does. Suppose we were to have a series of investigations in widely varying communities centered on availability, duplication, and shortages; how provision affects use; and whether library limitations as we conceive them have much, if any, effect on the number and kinds of people we attract. We may well find that in some communities our libraries are little used, not because they are remiss in book provision but because the potential audience is indifferent. If this is the case, I do not see how more and better books can affect the reading pattern appreciably. This is not to say that our libraries generally are as good as they need be; I am sure they are not, and I am well aware that many have too little to stir up interest or to permit satisfying an already stirred-up interest; still, I am frequently impressed with the high quality of even small libraries that seem to receive little use. Studies of use in relation to resources would, I believe, contribute a good deal to what we used to call the sociology of reading, a field that seems all but completely neglected at the present time.

From this topic I turn to one in which there is very little basic investigation in spite of its overriding importance—library finance. Some excellent material has been produced, notably the recent Sokolow study of *Community Determinants of Library Tax Incomes in Illinois*,¹² but surely much more remains to be done in the conduct of similar studies in other states, and in budgeting, expenditures, bond issues, and above all in unit costs. Over 30 years ago, Leland noted the need of such investigations,¹³ but we have produced precious little along these lines. I doubt if there is any other single area in which librarians would welcome assistance so much as in this one.

These few suggestions are simply indicative and anything but exhaustive. I have included them primarily to lend support to the pleas so frequently expressed by the publishers of research—the editors of library periodicals, the producers of monograph and microcard series, the library press in general. There is no problem of outlets; the only problem is the production of materials worth publishing.

We may hopefully conclude that conferences like this one will help to bring about such materials.

References

1. Shugg, Roger W. "The Professors and Their Publishers," *Daedalus*, Winter 1963, p. 73.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
3. Butler, Pierce. *An Introduction to Library Science*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1933.
4. Welter, Rush. *Problems of Scholarly Publication in the Humanities and Social Sciences*. (A Report Prepared for the Committee on Scholarly Publications of the American Council of Learned Societies.) New York, The Council, 1959.
5. Cohen, Nathan M., et al. *Library Science Dissertations, 1925-1960* (OE-15044). Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1963.
6. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., Graduate School of Library Science. *Studies in Library Administrative Problems*; eight reports from a seminar in library administration, directed by Keyes D. Metcalf. New Brunswick, N.J., 1960.
7. Platt, John R. "Where Will the Books Go?" *Horizon*, 5:42-47, September 1962.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 43.
10. Connor, Jean L. "Role of the Medium-Sized Public Library in the 'System' (New York)." In Leon Carnovsky and H. W. Winger, eds. *The Medium-sized Public Library: Its Status and Future* (University of Chicago Studies in Library Science). Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1963, pp. 115-128.
11. Fiske, Marjorie. *Book Selection and Censorship: A Study of School and Public Libraries in California*. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, 1959.
12. Sokolow, Alvin D. *Community Determinants of Library Tax Incomes in Illinois*; A Preliminary Step in the Study of the Politics of the Local Public Library ("Research Report," Series, No. 3). Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1963.
13. Leland, Simeon E. "Observations on Financing Libraries," *Library Quarterly*, 2:344-366, October 1932.