



# Adult Reading Studies: Their Implications for Private, Professional and Public Policy

VIRGINIA H. MATHEWS

A COMMON UNDERSTANDING of the terms used in the title of this paper is important. General agreement is probable that the term “adults” refers to people 18 years of age or more—in school or out of it, old enough to drive a car, get married, go to war, and, in most states, buy a drink.

“Reading studies” is more difficult to define. In this paper it means a sampling of the scarce and rather inconclusive research that has been undertaken both in the United States and abroad, most often in the western European countries, within the past twenty-five years or so. In addition to this research there are many fragments of opinion and experiential insight to be found in articles, speeches and unpublished papers which contain estimates and informed guesses about the wide range of topics which congregate under the general heading of reading studies: literacy, illiteracy, and the reasons for either; library use or nonuse; needs assessments of various hard-to-reach populations; the books people do like to read, when they read, and where they get them; and the relation of book reading to the use of other media in the overall context of communications; and many others.

“Implications” will consider for whom such studies of adult reading have a special message, and from whom they deserve to receive more attention than has generally been accorded to them. Possible receivers of the implications will include the creators and producers of books and other reading materials: authors, editors, and publishers. This group is considered in Nemeyer’s article in this issue. Thus this article will focus on the implications of adult reading studies for other important groups: the expeditors and distributors

---

Virginia H. Mathews, was the former Director of the National Book Committee, New York, New York. She is now a consultant in the field of reading and library programs.

of books—librarians, booksellers, teachers and the other guides who introduce reading, make books and other materials available, and motivate people to read; and all of the other agencies—the broadcasting stations, the service organizations, the politicians—which create today's society.

Even the most casual survey of the field leaves one with several general impressions: (1) that the study—formal and informal—of adult reading patterns and habits is going on, with stepped-up interest, worldwide; (2) that many of those who are engaged in it seem not to be aware that anyone else is; and (3) that there is a remarkable similarity to the findings, regardless of the point of view of the researcher.

First, one should look over the range of studies, who is doing them, how they are being sponsored and paid for, and then look at some highlights of what has been learned: about who reads, and who does not; materials that have proved effective and a sentence or two about the methods of instruction used; and then at the complicated picture that emerges of motivation—why some adults find it worth the effort to learn to read, or read better, and others do not.

Heinz Steinberg, director of the Department of Further Education of the Municipality of West Berlin, and editor of the *International Bibliography on the Sociology and Psychology of Reading*,<sup>1</sup> has summarized much of what is relevant to these questions in his article, "Books and Readers as a Subject of Research in Europe and America" which appeared in the *International Social Science Journal* late in 1972. Steinberg notes that:

In the United States, reading is generally carried out by librarians and sociologists as an advisory service to libraries. The actual research, therefore, is often done in libraries and by university institutes of librarianship or sociology. Frequently it is directed almost exclusively to the practical needs of libraries, and the world of books outside tends to be overlooked.

Research in Europe, mainly sponsored by booksellers and publishers, is empirical in nature and so, often, commercially oriented and consequently biased in its findings. There are exceptions. In the United Kingdom, for instance, the research done by Brian Groombridge<sup>2</sup> was subsidized by the British Library Association, while in Scandinavia (Denmark and Sweden) it has also

been librarians who have both initiated and generally carried out studies and then interpreted their findings.<sup>3</sup> However, in the case of France, the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands in particular, the rule holds good, and the research sponsored by booksellers and publishers in these countries has been carried out almost altogether independently of American efforts.<sup>4</sup>

Steinberg is certain that European sociologists who do studies for booksellers and publishers are familiar with the work done by such Americans as Lasswell, Lazarsfeld, Schramm, Festinger and others who have done work in the field of communications research, but feels that they are almost totally unaware of the work of people like Douglas Waples<sup>5</sup> of the Library School of the University of Chicago, and those with whom he worked closely, like Berelson and Carnovsky. Steinberg compares the work of Waples with that of German librarian Walter Hofmann, with the comment that Waples's work is distinguished by "his single-minded pursuit of the facts, as they are, without any preconceived ideas as to what is desirable." Waples "pioneered the methodical approach and for his time found a valid answer to the big question, 'what does reading do for people?'"<sup>4</sup>

Steinberg stresses the need "to build a bridge between the Old and the New World, across language barriers (which still seem to be astonishingly high), and also between librarians and booksellers (who, although the business of both of them is books and their readers, seem to be surprisingly ignorant of each other's work)."<sup>6</sup>

Steinberg illustrates the difficulty in bridging what is perhaps the most serious gap of all—that between myth/preconception and fact—by giving an example of research skewed by national prejudice and lingering, often unconscious, cultural differences. This concerns the German opinion research organization, the Allensbach Institut für Demoskopie, which was commissioned by the association of the German book trade in 1968 to conduct a survey of the German book market. The second sentence of the report produced by the Institut reads: "it is astonishing how seldom Americans pick up a book." All of the evidence, submits Steinberg, clearly contradicts this allegation: the number of titles published, the number of copies of books sold, or the money spent on them; proportionally nearly twice as many books are bought in the U.S. as in the Federal Republic of Germany. In libraries of one kind or another, at least three times as many books are loaned.

How do such errors begin and proliferate? The Institut's assertion

was based, says Steinberg, on the 1956 Gallup poll in which a cross section of citizens in the United States, Canada, Australia, England and Germany were questioned, "Do you happen to be reading any books or novels at present?" Seventeen percent of the Americans said "yes," while 34 percent of the Germans said "yes." It is probable, believes Steinberg, that while most of the Americans answered truthfully, some of the Germans, at least, did not. This is not, he says, because Americans are less prone to lying to save face and appear in a good light to the interviewer, but quite simply a matter of difference in cultural values. Steinberg says,

To the average American a book is a tool that comes to hand as a matter of course, a means of study or entertainment. Whether the tool is used today or tomorrow, or was used only last year is rather a matter of indifference. Americans generally see no reason to pride themselves on the fact that they read books. For Germans, however, books are a symbol of culture, and a sociologist when he comes to interpret empirical data should allow for the fact. . . . The reverence for books of Europe's educated middle classes—which, moreover, because it was claimed as a class privilege has largely, prevented the use of books from spreading to the working classes—is a phenomenon [which must be taken into account].<sup>7</sup>

Books in Europe are a means of mass communication only in a very special sense, but they are a class symbol through and through.

European cultural pride was shaken by the first results of book market research in the 1960s, and newspapers took a grim delight in such headlines as "one household in three has no books," and "country people read absolutely nothing." Intellectuals, immersed in what Steinberg called "romantic cultural pessimism," agreed that young people were reading less and preferred to watch football and television despite the fact that investigations in Germany, and later ones in France, the Netherlands, Scandanavia and the United Kingdom showed that the younger generation reads more than the older, and that everywhere in Europe the older people are less interested than the younger in books.<sup>8</sup>

Researchers in the United States also found, in work done in the 1960s, that the higher the age group, the less books read. Jan Hajda, in his important work in Baltimore with the Enoch Pratt Library study, arrived at the tentative hypothesis that young people read more because "many more of them have graduated from high school or

college."<sup>9</sup> Berelson in studying the library's public, concluded, that "the major correlates of reading and library use are the education of the reader and the availability of reading resources."<sup>10</sup> Philip H. Ennis's later study of adult book reading for the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago again confirmed this finding of Berelson and others.<sup>11</sup>

Hajda's study in Baltimore in 1962 found that 25 percent of the sample of adults were registered borrowers of the public library, and that 52 percent had read a book within the year. He found too, that there is a watershed in book reading somewhere at the level of high school graduation, those not achieving this level not often turning to books, while the majority of those at or above high school level (completion) are likely to read one or more books a year. Berelson found in 1948 that 25 percent to 30 percent of the adult population read a book a month, and that approximately the same percentage used the library with regularity.

The most recent of the Gallup polls, taken in the U.S. in January in 1971 show slightly higher proportions of readers than his earlier studies: about one-fourth of the population constituting the hard core of book users—26 percent as against 21 percent in 1958—while nearly half—46 percent—read occasionally, perhaps at the rate of one book a year.

But how, asks Ennis, "do we account for the fact that the reading audience has not increased appreciably over the past 20 years, during which time the numbers of high school and college graduates has doubled and the number of books sold has trebled?"<sup>12</sup> A possible explanation given in his updated interest in the subject in *The Metropolitan Library*, is that the regular book readers read more books now than they used to, thus a smaller proportion of readers is accounting for the high level of reading.

Citing as his sources the U.S. Office of Business Economics's *Survey of Current Business*,<sup>13</sup> several editions of the *Bowker Annuals*<sup>14</sup> and Fritz Machlup's figures,<sup>15</sup> Ennis gives us some marketplace proofs in terms of how much money is being spent by citizens of the U.S. on books and libraries. The percentage of increase in total book expenditures between 1950 and 1960 was 108 percent; between 1960 and 1968, 84 percent. The number of general adult books sold by publishers rose by some 49 percent from 1947 to 1967, while the number of technical, and scientific books increased by 38 percent. During the period 1959-67 the adult trade paperback sales rose by a gigantic 1,340 percent and

those of adult hardback books by 37 percent. The tremendous growth of book clubs specializing in catering to highly particularized needs and interests, underscores, he says, the fragmentation and activity of the American reading public.

Edward J. Meade, program officer in charge, Public Education Program for the Ford Foundation, in a speech to the College Reading Association in the fall of 1972, offered some other insights as to the "economic potency of reading in this country," which, like those detailed by Ennis, confound and contradict the "reading is dwindling" school of thought which still has a considerable following in the United States, Europe, and elsewhere. He said:

Book sales in the U.S. in 1970 totalled slightly less than 3 billion dollars, an increase of almost 6% over the previous year's sales. For the last ten years, book sales have increased at an average of 8% per year . . . book club sales for the same year were responsible for the largest single dollar increase in the general books category, followed by mass market paperbound books. . . . School and college text books accounted for 29% of the total volume of books sold, which implies that over 70% of the books sold are bought voluntarily and not because they are required. . . . The 1967 Census of Business showed close to 3,000 bookstores operating the year round, with annual sales of \$28 million; and between 1958 and 1967, bookstores that were large enough to operate year round were increasing at the rate of more than 141 stores per year.<sup>16</sup>

Meade noted also that a 1970 study of adult newspaper readers revealed that 78 percent of Americans 18 years and older read the newspaper every day. Data was collected from a cross section of categories from college graduates to those who did not attend high school; by household income, from \$25,000 and over to less than \$5,000; and by locality, including metropolitan areas, suburban and rural; as well as by race and social position. In no category does the daily newspaper readership ever go below the level of 60 percent.

Worldwide, the production and apparent absorption of books argues that the reading habit is growing rather than diminishing. In an article for the *Unesco Courier*, Edward Wegman, head of the International Book Year Unit, tells us that, "in 1970, every minute of every day a book was published somewhere in the world: 546,000 titles in all, double the output of 20 years ago."<sup>17</sup> In reply to his own thematic question, "What do People Read?" Wegman once again confirms the

thesis of Berelson, Ennis and most other researchers, that unless the skill and motivation to read is sustained by the conditions of adult life—most especially the availability of books—reading will decline and wither. “More often than not,” he says, “people read books that are readily available, and when books they want are not there, they sometimes do not read at all.”<sup>17</sup>

Ennis lists the ways in which an adult can get a book into his hands: through libraries—public, college, research and special; through rental collections; from bookstores; from book clubs; through mass paperback outlets such as newsstands and kiosks; by direct mail from publishers; and through private collections, owning and borrowing from friends. Ennis thinks research is badly needed on how the availability of books—and, I would add, how availability of information about them—affects reading. It is, in fact, time that we have “some basic research into the nature of the reading public, its composition, its manner of recruitment, and the conditions of its maintenance.” Steinberg agrees. He points to some specifics: “What Lazarsfeld once did in the case of radio<sup>18</sup> still has to be done for television as far as its relationship to books is concerned.” In fact, asserts Steinberg, “the triumphal progress of television in Europe . . . far from harming has actually helped book consumption . . . so that the European book trade over the past two decades could hardly have gained a more effective ally than the television set. . . . Although the understandably complicated relationship between reading and televising has often been the subject of colourful speculation—an extreme example being the work of Marshall McLuhan—this has not yet been the subject of anything like enough factual investigation, either in Europe or in America.”<sup>19</sup>

Another subject which needs investigating is the subject of book clubs. “In the Federal Republic of Germany, for example, no one knows anything about the possible connection between belonging to a book club and being a library subscriber. However, the German Library Association has just commissioned the Institute of Sociology of the University of Hamburg to carry out a study of this, and some light may be thrown on the matter.”<sup>19</sup> America’s experience with its large number of specialized book clubs would make an invaluable contribution if investigated and shared, he suggests.

The varying development of the paperback market, too, calls for a sociological comparison between European countries and

between each of them and the United States. In the case of the Federal Republic of Germany it is known, thanks to the Allensbach Institut für Demoskopie, that young people prefer paperbacks, perhaps not because of their lower cost, but because they do not share the preference of the older generation for books in traditional binding. Yet in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Switzerland and in Austria, paperbacks are far from playing . . . the same part they do in the United States or even in the United Kingdom. Although the number of paperback titles and probably the number of copies produced certainly rose steeply in central Europe during the past decade, the central European market was certainly not revolutionized by paperbacks as America has been.<sup>20</sup>

Steinberg points out that Europe does not have the American drugstore, which provides both informational displays of paperback books, and an easy path to ownership.

Steinberg notes that European book consumption is not rising with the longer average length of education, as it is, if only very slightly, in the United States. He believes that school library facilities comparable to those in the United States, to be found thus far only in the United Kingdom, Denmark and Sweden, are an important concomitant to the better developed reading habit.

Again, Steinberg emphasizes the importance of context and relationship in doing research about reading and books: "everyone who has a concern for books must keep in view the full field of communications."<sup>20</sup> He points to the findings of Peter Mann at Sheffield University in the U.K.,<sup>21</sup> who investigated the relationship between the book trade and libraries. "His findings are just as instructive for booksellers as for librarians. . . . Generally speaking . . . there is no real competition between booksellers and libraries . . . they both stand to profit if they lie close together . . . the more books someone borrows, the more books he generally buys."<sup>22</sup>

Steinberg discusses the investigations of French sociologists that he deems the most successful of European endeavors in this field to date.<sup>23</sup> These studies showed a positive correlation between reading and interest in sports. This corresponded also to a German study that young people who go in for sports read more than those who do not. "French sociologists had already discovered that an important motive for reading was the wish to discuss things that one had read with other people. Gerhard Schmidtchen,<sup>24</sup> who conducted

the Allensbach investigation and wrote the report on it, added the observation, based on exact empirical evidence, that readers are better listeners than non-readers."<sup>25</sup>

Jan Hajda, whose thesis, Steinberg feels, "occupies much the same seminal position in American research as does the French investigation in European research," is quoted in Steinberg's summary, on the subject of solitude and loneliness, and their relationship to reading:

Solitude rejuvenates and refreshes; it reinforces . . . social ties, because it enables the individual to interact with others with increased attention, or to enjoy another's company more. On the other hand, loneliness is an unsought, painful, meaningless affliction, imposed on the individual against his will. . . . Solitude is a means of social integration; loneliness is an aspect of exclusion from social participation. . . . Books call for a harmonious response, for a sympathetic engagement with the very world which condemns the person to loneliness. Reading books also requires an effort. . . . This in itself makes book reading unattractive to a lonely person whose general level of interest and activity is considerably lower than that of an engaged person.<sup>26</sup>

Steinberg sums it up with: "what Hajda is getting at is that while it is impossible to read without solitude, loneliness leads people to drop the book-reading habit."<sup>26</sup> And thus, a new and contemporary profile of the reader emerges:

Readers are certainly not isolated people, rather do they seek contact in society. They are good listeners, but at the same time have the wish to communicate their thoughts to others by means of conversation. They are people, then, who seek to influence society, and in turn expose themselves to the influence of society. They are not introvert, for escapist reading is only marginal, but are on the contrary characterized by openness to communication. . . . Modern readers in America and Europe . . . do not read to escape from the world, but to live in it better. This really puts the main findings in the matter to date in a nutshell.<sup>27</sup>

As Steinberg has said, and as anyone can quickly confirm by a cursory survey of the literature, most of the study of reading habits that has been done in the United States has been done from the point of view of libraries and librarians, and emerges therefore, for

the most part, as user studies. There is as yet, apparently, nothing in European research to compare with these user studies under the library auspices in the United States.

Before looking over some of the conclusions of these studies it might be well to trace briefly the development of interest in adult reading—especially adult reading improvement—by libraries as it has grown in the past twenty-five years or so. At present this interest has grown to the point where there is something like general agreement that libraries, especially public libraries, do have a real and special mandate to concern themselves not only with the motivation and guidance of readers, and provision of materials for reading improvement, but in some cases, with literacy instruction as well.

“Prior to 1945,” according to the Adult Reading Improvement Newsletter published by the ALA’s Adult Services Division several years ago, “there was very little reporting, researching, and evaluating of adult reading improvement. The United States Army’s success in retraining soldiers in this field gave an impetus to studies of illiteracy and remedial reading, and the years from 1945 to 1962 have seen a wealth of material on reading improvement at the adult level.”<sup>28</sup> Bernice MacDonald, Coordinator of Adult Services for the New York Public Library system, reports that a search of the material since 1953 shows that the bulk of it falls into four main categories: (1) why adults are not reading as widely and deeply as they should; (2) descriptions of reading programs in action; (3) training the illiterate; and (4) self-help guides for the use of the would-be reader. MacDonald notes a dearth of material on the evaluation of adult reading programs and techniques, and considerable information on reading interests to be found under the heading “Books and Reading” in the *Education Index; Library Literature* is a less fruitful source, and reflects the library’s rather minor role thus far in the development of adult reading programs. An early discussion of the role of the library in adult reading, appears, along with other papers valuable to an understanding of the growth of U.S. interest in this field, in *Adult Reading*,<sup>29</sup> edited by David Clift in 1956, shortly after he became the executive director of ALA.

It is interesting that from whatever point of view, in both Europe and America, there is quite general agreement on the rough proportions of readers to nonreaders, for whatever reasons: because

they do not know how to read; because they do not choose to read; or because there is nothing available, in terms of present-day standards of convenience, especially in the United States.

It appears that about 25 percent of the adults cannot read at all, or read with barely enough skill (functional literates) to allow them to survive on a painfully deciphered diet of forms to be filled out, street signs, instructions and the like; while another 25 percent of any given population constitutes the core of reasonably regular and "serious" or "quality" readers. This leaves a full 50 percent consigned to an uncertain gray area of occasional, usually job-related readers—those who read when they are required to, and rarely by choice or with any degree of pleasure.

Marion Spencer, later the director of the Adult Reading Center at the Kalamazoo Public Library in Michigan, declared her dismay in 1966 while she was still the young adult librarian, concerning the high rate of reading attrition among people who had once learned to read, but whose skills and motivation had withered from lack of use: "Some of the Army recruiters say that one in three, 39%, fail the entrance exams because they don't read well enough. The alarming part of this is that 13% of that 39% are high school graduates."<sup>30</sup>

Philip Ennis, a sociologist, again asks the question around which he has been circling since his pilot study of nearly a decade ago: "Are current and early reading related? Is reading like home woodcrafting, a hobby almost invariably practiced by people who had early familial experience with woodworking, or is reading more like skiing, an activity that, in the United States at least, draws a high proportion of its adherents from people having no early experience with the sport? Reading, it turns out, is somewhere in between these two extremes."<sup>31</sup> Again, citing his study of adult book reading in 1965, Ennis shows that the public of current book readers is composed of regular readers who read at some time in the past and continue to do so now (34 percent), plus late starters who did not read when they were young, but began later in life, (15 percent). On the other hand, 24 percent of his sample began as readers, but deserted books as adults. Ennis confirms that the rate of current reading is higher among those with high school education or beyond (65 percent as compared with the 30 percent with less than high school). Nearly half the better educated (high school) are regular readers (47 percent), while only 15 percent are nonreaders. The

critical figure, says Ennis, is the ratio of deserters to late starters: among the better educated there is a near balance—a later starter for every deserter—but among the less well educated there are nearly three deserters for every late starter.

Turning now to the library user studies, we keep finding, as Berelson and others have found earlier, that the proportion of library users in the population corresponds roughly to the number who claim to be readers. Are they the same people? Are libraries more inclined to be used now by nonreaders than they were formerly? We do not know, but there are some indicators that changes are taking place.

Claire K. Lipsman, in a 1969 study of *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness*,<sup>32</sup> found that library usage is variable with income and education. Users are inclined to be more knowledgeable about community affairs and sources of information. She found two-thirds of the users in ghetto areas to be under 19 years of age, and fully a third of these to be of elementary school age, that is 12 years old and younger. More young adult males than females used the library in the 19-26 year old age group, for sport related interests, job information, and race- and culture-related identity problems. Lipsman observes that lack of adult use of the library is characteristic of all the libraries she studied in poverty areas.

The possibility that the reverse may also be true is borne out in an interesting way by a local survey and evaluation of library services undertaken by the public library of Huntsville and Madison County, in Huntsville, Alabama. This survey found that adults 30-60 years of age constituted the majority (59 percent) of the library's users, and points out that this pattern is most unlike that found in most other community library user studies, which usually find that the children and young people form the hard core of library users. A high employment rate—mostly government—and one of the most highly educated scientific communities in the country would seem to be the reason.

Lowell Martin's outstanding study of the Chicago Public Library showed that "student use of the public library has increased in recent years and in Chicago now constitutes 49% of total use by persons above 14 years of age. . . . This increase has occurred because of larger school enrollments and because of greater instructional demands for students to use resources."<sup>33</sup> Clara Jones, library director of another large city library, Detroit, in a speech at

the 1973 ALA summer conference, pegged library use in her city at 10 percent of the adult population, and 33 percent of the children, for a library use total of about 25 percent of the city's residents.

Bonser and Wentworth in their study of adult information needs in Indiana, reported "the public library, at least as represented by the cities selected for our study, has little relevance to the information needs of the adult population of our state. With regard to individual adult use, the well-educated housewife is a major user, and she uses the library primarily as a source of entertainment."<sup>34</sup>

Geoffrey Wilson, of the Free Library of Philadelphia, speaking at an institute on Library Service for the Undereducated at Drexel University in 1966 said:

What is most disturbing about library service to the disadvantaged is that the phrase represents a contradiction in terms. Libraries were started by the middle class for middle class use, the very concept of borrowing and returning books being essentially middle class. It pre-supposes that the borrower has a stable home; that he is not frequently forced to change residence; that he has sufficient privacy to keep his books away from infant brothers and sisters; and that he has acquired respect for borrowed property and has guilt feelings if he fails to return it. Finally, of course, it assumes that he can read, and is capable of self-instruction and self-improvement through books.<sup>35</sup>

Wilson went on to note that the disadvantaged have difficulty returning their books, and pointed once again to the pattern of low adult use in the city center. He cited the special classes begun by the Free Library of Philadelphia to help disadvantaged young men to tool up their reading and other learning skills in order to pass armed forces tests, and emphasized the high degree of motivation resulting from a specific, targeted need to improve one's lifestyle and see the world.

Mary Lee Bundy, who studied a 20 percent sample of users of 100 library units in the eight library systems of metropolitan Baltimore, Maryland, based her findings on 80 percent of some 21,500 responses. She found that in 1966, half of the users of these libraries who were 12 years old or more were students, and that 16.4 percent were housewives.<sup>36</sup> Helen Lyman notes, in her comprehensive study of *Library Materials in Service to the Adult New Reader*,<sup>37</sup> that five times as many Black women as men enrolled in the high school

equivalency program, thereby achieving the status of student as well as, in most cases, housewife.

Perhaps the most complete recent round-up of library use and nonuse information, compiled under the aegis of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries, was published as *Libraries at Large*.<sup>38</sup> Among the conclusions to be found in the mass of material:

1. that the body of recorded knowledge concerning the use of public libraries is inadequate, fragmented and not comparable;
2. that broadly based data concerning the use of libraries are almost totally absent;
3. that the literature up to that time (1967) was almost totally devoid of studies of nonusers (There have been more in the six years since the commission's various studies were analyzed and summarized.);
4. that library use has not kept pace with the increase in population, which has doubled, and attained a higher average level of education since 1949 when Berelson's classic study was published.

The commission looked carefully at previous studies of library use patterns by adults including those of Waples in 1933, Berelson in 1948, and Bundy in 1966 (the most recent major study at that time). For the commission's purposes, users were defined as adults who claimed to have visited a public library at least once during the preceding three-month period. Three out of every ten adults in the United States can be characterized as users of public libraries by this criterion. The profiles of users emerged, on a proportionate basis as follows:

1. more likely to be women;
2. likely to be young (21-34 years of age);
3. likely to be college educated;
4. more likely to be either single or married, as opposed to widowed or divorced, and particularly to be parent of two young children;
5. most likely to be Caucasian;
6. most likely to live in large urban centers (1 million population or more, or middle-sized cities—50,000 to 249,999); and
7. most likely to be in the professions or in white collar occupations with annual earnings of \$10,000 or more.

All library use, said the commission, seems to decline with age, and among people 50 years old and more, only two out of ten ever visit a library. People 21-34 are apt to be light to moderate users (13 percent of the total, three to eight times in any three-month period); middle-aged persons 35 to 49 years old tend to be the heavy users (some 7 percent of the population of adults, with nine or more visits during a three-month period).

Libraries other than public libraries (academic, professional and special) are used by only a minute proportion of the total adult population: 5 percent are classified as light users; 3 percent as moderate users; and 5 percent as heavy users.

Information as to the reasons for use are especially relevant to this overview, and the three most frequently given reasons among the user group were: (1) to get information on special problems, 52 percent; (2) to borrow nonfiction books, 50 percent; and (3) to borrow fiction books, 46 percent. It is evident from this that the information function of the library has become at least as important as its creative reading function, especially as "to use reference books and periodicals" was cited almost as often as the first two. "Add to this," says the commission report, "the 35 percent who report that they go to public libraries in order to aid their children with their schoolwork, the 15 percent who wish to examine documents, and the 10 percent who attend lectures, exhibits or performances, and we readily see that contemporary libraries are no longer mere circulation sources."<sup>39</sup>

All of this throws light on the fact that increasingly perhaps, the 25 percent or so of the adult population who claim to read often, and who told the pollsters who questioned them on behalf of the commission that they had read at least one book in the preceding three-month period, do not get their books at the library, and that readers may be no longer synonymous—if they ever were—with those who use libraries. Asked in fact where they had acquired the books they read, this particular sample replied: that they had bought them (40 percent); borrowed them from the public library (18 percent); borrowed them from friends (1 percent). The emergence of paperbacks and their accessibility is creating a high proportion of readers who are not public library users, and the public library is becoming more used for information than for reading. In all, less than one-fifth of the adult public which claims to read books, report that they borrow them from libraries.

"Not to be overlooked" said the commission report, "are some of the auxiliary functions that public libraries offer the adults who use them. For some 22 percent public libraries offer the opportunity to relax and browse, for one in ten the public library is a place where one can work in quietude and without interruption, and for 8 percent, public libraries are used for borrowing or listening to phonograph records. Thus, a number of adults who visit public libraries view them at least to some extent as oases—quiet refuges that offer a pleasant haven where one can retreat temporarily from the daily hustle and bustle of life."<sup>39</sup>

So much then for a very once-over-lightly look at the studies that have been done of library use, and nonuse. Growing out of them, in part, and in the past seven years or so, has been a burgeoning interest in user needs—especially the needs of those who do not use libraries and therefore do not apparently associate them with whatever needs they may have for information, personal development, or recreation. Various methods have been employed for carrying out these inquiries. Among the most fruitful and direct has been to hold hearings, or set up conferences in which a cross section of citizens or representatives of potential user groups could express their needs.

In the summer and early fall of 1967, the National Advisory Commission on Libraries held a series of regional hearings at which subcommittees of commission members heard testimony from businessmen, professional people, farmers, white collar and blue collar workers, students, teachers, and local, state and national officials from communities of varying sizes. There was testimony about the needs of the blind, the aging, and virtually every religious and ethnic group. Some 400 people in twelve areas of the country from Alaska to Florida gave opinions and suggestions as to needs which libraries ought to try to fill.

A Ford Foundation-sponsored study of neighborhood information centers, conducted by Alfred Kahn and others at the Columbia School of Social Work showed a great need for information on all manner of subjects. It engendered also, to Kahn's surprise, "considerable response from librarians and library people at all levels. I had apparently underestimated opportunities in this sphere."<sup>40</sup> The National Book Committee's survey and analysis of "outreach" library programs which were in operation by the summer of 1966<sup>41</sup> reflected keen awareness of user needs by a number of

libraries, and willingness to move into new areas of service. Some thirty-three communities in nineteen states were involved, and community information and referral service was found to be one of the great needs of ethnic minorities, the culturally different and poor. Legal aid, employment opportunity services, homework study space and basic adult education and literacy training (especially short term, to pass a test or make an application)—all have been constant in this, as in all other assessments. There is evidence that people living in the most disorganized communities can be taught to bring their survival needs to those libraries which are committed to providing direct responses to them.

Long term needs, which one might call “developmental”—the need to learn or sharpen communication, especially word skills of listening and speaking, writing and reading; and the need for social identity and cultural pride—have been probed and successfully served by some libraries, too. Libraries have found that interaction of people of all ages, and an integrated use of materials in all formats are important elements. There are rewards for learning to read which may be, in the long run, as important to a person as the most pragmatic job, health or housing information, and these cannot be lost sight of in the stampede to emphasize information services. Helen Lyman cites some of these literacy benefits self-perceived by her sample of new adult readers: two-thirds could communicate better; one-half had more confidence; while one-half said they related to people better. The most important payoff of learning to read, according to participants in the Norfolk College Reading Project, was the enhancement of the feeling of identity, dignity and personal worth.

Several studies of user needs, especially for information, are currently underway or have recently been completed. One, primarily a literature search, is being conducted by Drexel University Library School. The National Survey of Library Services to the Aging, conducted by Booz, Allen and Hamilton in 1972, gave examples of what is being, and what should be done in this area.<sup>42</sup> Edward Banfield in his chapter in the *Metropolitan Library* suggests a need, especially in urban areas, for tutorial services, subject oriented ones for serious readers, will enable them to work with specialists; for private study cubicles in libraries for adults; and for a mail-order purchase of books service through libraries.<sup>43</sup> A Dallas Public Library independent study project which addresses the continuing education

needs of adults is in progress, as is the Neighborhood Information Centers Demonstration Project, which is being directed by the Cleveland Public Library with user need and library response investigations being done along with practice in four other inner cities.

One of the most interesting and specialized assessments was carried on by the direct interview technique, and three pilot projects have been built directly upon the findings. This is the library project of the National Indian Education Association in which information needs expressed by Indian people on three different reservations to Indian interviewers formed the basis for development of the following library services: information on how to organize for social action; for legal and civil rights; for local issues; for job and education skill development; for opportunities; for health and other services; and material to introduce and reinforce and preserve cultural heritage, and enhance self-identity, self-worth and pride.<sup>44</sup>

Among poor people in rural areas, as in cities, there is a great attraction for material dealing with "life coping skills." The Appalachian Adult Education Center at Morehead State University, which is carrying on a demonstration of six basic models for coordinating Library and Basic Education Services, has produced a Life Coping Skills Materials List, as of June 1973.<sup>45</sup> Materials are organized under seventeen major headings from advocacy to transportation, and including, among others, aging, children, consumer economics, family, health, housing, jobs, relating to others and self; with many subcategories which reflect the needs and interests of those with whom the project has been working.

In 1971, the Public Library Association, a division of ALA, received funds for a public library goals/feasibility study from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Council on Library Resources. Allie Beth Martin, Librarian of the Tulsa City/County Library was appointed project coordinator. A literature search provided a record of public library development, user needs and goals research since the Berelson study; interviews and questionnaires produced *A Strategy for Public Library Change* in 1972. Particularly valuable in this study are projections of user needs for the last quarter of this century as presumed by population growth and other factors:

1. families with fewer children who place more emphasis on the quality of education and life generally for those they do have;

2. more affluence and more leisure time;
3. a higher median age (from 27.6 to 32) by the year 2000, and a decided increase in the group of people 60 years of age and older;
4. greater emphasis placed on continuing education through the adult years;
5. other factors which the study sees as affecting public library programs serving adults include: external degrees and noncampus higher education; vocational dislocation and change; majority/minority conflicts and other tensions; greater citizen participation; the growing complexity of social and economic structures; and the need to preserve institutions that promote the freedom of human choice.<sup>46</sup>

Martin emphasizes the basic and general disagreement of most libraries surveyed in her study with the service philosophy outlined by Berelson. In the *Inquiry* study of twenty-two years before, Berelson said that public libraries should learn to serve better the group they already served well, i.e., the better educated middle class; whereas the majority of the libraries responding to the *Strategy* study had embarked on the opposite course of service to all, especially to inner-city, low income and less educated groups.

Finally, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, fulfillment of a priority recommendation of the earlier, ad hoc advisory commission whose findings have been already referred to, is at present exploring user needs in some depth. It commissioned papers and held a conference of experts in June 1973 to consider the needs of such groups in the society as: women, homemakers and parents; young adults/students; institutionalized persons; the mentally and physically handicapped; persons in the business community; the aging; the geographically remote; and the economically and socially deprived. The commission regards the needs of users and potential users, met and unmet at present, as a major priority in making recommendations for nationwide planning for library and information service. It has taken steps to identify major groups whose needs demand special attention, and to ascertain what those needs are, with a view to comparing present provisions with needs on a cost-benefit basis. Findings will be published and acted upon.

So, in summary, it can be said that user needs mined thus far by

various groups reflect primarily immediate needs for library services and materials that relate to immediate problems of life: home, business and farm management; child nurture; health and nutrition; housing and jobs; current events and hobbies. Libraries, in a sense, are at the threshold of user potential and the exploration so far has probed almost entirely the first level of need. They are in almost the same position as the nineteenth-century missionaries who found that they must tend to physical needs before they could offer their prescriptions for spiritual needs. There is not as much evidence at present as one would hope to see that librarians are aware that there are as many *potential* dreamers, lovers of art and beauty and poetry in poor neighborhoods as there are in middle-class ones, and that libraries have as much responsibility to provide for the emotional and often unconscious and unarticulated needs of people as they do for those recognized, real and practical needs.

Which materials do people choose when they realize that such things exist and they have access to them? What books do they like to read when they are able to read well enough to feel comfortable doing it?

People in general like what they have been exposed to; they are often unwilling to try things that are unfamiliar or that may demand more response than they know how to give. We know that nonprint media appeal to library users and potential readers. Television of course, has been a household companion for twenty or more years of almost the entire population; films, recordings, tapes, pictures, games, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets and books—especially paperbacks—are familiar to most. Helen Lyman's survey of books enjoyed by new adult readers included especially: lives of real people; world news; ethnic and cultural materials, and books by authors of the same ethnic group as their own; romances; sports; and adventure and mystery. Among Blacks, stories of the Black experience, especially by those who have in some way "made it" in the society, are popular. Poetry and short stories make a good showing, too. It is evident that for all social and economic classes, choice of reading material still represents the broadest range of options, and the possibility of being totally individual and independent—a possibility that is less and less frequently offered in other activities in today's world.

Queries to librarians concerning book selection in libraries elicited this comment quoted in *Libraries at Large*: "We used to ask, 'How

much will this book be used?' Now we ask, 'Should this book be available in this library?'<sup>47</sup> Many observers have noted the increased demand for books at both ends of the difficulty level and specialization spectrum: the highly specialized and the very easy to read and elementary. Much fiction reading has been siphoned off from library borrowing into paperback buying, so that although libraries have been reporting the upsurge and preponderance of nonfiction borrowing for some years now, millions of copies of fiction titles are being sold, and titles in the "romantic novel" category—e.g., the Gothnic novel—are finding more readers than ever. Easy, fast-moving and interesting material for scarcely literate adults is still cited as a great need in all quarters, as is popular material in foreign languages, and simply written technical material.

Some kind of "sorting out" of the implications of all of this fragmentary and not totally enlightening knowledge, or half-knowledge, of adult reading—who does it, and why, and what it does for them—is needed. Do these implications persuade one that it would be desirable for more adults to become readers of books as differentiated from users of books and/or information and, if so, can this be accomplished and how? Is there sufficient evidence that people in this technological-electronic age need reading, or need to be readers, if they are to transcend the many frightening, threatening and disagreeable and dangerous conditions of life in this last lap of the twentieth century?

My answer to all of these questions is "yes." It is obvious that many of the needs which used to be filled only by print, and therefore by reading, are now being, and will in the future be, filled by other means. Superficial and short-term needs for information, for news, and for solutions to immediate problems will be filled by computers, by television, and by other media not yet invented. But short-term solutions do not often change lives as we have learned and keep on learning from the welfare program. Perhaps we are in process of clarification—perhaps even purification—of what is meant by reading.

There can be little responsible disagreement with the fact that the vast majority of those who provide leadership in the transaction of the major social, economic and political business of the United States (or any other country) are those who characteristically use reading skills on a daily basis and in every act of communication they perform. Reading hones the ability to focus, grasp, analyze, and interpret. Reading relates to more than just printed symbols: one

reads an expression, a situation, the message of a television commercial, or the convictions of the news commentator with just about the degree of precision developed and exercised by practicing with printed words.

Different media communicate differently at various levels and in varied depths to different people in different situations. Although most realize that a picture may, indeed, in some circumstances be worth a thousand words, the work of the world cannot be conducted only with pictures and spoken language. Higher intelligence and entrepreneurial skill cannot be developed without a high degree of ability to read. The conciseness and clarity, the discipline required to express ideas in written symbols, are essential also to the creative, sophisticated use of the sound and sight media.

Many poor people, undereducated, and nonreaders seem to understand this, and many of them are not content with the often-expressed, well meaning, middle-class, and perhaps subconsciously racist contention that their children do not need to learn to read—they can look at pictures instead. Poor people, minority people, know better. They know that their children will need the reading skills and experiences, and the *thinking* skills these help to sharpen, if they are to have a *real* shot at self-determination, and they are fiercely determined to get them.

As the era of human resources continues to emerge, it becomes ever more clear that flexible minds and strong spirits will be required to adapt creatively to the quickening pace of change. As it unfolds, the relationship of books and reading to massive, worldwide concerns of people for the quality of life, and the environment of spirit and body; the rising tide of human expectation and liberation; and a higher consciousness of personhood and humanity becomes more clear.

August Heckscher said it beautifully in his article on reading in America, in the 1959 report on *Reading for Life*. "All books are, in the deepest sense, a criticism of life. It is significant that when people have been most involved in the realities of their fate, as in periods of war and depression, the amount of reading in our society has mounted. This is not merely because there is then more time, or greater need for economy, or less competition from consumer goods. It is also because people have felt themselves immersed in events, and in books they have found their own experience made comprehensible and deepened by art."<sup>48</sup> At another point

Heckscher says: "The answers we need are not in books, but the qualities necessary to attain the answers—a basic wisdom, an alive sense of life's meaning and direction—will be found through the use of books, or probably not at all. . . . The statesmen who rode out the storms of another revolutionary age—men like Adams, Jefferson and Madison, who imposed the pattern of their thought upon our early history and institutions—were among the best read men of their own or of any other period."<sup>49</sup>

How can one stir up "an alive sense of life's meaning and direction" in people who have been dulled by despair, who cannot believe that life has any meaning or direction beyond the survival of crisis and the temporary cessation of pain? Or, how does one bring belief in the future, or hope of gaining some control over one's destiny even to the middle-class nonreader who has been taught to silence his questionings and fill his voids with things instead of thoughts?

The implications of the studies and findings discussed in this paper tend to support (1) that exposure to and access to books make a difference; (2) that people links, people that bridge the gap between life and books, make a big difference; (3) that self-image and self-identity are at once motivators to read, and are reinforced or generated by reading; (4) that reading is seen, especially by younger people, as a social, rather than an antisocial activity; and (5) that longings and unconscious concerns, as well as needs and interests, and other media, can lead to reading if the right conditions prevail.

What should librarians, booksellers, teachers, parents, friends and behavior models do about any or all of this? Librarians need to renew their commitment to adults, and to reading. They need to learn enough about the teaching of reading, methods of instruction, and levels of reading skill to be able to collaborate effectively with reading teachers and agencies; to provide for the teaching of reading in libraries; to train volunteers and aides to work as models of reading behavior, reading guides; to create opportunities for interaction and socializing related to books and reading; to make common cause with booksellers to produce book and reading events for adults; to expedite book ownership through "buy or borrow" experiments; or to find ways to sell books through the library if other sources are not conveniently available, because of the strong correlation between book ownership and self-identification as a

reader. As MacDonald says: "Clearly, there is a need for planning, coordination and implementation of a library literacy effort at the national level, including studies, experimental projects, demonstrations, institutes and, at the same time, the provision of immediate service however imperfect."<sup>50</sup>

Right now, libraries are going full steam ahead on implementation of their role as information and referral centers, and this is fine. But they must be careful not to lose sight of long range needs, and their responsibility to help "survival information" seekers and new literates make the transition—or even want to and believe they can make the transition—into the reading habit, into becoming readers.

We know that "all behavior is learned, and that much of it is learned by imitation. Reader behavior is no exception. Attitudes toward reading and the way of life that reading creates are learned by children from both the conscious and the unconscious actions and feelings of the adults who surround them from their earliest years. This means especially, but not exclusively their parents. . . . But what of the child who sees no reading models in his home? Suppose he has parents who, for one reason or another, can't read or who don't want to read? Suppose books are neither valued nor available in his home. . . . For the child who missed out on an early reading start, it is never too late."<sup>51</sup> Recent writing by young Black men like Malcolm X, whose homes could not give them a reading start, gives powerful testimony that an adult reading model and a reading atmosphere can come later than early childhood and still make reading a powerful force in one's life. Claude Brown, in *Manchild in The Promised Land* tells of meeting his adult reading model, a middle-aged foreign woman, a refugee whose background could hardly have been more different from his. She believed in his intellect, talked books with him, encouraged him to become a reader, and later, a writer. We have the experience too, of Dan Feder, who set out to get some of the young adults in a Michigan prison *Hooked On Books*,<sup>52</sup> and succeeded; and many other experiences of a similar nature.

Teachers, foremen in factories, labor leaders, wardens, not to mention librarians, could all become reading models, and help others to do so. Youth workers who are helping young people to reshape their lives in drug clinics, social workers, and people working with the elderly could be sensitized to opportunities to

create readers. Programs aimed at keeping alive the interests and involvements of older, better educated, more affluent Americans would be very important. Librarians, again, are the logical professionals to initiate and organize the efforts.

Museums, cultural centers, neighborhood centers—all could be brought into partnership with libraries and bookstores to help provide the social settings and the curiosities and interests that stimulate reading. Television stations that would relate reading to their programming through follow-up bibliographies to extend interests stimulated by telecasts could be more active and most effective partners. Industries and foundations with local interests could sponsor community or statewide research projects which would provide information for library planning. Some of the research needs pointed out by Steinberg need to be implemented, especially those that would help establish a closer working relationship between book ownership and book borrowing opportunities.

As to public policy, government at all levels must be convinced that reading and its encouragement, provision of quality library resources, the care and freedom and encouragement of writers are matters of genuine commitment and not just lip-service. With just a small amount of encouragement so far, several states have had the courage to name reading as their number one priority, and to put some of their state funds behind it. Social goals, family patterns and lifestyles will be involved in turning America into a nation of readers, with all that that implies, but legislation in support of this long-range objective, with appropriations to implement it, would be a splendid and necessary start. Such legislation, under consideration at various stages in Congress for the past year or more, has been overshadowed by the inertia of a weakened administration, economic disaster and other crises, while existing library legislation languishes before an uncertain future.

Above all, however, stands the commitment of librarians to an open society, to the importance of developing adult readers, and to their own expanding vision of professional responsibility and potential. I believe that librarians can be counted on, now that so many of them have hit their stride, to make all the studies, all the demonstrations, and all the uncertainties of the past the prelude to a glorious future.

## References

1. Fertig, Eymar, comp. *International Bibliography to the Sociology and Psychology of Reading*. Heinz Steinberg, ed. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1971.
2. Groombridge, Brian. *The Londoner and His Library*. London, Research Institute for Consumer Affairs, 1964.
3. Elberling, B.V. "The Danish School of Librarianship's Sociological Laboratory," *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*, 20:184-88, July-Aug. 1966.
4. Steinberg, Heinz. "Books and Readers as a Subject of Research in Europe and America," *International Social Science Journal*, 24:745, 1972.
5. Waples, Douglas. *The Library*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1937.
6. Steinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 745-46.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 746.
8. Lichstenstein-Rother, Isle, ed. *Jugend und Buch in Europa*. Gutersloh, Bertelsmann, 1967.
9. Hajda, Jan. "An American Paradox: People and Books in the Metropolis." Ph.D. dissertation prepared for the University of Chicago, 1964.
10. Berelson, Bernard. *The Library's Public: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1949; and Leigh, Robert D. *The Public Library in the United States*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1950.
11. Ennis, Philip H. *Adult Book Reading in the United States: A Preliminary Report* (National Opinion Research Center Report, no. 105). Chicago, National Opinion Research Center, 1965.
12. ————. "Who Reads?" In Ralph W. Conant and Kathleen Molz, eds. *The Metropolitan Library*. Cambridge, Mass., M.I.T. Press, 1972.
13. U.S. Office of Business Economics. *Survey of Current Business, U.S. Office of Business Economics*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1961.
14. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, several editions, esp. 1970.
15. Machlup, Fritz. *The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States*. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press, 1962.
16. Meade, Edward J. "Reading the First R: A Point of View." Speech delivered to the College Reading Association, Sept. 1972.
17. Wegman, Edward. "The Books People Read," *Unesco Courier*, 1972.
18. Lazarsfeld, Paul F. *Radio and the Printed Page*. New York, Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1940.
19. Steinberg, *op. cit.*, p. 750.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 751.
21. Mann, Peter H., and Burgoyne, Jacqueline L. *Books and Reading*. London, Deutch, 1969; and Mann, Peter H. *Books: Buyers and Borrowers*. London, Deutch, 1971.
22. Steinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 751-52.
23. Syndicat National des Editeurs. *Etudes sur la Lecture et le Livre*. Paris, Syndicat National des Editeurs, 1960.
24. Schmidtchen, Gerhard. "Eine Politik für das Buch," *Börsenblatt für den Deutschen Buchhandel*, 24:3239-55, Dec. 20, 1968.

25. Steinberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 752-53.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 748.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 753.
28. "What and Why is Adult Reading Improvement?" In Bernice MacDonald and Faye Simkin, eds. *Adult Reading Improvement* (ASD Guide to the Literature of Adult Services, no. 2). Chicago, ALA, 1967, p. 2.
29. National Society for the Study of Education. Committee on Adult Reading. *Adult Reading* (Yearbook of the National Society . . . 55th, pt. 1). David H. Clift, ed. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956.
30. Spencer, Marion. "Case Four." In Conference on Library Service to the Undereducated. *Library Service for the Undereducated*. Dorothy Bendix, ed. Philadelphia, Drexel Institute of Technology, 1966, p. 43.
31. Ennis, "Who Reads?" *op. cit.*, p. 52.
32. Lipsman, Claire K. *The Disadvantaged and Library Effectiveness*. Chicago, ALA, 1972.
33. Martin, Lowell A. *Library Response to Urban Change: A Study of the Chicago Public Library*. Chicago, ALA, 1969, p. 4.
34. Bonser, Charles F., and Wentworth, Jack R. *A Study of Adult Information Needs in Indiana* (Indiana Library Studies Report, no. 3). Bloomington, Indiana State Library, 1970, p. 113.
35. Wilson, Geoffrey. "Case Five." In Conference on Library Service to the Undereducated, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
36. Bundy, Mary Lee. *Metropolitan Public Library Users: A Report of a Survey of Adult Library Use in the Maryland-Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan Area*. College Park, University of Maryland School of Library and Information Services, 1968.
37. Lyman, Helen H. *Library Materials in Service to the Adult New Reader*. Chicago, ALA, 1973.
38. Knight, Douglas M., and Nourse, E. Shepley. *Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and the National Interest*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1969.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
40. Kahn, Alfred J., et al. *Neighborhood Information Centers*. New York, Columbia University School of Social Work, 1966, p. 24.
41. National Book Committee. *Neighborhood Library Centers and Services*. New York, National Book Committee, 1966.
42. *National Survey of Library Services to the Aging*. Cleveland Public Library (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology), 1971.
43. Banfield, Edward C. "Some Alternatives for the Public Library." In Conant and Molz, eds., *op. cit.*, pp. 89-100.
44. *Summary of the National Indian Education Library Project Report*. St. Paul, University of Minnesota Press, 1972.
45. Cotner, Susan, comp. *Coping Skills Materials List: Categories and Sub-categories*. Morehead, Ky., Appalachian Adult Education Center, Bureau of Research and Development, Morehead State University, June 1973. (Mimeographed)
46. Public Library Association. *A Strategy for Public Library Change: Proposed Public Library Goals-Feasibility Study*. Allie Beth Martin, project coordinator. Chicago, ALA, 1972.

47. Knight and Nourse, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
48. Heckscher, August. "Reading in America: Its Social and Cultural Background." In Price, Jacob M., ed., *Reading for Life: Developing the College Student's Lifetime Reading Interest*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1959, p. 60.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
50. MacDonald, Bernice. *Literacy Activities in Public Libraries*. Chicago, ALA, 1966, p. 00.
51. Mathews, Virginia H. *Adult Models for Children's Reading Habits* (National Right to Read Program, Parents and Beginning Readers Series, no. 8). Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1971.
52. Feder, Dan. *Hooked on Books*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1964.