Education in Librarianship for Serving the Disadvantaged

MARGARET E. MONROE

The public library, that autonomous agency designed to serve "all" the public directly and to account for its productivity to that same public, has been responsive over the years to the needs of some of its larger publics. Those branches of the public library service designed around specific publics (children, young people, teachers, businessmen, city government and so forth) have developed a style of service that permits relatively rapid responsiveness to change in the publics. Yet the public library as an institution has administratively been organized to serve the monolithic "all," and administrative structure, policies, and assumptions have been based on the concept of centralized policy making and uniformity of procedure and service.

The inconsistencies between these two basic assumptions have been resolved in the case of service to children through a high degree of autonomy within children's services for policies in collections, personnel and services. Young adult service, not often granted such autonomy, has suffered in a no-man's-land between children and adult services. For the period 1924 to the mid-1960s the adult education movement within the public library attempted to achieve the needed flexibility in collections, personnel and services provided to groups of adults with various special needs. But public library administration has just come, in the 1970s, under the impact of recognition of its unreadiness to serve the disadvantaged, to review its assumptions and to identify the need for decentralization of policies on collections, personnel and services so that service may be relevant to the various segments of its public. The problems posed by initiation of such decentralization are far from solution, and some public library directors, appalled by their complexity and seeming insolubility, are ready to reject decentralization or arbit-
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trarily to limit the focus of the public library to a single, more homogeneous segment of the public.

The public library, then, has not failed to recognize the challenge presented by the enormous numbers of non-reading, ill-educated disadvantaged in those central cities where formerly respectable proportions of the population provided a well-educated reading public. As Guy Garrison has noted in his astute summary of the dilemma of the municipal public library, this challenge comes at the very moment that the demand for reference and information service in the metropolitan context has sharply increased and offers a competing focus for attention.1

Library education is charged with the responsibility for preparing librarians to work in the variety of contexts which the differing public library solutions to this problem provide. Nothing is homogeneous, defined or clear about public library philosophy or practice in serving the disadvantaged, but the increasing tempo of innovation in many of the major metropolitan public libraries in the last six or seven years has set the pace for changes required in library education. Clearly the role of the practitioner in innovation and the role of library education in evaluating and institutionalizing innovation through research and education of personnel is exemplified in the field of service to the disadvantaged.2

Garrison has discussed the challenges to library education with insight,3 but detailed, precise reporting on what response library education has made to the vital problem of serving the disadvantaged has not been available. For the purposes of this report, a survey among accredited library schools was undertaken and completed in 1971.

Report on the 1971 Survey of Library Education's Response to Service to the Disadvantaged

An inquiry directed to deans, directors and selected instructors in accredited library schools in the United States and Canada in February 1971 requested information and opinions from all instructors of courses in each school that incorporated attention to service to the disadvantaged. Fifty-five instructors from thirty-five library schools responded to the detailed questionnaire, providing information on some courses in two-thirds of the accredited programs. Analysis of the group responding suggests that the kind and range of response may be typical of library school programs as a whole, since the non-responding group included about the same proportion of schools known to give particular attention to this area of instruction as did the responding group.
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**TABLE 1**

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO 1971 SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Instructors Responding Per School</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Responding—Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Instructors Responding—Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CURRICULUM**

Nine courses designed specifically to prepare librarians for service to the disadvantaged were reported by seven schools, and included:

- Afro-American bibliography (UCLA)
- Inner-city library service (Kent)
- Institutional and hospital library service (Columbia)
- Library aids to the disadvantaged (Kansas State Teachers)
- Library service to the disadvantaged (UCLA)
- Library service to the disadvantaged child (Western Michigan)
- Minorities: library and information services (Syracuse)
- Urban libraries (Columbia)
- Working with the disadvantaged (Kentucky)

Several of these had been newly initiated in 1970-71 or in the summer of 1971, and two other schools reported plans to initiate special courses in some aspect of this area.

An important group of twenty-four basic courses of the type often considered core or required of all students was reported as giving particular attention to service to the disadvantaged. These included:

- Foundations of librarianship 14
- Building library collections 5
- Reader services (including reference) 4
- Library administration 1

The cluster of traditional elective courses most frequently reported as incorporating attention to the disadvantaged was that of service to children and youth in public and school libraries. Fifty-two courses were identified in this group.

- Children's literature 17
- Adolescent literature 11
The next most frequent grouping of traditional courses reporting attention to service to the disadvantaged is that of adult services and its various alternates (reading interests of adults, adult education and the library, library service to individuals/to groups, the library in the community). Eleven such courses in nine schools were identified by the survey as giving this attention. One such course was in the process of being converted into one designated primarily as "service to the disadvantaged," and there is other evidence to suggest that a majority of the courses specifically designated for service to the disadvantaged had evolved from the area of adult services. Ten instructors of courses on public libraries or public library systems reported particular attention to administrative and policy aspects of service to the disadvantaged.

An interesting scattering of other elective courses was reported as incorporating consideration of this area:

- Audiovisual services: 3
- Bibliography of the social sciences: 1
- Communications: 1
- Health science libraries: 1
- Library architecture: 1
- Literature of the humanities: 1

The total of 114 courses reported by fifty-five instructors as giving full, important, or at least some measurable attention to service to the disadvantaged provides a rough estimate of library education's response to this social need. Since undoubtedly many non-responding instructors in the reporting schools give attention to this area of concern as well, these figures must be considered as indicative, not as definitive. The reporting instructors, however, were those who were identified by the investigator, by the school's administrative head, or by one of their colleagues as actively concerned with preparing librarians to serve the disadvantaged, and who found this analysis of sufficient importance to respond to a group of detailed questions. The responses to the survey questions on curriculum and methodology, then, come from this group of concerned instructors.

DISADVANTAGED GROUPS EMPHASIZED

The degree of emphasis placed on particular groups of the disadvan-
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taged population in the library science courses reported upon was quite varied. Of the checklist of eight named groups, seven were named by one instructor or another as receiving highest emphasis, only criminal offenders lacking such a top ranking, while four of the eight were also ranked by one or more instructors at the lowest rank. The three top ranking groups receiving greatest emphasis in course instruction each received between twenty and twenty-three placements in the top rank, some of the instructors ranking more than one group in the top level.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Emphasized</th>
<th>Ignored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total score (weighted 1–8)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educationally disadvantaged</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally different (black)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally different (Spanish-speaking)</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically handicapped</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally disturbed or retarded</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalized</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal offenders</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-seven write-in identifications of other groups receiving emphasis in library science courses included seven named as of top rank: aged, blind, American Indian, Eskimo, poor Southern whites in North, immigrants to Canada, and those with reading disabilities. Three groups received consistent enough write-ins to warrant computation of weighted scores and rankings.

Scattered mention of other groups included, in addition to those mentioned as given a top ranking, Hawaiian, rural disadvantaged, students, alienated youth, and Asian Americans.

While four instructors reported "equal emphasis given to all" and did not rank by emphasis in their courses, fifty instructors found the choices reasonable to make, even if using the categories only to check...
TABLE 3

DISADVANTAGED GROUPS (WRITE-INS) RANKED BY EMPHASIS IN INSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total Score (weighted 1-8)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants to Canada</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

those to which they did give attention. Forty-one instructors gave numerical ratings to some or all groups on the list.

PERSPECTIVE ON SERVICE TO THE DISADVANTAGED

Instructors were asked to identify the approach or perspective from which they prepare librarians to serve the disadvantaged. Given three statements from which they could choose or the possibility of phrasing their own, ten instructors responded by writing out their own approach, finding the categories not suitable to their course emphasis or their style of thought. Twenty-two instructors used the alternative approaches offered them, checking without further comment. Another twenty-three instructors used the categories for checking but added comment to amplify or interpret the meaning.

TABLE 4

INSTRUCTOR PERSPECTIVES ON SERVICE TO THE DISADVANTAGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approaches</th>
<th>Number of Instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Emphasis on special skills needed for the special publics</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Treat service to the disadvantaged as not dissimilar to other service programs</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Phase of passing significance in my area of specialty</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of those checking item 3 checked any other category as well, while items 1 and 2 were frequently checked simultaneously. No instructor failed to check or comment on “approach.”

Overwhelmingly the approach to instruction on service to the disadvantaged emphasized the preparation of students to understand special groups. Films, books, and speakers who represented the special groups...
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were used to sensitize, to interpret so that the student upon becoming a librarian would have the basis for a "creative response" to service to the special groups. Special skills seemed to be emphasized only where specific courses in service to the disadvantaged were presented, or where the range of courses in the services field was broad, as in Pittsburgh's three-course adult services sequence, and allowed depth probe into separate aspects of service skills. The concept of "special publics" has taken root in the instruction in public and school libraries at this time, and for many instructors the concept is the matter of greater importance than the specific selection of groups for emphasis; many instructors reported allowing the students' choice of emphasis to determine which groups were studied in detail. For several instructors, including Lowell A. Martin, this area was discussed in terms of the library's responsiveness to needs of special groups.

On the other hand, some instructors clearly rejected the "special publics" approach, and interpreted their orientation as service to individuals. The disadvantaged were viewed as having a personal handicap, as being an ineffective reader or a non-reader or a reluctant reader, with the "non-user to be thought of as an individual and not as a member of a group." Keen concern for these potential users was evident, but they were to be conceived of as unique persons, not as sharing certain dilemmas in common with others in a style that would respond to special library approaches. There were perhaps five or six instructors who consistently interpreted their approach to the disadvantaged in these terms.

A handful of instructors reported a "service techniques" approach to instruction on the disadvantaged, emphasizing the special adaptations of service techniques found to exist and thought to be successful. These few instructors were far outweighed by those stressing understanding of the groups and the librarian's attitudes toward them. A few instructors emphasized the usefulness of analyzing both successful and unsuccessful service techniques as a way of coming to grips with the dynamics of service to particular groups.

Finally, a group of eight or ten instructors interpreted their approach to preparing librarians for service to the disadvantaged in terms of understanding the dynamics of society or of the community as a whole. Courses in public library administration, in planning services to readers, and in adult services, as well as courses designed specifically around service to the disadvantaged, were those most usually couched in these terms. Typically the content of these courses reflected concepts
drawn from other disciplines: Maslow's hierarchy of human needs from the field of educational psychology, management principles and planning approaches drawn from the field of business administration, communications concepts, sociological concepts of social change couched in social work theory, and so forth. A constant factor in such interpretations was the stress on the library's joint planning with other community agencies and on the preparation of students to understand the range of community agencies as a basis for cooperative planning and programs.

While these four approaches have been identified out of the fifty-five responses, it is important to point out that many instructors reflected two or more. Special publics and social dynamics approaches went hand-in-hand for some instructors while others, acknowledging the reality of the "special public," regularly approached it as reflecting a need for individualized service approaches within an undifferentiated service program "for all." Lowell A. Martin's challenge to public librarians to develop public libraries as a conglomeration of special library services not only awaits development in the field, but has still to make more converts on library school faculties.

**METHODOLOGY**

Responses to a checklist of methodologies and classroom techniques showed individual student papers or projects to be most frequently used to develop the learning experience; class projects were a close second.

In discussing the methodologies used in preparing librarians to serve the disadvantaged, instructors stressed the importance of discussion, whether in small "teaching-learning" groups or in the class as a whole.

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology or Technique</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual projects or papers</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class projects on special group in a general course</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field observation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special course on special public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[452]
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as leading to new insight, while others stressed the shock of first-hand experience with members of the disadvantaged populations themselves—in the community, in the classroom, on film, in books—as the route to insight. These techniques were closely related to the importance attached to understanding the special groups and preparing librarians to respond creatively to their needs. Both techniques—discussion and first-hand experience—were used by many instructors for the purpose of producing sensitivity, awareness, and insight.

Field observation, individual papers, and bibliographic study tended to be the approaches taken by instructors who focused on orienting the students to knowledge about the special publics and the services that libraries were offering them. On the other hand, those seeking to prepare students for individualized approaches to non-readers and non-users tended to set book choice problems related to hypothetical individuals with interesting sets of personal and social characteristics, or to have students prepare reading lists, reading collections or lists of non-print materials for such hypothetical users.

For those concerned with the students’ comprehension of the dynamics of society and the community as the context within which the disadvantaged are to be served, case studies, simulation and games, and field projects were the usual techniques in establishing learning situations. The requirement of field work in relation to the courses specifically designed to prepare librarians for service to the disadvantaged was common, but was also an aspect of a number of courses both for adult service and for service to children and youth.

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES

There was a variety of issues on which there was no unanimity among instructors preparing librarians to serve the disadvantaged. The choice of personnel, however, was no issue. While there was no mention of the need to recruit members of minority groups into professional education, there was the important emphasis on sensitizing the self-selected to the needs, interests, and problems of a range of minority groups. Similarly, although no attention was given to selecting people of personal maturity, breadth of human experience, or first-hand experience of poverty or ghetto living, there was attention given by a few instructors to educational experiences that would produce the attitudes, values, and personal flexibility that might be expected as the outcome of such first-hand experience.

While instructors reflected the habit of somewhat uncritically ac-
cepting whatever students came their way, they did address themselves directly to issues on curriculum and methodology, areas over which they exercise some control. The chief issue in curriculum was that of whether preparation for serving the disadvantaged should be integrated into the established courses, required or elective, or should be separately developed in courses dealing solely with the disadvantaged. Three major arguments were advanced for the integration into established courses: all students need contact with the problem and its various solutions, specialized courses may tend to develop too rigid a style of thinking about a group which contains great variation in readiness to use all types of library services, and service to the disadvantaged must be kept in a perspective of service to all other library publics.

The case for specialized courses on service to the disadvantaged, however, lay in the recognition of the need for greater depth than allowed by a course responsible for a broader content. Usually those who argued for the specialized course or course sequence carried a conviction of the need for specialization in library education, some advocating it at the masters level, others convinced that the specialist or second professional year of study was the most appropriate.

The great range of approaches to the substantive content of instruction in service to the disadvantaged is suggested by the continuum that spans: (1) book materials for the disadvantaged; (2) understanding the dynamics of life in specific groups of the disadvantaged; (3) interdisciplinary education, with social work, sociology, public administration, learning theory, communications theory, and others making their contribution in the content of library science courses or through courses carried by the student in other academic departments; and (4) research-oriented theory combined with field practice in library social action programs. These were hardly presented in the climate of debate, but represent a variety of quite distinct (although not mutually exclusive) approaches to content. There is no question that the instructors most deeply involved in preparing librarians in this field drew regularly upon the research findings, concepts, and even theoretical structures of the related fields of sociology, education, communications, and business administration. Such professors as Penland at Pittsburgh, Allen at Kentucky and Marshall at Toronto demonstrated in their course work a variety of styles in integrating these fields into librarianship. Marshall stressed that as librarians or library educators "we must develop our own theory and practice, but cooperatively and with great
sensitivity and sophistication," lest we misapply the borrowings of theory and practice from the related fields.

Perhaps one of the most striking innovations in methodology rising from attention to service for the disadvantaged is the reinstitution in library education of the field experience. The forms range from field observations to field projects to a more extensive practicum to a full internship. The field experience, whatever its form, is based on two educational concerns: understanding or "getting the feel of" the dynamics of the human situation, and highly focused experience with concrete realities as a basis for understanding, testing or constructing theory. This is a considerably more sophisticated approach to field experience than the work experience that early apprenticeships tended to provide, where induction into a library's way of doing things was the objective and stress was on practical skills. Professional education generally is reinventing the practicum at this new level as a method of more rapidly sophisticating the practitioner. The library field experience is now more closely tied to classroom work, providing the basis for discussion and understanding, and awakening both instructor and student to aspects of library practice as they evolve in daily work.

Three trenchant comments from skilled library educators on the responses to this inquiry identified aspects of preparing librarians to serve the disadvantaged which support the importance of various forms of field experience.

In responding to the questionnaire, Lowell A. Martin of Columbia commented: "This is a stimulating and sometimes shocking area of instruction for many students. Some are turned off when they grasp the complexity and reality of the situation. Others are challenged and a number have sought jobs in disadvantaged areas." With close to unanimous emphasis in responses to this survey on the need to "make the student aware" of needs and life styles of the many groups of publics they serve, true apprehension of the problems with which the disadvantaged publics grapple, or fail to grapple, is seen by many, including Martin, to be achieved only through inclusion of some components of field experience. If the "we/they" connotations warned against by McClaskey of Minnesota are to be avoided in this area of service, field experience must be long enough to enable the student to pass through cultural shock and to develop a useful professional style and a group of professional strategies and skills.

Genevieve Casey of Wayne State identified mutual exploration as
the style of learning which instructors in service to the disadvantaged inevitably develop as she wrote: "Since totally workable patterns of service have yet to be found, one gropes with students." And it may be important to add that those field experiences in which library practitioners are willing to join the instructors and the students in the mutual search are the most rewarding. It is only thus that faculty insight can most fruitfully develop.

John M. Marshall of Toronto pointed to the need for research into the information needs of the disadvantaged and into the responses of the disadvantaged to libraries, librarians and library services. He makes a brief case for abandoning "reliance upon the dubious results of so-called objective, value-free social science research," and engaging instead in action research that will deeply involve instructor-researchers in field experience. It follows that field projects, field research, and internships have a common locus and often a common focus. With the obligation not only to teach but also to expand the area of professional knowledge, instructors are becoming committed to the field experience anew in the area of service to the disadvantaged.

CURRENT PHILOSOPHY AND EXPERIMENTATION IN EDUCATION FOR SERVICES TO THE DISADVANTAGED

In 1967 Lester Asheim reviewed education for library adult services in the perspective of changes both in the needs of adults for these services and in library education as a field. He proposed three major considerations for the field of adult services education: (1) preparing librarians for ready adaptation to changes in adult needs by stressing principles and theory rather than specific skills and techniques; (2) providing a true specialization in adult services (as is now developing in various other aspects of librarianship) and relinquishing the concept of preparing librarians for any type of library function in any type of library; and (3) beginning the counseling, career-choice and orientation to the profession prior to the masters degree program. He made pointed though brief comment on preparation for service to the disadvantaged:

To this group must be added an increasingly enlarged number of other groups who have also always been represented in the total library audience but never in such numbers and with such special services. The thrust of today's social programs, focusing attention upon the culturally deprived and the physically handicapped, for example, creates new
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challenges to the traditional services—and again, a new area of expertise. The skills of the social worker are going to be needed by today's library graduates if they are to function in this area of adult services—and a knowledge of materials quite different from the classics and the scholarly works that would be the essential background for the college and university librarian.6

With more detailed attention to curriculum and methodology, Lawrence A. Allen of the University of Kentucky proposed the specific elements of the library education curriculum needed to prepare “community librarians.”? Behavioral sciences, management and administrative theory, and library specialization are three areas analyzed for the components needed by community librarians. Communications theory, adult education methods, adult psychology, and interpersonal relationships (with sensitivity training as a laboratory method) compose the elements of behavioral sciences for this curriculum. Concepts and process of cultural change, community analysis, organizational sociology and psychology, and management theory and functions are the elements of administrative and management theory which Allen selects for emphasis. Library specialization consists of updating library and information science broadly, studying the library problem peculiar to the type of community in which the student specializes, and in internship. It is clear that the library components are not rich in “librarianship,” but that the borrowing from related fields are rich indeed. Allen discussed this curriculum as one for post-masters degree education primarily, either as a second year of professional study or in informal institutes or conference contexts.

Garrison, two years of national stress later, daringly proposed comparable elements for the preparation of public librarians in the basic masters program. Like Asheim and Allen, Garrison asked a restructuring and tightening of the “core” of basic library science, and emphasized such areas of learning as: techniques of community organization, urban planning, economics of public service, intergovernmental relations, communication theory, and group dynamics.9 Further, he envisioned a role for library employees working in the community that might be questioned as requiring much traditional library education:

In the future technical expertise may have to take the back seat. One will look for versatility, determination, relationships with people, and imagination as more important than library skills. The curriculum for preparing public librarians may grow more and more to resemble a social
service curriculum. In fact, some may wonder if the people might not better be partially trained directly in social service administration.8

Ending with an emphasis on internships as essential to such education, Garrison concludes that “we ought to produce fewer but more intensively trained public library professionals.”8

The stress placed by Allen and Garrison on community planning and intergovernmental relations was viewed in another context by Monroe in 1970:

Unlike librarians of other types of libraries, the public librarian works within an autonomous library—the library for the total community. He has, therefore, a unique responsibility for direction-finding and goal-setting with a freer play to his own insight and enterprise than may be possible in any other type of library. He must have the skills of interpreting his program, since public libraries are fully accountable to the public (the trustees, the governmental units from which they derive their support, and public opinion in general). The skills of consultation and planning, therefore, are of major importance to every public librarian.9

It has been the intensive, mandatory involvement of public librarians at all levels of service to the disadvantaged that has brought home the importance of this area of professional skills.

The single sustained experiment in preparing public librarians to serve the disadvantaged upon which detailed reports are available is that conducted by the University of Maryland at the High John Branch of the Prince George’s County Library.10 The branch, begun as an autonomous library organized and administered by the School of Library and Information Services of the university, was designed to serve as a laboratory for a professional education program that also included a seminar on library service to the disadvantaged. Initially the seminar was an appendage to the practicum at High John, but experience reversed the roles as the behavioral science content of the seminar was enriched and the High John field experience became exemplary for theory as well as the medium for cross-cultural understanding. The final adjustment in the program came as the administration of the library itself was turned over to the Prince George’s County Library, with the function of school laboratory maintained and the school’s role that of innovator, experimenter, and researcher.

The High John experiment continues into 1971, and several basic problems are spotlighted for analysis. The essential experience for student librarians of understanding the cultures of ethnic groups at the poverty level involves culture shock for many students, requiring im-
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important readjustment in values and concepts; the most effective mode for such acculturation of public librarians will be sought. Secondly, the research orientation will be continuously focused on the role of the public library in service to the disadvantaged so that alternative positions may be more clearly enunciated. Finally, establishing appropriate models of preparing librarians for service to the disadvantaged will be based on the project’s clarification of what such effective service is. It is important to note that the school has intensively involved in its educational program successful library practitioners, effective library research specialists, and an educational sociologist with experience in civil rights and poverty program development. Assessment of the kinds of faculty needed will be as important as the components and modes of learning.

Theoretical models are indeed sought by a number of library educators preparing librarians for service to the disadvantaged, and at least two exist couched in the perspective of public librarianship generally or even more broadly in librarianship as a field. That such theoretical models applicable to librarianship as a whole are available may challenge Garrison’s implication that library service to the disadvantaged has larger components of social service than librarianship, or at least modify this to become librarianship in the context of social service.

INNER-CITY TASK SURVEY, 1969

During the period December 1968 to March 1969, this writer conducted 147 interviews with the staffs of thirteen metropolitan public libraries working in the inner-city and ascertained a rough measure of relative amounts of time expended by each staff member in various types of services. The categories of work were grouped by professional orientation for analysis.

KINDS OF ACTIVITY IN SERVICE TO DISADVANTAGED—1969 SURVEY

A. LIBRARY TASKS
   1. Selecting material for the library’s collection
   2. Helping people choose materials
   3. Book or film programs
   4. Talking to community groups visiting the library
   5. Talking to groups outside the library
   6. Training library staff assistants
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7. Talking about your work to other librarians
8. Studying the community you serve

B. LIBRARY-SOCIAL WORK
1. Activity programs in the library
2. Home visits in the community
3. Attending community meetings
4. Contact with community agency staff
5. Walking around the community talking to people about the library

C. SOCIAL WORK
1. Talking to individual readers about their problems

D. EDUCATION
1. Tutorial help (reading, etc.)

Only clerical, technical, disciplinary and purely administrative tasks were omitted from this list. Time categories were presented without

TABLE 6
PATTERNS OF EMPHASIS IN TIME SPENT ON ACTIVITIES RELATED TO PROFESSIONAL SKILLS NEEDED (PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL STAFF TIME BY LIBRARY SYSTEM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library System</th>
<th>Library Tasks</th>
<th>Library-Social Work</th>
<th>Social Work</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range: 57.4-77.7% 13.6-41.7% .96-11.0% 0.0-7.4%

Median: 66.1% 19.9% 7.4% 1.7%
Education in Librarianship

the professional designation. The interviewee could choose to estimate his time in hours or percentages on a weekly basis. Discussion and adjustment of the figures with the interviewer helped to establish their validity.

Analysis of time spent, library by library, demonstrates unique patterns within each library, but there is a consistent emphasis upon the strictly library tasks. Within the library-social work tasks, contact with agency staff ranked first (5.9 percent median); activity programs, second (4.8 percent median); attending community meetings, third (4.2 percent median); walking around community, fourth (2.9 percent median); and home visits, fifth (1.5 percent median).

Of the strictly library tasks, four (A:1,6,7,8) were preparatory to direct service and four (A:2,3,4,5) were direct service. Staff with professional education in librarianship spent considerably more time in preparatory service than in direct services, and were distinctly different

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Time in Direct Service (Compared with Preparatory Service)</th>
<th>Percentage of Staff from Librarianship</th>
<th>Percentage of Staff from Social Work</th>
<th>Percentage of Staff from Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither service given</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–20% direct service</td>
<td>51.85</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>47.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(80–100% preparatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–40% direct service</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(60–80% preparatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–60% direct service</td>
<td>20.37</td>
<td>46.15</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40–60% preparatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–80% direct service</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30–40% preparatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–100% direct service</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0–20% preparatory)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCTOBER, 1971
from those staff with professional education in social work or education.

While no one of the library systems would be prepared to defend the proportion of time spent, and present practice is no more than a guideline, nevertheless the present adaptation of public library service to the disadvantaged stresses the traditional library tasks, although typically presented in an untraditional manner, and the professional library staff spend large proportions of time in professional preparatory work.

As further detailed analysis of this survey is available, its values may lie in suggesting an approach to deriving curriculum from practice. This is one of the knottiest problems of library education, and the concern for preparing librarians to serve the disadvantaged has provided an important opportunity to make such exploration.
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